

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: ISDSA1034

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 01-Oct-2014

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 23-Oct-2014

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Belarus	Project ID:	P149697
Project Name:	Transit Corridor Improvement Project (P149697)		
Task Team Leader:	Simon David Ellis		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	22-Sep-2014	Estimated Board Date:	19-Dec-2014
Managing Unit:	GTIDR	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	Rural and Inter-Urban Roads and Highways (100%)		
Theme(s):	Infrastructure services for private sector development (30%), Other public sector governance (40%), Regional integration (30%)		
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:	270.01	Total Bank Financing:	250.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
Borrower			20.01
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development			250.00
Total			270.01
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Project Development Objective(s)

The Project Development Objective is to improve transport connectivity, border crossing procedures and safety for domestic and international road users on selected sections of the M6 corridor.

3. Project Description

Component 1: Improvement of Sections of M6 'Minsk – Grodno' Transit Corridor. This Component

will finance the reconstruction and upgrading of selected sections of the M6 road, from a two-lane to a four-lane road. The road improvement would meet two strategic objectives for the government by: (i) linking Minsk to Grodno as part of their national strategy of connecting all six Oblast centers to high standard roads; and (ii) developing international transit corridors to promote cross border trade. The crucial M6 transit route provides links between Minsk, Grodno and the Polish border. This component would finance the extension of the current four-lane road from Minsk for a further 73.4 kilometers (km 57.0 to km 130.4), and extend the current four lane road from Grodno for a further 13.3 kilometers (km 197.7 to km 211.0). There are insufficient finances for the whole road but these sections have been prioritized based on their overall economic returns. The road would be designed for the European standard axle load of 11.5 tons and also include two level interchanges and road safety features according to European standards. The route carries a substantial proportion of transit traffic with volumes averaging 5975 vehicles per day, of which 32 percent are trucks. This component will also finance financial and technical audits. Through counterpart financing, the government would finance the feasibility studies, engineering design, technical and environmental supervision, land acquisition, and infrastructure loss. Following improvement, the road would be tolled and have Weigh-In-Motion sensors installed (not financed through this loan).

Component 2: Modernization of Sector Institutions. This Component includes the following two sub-components: Sub-component 2.1: Traffic and Road Safety Coordination Center. The proposed Traffic and Road Safety Coordination Center (TRSCC) will be established within Beldor Center to promote safer roads through improved traffic management, emergency response and traveler information dissemination in the road sector. Sub-component 2.2: Road-side services. The provision of road side services is important for the safety and convenience of road users but is also a potential source of employment for local communities and particularly women.

Component 3: Border Management Enhancement. This Component will finance activities designed to improve the overall performance of border management in Belarus, facilitating the movement of cross-border trade at the Bruzgi BCP by reducing average clearance times and the number of transactions subjected to secondary inspections. This component will support the implementation and increase the effectiveness of the 'two agencies at the border' policy being adopted by the SCC. It will also support national ambitions to transition to a one-stop-shop approach as part of a single electronic window environment.

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

The section to be upgraded is located between Minsk and Grodno and is a 86.7 km part of the highway from Minsk to Grodno and on to the Polish border. The project area is generally flat with some rolling sections. The road mainly crosses farmland but there are sections of forest available for wood supply (plantations of common industrial tree species managed by state forestry enterprises) and several rivers and creeks to cross. Good construction practices and reasonable housekeeping during the upgrade of the road will ensure that negative impacts on flora, fauna and landscapes are minimized. While the alignment goes through the protected area - Landscape Sanctuary "Naliboksky" at km 91.07 - km 101.0, no impacts on natural habitats or important ecosystems are expected. There are a number of settlements along the way and there will be need for limited land acquisition, physical resettlement and some provision of sound barriers for houses that are close to the road.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Alexei Slenzak (GENDR)

Jennifer Shkabatur (GSURR)
 Klavdiya Maksymenko (GSURR)

Public Disclosure Copy

Public Disclosure Copy

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	Yes	The overall project is proposed as environmental category "B" in accordance with the Bank's operational policies. The Ministry of Transport through Belgipodor have already prepared a first draft of the EIA/EMP which is of good quality. The EIA/EMP includes: baseline data on the environmental characteristics of the project area, national and WB EA legal requirements and institutional responsibilities; potential environmental impacts; project alternatives analyzed; and a detailed Environmental Management Plan.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The alignment goes through the protected area "Zakaznik Naliboksky" at km 91.07 - km 101.0. There are only low-value trees at some sections nearby the alignment and no impacts on critical natural habitats or important biodiversity are expected. Some sections of the road go through forest available for wood supply (plantations of common industrial tree species, managed by state forestry enterprises).
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	
Physical Cultural Resources OP/ BP 4.11	No	
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	The upgrading of the road from two lanes to four lanes will require some land acquisition along the length of the road. Physical resettlement is, however, to be expected only on a very limited scale and will concern a few households. In some cases the land plots of the households will need to be acquired for projects purposes. It is also projected that as the result of widening of the road some houses will be located so close to the road that it would not be possible to ensure noise protection to the acceptable standards by installing sound barriers, and these houses would have to be resettled. Individual preliminary

		consultations were held by the client with the households that are likely to be affected. The specific number and exact location of such households will be identified only after the finalization of the technical design. A resettlement policy framework (RPF) was prepared for the project, agreed by the Bank and disclosed in Belarus in Russian and in English on Bank's Infoshop in May 2014. A RAP was prepared for the section of the road in Grodno oblast. The was disclosed in Russian on the site of GRODNOAVTODOR on September 24, 2014 and on Infoshop on September 24, 2014. A RAP for Minsk Oblast is currently under preparation. RAP(s) for the other sections of the road will be prepared after appraisal upon completion of the technical design as needed.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	Activities under the project will not involve abstraction of water or pollution of international rivers or its tributaries. The alignment runs at a distance from Neman and the planned works will not result in pollution of Neman. OP 7.50 is not triggered.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	

II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

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

The upgrading of the road from two lanes to four lanes will require some land acquisition along the length of the road. However, physical resettlement of individuals is only expected on a very limited scale and will concern a few households. In some cases the land plots of the households will need to be acquired for projects purposes. It is also projected that as the result of widening the road some houses will be located so close to the road that it would not be possible to ensure noise protection to the acceptable standards by installing sound barriers, and these houses would have to be resettled. No potential large scale, significant or irreversible impacts are expected.

Potential environmental impacts are standard for road upgrade/rehabilitation and include local air pollution from trucks and other construction machinery, noise, operation of borrow pits, generation of waste during construction process and operation of construction camps. These impacts will be mitigated through implementation of the mitigation measures contained in the EMP.

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

<p>Project activities will require land acquisition and a limited physical resettlement of individual households. No potential indirect and/or long-term environmental impacts are expected due to anticipated future activities in the project area.</p>
<p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p>
<p>No alternatives were considered because the project will upgrade the existing road and no areas were identified that merit by-passing. While some land acquisition will be necessary in order to widen the road as part of the project, the project will aim to minimize cases of physical resettlement. Households that will have to be resettled will receive full compensation according to the principles outlined in the RPF and site-specific RAP.</p>
<p>4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.</p>
<p>A resettlement policy framework (RPF) was prepared for the project, agreed by the Bank and disclosed in Belarus in Russian and in English on Bank's Infoshop in May 2014. A RAP was prepared for the section of the road in Grodno oblast. The RAP was disclosed in Russian on the site of GRODNOAVTODOR on September 24, 2014 and on Infoshop on September 24, 2014. A RAP for Minsk Oblast is currently under preparation. RAP(s) for the other sections of the road will be prepared after appraisal upon completion of the technical design.</p> <p>The EIA and EMP was prepared by the Client and disclosed in country in Grodno Oblast in December 2013 and in Minsk Oblast in June 2014. These documents were disclosed in infoshop on September 5, 2014.</p> <p>The borrower has prior experience of successful implementation of World Bank funded projects in the road sector. The PIU will identify the specialist responsible for monitoring the implementation of the RAP(s) and reporting to the Bank on resettlement implementation. The State Enterprise Beldor NII and Belgiprodor will be involved in monitoring the adherence to environmental safeguards requirements. The Bank's specialists will monitor resettlement and environmental issues in the course of their regular supervision missions.</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>The RPF was disclosed on Infoshop on March 1, 2014 (in English), and in country on May 1, 2014 (in Russian). Individual preliminary consultations were held by RUE GrodnoAvtoDor with the households that are likely to be affected based on the draft RAP for Grodno Region. Once these consultations were completed the RAP for Grodno region was finalized and disclosed in Russian on the website of RUE "GrodnoAvtoDor", and in English in Infoshop. Additional public consultations will also be held now that the final RAP has been disclosed. The RAP for Minsk Oblast will be prepared and provided to the Bank for approval and disclosure once the technical designs have been completed.</p> <p>Detailed grievance redress mechanisms are described in the RPF and RAP. The hot line of the MoTC will be used as additional grievance mechanism for project implementation and resettlement monitoring. The grievances and queries related to the project will be redirected to the project support team for addressing them.</p> <p>The EIA and EMP was prepared by the Client and consulted upon in December 2013-January 2014 in Grodno oblast and June -July 2014 in Minsk oblast. The document was disclosed in the Infoshop on September 5, 2014 following approval by the Bank.</p>

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	11-Aug-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	05-Sep-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	20-Aug-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	01-Mar-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Belarus	01-May-2014
<i>Comments:</i> Resettlement Action Plans for the Grodno Oblast have been prepared and disclosed in country and submitted to the info shop on September 24, 2014.	
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 4.12 - 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"/>]
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information	
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
All Safeguard Policies	

Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader:	Name: Simon David Ellis	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Regional Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Agnes I. Kiss (RSA)	Date: 02-Oct-2014
Practice Manager/Manager:	Name: Juan Gaviria (PMGR)	Date: 02-Oct-2014