

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATASHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE**

I. Basic Information

Date prepared/updated: 02/17/2009

Report No.: AC4196

1. Basic Project Data

Country: Haiti	Project ID: P115261	
Project Name: HT: Emergency School Reconstruction Project		
Task Team Leader: Michael Drabble		
Estimated Appraisal Date: February 11, 2009	Estimated Board Date: February 26, 2009	
Managing Unit: LCSHE	Lending Instrument: Emergency Recovery Loan	
Sector: Primary education (65%);Pre-primary education (25%);Secondary education (10%)		
Theme: Education for all (P)		
IBRD Amount (US\$m.):	0.00	
IDA Amount (US\$m.):	5.00	
GEF Amount (US\$m.):	0.00	
PCF Amount (US\$m.):	0.00	
Other financing amounts by source:		
<u>BORROWER/RECIPIENT</u>		0.00
		0.00
Environmental Category: B - Partial Assessment		
Simplified Processing	Simple <input 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

The project's development objective is to support the Government of Haiti in: (i) restoring access to basic education in selected public primary schools damaged by the hurricanes of August/September 2008 and (ii) developing, demonstrating and disseminating improved standards and methods of safe school construction.

3. Project Description

Component 1: "Building back better" a few selected destroyed and/or heavily damaged public primary schools (US\$4.3 million)

The main purpose of this component is to promptly "build back better" and safeguard seriously damaged educational infrastructures. The Project will intervene in schools that have been destroyed and/or schools whose infrastructure represent a serious risk for the safety of the student population and educational staff (sub-component 1.1). This component will also finance the upgrade of facilities in a few selected schools that are used as temporary shelters in case of natural disasters (sub-component 1.2). The first component of the ESRP will therefore support the "hardware" whereas the second

component will support the “software” relating to safe educational infrastructure. The latter, through capacity building, communication activities, stakeholder consultations, training and involvement of partners at central and local levels will lay the ground work for the demonstration effect that the ESRP will seek to promote for the enforcement of new methods for safe school construction.

Component 2: Reducing and mitigating the vulnerability of educational infrastructures (US\$0.7 million).

The main objective of this second component is to put in place a nation-wide program contributing to the reduction of major risks to and vulnerability of schools caused by natural disasters, compounded by faulty designs and weak supervision in the construction of educational infrastructures as well as a lack of maintenance. To this end, the second component will on the support the creation of a mechanism for increased preparedness of key stakeholders in case of natural disasters that could possibly affect school facilities, students and educational staff, which will include the elaboration of the National Action Plan for Safe Schools – NAPSS as its key deliverable (sub-component 2.1). Second, this component will reinforce the capacity of the DGS to properly enforce new norms and regulations relating to the construction and maintenance of educational infrastructure (sub-component 2.2).

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

The project is national in scope and will involve projects at a variety of sites affected and damaged by recent hurricanes, floods and landslide events.

It is not possible at this stage to give a complete description of the civil works since the pre-qualification and the complete technical assessment of works will only been carried out after the approval of the emergency project. However, as a reference we include the table below, which presents a quantitative description of civil works required under the new standards set up by the MENFP for a six-classroom primary school. It is expected that this type of school would accommodate 40 children per classroom, equivalent to a total of 240 children, with six teachers and a school principal (sometime being also a teacher). In most cases, the emergency operation will be called to intervene on existing educational infrastructure and will probably not include in the civil works all the facilities listed below.

- (i) Six classrooms for a total area of 7.2m x 7.2 m per classroom
- (ii) One administrative building (76m²) and small library (30m²)
- (iii) Drinking fountain with 10 faucets
- (iv) Canteen (137.5m²) with a kitchen (12.2 m²) and storage (9 m²)
- (v) Water tank (5,000 gallons)
- (vi) Water cistern (220 gallons) to be alimented by the water tank
- (vii) Latrines with 6 stalls (3 for boys and 3 for girls)
- (viii) Playground (volley and/or basket ball fields)
- (ix) Courtyard

(x) Surrounding security wall of 220m long and entry gate of 4.5m

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Mr Glenn S. Morgan (LCSEN)

Mr John Atis (LCSHE)

6. Safeguard Policies Triggered	Yes	No
Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01)	X	
Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04)		X
Forests (OP/BP 4.36)		X
Pest Management (OP 4.09)		X
Physical Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11)		X
Indigenous Peoples (OP/BP 4.10)		X
Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12)	X	
Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4.37)		X
Projects on International Waterways (OP/BP 7.50)		X
Projects in Disputed Areas (OP/BP 7.60)		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: The project does not expect to have large scale or significant impacts since the majority of school construction activities will involve reconstruction on existing school sites. Among other issues construction or rehabilitation of schools will involve environmental impacts associated with the demolition and removal of waste materials, control of dust and noise, and work site safety. Where schools are built on new sites, planning and site selection methodology will pay attention to issues such as risks associated with sites such as flood or site stability issues. Special attention will also need to be paid to on-site sanitation issues or other localized risk issues such as drainage.

The EMF includes an assessment of social benefits and risks of the project. The likely beneficiaries of the projects are those families living in communities that have been adversely affected by hurricanes and tropical storms FGHI. As outlined in the project descriptions, these populations will be consulted throughout the school reconstruction process. The extent of community ownership and likely involvement in the school in the foreseeable future will be assessed during the prequalification process.

With respect to involuntary resettlement, in the unlikely event that a proposal (after duly carrying out a full pre-qualification process) for the reconstruction of a school triggers this policy, the project through the FAES and after consulting the local stakeholders will try to avoid any involuntary resettlement by exploring all viable alternative locations and designs for the civil works. Should involuntary resettlement be unavoidable, the extent of land taken will be the minimum possible. By the same token, it should be noted that the project will try to minimize the loss of resources that could derive from involuntary

resettlement. It should be noted that resettlement due to land acquisition is expected to be nil or negligible.

The project is categorized as an environmental risk category B due to the small scale, highly localized and temporary nature of expected impacts.

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

There are no long term impacts anticipated with the construction or rehabilitation of schools.

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

Where new school sites are involved alternatives will be considered as part of the site selection and site design process. For existing sites, alternatives will be considered only as part of the redesign process for school buildings. The project will also support studies and institutional strengthening for improving school design and construction standards including planning for environmental risks.

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 has conducted an environmental analysis to assess the nature and scope of potential environmental and social risks associated with the project. This analysis involved a review of existing procedures and standards for school design, site selection criteria and a review of recent experiences in school construction. The analysis involved discussions with counterparts as well as a rapid screening of potential sub-projects. The analysis proposes a methodology for site screening under the project as well as measures for managing the environmental management issues associated with construction. A revised EMF will be elaborated within four months of project effectiveness.

A Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) will be prepared within four months of effectiveness. The RPF will underscore that the project will adopt adequate procedures to avoid moving (or depriving from resources) people and that general principles of doing no harm, of avoiding or minimizing resettlement will be followed for all school reconstruction projects. As mentioned earlier as part of the screening of civil works project undertaken by FAES, if the involuntary resettlement policy is triggered, the implementing agency will immediately launch the elaboration of a Resettlement Action Plan whose content and format will be described in RPF.

5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people. Safeguards pre-cautions will be established with respect to the pre-screening of proposed sub-projects to ensure adequate evaluation of any site risks; establishing measures to ensure that contractors follow good environmental construction practices at each construction site; that capacity building under the project include review of technical design and construction standards; and that measures for sub-project supervision include

consideration of extent to which poor maintenance of sites may contribute to problems at specific sites. Project planning and site selection will provide opportunity for stakeholder consultations.

The Borrower has an acceptable institutional capacity for ensuring safeguard compliance. Specifically, the FAES (executing agency) has been conducting construction and rehabilitation of social infrastructure for more than a decade, following World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank procedures. Nonetheless, the client has expressed an interest in further strengthening its capacity, with a focus on undertaking environmental assessments of sub-projects. This request will be taken into consideration under the institutional strengthening activities incorporated under the project. To the greatest extent possible the project would support the development of a single review procedure which would apply to all sub-projects to be supported by FAES not only those financed by the Bank under the proposed operation.

B. Disclosure Requirements Date

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other:

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	N/A
Date of receipt by the Bank	09/01/2009
Date of "in-country" disclosure	09/15/2009
Date of submission to InfoShop	09/15/2009
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	

Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process:

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	N/A
Date of receipt by the Bank	09/01/2009
Date of "in-country" disclosure	09/15/2009
Date of submission to InfoShop	09/15/2009

Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework:

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	
Date of receipt by the Bank	
Date of "in-country" disclosure	
Date of submission to InfoShop	

Pest Management Plan:

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	
Date of receipt by the Bank	
Date of "in-country" disclosure	
Date of submission to InfoShop	

*** 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:

Per OP/BP 8.00, the Environmental Management Plan and the Resettlement Management Framework will be done post-appraisal. Both documents will be reviewed and approved within four months of effectiveness and disclose accordingly.

No, will be done within 4 months of effectiveness

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?	No
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?	No
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Sector Manager review the plan?	No

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?	No

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

<i>Signed and submitted by:</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
Task Team Leader:	Mr Michael Drabble	02/10/2009
Environmental Specialist:	Mr Glenn S. Morgan	02/10/2009
Social Development Specialist Additional Environmental and/or Social Development Specialist(s):		
<i>Approved by:</i>		
Regional Safeguards Coordinator:	Mr Reidar Kvam	02/11/2009
Comments:		
Sector Manager:	Ms Raja Bentaouet Kattan	02/11/2009
Comments:		