

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: ISDSA13924

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 07-Sep-2016

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 08-Sep-2016

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	China	Project ID:	P153892
Project Name:	Guangxi Rural Poverty Alleviation Pilot Project (P153892)		
Task Team Leader(s):	Paavo Eliste		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	22-Jun-2016	Estimated Board Date:	21-Dec-2016
Managing Unit:	GFA02	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
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:	177.00	Total Bank Financing:	100.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
Borrower			77.00
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development			100.00
Total			177.00
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Project Development Objective(s)

The Project Development Objective is to increase income generation opportunities through demonstration of value chain development models in selected poverty counties of Guangxi.

3. Project Description

The project comprises four components, which are summarized below. A detailed project description is provided in Annex 2. The project would be implemented over a period of six years.

Component 1: Improvement of Pro-Poor Value Chains. This component aims to address market

failures in the development of agricultural and non-agricultural rural value chains and key industries with a particular focus on increasing the value of economic activities of targeted farmer cooperatives. Component 1 comprises the following two sub-components:

a) Cooperative Development Fund (CDF) would provide grant financing to new or existing cooperatives (about 10 per county and 120 over the project implementation). The CDF would be managed by the selected farmer and non-farmer cooperatives who will implement their investment plans for value chain development. These investment plans would be initiated by cooperatives and formulated jointly with the help of technical experts, agro-enterprises, and county governments. Cooperatives would need to provide a beneficiary contribution at levels reflecting the financial capacity of the individual cooperatives. Investment proposals would be subject to appraisal and approval by the county and Regional PMOs. Funds could be used by the cooperatives to invest primarily in the fixed value adding production and processing equipment and facilities, nurseries, advanced breeding stations, equipment for improved seed production, storage facilities for agricultural produce, and other small-scale cooperative level infrastructure, goods, and related capacity building and technical assistance services. Depending on the actual needs of cooperatives, these investments may be associated with agricultural production (such as herbs, dragon fruit, kiwi, oil tea, etc), livestock (goats, pigs, chicken, etc), rural tourism, and related processing and marketing equipment and equipment, infrastructure and services. The component would also pay significant attention on strengthening of the institutional and management structures of the cooperatives. The project will allocate a proportion of the CDF fund for capacity building and training of cooperatives which would be mandatory before investments to economic activities will be made available. The cooperative training activities supported through the project would cover management and technical topics, and quality of the training activities delivered would be a special area of focus in the training plans. Specific measures would be taken to ensure participation of women in cooperatives both as individual members and in management boards. Furthermore, the governance structures of the beneficiary cooperatives must be aligned with the provisions of the cooperative law, and the CDF review and approval process will pay close attention to the proposed ownership structures to ensure equitable sharing of benefits. The project will monitor the institutional development aspects of farmer cooperatives by using the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT).

b) Matching Grant for Enterprises (MG) would provide matching grants to finance enterprise investments, which demonstrate linkages and benefit sharing arrangements with targeted cooperatives of poor farmers. It is expected that some 20-30 grants could be awarded to eligible enterprises individually or in partnership with farmer cooperatives. These grants will be identified during the project implementation. Numbers of poor farmers participating in value adding income generation activities and fair benefit sharing arrangements would be key selection criteria for such matching grants. The grants would be provided based on the application process which includes transparent evaluation and competitive selection process (the details will be defined in the Operational Manual). To ensure ownership and to demonstrate commitment, the selected enterprises would need to match the grant amount with their own funds at negotiated level of cost-sharing requirement which would need to come from the enterprises own resources and/or from commercial lending. The project will provide matching grants up to 30 percent from total investment cost. The matching grants aim to leverage private investments with strong public good characteristics, such as income-generating activities for poor farmers, and would focus on investment in the following key areas: storage and logistics systems; processing; marketing (branding, certification, etc.) and product quality (including food safety improvement). The management and implementation of this subcomponent would be done at the Regional level.

Component 2: Improving Public Infrastructure and Services. This component would support the establishment and strengthening of public infrastructure and service systems in support of value chain/key industry development under Component 1 and would include two subcomponents:

a) Rural Infrastructure, which would be identified, to the extent possible, to complement the CDF investments under the Component 1. The component would support: (i) rehabilitation and construction of production road infrastructure, such as off-grade access roads to village/cooperative production areas or processing and marketing facilities, and rehabilitation and construction of tractor roads, field tracks, and foot paths; (ii) rehabilitation and construction of small-scale irrigation and drainage infrastructure and construction of small water storage facilities; (iii) establishment of IT and telecommunication infrastructure and procurement of information infrastructure and equipment; and (iv) rehabilitation or construction of public market facilities, electricity supply and other infrastructure and procurement of related equipment.

b) Risk management, which would support the development of value chain or industry-level comprehensive risk assessment and risk mitigation plans for a clusters of counties. The plans would consider: (i) production risks (e.g. natural disaster, outbreaks of diseases, etc.), (ii) marketing risks including potential risk of food safety and food quality violation and the impact on consumer trust by the project beneficiaries or outside fellow producers/suppliers, and (iii) financial risk such as cash flow constraints and working capital requirements. The risk management and mitigation plans would identify responsibilities of public and private stakeholders (and main audience of these plans), such as producers, processors, food safety testing and quality institutions, insurance companies, etc. and identify gaps and bottlenecks, which will be addressed under the project. The project investment would follow priorities identified in the risk mitigation plans and could include, inter alia, investments in food safety testing and control (tests according to a testing regime or if necessary additional training and equipment for the related public sector testing/controlling institutions, such as FDA offices), initial subsidies for crop and livestock insurance schemes etc. as part of the risk management plan implementation. Marketing risks mitigation support could include developing and registration and protection of local/regional brands, geographical indication as well as strategic product marketing and promotion. The component would finance mainly TA and consultant services, equipment and crop and livestock insurance subsidies.

Component 3: Enhancing Investments in Poor Areas. This component would improve and facilitate investments in poor areas by existing and new micro-entrepreneurs and business entities, such as Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs), migrant returnees, or cooperatives and would include two activities:

a) Business Incubation, which would support the setting up and operation of Business Incubation Centers (BICs) in each county, which will provide support for existing and start-up businesses. The BICs would support development of marketing skills and enable market linkages by reducing information asymmetries, building trust, and creating shared value between value chain actors. They would also provide training for financial management skills and help enterprises with access to appropriate financing products by facilitating linkages with partnering financial institutions. In addition, BICs will offer business development services such as training (business management, business planning), and provide assistance with navigating regulatory requirements, standards, and compliance. Other services could include promotion of business networks and fairs and media events to promote the products of participating enterprises. Finally, the BICs would offer to their clients office facilities and meeting rooms with reliable internet connection to enable sales, procurement, and management functions to operate in a professional environment. The

component would provide seed funding in the form of grant but the BICs are expected to become financially sustainable over time through generation of its own revenue to reach a point where it can cover its on-going operating expenses through earned revenues. The component will finance equipment, TA and related consultancy services, necessary office equipment and operating costs associated with running of business incubation centers (e.g. 100% during year 1-2 and 50% from year 3 onward).

b) Improved Access to Financing will support, in cooperation with local finance institutions, the scaling-up of the government program of a comprehensive household credit rating piloted in Tiandong county and the validation of rural assets, which would help individual households and cooperatives accessing loans from local finance institutions. Credit rating will be done on a biannual basis (twice under the project) for all households in the project villages. The validation of assets, which can be used as collateral, will help cooperatives to access loans including loans for working capital. The project support of the credit rating would be output based with a prior agreed payment per each rated household for the rating teams. For the rural asset validation the project would engage and support professional service providers such as asset validation firms or accounting companies.

Component 4: Project Management, M&E and Learning. This component would aim to strengthen and develop the administrative and technical capacity of staff of the Project Management Offices at the county, prefecture and regional level to manage the project effectively. The component would in particular aim to establish a monitoring and evaluation and impact evaluation system in order to enable the learning from the pilot nature of the project with an external professional monitoring agency to be engaged under the project. The component would also support regular supervision, progress monitoring, acceptance checks, and safeguards implementation supervision and monitoring.

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

The proposed project areas are rural areas located in the northwestern Guangxi. The project area extends from the edge of Yunnan-Guangxi-Guizhou karst region to earth hilly region (northwest to southeast). Within this area more than 100 administrative villages in 10 project counties under the two prefecture-level cities of Baise and Hechi are proposed. These include: Tiandong, Tianlin, Leye, Donglan, Bama, Fengshan, Dahua, Du-an, and Pingguo County, and Yizhou City (a county-level city). About 30% of the potential project villages presents mild to severe level of rock desertification, namely, the result of soil erosion in karstic area. All of the selected counties/city are characterized by a high level of poverty combined with poor natural resource conditions, difficulties in water management, limited availability of farm land, and a majority population ethnic minorities.

The proposed project area is subject to tropical or sub-tropical weather. Hechi City has an area of 33,508 km² and a population of 4.5 million (2014). Annual average temperature is 16.9~21.5 degrees Celsius. Annual average precipitation is 1,200~1,600mm. Baise City has an area of 32,652 km² and a population of 3.8 million. Annual average temperature is 19~22.1 degrees Celsius. Annual average precipitation is 1,113~1,713mm. These preliminary natural and social data indicate that, a) light, heat and rainfall conditions are favorable for vegetation growth; b) rainfall is relatively abundant, but due to the porous rocky geology in karstic area, surface water easily goes underground that brings difficulty to household and farmland water uses; 3) in karstic area, soil coverage is thin and vulnerable to natural or human activity induced erosion; while the landscape is beautiful; and 4) the large population in the project area poses heavy pressure on natural resources, notably farmland.

Project activities will be implemented in rural communities with very small investment in rural

facilities such as storage, processing and a few rural markets. No large scale land acquisition nor resettlement is foreseen. A high proportion of farmers will use their land as production resource when joining cooperatives.. The Ecological Resettlement is one of the government poverty reduction programs in Guangxi. However, the selection of project villages followed poverty criteria and economic development potential for agricultural and non-agricultural activities. The villages which were included under the project would need to have a long-term development perspective (eg stable communities by having availability of labor and access to natural resources) and be not subject to on-going or future resettlement under the government ecological resettlement programs.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Aimin Hao (GSU02)

Ning Yang (GEN2A)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The project is assigned Category B based on screening of environmental and social issues. An Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), including a generic environmental management plan and pest management plan were prepared. Public consultation and information disclosure was conducted following OP4.01.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	The policy is triggered because of the location and nature of the proposed project activities. Agricultural production and small scale infrastructure related activities are likely to have limited impacts on natural habitats. Sub-project screening criteria includes the requirement on avoidance of critical natural habitats or potential significant impacts on natural habitats. The EMP includes measures to mitigate impacts on natural habitats. The project will not involve significant degradation or conversion of any critical natural habitats.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	The agricultural products involved in the project will be diverse (12 plants are proposed so far). Only several are trees (such as mango and orange); others include shrubs (e.g. tea) and vines (e.g. dragon fruit and grape). These are all counted as woodland in the client's project proposals. There will be no large scale plantation supported under the project. The project interventions are to mainly improve the productivity and quality of existing plants, though some limited new plantation is expected to take place. The EMP included measures to manage the general environmental and natural habitat issues.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	While the project does not finance directly pesticides and agrochemicals, increased level of agricultural production activities may lead for farmers to use pesticides using their own funds. The pesticides uses for this project would be limited given

		the following considerations: 1) a significant share of agriculture products supported in the project are all perennial plants that are diverse and are adapted to local ecological environment and do not thus require significant use of agrochemicals. Compared to annual crop production, pesticide uses are thus anticipated limited; 2) the main thrust of the project is to support production of safe and pollution free food products from mountain areas (organic and green food) for which there is currently a strong demand among increasingly quality conscious urban consumers. Overuse of agrochemicals would thus go against this core principle of the project. The PMP includes a set of physical, mechanical and biological pest control measures that are specific to each type of plants and a concrete plan to promote IPM to reduce chemical pesticides.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	The project doesn't involve any physical cultural resources. Sub-project screening criteria includes the requirement on avoidance or potential significant impacts on PCRs. Chance-finds procedures are included in the EMP.
Indigenous Peoples OP/ BP 4.10	Yes	The World Bank's safeguard policy on ethnic minorities (Indigenous Peoples OP/BP4.10) is triggered. Ethnic minority people account for more than 87 percent of total population in the 10 project counties. Different minority ethnic groups are present in project areas, including the Yao, Dong, Gelao, Maonan, and Zhuang. The latter make up nearly 90 percent of all ethnic minorities in the project villages. To ensure that smaller ethnic minority groups equally benefit from the project investments where feasible, an Ethnic Minority Development Framework (EMDF) has been prepared. Based on this EMDF, project activities benefiting smaller ethnic groups will be given preference when selecting investment proposals from cooperatives, and special attention will be paid to avoid any impact on ethnic cultures in project supported tourism development proposals. Information on equal participation of ethnic minority groups was disclosed locally on May 13, 2016, and at InfoShop on July 22.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	No involuntary resettlement is foreseen and only very small-scale land acquisition is expected to take place under the project for small civil works such as construction of storage and agricultural processing facilities. In order to ensure that any land acquisition is minimized and fully compensated, the World Bank's involuntary resettlement/land acquisition safeguard policy

		<p>(Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP4.12) is triggered. Because detailed project activities will be decided during implementation through participatory decision making within individual cooperatives, a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) has been prepared to guide the proper implementation of OP4.12.</p> <p>Some farmers will use their land as input when joining cooperatives. Proper cooperative management procedures will ensure that farmers understand risks associated with investment, and no farmer households should feel obliged to join against their free will.</p> <p>Small scale ecological resettlement as a means to poverty alleviation has been planned in some project counties. The vast majority of proposed project activities do not overlap with local ecological resettlement. It has been agreed with Guangxi Regional PMO and all 10 project counties that villages planned for ecological resettlement will NOT be included in project activities. This is a key focus of attention for project monitoring and supervision. The RPF has been disclosed locally on May 13, 2016 and at InfoShop on July 22.</p>
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The project will not involve any dams. Water tanks to be supported by the project are small storage facilities with a capacity range from several to dozens of cubic meters that will store rain water. Channels will be built to direct the water for household and/or irrigation uses. It also should be noted that in the karstic part of the project area, precipitation is adequate but due to porous karstic geology it is difficult to keep surface water, hence these kind of water tanks are useful.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The project does not involve in any international waterways. The policy is not triggered.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The project is not located in any disputed areas. The policy is not triggered.

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>Environment</p> <p>OP 4.01 Environmental Assessment. Three environmental policies triggered for the project, i.e. OP4.01 Environmental Assessment, OP4.04 Natural Habitats and OP4.09 Pest Management As per OP4.01, the project is assigned Category B for environmental purpose given the nature of the project and the limited scale of its activities, and associated environmental and social impacts. As designed the project will adopt a framework approach because the specific location of investments</p>

under Components 1 and 2 will be identified during the implementation through a participatory approach. Therefore, an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), including a generic Environmental Management Plan (EMP) and Pest Management Plan (PMP) was developed during the project preparation. Several WBG Environmental, Health and Safety Guidelines relevant to agriculture sector were incorporated into the EMP where applicable.

Component 1a Cooperative Development Fund (CDF) and 2a Rural Infrastructure will involve physical activities. Under the CDF, the project will support the establishment and capacity building of over one hundred new or existing village level cooperatives. The project will finance their production and market related equipment and facilities, nurseries, breeding and seed production, and cooperative level infrastructure. These cooperatives may engage in agricultural production of over ten types of plants (such as dragon fruit, kiwi and oil tea) and four types of livestock (such as pig, chicken) and rural tourism. These plants are all perennial and existing local species. The project doesn't involve massive plantation or large scale livestock farm, but aim to help organize farmers better and help them to improve product yield and quality and remove the bottlenecks in production or marketing.

Component 2a will support rehabilitation or construction of public infrastructure in rural areas, including off-grade access roads, small-scale irrigation and drainage facilities, small water storage tanks, market facilities and household power supply and information facilities. These infrastructure will be managed by local governments.

The project will bring about environmental and social benefits in terms of improved agricultural practices and increased income generation opportunities for poor communities in the project area. The agricultural production and infrastructure construction activities, if not well managed, may bring negative environmental and social impacts, including: (1) impacts on natural habitats such as soil erosion, vegetation clearance and water pollution, particularly in the karst area; (2) construction impacts and social disturbance such as noise and dust associated with small civil works; (3) waste management in rural tourism facilities and livestock farms during operation; (4) pesticides management associated with growing a number of agricultural products.

These environmental and social impacts are found to be limited, localized and temporary. The project ESMF included baseline survey, impact assessment, environmental management plans specific to each type of activities and procedures to address environmental and social issues, which are expected to avoid and mitigate these impacts adequately. The ESMF has been reviewed by the Bank team and considered satisfactory to Bank safeguards policy and domestic requirements.

OP 4.04 Natural Habitats. During the development of the ESMF, surveys on ecological and social baselines were carried out through desk review, consultation and field visits. A number of ecologically sensitive areas, including nature reserves, scenery areas, geological parks, and drinking water source protection areas were identified in the project region. Given the location of the candidate project villages and these sensitive areas, the project activities is unlikely to affect these sensitive areas. The project design and the ESMF have incorporated procedures and measures to avoid involving the identified sensitive areas and to mitigate effectively the potential impacts to the common natural habitats in the project area.

The agricultural products involved in the project are local featured perennial plants. These plants are diverse; several are fruit trees (e.g. mango and orange); others include shrubs (e.g. oil tee) and vines (e.g. dragon fruit, kiwi and grape). The project will not support large scale plantation, but

rather to improve the production yield and quality through promoting advanced agricultural technologies and organic food. There may be limited vegetation clearance and soil erosion associated with the growing activities, which have been assessed and mitigation measures included in the EMP.

Particular attention was given to the karstic part of the project area the karst topography are prone to soil erosion due to thin soil coverage. A set of measures and good practices in the karstic area were incorporated into the EMP.

OP 4.09 Pest Management. The project does not finance directly pesticides and agrochemicals, increased level of agricultural production activities supported the by the project Component 1a may led for farmers to use pesticides using their own funds to control agricultural pests. Survey on the pest management practices in the project area was conducted; plant specific pesticide practices were studied. The pesticides uses for this project would be limited given the following considerations: 1) a significant share of agriculture products supported in the project are all perennial plants that are diverse and are adapted to local ecological environment and do not thus require significant use of agrochemicals. Compared to annual crop production, pesticide uses are thus anticipated limited; 2) the main thrust of the project is to support production of safe and pollution free food products from mountain areas (organic and green food) for which there is currently a strong demand among increasingly quality conscious urban consumers. To this end, the PMP includes a set of physical, mechanical and biological pest control measures that are specific to each type of plants and a concrete plan to promote IPM to reduce chemical pesticides. Capacity building, monitoring and reporting requirements are included as well. Further, during implementation farmer cooperatives to be selected will include in their proposals supplemental requirements, as necessary. on pest management measures (including training aspect) specific to plant types.

Social

OP 4.10 Indigenous Peoples. More than 87% of population in the ten project counties are ethnic minority groups, with the Zhuang ethnic minority as the predominant group accounting for 74.5% of total population and nearly 90% of ethnic minority population, and the second largest is Han accounting for 12.7%. Other smaller ethnic minority groups in the project area are Yao (11.5%), Dong, Gelao, Shui, and Maonan. The Zhuang people have development features similar to those of the Han, the main Chinese population. It is the smaller ethnic minority groups, which are Yao, Miao, Dong, and Maonan, that need attention from the project to ensure equitable access to project benefits. An Ethnic Minority Development Framework (EMDF) has been prepared to promote active participation in project activities by smaller ethnic minority groups wherever feasible. Based on this EMDF, special attention will be paid to avoid any impact on ethnic cultures in project-supported tourism development proposals.

OP 4.12 Involuntary Resettlement. No resettlement is expected to take place due to project activities. However, small scale civil works are expected in order to construct necessary rural facilities such as storage, agricultural product processing facilities, and market places. The detailed activities will be decided through the management of individual cooperatives using participatory decision making process. When farmers use their land as input to join cooperatives, they should be fully informed of risks associated with investment. No farmer households should be obliged to join a cooperative against their free will. Ecological resettlement was planned as means of poverty

alleviation by local government. No overlap has been identified with proposed project activities. It has been agreed with Guangxi Regional PMO and the 10 project counties that villages involved in ecological resettlement will NOT be included in project activities, and this will be a focus of attention for monitoring and supervision.

A Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) has been prepared and disclosed to guide proper compliance with OP4.12. The project management offices at various levels will be responsible for monitoring of compliance with OP4.12 and include updates in the project progress report. Project supervision by the Bank team will pay close attention to safeguards compliance.

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

Through the promotion of improved agricultural production practices and improvement of rural infrastructure, the project are expected to help local poor communities to better carry out agricultural production and to reduce reliance on the natural resources, this will in long term bring environmental and social benefits in terms of protection of farmland, conservation of natural habitats and the control of soil erosion in karst area (i.e. the process of 喀斯特 rocky desertification 喀斯特). The negative impacts associated with the project activities are expected to be limited, localized and temporary. Cumulative impacts are minimal because the project activities will be of small scale and scattered. The EMP included project intervention-specific mitigation measures with particular attention to the karstic area.

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

At project design level, considering that the project area 喀斯特 poverty is the result of limited availability of natural resource and farmland, difficulties in water management (particularly in the karstic area), and long standing backward livelihood practices, the project aims to build farmer 喀斯特 capacity through improve efficiency and value-added in the agricultural production. To this end the project do not support large-scale plantation or livestock farms, but rather to promote green local features species and organic or green food. In addition, during the development of the project design and ESMF, several alternatives were considered, including selection of plant species and growing practices that are in favor of the control of soil erosion and water pollution in karst area and the use of pesticides.

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.

The RPMO engaged an accredited EIA consultant to prepare the ESMF, which addresses the project related environmental and social issues, and sets out principles and procedures to address the environment and social impacts of sub-projects. The RPMO will take overall responsibility of the implementation of the ESMF and EMP.

The ESMF includes a study of environmental and social baselines which include specific description of each project counties, an inventory of potential project villages and their key environmental issues which will help screen and assess subproject impacts during the project implementation. The ESMF included an assessment of potential environmental and social impacts, for which the karstic part of the project area was given particular attention. The ESMF also included procedures for sub-project screening, environmental document preparation, information disclosure and public consultation, review and approval, which follow the Bank safeguard policy and domestic environmental regulatory requirements.

<p>The ESMF includes a grievance redress mechanism and PMO/PIU capacity building plan, a generic Environmental Management Plan (EMP) and Pest Management Plan (PMP). The EMP includes activity-specific mitigation plans for agriculture related growing activities, rural infrastructure rehabilitation and construction, and storage and market facilities. In addition to general mitigation measures, the EMP includes mitigation measures specific to subproject activities in karst areas. The PMP addresses the selection and use of pesticides building on the integrated pest management approach. A set of physical, mechanical and biological pest control measures that are specific to each type of plants and a concrete plan to promote IPM to reduce chemical pesticides. Monitoring and budget requirements are included in the ESMF as well.</p> <p>The RPMO commissioned a social research team to conduct a thorough social assessment, based on which a Resettlement Policy Framework and an Ethnic Minority Development Framework was prepared to address OP 4.12 and OP 4.10. The RPMO designated staff to be responsible for safeguards compliance, and is committed to include monitoring of safeguards compliance into project progress reports.</p>
<p>5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.</p>
<p>Public consultation and information disclosure was carried out during the project preparation. The project environmental and social consultants carried out consultation through questionnaire survey, focused group meeting and interviews. Public opinions have been incorporated into the project design and the ESMF/EMP. The draft full ESMF, including PMP, was disclosed locally and on the website of Guangxi Poverty Reduction on May 12, 2016, with newspaper announcement of the disclosure on Guangxi Daily on May 13, 2016. The RPF and IPDF was disclosed locally on May 12, 2016 as well.</p>

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	20-May-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	02-Jun-2016
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
China	12-May-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	30-May-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	02-Jun-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
China	12-May-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	20-May-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	02-Jun-2016

"In country" Disclosure	
China	12-May-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	20-May-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	02-Jun-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
China	12-May-2016
<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 Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
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 4.09 - Pest Management	
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes [<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples	
Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]

If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" 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 Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Is physical displacement/relocation expected? Provided estimated number of people to be affected	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] TBD [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods) Provided estimated number of people to be affected	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] TBD [<input type="checkbox"/>]
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(s):	Name: Paavo Eliste	
Approved By		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Peter Leonard (SA)	Date: 07-Sep-2016
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Nathan M. Belete (PMGR)	Date: 08-Sep-2016