

INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
ADDITIONAL FINANCING

Report No.: 89713

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 07/09/2014

I. BASIC INFORMATION**1. Basic Project Data**

Country:	Liberia	Project ID:	P147967
		Parent Project ID:	P121686
Project Name:	Liberia: Youth, Employment, Skills Project Additional Financing (P147967)		
Parent Project Name:	Liberia - Youth, Employment, Skills Project (P121686)		
Task Team Leader:	Emily Weedon Chapman		
Estimated Board date	Not applicable		
Managing Unit:	GSPDR		
Sector(s):	Education (25%); Health and Other social services (75%)		
Theme(s):	Social safety nets (75%); Improving labor markets (25%)		
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?			No
Project Financing Data (in USD Million)			
Total Project Cost:	3.40	Total Bank Financing:	0.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
Africa Catalytic Growth Fund (ACGF)			3.40
BORROWER/RECIPIENT			0.00
International Development Association (IDA)			0.00
Total			3.40
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		
Is this a Transferred project?	No		

2. Project Development Objective(s)

A. Original Project Development Objectives - Parent

The objective of the Project is to expand access of poor and young Liberians to temporary employment programs and to improve youth employability, in support of the Government of Liberia's response to the employment crisis.

B. Current Project Development Objectives - Parent

There have been no amendments to the PDO.

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

The Africa Catalytic Growth Fund (ACGF) additional financing does not propose to amend the PDO of the parent Project.

3. Project Description

1. The ACGF additional financing would provide US\$3.4 million to the Youth, Employment, Skills Project (YES) Component 1: Community Livelihoods to continue its aim to bridge the employment gap within Liberia through the increase of income generating opportunities for the poor and youth in particular. The additional financing would allow for expansion of the community-based public works subprojects under Component 1 with the adoption of an emphasis on productive activities, the piloting of business skills training, and the undertaking of an expanded impact evaluation to assess these revisions to the Project cycle. The additional financing would target 9,000 Liberians across the country's 15 counties. In order to evaluate the impact of the proposed subproject revisions, the 9,000 participants would be divided to receive three variations of the activity, as summarized below and further detailed in the revised Project Operation Manual (POM).

Community Training (Cash transfer + business skills training)	Community Livelihoods (Productive public works)	Community Livelihoods & Training (Productive public works + business skills training)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">•1,500 people in 30 communities•Cash transfer of US\$150 per participant•10 days of life skills training•10 days of business skills training	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•3,750 people in 75 communities•Cash transfer of US\$150 per participant•Support for productive subproject identified by community•10 days of life skills training	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•3,750 people in 75 communities•Cash transfer of US\$150 per participant•Support for productive subproject identified by community•10 days of life skills training•10 days of business skillstraining

2. The additional financing would include quotas for the equal participation of men and women, as well as for a minimum of 75 percent of participants being aged between 18 and 35 years old. To date, the parent Project has successfully achieved gender equality and the

additional financing would reflect lessons learned from these activities to maintain this balance. The latter quota allows for the inclusion of beneficiaries above 35 years old who meet the Project's targeting criteria, as detailed in the POM. This inclusive approach to targeting of men and women, as well as youth and adults aims to promote the Project's positive contributions to the dynamics of beneficiary communities.

3. Subcomponent 1.1 would be revised to encourage the productive outcomes witnessed amongst some previous Project beneficiaries, such as investing the labor and income transfer provided through the Project's public works activities in agriculture and non-farm household enterprise activities. The additional financing would formalize the community-driven nature of activities under the parent Project by facilitating community beneficiaries to develop public works subproject proposals for investment in community farms or other productive activities. Subproject proposals would outline the identification of activities, allocation of participant labor, timeline for work phases, necessary inputs, including allocation of land by the community if necessary, and sustainability and management measures. All subproject proposals will be screened by the Project's implementing partner, the Liberia Agency for Community Empowerment (LACE), prior to the commencement of any activities.

4. Subcomponent revisions include an emphasis on agricultural activities, although communities would have the flexibility to identify other priority productive activities, such as rural road rehabilitation. Based on recommendations of the parent Project's mid-term review (MTR) and analysis of work required during an agricultural cycle in Liberia, this subcomponent proposes to increase the allocation of work days from 40 days (as provided under previous phases of the Project) to 50 days. To support these activities, the subcomponent would invest in capital inputs (with an established per community budget limit) as identified by the community subproject proposals. The revised POM specifies a negative list for these inputs; it includes tree crops, poultry/livestock, and chemical fertilizers.

5. The additional financing also would test the viability and impact of providing business skills training to the Project's beneficiaries. This would build on the positive outcomes witnessed from the life skills training taught under the parent Project. A business skills training has been developed for illiterate learners and depends on interactive pedagogies, including games, group discussion, and visual aids. The curriculum is based on good practice examples from Cote d'Ivoire, Liberia, and Uganda, amongst others, has been subject to Government and non-governmental organization (NGO) consultations, and will be pre-tested with existing Component 1 beneficiaries. The training would be conducted at the community level over a three week period by locally recruited trainers, hired by a local NGO partner, and approved and trained by LACE. The first week of training would provide introductory lessons about starting/expanding a household enterprise and basic market research. Participants would then have a one week break to begin developing simple enterprise development plans, with one-on-one follow-up by the trainers during this period. The final week of training would focus on group review and assessment of the plans. Curriculum design and implementation arrangements prioritize the delivery of training activities in remote and unserved communities.

6. The additional financing does not propose any changes to the institutional arrangements of the subcomponent. LACE would remain the implementing partner. LACE would be

responsible for the overall management of the activities and ensuring their implementation in keeping with the revised POM. As outlined in the POM, LACE would recruit local NGO partners, Community Facilitators (CFs), to undertake the day-to-day implementation of activities at the community level. The Project’s Master Trainers would be retained to provide support for CF implementation of the training modules.

7. Subcomponent 1.2 would continue to focus on capacity building and technical oversight for productive safety net activities. The additional financing would support an impact evaluation of the proposed revisions to the Community Livelihoods activities. The key research question of the evaluation would be to assess whether the proposed design revisions of a public works subproject, with a greater emphasis on training, can promote productive investment toward self-employment and/or household enterprise development.

8. There would be no change to Component 2: Skills for Jobs activities under which are expected to be completed by December 2014.

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

9. The additional financing will fund activities under Component 1: Community Livelihoods in rural and peri-urban areas in all 15 counties in Liberia. It is proposed that the geographical allocation is split equally between the 15 counties, with 600 participants per county. The final allocation of participants per county, however, may be revised to take into account the relative population and poverty levels within the counties.

10. Within the county, geographic selection of districts and then communities will be based on the following criteria: poverty, lack of access to income earning opportunities/investment activities and basic social services, infrastructure deficits, and previous participation in earlier phases of the Project. LACE will organize meetings with local government authorities and NGO representatives, first the county level to identify districts and then at the district level to identify communities. LACE will retain minutes of the meetings with the key stakeholders, as outlined in the POM, regarding selection of beneficiary communities as based on these criteria.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Gloria Malia Mahama (GURDR)

Felix Nii Tettey Oku (GENDR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The project triggers OP4.01 due to the planned small scale public works and small scale agriculture and aquaculture activities under the Community Livelihood subproject works. An ESMF and RPF have been prepared to address potential environmental/social impacts

		associated with the demand driven sub-projects and mitigation measures related to the project activities.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	Natural habitats are not expected to be significantly impacted by the project; all subprojects that might trigger OP4.04 are eliminated at the screening stage.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	Forests are not expected to be significantly impacted by the project; all subprojects that might trigger OP4.36 are eliminated at the screening stage.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	The works to be undertaken under this project are not expected to trigger this safeguard.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	The Project does not involve or affect physical cultural resources.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	There are no Indigenous Peoples in the Project area.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	<p>OP/BP 4.12 is triggered because Component 1 of the additional financing emphasizes expansion of community-based public works that will include investing in community farm, rural road rehabilitation, and other productive activities. These activities may require land acquisition and preparation for communal agricultural production. This may lead to temporary loss of land, livelihoods, and assets. It could also deepen vulnerability for occupiers of community lands or inflame existing land disputes if validation or due diligence are not undertaken to identify land owners and occupiers and mitigate any adverse impact.</p> <p>A RPF has been prepared for this Project. Given that sub-projects are identified during project implementation through a community participatory process, the exact activity and location is not yet known. Therefore, all subprojects will be screened for potential impacts during Project implementation. Where land</p>

		acquisition and loss of livelihood, assets, or access are involved, appropriate action plans will be prepared to mitigate these impacts. Even for communal land, validation and evidence of identification and consultation with land owners and occupiers where applicable will be undertaken and agreement on the usage of the land will be evidenced in a signed document.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The project does not involve dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	N/A
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	N/A

II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:

11. In accordance with the World Bank's Safeguard Policy on Environmental Assessment, the YES Project has been classified as a Category B project. The Project is expected to have limited, localized, and reversible adverse potential impacts on human populations and the wider environmental which are site-specific and can be relatively easily mitigated in most cases. The parent YES Project triggered World Bank safeguard policy OP 4.01 (Environmental Assessment). The additional financing has triggered the same safeguard policy OP 4.01 (Environmental Assessment) and also triggers safeguard policy OP 4.12 (Involuntary Resettlement).

12. The parent Project has shown a satisfactory performance in the implementation of safeguard arrangements. The overall safeguards compliance of the parent Project was also rated as Satisfactory in the latest Implementation Status and Results Report (ISR). The activities undertaken primarily included the basic road maintenance, such as clearing brush and filling potholes, the cleaning and clearing of public areas, and a limited number of small scale agricultural activities. The parent YES Project adopted the ESMF for the Community Empowerment Project II (CEPII), a Bank-financed Grant managed by LACE from 2007 to 2013. An environmental assessment in January 2009 of the Cash-for-Work Temporary Employment Project (CfWTEP) component of the CEPII, on which the Parent YES Project Component 1 is built, found no apparent negative impact from the subproject works.

13. A safeguards audit, conducted in March 2014, confirmed the parent Project's overall environmental compliance as satisfactory. Site visits to selected subproject sites were undertaken to assess safeguards compliance and performance. A risk based approach was adopted in the selection of the sites to ensure that every type of subproject works was visited.

This included supported sites with small scale agricultural activities that the additional financing is looking to upscale. It was observed that the existing mitigation measures are addressing the actual environmental impacts from the works and will be adequate to mitigate expansion of similar activities under the additional financing. The audit noted that investments are small-scale community-driven development (CDD) sub-projects whose overall environmental impacts are minimal and that the project has demonstrated good environmental practice. Copies of completed subproject screening checklist, EMP were observed as required by the ESMF for the parent YES Project. Areas for capacity building include clarifying the responsibility of a clear national focal point for safeguards at LACE and creating a central repository for filing of relevant safeguard documentation.

14. The environmental risks foreseen under the Project are limited. The upscaling of the activities under the additional financing of Component 1 will include small scale agricultural and aqua-cultural (fish pond) activities with minimal impact to identified environmental receptors around the subproject sites. In March 2014, an environmental audit of a selected sample of the activities that were supported under the parent YES Project, and similar to the proposed upscaling activities under the additional financing, found no observable adverse environmental impact to surrounding receptors. The additional financing will not support the use of chemical pesticides as part of the agriculture upscaling activities under Component 1. Chemical pesticides have been included on the negative list of the project revised POM. Moreover, as noted above, LACE will screen all proposals for subproject activities prior to commencement of any works. An EMP checklist will be completed for all subproject works that do not require an ESIA following the in-house subproject screening.

15. If the Government or other development partners contribute material inputs to the Project, Component 1 may also undertake other activities building or improving community assets such as replacing or laying culverts, painting public buildings, and minor rehabilitation of public schools, health clinics, community center, and markets. Any such contributions would be detailed in the community subproject proposal, reviewed by LACE, including screening for any potential social or environmental impacts, and submitted for World Bank for No Objection prior to approval. Prior to any such construction, the Project will conduct an assessment of potential environmental and social impacts. In addition, some works undertaken may require the provision of ear protection, protective headgear and gloves, masks, and safety shoes to workers to mitigate safety and health concerns. The revised POM provides further guidance through specific screening tools and mitigation measures, including a subproject-specific EMP checklist, as well as an outline of the roles and responsibilities of all parties responsible for safeguards monitoring and supervision.

16. This project triggers OP 4.12 (Involuntary Resettlement) and requires the preparation of a RPF. Under Component 1, the public works emphasizes investing in community farms and other productive activities, which may result in land acquisition. Even where lands are donated for free by the community to the Project, LACE will conduct due diligence verification to validate the status of land allocated to the Project by the traditional authorities or family heads. Evidence of informed consultation with community members and occupiers of the land, if any, is required. Agreements reached during these consultations should be signed by all relevant parties and documented. The community identification and allocation of land for Project activities helps to

mitigate the potential for loss of livelihoods, deepening of vulnerability, or other negative impacts to specific persons affected by the land released for the Project. However, should there be land acquisition leading to involuntary resettlement and/or losses of access to resources and livelihoods, the Project will be mandated to develop a full or abbreviated Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) consistent with the guidance in the RPF.

17. The social risks also include possible tensions regarding employment, including the selection of project beneficiaries and beneficiary expectations of the Project. Given interest in previous temporary employment and skills development interventions, the demand by potential beneficiaries is foreseen to significantly outstrip the supply of work and training opportunities. This risk can be mitigated through transparent selection processes and effectiveness dissemination of information. Mechanisms for effective targeting and recruitment are detailed in the POMs for Component 1. Open and transparent information campaigns will be run to ensure that the targeting rationale of the Project is clear and well shared. Revisions to the Component 1 POM, as updated for the additional financing, reflect lessons learned under the parent YES Project to improve targeting and communications activities. The additional financing aims also to mitigate this risk by increasing funding support to scale-up opportunities for youth under Component 1.

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

18. As detailed above, the safeguard issues identified are not expected to have any long-term impacts. Furthermore, establishing preventive mitigation measures and ensuring their proper implementation throughout the Project also should limit any potential adverse effects in the immediate and longer-term.

3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.

19. Project alternatives were not considered relevant because the YES Project is envisioned to have limited and reversible adverse impacts on human populations and the wider environment which can be easily mitigated by simple measures. Safeguard and impact evaluations undertaken of the pilot CfWTEP, the parent YES Project activities to date, and feedback from recent consultations undertaken during revisions of the Project's ESMF and RPF for this additional financing showed an overall positive social and environmental impacts.

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.

20. The assessment of Category B projects requires examination of the Project's potential negative and positive environmental and social impacts and identification of measures needed to prevent, minimize, mitigate, or compensate for adverse impacts and improve environmental performance. The Government of Liberia through its implementing partner, LACE, has revised the existing ESMF and RPF to assess and provide suitable mitigation to all potential identified adverse environmental and social impacts associated with the additional financing of the YES Project. The revised ESMF and RPF were duly disclosed publicly in country on June 13, 2014 and to the World Bank's InfoShop on July 9, 2014. As noted above, the revision of the POM for Component 1 also reiterates the operational mitigation measures to address potentially negative social and environmental impacts of the proposed additional financing to the YES Project.

21. The institutional capacity of the relevant Government ministries and Project implementing partners has improved over the years through successful implementation of similar World Bank funded projects. LACE has been implementing World Bank-financed projects since 2005 and has an existing ESMF and RPF for the Community Empowerment Project II (CEPII) and the CfWTEP, which were financed by the World Bank from 2008 to 2013 and overlap programmatically with the proposed additional financing to the YES Project. The existing ESMF and RPF have been revised to address potential environmental and social impacts from the upscaling activities, which include small scale agricultural and aquaculture subproject works. In all cases, these activities constitute small community-based works that are undertaken in close consultation with communities and local leaders. Under the parent YES Project, the Component 1 subprojects were mostly cleaning and clearing of roads and other public spaces, as well as a limited number of cases of support of communal agriculture and aquaculture. Under the proposed additional financing, the upscaling activities will include the Project's support to small scale communal agricultural and aquaculture works. The additional financing will not support the use of chemical pesticide as part of the agriculture upscaling activities under Component 1. Taken together, these activities (cleaning and clearing of roads/other public spaces and communal agriculture/aquaculture) cover the entire spectrum of works that may be undertaken by the Project beneficiaries that participate in Component 1.

22. In January 2010, in response to recommendations of a Bank safeguard supervision mission of the CEPII, LACE developed a Social and Environmental Impacts Management Plan, which focuses on delegating responsibility for the oversight of safeguard measures to specific staff, to strengthen its capacity on safeguards. This Management Plan will be sustained under the proposed additional financing to the YES Project. It will be enhanced further through the recruitment of a Social Protection Program Manager to serve as the main safeguard focal point at the national level. LACE Project Engineers, Field-based Engineers, and Community Facilitators (CFs) will oversee the potential environmental impacts arising from LACE activities. A safeguards orientation workshop was organized on April 3, 2014 at LACE for all staff and partners with responsibilities outlined in the Management Plan to highlight the potential impacts associated with the Component 1 subproject activities and identify their specific roles as part of the implementation plan. Additionally, LACE, with assistance from the Bank's Safeguards Specialist, has developed a detailed subproject screening checklist of potential impacts arising from specific activities to allow responsible staff to effectively monitor and mitigate environmental impacts of projects.

23. The additional financing would provide resources to expand the impact evaluation of Component 1. This will include a thorough environmental and social audits of subproject works to assess performance and compliance with safeguard due diligence within the revised ESMF and RPF and offer opportunity for recommended action plans address any identified noncompliance.

24. For Component 2, the Ministry of Youth and Sports is the responsible entity; however, the additional financing does not allocate resources to the continuation of Component 2 activities.

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

25. The key stakeholders involved in the YES Project include the Ministries of Planning and Economic Affairs, Youth and Sports, Education, Labor, Agriculture, and Public Works, LACE, training service providers, Community Facilitators, Community Technicians, communities benefiting from the Community Livelihood activities, and individuals receiving temporary employment or skills training through the Project. Throughout the Project's development, these stakeholders have been involved in a series of discussions regarding its rationale, design, and implementation arrangements. They will continue to be involved throughout its implementation; community participation—specifically regarding the selection of Project beneficiaries and the works undertaken—is a key feature of Component 1.

26. Additionally, various stakeholder consultations have been held during the preparation of the revisions to the Project's ESMF and RPF as part of the proposed additional financing. The consultations took the form of community fora, focus group meetings at both community and roundtable meetings. Key project stakeholders identified for consultations included Government ministries and agencies, specifically the Local Government Authorities, local NGOs, and project beneficiary community members. Meetings have been held with key officials and opinion leaders to examine the level of awareness and involvement with the Project, concerns of Project implementation, and to obtain relevant documents or baseline information of Project area and the environmental and social setting of Liberia. The consultation of the revised ESMF and RPF was undertaken within selected communities in geographically representative counties from March 23, 2014 to April 3, 2014. The consultations also served to gather information on the mandates and permitting requirements to inform the development of the Project.

27. Under the previous CfwTEP (which was an activity under the CEP II) and parent YES Project, LACE disclosed its relevant safeguards documents in country and World Bank Infoshop. The revised ESMF and RPF were duly disclosed publicly in country on June 13, 2014 and to the World Bank's InfoShop on July 9, 2014. Copies were also shared with the Liberian Environmental Protection Agency and the Ministry of Youth and Sports on June 13, 2014.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	April 16, 2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	July 9, 2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	Not applicable
"In country" Disclosure: Republic of Liberia	June 13, 2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	April 16, 2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	July 9, 2014
"In country" Disclosure: Republic of Liberia	June 13, 2014

<i>Comments:</i>	
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 [X] No [] NA []
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement	
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes [X] No [] NA []
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Sector Manager review the plan?	Yes [X] No [] NA []
OP/BP 4.37 - Safety of Dams	
Have dam safety plans been prepared?	Yes [] No [X] NA []
Have the TORs as well as composition for the independent Panel of Experts (POE) been reviewed and approved by the Bank?	Yes [] No [X] NA []
Has an Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) been prepared and arrangements been made for public awareness and training?	Yes [] No [X] NA []
OP 7.50 - Projects on International Waterways	
Have the other riparians been notified of the project?	Yes [] No [X] NA []
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 [] No [X] NA []
Has the RVP approved such an exception?	Yes [] No [X] NA []
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information	
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [X] 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 [X] No [] NA []
All Safeguard Policies	
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of	Yes [X] No [] NA []

measures related to safeguard policies?	
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [X] No [] NA []
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project includes the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [X] No [] NA []
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [X] No [] NA []

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader:	Name: Emily Weedon Chapman	
<i>Approved By:</i>		
Regional Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Alexandra C. Bezeredi	Date: July 9, 2014
Practice Manager:	Name: Stefano Paternostro	Date: July 9, 2014