



Note to Task Teams: The following sections are system generated and can only be edited online in the Portal.

Combined Project Information Documents / Integrated Safeguards Datasheet (PID/ISDS)

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 10-Jul-2017 | Report No: PIDISDSA22147

**BASIC INFORMATION****A. Basic Project Data**

Country Ethiopia	Project ID P163438	Project Name Ethiopia Rural Safety Net Project	Parent Project ID (if any)
Region AFRICA	Estimated Appraisal Date 26-Jun-2017	Estimated Board Date 14-Sep-2017	Practice Area (Lead) Social Protection & Labor
Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing	Borrower(s) Ministry of Finance and Economic Cooperation (MoFEC)	Implementing Agency Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources (MoANR)	

Proposed Development Objective(s)

To support the Government of Ethiopia in improving the effectiveness and scalability of its rural safety net system.

Components

Safety net transfers for food insecure households in rural areas
Enhanced access to complementary livelihood services
Institutional support to strengthening systems for the rural safety net

Financing (in USD Million)

Financing Source	Amount
US: Agency for International Development (USAID)	178.50
Borrower	622.00
CANADA: Can. Bureau of Assist. for Central and East Europe	67.10
DENMARK: Danish Intl. Dev. Assistance (DANIDA)	9.00
UK: British Department for International Development (DFID)	206.60
EC: EU - European Agency for Reconstruction (EAR)	5.30
EC: European Community Humanitarian Organization	6.00
IRELAND, Govt. of	33.90
NETHERLANDS, Govt. of THE (Except for MOFA/Min of Dev. Coop	26.40
International Development Association (IDA)	600.00



UN Children's Fund	0.70
World Food Program	10.00
Total Project Cost	1,856.00

Environmental Assessment Category

B - Partial Assessment

Decision

The review did authorize the preparation to continue

Note to Task Teams: End of system generated content, document is editable from here.

Other Decision (as needed)

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

1. **Ethiopia has achieved high levels of economic growth and significant advances in human development and poverty reduction.** Real gross domestic product growth has averaged 10.5 percent per year between 2003/04 and 2015/16, reflecting agricultural modernization, the development of new export sectors, strong global commodity demand, and Government-led development investments. While Ethiopia continues to be one of the most equal countries in the world (with a Gini coefficient of 0.3), consumption growth of the bottom 40 percent of the population did not match the consumption growth of the top 60 percent from 2005 to 2014, a period of high economic growth. Falling—and converging—poverty rates across regions mask significant disparities within regions and among woredas. While agricultural growth has been one of the main drivers of poverty reduction, the benefits have not been sufficient for everyone, especially marginal farmers who are vulnerable to drought. During the El Niño-induced drought of 2016/17, for example, almost 20 percent of the rural population required safety net support to meet their basic food needs.

2. **Ethiopia has a strong foundation to sustainable, inclusive growth, although challenges remain.** A series of ambitious Growth and Transformation Plans (GTPs) set out the structural transformation of Ethiopia toward a middle-income country by 2025. Within the focus on high and sustained rates of economic growth is a commitment by the Government for this growth to be equitable. This will require continued investments in agricultural growth supported by public investments in basic service provision and rural safety nets, which led to the significant reduction in poverty over the past decade. The rising frequency and severity of droughts points to the need for Ethiopia’s national systems to be designed and delivered in a way that can respond to crisis, which will harness the country’s investments in basic services and safety nets, while also promoting its shift to a middle-income country.



Sectoral and Institutional Context

3. **Ethiopia has made important advances in social protection.** In 2005, the Government launched the Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP), which provides predictable safety net support to chronically food insecure people in chronically food insecure rural areas. More recently, the Government has put in place a strong policy foundation for the social protection sector, with the approval of the National Social Protection Policy (NSPP) 2014¹ and National Social Protection Strategy 2016.²
4. **The Government aims to move away from delivering safety net support through a set of programs and toward a national safety net system.** The three largest programs providing safety net support in Ethiopia are the PSNP, Humanitarian Food Assistance (HFA),³ and the recently launched Urban Productive Safety Net Program (UPSNP). The PSNP provides cash or food transfers to 8 million chronically food insecure people in rural areas in exchange for participation in public works or as direct support. The HFA provides food and cash transfers (sometimes called food aid) to people who are negatively affected by shocks, particularly drought, in rural areas. The UPSNP provides cash transfers to urban poor living below the poverty line in 11 major cities in exchange for participation in public works or as direct support. Among these three programs, the PSNP and UPSNP provide a solid foundation for the national safety net system.
5. **To protect those vulnerable to drought, the Government set out a vision for a scalable safety net system in rural areas.** The NSPP and the National Policy and Strategy for Disaster Risk Management (and its associated investment framework) outline a vision for a rural safety net that scales up in response to shocks. To implement this vision, the design of fourth phase of the PSNP (2015–2020) adopted a ‘continuum of response’, which intended to sequence support to food insecure households first through the PSNP and its contingency budgets and then through the HFA. However, while the Government-led response to the El Niño drought in 2015/16 is lauded internationally for enabling Ethiopia to avoid famine, the response revealed limitations in how the ‘continuum of response’ was set out and the difficulties of coordinating the response across the NDRMC and MOANR.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Note to Task Teams: The PDO has been pre-populated from the datasheet for the first time for your convenience. Please keep it up to date whenever it is changed in the datasheet.

Development Objective(s) (From PAD)

To support the Government of Ethiopia in improving the effectiveness and scalability of its rural safety net system.

Key Results

6. **Timely transfers.** This indicator assesses the extent to which clients receive their transfers on time, as set out in a payment calendar.

¹ FDRE (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia). 2014. “Ethiopia National Social Protection Policy.”

² FDRE. 2016. “National Social Protection Strategy.”

³ HFA is defined as the provision of direct transfers to individuals or households for the purpose of increasing the quantity and/or quality of food consumption in anticipation of, during, and in the aftermath of a humanitarian crisis. As such, it includes both in-kind food transfers and cash transfers for smoothing consumption.



7. **Robust payment modalities, specifically for cash.** This result focuses on planned improvements to the payment systems for transfers for regular safety net transfers and those provided in response to drought.
8. **Targeting accuracy.** This indicator will assess whether the safety net transfers are reaching eligible households.
9. **Integrated Public Works Planning.** This indicator assesses the application of common standards through the percentage of rural safety net PW subprojects that have been screened using the Government's Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF).

D. Project Description

10. The proposed project will support the Government's rural safety net, which brings together, into a common framework, the PSNP and the HFA. Through the PSNP, the Government provides predictable safety net support to 8 million chronically food insecure people in chronically food insecure woredas in rural Ethiopia. These people are selected into the program through a community-based targeting process. Households with able-bodied adult members are asked to work on community-planned PW in exchange for their transfers, which they receive each month for six months of the year. These adults participate in PW that rehabilitate the natural resource base, build health posts and schoolrooms, construct and rehabilitate roads, and build other public infrastructure as prioritized by the community. Labor-constrained households receive unconditional transfers (PDS) and are linked with complementary social services where possible. The PSNP also provides livelihoods support in the form of skills training, business planning, savings promotion, credit facilitation, and, where appropriate, employment linkages. For the poorest PSNP households that have completed the required trainings, the program also offers a livelihood transfer for the purchase of productive assets.
11. The HFA provides food and cash transfers to households that are food insecure because of a shock, most often drought, in rural areas. The number of people supported by the HFA (and duration of this support) is determined through a biannual needs assessment. The households are selected into the HFA through a community-based targeting process. While the needs assessment will recommend that households receive transfers each month for three to twelve months, the actual amount of support depends on the level of funds allocated in response to the humanitarian appeal. Transfers are provided unconditionally, although in some areas, households are encouraged to participate in PW.
12. The PSNP has been designed so that safety net support can be expanded in response to drought. The program has the flexibility to provide extended months of support to existing clients and include additional households as temporary clients. To date, this scaling-up has only been financed through contingency budgets that were held within the program at the woreda and federal levels. Under the rural safety net, the Government has put in place a framework that brings together the PSNP and HFA in the eight regions.
13. To support the Government to improve the delivery of an effective and scalable safety net, this project will include three components.
14. **Component 1: Safety net transfers for food insecure households in rural areas** is focused on the delivery of predictable and timely transfers (both regular transfers to core clients and transfers to households in response to shocks). It comprises the public works that most clients work on in exchange for their safety net transfers and the nutrition-sensitive interventions that supplement these PW conditions.



15. **Component 2: Enhanced access to complementary livelihood services** aims to improve the access of PSNP clients to technical and financial livelihoods support services.

16. **Component 3: Institutional support to strengthening systems for the rural safety net** will provide technical support to the institutional and system reform required to deliver an effective and scalable safety net in rural areas. It will also support the development and enhancement of key instruments and tools, capacity building, and the management and administrative budgets for implementing the system.

E. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

17. The implementation arrangements for the proposed project reflect the institutional arrangements that the Government has set out to bring the PSNP and HFA together into a common framework. Currently, the Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources, in close partnership with the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, will be responsible for the overall management and coordination of the PSNP and the National Disaster Risk Management Commission is responsible for coordinating all aspects of a humanitarian response, including the management of the HFA.

Note to Task Teams: The following sections are system generated and can only be edited online in the Portal.

F. Project location and Salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

The public works has the potential for positive environmental and social effects. However, none of the actions or activities are potential Category A-type, and neither are they likely to have significant adverse impacts that are sensitive, diverse or unprecedented on the environment and/or affected people.

G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Ian Leslie Campbell, Chukwudi H. Okafor

SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The proposed project will support the Government of Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP), including stronger alignment with the humanitarian food assistance system. The PSNP provides safety net support to households in exchange for work on



public works (PW) projects. Many of the PW subprojects, though intended to impact the environment positively, will have some potential for negative environmental impacts if not designed and implemented following good practice. Thus given that there will be a large number of such projects, OP 4.01 is triggered. The Government has put in place an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) Screening process for the PSNP that refers for Special Attention any subprojects with one or more of the following features: (i) Involves disposal of medical waste, (ii) Likely to use pesticides or other agrochemicals, (iii) Incorporates a dam, (iv) involves land acquisition, or loss of assets or access to assets. For sub-projects with medical waste, a GOE Medical Waste Management Guide for Rural Health Clinics will be applied, and will be disclosed as part of the ESMF. For sub-projects likely to use pesticides, see OP 4.09 below. Dams in excess of 10 metres in height will be ineligible. Small dams will be required to be designed by a qualified engineer, and constructed by a qualified contractor under the supervision of a qualified engineer, in accordance with FAO guidelines for small dams which will be disclosed as part of the ESMF. For sub-projects involving land acquisition, see OP 4.12 below. After this initial screening, the ESMF procedure further screens the principal features of each subproject to ascertain whether it is of Environmental Concern. This is then followed by environmental and social screening to identify any site-specific potential impacts that might warrant an EIA.

For the Livelihood activities provided through the PSNP, the ESMF procedures for Livelihoods investments is to identify any household level activities which might give rise to negative cumulative environmental or social impacts if carried out at scale in each woreda. This identification will be made by drawing up a Woreda Environmental Profile highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the ecosystem and social issues in that woreda, and matching the strengths and weaknesses to the types of activity that households are likely to wish to undertake. The result of this analysis, in which the PW woreda staff participate, is a list of livelihood



		activities which should not be allowed in order to meet compliance with OP 4.01. The state of the bio-physical and social environment of the woreda and the appropriateness of the negative list will be reviewed on an annual basis under the ESMF Monitoring System.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	All sub-projects that might trigger OP 4.04 are eliminated at Screening stage.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	All sub-projects that might trigger OP 4.36 are eliminated at Screening stage.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	This policy is triggered under the assumption that small-scale irrigation projects might require pest management, and might involve the use of agrochemicals. For this purpose, the GOE Integrated Pest Management Plan Guide for the PSNP will be disclosed as part of the ESMF.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	OP 4.11 is triggered, because although deemed unlikely in view of the small scale of the subprojects, the possibility of ‘chance-finds’ cannot be ruled out. The policy will be addressed in the ESMF screening process at four stages: (i) Any subproject located within a known cultural heritage site is earmarked as a sub-project of Environmental Concern, to be referred to the Regional Environmental Protection Authority, who will decide if an EIA is required, (ii) Assessment for potential disturbance to cultural or religious sites is carried out as part of the site specific sub-project Screening, which also contributes to a decision whether to earmark a sub-project for possible EIA, (iii) Inclusion of assessment of potential cultural heritage impacts in the EIA of sub-projects, where EIA is found to be necessary, and (iv) Monitoring of sub-project implementation by DAs and wereda staff, in liaison with the Regional Bureau of Tourism and Culture.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	Social Assessments of the Government's Productive Safety Net Program have determined that some of the people in the project area meet the criteria of OP 4.10 and, therefore, this policy is triggered. An Enhanced Social Assessment and Consultation reflecting the requirements of OP 4.10 will be undertaken as part of the preparation of this project and the findings will be detailed in the PAD.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	PW subprojects involving the physical movement and resettlement of households are not eligible



under the Government's PSNP, and will be eliminated during the screening process. However, cases may occur that involve change of land use, or restriction of access to communal assets at both community and household level. Where such loss of assets or access to assets is involuntary, the procedures under OP 4.12 will be implemented. For this purpose a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) will be developed by Government. However, subprojects involving involuntary loss of assets or access to assets are currently ineligible for PSNP, and are thus screened out. They will continue to be ineligible and screened out until the completion of the ongoing upgrading of the Public Works monitoring system to track OP 4.12 compliance.

Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37

Yes

Any subproject that might incorporate a dam more than 10 metres in height will be ineligible, and will be specifically eliminated in the first stage of the sub-project Screening process. Smaller dams will be constructed subject to implementation of the FAO dam safety measures in Ethiopia, which will form part of the ESMF.

Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50

Yes

This policy is triggered because of the small-scale irrigation projects expected in watersheds of three international waterways. For the PSNP 4 Project, Government and the Bank notified the concerned countries in accordance with this policy. The new project will finance the same activities as those undertaken under PSPN4 and within the same geographic locations. In addition, the scope and water use implications will not exceed the estimates provided in the notification and planned for financing under PSNP 4. As such, no additional riparian notification is required.

Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60

No

All sub-projects that might trigger OP 7.60 are eliminated at Screening stage.

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:

From an environmental and social safeguard standpoint, the proposed operation is a Category B project, since impacts



of the project, for the most part, will be minimal, site-specific and manageable to an acceptable level.

Component 1: Safety Net transfers for food insecure households in rural areas

One of the key objectives of the Public Works (PW) carried out under this component of the project is to address the underlying causes of food insecurity, to which land degradation is universally agreed to be a major contributor, particularly in highland areas. Thus the design of the PW program is intended to have environmentally positive impacts. Under the previous phases, these micro-scale and small-scale subprojects, which include, for example, soil and water conservation and improvement of community infrastructure, have already been shown to constitute a vehicle for significant positive environmental transformation and enhanced productivity.

Nonetheless, negative impacts may occur if the locations or designs of the community subprojects do not follow good environmental practice, or if they are incompatible with optimum overall management of the watershed. Such impacts, which would be limited in scale and site-specific, could include, for example:

Community Road Construction and Rehabilitation Impacts

- Alteration of drainage patterns and increased flooding and soil erosion from road construction and materials excavation sites
- Right of way removal of vegetation and natural habitats
- Sedimentation of aquatic systems from soil erosion and runoff
- Impact of increased human use on adjacent habitats and wildlife
- Involuntary or voluntary displacement or loss of land or resources or access to resources normally used by individuals or the community for cultivation, livestock grazing, fuelwood, etc.
- Stagnant pools at excavation sites that create breeding sites for mosquitoes
- Potential for disturbance of cultural and historic sites and resources
- Increased in and out population migration due to improved access
- Unplanned, haphazard land use development created by improved access
- Temporary displacement or loss of access or livelihood due to construction detours

Small-scale Irrigation Development Impacts

- Changes in natural drainage patterns upstream and downstream
- Depletion of surface or groundwater sources
- Deterioration in soil quality due to poorly managed irrigation; potential waterlogging and salinization of soils, leading to agricultural abandonment and land degradation
- Runoff from irrigated fields and potential for agricultural chemicals to pollute water bodies
- Abstraction effects on source streams and related aquatic ecosystems
- Lowering of water quality due to agricultural runoff
- Increased pest and disease control problems due to the promotion of monoculture
- Reduced biodiversity due to focus on cash crops
- Potential for disturbance of cultural and historic sites and resources, and damage to nearby sites resulting from changes in the water table or salinization.
- Stagnant waters and disease vectors arising from poorly managed irrigation systems
- Increased use of agricultural chemicals with related human health concerns



Watershed Treatment and Water Harvesting Impacts

- Increased access can aggravate soil erosion problems, especially in higher gradient topography
- Poorly maintained drainage controls and in-stream structures can lead to eventual failures and increased flooding problems
- Reduced downstream nutrient levels from dams that reduce stream transport of organic material and sediment
- Social tensions arising from issues and rights of water allocation
- Mosquito and related health concerns arising from stagnant pools
- Impacts on cultural and historic sites and resources through changes in the water table
- Social problems arising from poorly managed regenerated catchment areas
- Afforestation and Revegetation Impacts
- Effects of some tree species (e.g., eucalyptus) in reducing groundwater levels
- Long term effects of forest harvesting on hydrologic systems and stream characteristics
- Possible reduction in tree and plant species diversity arising from the introduction of new plantations and re-vegetation schemes
- Effects of monocultures on ecosystem diversity, function and sustainability
- Changes in habitat characteristics and potential effects on endemic wildlife species
- Social problems arising from issues related to the ownership and user of new forests
- Effects of grazing bans on the cost of rearing livestock and shift of grazing pressures to other areas

Livestock, Pasture and Water Points Development Impacts

- Compaction of soils from increased activity around new water sources
- Potential contamination of water sources and needs for controls on human use
- Concentrations of livestock at specific watering sites/routes that result in overgrazing of vegetation and related land degradation
- Potential social tensions over access to pastoralists water sources
- Drinking Water Sources Development Impacts
- Increased water withdrawals could exceed groundwater recharge rates in some areas
- Development of springs may affect availability of downstream water supply
- Physical impacts of increased human traffic near water stations
- Potential contamination of open wells by livestock and human uses
- Reduced availability of aquatic ecosystems due to water abstraction
- Increased dependence on new water supply systems that prove to be unreliable
- Sanitation and health concerns associated with the operation of new drinking water sources
- Land use and social issues and tensions over the siting of and access to new water sources

School, Health Posts or Farmers Training Centres Construction, Rehabilitation or Expansion Impacts

- Site disturbance and potential drainage alterations from construction activities and expansion of facilities
- Involuntary or voluntary displacement or loss of lands or resources or access to resources normally used by individuals or the community for cultivation, livestock grazing, fuelwood, etc.
- Water shortages due to increased demands on existing sources
- Increased production of human and medical wastes and potential for contamination of waterbodies and groundwater



- Increased timber harvesting on nearby lands for construction materials
- Construction impacts on sensitive wildlife habitats and aquatic systems
- Increased pollution from site development and operations, including medical waste
- Sanitation and health issues related to increased human presence and medical waste disposal
- In-migration and settlement generated by rehabilitated facilities

Component 2: Enhanced access to complementary livelihood services

Since each household-level activity will be at micro-scale, and as the procedures under this Component will include the assessment of the agro-ecological suitability of the activity, including screening for potential negative impacts, no significant site-specific negative impacts are expected from individual household-level activities. The only environmental or social concerns might be potential cumulative negative impacts in the longer term of large numbers of households adopting new activities in fragile environments over a number of years. This might include, for example, an increase in livestock ownership with resultant potential over-grazing and environmental degradation, or a falling water-table in a woreda due to large numbers of households adopting shallow-well irrigation.

Safeguards Issues

This project triggers seven safeguard policies: The Environmental Assessment Policy (OP 4.01), related to the possible impacts mentioned above, for which an ESMF has been developed and disclosed; the Pest Management Policy (OP 4.09), predicated on the possibility of small quantities of pesticides being employed in small, community-level irrigation projects; the Physical Cultural Resources Policy (OP 4.11), because although deemed unlikely in view of the small scale of the PW sub-projects, the possibility of 'chance-finds' cannot be ruled out; the Indigenous Peoples Policy (4.10), which is applied under the present agreement between GoE and the WB, for which an Enhanced Social Assessment and Consultation reflecting the requirements of OP 4.10 has been undertaken; the Involuntary Resettlement Policy (4.12), predicated on the possibility that although sub-projects potentially involving physical relocation are ineligible, there might occur cases involving change of land use or loss of assets or reduction of access to assets. In such cases the procedures of OP 4.12 will be implemented, for which a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) has been developed and disclosed. However, sub-projects involving any form of involuntary asset loss are currently ineligible pending completion of an expanded PW database and monitoring system capable of identifying and tracking such sub-projects; the Safety of Dams Policy, predicated on the possibility that although dams of more than 10 metres in height are ineligible, smaller dams might have safety issues, for which compliance with the FAO Small Dams Safety Measures in Ethiopia is required; and the International Waterways Policy (OP 7.50), because of small-scale irrigation projects that may be implemented in watersheds of international waterways.

2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area: Activities under the proposed project include watershed development interventions and improved farming and land-use management systems, under the community watershed development approach of the government. These are expected to make contributions to positive environmental regeneration and transformation, which is one of the objectives of the PSNP. As stated above, any potential long-term or cumulative impacts that might have been caused by PW activities such as infrastructure will be detected through the Screening and mitigating procedures, and addressed. At the same time, potential long-term cumulative impacts that might have been caused by the implementation of large numbers of similar livelihoods strengthening activities will be managed by annual monitoring of impacts at woreda level, and corrective action taken. In view of this, no indirect or long-term negative impacts are anticipated from the project.



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

The principal project design alternative considered was to provide the cash or food on a predictable basis, but as direct support, ie., not to undertake physical public works. This would have avoided incurring any negative impacts from infrastructure sub-projects. However, this option was rejected, due to (i) potential large-scale dependency, with attendant negative social impacts; and (ii) because it would not offer the opportunity to carry out environmental rehabilitation of the watersheds through Soil and Water Conservation (SWC) sub-projects, which is necessary for improved livelihoods. In addition, the creation of new community infrastructure assets, which are also essential to meet the objectives of the project, would not be achieved.

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 1994 Constitution of Ethiopia proclaims that all citizens shall have a right to live in a clean and healthy environment, and that Government and citizens have a duty to protect the environment, and the design and implementation of programs and projects shall not damage or destroy the environment. The Constitution incorporates a number of other provisions relevant for the protection, sustainable use and improvement of the environmental resources of the country. It reflects a view of environmental concerns in terms of fundamental human rights, and provides a basis for the formulation of national policies and strategies on environmental management and protection. It assures that no development activity shall be disruptive to the ecological balance, and that people concerned shall be made to give their opinions in the preparation and implementation of environmental protection policies and programs.

The Constitution also:

- a) Maintains land under the ownership of the Ethiopian people and the government but protects security of usufruct tenure;
- b) Reinforces the devolution of power and local participation in planning, development and decision taking by regions and woredas;
- c) Ensures the equality of women with men;
- d) Ensures the appropriate management as well as the protection of the well-being of the environment
- e) Maintains an open economic policy;
- f) Recognizes the rights of groups identified as “Nations, nationalities and Peoples” having a common culture or similar customs, mutual intelligibility of language, belief in a common or related identity, a common psychological make-up, and who inhabit an identifiable, predominantly contiguous territory.
- g) Recognizes the rights of pastoral groups inhabiting the lowlands.

A series of legal proclamations form the basis for the environmental assessment and management framework in Ethiopia: the Proclamation on the Establishment of Environmental Protection Organs (No. 295/2002); the Proclamation on Environmental Impact Assessment (No. 299/2002); the Proclamation on Environmental Pollution Control (No. 300/2002); and the Proclamation on Solid Waste Management (No. 513/2007). The EIA Directive 1 of 2008, Directive to Determine Projects Subject to EIA, determines the categories of project subject to EIA Proclamation 299/2002.

There are two key public institutions that are directly responsible for monitoring environmental compliance: the Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change (MoEFCC) and the Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources (MoANR), which have decentralized to the regional level. In the case of MoANR, decentralization has gone further, to the woreda and kebele levels. There exists a critical mass of capacity within the MoANR and MoEFCC at the federal and decentralized levels to manage environmental and social safeguard issues.



Since 2005 the borrower has taken, and continues to take, extensive measures to build capacity for the implementation of safeguard policies, as follows:

All the regions in which PSNP is being implemented, have developed institutional capacity for implementing the ESMF.

There are now Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists working in all of the PW units at federal and levels and trained and woreda staff for overseeing ESMF screening. As a result, ESMF screening rates have generally been running at, or are close to, 100% in the PSNP regions. Investment in continuous training of regional and woreda staff and around 6,000 Development Agents is seen as key to this success and has sustained the technical capacities of each level in the implementation not only of the ESMF but of community-based watershed planning and the development of PW plans. Nonetheless, ESMF Screening of PWs in pastoral areas has not yet reached the standard of quality achieved in the highland areas and a strengthened focus is being given to provide additional capacity-building to address this issue.

The PW monitoring system covers not only ESMF Screening but also the implementation of mitigating measures specified at the time of Screening. While the PW Reviews have found that most mitigation measures have been implemented, the fact that some water and community road sub-projects in highland areas have resulted in negative environmental impacts highlights the need to continue to improve the implementation of ESMF mitigation measures for these types of sub-project. The implementation of mitigation measures in lowland areas has not yet been fully reviewed.

Under proposed project joint government-donor monitoring of ESMF implementation will be conducted, followed by corrective measures if required. This monitoring will be undertaken through (i) The PW component of the ERSNP M&E system, which tracks the nature and extent of implementation of the ESMF, and (ii) Twice-annual joint Government-donor PW Reviews, in which samples of PW sub-projects countrywide are examined for quality, sustainability, impact and ESMF compliance. Any rectification works (both labour and nonlabour) required will be conducted using Project resources in the form of repair and rehabilitation works under the next annual PW programme of activities. Ensuring that this happens is the responsibility of the DA involved in the community ERSNP planning process, and the NR Expert in the NR Woreda Case Team.

Given the large number of new public works subprojects in each year (45,289 undertaken in 2016/17), and the short subproject implementation cycle, subprojects likely to require the Resettlement Policy Framework continue to be ineligible and are being screened out, pending the planned strengthening of the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), and the establishment of a PW database and an expanded PW compliance monitoring system. However, arrangements are already underway for training the Development Agents in the implementation of OP 4.12, and a draft GRM manual has been developed. These are all essential steps for satisfactory management and monitoring of such subprojects in the future.

The implementation of the Enhanced Social Assessment and Consultation (ESAC) Action Plan developed for PSNP 4 in compliance with OP 4.10 is at an advanced stage of implementation. Specifically: (i) Targeting in pastoral areas is being strengthened; (ii) The PSNP has established a formal linkage with the GoE Grievance Redress System, also covering financial transparency and accountability; (iii) Implementation of the Expanded Social Accountability Pilot in 19 woredas (including Somali and Afar) is ongoing; and (iv) Improving communications and the awareness of both clients and non-clients continues. For the ERSNP, additional consultations have been conducted, leading to an updated ESAC report and Action Plan.



There has been a number of monitoring missions to pastoral areas with the aim of improving project performance for pastoral groups, and two specialists in pastoral communities are now working in the NRMD, allocated to the PWCU. In addition, a contextual assessment of the application of gender provisions in pastoral areas has been completed and an Action Plan has been agreed, to strengthen the implementation of gender and social development provisions.

All woredas during where the Livelihoods component is being implemented have developed Woreda Environmental Profiles and 'Negative Lists' limiting the types of activities that can be undertaken in order to meet compliance with the World Bank safeguard policies.

Staff of the Regional EPAs and the woreda Environmental (Natural Resources) focal persons participate in the annual awareness-creation and training courses for the PSNP Public Works, which includes ESMF training of NR Experts in the Woreda NR Case Teams. These training courses, which were upgraded by the expanded federal PWCU, are provided by teams drawn from MoANR at Federal and Regional level, with technical assistance from the Natural Resources Management personnel of MoANR, the regional Environmental Protection Bureaus and agencies such as WFP. The woreda-level trainees in turn train the DAs at the local level. The cost of implementing the ESMF training are covered partly by the PSNP 4 Management Budget at federal, regional, woreda and kebele levels, and partly by the regular government staffing and overhead budgets at all levels.

In order to address projects that might include the renovation or extension of medical clinics in the public works program, the Government's Waste Management Guide for Rural Health Clinics is published and disclosed, in accordance with OP 4.01.

To address the possible use of small quantities of pesticides in small-scale irrigation schemes, the Government Guide for Integrated Pest Management in Small-Scale Irrigation Schemes is published and disclosed under APL II, in accordance with the ESMF and OP 4.09.

The Physical Cultural Resources safeguard policy is addressed by being integrated into the ESMF screening process at three stages: (i) Any sub-project located within a known cultural heritage site is earmarked as a sub-project of Environmental Concern, to be referred to the Regional EPA, who will decide if an EIA is required, (ii) Assessment for potential disturbance to cultural or religious sites is carried out as part of the site-specific sub-project Screening, which also contributes to a decision whether to earmark a sub-project for possible EIA, (iii) Inclusion of assessment of potential cultural heritage impacts in the EIA of sub-projects, where EIA is found to be necessary, and (iv) Monitoring of sub-project implementation by DAs and woreda staff, in liaison with the Regional Bureau of Tourism and Culture.

The International Waterways policy OP 7.50 is triggered because some of the public works may be small-scale irrigation projects located in watersheds of international waterways. Under PSNP 4 the World Bank, on behalf of Government, notified the concerned riparian governments in accordance with this policy, covering the period of PSNP 4. Since the ERSNP will not result in a net increase in the PW program, nor its duration, already planned under PSNP 4, no additional notifications are required.

Safeguard Policies Not Triggered: The Natural Habitats and Forests safeguard policies are not triggered because (i) Land not already converted to settlement, cultivation or community grazing is not incorporated in the watershed areas covered by the community watershed development plans; (ii) PW activities involving land conversion are ineligible for funding under the proposed project; (iii) The DA screens out (for separate EIA) any activity within a National Park or other designated wildlife area or buffer zone, and any activity in a Priority Forest Area, and any



activity that might involve draining of, or disturbance to, a wetland. OP 7.60 (Projects in Disputed Areas) is not triggered because any PW activity proposed in, or adjoining, a disputed area is ineligible for funding and is specifically eliminated by the ESMF Screening process.

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

The provisions of the ESMF are incorporated into the training materials used at woreda and kebele levels, which will reach some 1.5 million beneficiary households, and are regularly updated according to community and government staff feedback. Consultation on the safeguard policies have taken place through the annual training programmes, twice-yearly Public Works Reviews, and the participatory community public works planning meetings conducted annually by the DAs in over 10,000 watersheds during the nine years of APL I, II and III.

The Enhanced Social Assessment and Consultation, ESMF and RPF for the proposed project were the subject of extensive consultation among stakeholders including at community level, with a focus on potentially affected people. and the reports and requirements of these consultations are incorporated in the final documents as disclosed in the World Bank Info Shop and Country Office public-access library, and through the MoANR at federal and regional levels, as well as through the MoEFCC.

The second phase of the Social Accountability Pilot, which covers PSNP, is still ongoing. Furthermore, the third phase of the Social Accountability Program, which is in the design stage and is scheduled to be launched in 2018, will scale up PSNP coverage incorporating a focus on monitoring impacts of the PSNP on historically marginalized and vulnerable groups.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission to InfoShop	For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors
30-Jun-2017	30-Jun-2017	

"In country" Disclosure

Ethiopia
07-Jul-2017

Comments

The ESMF was disclosed on the website of the Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources (MOANR)

Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission to InfoShop
-----------------------------	--------------------------------



30-Jun-2017

30-Jun-2017

"In country" Disclosure

Ethiopia
07-Jul-2017

Comments

Published on website of Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources.

Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework

Date of receipt by the Bank

Date of submission to InfoShop

30-Jun-2017

07-Jul-2017

"In country" Disclosure

Ethiopia
07-Jul-2017

Comments

Published on website of Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources.

Pest Management Plan

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?

Date of receipt by the Bank

Date of submission to InfoShop

NA

"In country" Disclosure

If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.

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?

No

OP 4.09 - Pest Management

Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?

Yes

Is a separate PMP required?

No

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?

Yes

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?

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 Practice Manager review the plan?

Yes



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

OP 7.50 - Projects on International Waterways

Have the other riparians been notified of the project?

Yes

If the project falls under one of the exceptions to the notification requirement, has this been cleared with the Legal Department, and the memo to the RVP prepared and sent?

NA

Has the RVP approved such an exception?

NA

The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information

Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?

NA

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?

NA



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

CONTACT POINT

World Bank

Sarah Coll-Black
Sr Social Protection Specialist

Abu Yadetta Hateu
Sr Social Protection Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Ministry of Finance and Economic Cooperation (MoFEC)
Ato Fisseha Aberra
Director, Intl Financial Inst Cooperation Directorate
faberrak@gmail.com

Implementing Agencies

Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources (MoANR)
Ato Berhanu Woldemichale
Director, Food Security Coordination
berhanuw@yahoo.com



FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 473-1000
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/projects>

APPROVAL

Task Team Leader(s):	Sarah Coll-Black Abu Yadetta Hateu
----------------------	---------------------------------------

Approved By

Safeguards Advisor:		
Practice Manager/Manager:	Dena Ringold	10-Jul-2017
Country Director:	Nicole Klingen	10-Jul-2017

Note to Task Teams: End of system generated content, document is editable from here.