

**COMBINED PROJECT INFORMATION DOCUMENTS / INTEGRATED
SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET (PID/ISDS)
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: PIDISDSA20099

Date Prepared/Updated: 05-Oct-2016

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country:	Cote d'Ivoire	Project ID:	P156739
		Parent Project ID (if any):	
Project Name:	Urban Water Supply Project (P156739)		
Region:	AFRICA		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	11-Oct-2016	Estimated Board Date:	15-Dec-2016
Practice Area (Lead):	Water	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Borrower(s):	Republic of Cote d'Ivoire		
Implementing Agency:	Cellule de Coordination du PRICI (CC-PRICI)		
Financing (in USD Million)			
	Financing Source		Amount
	BORROWER/RECIPIENT		0.00
	International Development Association (IDA)		50.00
	Financing Gap		0.00
	Total Project Cost		50.00
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):	The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate		
Other Decision:			
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

Cote d'Ivoire has seen strong growth coming out of the years of crisis. With a Gross National Income (GNI) of US\$1,410 per capita in 2015, Cote d'Ivoire is ranked as the third largest economy and population in West Africa. As a result of the intermittent political crisis from 1999-2011, the Ivoirian economy grew by only 2 percent a year in nominal terms during that period. However since Cote d'Ivoire's recovery in 2011, growth has been more robust with the economy growing at an average of 9.7 percent from 2012 to 2013, before moderating slightly to 7.9 percent in 2014. Real GDP per capita increased cumulatively by more than 20 percent during the 2012-2014 period. All the main economic sectors, including agriculture, industry and construction, have contributed to the renewed strong growth of GDP and employment, which were supported by an upsurge of public and private investments. According to the IMF, growth is projected at 8.5 percent in 2016 in response to the authorities' continued efforts to improve the business climate and address infrastructure gaps.

In addition to establishing an appropriate macroeconomic framework and following prudent fiscal policy, the Government has dedicated significant resources in recent years to improve security and social cohesion. The Government has also adopted structural reforms to set the stage for resilient and private sector-led growth. Some of the main reforms aimed at improving the business climate, ensuring financial stability and greater inclusion, and improving public governance and financial management.

Despite the progress made since 2011, Cote d'Ivoire has only been moderately successful at reducing the incidence of poverty. The incidence of poverty has only slightly decreased from 48.9 percent in 2008 to 46.3 percent in 2015, after having dramatically increased since the mid-1980s and population has increased 2.3 percent annual during this period. Cote d'Ivoire ranked only 172 out of 187 in the 2015 UNDP Human Development Index.

While urban water services showed resilience throughout the crisis, the performance and development of the sector were compromised, and the impact of the crisis is still felt today. Although urban water supply (UWS) services were maintained throughout the political crisis, quality and sustainability of service declined and investment in development of the sector was curtailed. The crisis generated major relocation of the population that unexpectedly increased water demand, particularly in Abidjan, the economic capital, which now accounts for more than 40 percent of the urban population. Billing and collection became impossible in the northern part of the country from 2004 until 2012, and regular commercial procedures could not be fully applied elsewhere. The performances of the (private) Cote d'Ivoire Water Company (Société de distribution d'eau de Cote d'Ivoire, SODECI) substantially deteriorated and customer tariffs have not been adjusted since 2004 and has not recovered post-crisis. According to IBNET the percentage of population served dropped by 15 percentage points between 2000 and 2011 and has slowly begun to recover since then and key performance indicators such as Non-Revenue Water increased from 17 to 27 percent and continuity of supply dropped from 24 hours to 13 hours per day.

As a result, the sector's capacity to self-finance renewal and expansion investments and its ability to meet the increasing water demand was sharply reduced, thus creating water deficits. The end of the crisis raised expectations among the urban population accustomed to previously high quality of service that water shortages would be promptly addressed. These expectations were only partly satisfied through emergency investments by development partners.

Sectoral and institutional Context

Legal and Institutional Context

There is no specific legal instrument governing water supply services in Côte d'Ivoire, but the 1998 Water Code (Law No. 98-755 dated December 23, 1998), which sets the country's legal framework of the integrated management of water resources (a) ranks water supply to the population as the first priority use of water; and (b) explicitly provides for the delegation of the management of water services to private operators. In that context the Ministry of Economic Infrastructure (Ministère des Infrastructures Économiques, MIE) is in charge of sector planning and development in urban and rural areas, which is partly delegated to the National Water Agency (Office national de l'eau potable, ONEP), while the delivery of water services in urban and semi-urban areas (735 cities, towns and villages) has been contracted to SODECI. Rural water facilities (water points and small pipes systems) are usually managed by communities.

Côte d'Ivoire has the longest running public-private partnership (PPP) in Africa. The Government has successfully delegated the operation and management of urban water services to the private sector under an affermage contract for over 50 years. This model has been replicated and adapted in various forms across the region. The sectoral institutional and contractual framework was last updated with the signing of a new 15-year affermage contract with SODECI in 2007 and the establishment of ONEP in 2009. Apart from its operating responsibilities, SODECI is also in charge of managing the Water Development Fund (Fonds de développement de l'eau, FDE) initially designed to finance renewal expenditures, systems expansion and social connections from a portion of the water tariffs. ONEP is in charge of planning sector development in rural and urban areas, managing assets, monitoring operators and proposing tariffs for Government approval. A separate National Water Fund (Fonds national de l'Eau, FNE) was set up in 1987 to manage the long-term debt associated with water supply investments.

The current sector institutional framework exhibits weaknesses, when compared to neighboring West African countries that have enhanced the initial Ivorian model by creating fully autonomous asset-holding companies (société de patrimoine) and enforcing performance-based incentives defined in the contract with the operating companies. In Côte d'Ivoire, the MIE retains full ownership of sector assets and ONEP is deprived of suitable tools (financial modelling, assets inventory) and adequate financial resources to properly carry out its mandate. In addition, the affermage contract is not strictly adhered to and explicit performance objectives are not being enforced on the private operator.

Tariffs were designed to maintain a self-sustaining model. Water revenues collected from customers are apportioned in three parts: (a) the SODECI tariff to cover operating costs of water supply services; (b) the FDE surcharge to finance renewal expenditures, systems expansion and social connections, and; (c) the FNE surcharge, to cover the sector's debt service. However tariffs have not been increased since 2004 (average tariff 393 FCFA/m³ - US\$0.67) and the water utility maintains that this is insufficient to finance all components of the FDE, which remains under funded. Without a clear picture of the financial situation of the sector and assets registry, it is impossible to properly understand the sector financing needs nor assess the need for possible tariff increases.

Situation of urban water and sanitation services

The access rate to piped water in urban areas is estimated at 70 percent of the population, with an important disparity between Abidjan (90 percent) and other urban centers (65 percent). Urban areas account for 50.2 percent of the country population, which was estimated at 22.7 million people according to the 2014 census. Government efforts to increase the water production capacity after the end of the crisis with the support of external partners, including IDA, have succeeded to close the water production deficit in Abidjan, which had reached 200,000 m³ per day in 2014. However, a portion (48 out of 354) of the other water production centers still face significant water shortages.

Access to urban sanitation services is less developed. According to the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program, the access rate of the urban population to sanitation is only 33 percent, and significantly higher in Abidjan (about 50 percent) equipped with an extensive sewerage network operated by SODECI under a separate affermage contract. The National Sanitation and Drainage Agency (Office national de l'assainissement et du drainage, ONAD) has developed a strategy that prioritizes the preparation of strategic sanitation master plans in secondary cities, the improvement of on-site sanitation, support to sludge haulers and the construction of sludge treatment plants.

The crisis has had an enduring impact on the operational performances of the UWS sector; as can be seen from Table 1, which benchmarks Cote d'Ivoire with the best-managed utilities in the sub-region.

Table 1: Benchmarking of Operating Performance Indicators (2014) - (Please refer to the PAD in Word version)

The crisis has also impacted the financing of the sector. As mentioned above, bill collection from private customers was severely affected by the crisis. This was compounded by the irregular payment of the water bills of public customers by the Government. In addition, while SODECI's remuneration is adjusted on yearly basis in line with its contract, end user tariffs remained unchanged resulting in a shortfall in funding to the FDE and FNE thus limiting funds availability for capital expenditures and renewal of existing assets. A major improvement took place in early 2015, when the Government resumed timely payments of its water bills. However, even though the financial flows within the sector may be monitored, the fragmented sector organization and the absence of adequate investment and planning tools prevent the Government from having a comprehensive picture of the sector's financial situation, including assets and liabilities.

Government's priorities and project rationale

There is an urgent need to improve levels of service outside of Abidjan and place the sector on a more sustainable footing. In requesting IDA's assistance through the proposed project, the Government wishes to address:

(a) The need to urgently reduce the persistent water shortages in urban centers in response to social tensions arising from unmet expectations to improve living conditions in the aftermath of the crisis;

- (b) The need to focus on water services outside of Abidjan which has already benefited from significant investments by other development partners;
- (c) The recognition that the UWS sector has to build financial visibility to move out from its current emergency phase to a more sustainable financial footing.

The Government also wishes to concentrate efforts on urban water supply. In view of the financial envelope that would be available to the proposed project, and of the financial support allocated to urban sanitation under ongoing and scheduled IDA operations of about US\$50 million, it was agreed that the proposed project should focus on urban water supply.

The proposed project is aligned with the Government priorities. It would first focus on secondary urban centers that face water shortages and production deficiencies, exhibit below-average water access rates, and for which technical studies are available so as to expedite implementation. The proposed project would also help provide the sector actors with adequate tools for creating financial visibility and strengthen capacities to carry out their missions.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Development Objective(s)

The proposed project development objective is to improve quality of, and increase access to, water services in selected urban areas and to strengthen capacity of ONEP for financial planning.

Key Results

The following key performance indicators would measure success in achieving the PDO:

- (a) Number of people in urban areas provided with access to Improved Water Sources under the project (core);
- (b) Number of people with access to enhanced water supply services due to the project;
- (c) Number of direct project beneficiaries, of which female (core);
- (d) Water service continuity in the targeted urban areas (hours per day)
- (e) Sector financial model used for financial planning and decision making

D. Project Description

A. Project Components

Selection of Project Activities. Given the immediate and medium-term Borrower priorities in the water and sanitation sector, and taking into account the scheduled interventions of other donors of the sector, the project would focus on the following areas: (i) help finance a priority investment program to quickly address difficulties arising from water shortages in eight urban centers (total population: 522,000); (ii) help provide access to water services through new social connections and by re-activating currently inactive household connections; and (iii) help improve the financial visibility of the sector and facilitate better execution of the current PPP contractual arrangements.

Project sites were selected as part of the government's investment planning process targeting areas that face significant challenges for urban services. All targeted centers exhibit low access rate or significant failures in the water supply system due to the deterioration of existing

facilities, particularly for production facilities using surface water (water intakes and treatment plants - WTPs) and groundwater (boreholes) and for water storage facilities. The deteriorated condition of facilities, compounded by other deficiencies, led to various sustainability issues in the delivery of water services, which are listed in table 2.

Table 2 Sustainability Issues in the Targeted Centers - (Please refer to the PAD in Word version)

Shortcomings of financial planning and sector regulation. The absence of information on the value of fixed assets and of consolidated financial statements prevents getting a clear financial picture of the sector. Sector regulation is hampered by: (a) the impact of the crisis on billing and collection, which led to set up makeshift solutions to keep the sector running and compensate SODECI's losses; and (b) the fact that the public party to the PPP largely depends on SODECI's willingness to share detailed information and is not in a position to implement financial planning and tariff-setting. Therefore, the project activities in Component B have been developed to give the water sector actors, particularly ONEP, the tools to place the sector on a more sound financial footing.

The project activities identified with the MIE and the ONEP are categorized into two components.

(a) Component A - Urban water supply (USD 45.64 million). This component would include the following activities: (i) construct water treatment plants, boreholes, water intakes and pumping stations in selected urban centers; (ii) construct storage tanks; (iii) construct water transmission lines and expand water distribution networks (53 km); (v) install 10,000 social connections; and (vi) works supervision. A detailed presentation of the project activities is provided in Annex 2.

(b) Component B - Institutional support (USD 4.36 million). This component would include the following activities: (i) institutional strengthening through the preparation of the inventory of sector assets, the development of a financial model and the audit of ongoing affermage contract and of the agreement between ONEP and the Government; (ii) capacity building for ONEP in financial planning and operations monitoring; and (iii) support to project management.

B. Project Cost and Financing

The financing instrument is Investment Project Financing (IPF), consisting of an IDA credit equivalent to US\$50 million over five years. The selection of the IPF instrument is based on its flexibility and suitability to finance a range of activities, including works, equipment and capacity building.

Total project financing requirements are estimated at US\$50 million, inclusive of price and physical contingencies, which would be entirely funded by the IDA Credit, as shown in table 3.

Table 2: Project costs and Financing (US\$ million) - (Please refer to the PAD in Word version)

C. Lessons Learned and Reflected in the Project Design

The social acceptability of PPP schemes largely depend on the services delivery

performance. Although SODECI clients were eventually satisfied that water supplies remained available during the crisis, they now demand a quick return to the performance level that was previously attained in terms of water quality, water pressure and reliability and continuity of services. In that respect, the restoration of quality services is a precondition for the improvement of billing and collection.

Successful West Africa PPPs in the water sector have relied on performing private operators and also on strong sociétés de patrimoine to execute the role of asset holder on behalf of government. The smooth execution of PPP arrangements require the latter to (a) closely monitor the operators' performances, (b) make adequate investment decisions, and (c) be provided with adequate tools to enable the regulation of contracts. The effectiveness of regulation requires in turn, performance-based contracts and financial models to assist in tariff-setting decisions.

Component Name

Component A - Urban water supply

Comments (optional)

Component Name

Component B - Institutional support

Comments (optional)

E. Project location and salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

The Project will focus on nine inland urban centers: Agboville, Beoumi, Bingerville, Ferkessedougou, Korhogo, NDouci, NZianouan and Tiassale.

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Abdoul Wahabi Seini (GSU01)

Abdoulaye Gadiere (GEN07)

II. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

The project would replicate implementation arrangements used in the previous water-related IDA-funded projects, namely the Emergency Urban Infrastructure Project (EUIP, P110020 and P120810, closed on March 31, 2014) and the Emergency Infrastructure Renewal Project (Projet de Renaissance des Infrastructures de Côte d'Ivoire, PRICI - P124715, closing in December 31, 2016). Under these multi-sector projects, ONEP was the executing agency of the urban water supply components, whereas day-to-day implementation activities, including fiduciary responsibilities, reporting and monitoring were vested into a stand-alone Project Coordination Unit (PCU). These arrangements were carried out to the Bank's satisfaction and their replication would expedite project implementation.

The Bank's fiduciary team carried out a specific assessment of the capacities of PRICI's PCU to check whether it could manage the proposed project together with the proposed additional financing of the PRICI. The assessment concurred with the proposed implementation option, provided that the procurement and financial management units of the PCU be strengthened (see paragraphs 57 and 60).

This institutional option will be formalized with the adoption and signing of the following agreements: (a) a project management contract between MIE and the PCU, and (b) a delegated management contract between ONEP and the PCU.

Oversight and Supervision. A Steering Committee (Comité de Suivi et de Pilotage, CSP) chaired by the Minister of Economic Infrastructure would be in charge of the overall oversight and of the strategic leadership of the proposed project. The CSP would ensure that project activities are consistent with the sector strategy and coordinate with other ministerial departments. The CSP would include representatives of the Ministry of Economy and Finance, the Ministry of Budget, the Union of the Cities and Communes of Côte d'Ivoire, ONEP, ONAD, SODECI and CIE. The PCU would act as the CSP's secretary.

III. Safeguard Policies that might apply

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	Project activities involve expansion and rehabilitation of existing piped water schemes. Which means, most of the adverse impacts and risks expected from the project are constituted by dust, noise and waste nuisance. Based on that, the project is classified B because expected potential impacts will be moderate, site specific and easily manageable. In addition, Conventional and well mastered water treatment technologies envisaged under the project should minimize potential risks and impacts. The specific areas of the civil works are not yet known and will be determined later. Therefore, to comply with the Bank and the national environmental regulation, the Borrower has prepared an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) that has been reviewed, consulted upon and disclosed in-country and at Bank Infoshop on September 28, 2016.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The project will not finance activities that affect natural habitats.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	The project will not finance activities related to forest exploitation, harvesting, direct or indirect forest degradation, and increased access to forests.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	The project will not finance acquisition, transport, distribution, storage or use of pesticides or similar chemicals that could threaten environmental and

		human health.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	This policy is triggered because of the nature of civil works to be financed under component A of the project, which will unquestionably induce excavation. Some of the project intervention areas have been inhabited for centuries, therefore likely to host underground artifacts. To prevent any destruction due to excavation during civil works and to make sure all precautions have been taken to safeguard physical cultural resources, a chance find procedure was included in the ESMF and subsequently detailed in ESIA's.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	There are no Indigenous Peoples in the project areas.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	The project will include rights of way for the water distribution networks, and minimal land acquisition for water production, storage and distribution. Therefore, the Borrower has prepared a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) that has been consulted upon and disclosed in-country and at Bank Infoshop on September 28, 2016. During project implementation, the social impact assessment will determine for each sub-project, whether the project activities will lead land acquisition, lost of resources or asset. Therefore, Resettlement Actions Plans (RAP) will be prepared, implemented and disclosed accordingly.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The project will not finance dam works or activities associated to existing dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The project will not finance activities that will interfere with international watercourses; either in terms of water withdraw or discharge of pollutants.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The project intervention areas are not under dispute.

IV. 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 overall project environment and social impact was assessed significantly positive on the quality of life and reduction of sanitation related diseases. Project activities involve rehabilitation and expansion works of existing piped water schemes. Most of the adverse impacts and risks that would happen during construction and rehabilitation works are constituted by dust, noise and waste nuisance. No potential significant and irreversible adverse impact, direct or indirect, is expected to occur from project activities either during the construction or operation phase. That is

<p>why the project is rated as EA category B.</p> <p>The impacts and risks that the Borrower will prevent and monitor in the course of the project implementation are minor to moderate biophysical and social impacts related to: noise, increased dust in the local atmosphere, increased risk of accident and loss of vegetation at the borrow pit sites.</p> <p>It is expected that only a limited number of temporary displacement may occur during project implementation which shall be managed through the RPF. No RAP or ESIA has been prepared at this stage, as the exact location of the civil works is unknown.</p>
<p>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</p>
<p>No potential indirect or long term or cumulative impacts are foreseen during project implementation and operational phase.</p>
<p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p>
<p>Not relevant.</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>To prevent the negative impacts and maximize the positive ones during the project lifetime, three safeguard policies have been triggered: Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01); Physical Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11) and Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12). The World Bank Group Environmental, Health and Safety (EHS) guidelines for water and sanitation also apply, especially when it comes to finalize and incorporate the environmental clauses in the enterprises contracts.</p> <p>An Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) have been prepared, consulted upon and disclosed in country and at the Bank Infoshop on September 28, 2016.</p> <p>The ESMF provides a screening mechanism for mainstreaming environmental and social sustainability aspects from the identification of subprojects/activities to their implementation phase. Prior to its commencement, as soon as the implementation site is identified, any eligible investment subproject/activity will be processed through the environmental and social screening procedure and then if eligible, be subject to the preparation and approval of an ESIA/ESMP and/or RAP (if necessary) prior its implementation. The screening is executed by the Project coordination unit's environmental and social safeguard specialist. Any specific ESIA/ESMP prepared in accordance to the screening result would be approved in consultation with all the stakeholders before the concerned activity starts.</p> <p>The RPF outlines the principles and procedures to be followed in the event of land acquisition, impact on assets and/or loss of livelihoods. Any specific Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) prepared in accordance to the social impact assessment result will be prepared, approved on with all the stakeholders then fully implemented prior to the commencement on the ground of related civil works.</p> <p>The Borrower's institutional capacity to manage these potential safeguards impacts was</p>

assessed during the preparation/update of the ESMF and RPF. And the Borrower has reasonable capacity in implementing environmental and social safeguard measures in water and sanitation projects.

In that respect, the Borrower is successfully implementing the ESIA/ESMPs and RAPs of the previous water-related IDA-funded projects where the team has already been capacitated on Bank safeguards policies. Recent supervision missions of the PRICI concluded that the implementation of ESIA/ESMPs was appropriate and the Safeguard rating is **►(Satisfactory)►(** . While the same institutional framework used for the PRICI would be adopted for the proposed project (the PCU monitoring the overall implementation of the ESIA/ESMPs, and RAPs, while ONEP as being responsible for implementing its applicable portions of the ESIA/ESMPs related to water and sanitation activities), any capacity strengthening measure deemed necessary to improve the safeguard function in this operation would be taken at both levels. An amount of US\$0.36 million is earmarked in the project budget to support the implementation of the safeguard measures. The Project will also provide additional resource social person to continue strengthening the capacity of PRICI for social related management. The Implementation of the RPF will be ensured by the existing social unit in the PIU, that will be also supported by the Bank safeguards team.

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

The key stakeholders are: the beneficiary communities, Ministries (and their relevant agencies/ departments) in charge of urban development, habitat, hydraulics, drainage and sanitation; environment and protection of nature; and local development and decentralization; the participating municipalities and communes, NGOs and other relevant institutions.

One of the key principles of this project from the outset was to foster participation of all relevant stakeholders. This approach will be sustained throughout project implementation. The environmental and social assessment studies, namely the ESMF and RPF, were also carried out according to the same principle, using broad-based public consultation approach and involving the above stakeholder groups. The objective was to raise awareness of project activities and impacts and foster ownership on their part. All the relevant bodies have been adequately informed of the Project. Concerns of the communities and some details of the consultations have been taken into account in the body of the reports and other results provided as annexes in the ESMF and RPF. The key concerns raised during the consultation process included: (i) permanent consultation and interaction with the population, (ii) timely compensation process for those impacted by the project and; (iii) development of access to homes, businesses and social infrastructure during the execution of works. All these concerns have been addressed in the alternatives proposed through the ESMF and the RPF.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	21-Sep-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	28-Sep-2016
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	

Cote d'Ivoire	28-Sep-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	21-Sep-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	28-Sep-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
Cote d'Ivoire	28-Sep-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
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

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment	
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources	
Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement	
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Is physical displacement/relocation expected?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] TBD [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Provided estimated number of people to be affected	
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] TBD [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Provided estimated number of people to be affected	
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information	

Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
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 [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
All Safeguard Policies	
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

V. Contact point**World Bank**

Contact: Matar Fall

Title: Lead Water and Sanitation Spec

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name: Republic of Cote d'Ivoire

Contact: Gilbert Ekpini Ekpini

Title: Chief of Staff, Ministry of Economic Infrastructures

Email: pdimba@prici.ci

Implementing Agencies

Name: Cellule de Coordination du PRICI (CC-PRICI)

Contact: Pierre Dimba

Title: Project Coordinator

Email: pdimba@prici.ci

VI. 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>**VII. Approval**

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Matar Fall	
Approved By		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Maman-Sani Issa (SA)	Date: 05-Oct-2016

Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Alexander E. Bakalian (PMGR)	Date: 06-Oct-2016
Country Director:	Name: Pierre Frank Laporte (CD)	Date: 07-Oct-2016