

## INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATASHEET APPRAISAL STAGE

### I. Basic Information

Date prepared/updated: 05/29/2007

Report No.: AC3011

### 1. Basic Project Data

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Country: Liberia   | Project ID: P105683  |
| Project Name: Community Empowerment II   |  |
| Task Team Leader: Giuseppe Zampaglione   |  |
| Estimated Appraisal Date: April 11, 2007   | Estimated Board Date: June 14, 2007  |
| Managing Unit: AFTH2   | Lending Instrument: Emergency Recovery Loan                                  |
| Sector: Other social services (40%);Primary education (30%);Health (30%)   |  |
| Theme: Conflict prevention and post-conflict reconstruction (P);Other human development (S)                        |  |
| IBRD Amount (US\$m.): 0.00   |  |
| IDA Amount (US\$m.): 6.00  |  |
| GEF Amount (US\$m.): 0.00  |  |
| PCF Amount (US\$m.): 0.00  |  |
| Other financing amounts by source:   |  |
| <b>BORROWER/RECIPIENT</b>  | 0.00   |
|  | 0.00   |
| Environmental Category: B - Partial Assessment   |  |
| Simplified Processing  | Simple <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Repeater <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies) | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>          |

### 2. Project Objectives

As part of the government response to the social and economic emergency in Liberia, the Project will improve poor rural communities' access to basic services and economic opportunities through a Community Driven Development approach, by investing in community sub-projects and in capacity building at the community and local government levels.

Building on progress made under the current CEP operation, the Project will support the rehabilitation of and access to social and economic services. In so doing it will address the emergency situation in social services, in health and education in particular (as highlighted in section B of this EPP), and open new economic opportunities. The Project envisages a strong involvement of local authorities in key sub-project phases by providing them with capacity-building and involving them in the selection and supervision of sub-projects.

Progress towards achieving the Project objectives will be measured by the following key indicators:

- a) All supported communities have benefited from social mobilization and at least 90% of sub-projects undertaken reflect the emergency priorities of targeted communities and beneficiaries, and are implemented in collaboration with local authorities;
- b) PMCs are inclusive, well-representative, and well-trained;
- c) At least 400 PMC members are successfully trained every year in sub-project management;
- d) Completion of at least 80 sub-projects, by end of Project implementation;
- e) Increase in access to basic services, in particular health and education by end of Project implementation;
- f) Project management expenses as defined in the MAAFP are less than 13% of total budgeted annual expenditures.

### **3. Project Description**

CEP II will be implemented over a four year period from September 1, 2007 to June 30, 2011. CEP II is financed by a US\$ 5 million IDA grant and by a □9 million co-financing agreement with the European Commission (EC). The Project will include the following components:

- 1) Community Driven Program (US\$4 million or US\$13.0 million with EC co-financing). This component will provide support to local communities to select, design, implement, and maintain small-scale sub-projects that will help in restoring social and economic infrastructure. This will be achieved through community mobilization and collective action. Funds will be channeled directly to the communities based on a participatory needs assessment. Communities will be assisted by Community Facilitators (CF) and Engineering Consultants. This component will finance 80 sub-projects (or 260 with EC co-financing).
- 2) Capacity Building Program (US\$0.4 million or US\$1.3 million with EC co-financing). This component will fund training programs for communities, local authorities, and other key stakeholders to enable them to play a leading role in identification, design, and implementation of community-based activities as a means of ensuring greater sustainability. Intermediaries, NGOs, consultants and the LACE will prepare various training modules (book keeping, procurement, sub-project operations and maintenance) including “hands-on training”.
- 3) Project Management (US\$0.6 million or US\$1.95 million with EC co-financing). This component will finance (a) the M&E system to collect data from the community, regional and central levels; (b) Information, Education, and Communication (IEC) activities; (c) financial, technical, procurement, and management audits; (d) technical assistance for social and beneficiary assessments, community mobilization, and environmental studies; and (e) incremental operating costs for the implementing agency, LACE. The component will also finance the strengthening of LACE’s operational capacity.

CEP is implemented by LACE, an independent public agency, established in 2004 by the Act of the National Legislature that operates like a private sector entity. The

objectives of the Agency are to improve the living standards of poor communities through the provision and strengthening of basic social services and to promote a community-based approach in sub-project identification, preparation, implementation, administration and maintenance.

#### **4. Project Location and salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis**

The Project will be implemented in all counties in various communities throughout Liberia. However, the exact location and the type of sub-projects are not currently known as they will be demand-driven by the community. Based experience from CEP I, project sites tend to be small – about one acre in size. While there has been a concentration of primary schools, sub-projects have also included health centers, markets, small bridges, wells and a disability center.

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

Mr Edward Felix Dwumfour (AFTS4)

Ms Beatrix Allah-Mensah (AFTS4)

| <b>6. Safeguard Policies Triggered</b>                  | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> |
|---|------------|-----------|
| <b>Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01)</b>            | X          |           |
| <b>Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04)</b>                    |            | X         |
| <b>Forests (OP/BP 4.36)</b>                             |            | X         |
| <b>Pest Management (OP 4.09)</b>                        |            | X         |
| <b>Physical Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11)</b>         |            | X         |
| <b>Indigenous Peoples (OP/BP 4.10)</b>                  |            | X         |
| <b>Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12)</b>            | X          |           |
| <b>Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4.37)</b>                      |            | X         |
| <b>Projects on International Waterways (OP/BP 7.50)</b> |            | X         |
| <b>Projects in Disputed Areas (OP/BP 7.60)</b>          |            | X         |

## **II. 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: Environmental Impacts: The Project identifies a number of environmental issues which are direct or indirect consequence of implementation of sub-projects due to the nature of the sub-projects. These sub-projects like rehabilitation or construction of schools, health facilities, bridges, markets and community water and sanitation have been identified to have, in some cases, minimal environmental impacts. A Rapid Environmental Assessment of CEP I sub-projects noted that due to the minimal level of environmental impact of the on-going sub-projects, mitigation measures could be adopted to address them. Three key environmental issues were identified in this category. One of these is land clearing for construction and use of land for waste disposal which may have very localized and perhaps temporary health implications. These can be mitigated by construction of garbage bins and good waste disposal practices. The second issue is the

possibility of biodiversity loss, soil erosion due to clearing of trees which can be mitigated through community tree and grass planting. The third issue is the possible creation of open pits as a result of rehabilitation or construction activities. In order to save both human and animal life, the assessment proposed a conspicuous marking of these pits. Most importantly, the Rapid Environmental Assessment proposes mitigation measures for all identified environmental issues and specific environmental plans.

**Social Impact:** The implementation of the sub-projects may require acquisition of land. This could lead to resettlement or relocation of some community members. The Project liaises with community leaders and works through local governance structures and community consultations to acquire lands for proposed LACE projects. As a result, resettlement due to land acquisition problems is expected to be nil or very negligible. More importantly, the project is determined to avoid as much as possible, relocation issues. However, in cases where this is unavoidable, the project has an RPF and mechanisms for ensuring that the relocation and resettlement is done in accordance with the Liberian government and LACE policies in consultation with other key stakeholders. The RPF also makes provision for the development of a Community Resettlement Policy (CRP). These are to ensure that all affected persons are adequately resettled or compensated.

The resettlement issues aside, the project is expected to positively impact the beneficiary communities and individuals in a number of ways. The rehabilitation of the social infrastructure on the whole will create access to health, water and sanitation facilities, access and improvement in education of the children. Markets will create economic opportunities and bridges will facilitate easy access and create other opportunities. Overall, the positive changes in the living conditions of the people in terms of having access to basic infrastructure, will also serve as the basis for their social and economic empowerment and reduction in poverty levels.

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

The assessment found that there are no long-term impacts anticipated due to future activities.

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

Due to the limited social and environmental impact of sub-projects, there are no alternatives envisaged at this time

**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.**

As described above, LACE has prepared a package of two safeguard documents which are the ESMF and the RPF. The objective of the frameworks is to ensure that project activities do not have negative impact on the environment and distort social relations and structure. The Government of Liberia through the LACE has therefore taken measures to examine the environmental and social impact of the Project and map out possible

mitigation measures to address even the mildest anticipated environmental and social effect.

Institutional Capacity for Safeguard Compliance: LACE has demonstrated its commitment to environmental and social safeguards issues. However, capacity is limited, and LACE is planning to hire an Environmental Consultant on retention basis to work with the LACE team. Consultations with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and other allied environmental institutions in Liberia, local government institutions will be a main feature of implementation. To ensure further commitment and measurable targets, LACE is being encouraged to ensure that monitoring and evaluation indicators reflect the environmental and social issues identified. In addition to this commitment, a capacity building through training has also been identified as an additional means to support implementation at the community level. Whilst this proposal is targeted at community members, it is proposed that the project supports LACE and local government staff to undertake some training on environmental and social impact assessments, mitigation and management plans.

5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people. The preparation and presentation of the ESMF and the RPF have been done through consultations with project affected community members and other stakeholders from both government and non-governmental agencies. Other development partners have been involved in the processes as well. The final report reflected the views of some of these stakeholders. The documents are however yet to be sent to the World Bank's info-shop as required. In preparation of the EIA, a team of consultants supported by LACE visited 20 sub-project sites in Bong, Bomi, Nimba, Lofa and Montserrado counties, representing the geographical areas of central, western, northern and southern Liberia. The consulting team visited and held meetings with local authorities and the cross section of stakeholders such as local leaders, health authorities, NGOs, CBOs, Project facilitators, Contractors, PMCs and other community members. It is estimated that more than 1,000 people have been reached. The LACE will continue with consultations during implementation.

---

#### ***B. Disclosure Requirements Date***

---

**Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other:**

|                                 |            |
|---------------------------------|------------|
| Date of receipt by the Bank     | 01/31/2007 |
| Date of "in-country" disclosure | 04/20/2007 |
| Date of submission to InfoShop  | 05/25/2007 |

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

**Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process:**

|                                 |            |
|---------------------------------|------------|
| Date of receipt by the Bank     | 03/31/2007 |
| Date of "in-country" disclosure | 04/20/2007 |
| Date of submission to InfoShop  | 05/25/2007 |

\* If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources, 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 (to be filled in when the ISDS is finalized by the project decision meeting)**

**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 Sector Manager (SM) review and approve the EA report? | Yes |
| Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?                      | Yes |

**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 Sector Manager review the plan?            | Yes |

**The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?   | No  |
| 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 |

#### *D. Approvals*

| <b>Signed and submitted by:</b>                                   | <b>Name</b>              | <b>Date</b> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------|
| Task Team Leader:   | Mr Giuseppe Zampaglione  | 04/20/2007  |
| Environmental Specialist:   | Mr Edward Felix Dwumfour | 04/20/2007  |
| Social Development Specialist                                     | Ms Beatrix Allah-Mensah  | 04/20/2007  |
| Additional Environmental and/or Social Development Specialist(s): |                          |             |
| <b>Approved by:</b>   |                          |             |
| Regional Safeguards Coordinator:                                  | Mr Paul Jonathan Martin  | 05/18/2007  |
| Comments:   |                          |             |
| Sector Manager:   | Mr William Experton      | 05/25/2007  |
| Comments: Approved as acting for Eva Jarawan                      |                          |             |