

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

Additional Financing

Report No.: PIDISDSA21407

Date Prepared/Updated: 20-Apr-2017

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country:	Haiti	Project ID:	P163199
		Parent Project ID (if any):	P126346
Project Name:	Disaster Risk Management and Reconstruction Additional Financing (P163199)		
Parent Project Name:	Disaster Risk Management and Reconstruction (P126346)		
Region:	LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	24-Apr-2017	Estimated Board Date:	25-May-2017
Practice Area (Lead):	Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience Global Practice	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Borrower(s)	Minister of Economy and Finance		
Implementing Agency	Unite de Coordination et Execution, Unite de Coordination des Projects		
Financing (in USD Million)			
Financing Source			Amount
IDA Grant			0.00
IDA Grant from CRW			20.00
Financing Gap			0.00
Total Project Cost			20.00
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 2014 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, with over 55 percent of the vote at the first round. The Electoral Council confirmed these results on January 3, 2017. President Moise sworn 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 600 mm in less than 24 hours, and a rise in sea levels of 2 to 3 meters in the departments of Grand'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 Grand'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. 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 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 (Grand'Anse, Nippes, and Sud departments). This figure was later evaluated to be 32 percent of GDP by the PDNA, with damage and losses to the transport sector due to the destruction of bridges and roads amounting to 17.7 percent of total damage and losses.

Reconstruction needs were assessed at 25 percent of GDP (US\$2.2 billion). 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 Grand'Anse were entirely destroyed. More than 100,000 houses were heavily damaged or destroyed, half of which were Grand'Anse. Key roads and bridges were washed away. The area's already limited water, sanitation and energy infrastructure was damaged. Although damages and losses appear more modest in the education and health sectors, the population has been significantly affected by the damage and destruction of schools and the interruption of services at damaged or destroyed health centers. Over 450,000 children are estimated to remain out of school, the vaccine cold chain has been destroyed, and a sharp increase in suspected cholera cases has been recorded in affected departments.

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\$20 million is sought from the IDA Crisis Response Window (CRW) to support the country's reconstruction and 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, paragraph 12. The environment and social requirements will not be deferred to the project implementation stage.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

Disaster Risk Management

Haiti is one of the countries most exposed to natural hazards in the world, with over 93 percent of its surface and more than 96 percent of its population at risk of two or more hazards. Between 1971 and 2013, Haiti has been subjected to natural disasters almost every year with adverse effects on economic growth. The country has a higher number of disasters per km² than the average Caribbean country. In 2008, tropical storms and hurricanes caused losses estimated at 15 percent of GDP. The earthquake on January 12, 2010 killed 220,000 people, displaced 1.5 million people, and destroyed the equivalent of 120 percent of GDP.

Climate change is expected to exacerbate the risk of hydro-meteorological hazards by increasing the frequency and/or intensity of extreme events, further increasing Haiti's vulnerability. Climate projections for the Caribbean estimate that temperatures could rise from 1.2°C to 2.3°C by 2100, with a median increase of 2.0°C during the 21st century. In addition to claiming human lives, climate-related hazards may also take a heavy toll on all sectors of the Haitian economy and revert hard-won development gains.

Beyond its extreme exposure, disasters have catastrophic effects in Haiti due of the high level of vulnerability to natural hazards, institutional fragility and weaknesses, and the lack of adequate resources invested in the Disaster Risk Management sector. According to the 2014 Poverty Assessment, almost 70 percent of the population is either poor or vulnerable to falling into poverty, and nearly 75 percent of households are economically impacted by at least one shock each year. Despite the 2001 National Plan for DRM established the National Disaster Risk Management System (Système National de Gestion des Risques et des Désastres, SNGRD), the country still lacks the necessary legal framework and norms to effectively reduce risk and manage disasters at the national and local levels. The National Plan set up the basis for handling emergency and preparedness operations under the Technical Directorate of the Civil Protection, however no line ministry is officially responsible for identifying, managing and reducing risk. Finally, this critical lack of norms and responsibility results in inadequate resource allocation: the limited resources are allocated at the national level alone, leaving the regional and local level without any financial capacity to prepare for, or respond to, disasters or to reduce and manage risks.

Transportation

The transport sector continues to represent a major bottleneck to Haiti's social and economic development. Roads remain the primary mode of transportation for both people and goods, and infrastructure investments remain critical to Haiti's medium and long term social and economic development. With about 80 percent of traffic by land, Haiti has a limited network which suffers from a lack of maintenance, and from the impacts of climate change and variability, and entire regions remain isolated during the rainy season, further exacerbated in the wake of an extreme natural event such as Hurricane Matthew. Matthew's destruction of bridges and roads amounts to 17.7 percent of total damages and losses recorded in the country.

The agriculture sector in Haiti has been also declining for many years partly because of neglected rural infrastructure. Transport services are often unavailable, and Haiti's two rainy seasons often make roads impassable and explain why loss estimation could reach up to 50 percent for some products.

The Bank has been supporting the transport sector nationwide since 2006, with a particular focus on critical spot interventions and on strengthening road maintenance country system to improve resilience and protection of assets. Transport connectivity must be improved to facilitate economic and agricultural trade dynamics, including (i) a functioning structural network of Primary secondary and tertiary roads to ensure access to internal and external markets; and (ii) all-weather rural roads linking

production, processing sites and local markets. A reliable road network would also lower transportation costs and facilitate greater accessibility to social services for rural and peri-urban communities, including the delivery of aid and access to health services during emergencies. In the case of Haiti, it would also have a significant positive gender impact. DRMMP will continue to provide technical assistance to improve infrastructure investment identification and prioritization, both for emergency recovery and reconstruction activities, and in the medium-to-long term.

Rural Connectivity

DRMMP has financed a new methodology, the Rural Index Access (RAI), and the spot-improvement approach. The Rural Access Index (RAI) for Haiti is about 39 percent, which is well below the average of the Latin American and Caribbean region. Data collected highlighted particular rural connectivity issues and challenges: 50 percent of the country remains isolated and that two-thirds of rural Haitians, an estimated 3.2 million people, live in poorly connected areas. Markets, which play a critical role for the exchange of goods, are still in very poor conditions in terms of infrastructure, hygiene, and governance and links to stable value chains. Enhancing rural roads will contribute to sustainably improving access to basic services, especially in rural areas and small towns, which experience deep and stagnating poverty.

The proposed AF would continue to provide institutional and structural support in both the Transport and DRM sectors, including institutional support to the Centre National de l'Information Géo-Spatiale (CNIGS) and the DPC, and the financing of recovery and reconstruction infrastructure activities in the affected areas.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Original Project Development Objective(s) - Parent

The Project Development Objective is to support the Recipient in improving disaster response capacity and enhancing the resiliency of critical transport infrastructure.

Proposed Project Development Objective(s) - Additional Financing

The Project Development Objective is to support the Recipient in improving disaster response capacity and enhancing the resiliency of critical transport infrastructure.

Key Results

D. Project Description

The proposed second AF would provide additional financing to support all five components, predominantly Component 3 – Rehabilitation of Vulnerable and Damaged Critical Transport Infrastructure with an additional US\$ 17 million. The existing PDO and other project components remain relevant and there would be no change under the proposed AF. This AF would also include a Level Two Restructuring with changes captured in subsequent sub-sections.

The proposed AF and restructuring would extend the closing date of the Original Grant by three years from June 30, 2017 to June 30, 2020. The financing agreement of the parent Project would be amended accordingly. This extension would allow for the completion of activities under the parent Project that were pushed so as to allow for emergency recovery and reconstruction activities,

specifically Bridge Estimé Dumarsais, and the additional infrastructure activities added under Component 3.

Component Name:

Component 1 – Natural Hazard Risk Assessment and Analysis

Comments (optional)

Component 1 – Natural Hazard Risk Assessment and Analysis (US\$1 million): Component 1 will support enhancing the Government’s capacity to analyze and manage natural hazard and risk data by the National Geo-Spatial Information Center (CNIGS) and continuing strengthening the technical and institutional capacity of the seven targeted sectoral line ministries by providing technical assistance to incorporate risks assessment and reduction elements into development planning.

Component Name:

Component 2 – Support to Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Response

Comments (optional)

Component 2 – Support to Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Response (US\$1 million): The proposed AF would also involve few changes under Component 2. The sub-component 2.1, ‘Institutional Development of the DPC and Expansion of its CCPC Network’ will add new activities financed by the AF, in particular supporting some risk awareness initiatives and a rapid assessment of the evacuation shelters in the affected areas affected by hurricane Matthew. The sub-component 2.2 ‘Communication Network and Decision support system’, and sub-component 2.3, “Pilot Emergency Shelter Rehabilitation and Construction” will remain unchanged.

Component Name:

Component 3 – Rehabilitation of Vulnerable and Damaged Critical Transport Infrastructure

Comments (optional)

Component 3 – Rehabilitation of Vulnerable and Damaged Critical Transport Infrastructure (US\$17 million): Under this component, additional resources would be used to finance emergency recovery and reconstruction activities, and to finance those activities that were postponed under the parent Project so as to free up resources to respond to the emergency. Additionally, the proposed AF would finance the provision of support to the Bridge Management Unit based at MTPTC and technical units in the Transport Directive covering the emergency response.

Component Name:

Component 4 – Emergency Response and Recovery

Comments (optional)

Component 4 – Emergency Response and Recovery (US\$ 0.5 million): No change.

Component Name:

Component 5 – Project Management and Implementation Support

Comments (optional)

Component 5 – Project Management and Implementation Support (US\$ 0.5million): No change.

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

The works of the parent project took place throughout Haiti. Rehabilitation and reconstruction/construction activities consisted of (i) rehabilitation of shelters; (ii) repair of critical points of infrastructure damaged by adverse natural events (e.g. Hurricane Tomas); (iii) rehabilitation of existing infrastructure critical points in order to improve resiliency; (iv) new works to support all-weather transportation network; (v) small works to improve local access to the backbone network; and (vi) a specific subcomponent dedicated to urgent works in Port-au-Prince: urban road repairs, rehabilitation and a pavestone works. Road network repair activities largely took place in Southern

Haiti, which is the area most affected by adverse natural events.

The proposed AF will target the restoration of connectivity to the communities most affected by Hurricane Matthew in Southern Haiti, by rehabilitating or reconstructing roads and bridges damaged by the hurricane. In addition, it will strengthen the preparedness capacity of the civil protection services by developing a strategy of evacuation shelters focusing on the highly vulnerable communities.

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Asli Gurkan(GSU04)

Felipe Jacome(GSU04)

Nyaneba E. Nkrumah(GEN04)

II. IMPLEMENTATION

The project would continue to be implemented by the Minister of Interior and Regional Authorities (MICT), and the Ministry of Public Works, Transportation and Communication (MTPTC). Both Ministries are established World Bank project implementation partners.

Overall project implementation will be coordinated by the MICT's Directorate of Civil Protection (DPC) and its Project Coordination Unit (UCP). The UCP-DPC would also be responsible for the implementation of Components 1, 2 and 5.1. The UCP-DPC has experience in managing Bank-financed disaster risk management projects and has a sound fiduciary track record.

The Central Coordination Unit (UCE) of the MTPTC would be responsible for the implementation of Components 3, 4 and 5.2 of the project. This unit has experience managing other Bank-financed infrastructure projects.

III. SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The original project in the amount of SDR 37.6 million was approved on December 1, 2011 and was effective April 3, 2012. This additional financing will add \$20 million to scale up the works that have already been financed under the parent project. The planned works under the AF will continue repairing or rebuilding existing transport infrastructure such as roads and bridges. As such, the scope of environmental impacts and accompanying mitigation measures are well described in the existing ESMF and include impacts related to waste/debris removal and disposal, worker and fire safety, soil removal and erosion, increased levels of dust and noise, oil spills or leakage from machinery and so on. The impact of the parent project and the additional

		<p>financing is expected to be geographically limited. On the social side, potential risks may include delays in compensation related to land acquisition and involuntary resettlement or lack of appropriate consultations on relevant project information.</p> <p>Planned works financed by the additional financing include the reconstruction of two bridges on the river Ladigue and the river of Cotes de Fer. However, the exact siting of these bridges on the river is to be determined after engineering design studies. Other works financed by the additional financing will include spot repairs on roads, bridges and other transport infrastructure. Finally, the Parent project will also finance the reconstruction and rebuilding of temporary shelters. The existing ESMF will be updated to reflect these new works and a draft version will be available for the decision meeting. Public consultations will be conducted after the decision meeting and the documents will be re-disclosed on the World Bank's website and on the Ministry's website on April 20.</p> <p>The implementing agency (UCE) already has the environmental capacity to manage the project and has been managing the parent project since its approval. The environmental safeguards implementation is currently rated as satisfactory, whereas social safeguards implementation as moderately satisfactory.</p>
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The parent project did not trigger this safeguard and the additional financing, as envisioned, is unlikely to do so. However, for each new activity that requires an ESMP, an assessment of its impact on the natural habitat will be made. If triggered, additional safeguard measures will be developed.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	The project is not envisioned to operate in any forested area.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	No pesticides will be used.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	As with the parent project, it is expected that the AF will not involve any sites with archeological, paleontological, historical, religious or other area of unique natural value as defined under the policy. However, the

		existing EMSF includes chance finds procedures that may be applicable.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	There are no indigenous people in this project.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	<p>This policy was triggered by the original project. This policy continues to be relevant under the AF at hand due to road and infrastructure works. The planned works aim mainly at repairing or rebuilding existing transport infrastructure and therefore might cause limited resettlement.</p> <p>The original project prepared a RPF to guide RAPs for a number of works. The current RPF will be revised, consulted and disclosed by appraisal on April 20. This RPF will incorporate implementation experience and lessons learned as summarized in the section below.</p> <p>The list of localities to benefit from rehabilitation and repairs activities are currently tentative. It will be finalized once detailed design studies are completed during project implementation. Site specific Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) will be prepared during the implementation stage, if needed. No work will be commenced prior to the preparation and implementation of appropriate safeguard instruments.</p>
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	There are no dam related activities in the project.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The project is not on an international waterway.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The project is not in a disputed area.

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:

There have been no large scale, significant or irreversible impacts associated with the parent project and similarly, there are none expected under the additional financing. Any negative impacts will be short-term and highly localized. Such negative impacts may include impacts related to waste management (from construction waste), pollution of the river (oil spills from machinery, construction material, etc); noise, occupational health and safety, soil erosion. During the supervision of the parent project, some of these issues were identified and

mitigated with no residual impacts and there is now adequate capacity for identifying and managing these risks.

Early in implementation the PIU safeguard specialists were lax in preparing ESMPs and seeking approval from the Bank prior to works but with capacity building, this has rapidly improved and now ESMPs and RAPs are prepared prior to authorizing the commencement of works. In all, two ESMPs were prepared, one for Dolin bridge and for Chalon bridge. The implementation of the construction of the Chalon Bridge (RN2) and of the upgrading of the Faustin area (Delmas) were completed and well received by the population. The implementation of environmental safeguards under the original project has been satisfactory. Lessons to continually improve safeguards management have been raised and addressed through ongoing project implementation support.

The implementation of social safeguards under the parent project is moderately satisfactory. In terms of the scope of impacts, in totality, 312 households have been affected either by land acquisition (30 households) or loss of economic income (282 households). No physical resettlement has occurred to date under this project. This impact has been captured in four RAPs that have been prepared to date (Faustin 1er, Dumarsais Estimé, Dolin, and Chalon). The RAP prepared for Dumarsais Estime bridge, for example, has identified 3 households affected by land acquisition and 8 households affected by economic loss. The PIU is in the process of completing the compensation. No works has started under the Dumarsais Estime bridge under the parent project, but it is expected that works would start under AF once all compensation is completed. The details of other RAPs' implementation status are included in the updated RPF.

Based on the implementation progress, first key lesson learned under this project is that land acquisition, no matter how small the amount of land may be, can get complicated in Haiti. As an indication of this, the project has seen delays in small-scale land acquisition and compensation for the Dolin bridge as a result of complications regarding land tenure and titling in Haiti. Keeping this lesson in mind, land acquisition is best avoided or minimized under AF. Second key lesson learned is that resettlement and compensation procedures demand close oversight both from the PIU and the Bank side to avoid complaints and to resolve issues upfront. Third key lesson is that it is very important to have a social specialist as part of the PIU who will keep regular communication with the project affected people as well as keep records on the social impacts. The PIU is equipped with an experienced social safeguards specialist who has participated in numerous World Bank trainings over the duration of the project. This specialist will be retained under the AF. The Bank's social specialists work closely with the PIU and they jointly take field visits to meet with PAPs. As an additional measure under the AF, the project team will hold monthly consultation meetings in affected communities to closely monitor social impacts and to facilitate beneficiary feedback. As part of the AF's updated results framework, the project has added an indicator to track actions taken based on these monthly consultation meetings.

GRM: No official complaint has been brought to date against the project. The delays in the land compensation have already been in the radar screen of the PIU and the Bank team. The issue has been brought up already at the high level discussions last FY and will be once again

brought up with the new Minister of Public works in the coming days. The Ministry of Public Works (MTPTC) had developed grievance redress procedures under a previous project (Projet de Reconstruction Post-séisme en Haïti), including a GRM form. This form is included in the Annex of the updated RPF of this project. However, the implementation experience shows that the project uses a more informal type of GRM to try to address issues ex-ante, consisting of site visits and discussions with beneficiaries to resolve issues amicably before the issue escalates to a complaint. The GRM form has not been used in practice until now. The monthly consultation meetings will be used as feedback forums to flesh out any concerns by project beneficiaries/PAPs before they become more formal complaints. However, the existing GRM procedures will also be explained in detail to local communities during AF project implementation.

The implementation experience and all lessons learned summarized above will be a key part as of the RPF consultations. The summary of RPF consultations will be included in the updated RPF, to be finalized and disclosed by appraisal.

Additional Financing

This AF responds to urgent needs to restore connectivity of the most affected communities by hurricane Matthew. The planned works aim mainly at repairing or rebuilding existing transport infrastructure. Depending of the detailed design studies for the reconstruction of the two bridges on the Ladigue river and the of Cotes de Fer river, some very limited resettlements may occur, should the location or size of the bridges' changes. The AF will also likely complete the construction of the Dumarsais Estimé Bridge, planned under the original Project. A RAP for this site was already prepared under the original project which foresees compensation for land acquisition for 3 households (no physical resettlement) and the economic compensation for 10 households.

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

There are no indirect, cumulative or longer-term negative impacts that are associated with this project. Most of the long-term impacts of the works financed by the additional financing are largely positive. For example the works will ensure that there is adequate transportation networks, particularly in areas most impacted by the hurricane. In terms of the road, bridge and shelter rehabilitation, labor influx issues will be assessed but these are largely small scale works and the labor pool will be very limited and likely commute to the job site daily from their various homes. The siting of the bridge and shelters will change the landscape as would erecting any structure. It would be important to ensure that attention is paid to siting to avoid restriction of access to structures, important tree stands, and other natural vegetation that is considered important to the communities, as well as minimize loss of economic income. Analysis of alternatives will be particularly important to ensure that any potential long term risks or indirect risks are minimized. Similar to the parent project, a screening checklist will be used to identify the potential impact of any activity, and in the unlikely event that these will have long term negative impacts, these will be screened out.

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

As the design studies will be finalized during the AF, one of the key considerations will be to avoid or minimize adverse impacts. The design studies will particularly look at the siting of the bridges. The assessment will consider engineering stability, environmental considerations such as erosion, community convenience and other factors. Based on this assessment of alternatives, a site selection will be made.

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.

Safeguards Implementation under the Original Project

Currently one social specialist and one environmental specialist support this project in the Unité Centrale d'Exécution (Project Coordination Unit) within the Ministry of Public Works, Transport, Energy and Communications (UCE-MTPTEC). These specialists are tasked with the preparation, coordination of the implementation and monitoring of all Environment and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) and RAPs required by the Project. These specialists will be retained under the additional financing to monitor the environmental and social impacts of activities.

The borrower, with support of the Bank, has undergone a series of training specifically focused on improving the performance of the PIU in all areas including safeguards. A consultant was recruited to work with the safeguards unit, assess its strengths and weaknesses, and improve their organization and functionality. This approach has strengthened its Project Implementation Unit and the PIU now has a functioning social and environmental unit. Both specialists have the technical capacity to manage the project. There is good monitoring and documentation capacity in place in the project implementation unit.

From a social safeguards perspective, the borrower has effectively addressed involuntary resettlement throughout all of its works, despite some delays in compensation. The Social Safeguards rating of the parent project is Moderately Satisfactory. 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 key stakeholders continue to be the Ministry of Public Works, Transport, Energy and Communications (MTPTC), local authorities, and the beneficiary population in Haiti's Southern Peninsula.

For the Parent Project, all key documents such as the ESMFs and ESMPs were prepared, consulted and disclosed on the World Bank website and in-country on the Government's website. In country consultations were done with the affected populations. Given that the sites of the bridges and other infrastructure are not precisely known, consultations will be broader at the ESMF stage, focusing largely on civil society groups, NGOs, and Government institutions. During the preparation of the ESMP (PGES), the sites will be known, and

consultations will focus more specifically on project affected communities. The documents will be similarly disclosed on April 20.

For the AF the revised RPF will be updated, prior to consultations with staff of MTPTC, related ministries and civil society groups in the Southern Peninsula. The documents will then be re-disclosed in-country and on the World Bank website on April 20.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	12-Mar-2017
Date of submission to InfoShop	20-Apr-2017
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Haiti	20-Apr-2017
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	15-Mar-2017
Date of submission to InfoShop	20-Apr-2017
"In country" Disclosure	
Haiti	20-Apr-2017
<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 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources						
Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement						
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is physical displacement/relocation expected?	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)	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	TBD	<input type="checkbox"/>
282 Provide estimated number of people to be affected						
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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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: Pierre Xavier Bonneau
 Title: Program Leader

Contact: Sergio Dell'anna
 Title: Disaster Risk Management Speci

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name: Minister of Economy and Finance
 Contact: Wolff Dubic
 Title: Directeur
 Email: woldub@yahoo.fr

Implementing Agencies

Name: Unite de Coordination et Execution
 Contact: Jules Cesaire YAGANZA
 Title: Directeur du Departement Techniques Industrielles et Exploit
 Email: Garijan@yahoo.com

Name: Unite de Coordination des Projects
 Contact: Jules Cesaire YAGANZA
 Title: Directeur du Departement Techniques Industrielles et Exploit
 Email: ucpmefhaiti@yahoo.com

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: Pierre Xavier Bonneau, Sergio Dell'anna	
<i>Approved By:</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Noreen Beg (SA)	Date: 20-Apr-2017
Practice Manager/Manager:	Name: Ming Zhang (PMGR)	Date: 20-Apr-2017
Country Director:	Name: Michelle C. Keane (CD)	Date: 24-Apr-2017