

INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATASHEET

APPRAISAL STAGE

I. Basic Information

Date prepared/updated: 03/30/2009

Report No.: 47981

1. Basic Project Data

Country: Kazakhstan	Project ID: P099270
Project Name: SOUTH-WEST ROADS: WESTERN EUROPE-WESTERN CHINA INTERNATIONAL TRANSIT CORRIDOR (CAREC 1B & 6B)	
Task Team Leader: Henry G. R. Kerali	
Estimated Appraisal Date: July 21, 2008	Estimated Board Date: April 7, 2009
Managing Unit: ECSSD	Lending Instrument: Specific Investment Loan
Sector: Roads and highways (100%)	
Theme: Regional integration (P);Trade facilitation and market access (S);Other rural development (S)	
IBRD Amount (US\$m.): 2,125.00	
IDA Amount (US\$m.): 0.00	
GEF Amount (US\$m.): 0.00	
PCF Amount (US\$m.): 0.00	
Other financing amounts by source:	
<u>Borrower</u>	375.00
	375.00
Environmental Category: A - Full 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 type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

2. Project Objectives

The overall goal of the Government's Western Europe to Western China (WE-WC) Corridor development program is to improve transport efficiency and safety, and promote development along one of Kazakhstan's main strategic road transport corridors. Transport and trade efficiency will be improved through provision of better infrastructure and services along the entire corridor to reduce transport costs, and through gradual reform of the entities responsible for all categories of roads. The Bank will finance the portion of the Corridor from Shymkent to Aktobe/Kyzylorda oblast border (1,065 km) as a Specific Investment Loan, whereas other International Financial Institutions (ADB, EBRD and IDB) will finance other sections of the same corridor.

The development objective of the Project is to increase transport efficiency along the Corridor between Shymkent to Aktobe Oblast border, and initiate reforms to improve road management and traffic safety in Kazakhstan. The aim is to support local and regional socio-economic development. Benefits will include transport efficiency gains and traffic safety improvement.

The main beneficiaries will be domestic and regional businesses and traders, as well as local populations living along the road corridor. Kazakhstan has a higher population density in the southern sections of the road, with traffic volumes which are relatively high, approximately 10,000 vehicles per day (vpd) close to Shymkent city, mainly due to local commuting. Traffic volumes decrease further north with the majority of traffic comprising trucks transporting goods (around 500 vpd North from Aral). The government expects ribbon development to be attracted along the corridor as a result of the project intervention. However, this will require incentives to attract private sector investments to be integrated within the overall WE-WC Corridor development program.

3. Project Description

The project will finance major upgrade of road infrastructure along one portion of the corridor, from Shymkent to the Aktobe/Kyzylorda oblast border. The project will improve road management capacity and assist the government to prepare and implement a road safety and road service improvement action plan. The project will serve local travel as well as international transportation of general cargo and other goods produced locally and in the region (Tajikistan, the Kyrgyz Republic and Uzbekistan). Institutional measures include the introduction of an efficient road management system incorporating modern methods for planning and executing road maintenance, and strengthening the capacity of the Committee for Roads (the Committee) within the Ministry of Transport and Communication (MOTC) to efficiently implement all investments.

The preliminary road design prepared by the MOTC envisaged the widening of some sections of the road and the construction of bypasses around some of the towns along the WE-WC Corridor. The Feasibility Studies financed by the government, which included an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), based on the national laws of Kazakhstan, and a social analysis were completed in December 2007. A number of follow-up actions were identified during several joint meetings between the government and the IFIs leading to an overall agreement on shared responsibility for addressing gaps in the Feasibility Studies, especially regarding the EIA and land acquisition and resettlement issues. The Bank took responsibility for reviewing the economic analysis and supervised the preparation of a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) that applies to the entire Corridor. The ADB took responsibility for reviewing the Environmental Impact Assessment and supervised the preparation of an Environmental Assessment Review Framework (EARF) for the entire Corridor.

The project has five components:

Component 1: Upgrade and reconstruction of road sections between Aktobe/Kyzylorda Oblast border to Turkestan (excluding the bypass of Kyzylorda). This component will finance the upgrade and reconstruction of road sections in Kyzylorda oblast totaling about 834 km with a design oriented towards increased road safety, and includes the costs of consultant services for supervision. Preparation and design costs have been financed by the Borrower's own funds. The proposed reconstruction will improve ride quality leading to lower operating costs for road users, guarantee road structural soundness for a prolonged period, and prevent collapse, leading to lower life-cycle cost for the road asset.

Communities living along the Corridor would also benefit from improved access to markets.

Component 2: Upgrade and reconstruction of road sections between Turkestan to Shymkent, including bypasses at Kyzylorda and Shymkent cities. It is proposed that the road sections between Turkestan to Shymkent will be upgraded from 2 lanes to 4 lanes. Preparation and design costs are being financed through the Borrower's own funds.

Component 3: Project Management Consultants. The consultant services will assist the Committee with the management of all activities associated with the projects as part of a joint effort by all IFIs and the Government to ensure efficient and transparent implementation of the WE–WC Corridor program. Monitoring of the implementation of safeguards instruments, especially EMPs and section-specific RAPs, will also be part of the responsibility of the Project Management Consultants.

Component 4: Institutional Development. The component comprises consulting services, technical studies, the provision of equipment, and training to strengthen the internal management and operations of the Committee, particularly to improve road sector planning, programming, budgeting, and implementation, and to improve the efficiency of road management and maintenance practices, including environmental management. This component also includes technical studies to prepare actions plans for road safety improvements, and implementation of an action plan to facilitate private sector investments in the provision of services to transporters along the corridor.

Component 5: Supervision of Civil Works financed under Components 1 and 2. This includes review of detailed engineering designs and supervision of the implementation of Environment Management Plans prepared for each road section.

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

The salient points regarding social, land acquisition and environment can be summarized as follows:

Environment:

The environmental conditions for the project are characterized by arid climate, sparse vegetation, few year-round surface water courses and large areas with naturally hyper-saline soils. Saksaul forests, which are adapted to dry, saline conditions with extreme temperature differences, play an important role in soil stabilization and erosion control. The landscape in the north is very arid, barren, hardly vegetated and prone to wind erosion, dust generation, moving sand dunes. Surface drainage exists mainly seasonally, when flash floods can occur and draining waters can have a high erosion potential. The landscape has a very soft relief with wide valleys and basins, separated by slightly elevated plateaus. Land use is restricted to low density animal grazing in the natural environment (mainly camels, sheep, goats, some cattle). Permanent settlements are extremely sparse. South and east of Zhosaly, the climate is less severe and the settlements are more common, centered on former state farms and railroad facilities. The

steppe vegetation, dominated by grassland with small clusters of forest near rivers and in valleys, is interrupted by large tracts irrigated with water from the Syr Darya River. The area between Turkestan and Shymkent is used extensively for agriculture and horticulture.

The road section was constructed in 1970 and since 1990 there was no investment. The condition of the pavement is poor. The railway line runs parallel to the road in most of the locations and therefore it could be used for haulage of materials during the construction. The issue of bringing suitable material on the construction site will be important. Although there is evidence that the existing infrastructure was built using locally available materials, their use is questionable due to their saline content that makes them water-sensitive. The reconstruction financed through the project will use material from borrow pits for the upper portion of the embankments to avoid the degradation of the pavement structure. At least thirty bridges need reconstruction; most are rather small (20 to 30 meters). In some areas the road crosses moving sand dunes and the rehabilitation design will have to take this into consideration.

The proposed alignments for the road sections, including the bypasses, were examined in detail by the Project team during a series of field missions that included environmental and social specialists. The majority of the construction works, except bypasses around settlements and notably around Kyzylorda city, will remain confined within the existing right-of-way. Thus, the Project is not expected to have unprecedented or significant adverse impacts on the environment that cannot be mitigated. Nevertheless, the Project was classified environmental screening Category A for the following reasons: (a) the standard approach of the Bank's Europe and Central Asia (ECA) region is to classify road widening as Category A; (b) the unusually large physical dimensions of the Project and the corresponding scope of civil works; (c) the dimensions of induced impacts such as material sourcing and the production and transport of construction materials; and (d) the substantial cumulative length of bypasses in the project and the reconstruction of several large bridges. Furthermore, the Category A classification is warranted by the planned widening of the road between Shymkent and Kyzylorda from 2 to 4 lanes, and a 20 km bypass around Kyzylorda, where a new road corridor and a new bridge over the Syr Darya River will be constructed.

The main environmental impacts identified during the environmental and social studies carried out by Consultants hired for the borrower are extensively characterized in the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) report of February 2009. Most impacts that cannot be avoided can be offset or mitigated with readily available environmental management measures. The environment along the alignment is neither sensitive nor particularly valuable in terms of biodiversity and ecological significance. Most of the land is arid steppe to semi-desert landscapes with few river crossings, some wetlands (partly natural, partly irrigated lands) and no forests, sensitive natural habitats or protected areas directly impacted by road construction. The key impacts on soil, air and vegetation are anticipated to include: (a) the conversion of land; (b) emissions in the form of noise, dust and exhaust gases; (c) associated impacts of borrow pits; (d) construction of temporary access roads, storage areas, and camps; (e) temporary impacts from civil

construction works, aggregate and asphalt plants; (f) transport and limitations for road use. Additional impacts from road operation are expected to be minor due to engineering measures to control noise and traffic safety for both people and livestock. Measures to address these impacts are comprehensively listed in the EMPs produced by the Borrower for each road section (both environment Category A and B). There were sites of cultural significance identified near the road alignment at Turkestan and Sauran. However, these will not be affected by the planned civil works. The EMPs specify procedures and actions in case of archaeological “chance finds” during construction

No sensitive natural habitats, rivers, wetlands, forests or protected areas are affected and the bulk of required land will be Government owned and is currently unoccupied and not used for economic purposes. This was confirmed by the existing environmental documents, the latest of which is a comprehensive Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for the entire project, which was disclosed at the Bank and in Kazakhstan in February 2009.

Land acquisition and Resettlement:

Most of the reconstructed road sections will follow the existing alignment, staying within long-established rights of way that have not been subject to encroachment. The exceptions are bypasses that will be constructed around populated areas. The planned bypasses will require land acquisition, although much of the land is government property. The feasibility study estimated that bypasses would require the demolition of 7 residences and 31 other structures in South Kazakhstan and Kyzylorda Oblasts, as well as requiring over 3,000 ha for permanent use, mostly for bypasses and future intersections. Preliminary data from the detailed designs indicate that displacement will be greater than anticipated in the feasibility study, with 152 structures in South Kazakhstan Oblast and 20 structures in Kyzylorda Oblast earmarked for demolition. Sixty-one are residences and 65 are commercial units. The number will change depending on the alignment adopted for the last remaining section. An estimated total of 105 landowners and users in Kyzylorda Oblast and 750 in South Kazakhstan Oblast will lose part or all of their holding due to widening the existing right of way establishing new bypasses, for which they will be compensated. Local governments allocate reserved land to substitute for actively used land, where possible. This is consistent with the Land Code in Kazakhstan, which gives preference to land swapping and replacement of buildings, rather than cash compensation.

Additional land will also be required for temporary use during construction. The feasibility study estimated that around 3,600 ha along the entire Corridor would be needed for temporary use (staging areas, borrow pits, construction bypasses, and the like), most of which is government land. If private lands are used temporarily, the contractors will negotiate compensation with owners or users and will return the land to its original condition after use. Illegal or temporary occupation or use of land along the roadway or within the right-of-way is uncommon and therefore the project will incur minimal removal of unauthorized structures from the right-of-way in carrying out the rehabilitation works. The Roads Committee is committed to regularize ownership in

cases of informal use in order to compensate the currently informal users for their lost assets.

The Borrower prepared a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) prior to Appraisal providing detailed information about procedures and standards set in Kazakhstan for the acquisition of private land and rights-of-way. The RPF also identifies any additional provisions that will be undertaken to assure compliance with OP 4.12. The RPF was disclosed in country in August 2008. In parallel to the environmental and social impact assessment (ESIA) consultants hired by the Borrower prepared an Expanded RPF, which will be transformed into a RAP once the final design is completed and additional socio-economic analysis is carried out of project affected persons. The Expanded RPF was disclosed both in-country and in InfoShop in March 2009. The overall RAP will be further developed and detailed as the design is finalized, and section-specific RAPS will be prepared acceptable to the Bank prior to the bidding for construction contracts.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Mr Norval Stanley Peabody (QAG)

Mr Wolfhart Pohl (ECSSD)

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 was initially structured as an Adaptable Program Loan (APL) comprising three phases in order to sequence the financing and to allow sufficient time for the required environmental and social impact assessments to be carried out for later phases of the APL. Following the appraisal mission of July 2008, the Project was redesigned as a single Specific Investment Loan (SIL) instead of an APL in order to be responsive to a request from the Government. With the redesign of the proposed Project as a SIL, the previously planned phases of the APL program would be prepared and implemented at once under a single project. Consistent with Bank policy, the proposed Project was reclassified as environmental screening Category A due to the nature of activities that were to be supported under what was originally phase 3 of the APL and is now

Component 2 of the SIL. Under Bank operational policies OP 4.01 (Environmental Assessment) and OP 4.12 (Involuntary Resettlement), the Client is required prior to appraisal, to prepare a full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for the project and a Resettlement Action Plan or a Resettlement Policy Framework for road sections where involuntary resettlement and significant private land acquisition are planned. The Government hired independent consultants to prepare the ESIA and the section-specific RAPs. The ESIA was completed and presented during public consultations in January 2009 as a final draft, was subsequently updated based on comments received from the affected stakeholders, and was disclosed in February 2009. Consultants also prepared a draft Resettlement Report, the substance of which was also presented during the same public consultations. This document, which was based on the original RPF, contained many details regarding affected land holdings but can not be finalized as a Resettlement Action Plan until detailed designs are completed. Therefore it was disclosed as an expanded Resettlement Policy Framework in March 2009. In view of the above, presentation of the Project to the Board has been delayed until the ESIA and RPF were completed, disclosed and consulted upon to the satisfaction of the Bank. OP 4.01 (Environmental Assessment) and OP 4.12 (Involuntary Resettlement) require that the preparation, disclosure and meaningful consultation on the ESIA and RPF be completed prior to appraisal. As those tasks were completed only after appraisal, the World Bank Board will be notified of this fact and their approval sought for a waiver on the application of the requirements under OP 4.01 and OP 4.12.

Environmental Assessment: The major part of construction works under component 1 will be confined to the existing right-of-way. The corridor of the ROW is generously dimensioned, thus no significant / major impact on local population's health, safety or quality of life is expected.

The proposed bypasses will not affect sensitive habitats or protected areas. During two separate field visits with walk-over surveys conducted by the Bank safeguards specialists, it was verified that the impacts by the construction of the bypasses will be localized and manageable with readily available standard mitigation measures. The impact of the works on soils and vegetation is expected to be minor, if managed diligently. Rehabilitated road sections show natural re-vegetation only 2-3 years after works, despite the arid climatic conditions. The extraction of fill and aggregate materials will be restricted to non-river sources in the project area. In some areas North from Kyzylorda, the core portion of the road embankment may have to be reinforced with geotextile or lime addition to prevent corrosion of the upper part of the pavement by saline material. Most of the time also, the upper portion of the embankment will have to be quarried from borrow pits to ensure that the pavement structure is not be in contact with the saline material that is underneath. Extraction procedures are well regulated under Kazakh environmental laws, rehabilitation is compulsory and noncompliance is prosecuted. Nonetheless, the EIA will set the requirements for extraction of the material that will be used for the constructions financed under the project.

Involuntary Resettlement: Most of the road sections to be financed by the Bank will follow the existing alignment, staying within the long-established right-of-way, except

where bypasses will be constructed around populated areas. As it was already mentioned above, it is expected that a total of 105 land owners and users in Kzylorda Oblast and 750 in South Kazakhstan will lose part or all of their holdings for the expanded right of way and bypasses. Most of these will lose miniscule parts of their plots. They will be compensated in cash or given alternate lands. Local governments generally have reserve land and the Land Code in Kazakhstan gives preference to land swapping and replacement of buildings, rather than cash compensation. Nonetheless, private owners can select their preferred option. Discussions with local officials suggest that private landowners are increasingly aware of their rights and often do exercise them. For example, highway construction in the north of Kazakhstan was held up in 2007 when owners refused to agree to the government's compensation offer and the government was reluctant to expropriate the land forcefully.

Local consultations occur at two stages in the preparation of such road projects in Kazakhstan: during the feasibility study and the final design. At the feasibility stage for the WE-WC Corridor program, consultations were held primarily with local (Rayon) officials to discuss and reach agreement on preferred alignments and their implications. Based on the agreement, Rayon officials have frozen property transactions within the proposed alignments to deter speculation. This stage was completed in November 2007 in the Project area. Local officials were consulted again to participate in refining the alignment options, following which the design teams will obtain cadastral data. Consultations were held with local communities during the preparation of the project on the proposed designs and alignments, and were concluded in January 2009. The report on the consultations notes that for one road section of about 2.3 km at Temirlanovka village, the outcome of public consultations has recommended that designs for an alternative alignment should be prepared by the Committee for Roads. Alternative alignments have been sketched out and will be discussed in a public hearing early in April 2009, following which the final design work will be carried out. This must fully comply with the Environmental Assessment Framework and the Resettlement Policy Framework that had earlier been prepared and disclosed for the Project. Once the section-specific RAPs are prepared, a further round of consultations will be carried out as the land acquisition process is initiated and officials start negotiating with private owners whose land is scheduled to be acquired permanently or used temporarily during construction.

After the detailed designs have been completed, the PMC safeguards specialists will carry out a focused social assessment in the settlements affected by the bypasses to be financed under the Project, as well as a census of people who will lose structures or land (permanently or temporarily) due to the Project. This will be completed within six months of project effectiveness. The results of the census will be incorporated in the overall RAP and section-specific RAPS. The social assessment will establish a baseline for highway use (active users and passengers in buses, etc.) and the economic influence of the road on the settlements in general and on households from which land has been acquired in particular. The census will be repeated after the road works are completed to determine whether or not the incomes of those households affected by land acquisition and resettlement have been restored. The data from the social assessments will be used to

anticipate and address unforeseen issues and to establish a baseline from which to monitor the impacts of the project.

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

An increased amount of traffic (which is desirable from the economic perspective) is expected to result in higher emissions of exhaust gases and noise. The EIA addresses and investigates the impact of this issue and for emissions concludes that the gaseous limit values set by Kazakh authorities will continue to be respected. Regarding noise the EIA presents a number of mitigation and management measures, such as buffer zones, sound barriers, tree plantations and, most effectively, the re-routing of the alignment around settlements via bypasses. These measures will be incorporated in the design. The possible development of new activities or the extensions of existing activities along the corridor is not considered to be a significant issue and will consist mainly of additional services to the road users. Any induced and indirect impacts will take effect over a longer period and over a larger area than affected by the Project. These include increases in traffic volumes, economic activities, better connectivity and further development along the roads corridor. However, as the project deals with rehabilitation of a road, which during the Soviet Era used to be a technically sound, functioning transport corridor and still performs this function albeit impacted by the deteriorated physical state of the road, no radical, rapid development is likely to occur. Instead long term, gradual processes are expected, which will allow the synchronous development of appropriate institutional and regulatory instruments for monitoring and control.

The construction of 4-lanes between Shymkent and Turkestan—the most heavily trafficked road section—is expected to reduce the number of accidents very drastically.

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

The bulk of the Project location is defined by the existing alignment, which will largely remain unchanged and will be rehabilitated and reconstructed. New alignment sections, notably the bypasses around villages, were selected from a number of design options based on: (i) assessments of negative impacts and nuisance for local populations, and (ii) the need to avoid any significant negative environmental impacts. Incomplete data from the detailed designs indicate that displacement will relate to 152 structures in South Kazakhstan Oblast and 20 structures in Kyzylorda Oblast earmarked for demolition (most are non-residential structures); this number will change as the design of the final section is completed. The Bank is satisfied that the designers have made a concerted effort to minimize land acquisition and the demolition of structures. Had the construction been contained entirely within the existing alignment, the result would be the demolition of 425 residences and 96 other structures.

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. In the course of project preparation the Borrower with assistance from the Bank and other IFIs prepared the following safeguards documents, covering environmental and social

issues along the road alignment: (a) a preliminary Environmental Assessment prepared for the Committee by a Kazakh Design Institute (2007); (b) an Environmental Assessment Review Framework (2008); (c) a Resettlement Policy Framework (2008); and (d) an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment report (2009) and an Expanded Resettlement Policy Framework (2009). All of these documents have been subject to public consultation and disclosed at the World Bank InfoShop and in Kazakhstan.

The current capacity of the borrower to implement the described measures relies on four main entities currently in charge of country based environmental and social safeguards. Those entities are responsible for: (a) environment; (b) water resources; (c) forestry and hunting; and (d) land management.

Construction works are supervised by the Ministry for Environmental Protection (MoEP) and its subordinate agencies. Local units of the MoEP, Environmental Expertise and Nature Use Regulation Department (EENUR) are structured into thematic groups, which at Oblast level include among others (i) environmental expertise, (ii) permitting, (iii) supervision and monitoring, (iv) environmental laboratories. At the Rayon level each of these thematic units is represented by one inspector.

Routine operations are usually inspected once per year and carried out by MoEP staff and/or Oblast and Rayon representatives. During construction works Oblast and Rayon level the Ministry for Environmental Protection regional staff monitor the sites and play a key role in commissioning the finalized project, thereby checking environmental compliance with design and final implementation of all required environmental restoration and recultivation measures. The Ministry for Environmental Protection regional staff usually contacts the project developers, the contractor's environmental staff and the unit on site, which is a mandatory requirement (called "production control" under the Kazakh legislation).

The EIA process in Kazakhstan is laid down in the environmental code and a set of detailed implementation instructions (Feb. 2004). 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 logical. It is deemed compatible with international good practice. The borrower has prepared an EA for the whole alignment. This was reviewed by the Bank team who conducted a gap analysis, identified issues to be rectified and improved and assisted the Borrower in producing TOR for a Consultancy to address the identified gaps. The final EIA will be produced and reviewed by the Bank prior to the presentation of the project to the Board.

For the issuance of a construction permit (CP) a "full" EIA is required (including field studies and site investigations), which needs to be based on the final design, and contain a section with a detailed EMP. The EMP has to be part of the design documents and is reviewed by the local EPAs as well as by the expertise unit of the MoEP. In the case of road projects it should specifically address river crossings, water courses, soil and

vegetation conservation and re-cultivation, protected areas and natural habitats. This EIA needs to be approved by the MoEP and forms the basis of the environmental permit for the construction or operation of a project. This permit can be issued either by the Ministry or one of its local branches. In Kazakhstan EIAs may only be elaborated and submitted for approval by companies or institutions with an official license by the MoEP.

The detailed EMPs, which will be part of the tender/contract documents, will include chance find procedures for physical cultural heritage items (although the project has not triggered this safeguards policy and the probability of encountering PCR chance finds is considered very low). Public consultation is mandatory. The final environmental approval on a large construction project (e.g. major infrastructure like the WE-WC corridor project) is given by the Chief Environmental Expert of the MoEP's Expertise Department.

. The borrower requested the Project Management Consultants –PMC, a firm that is being hired for the management of the project– to include in their team staff familiar with the Bank safeguards. The PMC will provide two environment specialists (one international and one national) and two resettlement specialists (one international and one national) to help with the implementation of the measures agreed upon in the ESIA and RPF.

5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people. In compliance with national legislation an environment impact assessment with generic environmental management plans corresponding to the feasibility study and preliminary design level was completed in December 2007 by the Client. These documents have been disclosed by the borrower in the country and in the affected areas and in the World Bank InfoShop before appraisal. The Client has prepared a full EIA following the new design for the project as a SIL, which was disclosed and meaningfully consulted upon prior to the presentation of the project to the Board. The Expanded Resettlement Policy Framework was discussed in principle in consultations and disclosed in country and in InfoShop, and will be subject to further consultations and disclosure as it is turned into a RAP that includes section-specific RAPS.

Additionally all IFIs involved in financing the WE-WC Corridor agreed to assist with the production of an environmental management review framework. This framework contains a general overview of the corridor, environmental baseline conditions, an overview of Kazakhstan's and the IFI's relevant safeguards policies and resulting consequences for project preparation and implementation, a framework approach for safeguards procedures and responsible entities and authorities. This document was disclosed by the MOTC in Kazakhstan and at the Bank before appraisal.

Under Kazak legislation, and for a project of this type, local consultation regarding the alignment and its implications for land acquisition and resettlement occur at two stages. (1) At the feasibility stage for the WE-WC Corridor program, consultations were held primarily with local (raion) officials to discuss and reach agreement on preferred

alignments and their implications. This was completed in November, 2007. Based on the agreement, raion officials were expected to freeze property transactions within the proposed alignments to deter speculation. (2) During the final design stage, expected to be completed in June, 2009, local officials again participate in refining the alignment options, following which design teams obtain cadastral data and begin discussions with private landowners. A Resettlement Policy Framework for the Corridor was completed prior to appraisal and was disclosed both in Kazakhstan and by the Bank.

In accordance with the World Bank's Operational Policies OP4.01, OP4.12 and BP17.50 two additional stages of public consultations were carried out under the Consultancy for the preparation of ESIA and RPF/RAP in communities along the alignment. In October 2008 consultations on the general project concept as well as the TOR for the environmental and social assessment were carried out in Turkestan and Kyzylorda and in January 2009 the draft EA report as well as the Resettlement Report (effectively the draft RPF) were presented in a series of consultations in about 8 communities along the alignment. Two of the consultations were observed by the Bank team and found to be open, transparent and effective in fostering free and unencumbered expression of opinion by the affected stakeholders. There were significant concerns raised about some of the design features (e.g. Overpass in a village named Temirlanovka) and many constructive proposals received from the local population on the presented design and its environmental and social performance. Such proposals included solutions for traffic safety (especially pedestrian safety), animal crossings, noise protection and community cohesion. The proceedings and results were summarized in a Consultation outcome report (see Annex 12), which is the basis for communicating required design changes from the Committee for Roads to the design engineers responsible for individual lots. Regarding the overpass in Temirlanovka village, in view of the clear outcome of the consultations the Committee for Roads instructed the designers to prepare alternative alignments, which will be presented at a public hearing in early April 2009, after which the final alignment will be selected and final design work will be undertaken.

Once the final alignment is approved, the Roads Committee and the PMC will conduct a series of seminars for oblast and raion officials to familiarize them land acquisition and expropriation policies and standards of Kazakhstan and the World Bank to ensure that uniform procedures are followed throughout the corridor that comply with OP 4.12.

B. Disclosure Requirements Date

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other:

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	No
Date of receipt by the Bank	02/02/2009
Date of "in-country" disclosure	03/06/2009
Date of submission to InfoShop	02/27/2009
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	03/25/2009

Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process:

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	No
Date of receipt by the Bank	02/12/2009
Date of "in-country" disclosure	03/18/2009
Date of submission to InfoShop	03/25/2009

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:

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?	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

D. Approvals

<i>Signed and submitted by:</i>		<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
Task Team Leader:		Mr Henry G. R. Kerali	03/25/2009
Environmental Specialist:		Mr Wolfhart Pohl	03/25/2009
Social Development Specialist		Mr Norval Stanley Peabody	03/25/2009
Additional Environmental and/or Social Development Specialist(s):			
<i>Approved by:</i>			
Regional Safeguards Coordinator:		Ms Agnes I. Kiss	03/25/2009
Comments:			
Sector Manager:		Mr John V. Kellenberg	03/26/2009
Comments:			