

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET  
APPRAISAL STAGE**

**Report No.: ISDSA15444**

**Date ISDS Prepared/Updated:** 16-Nov-2015

**Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed:** 16-Nov-2015

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**1. Basic Project Data**

<b>Country:</b>	Kazakhstan	<b>Project ID:</b>	P153497
<b>Project Name:</b>	Center West Regional Development Corridor (P153497)		
<b>Task Team Leader(s):</b>	Jacques Bure		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	02-Nov-2015	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	28-Jan-2016
<b>Managing Unit:</b>	GTI03	<b>Lending Instrument:</b>	Investment Project Financing
<b>Sector(s):</b>	Rural and Inter-Urban Roads and Highways (100%)		
<b>Theme(s):</b>	Infrastructure services for private sector development (25%), Rural services and infrastructure (25%), Export development and competitiveness (25%), Regional integration (25%)		
<b>Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?</b>			No
<b>Financing (In USD Million)</b>			
Total Project Cost:	1195.00	Total Bank Financing:	1051.69
Financing Gap:	0.00		
<b>Financing Source</b>			<b>Amount</b>
Borrower			143.31
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development			1051.69
Total			1195.00
<b>Environmental Category:</b>	A - Full Assessment		
<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	No		

**2. Project Development Objective(s)**

The Project Development Objective are (a) to improve the transport connectivity within the regions along the Kazakhstan Center West Corridor and (b) to strengthen the capacity of selected agencies for the effective implementation of the corridor development and road asset preservation policies.

### 3. Project Description

The proposed Centre-West road project is part of transit corridor Baku-Astrakhan-Atyrau-Aktobe-Aktau-Turkmenistan border?, which connects Kazakhstan with Azerbaijan and Europe in the west, with Russia in the north, through Iran with countries of the Persian Gulf, and Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan in the south. Estimated 2,000 km Center-West project will start in Astana and pass through Akmola, Kostanai, Aktobe, Atyrau, and Mangistau oblasts, thus linking two of four identified ?urban agglomerations?, and two of the identified ?second-tier? towns. The project is expected to contribute to the local development of the regions through which it passes and promote pro-poor growth by overcoming the spatial mismatch between the location of jobs and settlements for low-income residents.

The Centre-West corridor will be part of an overall network upgrade program that will also enhance existing links between Astana and Almaty (Centre South from Astana - Pavlodar - Semei - Kalbatau - Ust-Kamenogorsk) and between Astana and Ust-Kamenogorsk (Centre East from Astana - Pavlodar - Semei - Kalbatau - Ust-Kamenogorsk). The Government is aiming for completion of all the corridors by 2020.

The construction will be mainly a two lane standard (which indicates a well-grounded consideration of standards and costs), and expand to four lanes on the first 98km from Astana to Zhanteke because of the expected traffic and the potential for tourism development of the Zhanteke region and the Ramsar wetland around the lake Tengiz of Korghalzhyn. Tolling may also be considered along the four-lane section close to Astana and consistent with a broader tolling plan currently envisaged by the GOK.

Out of seven options identified at the pre-feasibility stage, the Government has chosen to study feasibility of the following three routes. The three routes follow only limited sections of existing main highways, with most of its route currently consisting of either local roads or, in the western end, tracks in the desert.

Route 1 traverses Astana, Zhanteke, Egyndykol, Arkalyk, Turgay, Akshiganak, Yrgyz, Shalkar, Kandyagash, Dossor, Beyneu to Aktau (total of 1,997km).

Route 2 traverses Astana, Zhanteke, Egindykol, Arkalyk, Turgay, Akshiganak, Yrgyz, Aktobe, Dossor, Beyneu to Aktau (total of 2,097 km).

Route 3 traverses Astana, Zhanteke, Egindykol, Arkalyk, Turgay, Karabutak, Aktobe, Dossor, Beyneu to Aktau (total of 1,936 km).

The preferred option for the GoK is Route 1. The section proposed for the Bank to finance starts from Astana and traverses Zhanteke, Egindykol, Arkalyk, Turgay to Yrgyz (20 km to the west of Yrgyz up to the junction with the existing Western Europe- Western China Corridor) or further West to Shalkar, another 100 km-to be confirmed at negotiations). All the roads of this proposed section, except for Astana-Zhanteke part, are currently local, or secondary, gravel roads in poor condition ineffectively managed by Akimats. After reconstruction the road will be converted into the republican roads network.

Section 1 (170 km) starts from about 10 km west from the city center of Astana in suburban Astana, runs in a north-westerly direction toward Zhanteke and further West. This section consists primarily of reconstruction of an existing two lane paved, although very poorly maintained, road. The construction will be mainly a Class II (2 lane) highway, except for one portion of this section (98

km) that is close to Astana, which will be a 4-lane construction, since it is expected to carry a traffic of about 7,000 vehicles per day. This particular section may be tolled to introduce concession for operation and maintenance of 4-lane road infrastructure.

Section 2 (220km) continues West after Zhanteke to Arkalyk. This section will be a green field project as there is no existing roads at present. The new road would go through a semi desert with scattered wetlands and mostly flat terrain with some agriculture land on the last 10 km towards Arkalyk.

Section 3 (290 km) uses the existing road that connects Arkalyk to Turgay. The road also connects settlements in between, all of them being modest in size. The road often runs in parallel to an hydrographic complex made of medium size rivers and their associated tributaries and wetlands.

Section 4 (190 km) continues west after Turgay to Yrgyz (20 km to the west past Yrgyz up to the junction with the existing Western Europe- Western China Corridor). This section consists of reconstruction of an existing gravel road in a very poor condition, not accessible during the spring or autumn.

#### Project Components

Component 1 (US\$1,208 million): Infrastructure development and Supervision. The component will finance civil works on about 900 km of road sections between Astana and Yrgyz (or further west to Shalkar, another 100 km-to be confirmed at negotiations) and consulting services for supervision of civil works. Land acquisition and road design costs will be covered from the GOK co-financing part, and not be financed from the Loan proceeds.

Component 2 (US\$6 million) Corridor Development. The component will support: (i) preparation of a Corridor Development Action Plan (Plan) and (ii) implementation of some key priority activities from the Plan. The objective of the component is to customize the corridor to local advantage and to ensure that economically disadvantaged sparsely populated and remote areas within the corridor in Akmola, Kostanay, and Aktobe oblasts are provided with reasonable access to basic services and new markets. Local development plans and existing strengths, resources, as well as services in demand along the alignment were assessed in consultation with local communities. The assessment identified agriculture, tourism, services, and education as strategic focus of the corridor. The Plan will support activities aimed at unlocking the potential of industries identified and capacity building for local communities, such as: the development of service areas for retail and sales of local food and crafts, tourist information, transport services, pharmacies, milk collection points from local farmers, support to livestock bazaars, etc.

Component 3 (US\$20 million) Operation and Maintenance: This component will allow the MoID to implement a strategy designed with the assistance of the Bank during the preparation of the road sector reform in 2012-2013. As the road will become a new republican road, it is necessary to create facilities and equipment for operation and maintenance.

Component 4: (US\$3 million) Road Safety. The component will be implemented by the Committee of Administrative Police of the Ministry of Interior (CAP) Kazakhstan's lead road safety agency with assistance from local consultants hired under the Project. The objective of this component is to help the Kazakh authorities design National Road Safety Strategy 2016-2020 (NRSS), strengthen institutional capacity in relation to the NRSS implementation, and increase road safety education and awareness of road users in Kazakhstan.

Component 5: (US\$ 2million) Project Management. The component will be covered from the GoK budget. CR identified KazAutozhol (KAZ) as a Project Management Unit (PMU) for the CWP and other roads projects to be financed by other IFIs. While the MoID through CR will retain the overall responsibility for the project implementation, KAZ is expected to assist the CR on day-to-day operations managing project activities, such as supervision of social, environmental, and fiduciary safeguards, provision of logistical support, M&E, inter-agency coordination, etc.

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

The section proposed for the Bank to finance starts from Astana and traverses Zhanteke, Egindykol, Arkalyk to Turgay-Yrgyz in Akmola, Kostanay, and Aktobe oblasts. All the roads of this proposed section, except for Astana-Zhanteke part, are currently local, or secondary, gravelroads in poor condition ineffectively managed by Akimats. The project has all physical characteristics of a large linear infrastructure project, with significant spatial extension, visible impact on landscape, biosphere and land use patterns, strong dependence of its impacts on topography, climate, natural conditions and anthropogenic activity.

Important natural habitats sites are no closer than 25-30 km from the road alignment and will not be affected by the Project and its associated activities. At the same time, there are saiga migration routes in the project area.

Turgay geoglyphs - a unique and previously unstudied large-scale earthworks in the Turgay region of northern Kazakhstan - were discovered in 2007 using satellite imagery (Googleearth) and include Eki Din, Sahna, and Kogai cross forming a pattern of equilateral crosses, swastikas, circles and lines produced on the ground and formed by rocks, live trees, gravel, and earth. There are at least 263 mounds in Kostanay oblast in the form of trenches and ramparts, arrayed in five basic shapes. The "youngest" Turgay geoglyph was constructed between the first century BC and the first century AD. Meanwhile, ancient Turgay geoglyphs, which can be viewed only from space, can be aged between 7000 years of age and older. Geoglyphs are unique historic structures of ancient civilizations and due to their physical characteristics (round-like 0.15 - 0.8 m high elevations of clay, rock, gravel 10--12 m in diameter each) they cannot be easily identified at the ground level and can be damaged by earthworks on road alignment and associated infrastructure (e.g. borrow pits, construction camps, access roads, etc.).

#### **5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists**

Alexei Slenzak (GENDR)

Lola Ibragimova (GSURR)

<b>6. Safeguard Policies</b>	<b>Triggered?</b>	<b>Explanation (Optional)</b>
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	A safeguards category of A is proposed. This is justified by greenfield construction of approximately 450 km of road sections (e.g. Zhanteke - Arkalyk, Turgay - Yrgyz) planned under the project. The alignment will run through a variety of areas with different safeguards implications: (i) in zones of intense agricultural use where existing irrigation systems will have to be preserved, and (ii) where the road would cross rangeland under use for

		<p>animal husbandry animal underpasses will have to be planned to guarantee the safety of drivers and animals. The main envisaged negative impacts during construction is the operation of borrow areas, generation of waste (construction materials, spent consumables, household waste and wastewater from camps), excessive land use, topsoil destruction and erosion. There is also a potential risks of pollution of surface water from runoff and accidental spills involving fuels and lubricants. During operation of the road storm drainage management, noise, dust, air pollution will be the main issues. Some sections of the alignment involve greenfield construction. Site-specific Mitigation Plans will address/minimize the risks of potential negative impacts on steppe areas, rivers, and other sensitive elements of greenfield sections.</p> <p>Component 2 will finance preparation of a Corridor Development Action Plan and implementation of some key priority activities from the Plan (with focus on agriculture, tourism, services, etc.). The Plan will take into account potential negative environmental impacts of economic activity (agriculture, small businesses, tourism) and will provide guidance on mitigation measures to avoid or minimize these impacts.</p> <p>Component 3 will finance the road's operation and maintenance activities. Environmental aspects of road maintenance, such as location and design of maintenance depots, transport/storage/application of de-icers, maintenance of road maintenance machinery will be addressed in design documentation and schedules of depots.</p> <p>Component 4 will finance various road safety measures which will generally have positive social impact in the project area.</p> <p>The Borrower has prepared the ESIA and EMF which was reviewed by the Bank team, disclosed and consulted upon.</p>
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	<p>The Project is not expected to impact established protected areas. According to the data available at the Association for Conservation of Biodiversity the project location passes through the summer habitat range and potentially some of the migration routes of Saiga tatarica, a critically endangered species of antelope. Saiga migrates in spring from the South of Kazakhstan to Akmolinskaya, Kostanaiskaya and Aktyubinskaya oblasts, the basins of the rivers Irgiz, Turgai, Ulyshilanshik and Tersakkan and Lake Tengiz. Vehicle traffic and noise of moving vehicles may eventually create conditions that prevent</p>

		<p>saiga from crossing. Associated facilities (e.g. construction camps or borrow pits) may potentially divert animals to other routes. Additional potential impacts include cases when animals are hit by the moving vehicles or hunted by construction workers or local inhabitants. Therefore, the OP 4.04 Natural Habitats is triggered for the project. Specific areas with high concentrations of saiga and potential critical habitats and their migration routes will be surveyed. The Client and their contractors will establish collaboration with environmental organizations that perform Saiga monitoring which will become an important part of preparation and implementation of site-specific EMPs. According to the report "Saiga crossing options" (by Kirk A. Olson from Smithsonian Conservation Biology Institute for the Frankfurt Zoological Society, Association for the Conservation of Biodiversity of Kazakhstan, Fauna &amp; Flora International and Convention on Migratory Species) properly designed underpasses/crossing points are considered to be sufficiently effective and acceptable measure for saiga migration and the road would not lead to significant degradation of the habitat (i.e. not significantly interfere with migration). Specific locations for such crossings (if needed) will be determined during preparation of site-specific EMPs.</p>
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	Policy OP 0.36 Forests in not triggered.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	The use of pesticides or herbicides is not foreseen under the project. The policy is not triggered.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	<p>While the inventory of known physical cultural resources conducted in the project area has not revealed PCR objects that may be potentially affected by the project, the policy on Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11 is triggered due to presence in the project area of so-called Turgay geoglyphs - unique and previously unstudied large-scale earthworks in the Turgai region of northern Kazakhstan. Turgay geoglyphs have not been designated a status of historical or cultural monuments to be protected according to legislation of Kazakhstan. OP/BP 4.11 Physical Cultural Resources is triggered in order to take into account the sites with geoglyphs in project design and ensure sound protection of this cultural heritage for present and future generations. The team is currently identifying the location of geoglyphs in relation to the proposed alignment. In case there is a threat of damage to geoglyphs, re-routing of the alignment will be done at design stage. If re-routing is not possible, Site</p>

		Management Plan will be done as part of site-specific EMPs. The project will also support further research and promotion of geoglyphs as historic and cultural heritage and a tourism attraction in the project area. Chance finds procedure is described in the ESIA. The requirements regarding chance finds will be included in the construction contracts.
Indigenous Peoples OP/ BP 4.10	No	No indigenous peoples live in the project area or will directly or indirectly be affected by the project.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	The project is expected to have land acquisition and resettlement impacts due to construction works associated with expansion to four lanes from the existing two including construction of the new road section. The RPF is prepared by the client. In case the detailed designs become available at the project preparation, the client will also prepare RAP(s).
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	None of the potentially affected water bodies are international. Hence, there are no grounds to trigger OP7.50.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The project is not located in or near disputed areas.

## II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

### A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

<p><b>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</b></p> <p>The design of the road has taken into account measures for the minimization of environmental impacts. The routing as much as feasible avoids sensitive areas and habitats and protected areas, follows existing infrastructure corridors and thus limiting the conversion of land to non-critical land types and land use types. The design will include measures to protect the adjacent population from noise (routing, barriers), increase traffic safety by speed controls, pedestrian crossings and underpasses. The design will also take into account requirements articulated from farmers along the alignment for safe crossings for animals and farm traffic through sufficiently dimensioned underpasses. Similar underpasses will facilitate wildlife crossings. The design will also include results from hydrographic and hydrological studies, installing sufficient culverts to avoid damming of permanent or seasonal watercourses and the creation of swamps or waterlogged areas, and the dimensioning of bridges will take the seasonality of discharges, as well as the proneness to flash floods into account.</p> <p>Most environmental impacts during the construction period will be mitigated by good housekeeping measures. There will be standard procedures for the control and mitigation of emissions, such as dust, noise, exhaust fumes and liquid discharges from camps and the road platform. Surface watercourses will be protected by settling ponds and filters (e.g. straw bales). Wastewater from construction camps will be treated on site in settlement and aeration basins,</p>
---

where biological waste will be processed, before discharge into surface streams or rivers. Septic sludge from toilets will either be composted on site or trucked to existing water treatment plants along the alignment. Groundwater is not expected to be impacted by the project, as no deep excavations or major cuts are expected. Water for the construction activities as well as the camps will be extracted in relatively small quantities from existing wells or the public supply system. Generally water availability is unconstrained in the project area.

Noise and exhaust emissions will be minimized by the requirement for Contractors to use modern equipment and machinery complying with modern emission standards, and to maintain the equipment in good working order throughout the project. This will be prescribed in the equipment specifications in the tender documents. Nuisance to the public will moreover be minimized by limiting work hours and not allowing nighttime works. Where works are carried out in close vicinity to residential areas additional measures, such as noise barriers or the installation of insulating windows will be implemented in accordance with good practice and in consultation with the community.

Borrow pits will be operated by the Contractors only at locations that have been pre-identified previous to project implementation and for which both operational and environmental permits have been obtained. No borrow pit will be operated without a site specific EMP that will contain a plan for its closure, remediation and re-cultivation that will be approved by the local environmental authorities (as required under Kazakh regulations) as well as the supervising engineer (who will ensure that international good practice is followed).

All environmental management measures to be carried out by the Contractors during the construction period will be integrated in the tender documents and become part of the works contracts. This will also include a manual on chance find procedures to be followed in case of unanticipated discovery of potential PCR. The Contractors will be required to have permanent staff on site with the specific responsibility of environmental and social management (including a grievance specialist), reporting to the supervision engineers and local authorities.

The project will not result in any significant negative social impacts. There is a social assessment ongoing, which will confirm this and will also help to design the project to achieve maximum social benefits.

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

While we expect that in future the improved access will have broader economic/social development implications particularly of new roads or significantly improved roads, these future developments are not considered to be associated with this project in the sense of needing to apply our SG policies to them. This is because there are no specific developments that we can expect to occur as a result of the project (as would be the case, e.g., for a road providing direct access to an area which will be developed for a ski resort).

Component 2 will finance preparation of a Corridor Development Action Plan and implementation of some key priority activities from the Plan (with focus on agriculture, tourism, services, etc.).

The Plan will take into account potential negative impacts of economic activity (agriculture, small businesses, tourism) on environment and will provide guidance on mitigation measures to avoid or minimize these impacts.

Component 3 will finance the road's operation and maintenance activities. Environmental aspects of road maintenance, such as location and design of maintenance depots, transport/storage/

application of de-icers, maintenance of road maintenance machinery will be addressed in design documentation and schedules of depots.  
Component 4 will finance various road safety measures which will generally have positive social impact in the project area.

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

Out of seven alternatives initially, three alignment alternatives were prioritized based on pre-feasibility assessment and further consultations with local administrations, citizens, and businesses. Alternative route options do not differ significantly in terms of potential environmental impacts. All three routes pass via Korgalzhyn, Arkalyk, and Turgay. Project Alternative 1, total of 1267 km, continues to the West via Yrgyz, Shalkar and Emba up to Kandagash and Aktobe. This alternative envisions the construction of 452 km of new road sections and rehabilitation of 692 km of roads. The Alternatives 2 and 3 are connected to the existing M-32 (Samara-Shymkent) road at Yrgyz and Karabutak respectively. They require rehabilitation of 297 km of roads, and 452 km and 583 km of new construction respectively. In all three alternatives, the highest traffic is expected at the road sections spanning from Astana to Arkalyk connecting the two economic centers. The rehabilitation and new construction of these sections will spur generation of local and regional trips due to improvement of travel conditions and enhanced connectivity. Economic analysis also takes into account generated trips between settlements along the routes and major economic centers, as well as diversion of long-distance and international traffic from an existing alternative road Astana-Atbasar-Kostanay-Karabutak-Aktobe.

Based on economic analysis of alternatives Route 1 was chosen as preferred alignment. The preferred option contributes to development of the central regions (e.g., around Arkalyk, Turgay, Akshiganak, Yrgyz, Shalkar).

**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 EIA process in Kazakhstan is described in the Environmental code (2007) and a set of detailed implementation instructions. It foresees 4 stages, which correlate with the respective design activities and range from (i) a desk study for pre-feasibility level, (ii) a preliminary EIA and (iii) a detailed ("full") EIA for the detailed design stage and (iv) an EMP as separate section of the design documentation. In this respect the EIA process is both logical and deemed compatible with international good practice.

The borrower prepared ESIA report. The ESIA was reviewed by the Bank team, a gap analysis carried out and issues to be rectified and improved identified. The team, the PMC (project management consultant) from the ongoing SWRP (South West Roads Project) and a qualified Consultant assisted the Borrower to address the identified gaps and upgrade the ESIA's to a quality acceptable to the Bank before project appraisal.

Unoccupied land plots shall be chosen for borrow pits. Location of these land plots as well as design documentation including re-cultivation plans will be agreed with nature protection agencies (water, forest, wildlife etc.) to ensure that adverse impacts on environment are eliminated or minimized. Construction contractor(s) bears full responsibility for the borrow pit operation and land re-cultivation after its closure. Land re-cultivation will include restitution of slopes and returning the topsoil which was removed and stored at a separate location. To make a former borrow pit a "green-field", re-cultivation measures will include setting seeds of various plants or allowing the endemic plants to naturally take over. During the road construction and land

remediation works the borrow pit sites will be regularly inspected by the representatives of the project owner and the state agencies responsible for environment.

The environmental compliance of the on-going projects (East-West, and South-West Roads) is generally satisfactory, as has been determined by several performance assessment missions carried out by the World Bank team. Local experts will be engaged by KAZ for the purposes of supervision of environmental and social safeguards. Contractors and supervision engineers regularly monitor the operation and remaining volumes of material in the borrow pits. Every borrow pit has closure/re-cultivation plan, which is prepared upfront as part of the design documentation for borrow pits. The documentation for borrow pits is in good order on file with contractors and supervision engineers.

**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 of the road are (a) the Committee for Roads, an agency of the Government of Kazakhstan, as the project proponent; (b) commercial and private road users, who will be the primary beneficiaries from improved road quality; and (c) PAPs such as the residents of communities along the road, farmers, herders and proprietors of roadside services. For this last group there will be benefits as well as some disadvantages and negative impacts caused by the project.

To ensure that all views and concerns of all stakeholders are appropriately reflected in project design and implementation, and environmental and social safeguards instruments fully capture the baseline situation, the expected impacts and the views and concerns of the PAPs, two sets of consultations were undertaken during the preparation of the Bank financed project. The first public hearings were carried out on June 9-12, 2015 in 5 regions of Akmola oblast, Tselinograd, Kurgaldzhin, Egindikol, Atbasars and Zharkaiyn regions, in Kostanay region, in Arkalyk town, Amangeldy and Dzhangeldy regions, and also in Irgiz region of Aktobe oblast. On June 29, 2015 public hearings were held in Akmol, Zhanteke, Egindikol, Sochinskii villages. Public hearings gave the opportunity to local residents and other project stakeholders to get acquainted with the general details of the project and to discuss the effective points concerning ecology and social aspects, to express the wishes and recommendations which have to be included in the ESIA TOR and RAP. The draft ESIA was disclosed on September 29, 2015, before start of project appraisal and public hearings were organized on November 9-11 in the project region (Zhanteke, Egindikol, Sochinskoye, Arkalyk, Amangeldy, Djangeldy, Akshyganak, Yrgiz).

**B. Disclosure Requirements**

<b>Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	07-Sep-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	29-Sep-2015
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	16-Nov-2015
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
Kazakhstan	29-Sep-2015
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	17-Sep-2015

Date of submission to InfoShop	28-Oct-2015
"In country" Disclosure	
Kazakhstan	21-Oct-2015
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>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.</b>	
<b>If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:</b>	

### ***C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level***

<b>OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment</b>	
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"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats</b>	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources</b>	
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"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement</b>	
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	
<b>The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information</b>	

Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>All Safeguard Policies</b>	
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]

### III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Jacques Bure	
<b>Approved By</b>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Agnes I. Kiss (SA)	Date: 16-Nov-2015
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Juan Gaviria (PMGR)	Date: 16-Nov-2015