

COMBINED PROJECT INFORMATION DOCUMENTS / INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET (PID/ISDS)

Additional Financing

Report No.: PIDISDSA21555

Date Prepared/Updated: 04-May-2017

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country:	Haiti	Project ID:	P163081
		Parent Project ID (if any):	P126744
Project Name:	Relaunching Agriculture: Strengthening Agriculture Public Services II Project - Additional financing (P163081)		
Parent Project Name:	Relaunching Agriculture: Strengthening Agriculture Public Services II Project (GAFSP - IDA) (P126744)		
Region:	LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	08-May-2017	Estimated Board Date:	14-Jun-2017
Practice Area (Lead):	Agriculture	Financing Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Borrower(s)	Ministry of Economy and Finance		
Implementing Agency	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development		
Financing (in USD Million)			
Financing Source			Amount
International Development Association (IDA)			0.00
IDA Credit from CRW			35.00
Financing Gap			0.00
Total Project Cost			35.00
Environmental Category:	B-Partial Assessment		
Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):	The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate		
Other Decision:			
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

Haiti's geography, people, and history provide it with many opportunities. The third largest Caribbean nation by area and population (10.4 million), Haiti shares the island of Hispaniola with the Dominican Republic. In addition to an illustrious early history, as the first independent nation in the region and the first nation in the world to be led to independence by former slaves, Haiti benefits from proximity and access to major markets, a young labor force, a dynamic diaspora, and substantial geographic, historical, and cultural assets. The country possesses untapped markets and a pent-up demand for the private sector to explore, including agribusiness, light manufacturing, and tourism.

However, almost 60 percent of Haiti's population, or 6.3 million people, remain poor, and 24 percent or 2.5 million, extremely poor, with poverty highest in rural areas. The poorest regions, which are also the furthest from the capital, show extreme poverty rates exceeding 40 percent and very limited access to basic services. Like poverty, inequality is high with a Gini of 0.6 (highest in the Americas).

On January 12, 2010, a catastrophic earthquake of magnitude 7.0 struck 25 kilometers west of Port-au-Prince, Haiti's capital. The earthquake killed 220,000 people and displaced 1.5 million. It resulted in damages and losses of US\$7.9 billion (120 percent of GDP) and of US\$11.3 billion in estimated reconstruction needs. The disaster compounded Haiti's many preexisting development challenges, increasing poverty and vulnerability, threatening livelihoods, and hampering already weak service delivery and human development outcomes. The disaster also exacerbated Haiti's underlying socio-economic drivers of poverty, such as social divisions and inequity, fragility of political mechanisms, the government's weak capacity, risks of political instability and persistent volatility. Compounding these challenges, cholera broke out in October 2010, sickening over 800,000 people and killing over 9,000 to date.

Though criticized for delays and insufficiency, post-earthquake reconstruction efforts have delivered visible results. In the aftermath of the disaster, Government, Partners and private actors together made considerable headway toward reconstruction, investing approximately US\$3 billion in Official Development Assistance and much more from private flows. Over a million people have left tent camps for more permanent housing. Collapsed infrastructure and many affected neighborhoods have been rebuilt, education services have been re-established and extended, deaths from cholera driven down to below 1 percent of cases (though resurgences of the disease remain), numerous safety net programs have been financed, and short-term employment generated for thousands, particularly in the capital. The 2015 Poverty Assessment undertaken jointly by the Government and the World Bank shows that the percentage of extremely poor Haitians (those who cannot fulfill their nutritional needs) fell from 31 percent to 24 percent between 2000 and 2012, with the drop being mostly urban and the largest drop witnessed in the capital.

On October 4, 2016, category 4 Hurricane Matthew struck Haiti, affecting over 2 million people, about 20 percent of the country's population. The Government of Haiti (GoH)'s Directorate of Civil Protection (DPC) reported 546 deaths, 128 missing, 439 injured, 175,500 people living in temporary shelters, and immediate humanitarian assistance needs for 1.4 million people (about 12.9 percent of the population). The GoH has requested CRW support in light of the large scale of damages, losses and reconstruction needs, and the deep poverty of the affected region. The hurricane also caused the first round of Haiti's long postponed Presidential elections to be rescheduled to November 20, 2016. Haitians elected Mr. Jovenel Moise, the candidate from former President Martelly's party, in one round, with over 55 percent of the vote. The Electoral Council confirmed these results on January 3, 2017. President Moise was sworn in on February 7, 2017.

Situation of Urgent Need of Assistance or Capacity Constraint

Hurricane Matthew made landfall on October 4 at 7a.m. on the south-west coast of Haiti. The

hurricane caused maximum wind speeds of 230/km/h and rainfall of over 600mm in less than 24 hours, and a rise in sea levels of two to three meters in the departments of Grande-Anse, Nippes and Sud. This is the first hurricane of this magnitude to make landfall in Haiti in 52 years. The hurricane's high wind speeds, heavy rainfall, and devastating storm surge resulted in flooding, landslides and extensive destruction of critical infrastructure and livelihoods, including large sections of road networks and bridges, with some key roads and bridges washed away. The southern departments of Grande-Anse, Nippes, and Sud were especially affected, where 80 percent, 66 percent, and 65 percent of people respectively are poor (under the national poverty line of US\$2.41 per day) and 36 percent, 30 percent and 26 percent are extremely poor (under the national extreme poverty line of US\$1.23 per day). Lesser damage was seen in coastal areas in other parts of the country.

On October 4, 2016, Haiti's interim President called for an immediate emergency response in the face of the national crisis and humanitarian emergency. The Government appealed to the international community to fund US\$120 million in humanitarian assistance to provide relief to 750,000 severely affected people. The United Nations launched a flash appeal for that amount on October 10, 2016. On October 13, 2016, the Minister of Finance requested support from the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) in undertaking a Rapid Damage and Loss Assessment (DaLA). A team immediately set to work. The Rapid Assessment results became available on October 26, 2016, showing a massive impact on the Southern regions. The Bank also participated in the subsequently launched Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA).

Total damages and losses were initially estimated by the DaLA Rapid Assessment at US\$1.9 billion, the equivalent of 22 percent of GDP, with impacts largely concentrated in areas with poverty rates higher than the national average (Grande-Anse, Nippes, and Sud departments). The agriculture and housing/urban sectors were the hardest hit. Up to 90 percent of crops and livestock were lost in coastal areas, including staple food crops, but also cash and tree crops such as coffee, cocoa and vetiver. Thousands of structures were damaged and 75 percent of structures in the heaviest hit communities in Grande-Anse were entirely destroyed. More than 100,000 houses were heavily damaged or destroyed, half of which were Grande-Anse.

Given the magnitude of the disaster, the GoH requires significant support to "build back better", and to enhance the country's overall resilience to disasters. In view of this, US\$35 million is sought from the IDA Crisis Response Window (CRW) to support the country's recovery needs under the Project. Given the urgency to respond to the disaster, the Project would be processed invoking the Condensed Procedures of OP 10.00. The Safeguards Action Plan setting forth the sequence for the preparation of the relevant safeguards instruments is annexed to the project paper.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

Haiti remains extremely vulnerable to natural disaster with 96 percent of the population at risk. On October 4, 2016, Hurricane Matthew, a category IV hurricane, landed in Haiti and caused a large scale disaster affecting over 2.1 million people (almost 1/5 of the population) and leaving almost 1.4 million people in need of lifesaving assistance in the southern part of the country. Winds speeds up to 140 mph and torrential rain for 48 hours (around 1,016 mm) triggered widespread flooding and numerous landslides and caused severe damage to all sectors - water, electricity, education, health, food security, and livelihoods - particularly in the Departments of Sud, Grande-Anse, and Nippes. It is estimated that Hurricane Matthew caused losses and damages equivalent to 22 percent of the Gross Domestic Product, killed 500 people and triggered humanitarian assistance for 1.4 million people (12.9 percent of the population). The impact of Hurricane Matthew on the agricultural sector is estimated at US\$603.0 million, including US\$213.0 million in losses and US\$390.0 million in damages, making Hurricane Matthew one the most devastating events of the past decades.

Agriculture plays a significant role in the Haitian economy, contributing to more than 25 % of the country's GDP. The sector employs about 57% percent of the active population, while providing 66% of employment in rural areas and 75% of employment to low-income rural households, thus representing the main source of income in rural areas. National agricultural production provides about 50% of food availability, which is complemented by commercial imports (45%) and food aid. The departments struck by Hurricane Matthew had under cultivation 85% of the national production of maize and 37% of the national fruit production. These areas also accounted for about one third of the country's stock of cattle, pigs and goats and poultry.

In urgent need of assistance because of a natural disaster, the approval of this AF would allow to quickly mobilize the resources needed to provide much needed support to farmers in the areas affected by Hurricane Mathew. The task team has discussed alternatives to the proposed AF with the GOH and it was agreed that the proposed RESEPAG II AF is the most appropriate mechanism for a rapid mitigation response. Indeed, the activities will primarily target areas already covered under the original project, the same profile of producers and tools to engage these producers, and use identical delivery mechanisms. It will also be possible to use the current institutional arrangements and staff already in place.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Original Project Development Objective(s) - Parent

The PDOs are to strengthen the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development's (MARNDR) capacity to define and implement the National Agriculture Extension Strategy, to increase access of small farmers to agriculture extension services and training on animal and plant health in priority regions, and to provide financial assistance in the case of an agriculture sector emergency.

Current Project Development Objective(s) - Parent

The development objectives of the Project are to: (a) reinforce the capacity of the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development to provide or facilitate access to services in the agricultural sector; (b) increase market access to small producers and food security in Selected Areas; and (c) provide financial assistance in the case of an Agriculture Sector Emergency.

Proposed Project Development Objective(s) - Additional Financing

The new proposed PDO is: to (a) reinforce the capacity of the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development to provide or facilitate access to services in the agricultural sector; (b) increase market access to small producers and food security in Selected Areas; (c) improve livelihood in areas affected by Hurricane Matthew and (d) enable the Government to respond promptly and effectively to an eligible emergency.

Key Results

D. Project Description

Following the devastation caused by Hurricane Matthew, the project expects to receive US\$35M Additional financing (AF) from the IDA Crisis Response Window to help restore productive assets lost, rehabilitate damaged or destroyed infrastructures, and support livelihoods to victims of Hurricane Matthew. The AF would (i) provide emergency assistance to allow more than 7,700 farmers to carry

out winter 2016 and spring 2017 planting campaigns to secure food production; and to increase the number of beneficiaries of the pre-existing voucher schemes by 7000 (increasing from 8,000 to 15,000 farmers) while fostering more resilient production systems; and (ii) introduce new activities to restore/rehabilitate irrigation systems through cash-for-work programs and larger infrastructure civil works allowing at least 3,500 hectares of agriculture land to recover access to irrigation and providing temporary jobs to at least 21,000 persons; and help restock part of the small animals lost by around 8,000 poor households.

In the Proposed AF, the emergency assistance and extension of the voucher scheme program activities would remain in the department of Sud, although more municipalities would be targeted. Irrigation works would be also conducted in the department of Sud, and would be closely related to the voucher schemes areas to ensure the adequate access to irrigation services of farmers benefiting from voucher schemes. Lastly, activities related to livestock restocking would concern the western areas of the department of Sud and Grande-Anse.

Changes to the original project as part of the level 1 restructuring include: (i) Revision of the Project Development Objective (PDO) wording to reflect activities in the affected areas and an increase in scope of the Emergency Response Contingency (ERC); (ii) Activation of the Involuntary Resettlement Policy (OP/BP 4.12) to anticipate the possibility of an involuntary resettlement in the affected areas; (iii) Upgrading of the Results Framework to reflect adjusted outcomes and targets, and emerging good practices in climate resilience; (iv) Extension of the original grant closing date of to align it with the closing date of the Additional Financing; and (v) a reallocation between disbursement categories.

The AF will trigger Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12). While the implementation of RESEPAG2 has thus far not involved any resettlement of families or economic restrictions, rehabilitation of irrigation and water management infrastructure may result in involuntary resettlement. A Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) will be prepared in accordance with OP4.12 to ensure application of the appropriate safeguard policies. The completion of social safeguards instruments was deferred to the implementation stage in line with the flexibility afforded by OP 10.00 paragraph 12. Consultation in the affected areas will include outreach to main stakeholders and the affected communities to the extent possible. Once sites where project activities will be implemented are identified, Resettlement Action Plans (RAP) or Abbreviated Resettlement Action Plans (Abbrev. RAP) will be prepared consulted and disclosed for sites with resettlement impacts in accordance with the policy. Any compensation or livelihood restoration efforts that may be needed will be completed prior to commencement of the works.

Closing Date

The proposed AF would extend the current closing date of the original Grants from 30-June-2018 to 31-Dec-2019. The Financing Agreement of the parent project would be amended accordingly. This extension would allow for the completion of the activities under the Parent project so as to allow for emergency recovery and reconstruction activities as described under the components listed below and in more detail under the Project Paper.

Component Name:

The project will maintain its structure around four components: Component 1: Agricultural support services; Component 2: Direct support to producers and associations; Component 3: Emergency Response Contingency Reserve; and Component 4: Institutional strengthening, monitoring and evaluation, project management and studies.

The proposed AF will finance the scale up and the implementation of new field activities under Component 2 only, which will increase in cost by US\$28.7M; Component 3 will receive an additional allocation of US\$ 2.4M to compensate for expenses already incurred immediately after the Hurricane, and Component 4 will receive an additional allocation of US\$ 3.9M to account for additional operational and monitoring costs.

Component Name:

Component 1 Agricultural Support Services (Total: US\$ 11, IDA-H7410 US\$ 1, GAFSP TF-11396 US\$ 10, US\$ 0 IDA/AF).

Comments (optional)

This component will not change.

Component Name:

Component 2: Direct Support to Producers and Associations (Total: US\$ 54.2, IDA-H7410 US\$ 25.5, GAFSP TF-11396 US\$ 0, US\$ 28.7 IDA/AF).

Comments (optional)

The Additional financing will scale up the provision of vouchers under this component. It will broaden its current geographical scope to the Department of Sud and it will use the same delivery mechanisms as the parent project reaching an additional 7,000 beneficiaries. Two new sub-components are being added to this component: (i) Animal Husbandry and (ii) Irrigation Rehabilitation and Micro-catchment protection.

Component Name:

Component 3: Emergency Response Contingency Reserve (Total: US\$ 3.9, IDA-H7410 US\$ 1.5, GAFSP TF-11396 US\$ 0, US\$ 2.4 IDA/AF).

Comments (optional)

This component will change in title to “Emergency Response Contingency (ERC)”. Through this component uncommitted project funds, rather than an established upfront reserve amount, will be channeled to facilitate a timely response in case of an eligible emergency.

Component Name:

Component 4: Institutional Strengthening, Monitoring and Evaluation, Project Management and Studies Services (Total: US\$ 11, IDA-H7410 US\$ 7.1, GAFSP TF-11396 US\$ 0, US\$ 3.9 IDA/AF).

Comments (optional)

This component will not change in its design. However, to take into account the increased technical and geographical scope, and the increased in financial resources, additional allocation are being considered for equipment, vehicles, staff and consultancies.

E. Project location and Salient physical characteristics (if known) relevant to the safeguard analysis

Parent Project

Component 1, 3 and 4 activities are conducted nationwide. Component 2 activities are implemented in specific areas located in the Sud and Centre department for the voucher schemes; and Sud, Nord and Nord-Est departments for the matching grant schemes.

Additional Financing (AF)

The Haitian government carried out a Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) identifying the areas most affected by Hurricane Matthew, and prioritized the most pressing interventions to ensure food production in the season following the disaster. The emergency assistance program and extension of the voucher scheme program activities would remain in the Sud department, although more municipalities would be targeted. Irrigation rehabilitation works would be also conducted in the

department of Sud, and would be closely related to the voucher scheme areas to ensure optimization of benefits. Lastly, activities related to livestock restocking would concern the western areas of the department of Sud and Grand'Anse.

In the Proposed AF, the emergency assistance and extension of the voucher scheme program activities would remain in the department of Sud, although more municipalities would be targeted. Irrigation works would be also conducted in the department of Sud, and would be closely related to the voucher schemes areas to ensure the adequate access to irrigation services of farmers benefiting from voucher schemes. Lastly, activities related to livestock restocking would concern the western areas of the department of Sud and Grand'Anse.

Salient physical characteristics relevant to environmental and social safeguards under the RESEPAG II AF relate to high variability of landscapes, biodiversity and climatic zones, extreme weather, advanced deforestation, earthquake activity and climate change. Alternating topography of mountains and valleys create variability in rainfall varying from 550 mm on leeward slopes to 2,700 mm on northern and windward slopes. The heterogeneity of the territory is a determining factor for crop types, cropping season, land use and forest cover.

Haiti is subject to extreme weather events such as droughts, hurricanes and tropical storms. Deforestation and steep slopes have intensified these risks. Loss of forest to charcoal and timber production and to agriculture since colonial days has reduced forest cover from 75% to 1.5%. Deforestation has contributed to high runoff, erosion, landslides, flooding, dust, loss of agricultural productivity, reduced rainfall, siltation of waterways and degradation of coral reefs and mangroves. An estimated 36 million tons of topsoil are lost in Haiti annually.

Haiti is seismically active as it sits astride two shallow fault lines; it is vulnerable to earthquakes, especially in built-up areas.

Although degraded, Haiti's natural environment still contains areas with notable concentrations of globally or regionally threatened species, including numerous endemic ones. These Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) occur throughout Haiti.

With predicted climate change, temperatures are projected to increase and rainfall is projected to decrease, which is likely to intensify droughts in the center of the country. Sea level is projected to rise between 0.13 and 0.56 m by 2090, which would threaten coastal zones. Future increases in number and intensity of tropical storms and hurricanes are likely, with associated increases in highly erosive rainfall, floods and storm surge levels.

The project expands access to agricultural extension services and promotes environmentally friendly investments and practices in agriculture. The project aims to have a positive impact on agriculture, resource use and surrounding landscapes. It does not support any activities that have large-scale, significant or irreversible adverse impacts on the environment. The project provides agricultural extension services to existing agricultural lands, and does not support the clearance of new lands and such activities are not eligible for direct support. No agriculture activities that require the clearing of forested land or that damage freshwater habitat are supported.

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Asli Gurkan(GSU04)

Felipe Jacome(GSU04)

II. IMPLEMENTATION

The proposed AF will be implemented under the same institutional arrangements of the parent project. The closing date of the proposed additional grant would be December 31, 2019 to ensure that all additional planned activities would be satisfactorily completed in accordance with the revised and updated implementation plan. The date of the original grant would also be extended to December 31, 2019.

III. SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	<p>This policy will continue to be triggered under the AF as original components will not change, and animal husbandry and rehabilitation of irrigation canals will be added.</p> <p>Environmental and social impacts under the Parent Project have been low, and safeguards performance has been satisfactory. The project was designed to avoid the financing of activities with significant environmental impact and promote environmental good practice such as reforestation and soil conservation. In the control of agricultural pests, the project has focused on integrated pest management.</p> <p>In summary, impacts observed include inadequate sanitation in sub-projects (poor design of latrines and septic tanks) in several sub-projects, as well as clearing existing land of trees and shrubs for market gardening, as expected in an agricultural project. Potential health and hygiene impacts from non-sanitary practice in food production (e.g., dairy production) also pose potential risks, although no incidences of contamination have been recorded.</p> <p>Several positive activities were financed under the project, including use of biological control methods against the mealybug, a parasite of pea, bean and groundnut; planting of trees as part of productive landscapes (for cover as well as for fruit production); and planting of mangroves to compensate losses resulting from expansion of salt ponds.</p>

	<p>E&S impacts were adequately managed using the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) prepared for RESEPAG II. No new, significant impacts are expected under the AF.</p> <p>The MARNDR has made minor updates and modifications to the ESMF and IPMP, to identify and manage the potential adverse impacts under the current project, which include:</p> <p>(i) animal husbandry, mostly small scale, resilience-oriented, mixed agriculture-livestock systems, with very limited inputs, to around 8,000 households: includes training, production of forage, preparation of enclosures (for goat keeping), provision of beehives and protective equipment (for bee-keeping). Impacts would be limited and include production of waste (animal waste), cutting of vegetation (for feed), overgrazing, and damage to riparian habitat. Mitigation will include effective waste management, control of water discharges, prevention of animals' access to surface water bodies and prevention of free-grazing by raising animals in closed systems and provision of feed via forage tree planting and harvesting; and</p> <p>(ii) Irrigation Rehabilitation and Micro-catchment protection: cash for work for small-scale rehabilitation works (off-farm infrastructures); and civil works on river intakes, rivers embankments, sections of canals and drains, protection of infrastructure (mainly bridges and access roads). Impacts are likely to include health and safety of workers, construction waste (cement, metal and timber scraps, etc.), noise, dust, water quality (turbidity). Mitigation will include generic workplace design good practice, providing adequate protection equipment to workers, adequate waste management systems, etc.</p> <p>The project was rated category B because potential adverse impacts on the environment were moderate and easily identified, mitigated and managed. The project will remain Category B.</p>
--	---

		<p>Social risks and impacts: On the social side, no major safeguards risks are expected. Potential risks may include delays in compensation related to land acquisition or lack of appropriate consultations on relevant project information.. The project will avoid or minimize land acquisition based on these lessons learned., RPF will include measures to deal with such potential delays in payments should land acquisition be necessary. The communication activities will particularly target matching grants and voucher schemes activities, which may be open to speculation of corruption and unfairness unless the project team clearly explains the rules and procedures for distributing project benefits. Risks linked to labor influx are expected to be limited. They will be mitigated by prioritizing local labor and ensuring clarity on where laborers coming from outside will be hosted through their stay in the host community and ensuring that contracts are consistent with ESMF and RPF provisions. ESMF will include an annex with a social assessment targeted to new locations and sub-projects to be covered under the AF.</p>
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	<p>This policy will continue to be triggered since original components will not change, and animal husbandry and irrigation rehabilitation will be added. Because the project focuses on capacity building and provides agricultural extension services to existing agricultural lands, it does not support the clearance of new lands and such activities are not eligible for direct support. No agriculture activities that require the clearing of forested land or that damage freshwater habitat are supported. Nevertheless, because of the potential for indirect impacts on natural habitats, particularly if some agricultural activities are carried out around protected areas or KBAs, this safeguard policy has been triggered. Measures to protect riparian habitats, water quality, manage waste, etc., will be included in the ESMF.</p>
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	<p>This policy will continue to be triggered since original components will not change, and animal husbandry and irrigation rehabilitation will be added. Because of the project's</p>

		potential to indirectly influence the management of natural forests, particularly in silvo pastoral landscapes, this safeguard is triggered. A section in the ESMF requires the development of a Forest Management Plan (FMP), should any project activities affect such forest landscape. Measures to protect riparian habitats, forests, etc., will be included in the ESMF.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	<p>The project supports investments related to agricultural extension services. These investments include the procurement, handling, storage and use of pesticides for plot demonstration and emergency interventions of insect pest outbreaks. Only approved pesticides under national or international law (including World Health Organization – WHO) will be supported under project financing. A list of pesticides that fall under these categories or are otherwise ineligible for support are included in the IPMP.</p> <p>In line with the approach taken under RESEPAG II, activities under the AF will avoid the intensive use of pesticides and instead will support an approach that includes IPMP: (a) avoiding the use or promotion of pesticides in WHO toxic categories I (Ia and Ib) or II (except under strict supervision of a trained and certified “Pest management Specialist”); (b) reduce reliance on synthetic chemical pesticides; (c) promote the use of biological or environmental pest control methods based on prevention, surveillance and monitoring; (d) favoring the use of multiple strategies (e.g. crop rotation, cultural practices, host plant resistance, biological control methods, chemical control); (e) pest control that increases natural enemies of parasites; (f) applying products only when infestation levels are critical; (g) avoiding the use of herbicides and pesticides near water sources and their contamination with pesticide residues when cleaning the equipment used; and (h) training producers, technicians, and farm workers to responsibly manage pesticide products, equipment, and containers to avoid their own contamination or that of livestock food or produce.</p>

		Under the AF, the project will implement the IPMP developed under the guidance of the ESMF, including screening criteria to exclude pesticides that are prohibited under the Bank's policies. A specific plan is included in the IPMP to provide for screening, no-objection and monitoring during the procurement of pesticides. The IPMP also includes guidelines on the relevant aspects of integrated pest management that are part of the extension and training services provided under the project.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	This policy will not be triggered since the new activities (irrigation) will not have additional impact on physical cultural resources.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	The policy is not triggered because there are no groups in Haiti who meet the definition of IPs of OP 4.10.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	<p>This policy was not triggered in the original project as no involuntary displacement of people or land acquisition was foreseen.</p> <p>The AF will trigger Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12). While the implementation of RESEPAG II has thus far not involved any resettlement of families or economic restrictions, rehabilitation of irrigation and water management infrastructure may result in involuntary resettlement.</p> <p>A Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) will be prepared, consulted and disclosed at project implementation stage in accordance with OP4.12 to ensure application of the appropriate safeguard policies. The deferral of the completion of social safeguards instruments to the implementation stage was granted in line with the flexibility afforded by OP 10.00 paragraph 12. This will ensure adequate time to prepare, consult, and disseminate the RPF and other safeguard-related documents following the Safeguards Action Plan annexed to the Project Paper.</p> <p>Consultation in the affected areas will include outreach to main stakeholders and the affected communities to the extent possible. Once sites where the project activities will be implemented are known, Resettlement Action Plans (RAP) or Abbreviated Resettlement</p>

		Action Plans (Abbrev. RAP) will be prepared consulted and disclosed for sites with resettlement impacts in accordance with the policy. Any compensation or livelihood restoration efforts that may be needed will be completed prior to commencement of the works.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	This policy will not be triggered since no dams, nor will irrigation systems dependent on dams, per the WB definition, be restored or rebuilt.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	This policy will not be triggered since neither the parent project, nor any activities under the AF, will take place on international waterways, per the WB definition.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	This policy will not be triggered since neither the parent project, nor any activities under the AF, will take place in disputed areas, per the WB definition.

IV. 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:

Safeguards Implementation under the Original Project

Component 1, SPS activities: impacts are from handling and use of testing material, disposal of animal carcasses, disposal of syringes from vaccination campaigns and occupational health and safety concerns, construction impacts (e.g., noise, dust, construction waste, etc.) during construction and rehabilitation of buildings, fences, walls, etc., including the central building for UPS (Sanitary Protection Unit) and some departmental sanitary protection offices (CDPS – Centre Départemental de Protection Sanitaire). No new facilities will be planned under the AF. Impacts will be limited in time and space, and actions to minimize and mitigate them are included in the project's ESMF.

Component 2, Support to Producers: the project targets improved, environmentally friendly, climate smart agriculture. Impacts from the voucher program, which aims to promote access to seeds, fertilizer, ploughing services, agrochemicals, etc., are expected to be low, however include impacts from potential misuse of agricultural inputs (fertilizer, agrochemicals) especially when applied on a large scale. Impacts from inadequate sanitation in sub-projects under matching grants (e.g., poor design of latrines, septic tanks), cutting trees and shrubs for land clearing for market gardening, health and hygiene impacts from non-sanitary practice in food production (e.g., milk production). Mitigation measures will be managed through the ESMF, under which Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMP) will be prepared to minimize, mitigate and manage these potential impacts. In addition, an integrated pest management plan waste management plan was prepared to manage agrochemicals.

Components 3 and 4 have no impacts per se.

Social safeguards rating under the Parent project has been satisfactory. OP 4.12 was not triggered under the Parent project and there were no resettlement impacts or any other major social risks or issues that occurred to date. Under the Parent project, an involuntary resettlement screening form has been used to properly detect and exclude any investments with OP 4.12 related impacts. Under RESEPAG I, a social assessment was carried out based on extensive consultations with both Ministry of Agriculture (MARNDR) staff and community members in the pilot areas as well as a stakeholder analysis. The results of this assessment have served as the basis for the design of this project, RESEPAG II. Under the AF, the ESMF update will include an annex with a social assessment targeted to new localities and new sub-projects covered by the AF. MARNDR is continuing to consult with potential project-affected people even before the start of project activities in some areas and has disclosed all safeguard instruments both locally and globally in Haiti in the context of the Agriculture Sectoral Table. The Sectoral Table is represented by civil society, farmers groups, the private sector, women's groups, youth organizations, donors, technical cooperation agencies, MARNDR and other ministries.

A gender review has been carried out during RESEPAG I. Consultations with women during the project preparation phase ensured women's inclusion at the policy and program levels. A resultant just-in-time grants series "Fostering Economic Empowerment for Women Agricultural Producers in Haiti" is working to integrate gender, particularly women's issues, within the Ministry of Agriculture. A collaboration between the gender specialist and the Ministry of Women Condition allowed to consider gender inclusion during the design of RESEPAG II. The Ministry of Agriculture has also hired a gender specialist to ensure that gender is being respected in the different parts of the implementation. The Ministry of Women Condition has been a key stakeholder in the implementation of the matching grant component allowing the project to reach almost 50% of women participation. Under the Additional Financing the inclusion of women will remain important to at least 40% with some of the activities reaching 80% notably with the livestock packages.

In terms of capacity for managing social safeguards. The project team has a good presence in the field and is regularly in contact with the project beneficiaries. The project team has been holding consultations about the project activities and preparing minutes of these consultations. There is no social safeguards specialist under the parent project. However, the environmental specialist have attended several safeguards trainings. He is familiar with the OP 4.12 requirements and have used screening forms to detect and resettlement related impacts. Under the AF, a second safeguards specialist will be hired, to be in charge of monitoring social risks and impacts. The person hired by the PIU will have documented social expertise, particularly give n the fact that resettlement action plans may have to be implemented under the project.

Additional Financing to Respond to Hurricane Matthew

Under the AF, most of the planned activities would restore or improve pre-existing agricultural production conditions, and therefore are not expected to create any significant

additional adverse environmental or social impact. However, (i) animal husbandry and (ii) the rehabilitation of damaged irrigation canals, water intakes, and water reservoir infrastructures may imply some minor environmental and social impacts related to: (i) additional waste (animal waste), vegetation harvesting, overgrazing, damage to riparian habitat, etc. Because the production systems in Haiti are extensive, point source pollution of wastewater, ammonia, odor, nuisances, etc., typically associated with intensive production systems, are not encountered; and (ii) construction, especially around water bodies (streams, canals) includes health and safety, waste production, noise, water quality (turbidity), increased level of dust, loss of vegetation cover, etc.). These potential negative impacts are expected to be moderate, localized, and can be mitigated through (i) for animal husbandry system promoting enclosure of goats, training and technical assistance that goes with the livestock will be the principal vehicle to effective management of waste, wastewater, preventing animals' access to surface water bodies, production of forage trees for feed, etc.; (ii) for irrigation rehabilitation, mitigation will be through the application of good construction and management practices and with close supervision of contractor performance by field engineers and in close consultation with local communities. The impacts and mitigation measures will be addressed during the preparation of the ESMPs and RAPs for each subproject.

The AF triggers the Involuntary Resettlement Policy (OP 4.12) as works along riverbanks and irrigation systems may require a minimal degree of land acquisition and cause economic impacts, such as impact on fruit trees or damaged crops. These works will not be large-scale, significant or have irreversible adverse impacts on the population. The project will prepare, consult and disclose a Resettlement Policy Framework at project implementation stage.

Lessons learned on social safeguards from RESEPAG II:

Lesson 1: It is important to have a dedicated social specialist as part of the PIU to track and document social issues and impacts. Under the AF, there will be a second safeguards specialist hired to focus on social safeguards and social issues at large.

Lesson 2: A well-functioning Grievance Redress mechanism is needed to keep track of beneficiaries' concerns and provide timely response. Under the parent project, there is a hotline established under the Ministry of Agriculture. 10 complaints were received, mostly coming from agricultural producers whose proposals were not accepted. Under the AF, the hotline will be coupled with a communication strategy focusing some specific social risks. (Eg. to explain to the farmers the eligibility criteria, targeting strategy and the voucher system that the project is implementing). The Ministry of Agriculture will designate one focal point from the Ministry in each Department to act as liaison for managing safeguards-related issues and address grievances. The Focal Points would resolve issues, and escalate them to the staff in Port-au-Prince as needed. Meetings will be held every two months between staff in capital city and the regional Focal Points to exchange information.

Lesson 3: Even in projects that have not triggered OP 4.12, involuntary resettlement screening form is a useful tool as part of ESMF to detect potential resettlement risks upfront. Under the AF, this practice will continue as part of first environmental screening and a RAP will be prepared when potential impacts are detected. No activities can start before the RAP is effectively implemented and that the project affected people receive their compensation. The safeguards specialists under AF will receive a refresher training on OP 4.12 as well as how to

screen out social impacts beyond resettlement.

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

The project has potential indirect impacts on natural habitats if some agricultural activities are carried out around protected areas or Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs). Also, the project has the potential to indirectly influence the management of natural forests, particularly in mixed land use landscapes (forestry and grazing).

However, the project is designed to avoid the financing of activities with significant environmental impact and promote environmental good practice such as reforestation and soil conservation. The ESMF has provisions to prepare a Forest Management Plan (FMP) should any project activities affect such forest landscape.

In the control of agricultural pests, the project has focused on integrated pest management: use of approved pesticides only; reduce reliance on synthetic pesticides; promote biological pest control; utilize multiple strategies (crop rotation, resistant varieties, and biological control); natural predators of parasites; critical use of products; protect water sources; and training operators.

Furthermore, the ESMF and the capacity building provided to the Environmental Cell in MARNDR will enhance the ability of the Ministry to optimize environmental outcomes in the project area.

No potential indirect or long term social impacts are expected. Resettlement, land acquisition and loss of economic livelihood are unlikely. The project will avoid or minimize land acquisition based on the lessons learned regarding delays and complications with land titles. RPF will include measures to deal with such potential delays in payments should land acquisition be necessary.

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

The project design is broad and includes many components. It takes into consideration the role played by the agricultural sector in employment (57% percent of the active population; 66% of rural employment; and 75% of employment to low-income rural households); the variability of the topography and climate; environmental degradation; and social vulnerability. Project design considered the current alternative, which avoids funding activities with a significant environmental impact, commercial crops, monoculture and export-oriented crops, but promotes good environmental practices such as reforestation and soil conservation at the micro-producer level.

Most of the planned activities under the AF are not expected to create any significant adverse environmental or social impact, as they will be restoring or improving pre-existing agricultural production conditions, and will put a particular emphasis on the quality and resilience of these structures and systems. As the proposed project would support the rehabilitation of damaged irrigation canals, water intakes, and water reservoir infrastructures, including river embankments, this may imply some minor temporary environmental and

social impacts. These civil works are expected to be mostly of small size, and efforts will be placed on minimizing any possible negative effect through solid preliminary studies allowing to clearly identify areas of interventions, avoiding if possible to modify any previous canal routes, and ensuring the adequate design, use of appropriate construction materials, and construction techniques etc. Adequate management of waste and debris would be embedded in the Terms of reference and contractual obligations for the contractors. Clearing canals and areas of interventions may produce some solid wastes that could present disposal issues.

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.

Parent Project

The Borrower has prepared all the required safeguard instruments (ESMF and IPMP). The ESMF is the instrument used to identify when additional Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) are necessary and includes a procedure to screen out projects that will (i) negatively impact critical natural habitats; (ii) adversely affect the management of natural forests, or (iii) an IPMP that will address an increase in the use of, or the storage of, application or handling of, pesticides in categories I and II of the WHO Recommended Classification of Pesticides. The project design emphasizes the adoption of environmentally-friendly technologies and others that favor increased productivity over simple land expansion.

The MARNDR is experienced in implementing donor-funded projects (including World Bank, the IDB and IFAD) and managing the requisite safeguard actions. To strengthen their capacity, the MARNDR with the support of the RESEPAG II project has created an Environmental Cell within the Ministry to manage environmental risks within the agricultural sector more broadly. The project is supporting the development and operationalization of this Cell. The preparation, implementation and oversight of safeguard actions will continue to be provided by this Environmental Cell during implementation.

To assist the Environmental Cell, the ESMF includes indicators to monitor compliance as well as a training and dissemination program to build capacity within the Cell and to build a constituency for environmental awareness in the agricultural sector more broadly. The Bank (external consultant) will closely monitor environmental compliance to identify opportunities to enhance environmental outcomes and better manage adverse impacts.

The environmental and social capacity of the RESEPAG II project team has been largely adequate; it consists of an environmental specialist/agronomist; an economist/social specialist; and a social/gender specialist, who work on safeguards issues on a part-time basis. RESEPAG II staff is acquainted with the Bank's policies after attending several safeguards workshops organized in country.

Additional Financing to Respond to Hurricane Matthew

Under the AF, the ESMF, and its attached IPMP, will be updated to reflect the new components added to the project; reference will be made to the World Bank Group ESHS guidelines.

Under the AF, given that OP 4.12 is being triggered to address potential involuntary resettlement, the project concluded that the capacity of the PIU will need to be enhanced and that an additional specialist would be required to complement the current team. The Task Team recommended that the MARNDR/RESEPAG II hire a full-time, entry-level socio-environmental specialist to complement the team, to be in charge of monitoring environmental and social risks and impacts, and receive training by the team on an ongoing basis. Given the urgency of the emergency works the environmental specialist at the PIU will be trained to screen works for potential involuntary resettlement. The Bank will assist the MARNDR in preparing the TORs and in selecting the socio-environmental specialist.

The Project will also hire the services of a second Socio-Environmental Specialist in the coming months to write a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) to ensure the compliance of involuntary resettlement safeguards.

Social safeguards rating under the Parent project has been satisfactory. OP 4.12 was not triggered under the Parent project and there were no resettlement impacts or any other major social risks or issues that occurred to date. Under the Parent project, a rubric in the ESMF screening form covering involuntary resettlement has been used to properly detect and exclude any investments with OP 4.12 related impacts.

In terms of capacity for managing social safeguards, the project team has a good presence in the field and is regularly in contact with the project beneficiaries. There is no social safeguards specialist under the parent project. However, the current environmental specialist have attended several safeguards trainings. He is familiar with the OP 4.12 requirements and have used screening forms to detect and resettlement related impacts. Activities likely to cause involuntary resettlement were excluded.

In the event that involuntary resettlement cannot be avoided by the necessary works, the Bank team will support the PIU to develop and implement Resettlement Action Plans. The Bank Task Team will provide an additional safeguards training for relevant PIU staff before the beginning of AF activities. A second training will be provided 6 to 10 months into the implementation of the AF.

The AF will reinforce the existing Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRM) established by the Parent Project. The GRM ensures that complaints received are promptly reviewed in order to address project-related concerns. Additionally, communities and individuals who believe that they are adversely affected by a World Bank (WB) supported project may submit complaints to existing project-level grievance redress mechanisms or the WB's Grievance Redress Service (GRS).

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

The rural population depending on the Agricultural sector for their livelihood in Haiti is estimated to be around 5 million. The main stakeholders are the segment of this population who live and work in the regions supported by this project. Among this population, the project

will pay special attention to women. Studies from RESEPAG I show that while women undertake a large part of agricultural activities and participate in many productive organizations, they are disadvantaged compared with the men in terms of decision-making, control over resources, and access to economic benefits. Other stakeholders include the Ministry of Agriculture central and regional staff, local government officials, extension service providers, both public and private, as well as the general public who will benefit from improved agricultural output (in quantity and quality), as well as from the reduced risk of disease transmission through improved plant and animal health safety.

The Project team will conduct consultations in beneficiary communities affected by Hurricane Matthew areas to inform beneficiaries of project activities, opportunities to participate, potential adverse short-term impacts, and the grievance redress mechanism available to them. These consultations will be key in engaging the population in the emergency response programs, reconstruction works and cash-for-work activities. Specifically, the content of voucher programs will be consulted and validated with the beneficiaries; the beneficiaries of livestock replacement will be identified through community participatory engagement; irrigation infrastructure will be identified through community mapping; and cash-for-work schemes will be established through participatory processes. People affected by involuntary resettlement will be consulted on compensation and resettlement policies in accordance with OP4.12.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	26-Jul-2011
Date of submission to InfoShop	03-Aug-2011
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Haiti	03-Aug-2011
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	01-Sep-2017
Date of submission to InfoShop	02-Sep-2017
"In country" Disclosure	
Haiti	30-Jun-2017
<i>Comments:</i>	
Haiti	
<i>Comments:</i>	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes

Date of receipt by the Bank	26-Jul-2011
Date of submission to InfoShop	03-Aug-2011
"In country" Disclosure	
Haiti	03-Aug-2011
<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 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 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 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 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 type="checkbox"/>
OP 4.09 - Pest Management						
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input 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"/>

OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement						
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is physical displacement/relocation expected?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input 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)	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	TBD	<input type="checkbox"/>
OP/BP 4.36 - Forests						
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	Yes	<input 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 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 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 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	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>

been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?

V. Contact point

World Bank

Contact: Norman Bentley Piccioni
Title: Senior Rural Development Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name: Ministry of Economy and Finance
Contact: Jude Alix Patrick Salomon
Title: Ministre de L'Economie et de Finances
Email: hermann.augustin@agriculture.gouv.ht

Implementing Agencies

Name: Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development
Contact: Jules Cesaire YAGANZA
Title: Directeur du Departement Techniques Industrielles et Exploitation
Email: legrand_cesar@yahoo.fr

VI. For more information contact:

The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 473-1000
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/projects>

VII. Approval

Task Team Leader(s):	Name:Norman Bentley Piccioni	
<i>Approved By:</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Noreen Beg (SA)	Date: 04-May-2017
Practice Manager/Manager:	Name: Preeti S. Ahuja (PMGR)	Date: 05-May-2017
Country Director:	Name:Michelle C. Keane (CD)	Date:08-May-2017