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I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country:</th>
<th>OECS Countries</th>
<th>Project ID:</th>
<th>P158958</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Project ID (if any):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name:</td>
<td>Regional Agriculture Competitiveness Project (P158958)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Appraisal Date:</td>
<td>06-Feb-2017</td>
<td>Estimated Board Date:</td>
<td>25-May-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Area (Lead):</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Lending Instrument:</td>
<td>Investment Project Financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Agency:</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and Rural Transformation, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry, Fisheries and Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing (in USD Million)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Source</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Bank for Reconstruction and Development</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Development Association (IDA)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL BENEFICIARIES</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Category:</td>
<td>B - Partial Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Review Decision:</td>
<td>Track II - The review did authorize the preparation to continue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a Repeater project?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Decision (as needed):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Introduction and Context
Country Context
The small and open countries of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) continue to face serious development challenges. Following the withdrawal of preferential trade arrangements with the European Union (EU) in 2008, and a sizable contraction in their economies in 2009 that resulted from the 2008 global financial crisis, economic growth in OECS countries remained largely stagnant in 2010-2013. In addition, the crisis negatively impacted tourism, remittances, FDI and financial sector activity, while sharply increasing public debt and fiscal imbalances.
While in the past two years the economies of OECS countries have been slowly recuperating from the crisis, chiefly due to a recovery of the tourism sector, significant challenges remain. Despite improvements in a number of human development indices, OECS countries have not succeeded in reducing poverty to levels compatible with their per capita income levels. Official poverty rates are 30.2 percent in St. Vincent & the Grenadines and 37.7 percent in Grenada, with the majority of the poor living in rural areas. Lower demand for OECS exports and services resulting from the financial crisis exacerbated the already high pre-crisis levels of unemployment, which now stands at 10.2 percent in Grenada and 18.8 percent in St. Vincent & the Grenadines. Youth unemployment is a particular concern, reaching levels of over 30 percent in both of these countries. In addition, natural disasters have periodically impacted the region, significantly damaging OECS countries’ infrastructure and economies.

Following the expiration of preferential trade arrangements with the EU, the share of agriculture in OECS economies greatly diminished, including agricultural exports. OECS countries’ economies grew by an average of around 6 percent per year in the 1980s. This growth was largely driven by an expansion of agricultural exports under preferential trade agreements with the EU and by investment in tourism. In the late 1990s, the region started to experience a dramatic shift in its external trade position when it gradually lost preferential access for traditional agricultural exports (banana and sugar) to European markets. Consequently, by the end of the decade, average annual economic growth dropped to around 3 percent. In the early 2000s, OECS governments made efforts to offset exogenous shocks through increased public investment. However, this did not translate into a revival of growth and crowded out private investment. The growing fiscal imbalances associated with increased public investment were financed by expensive domestic and external commercial borrowing and resulted in a large public debt burden.

OECS countries are highly dependent on imports for their food needs. Trade balances have grown increasingly negative since the 1990s, and current OECS agricultural imports are about four times as high as agricultural exports. The main food items being imported are meat, cereals and dairy products. Imports of agricultural produce have increased over time in terms of volume, variety and value, contributed by growth of the tourism sector, rise of supermarkets, and higher incomes. According to World Bank estimates, 68 percent of tourism food demand is imported, representing around 20 percent of total OECS agriculture imports. Several recent studies on the linkages between the agriculture and tourism sectors in OECS countries found that there is scope for import substitution by increasing local food sales to the tourism sector. However, sales of locally-grown food items to the tourism sector and the local economy are constrained by poorly functioning mechanisms to match supply and demand, and by limited capacity among local farmers to generate a consistent supply of food items demanded by the tourism sector that meet the required food safety and quality standards, at competitive prices. On the other hand, and given the limited size of the tourism industry, the greatest potential for substitution of food imports lies with domestic markets (in particular supermarkets) and regional markets.

Sectoral and Institutional Context
Sectoral Context

Agriculture remains an important sector given its contribution to rural incomes, employment and food and nutritional security. The importance of traditional export crops diminished greatly throughout the OECS during the last two decades. Currently agriculture represents 5.4 percent of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in Grenada and 7.5 percent in St. Vincent & the Grenadines, down from respectively 13.4 percent and 21.2 percent in 1990. Following the gradual decline of the preferential trade agreements with the EU, OECS governments and farmers were slow to adapt to the newly competitive environment. Despite efforts by OECS governments to diversify their agricultural production base, a non-traditional, diversified agriculture that can provide the local economy, including the tourism sector, with fresh and processed food has yet to take off. Nevertheless, agriculture remains a major contributor to employment, representing about 11 percent of the labor force in Grenada, and 26 percent in St. Vincent & the Grenadines, representing a particularly important source of income for the rural poor.

Across OECS countries, demand for food is expanding in volume and variety, and tourism is an important driver of this growth. Fresh products, which have the greatest potential to be supplied locally, account for about 60 percent of food purchased by hotels, and are mostly imported. Locally produced fruits and vegetables have the greatest potential to substitute for some of the imported produce because of high local demand, competitive cost of production in some cases, high perishability of these products, their ability to grow in most OECS countries, and their suitability for production even on small farms. Some types of fish and seafood also have potential, while local meat, poultry, and dairy products have limited potential in the short run. Apart from hotels, the yachting sector has been expanding in recent years and thus has had an increasing impact on local economies including local food provisioning. Beyond the tourism sector, linkages between local farmers and supermarkets are of high importance given the latter’s demand for fresh food and thus the potential to substitute some of its imported food requirement with locally sourced food.

For hotels, especially the large ones, the main barrier to purchasing greater quantities of local produce and other fresh food is the limited ability of local farmers to deliver required quantities and quality of produce in a timely, consistent, and competitive manner. Most farms are small and lack the inputs, equipment, infrastructure, and farm management skills (including production planning, crop management knowledge, and post-harvest handling capacity) needed to become reliable suppliers. Few producers regard farming as a business, and most young people do not regard agriculture as a successful career. Yet, the agricultural sector has room for growth and can absorb young farmers—an important consideration since youth unemployment in OECS countries is, on average, almost twice the national unemployment rate.

The lack of aggregation of smallholder supplies and poor communication between supply and demand compromises market performance, while complicating the planning of farm production based on demand. The prevailing marketing system is one in which neither prices nor quantities are known before the start of the growing season. Poor market information leads to uncertainty for both buyers and sellers. Most hotels and supermarkets do not provide farmers with demand forecasts. This leads to a situation in which farmers cannot plan their production based on demand and periods of shortages and surpluses, which in turn contributes to considerable price variations over time and unstable farm income. The lack of aggregation in marketing not only limits farmers’ access to assured and remunerative markets (and a stable income over the seasons,
with a shorter season, but also complicates buyers purchasing operations while creating disincentives to procure locally, especially for the larger hotels. Finally, food losses are high, mainly because most farmers often produce the same products at the same time, and lack adequate storage facilities. The resulting surpluses lead to low prices and revenues for farmers, as well as losses.

While several agro-processing initiatives exist, the industry is underdeveloped. Difficulties in obtaining financing on affordable terms limit investments in infrastructure, equipment, and inputs required to achieve sufficient scale and generate consistent profits. Many agribusiness entrepreneurs have insufficient technical skills and knowledge needed to develop viable business plans, make the required investments, develop a network of reliable network of farmer suppliers, and comply with standards related to quality, food safety and certification required to penetrate profitable markets for higher quality fresh or processed agriculture products. Many struggle with low capacity utilization and face high production costs, which reduces the competitiveness of their products. While the food processing industry in the OECS currently lacks the capacity to absorb, process and preserve all the fresh produce that is on offer, at the same time agro-processors experience difficulties in obtaining the amounts of quality products they require in a consistent manner. While partially related to seasonality, this mismatch between local production and industry demand is mainly an organizational and marketing problem. Finally, public sector initiatives directly related to agro-processing have mostly resulted in crowding out of the private sector and have proved largely unsuccessful.

Institutional Context

The agriculture sector and its linkage with tourism are among the highest priorities for OECS governments. Agriculture-tourism linkages are tied into OECS governments national development strategies in view of the unexploited possibilities for increasing the share of locally-sourced food purchased by the tourism sector and reducing the growing food import bill. In addition, the continued focus on strengthening the agriculture sector is also driven by its potential to address food and nutritional security, while increasing employment and rural incomes.

The proposed operation is strongly aligned with Ministries of Agriculture’s priorities. Officials from the Ministries of Agriculture across OECS governments expressed strong interest in a World Bank Group (WBG) investment operation in agriculture that would bring needed technical assistance into the sector and provide financing for innovative agriculture projects, thus strengthening the sector and improving its linkages with tourism. The proposed operation intends to partially fill important financing gaps of the involved Ministries of Agriculture, contributing to agricultural growth and rural development.

The project is well positioned to contribute to the stated climate change policies and measures of both Grenada and St. Vincent & the Grenadines, as outlined in their Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs). Both countries INDCs focus, among other things, on better adapting to climate change with a prioritized attention to both tourism and agriculture. By taking into consideration climate change, as an emerging risk, but also appropriately including it in the project components design and implementation, the project provides an enabling framework for the achievement of some of the INDCs commitments.

Relationship to CAS/CPS/CPF

The proposed operation directly supports relevant objectives of the WBG’s FY 2015.
OECS Regional Partnership Strategy (RPS). The objective of the RPS is to help lay the foundation for sustainable, inclusive growth by strengthening the competitiveness of the leading sectors of OECS economies. During RPS consultations, all OECS governments identified the agriculture and tourism sectors, and their respective linkages, as key drivers for growth and competitiveness. In addition, efforts to support agriculture growth could have a significant impact on shared prosperity and yield significant economic benefits, especially by reducing dependence on imports. In order to reap the benefits of stronger linkages between agribusiness and tourism, the RPS highlights the need to improve the productivity of the agribusiness value chain. In addition, the RPS calls for linking producers and agro processors to markets, providing incentives for the adoption of improved technologies to make crop production more resilient and productive, and improving skills at the farm level to enable farmers to increase productivity, comply with quality and food safety standards demanded by markets, and increase resilience to climate change and natural disasters.

The proposed operation is also closely related to another WBG project in the OECS. The OECS Regional Tourism Competitiveness Project (P152117) is currently under preparation and seeks to improve the competitiveness of the tourism sector in OECS countries. Originally, one component of that project was the promotion of linkages with the agriculture sector, but subsequently the Bank decided to limit the project to the tourism industry only. The Bank then commissioned a separate study on the linkages between the two sectors to inform a separate agricultural competitiveness project. Both the proposed operation and the Regional Tourism Competitiveness Project are closely aligned given the strong emphasis of the RPS in linking these two sectors.

The proposed Project directly promotes the Bank’s Twin Goals and contributes to key longer term objectives. The project will contribute to the overall goal of decreasing rural poverty, enhancing rural employment, decreasing the food import bill, and increasing the resilience of smallholder farmers. In this way the Project would directly respond to the Bank’s overarching Twin Goals of eradicating extreme poverty and promoting shared prosperity.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

**Proposed Development Objective(s) (From PCN)**

The proposed Project Development Objective is to improve the sustained access of agricultural producers and agro-processors to input and output markets in requesting countries of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS).

**Key Results (From PCN)**

The key expected outcome indicators from the Project are:

i) Percentage of aggregation schemes that work under an alliance approach 24 months after first matching grant disbursement

ii) Percentage increase in the value of gross sales of agricultural producer supported by the Project

iii) Percentage increase in the value of gross sales of agro-processors supported by the Project

iv) Direct project beneficiaries (number), of which female (percentage) and youth (percentage)

D. Concept Description

Component 1: Support for preparation of Business Plans (USD 0.7 million)
The objective of this component is to promote the project scope and outreach (explained in Component 2) to potential stakeholders (such as farmers and farmer groups, aggregators, commercial partners, financing actors and technical service providers) through supporting the identification of business opportunities and their translation into viable business proposals and bankable business plans.

Under this component, the Project would finance pre-investment activities of the following nature: (i) communication and dissemination campaigns through local workshops and media outreach to raise awareness of the project and its activities; (ii) information sessions to commercial partners, including the tourism sector, about opportunities to use local products in their menus and shelves (iii) establishments of strategic alliances between potential aggregators and farmers, groups of farmers, commercial partners, technical service providers and financial actors; (iv) support to potential aggregators and allied producers for the translation of business opportunities into viable business proposals; and (v) transformation of selected business proposals into bankable business plans.

Component 2: Implementation of Business Plans (USD 4.3 million)

The objective of this component is to provide subproject grants to co-finance the implementation of technically feasible, financially viable and environmentally sustainable business plans whose implementation would contribute to a consistent and timely supply of sufficient quantities of quality produce to buyers while providing a reliable income to allied producers. These business plans would have been formulated with project support provided under Component 1 by potential aggregators with their allied producers, commercial partners, technical service providers and financial actors. Business plans would qualify for project support on a competitive basis. They would be expected to lead to improved links between agriculture and tourism by addressing the following bottlenecks:

- Limited aggregation of smallholder produce and lack of planning and coordination among stakeholders along the various value chains. This bottleneck would be overcome by developing aggregation schemes and improve their forward linkages (produce markets) and backward linkages (farmers ➔ production, input providers) while assuring compliance with quality and food safety standards. Actors which could assume the required aggregation role may include producer organizations, traders, wholesalers, larger (lead) farmers buying from multiple small farmers, agro-processors etc. Aggregators would link up with smallholder producers (➔ allied farmers ➔ ), which can be organized or not.

- Low productivity and limited market integration among aging smallholders whose population is decreasing. This bottleneck would be overcome by promoting agricultural commercialization among smallholders and stimulate young people to take up modern farming and link them to markets through strategic alliances with aggregators.

Specific items and activities that the Project would co-finance include the following:

- For aggregators: (i) investments in equipment (transport, office, information and communications ➔ technology (ICT) tools/mobile applications, etc.) and infrastructure (storage,
cold chain facilities etc.); (ii) technical assistance and training, e.g. on logistics, storage, marketing, agronomy, accounting, financial literacy, food processing, machinery, packaging, labelling, traceability, quality control, food safety & hygiene, etc.

- For allied producers: (i) investments in equipment for land preparation and harvesting, irrigation infrastructure including rain water harvesting structures and pressured irrigation, greenhouses, tunnels, hydroponics, aquaponics, etc.; and (ii) technical assistance, training and extension services on, inter alia, good agricultural practices, modern and improved technologies, climate smart agriculture, post-harvest handling, financial literacy etc.

In order to be eligible, business plans must be technically feasible and financially viable, and include a rigorous financial analysis. Business plans should also include a technical description of the subproject, evaluation of market feasibility, an environmental assessment, and a list of allied farmers, commercial partners and technical service providers. The list of allied farmers is expected to have a minimum percentage (further defined in the Operations Manual) of farmers who are younger than 40 years old. Proof of secured up-front resources from the financial sector (banks, credit unions, development banks), from remittances, the diaspora, a Citizen by Investment Program and/or own contributions (either in cash or in-kind) to support the business plan would be a distinct advantage. Business plans should be developed in close interaction with prospective off-takers/commercial partners.

A matching grant contract would be signed between the project and the aggregator and a group of allied farmers. Subprojects would consist of the portion of the business plan that would: (i) be financed with proceeds from the proposed Credit / Loan; (ii) be implemented by aggregators and allied smallholders; (iii) be governed by subproject agreements signed between the aggregator, allied producer group, the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) and the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA); and (iv) include investments and technical assistance activities. Aggregators would be responsible for a minimum percentage of the subproject financing. The contribution for private companies would be higher than for producer organizations (in case such as organization would be the aggregator). Contributions for allied producers would be even lower. Subproject finance would be governed by guidelines and procedures specified in the Project Operational Manual.

During preparation, the team will explore the possibility of linking into a partial credit guarantee (PCG) structure whose establishment at the regional OECS level is currently underway through the Small-and-Medium Enterprise Partial Credit Guarantee Project (P157715), which is expected to be approved before June 2017. The Bank, in cooperation with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the Caribbean Development Bank, is currently working to increase the stability and resilience of the financial sector within the OECS member states. This work includes a proposal for a PCG scheme to qualified financial institutions which potentially could increase the latter's willingness to provide co-financing (for both investments and working capital) to applicants for matching grants from the Project, and do so at more favorable interest rates.

Component 3: General Agricultural Services (USD 1.0 million)

This component's objective is to strengthen general agricultural services directly linked to the subprojects described in Component 2 and needed to enhance the probability of success.

Specific activities that the Project would finance may include the following: (i) activities to improve and increase the availability of seeds, seedlings and planting materials for the products supported in Component 2; (ii) organization of business roundtables and trade fares, or facilitation
of participation therein; (iii) study tours; (iv) strengthening of local service providers’ capacity, including training and certification to acquire knowledge and skills for providing support to the preparation of business profiles and business plans; and (v) elaboration of technical studies to generate new knowledge in key areas of competitiveness, including market studies, analysis of new potential value chains, and analysis on food safety requirements and quality standards and related technical skills.

Component 4: Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation (USD 1.0 million)

The objective of this component is to ensure effective project implementation, monitoring of activities and evaluation of the Project. The Project would finance the operational costs of the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) and parts of the PCU, including: (i) project coordination and management; (ii) monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment; (iii) fiduciary administration; (iv) safeguards management; (v) citizen’s engagement mechanism.

II. SAFEGUARDS

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

Environment

Under Component 2, the Project would co-finance aggregators’ investments such as transport, storage, post-harvest, cold chain facilities, ICT tools and mobile applications, equipment, infrastructure, or energy-saving technologies; and for allied producers, investments such as equipment for land preparation and harvesting, irrigation infrastructure including rain water harvesting, greenhouses, tunnels, hydroponics, and aquaponics. Technical assistance, training, and extension services would also be provided for storage, marketing, agronomy, accounting, financial literacy, food processing, machinery, packaging, labelling, traceability, quality control, or food safety and hygiene; and good agricultural practices, modern and improved technologies, climate smart agriculture, post-harvest handling or financial literacy.

The investments could take place anywhere in Grenada or Saint Vincent & the Grenadines, and eventually in other OECS countries. While the prime agricultural lands are in relatively flat lying areas, fairly steep areas are routinely cultivated and therefore erosion control is of concern and will be incorporated in the Environmental Management Framework (EMF) and extension services training for best management practice. Mixed cropping or taungya system is commonly practiced to diversify crops and stabilize soils, and offers synergies with agroforestry initiatives in the region. Pest management is also being improved through other World Bank projects in the region and lessons learned will be applied to this Project. Processing or storage facilities could be located in non-agricultural lands, and will apply lessons learned in other projects in the region.

Social

The location of sub-project sites is unknown at this point, however some of the physical characteristics of relevance to safeguards analysis would include: population density, patterns of land ownership, and proximity to vulnerable populations. Once specific sub-project sites are known, a screening of potential social risks and impacts will be conducted, as well as full-blown social assessments where needed. Given that some investments under Component 2 may lead to involuntary
resettlement impacts, a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) will be developed to guide the application of the Operational Policy (OP) 4.12 requirements. The RPF will clarify resettlement objectives and principles, organizational arrangements and funding mechanisms to be followed if any safeguards tools (e.g. Resettlement Action Plans, Compensation Plans) become necessary during project implementation. The RPF will be prepared and disclosed prior to Project appraisal.

B. Borrower’s Institutional Capacity for Safeguard Policies

Each OECS member country will implement its own project through a PIU located in their respective Ministries of Finance. The PIUs have experience in executing the fiduciary aspects of Bank financed projects; however, it is expected that their institutional capacity for environmental safeguards issues will be limited. Due to the program scope, it is recommended that the Bank team carries out an assessment and discussions on how to strengthen the PIUs’ capacity to address environmental management aspects of their respective projects. For example, Saint Vincent & the Grenadines’ PIU has environmental safeguards capacity but it is seconded to the Ministry of Works to support another ongoing World Bank project (Regional Disaster Vulnerability Reduction Project or RDVRP), while in Grenada the PIU plays a more central role in environmental safeguards but this may change as internal staffing levels dictate. Accordingly, during project preparation the team will engage with the PIUs and with the beneficiary agencies (e.g. Ministry of Agriculture) to determine how environmental safeguards can be supported in each case.

The social safeguards issues related to this project are anticipated to be minimal. The capacity of the PIU in Saint Vincent & the Grenadines to address involuntary resettlement/land acquisition and other social safeguards issues is considered satisfactory. The Social Development team is staffed with three individuals who have experience implementing the World Bank’s Social Safeguards policies in the context of the RDVRP and have received safeguards capacity building training by the World Bank. In Grenada, a social development specialist will be hired by the PCU on a retainer basis to manage any social safeguards issues that may arise during project implementation. The World Bank social development specialists are committed to capacity building and will work closely with the PCU consultant to provide support and safeguards training as needed.

C. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Michael J. Darr (GEN04)
Silvia Del Pilar Larreamendy Ricardo (GSU04)

D. POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safeguard Policies</th>
<th>Triggered?</th>
<th>Explanation (Optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Following Operational Policy (OP4.01) the Program would be Category B, because the investments under Component 2 could have negative impacts which can be readily mitigated with standard and appropriate measures in place. Impacts are expected to be minor and of short duration for the investments, which will be of relatively small scale, well-known typologies, and will not involve clearing of any new agricultural lands. The details of individual subprojects are not yet known, therefore an EMF will be prepared to guide screening and the subsequent preparation of an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for each investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>The Project will screen out and exclude any subproject works that would involve clearing of new land or agriculture; however, during project preparation the potential for effects to any sites with natural habitat will be assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests OP/BP 4.36</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The Project will categorically screen out and exclude any clearing or effects on forest lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest Management OP 4.09</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>This policy triggered as a precaution. While Integrated Pest Management (IPM) will be promoted, if pesticides are purchased or used, a Pest Management Plan will be created as part of the EMF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The project will screen out and exclude any effects on physical cultural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Policy OP/BP 4.10 is not triggered. In the context of preparation of other OECS regional projects in Saint Vincent &amp; the Grenadines and Grenada, screening, background research, and consultations were conducted by the World Bank to determine whether indigenous populations were present. These screening activities confirmed that while populations who claim historical indigenous heritage do exist in the OECS (in the area of Sandy Bay, Saint Vincent &amp; the Grenadines), these groups do not have distinctive customary cultural, economic, social or political institutions that are separate from the dominant society and culture. Nor do they have an indigenous language different from the official language of Saint Vincent &amp; the Grenadines (English). Therefore, it was concluded that this community does not retain the minimum characteristics necessary to claim indigenous group affiliation under Bank Policy OP/BP 4.10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The designs of individual subprojects are not yet known, however, some investments for aggregators (for example: transport, storage, cold chain facilities, infrastructure) and allied producers under Component 2 may lead to involuntary resettlement/land acquisition, especially any that may take place outside the footprint of existing agricultural lands. Therefore, OP 4.12 is triggered and a Resettlement Policy framework (RPF) will be developed to guide the application of the OP 4.12 policy requirements. The RPF will clarify resettlement objectives and principles, organizational arrangements and funding mechanisms to be followed if any safeguards tools (e.g. Resettlement Action Plans, Compensation Plans) become necessary during project implementation. The RPF will be prepared and disclosed prior to Project appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Improvements of canals or water conveyance systems are not envisioned and will be excluded in the EMF screening criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50
No
This policy should not be triggered since the program will not finance activities involving the use or potential pollution of international waterways.

Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60
No
The Project will categorically screen out and exclude any projects in disputed areas.

E. Safeguard Preparation Plan

1. Tentative target date for preparing the PAD Stage ISDS
   19-Jan-2017

2. Time frame for launching and completing the safeguard-related studies that may be needed. The specific studies and their timing should be specified in the PAD-stage ISDS.
   The EMF will be developed during Project preparation, including consultation. The RPF will be developed during project preparation, including consultation processes and any social assessment that may need to be conducted. The RPF will be publicly disclosed prior to appraisal.

III. Contact point

World Bank
Contact: Eli Weiss
Title: Senior Rural Development Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient
Name: Ministry of Economic Planning, Sustainable Development, Industry, Information and Labour
Contact: Laura Anthony-Browne
Title: Director of Central Planning
Email: lanthony-browne@svgcpd.com
Name: Ministry of Finance & Energy
Contact: Mike Sylvester
Title: Permanent Secretary
Email: psfinancegrenada@gmail.com

Implementing Agencies
Name: Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and Rural Transformation
Contact: Raymond Rayan
Title: Permanent Secretary
Email: rayjoel3163@hotmail.com
Name: Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry, Fisheries and Environment
Contact: Merina Jessamy
Title: Permanent Secretary
Email: merina.jessamy@gov.gd
IV. 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

V. Approval
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</tr>
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</table>
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<th>Name: Svend Jensby (SA)</th>
<th>Date: 06-Jan-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice Manager/Manager:</td>
<td>Name: Garry Charlier (PMGR)</td>
<td>Date: 13-Jan-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Director:</td>
<td>Name: Francisco Galrao Carneiro (CD)</td>
<td>Date: 19-Jan-2017</td>
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1 Reminder: The Bank’s Disclosure Policy requires that safeguard-related documents be disclosed before appraisal (i) at the InfoShop and (ii) in country, at publicly accessible locations and in a form and language that are accessible to potentially affected persons.