



Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet Restructuring Stage

Restructuring Stage | Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 18-Apr-2019 | Report No: ISDSR23884

Regional Vice President:	Axel van Trotsenburg
Country Director:	Alberto Rodriguez
Senior Global Practice Director:	Ede Jorge Ijjasz-Vasquez
Practice Manager/Manager:	Ming Zhang
Task Team Leader:	Diana Marcela Rubiano Vargas





I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA

Project ID P157324	Project Name Ecuador Risk Mitigation and Emergency Recovery Project
Task Team Leader(s) Diana Marcela Rubiano Vargas	Country Ecuador
Approval Date 15-Mar-2016	Environmental Category Partial Assessment (B)
Managing Unit GSU10	Is this a Repeater project?

PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US\$, Millions)

SUMMARY

Total Project Cost	150.00
Total Financing	150.00
Financing Gap	0.00

DETAILS

World Bank Group Financing

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)	150.00
--	--------

2. PROJECT INFORMATION

Current Project Development Objective

The Project Development Objective is to reduce the potential effects of the El Niño phenomenon and the Cotopaxi volcano, and support the recovery of basic and production services in affected areas in case of an Eligible Disaster, in selected sectors.

Proposed New PDO



To support the recovery of basic and productive services in selected sectors in affected areas in case of an Eligible Disaster and strengthen resilience to natural disasters and macroeconomic shocks

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project is being restructured to reflect the new context and investment priorities of the Government of Ecuador (GoE) considered for World Bank (Bank; WB) financing in light of the GoE's formal request to cancel US\$58.21m of the original US\$150m in project funds in a letter dated September 26, 2018 and the subsequent communications updating the list of priority activities to be financed by the project received on December 17, 2018 and February 7, 2019. This restructuring ISDS is part of the restructuring package to reflect the revised Project Development Objective (PDO) and update the description of the project activities and related safeguards information disclosed on June 15, 2016 through the combined PID-ISDS document (Dated June 1, 2016).

Preparatory activities under Component 1 were guided by the Alert Declarations in effect related to the Cotopaxi volcano and the El Niño phenomenon, and the emergency preparedness action plan prepared by the GoE. Component 2 was designed to respond to any natural disaster meeting certain trigger criteria, described in the Project's Operations Manual (POM). The main trigger was set to be the SGR's issuance of an Orange Alert Declaration for the El Niño phenomenon, or Red for the Cotopaxi volcano or any other Eligible Disaster. While the official declarations may be in effect for a defined period of months, implementation of Component 2, once triggered, shall occur over a period of years.

Project Components

Component 1: Disaster Preparedness and Risk Mitigation (US\$4.23 million total; US\$3.78million IBRD)

Component 1 aimed to reduce the potential impacts of the hazards expected from El Niño and the Cotopaxi volcano, according to the emergency preparedness action plan prepared by the GoE (jointly by the SGR, MICS and the MEF). Initially divided into four subcomponents corresponding to activities implemented by the original co-executing agencies, Public Water Company (EPA), Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG), Ministry of Transportation and Public Works (MTO) and Ministry of Public Health (MSP), Component 1 intended to finance a selection of emergency activities included in the GoE action plan, inter alia: river dredging, clearing of waterways, road rehabilitation, preventative stabilization works, building of livestock shelters, and procurement of medicines, supplies and components necessary to protect public health. By the time the earthquake occurred on April 16, 2016, only EPA and MSP had completed some of the activities that were planned. The remaining activities were re-evaluated because the GoE priorities shifted towards recovery and reconstruction after the earthquake (Component 2).

In terms of climate change co-benefits, 100 percent of IBRD investments under Component 1 are expected to contribute (US\$ 3.8 million).

Component 2: Post-Disaster Recovery and Reconstruction (US\$92.10million total; US\$82.24million IBRD)

Component 2 aims to provide support for the recovery and reconstruction of selected sectors, should an Eligible Disaster occur. The component follows a framework approach based on a list of eligible activities that contribute to the rehabilitation or reconstruction of select transport/road, water/sanitation/flood protection infrastructure, crop and livestock production or any other sector agreed between the GoE and the WB as described in the POM. Under the project restructuring, eligible activities will be limited to the transport, education and health sectors.



The criteria for activity selection under Component 2 included: (i) being within the geographical area impacted by the disaster noted in the applicable Alert Declaration issued by the SGR; (ii) being classified as a Category B or C sub-project in terms of the WB OP/BP 4.01 on Environmental Assessment, (iii) not being an activity that would affect international waterways, (iv) to the extent possible focusing interventions on specific geographic areas to maximize the impacts of the investments; (v) recovering vital infrastructure to restore critical basic and productive services; (vi) ensuring access and connectivity; (vii) prioritizing sub-projects that have an advanced level of preparedness and can ensure rapid response and recovery.

Component 2 was triggered following the orange alert declaration of April 2, 2016 associated with the intensification of the El Niño phenomenon that caused heavy rains, floods and landslides, and the red alert declaration associated with the April 16, 2016 earthquake. Most of the project funds are redirected to Component 2, and in February 7, 2019 the GoE confirmed the following list of investments under the ERL: i) the construction of a new fully-equipped educational unit, including equipment, to be executed by MINEDUC and the Works Contracting Service (SECOB), the national construction agency; ii) the purchase of 40 ambulances and medical equipment and supplies, to be executed by MSP; and iii) the rehabilitation of one road, as well as the reconstruction of the Manta fishing port managed by the Port Authority of Manta (APM), to be executed by MTOP.

In terms of climate change co-benefits: 13.32 percent of IBRD investments under Component 2 (US\$10.96 million) are expected to bring climate co-benefits by addressing El Niño and other hydro-meteorological hazards.

Component 3: Technical Assistance to MEF and Project Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation (US\$6.46 million total; US\$ 5.77million IBRD)

Component 3 provides support to the MEF, EPA, MTOP, MSP, MINEDUC, SECOB and other selected sectors, for the administrative management of the project, including: (i) the hiring of a Project Coordinator, specialists in financial management, procurement, and monitoring and evaluation for the PCU (Project Coordination Unit); (ii) the hiring of other technical temporary staff (including, but not limited to, environmental and social specialists) needed during project implementation; (iii) the carrying out of project audits; and (iv) the financing of the necessary goods and equipment. This component also includes technical assistance to MEF to strengthen the country's resilience to macroeconomic shocks.

Status of new project activities (Components 2 and 3) to mid-April 2019

The GoE defined the activities to be financed under Components 2 and 3 in a formal letter on February 7, 2019. Sub-projects under Component 2 are located in the areas most affected by the earthquake and the El Niño phenomenon in the provinces of Manabí and Esmeraldas. The GoE has proposed an overall implementation schedule that would allow completion of all the planned activities by the project's closing date.

The new school to be constructed under the project as a part of an area that agglomerates various public services is located in the city of Portoviejo in the province of Manabí. MINEDUC is finalizing the structural designs with its own resources. In accordance with the provisions established in Annex 14 of the Environmental and Social Screening and Assessment Framework (ESSAF), MINEDUC and SECOB have prepared an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) for the school works based on the identified impacts that are temporal, site-specific, easily mitigated and reversible. The ESMP has been socialized and is currently under final review by the Bank.

The Port of Manta (Terminal Pesquero de Manta), located in the canton of Manta, Manabí province, was amongst the infrastructure that suffered the greatest damages to infrastructure. Specifically, a large part of the fishing dock was



damaged, generating a significant decline in the respective operational capacity. The project will finance construction of two fishing docks, potable water supply for the fishing and cabotage terminal and reconstruction of the port's perimeter wall that was damaged from severe ground liquefaction during the earthquake. The designs and studies for the works have been completed by APM through a consultancy company with fiscal resources. The planned investment has an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) and ESMP, including management and final marine deposit of the dredged sediments. The ESIA/ESMP has been socialized with interested stakeholders in May 2018 as described in Annexes 3.1-3.3 of the final ESIA/ESMP, which was disclosed in-country and by the Bank on March 18, 2019.

The project is also expected to finance the rehabilitation of a provincial road between Abdon Calderon and El Quingue that was affected by the El Niño phenomenon and the 2016 earthquake. The works will focus on the rehabilitation of critical road sites that are affecting vehicular mobility. MTOP is finalizing the designs with its own resources. MTOP has prepared an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) for the rehabilitation works based on the identified impacts that are temporal, site-specific, easily mitigated and reversible. The ESMP has been socialized in the five settlements along the road section and is currently under final review by the Bank.

In case the final design of the road shows the need for resettlement or compensation for lost livelihoods (whether temporary or permanent) under OP 4.12, an abbreviated Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) will be prepared.

The bulk of activities under Component 3 will focus on building the country's resilience to macroeconomic shocks. These will include reforms to strengthen the GoE's fiscal position and sustainability, allow for a more efficient allocation and mobilization of government resources, and encourage private investment.

4. PROJECT LOCATION AND SALIENT PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS RELEVANT TO THE SAFEGUARD ANALYSIS (IF KNOWN)

The potential project intervention area initially covered the whole of the country, since Component 2 was open to address any eligible natural disaster. After the activation of Component 2, most of the project funds were concentrated around the most affected areas by El Niño and the 2016 earthquake. To address the El Niño episode, flood control and risk mitigation activities focused on the Guayas and Azuay provinces that are part of the Guayas flood plain, identified as the area with the strongest expected impact from flooding and landslides caused by the El Niño. The activities addressed river dredging on the Balao and Jubones rivers, as well as construction of flood protection and gabion walls in specific spots of the Guayas, Buenavista, and Gala rivers. The earthquake impacted the provinces of Manabí, Esmeraldas, Santa Elena, Santo Domingo de los Tsáchilas, Los Rios and Guayas. Of these, the province of Manabí experienced the highest loss of life and overall infrastructure damage, especially in the cantons of Manta, Pedernales and Portoviejo. MINEDUC will construct a new school in the province of Manabí. MTOP will rehabilitate a damaged road in the province of Esmeraldas. The reconstruction works on the damaged fishing port of Manta are located in the province of Manabí. Specific investments in mobile health services and goods for health supply will be provided in 84 percent of the country's health districts. None of the planned investments present particular safeguards concerns in terms of negative impacts on natural habitats, physical cultural resources or forests. No cases of involuntary resettlement have thus far been identified related with the investments, as neither presence of indigenous peoples that would be affected by project activities. Overall, less than 2.5% of the population of the emergency declaration provinces self-identifies as indigenous; a smaller proportion than the national



average of 7 percent. The province of Manabí, which will take on the largest amount of the project funds, has 0.3 percent of its population self-identifying as indigenous.

5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS SPECIALISTS ON THE TEAM

Mariana T. Felicio, Social Specialist

Tuuli Johanna Bernardini, Environmental Specialist

6. SAFEGUARD POLICIES TRIGGERED

Safeguard Policies	Triggered	Explanation
Environmental Assessment (OP) (BP 4.01)	Yes	After the restructuring, potential social and environmental impacts are related to the post-disaster recovery and reconstruction investments. The Environmental and Social Screening and Assessment Framework (ESSAF) the GoE prepared, consulted and disclosed during project preparation/effectiveness to guide the project’s social and environmental management has been updated to reflect the adjustments needed particularly to address the school investments by MINEDUC. The ESSAF remains the project’s overarching safeguards instrument that guides elaboration of investment specific assessments and management plans. See further details under Summary of Key Safeguard Issues.
Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03	No	
Natural Habitats (OP) (BP 4.04)	Yes	Given the rich biodiversity and the number of different types of protected areas in Ecuador, the project applied a precautionary principle to trigger OP/BP 4.04 particularly as the scale and location of the potential natural disaster impacts and the related response investments were unknown during project preparation. The ESSAF includes guidance to screen for potential natural habitat impacts and address them appropriately.
Forests (OP) (BP 4.36)	Yes	Given the forest coverage at the national level, the project applied a precautionary principle to trigger OP/BP 4.36 particularly as the scale and location of the potential natural disaster impacts and the related response investments were unknown during project preparation. The ESSAF includes guidance to screen for potential forest-related



		impacts and address them appropriately. No reforestation activities to prevent landslides or other type of disasters are projected under the restructured project.
Pest Management (OP 4.09)	Yes	Component 1 was to finance personal protection equipment for safe handling of chemical larvicides to control mosquitoes as vectors for several diseases that are prone to spread due to the El Niño effects that can increase the use of chemicals. The assessment of MSP's capacity and adequacy of its system for managing chemicals was conducted before project effectiveness. Annex 13 of the ESSAF, Emergency Plan for Vector Control, includes a detailed description of the related socio-environmental management by MSP
Physical Cultural Resources (OP) (BP 4.11)	Yes	Given the rich physical cultural resources (PCR) of Ecuador, the project applied a precautionary principle to trigger OP/BP 4.11, particularly as the scale and location of the potential natural disaster impacts and the related response investments were unknown during project preparation. Chance finds of cultural artefacts have not occurred in the context of the thus far executed minor works, yet they cannot be ruled out during the remaining project implementation period. The ESSAF specifies appropriate requirements for screening of investments, and sub-projects' Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) include appropriate management measures in case any known cultural resources might be affected.
Indigenous Peoples (OP) (BP 4.10)	Yes	Given presence of Indigenous Peoples in Ecuador, the project triggered OP/BP 4.11 particularly as the scale and location of the potential natural disaster impacts and the related response investments were unknown during project preparation. The majority of the disaster mitigation activities initially planned under Component 1 focused on existing infrastructure works that were not expected to have effects on indigenous populations. A screening of the zone of influence of the shelters for cattle to be constructed under Component 1 revealed that close to 90% of the population was Mestizo, while the indigenous populations were scattered throughout the zone and not concentrated in communities. The referred indigenous population did not meet the characteristics set out in OP 4.10.



Particularly for Component 2, yet applicable to the whole project, the ESSAF includes an Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) as Annex 9. The IPPF provides specific guidance on how to effectively engage indigenous communities as well as procedures to be used for screening all activities to be financed under the project, ensuring that they maximize social benefits and avoid or mitigate adverse impacts on indigenous peoples. No feedback was received on the IPPF when it was consulted.

When the ESSAF was developed, the possibility of developing PPIs as established in OP 4.10 was left open to the extent that the actions or sub-projects would affect or influence indigenous territories/peoples. As sub-projects have been identified and are currently under development, no applicable presence of Indigenous Peoples has been confirmed and no PPI has been formulated.

Involuntary Resettlement (OP) (BP 4.12) Yes

Project activities may result in limited temporary or permanent involuntary resettlement or land acquisition. Investments initially identified under Component 1—including maintenance of existing infrastructure such as roads, canals, and irrigation systems, dredging of rivers, and construction of cattle shelters in public land—were screened and found to trigger minimal disruption and not to require land acquisition. The ESSAF includes a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) as Annex 10 to ensure full application of the safeguard. Project funds will not be used for any resettlement-related compensation cost. No feedback was received on the RPF when it was consulted.

Safety of Dams (OP) (BP 4.37) Yes

The project will not finance construction of major dams. However, as there are major dams in the area susceptible to El Niño effects, the project applied a precautionary principle to trigger OP/BP 4.37, in case EPA, the responsible GoE agency, would have needed to incur to any dam related rehabilitation works with project financing under Component 2 on Post-Disaster Recovery and Reconstruction. The ESSAF describes the basic OP/BP 4.37 requirements that any work on rehabilitating a major dam will need to satisfy



under a WB financed project. Overall, the project is set to comply with the related procedures as applicable to any activity related with a major dam that the project might finance. However, considering the list of the confirmed investments, the safeguard is not relevant after the restructuring.

Projects on International Waterways (OP) (BP 7.50) No

Project activities have not been and will not be conducted in or influence international waterways. It was agreed with the GoE that any activity that would need to trigger this Policy would be excluded from project financing.

Projects in Disputed Areas (OP) (BP 7.60) No

Project activities have not been and will not be conducted in disputed areas.

II. KEY SAFEGUARD POLICY ISSUES AND THEIR MANAGEMENT

A. SUMMARY OF KEY SAFEGUARD ISSUES

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

The project triggers OP/BP 4.01 on Environmental Assessment. It is classified as an "Environmental and Social Category B" operation under the same. The project has been implemented in areas that were expected to be (in case of Component 1) and have effectively been (in case of Component 2) hit severely by the El Niño phenomenon and/or the April 2016 earthquake. Given the magnitude of expected damage caused by the El Niño and by a potential eruption of the Cotopaxi volcano, the project was designed to provide rehabilitation and recovery support to affected areas in which public infrastructure and services delivery were severely impacted. The civil works financed for preventive action under Component 1 consisted finally in six site-specific rehabilitative works of minor scale. These works were financed retroactively after the Bank confirmed their compliance with the applicable World Bank fiduciary norms and safeguards policies. Under Component 2, dedicated to recovery and reconstruction, the expected investments, re-confirmed in a letter from MEF received February 7, 2019, focus on reconstructing and/or rehabilitating road, port and educational infrastructure, the purchase of medical supplies and ambulances and technical assistance to strengthen the country's resilience to macroeconomic shocks. The ESSAF includes a negative list that has excluded any potential "Category A" investment from project funding, and the screening design ensures there have been no and will not be any significant or irreversible environmental impacts anticipated from project-financed activities. None of the planned civil works takes place in an environmentally or socially sensitive area nor is expected to cause cumulative or indirect/induced impacts on such areas.

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

Not applicable.

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



Not applicable to the main bulk of the planned preventive and emergency response works. The Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) of the rehabilitation/reconstruction/ improvement of the Manta fishing port administered by the Port Authority of Manta (APM), cleared by RSA in November, 2018, includes consideration of two alternatives in terms of the design of the fishing port rehabilitation: 1) construction of two docks and dredging, and 2) rehabilitation of accesses and marginal wharves and demolition and construction of enclosure. The first alternative was chosen, as it expands the port's operational capacity and improves its operational efficiency and that of environmental controls, and thus contributes to a greater socio-economic impact. Four alternatives were analyzed for the final marine disposal site for the sediments dredged from the port area: 1) within the dock of the fishing terminal and cabotage (2 miles north-east of the Port); 2) in front of the El Murciélago beach (expansion site); 3) in front of the minor Jaramijo port (4 miles from the Port of Manta and 1 mile from the Jaramijo port); and 4) on land. The first alternative was chosen for its least impacts, taken the sediment drag would not affect neighboring beaches, affect artisanal fishing activity nor generate impacts on economic activities. Alternatives 2 and 3 could have had an impact both on the quality of the beaches affecting tourism and a possible accumulation of sediments in the port of Jaramijo.

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 project was prepared and the investments under Component 1 were implemented according to Paragraph 12 of the World Bank's Operational Policy 10.00, which allows for certain exceptions to the investment project financing policy requirements, including deferral of safeguards requirements. The deferral was requested for postponing the disclosure of safeguards instruments to after Appraisal that took place on December 17, 2015. Site-specific safeguards instruments and environmental authorizations by the Ministry of Environment (MAE), as required per the national legislation, have been required for all investments planned or financed under the project, including those subject to retroactive financing under Component 1. The scope and depth of the ESMPs vary based on each sub-project's environmental impact and sensibility of the area of influence. The safeguards instruments must be ready and acceptable to the Bank and the environmental authorizations processed prior to bidding the works, and in every case before works start on the ground. Exceptions to processing the environmental authorizations as per the national legislation have been warranted in the ESSAF if properly justified based on an emergency, always subject to a written agreement by the MAE. There has been no such case thus far during project implementation, and none is expected during the remaining implementation period. MEF and the responsible co-executing agency will disclose the project-related environmental authorizations and the ESMPs that go beyond application of environmental and social good practices and require consultation with potentially affected people. The Bank will also disclose the latter through the WB external website.

The co-executing agencies prepared with MEF and Bank support an Environmental and Social Screening and Assessment Framework (ESSAF) for the project to ensure identification and adequate management of social and environmental issues and risks relating to project implementation, including a section on environmental good practices focused on civil works. The ESSAF includes an Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) that covers specific guidance on how to effectively and pro-actively engage indigenous communities as well as procedures to be used for screening all activities identified post-appraisal to ensure they maximize social benefits and avoid causing any potential adverse impacts. The presence of IPs in the areas that were declared in emergency during project preparation was analyzed in the ESSAF. The ESSAF includes a format to use for assessing if Indigenous Peoples, Afro-Ecuadorian and/o Montubio people are present in any particular sub-project location. Application of the tools included in the IPPF have thus far concluded that no subproject requires preparation of an IPP.

The ESSAF also includes a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) prepared in accordance with OP 4.12, providing guidance for land acquisition if any sub-project requires preparation of a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP). The RPF



reflects the two following principles: 1) prior to the approval of sub-projects, the responsible agency needs to ensure that the sites, boundaries and ownership of the related land plots are clearly identified and confirmed by presenting a legal title; and 2) for all activities, the responsible agency is obliged to develop and implement a RAP in case of involuntary resettlement, including agreement and payment of compensation measures with fiscal/other than project funds prior to the commencement of works for that particular sub-project. Implementation support has been made available by the Bank to screen and consider the need to prepare any RAP. Guidance has also been provided on conducting rapid social assessments, and simplified templates would be made available for the completion of site-specific RAPs if required. No sub-project has thus far required nor is expected to require preparation of a RAP. During the remaining project implementation period, in case the final design of the expected road rehabilitation works shows the need for resettlement or compensation for lost livelihoods (whether temporary or permanent) under OP 4.12, MTOP will prepare an abbreviated RAP.

Beyond the IPPF and RPF, the ESSAF consists of:

- i. Screening methodology for all types of potential civil works related with rehabilitation of water, road, health and school infrastructure to identify relevant environmental and social issues and risks, as well as environmental enhancement opportunities. The screening facilitates determining the relevant national requirements related to environmental, health and safety management and the applicability of the WB's Operational Policies on environmental and social safeguards. Said methodology includes a negative list to exclude any potential "Category A" investment from project funding, or investments that would result, e.g., in negative impacts on any type of forest, protected area/buffer zone and/or physical cultural resources. The screening methodology has proved functional during project implementation.
- ii. Description of potential negative environmental and social impacts of the expected types of project activities/investments, as well as applicable prevention/mitigation measures and good practices.
- iii. Description of the basic content required for site specific ESMPs to be completed and customized for each sub-project based on the results of site screening to specify the siting, design, demolition/land clearing, and construction management requirements for physical activities.
- iv. Procedures, roles and responsibilities for carrying out and approving site screening templates and site specific ESMPs, ensuring that sub-project siting, designs, plans, specifications and implementation plans reflect the environmental screening outcomes and the ESMP requirements are compliant with the applicable WB safeguards and meet the relevant policies/acts, strategies/rules and regulations of the GoE.
- v. Description of the applicable public communication tools and procedures and a multi-tiered Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) to receive and handle complaints relating to exclusion and inclusion errors during beneficiary targeting, those adversely affected by the project, and delivery of project benefits. Such mechanisms rely on existing community institutions, the co-executive agencies, and the overall project coordination by the MEF, as applicable.
- vi. Generic sub-project safeguards supervision/monitoring template for rehabilitation works to record compliance with the sub-project specific safeguards instruments (ESMP, IPP, RAP). These are administered by the responsible co-executing agency that mobilizes the personnel needed to provide close technical support and supervision at the local level. ESMPs are under preparation for one school construction sub-project and one road rehabilitation subproject.

As stated above, each civil work is required to comply with the environmental permitting requirements by national legislation. Each will also have an applicable ESMP, whose level of detail and scope depends on the type of activity, as acceptable to the Bank. ESMPs that go beyond application of good environmental and social practices and require consultations will be disclosed in-country and on the WB external website. The six maintenance or rehabilitation/reconstruction works conducted by EPA for flood prevention under Component 1 relied on environmental and social good practices specified for the type of works and natural and human environment in question. These were minor civil works that were presented to the Bank for retroactive financing. The request was



approved after the Bank confirmed the GoE and project-financed contractors and supervisors complied with sound environmental and social practices.

Monitoring, evaluation and reporting on environmental and social management is part of the project's implementation process, including local authorities' reporting systems. During construction, contractors will keep records of all activities carried out on each sub-project site, and these records will be submitted to the responsible co-executing agency. Departmental environmental officials are expected to be responsible for monitoring at the local level. The PCU at the MEF is overall in charge of securing that the co-executing agencies carry out adequate level of sub-project supervision. Once the larger construction works start, compliance with adequate environmental and social management will be monitored based on evaluation and progress reports and supported through feedback meetings, possible training as needed and implementation support missions.

Awareness on environmental and social mitigation measures: The ESSAF outlines provisions applicable in awareness/orientation sessions for environmental and social training aimed at contractors of civil works. Appropriate training will cover areas such as: managing key impacts, policy and legal framework on environment and construction, disposal of solid and liquid waste, and code of conduct to secure sound coexistence between workers and adjacent communities, including prevention of spread and contraction of HIV/AIDS. Environmental and social rules and procedures for contractors have been/will be incorporated within construction bids and contracts to enhance obligations on contractors.

In the section on good practices contained in the ESSAF, it is established that the infrastructure design should include, among other aspects, due consideration to ventilation, natural and artificial energy efficiency, access to water and sanitation supply, universal access for people with disabilities and security of vulnerable groups, as well as to historical and cultural considerations. Safety of the infrastructure will be particularly addressed in construction of the educational facilities.

Capacity of the borrower to implement safeguards: Regarding the participating agencies' capacity to plan and implement pertinent social and environmental management, each has at least a minimum environmental and social staff and technical capacity with support by the PCU/MEF and Bank as needed. Each agency has named responsible staff to contribute to preparation and implementation of the project's safeguards instruments. Thus far, EPA, MINEDUC and APM (the responsible co-executing agency being MTOP) have demonstrated strong capacity to comply with WB safeguards. Thus far safeguards work by MTOP has suffered of various changes in the planned investments, which have changed before any EA/ESIA/ESMP was completed. In mid-April 2019, MTOP is finalizing preparation of the ESMP for the Abdon Calderon-El Quingue road with close support by the Bank. The PCU at the MEF has gained a basic understanding of the WB safeguards requirements and serves to coordinate the respective work between the co-executing agencies and the Bank. Over the past decades, the GoE has implemented important pro-poor policies and taken steps to include indigenous peoples and other minorities, and all the co-executing agencies have experience in consultation and dialogue with indigenous communities. For example, the MSP includes a Division for Intercultural Health. Due to absence of a staff member dedicated to social issues, MINEDUC complemented the project team by a consultant specialized in social management to prepare the ESMP for the school in the city of Portoviejo.

Overall, the project contributes to enhancing GoE capacity in social and environmental management in disaster prevention and response. During thus far project implementation, the Bank team has facilitated the co-executing agencies' safeguards-related work on an as-needed basis, and the same approach will be followed during the remaining implementation period. The Bank team has worked closely with the counterpart teams during the preparation of the safeguards instruments, and will continue supporting the participating agencies' need for



safeguards support focused on monitoring, supervising and reporting safeguards implementation during the forthcoming construction phase of the planned investments.

5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanism for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.

The key project stakeholders are the public institutions in charge of disaster prevention and response. The potentially affected people are determined mainly based on their geographic location and socio-economic factors that contribute to their vulnerability.

Regarding the initially planned canal clean-up works, EPA disseminated to near-by landowners the message on the availability of sediment for potential and strictly voluntary material disposal in private lands. The project applied a protocol to verify the voluntary disposal of dredged materials as part of the social and environmental management of each investment, as applicable.

Regarding gender, it is well documented in the literature that gender and equality have a strong link to disaster vulnerability and resilience. However, the planned project investments will be mostly gender neutral, as they focus on maintenance and rehabilitation/reconstruction of existing infrastructure. The activities in need of strong gender mainstreaming will be covered by other sources of funding. As applicable, project indicators are disaggregated by men and women.

Regarding citizen engagement, the project has a grievance redress indicator at the intermediate level. The co-executing agencies have the responsibility to document and resolve grievances. Each co-executing agency follows up on grievances and reports them to the PCU. The agreed upon arrangements for public disclosure and stakeholder participation are detailed in Section 6.3 of the ESSAF.

Regarding the disclosure of the ESSAF, an advanced draft was published in-country on February 4, 2016 and on the Bank external website on February 8, 2016. Subsequently, the GoE organized consultations on the draft ESSAF in Quito, Guayaquil, Montecristi and Santo Domingo, with participation by a total of 115 people, representatives of relevant GoE agencies, provincial and local authorities, construction and engineering professionals and civil society to collect feedback and contributions to the final document. Participants in the consultations were overall interested in the project and its scope, as well as in the ESSAF, acknowledging they present an adequate project design and management of related environmental aspects and any potential impact on human settlements. Questions related to project coverage and the institutional and operational arrangements in terms of inter-institutional collaboration between the MEF, MAE, and the co-executing agencies. More specifically, in the consultation events organized by EPA, community and political leaders and other social actors expressed their satisfaction on the planned and on-going flood protection works, and additional sub-project needs were presented. In the consultation events organized by MTOP, questions were raised on the road sections selected for preventive maintenance, including the scope, beneficiaries, timing and required environmental authorizations of said works. The conducted consultations are presented in detail in Section 7 and Annex 8 of the ESSAF. The final ESSAF was disclosed in-country and on the Bank external website on April 22, 2016 before project effectiveness.

The ESSAF has remained object of continued update and improvement during project implementation, including inclusion of Annex 14 that details the applicable environmental and social management practices related to the educational infrastructure managed by MINEDUC and SECOB.



The ESIA/ESMP for the reconstruction of the Manta Port has been socialized with interested stakeholders in May 2018 as described in Annexes 3.1-3.3 of the final ESIA/ESMP, which was disclosed in-country and by the Bank on March 18, 2019.

B. DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other

Date of receipt by the Bank

06-Jan-2016

Date of submission for disclosure

31-Jan-2016

For Category 'A' projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors

"In country" Disclosure

Country

Ecuador

Date of Disclosure

31-Jan-2016

Comments

Resettlement Action Plan/Framework Policy Process

Date of receipt by the Bank

06-Jan-2016

Date of submission for disclosure

31-Jan-2016

"In country" Disclosure

Country

Ecuador

Date of Disclosure

31-Jan-2016

Comments

Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework

Date of receipt by the Bank

Date of submission for disclosure



06-Jan-2016	31-Jan-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
Country	Date of Disclosure
Ecuador	31-Jan-2016
Comments	

Pest Management Plan

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?

No

Date of receipt by the Bank

Date of submission for disclosure

"In country" Disclosure

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
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	NA
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes

OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats

OP 4.09 - Pest Management

Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes
Is a separate PMP required?	NA



If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?	NA
OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources	
Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?	Yes
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?	Yes
OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples	
Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	Yes
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	No
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?	NA
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement	
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	No
Is physical displacement/relocation expected?	No
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)	TBD
OP/BP 4.36 - Forests	
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	



Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?	
---	--

OP/BP 4.37 - Safety of Dams

Have dam safety plans been prepared?	NA
Have the TORs as well as composition for the independent Panel of Experts (POE) been reviewed and approved by the Bank?	NA
Has an Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) been prepared and arrangements been made for public awareness and training?	NA

The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information

Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank for disclosure?	Yes
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

All Safeguard Policies

Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader(s)	Diana Marcela Rubiano Vargas Alexander Agosti
---------------------	--



Approved By		
Safeguards Advisor	Noreen Beg	20-Dec-2018
Practice Manager/Manager	Ming Zhang	20-Dec-2018