

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
ADDITIONAL FINANCING**

Report No.: ISDSA6527

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 20-Feb-2014

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 20-Feb-2014

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	Project ID:	P146768
		Parent Project ID:	P117871
Project Name:	Regional Disaster Vulnerability Reduction Project (Additional Finance) (P146768)		
Parent Project Name:	Regional Disaster Vulnerability Reduction APL1 - Grenada and St. Vincent and the Grenadines (P117871)		
Task Team Leader:	Justin Taylor Locke		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	25-Feb-2014	Estimated Board Date:	09-May-2014
Managing Unit:	LCSDU	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	Irrigation and drainage (40%), Flood protection (20%), Urban Transport (20%), Aviation (20%)		
Theme(s):	Climate change (65%), Natural disaster management (15%), Other urban development (15%), Land administration and management (5%)		
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:	21.60	Total Bank Financing:	16.60
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
BORROWER/RECIPIENT			0.00
International Development Association (IDA)			16.60
Strategic Climate Fund Grant			5.00
Total			21.60
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		

Is this a Repeater project?	No
------------------------------------	----

2. Project Development Objective(s)

A. Original Project Development Objectives – Parent

The Program aims at measurably reducing vulnerability to natural hazards and climate change impacts in the Eastern Caribbean Sub-region. The objective of the Project in Grenada is to measurably reduce vulnerability to natural hazards and climate change impacts in Grenada and in the Eastern Caribbean Sub-region. The objective of the Project in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines is to measurably reduce vulnerability to natural hazards and climate change impacts in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and in the Eastern Caribbean Sub-region. The achievement of the Program Development Objectives of the Regional Disaster Vulnerability Reduction Program (RDVRP) would be measured using the following key indicators: (a) Reduced risk of OECS population to failure of public buildings and infrastructure due to natural hazards or climate change impacts; and (b) Increased capacity of OECS Governments to identify and monitor climate risk and impacts.

B. Current Project Development Objectives – Parent

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

3. Project Description

The proposed AF would be used for: a) emergency recovery activities; b) scale up activities; and c) cost overrun. Additional financing is required to cover the reconstruction needs as a results of the disaster, the financing gap for completion of the on-going RDVRP activities and the project scale up is required for financing new activities of similar type and objective to activities already included in RDVRP. There would be no change in the overall project design the project components would remain the same.

The additional funds will be used by the GoSVG to fill its financial gaps to adequately address its emergency recovery needs. The additional funds will be used for recovery and reconstruction efforts with a particular focus on the transport infrastructure to integrate disaster risk management and overall climate resilience.

The main causes for the cost overruns are: a) inflation since the approval of RDVRP in June 2011; b) increase in the scope of civil works activities due to damage occurred on account of heavy rain events experienced since 2011 combined with further decay and damage to identified rehabilitation sub-projects due to a lack of maintenance; and c) expanded scope of pre-engineering and design consultancy services required to further incorporate disaster and climate risk.

For project scale up, the proposed additional activities are in line with the original project objectives and would be the best mechanism to maximize development impact. The magnitude of scale up activities can be easily accommodated within the context of the project framework. Moreover, most of the scale-up activities were part of the initial RDVRP appraisal, but due to financing limitations all the activities could not be included under the RDVRP. Additionally, the PSIMPU would hire the

requisite additional staff to ensure the appropriate capacity is in place; coupled with the fact that the PSIPMU has gained sufficient experience in the overall project management, the PSIMPU would have the adequate capacity to implement the scaled up project.

Component 1: Prevention and Adaptation Investments

The proposed AF would be used to cover emergency response activities, financing gaps and scale up to increase the impact of RDVRP in terms of building disaster and climate resilience of the built infrastructure in the proposed Project locations. The AF would finance the following type of activities: (i) river training and bridge rehabilitations; (ii) retrofitting and rehabilitation of public buildings; (iii) rehabilitation and risk reduction of transportation infrastructure including slope stabilization and road realignments; and (iii) support for the preparation of future sub-projects. Specific sub-projects and activities identified under this component are summarized as follows:

- Emergency recovery river trainings and bridge rehabilitation;
- Financing gaps for consulting services to develop detailed designs for the Milton Cato Memorial Hospital;
- Scaled up consulting services and civil works to construct 2 additional satellite warehouses;
- Emergency recovery and scaled up consulting services and civil works for slope stabilization and road realignment works in the Dark View, Troumaca, Petit Bordel, Rose Bank, Ginger Village, Mt. Greenan, Maroon Hill, Spring, English Gutter, German Gutter and Coull's Hill areas; and
- Consulting services to carry out feasibility and pre-engineering studies and preparation of preliminary designs - including reliable cost estimates at Paget Farm in Bequia.

Component 2: Regional Platforms for Hazard and Risk Evaluation, and Applications for Improved decision making

The proposed AF would be used to cover financing gaps and scale up for the following activities to increase the impact of RDVRP. Specific sub-projects and activities identified under this component are summarized as follows:

- Scaled up scope for construction of: (i) South River Bridge; (ii) Green Hill Bridge; (iii) Dauphine Bridge; and (iv) Fenton River Fords aimed at Flood Mitigation measures for Arnos Vale/Warrawarrow River Watershed Pilot;
- Scaled up consulting services and civil works for River Defense Works at (i) Buccament; and (ii) Carriere;
- Emergency recovery coastal defense works in Dark View and Sans Souci; and
- Financing gaps required for the construction of Georgetown Coastal Defense.

Component 3: Natural disaster response investment

The proposed AF would be used to replenish the emergency response component that was utilized in response to the December 2013 disaster event.

Component 4: Project Management and Implementation Support

The AF would support strengthening of project management capacity by providing a Senior Quantity Surveyor and Procurement and Contract Management Specialist. The AF would also support M&E training, including the PPCR program level M&E, for the PSIPMU and staff of key implementing agencies. Project management and implementation support activities may include training and capacity building through participating in regional workshops and seminars. These activities are designed to improve national capacity for disaster risk management and climate change monitoring to support the integration of risk management principles into national development planning. In addition, the activities would strengthen the capacity of the PSIPMU to coordinate disaster risk management and climate resilience activities under the Project.

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

Project works may be undertaken in the principal islands of St. Vincent and the Grenadines such as St. Vincent, Bequia, Canoaun, and Union Island. Works contemplated relate to the repair and rehabilitation of existing infrastructure, retrofitting of key government buildings and new facility construction (particularly satellite warehouses), geotechnical studies and engineering supervision for slope stabilization along critical road segments, as well as river defense works and coastal erosion protection studies. The possible project locations have been field-checked by World Bank staff and are being inventoried and assessed in updated safeguards assessment instruments.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

M. Yaa Pokua Afriyie Oppong (LCSSO)

Michael J. Darr (LCSN)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	Yes	An Environmental Management Framework (EMF) was prepared and disclosed by the government in-country on January 27, 2014 based on the updated project portfolio for St. Vincent and the Grenadines. The EMF updated and expanded the previously prepared Environmental Assessment (EA) by providing screening methods and procedures for the application of Bank safeguards, including guidance on the scope of studies necessary to complete for each subproject, criteria for triggering additional studies in the case of complex or significant activities, and a generic Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for use in simple situations where activities need no additional assessment. It is likely that the majority of works will be relatively minor in nature and involve simple civil works where the environmental impacts are limited to the construction phase, requiring only the application of a standardized generic EMP, which was included in the EMF. However, any exceptions will be identified by screening as described in the

		EMF, and subject to additional assessment work during implementation.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	This safeguard has been triggered as a precaution due to potential project activities which may occur in highland forest areas, river valleys, coastlines and/or marine areas. During project preparation potentially sensitive areas were identified in riparian areas near Green Hill where bridge work is planned, at Georgetown where coastal defenses are under study, and at Ginger Village where a new road segment may be constructed. In the case of future undefined works, this policy along with all other Bank safeguards will be included in the screening procedures provided under the project EMF.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	There are no activities which would involve harvesting or change in management of forest resources.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	There are no plans for subprojects which involve augmenting the use the pesticides, herbicides or activities related to the management of pests. Incidental pesticide use from building treatments or vector control will be managed by including appropriate procedures in the generic standardized EMP for inclusion into contracts.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/ BP 4.11	Yes	While no works have been identified in sensitive areas, this safeguard is triggered as there is the small likelihood for encountering sites of cultural historical significance, particularly in the case of new construction excavations. In the case of small civil works, procedures for chance find are included in the EMF and its generic EMP together with appropriate small works contract clauses.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	The project will support the rehabilitation of small scale public infrastructure including river bank stabilization and slope stabilization sub-projects. In addition, the project may support the relocation of road infrastructure requiring the purchase of private lands. The existing Resettlement Policy Framework was updated and re-disclosed in-country by the government with sub-project resettlement plans developed

		accordingly during project implementation once final designs and resettlement impacts are known.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	

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>In accordance with Bank environmental safeguards requirements, the program has been classified as Category B, and the policy on Environmental Assessment (OP 4.01) is triggered.</p> <p>Environmental Safeguards. Prior to appraisal, the Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines (GoSVG) has updated and disclosed in-country the project-level EMF, which includes guidance during project execution for screening possible subprojects to identify complex projects or those in sensitive areas and which would require additional studies to comply with safeguards policies. A qualified external consultant has prepared this safeguards instrument for the project with support and guidance from the World Bank specialist during project preparation missions.</p> <p>For relatively uncomplicated projects, the EMF includes generic mitigation measures through the development of a generic EMP, to be included in the Operations Manual and included in future environmental compliance contracting clauses. Subprojects in environmentally complex settings or with potentially significant impacts (if unmitigated) will be identified using the screening methods in the EMF and will have individual Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) prepared as required during implementation, to develop subproject-specific mitigation measures.</p> <p>The EMF defines the principles, guidelines and procedures for assessing the environmental impacts of future individual subprojects identified and designed during project implementation. Procedures for screening future subprojects, selecting mitigation measures and conducting additional subproject-specific EIAs (if required due to environmental complexity and / or safeguard triggering) are also defined. The EMF specifically responds to the types of projects/sub-projects under Components 1 and 2 and includes standard procedures for mitigating environmental impacts of construction, monitoring and reporting. The EMF provides procedures for the application of Bank safeguards including information on subproject screening and categorization. Finally, the EMF includes a section with safeguards guidelines for emergency investments and works including a provision for expedited specialist review and the preparation of any safeguards studies prior to works as pertinent under OP 10.00.</p> <p>Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04. The EMF has been written to account for natural habitats when screening both known works and any future activities which are currently undefined. Most works in the portfolio will not affect natural habitats, and only a few have been identified with the potential to do so. During project preparation potentially sensitive areas were identified in riparian</p>

<p>areas near Green Hill where bridge work is planned, at Georgetown where coastal defenses are under study, and at Ginger Village where a new road segment may be constructed. Preliminary assessment of these projects were included in the EMF, which also contains guidance and procedures for screening future projects and triggering additional studies if need be. Erosion control, river defense and slope stabilization works thus far proposed are focused on mitigating existing landslides along public roads and are located in areas of previously altered habitat; however, areas with preserved riparian vegetation near bridges and on new roadway segments will be further assessed as explained in the EMF. Candidate sea defense works include extensive baseline data collection and a specific Environmental Impact Assessment as part of alternative selection and design. Locations for building rehabilitation and construction have been identified and will be subject to site screening, and as described in the EMF, the candidate work sites will be identified and reviewed for potential application of this policy. In the case of future undefined works, this policy along with all other Bank safeguards will be included in the screening procedures provided under the project EMF.</p> <p>Pest Management OP 4.09. This safeguard has not been triggered. Although some subproject activities may require the use of pesticides for termite control, road maintenance activities or emergency activities such as crop recovery or vector control, the use will be incidental and minor. The EMF has also provided for restricting pesticide use to licensed providers and other measures to ensure that this minimal use of pesticides is responsibly managed.</p> <p>Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11. This safeguard is triggered as a precaution as project activities may potentially include historical building retrofits, restoration of culturally significant structures, and chance finds of historically or culturally significant resources during construction of works. The EA and EMF include screening for historical structures as well as a "chance-find" procedure, particularly during activities such as major excavations, road realignments or similar works where such assets could be affected.</p> <p>Social Safeguards OP/BP 4.12. This safeguard is triggered as project activities will likely involve permanent or temporary acquisition of private lands. Land acquisition will likely be on a small scale and the nature and extent will be determined upon completion of final designs. The client has developed and disclosed a Resettlement Policy Framework and will prepare Resettlement Plans for Bank review and clearance as well as compensate affected parties prior to sub-project financing.</p>
<p>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</p>
<p>The project neither stimulates negative indirect impacts nor induces future activities in the project areas. Benefits and positive impacts will accrue from the improved resiliency of infrastructure and the increased capacity of GoSVG in managing environmental aspects.</p>
<p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p>
<p>The project has already included alternative evaluation in the terms of reference for coastal defense studies, as part of the engineering and design efforts, to avoid or minimize potential adverse impacts.</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 Central Planning Division (CPD) will manage the supervision of environmental compliance,</p>

while receiving technical support from the Minister of Works (MoW). The CPD has staffed a full-time Field Supervision Engineer with experience on similar projects (Hurricane Tomas Emergency Recovery) and so is familiar with environmental requirements. In addition to Bank requirements, CPD will also be responsible for (a) ensuring the proper application of national environmental laws, (b) ensuring environmental compliance in accordance with procedures detailed in the project's Operations Manual and (c) reflecting such requirements in associated works contracts.

Technical staff of participating Ministries will assist with contract supervision. The Ministry of Works has staffed a new Chief Engineer with abundant experience to help guide the execution of the project, ensure that environmental protection measures are implemented by contractors, and otherwise provide support to CPD.

A World Bank Environmental Specialist will further provide additional technical support by periodic field supervision. Environmental Assessments TORs will be forwarded to the Bank for review. EIAs produced will be forwarded to the Bank for review prior to the development of specific works contracts. All works contracts requiring an EIA will be subject to prior review and supervision missions will review project activities with respect to environmental compliance.

The CPD will further receive technical assistance for environmental supervision from relevant line guidelines for emergency investments and works including for the preparation of any safeguards studies prior to works as pertinent under OP 10.00.

The Central Planning Division (CPD) will manage the supervision of Social Safeguards Compliance – specifically compliance with OP/BP 4.12 – Involuntary Resettlement. The CPD has staffed a Social Safeguards Specialist and will continue to retain a specialist for the duration of the project. CPD's recent experience with land acquisition under similar projects (Hurricane Tomas Emergency Recovery Project-P124939) has increased its capacity to handle small scale land acquisition.

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

The existing EMF, RPF and Social Assessment have been updated and disclosed in-country. In addition, the Government of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines grievance redress mechanisms were documented and analyzed during the preparation of the updated RPF and Social Assessment and sent to the Bank for information purposes. The EMF, RPF and Social Assessment provides for future public comment as needed.

The majority of works contemplated involve the repair and retrofitting of existing infrastructure. In these cases, impacts to stakeholders will relate to temporary inconveniences associated with construction activities and will be managed to minimize impacts to the greatest extent possible. Advanced public notifications will inform potentially affected persons. Relevant line ministries will assist MoTW and the CPD in these efforts.

When sub-project-specific Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) or Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) are required, specific stakeholders will be identified and public meetings will be conducted to enable the reflection of stakeholder concerns in project design. These requirements are outlined in the project Operations Manual and will be incorporated into the design phase of relevant sub-projects.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	28-Jan-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	29-Jan-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	27-Jan-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	10-Feb-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	19-Feb-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	18-Feb-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 [<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"/>]
OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats	
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources	
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"/>]
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 [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Sector Manager review the plan?	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: Justin Taylor Locke	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Sector Manager:	Name: Anna Wellenstein (SM)	Date: 20-Feb-2014