

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

Report No.: PIDISDSA17001

Date Prepared/Updated: 17-Jun-2016

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country:	Africa	Project ID:	P155876
		Parent Project ID (if any):	
Project Name:	West Africa Regional Communications Infrastructure Project - SOP3 (P155876)		
Region:	AFRICA		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	19-Sep-2016	Estimated Board Date:	08-Dec-2016
Practice Area (Lead):	Transport & ICT	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	General information and communications sector (30%), Telecommunications (70%)		
Theme(s):	Regulation and competition policy (40%), Regional integration (40%), Infrastructure services for private sector development (20%)		
Borrower(s):	Government of Guinea Bissau		
Implementing Agency:	Ministry of Transport, Communication and ICT		
Financing (in USD Million)			
	Financing Source	Amount	
	BORROWER/RECIPIENT	0.00	
	International Development Association (IDA)	40.00	
	Total Project Cost	40.00	
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

Guinea-Bissau is a West African country bordered by Senegal in the north and Guinea-Conakry in the east and south. With a Gross National Income (GNI) per capita of only US\$ 570, Guinea-Bissau is the 12th poorest country in the world, despite being relatively rich in natural resources. More than half of the population (53.9 percent in 2010) gets by on less than US\$ 1.90 (2011-PPP) per day, which is well above the average for sub-Saharan Africa (42.6 percent) and high by global standards. Inequality is also high, with Guinea-Bissau exhibiting a Gini coefficient of 0.49, among the highest in Sub-Saharan Africa. Today, Guinea-Bissau ranks 177th of 187 countries on the United Nations (UN) Human Development Index. Bissau-Guineans suffer a wide range of both material and non-material deprivations (e.g., limited human capital, voice and agency), with many households trapped in a vicious circle of low assets, low productivity, and low incomes.

Guinea-Bissau is also one of the most politically fragile countries in the world. Behind the country's unsatisfactory development path is a history of political and institutional weakness since its independence. Unlike other Portuguese colonies, Guinea-Bissau was not considered fit for settlement, and the colonial administration thus made no significant investments in the country beyond what was required to extract natural resources. Since independence in 1974, four successful coups have been recorded in Guinea-Bissau, with another 16 coups attempted, plotted, or alleged. Between 1999 and 2009, Guinea-Bissau experienced government turnover each year.

After elections restored democracy in 2014, political tensions flared up again in 2015, but a resolution has been found that upholds the constitutional order. Guinea-Bissau's largest political party, the Party for the Independence of Guinea-Bissau and Cabo Verde (PAIGC), won the elections in early 2014, both at the parliamentary and the presidential level. The new government took important steps to curb military interference in politics and developed an ambitious national development plan and strategy (known as "Terra Ranca") aimed at re-igniting growth and poverty reduction. The plan is closely aligned with the recent WBG Country Economic Memorandum (CEM), finalized in January 2015. However, the Bissau-Guinean political structure will remain fundamentally fragile for years to come; building a robust system with strong social capital is a generational task. The country will therefore continue to be prone to political shocks and setbacks, which will challenge those trying to establish a more virtuous cycle of poverty reduction and sustainable, inclusive growth.

The main obstacles to Guinea-Bissau's economic development, besides political fragility, are low economic growth and lack of diversification of its economy. Growth over the past ten years has been low, at an average 2.6 percent. This is about half the growth performance of Sub-Saharan Africa. In addition, between 2000 and 2014, average GDP growth of 3 percent per annum exceeded population growth by a mere 0.7 percentage points, resulting in low average GDP per capita growth of 0.7 percent. Guinea-Bissau's economy is largely agrarian, dominated overwhelmingly by one cash crop: unprocessed cashew nuts, which account for 85 to 99 percent of the country's total exports and for nearly 50 percent of GDP. Including services related to agricultural production (such as trade and shipment associated with harvests), the contribution of agriculture to GDP is even higher.

Guinea-Bissau lacks the enabling environment conducive for private sector-led growth due to poor infrastructure, low levels of human capital and poor public services, which reinforce each

other. This situation is compounded by elite competition for rents and a weak public administration. The investment climate in Guinea-Bissau is not conducive to doing business, and the country ranks 180th of 189 countries in the World Bank's Doing Business rankings. Firms and households struggle to obtain access to finance, and the functioning of markets is undermined by the absence of public investments in fundamental economic services and public goods. Guinea-Bissau's transport, logistics, electricity, water, and telecommunication infrastructure is in a woeful state. The failure to provide for these key public goods and services over several decades – through direct public investments or effective public-private partnerships – severely limits the ability of poor households to participate in economic activity either through more productive autonomous activities or through accessing the employment opportunities that could be generated by a thriving private sector.

Sectoral and institutional Context

Improving the telecommunications system in Guinea-Bissau is considered as vital for growth, poverty alleviation, and shared prosperity. Telecommunications can connect market participants, even where physical connectivity is limited, improve the productivity of businesses and the effectiveness of public service delivery, increase agricultural market efficiency, and foster financial inclusion by channeling resources, including remittances or cash transfers, to recipients even in the most remote areas. The potential of telecommunications as an engine of economic growth remains largely untapped. In 2014, the contribution of the telecommunications sector to GDP was only 1.5 percent compared to 7 percent on average in Africa. The main factors explaining the underdevelopment of the telecommunications sector include: (i) the absence of a connection, through an entry point in Guinea-Bissau, to international connectivity and a national fiber optic backbone linking the major urban areas and allowing them to access international connectivity; and (ii) the reduced level of market competition since February 2014 with the technical and financial bankruptcy of the incumbent, Guine-Telecom, and its mobile subsidiary, Guinetel, which ceased all activity in early 2014. As a result, Guinea-Bissau is currently facing a growing digital divide between the capital city, Bissau, and the rest of the country

The Government's efforts to open the mobile phone market to competition and private sector participation helped revitalized the telecommunications sector for some time but the sector still faces many challenges. After having privatized the fixed-line State-owned operator, Guinee-Telecom in 1989 (with a 40 percent stake taken by Portugal Telecom, the remaining 60 percent held by the Government), the Government created Guinetel, a mobile operator subsidiary, and awarded a GSM license to the company which then launched its services in 2004. The Government then liberalized the mobile phone market by awarding two additional licenses to international operators: MTN in 2003 and Orange-Bissau (subsidiary of Sonatel) in 2007. The fixed-line services remained under the monopoly of Guinee-Telecom. An independent regulatory authority (Institute of Communications of Guinea-Bissau – ICGB) was set up in 1999, and then replaced by the Autoridade Reguladora Nacional das Tecnologias de Informacao e Comunicacao (ARN) following the adoption of the new telecom Law 5/2010 (and Decree no. 03-99). As a result of the liberalization process, and despite one decade of political instability, the liberalization of the mobile telephony market has generated significant macroeconomic benefits, government revenue, employment and private investment. Total revenues of the telecom sector increased by factor of six in the past 10 years, and its contribution to GDP grew to almost two percent. In 2011, Orange Bissau alone contributed to 3 percent of the Government total tax revenue, and its revenues represented 22 percent of the Government's total fiscal revenues. It can be estimated that Orange Bissau and MTN have created around 300 direct jobs and 4,000 indirect jobs, mostly through their distribution networks. Over 2004-2012, total private investment in

telecoms equaled US\$ 134 million, and accounted for 90 percent of total Foreign Direct Investment (FDI).

Competition has promoted communication services, especially mobile phones, but Guinea-Bissau still faces problems of access and affordability. Mobile telephony has developed rapidly, and most people either have, or have close access to, a mobile phone. However, Guinea-Bissau is facing a growing urban-rural digital divide. Affordability is a key problem. On average, a mobile subscriber spends more than 19 percent of his or her monthly income on mobile telecommunications services (voice and data), behind Senegal, Mauritania and much worse than emerging economies (3-5 percent).

The bankruptcy of Guinee-Telecom/Guinetel in 2014 (whose situation deteriorated after Portugal Telecom withdrawal in 2010) has become a major challenge for the Government. The mobile telephony market now comprises two operators (MTN and Orange-Bissau) with roughly similar market shares. In addition, the fixed-line market, in line with global trends, has come to a standstill with a penetration rate of 0.3 percent in 2013 compared to 1.1 percent for the West African Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU). A decree authorizing the privatization of Guinee-Telecom/Guinetel was adopted in early May 2014, and the restructuring process is ongoing to improve prospects for privatization. The last inventory provided by the management of Guinee-Telecom (and Guinetel) in May 2014 indicates overstaffing (170 employees), a net loss registered for the last 6 consecutive years, and Government arrears estimated at \$ 33 million accumulated since 1997. The government is looking for technical and financial assistance from donors to (i) identify the best options for the strategic repositioning of Guinee-Telecom/Guinetel and (ii) prepare Guinee-Telecom/Guinetel for the privatization transaction (through a sale of shares to an international operator).

Developing the Internet market is another major challenge. Guinea-Bissau is the only country on the West African coast not connected to a submarine cable. Guinea-Bissau was included in the Bank's West Africa Regional Communications Infrastructure Program (WARCIP) Series of Projects (SOP) to connect to the African Coast to Europe (ACE) submarine cable, as approved by the Board in 2011. The political situation leading to a de facto Government prevented the operation from moving forward at the same time as the other coastal countries supported under WARCIP. As a result, there is no "open access" (i.e. shared) entry point for international connectivity in Guinea-Bissau, and each operator is thus constrained to deploy its own satellite, microwave or fiber optic networks in order to bring international connectivity in Guinea-Bissau. Deploying such networks is extremely costly - due to high levels of Capital Expenditure (CAPEX) and Operating Expenses (OPEX) that are not mutualized- whereas their reliability is significantly limited. This situation negatively affects both the quality and price of services and explains why broadband market is still in the initial stage of development. Internet usage in Guinea-Bissau stood at 4 percent in 2015 (compared to 19 percent in Gambia and 51 percent in Senegal). The broadband market, concentrated in the capital, is nascent, with a penetration rate of around 0.9 percent of the population compared to the ECOWAS average of 7 percent and 1.5 percent in Gambia (or 15 percent in Senegal and Morocco). Orange-Bissau enjoys a virtual monopoly since 2011 despite the presence of MTN and Eguitel (a local Internet Service Provider licensed in 2003 relying solely on satellite connectivity). Orange-Bissau owes its lead in the broadband market to its terrestrial fiber optic connection to the terrestrial optical fiber networks owned by the Orange-Sonatel in Senegal (via Ziguinchor) which is also backed up by a microwave connection to Guinea-Conakry where Orange-Guinea has access to the ACE landing

station. MTN's terrestrial connections are not as developed as those of Orange and rely on less dependable and more expensive micro-wave networks and satellite connectivity. Without improved access to international and national terrestrial connectivity by every operator (i.e. under open access principle), Guinea-Bissau cannot expect substantial improvement in the coverage, quality, and price of broadband services. For households, the price of a monthly subscription for mobile broadband service ranges between US\$ 60-80 (excluding installation costs of US\$ 185) or 142 percent of monthly Growth National Income (GNI) per capita.

The Government has recently adopted a national development strategy (Plan stratégique et opérationnel 2015-2020) which places great emphasis on improving the information and communication technology (ICT) sector. It is also well integrated in national strategy, Terra Ranca (2014), which identifies the ICT sector as a key contributor to the national economic development. The sector objective is to improve access and usage of ICT services (especially for broadband services) to spur the development of a digital economy that would modernize and transform the country. For this, the Government has committed to engage in a series of important telecommunications reforms, including: (i) strengthening the institutional capacity of the Ministry of Transport, Communications and ICT; (ii) development of a Master Plan for the ICT sector; (iii) rehabilitation, restructuring and privatization of Guinee-Telecom and Guinetel; (iv) rehabilitation, restructuring and privatization of the Post Office in Guinea-Bissau; (v) installation of submarine optical fiber cable; (vi) expansion of the national optical fiber backbone; (vii) transition from analogue to digital technologies; (viii) transition to 3G and 4G mobile broadband services; and (ix) development of ICT services, applications and local content.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Development Objective(s)

The Development Objectives of this project are to contribute to increasing the geographical reach of broadband networks, and reducing costs of communication services in the territory of Guinea-Bissau.

Key Results

Achievement of the development objective of the proposed project will be assessed through the key monitoring and evaluation indicators summarized below in line with indicators of the earlier phases of the Program.

The indicators to be monitored for Guinea-Bissau will include:

- ? Core indicator: Access to telephone services (fixed mainlines plus cellular phones per 100 people)
- ? Core indicator: Access to Internet (number of subscribers per 100 people) ;
- ? Core indicator: Number of direct project beneficiaries, including percentage of women ;
- ? Core indicator: Beneficiaries that feel project investments reflected their needs;
- ? Custom indicator: Volume of international traffic (K/bits per person) ;
- ? Custom indicator: Average monthly price of wholesale international E 1 capacity link from capital city to Europe.

D. Project Description

Similarly to the previously approved WARCIP projects, the WARCIP Guinea-Bissau project will have three components: Component 1 ? Supporting connectivity?, Component 2 ? Creating an

enabling environment for connectivity? and Component 3 ? ?Project implementation?.

The project activities will contribute to the PDO of the proposed project by addressing the key issues of limited geographical reach of broadband networks and high costs of broadband services in the territory of Guinea Bissau, paving the way for successful development of e-government and digital economy, through: (i) focused investments on the basis of a PPP in the connection of Guinea Bissau to the ACE submarine cable and the roll out of crucial and missing terrestrial fiber backbone links (to connect the ACE cable in Guinea Bissau to the city of Bissau with a ring topology covering the main district of the capital city, and the capital city of Bissau to the entry point of the regional power transmission infrastructure (West Africa Power Pool, WAPP, and its sub-program OMVG/OMVS) near Bissau); as well as (ii) technical assistance to strengthen the legal, regulatory and institutional framework to ensure open access to the submarine cable and the terrestrial fiber optic backbone links and promote a procompetitive environment to foster investments from telecoms operators and Internet service providers.

Component Name

Supporting Connectivity

Comments (optional)

This component would include two sub-components with infrastructure (submarine cable connection and terrestrial fiber optic), implemented under the guiding principles of infrastructure open access and Public-Private Partnership (PPP). This component will finance (i) the fee for the participation of Guinea-Bissau in the ACE consortium that owns the ACE submarine cable and the construction of a domestic landing station (in Suro, 23 km away from Bissau); and (ii) the laying of a fiber optic line from Suro to Bissau, around Bissau and to a connecting point with the regional power transmission infrastructure (West Africa Power Pool, WAPP, and its sub-program OMVG/OMVS) near Bissau.

Component Name

Creating an enabling environment for connectivity

Comments (optional)

This component will finance technical assistance for sector reforms in key three areas, aimed at increasing competition and promoting broadband usage. It will also finance the design of the PPP transaction needed for Component 1.

Component Name

Project Implementation

Comments (optional)

This component will finance support needed by the Government of Guinea-Bissau to implement the Component 1 and 2. This includes setting up a Project Implementation Unit (PIU) located with the Ministry of Transport, Communication and ICT and covering PIU staff, office equipment, operating costs, and trainings. The component will also cover the cost of audits, communications, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and will contribute towards monitoring project elements such as citizen engagement, climate change and environmental and social studies.

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

Connecting Guinea Bissau to the ACE submarine landing cable is likely to be made via the construction of a domestic landing station in Suro (23 km away from Bissau). In addition three terrestrial fiber optic missing links will be built in Guinea Bissau for a total of 40km (23km from Suro to Bissau and 16km within the city of Bissau) and from the city of Bissau to the entry point (i.e. around 20km) of the regional power transmission network OMVG. However the exact path of the terrestrial fibers as well as the location of the domestic landing station in Suro are not yet known.

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Serigne Omar Fye (GENDR)

Upulee Iresha Dasanayake (AFCF1)

II. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

The project will be implemented by a Project Implementation Unit (PIU) under the aegis of the Secretary of State Transport and Communications. The PIU's procurement and financial management (FM) capacity will be assessed during appraisal. The PIU will be set up with the Project Preparation Advance (PPA) under which four staff of the PIU will be hired (Coordinator, Procurement Specialist, Financial Management Specialist, and Accountant). The PPA will also finance four technical assistance activities related to project preparation. Until the project's PIU is set up, the project's activities are being carried out by another existing PIU (for the energy sector project). In the transition period between the selection and hiring of the WARCIP Project Coordinator and the rest of the PIU's members, transfer of files and PPA implementation documents will take place in a manner satisfactory to the World Bank. The Project Coordinator will report to the Minister of Transport and Communications.

The PIU will be assisted by focal points, composed of representatives from MTC, Ministry of Finance (MoF), National Regulatory Authority (Autorit   de R  gulation Nationale, ARN), the Guinetel/GuineTelecom Restructuring Commission, NITeGov, and the private sector representing the SPV. The PIU and the focal points will set up regular meetings to take stock of project implementation, anticipate potential problems, share solutions, and keep project-related data flow on a near-real time basis. The focal points are not consultants hired under the project but rather staff of their respective institutions and therefore not eligible for funding under the project.

III. Safeguard Policies that might apply

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The Project's physical investments such as connecting Guinea Bissau to the ACE submarine landing cable, building the terrestrial fiber optic links for a total of 40km from Suro to Bissau and within the city of Bissau and from the city of Bissau to the entry point (i.e. around 20km) of the regional power transmission network OMVG could have negative environmental and social impacts the nature of which cannot be determined at this stage in project

		preparation as investment sites have not yet been identified . In this regard, OP/BP 4.01 is triggered and the Borrower has prepared an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) , which has been reviewed, consulted upon, approved and disclosed in-country and at the World Bank InfoShop.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	The ESMF addresses both impacts and proposed mitigation measures for critical natural habitats.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	There is no forest in the proposed project areas.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	There is no pest-related issues in the proposed project areas.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	While not damaging cultural property, subproject preparation may later identify and include assistance for preservation of historical or archeological sites. If these opportunities occur, cultural property management plans would be prepared for those sub-projects. The ESMF addresses both impacts and potential project zones and mitigation measures to be followed if and when these properties are discovered during project implementation.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	There are no indigenous people in the proposed project areas.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/ BP 4.12	Yes	Some project activities may induce involuntary resettlement and restriction of access to livelihoods of populations living in and around the proposed project areas. Because the exact nature and location of investments cannot be determined up front, the Borrower has prepared a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) that has been reviewed, consulted upon, approved and disclosed in-country and at the World Bank InfoShop.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/ BP 7.60	No	

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:

Connecting Guinea Bissau to the ACE submarine cable and other associated investment activities could have negative impacts on the social and biophysical resource base. However the significance of such impact will be determined once the investment sites are identified and the relevant analysis

carried out. Based on experience from similar projects in the Region however, the impacts may be limited and short lived. One such potential impact is the temporary increase in turbidity of Ocean water and its effect on marine life and habitat while the other impact is plant destruction and disturbance caused when laying the fiber optic cable.

During the construction phase, there may also be some temporary inconveniences and limited economic disadvantages to fisherman and other businesses in the project area. No land acquisition issues are expected as the site for the Landing Station is vacant state property which has been allocated to the project for the purpose. The terrestrial connectivity is expected to follow the major roads already in place between Suro and Bissau, however this may cause some temporary displacement of populations and impact their livelihoods.

To endure the appropriate mitigation of the aforementioned potential environmental and social impacts, four safeguard policies have been triggered for the project: OP 4.01 on Environmental Assessment; OP4.04 on Natural Habitats; OP 4.11 on Physical Cultural Resources; and OP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement. As the precise route and civil works are still to be determined, an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) has been prepared, consulted upon and disclosed both in-country and at the World Bank InfoShop prior to formal appraisal of the project.

Site specific Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) and Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) will be prepared as and when necessary during project implementation.

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

No long term environmental or social impacts are anticipated due to project activities. An indirect impact may be restriction of access during the construction period for tourism, local fishing and other activities in the project area, and potential disruption in some shipping activities during the marine survey and cable construction.

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

Not applicable

4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.

The Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF), prepared for the project have been consulted upon, approved and disclosed in-country and at the Bank's InfoShop.

Notwithstanding, when necessary and as soon as activity sites are selected and designs of civil work completed, site specific Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) will be prepared, consulted upon and disclosed prior the commencement of works. In the specific case where a RAP is needed, it will be prepared, approved and executed prior the commencement of works.

The Project Implementation Unit (PIU) for the operation will be located within the sector ministry (Secrétariat d'Etat aux Transports et aux Communications) which has limited capacity for safeguards and need capacity building. The ESMP enforcement entity (Autorité Compétente d'Evaluation Environnementale-AAAC, formerly Célula de Avaliação de Impacte Ambiental –

<p>CAIA) is very weak in supporting project developers to comply with regulation and best practices. The PIU will appoint a Safeguards Specialist to ensure proper implementation, documentation, follow up and reporting of the mitigation measures (screening, execution of specific ESMPs) recommended through the instruments ESMF and RPF. A provision of a total amount about US \$250,000 is earmarked in the project budget for the execution of the above-mentioned measures. Further, the project bidding documents will include a clause for the disposal of any waste generated during construction and site clean-up before handover.</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>Key stakeholders for consultation will include current inhabitants in and around the landing site and the terrestrial route between Suro and Bissau, and in Bissau who would potentially be affected by project activities, AAAC (Autorité Compétente d’Evaluation Environnementale), businesses, and civil society. Issues raised in the consultations to date have focused on local involvement in the environmental and social management of the project and ensuring there is adequate capacity to supervise safeguards implementation. The PIU will ensure that all safeguard document are processed in compliance with national laws and regulations and environmental permits are issued by the Minister in charge of environment, prior commencement of any eligible works.</p>

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	25-Feb-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	15-Mar-2016
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Guinea-Bissau	13-Apr-2016
<p><i>Comments:</i> The ESMF has been disclosed in country on the Ministry of Economy and Finance website: link: www.mef-b.com/fr/projet; In Suro (the Committee Tabanca house); In prabis (administration headquarters); In Cumura (Parish); In Bor (Parish); In Bissau, namely: In the Secretariat of State for the Environment (Government Palace); In the City Hall of Bissau; At the headquarters of the AAAC, In PUASEE headquarters, both on the street Justino Lopes, and in the RNA headquarters.</p>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	25-Feb-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	15-Mar-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
Guinea-Bissau	13-Apr-2016
<p><i>Comments:</i> The RPF has been disclosed in country on the Ministry of Economy and Finance website: link: www.mef-b.com/fr/projet; In Suro (the Committee Tabanca house); In prabis (administration headquarters); In Cumura (Parish); In Bor (Parish); In Bissau, namely: In the Secretariat of State for the Environment (Government Palace);</p>	

In the City Hall of Bissau; At the headquarters of the AAAC, In PUASEE headquarters, both on the street Justino Lopes, and in the RNA headquarters.
If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.
If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment	
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats	
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
OP/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 type="checkbox"/>] TBD [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Provided estimated number of people to be affected	
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] TBD [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Provided estimated number of people to be affected	
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information	
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

World Bank's Infoshop?	
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"/>]

V. Contact point

World Bank

Contact: Isabelle Ngoc Dung Huynh
Title: Senior Operations Officer

Contact: Arthur Denis Pascal Foch
Title: ICT Policy Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name: Government of Guinea Bissau
Contact:
Title:
Email:

Implementing Agencies

Name: Ministry of Transport, Communication and ICT
Contact: Joao Bernardo Vieira
Title: Secretary of State for Transport and Communications
Email: t.ministerio@yahoo.com.br

VI. For more information contact:

The InfoShop
The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 458-4500
Fax: (202) 522-1500
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/infoshop>

VII. Approval

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Isabelle Ngoc Dung Huynh, Arthur Denis Pascal Foch
----------------------	--

<i>Approved By</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Maman-Sani Issa (SA)	Date: 07-Jun-2016
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Boutheina Guerhazi (PMGR)	Date: 10-Jun-2016
Country Director:	Name: R. Gregory Toulmin (CD)	Date: 17-Jun-2016