



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

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 22-May-2016 | Report No: PIDISDSA18439

For Official Use Only



BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country Papua New Guinea	Project ID P159517	Project Name Rural Service Delivery Project	Parent Project ID (if any)
Region EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC	Estimated Appraisal Date 05-Sep-2016	Estimated Board Date 28-Feb-2017	Practice Area (Lead) Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience Global Practice
Lending Instrument Investment Project Financing	Borrower(s) Department of Treasury	Implementing Agency Department of Provincial and Local Government Affairs	

For Official Use Only

Financing (in USD Million)

Financing Source	Amount
International Development Association (IDA)	23.00
Local Govts. (Prov., District, City) of Borrowing Country	1.00
Total Project Cost	24.00

Environmental Assessment Category

B - Partial Assessment

Decision

Track II-The review did authorize the preparation to continue

Other Decision (as needed)

Type here to enter text

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

1. **Papua New Guinea (PNG) is a resource-rich country of approximately seven million people.** PNG's population is characterized by a diverse number of social groups with over 800 distinct languages, with strong local and clan-based affinities and allegiances. 87 percent of the country's population lives in rural areas. Average national population density is low at about 14 per km². PNG is rich in natural resources, but is subject to extreme weather events and natural disasters. The economy is dominated by agriculture, fishery, and



the oil/minerals sectors.

2. **Despite the positive economic performance over the past decade, PNG's human development indicators remain low.** More than 40 percent of children under five years of age suffer from moderate to severe chronic malnutrition. Life expectancy at birth is 63 years, considerably below the Pacific Islands average of 70 years; the infant mortality rate is 48 per thousand compared to a regional average of 26.5; and the maternal mortality rate is very high at 230 per 100,000 live births. The Government of PNG recognizes the lack of infrastructure facilities as a major constraint to economic development and delivery of basic services to the population, especially in the context in which the national population is growing at 2.7 percent each year.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

3. **Public service is delivered at several levels in PNG, including Provincial Government, District Development Authority, and Local-Level Government.** Since the passing of the 1995 Organic Law for Provincial and Local Level Government, the Government of PNG has been striving to (i) reduce administrative costs of service provision at sub-national levels; (ii) strengthen the ability to make technical and financial decisions regarding development priorities; and (iii) better align public expenditures and priority public services.

4. **Fiscal transfers to sub-national governments have increased substantially over the years, while fixed sector allocations have been largely removed.** The annual capital funding to the Provinces in 2015 included PGK 10 million in direct funding per Province under the Provincial Services Improvement Program (PSIP), PGK 10 million per District under the District Services Improvement Program (DSIP), and PGK 100,000 per Local Level Government (LLG). Accordingly, Provinces and Districts now play a greater role and also have a greater flexibility in utilizing public funds for addressing local development needs. It requires an effective mechanism and capacity at sub-national levels for consolidating and prioritizing local needs, and for utilizing available public resources to meet them in a transparent manner. Communities, on one hand, need a platform and instruments to voice their needs and formulate their demands in concrete proposals to seek district or provincial funding. Provinces, districts, and LLGs, on the other hand, need a platform that systematically collects the demand of communities, prioritize them in a fair and transparent manner, and respond to them.

5. **A new District Development Authority (DDA) Act, which was passed in late 2014, is expected to further enhance the role of districts in managing public funds at sub-national levels.** Under the act, a DDA was created at every district to control budget allocation priorities and be responsible for service delivery in districts. DDAs are chaired by the district members of parliament (MP), and represented by the head of each LLG in the district. While many of the implementing and operating processes of the DDA act are yet to be established, it is envisaged that the DDAs will play a more prominent role in (a) allocating DSIP funds against priority development needs expressed by LLGs (as the Heads of LLGs form the DDA), and (b) harmonizing the use of DSIP funds and the districts' service delivery plans with the provincial development plans (as the Chairman of each DDA is represented in the Provincial Executive Council, which determine and control budget allocation priorities and draw up a rolling five-year development plan for the province). Meanwhile, LLGs are expected to continue to play a key role on the ground in directly communicating with the population at ward and village levels, and supporting the provision of services. It is within this context the Government of PNG is exploring ways to improve the fiscal transfer system, as well as the processes through which the PSIP, DSIP, and LLG funds can be applied effectively to meet the priority needs at Local-level Government (LLG) and ward levels where



resources and staff are limited, and the most basic social and economic services are needed.

6. **The Government is interested in applying the community-driven development (CDD) approach for enhancing the effectiveness of service delivery at local levels.** This approach, currently being piloted under the Rural Service Delivery and Local Governance Project (RSDLGP) by the Department of Provincial and Local Government Affairs (DPLGA) with the support of the World Bank in Central Province and Western Province, has shown promising performance in delivering basic services to rural areas, while increasing community commitment to the sustainability of small scale investments. The approach is increasingly seen by the Government as an effective way to deliver services to rural communities with transparent and accountable systems. The Government is interested in expanding the coverage of RSDLGP to other provinces, with a view of eventually incorporating the model in their regular local governance framework—making effective use of sub-national level funds (e.g. PSIP, DSIP, and LLG funds) in response to community-level demands in a systematic way.

For Official Use Only

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Development Objective(s) (From PAD)

The Project Development Objective is to improve communities' access to basic infrastructure and services in targeted rural areas through inclusive, participatory planning and implementation.

This will be achieved through a community-driven development (CDD) approach, emphasizing the principles of transparency, accountability, and sustainability.

Key Results

7. **The following indicators will be used in measuring the achievement of the PDO:**

- i) Direct Beneficiaries (Increase in the number of rural population with improved access to basic infrastructure or services in the targeted area), and of which female;
- ii) Percentage of villages in the targeted wards represented in ward development planning;
- iii) Percentage of project beneficiaries that feel project investments reflected their needs (percentage, gender disaggregated);
- iv) Percentage of women participating in community decision making meetings in targeted wards.

D. Project Description

Component Name	Cost (USD Million)	Comments
Preparation and implementation of ward development grants	15.90	
Capacity building of national and sub-national entities	1.60	
Project Management	6.50	



Project Design and Components

8. **The project will maintain the three components from the pilot Rural Service Delivery and Local Governance Program (RSDLGP)**, which are: (1) Preparation and implementation of Ward Development Grants; (2) Capacity building of national and sub-national government (or non-government) entities, and (3) Project management (including monitoring, evaluation and knowledge sharing). The proposed project will provide two rounds of Ward Development Grants to rural wards in five targeted provinces, which could be used for a wide-range of small-scale social or economic investments and/or services (e.g. classrooms, health aid posts, water supply and sanitation systems, access roads, bridges, wharves, solar power systems). The specific purpose of these community grants would be determined by communities on an annual basis with the support of trained facilitators, and would be approved at LLG and/or district levels based on agreed-upon criteria that reflect Government policies and any relevant World Bank requirements. Communities will identify their priorities and be responsible for the design, implementation, and maintenance of their investments, as well as reporting on the use of the funds. These three components are described in more detail below.

Component 1: Preparation and Implementation of Ward Development Grants

Subcomponent 1.1: Ward Development Grants

9. **This subcomponent will provide grants to wards to finance community-identified sub-projects.** Wards will be responsible for the identification and prioritization of community needs. The sub-projects will be developed through a participatory planning process that will be integrated into the preparation of Ward and LLG development plans and coordinated with DDA decisions and budget allocations. Typical sub-project grants are expected to include small-scale community infrastructure, technical assistance, and capacity building. Based on the experience of RSDLGP, most common types of sub-projects are expected to be water supply systems, classrooms, health aid posts, community halls, solar power, and footbridges. In order to also help communities to assess and address non-infrastructure needs, ward-level sub-project prioritization will involve some socialization and awareness raising activities on them, such as on maternal and child health. The average size of grant provided to wards will be between PGK 70,000 and PGK 114,000 (depending on the population and distance from the nearest road). This is an increase from the RSDLGP allocation of PGK 50,000.

Subcomponent 1.2: Subproject Preparation and Implementation Support Grants

10. **Grants will also be provided to the target LLG administrations to provide support to wards in preparing and implementing sub-projects.** The grant will be used by each target LLG to contract two community development workers (CDWs) and a rural infrastructure specialist (RIS), who will work as part of LLG administration with the LLG Manager, Project Officer, and Financial Officer to facilitate and monitor the preparation and implementation of sub-projects. The grants would be transferred on regular (monthly or bi-monthly) intervals to cover the administrative cost of supporting wards in the ward development grant (WDG) sub-project cycle, including local travel expenses.

Component 2: Capacity Building of National and Sub-national entities

11. **This component would support the strengthening of capacities of national and sub-national government entities as well as community members to manage and implement sub-projects, and to improve local governance as it relates to basic service delivery.** At the central level, the capacity of the Department for Provincial and Local Government Affairs (DPLGA) will be strengthened. Activities will be carried out to build their capacity in the overall development and monitoring of the project; coordination across the key government stakeholders (including Department of Community Development, Religion & Sports; Department of



Implementation and Rural Development; the National Economic and Fiscal Commission); coordination among other donor and international development agencies who are implementing similar programs; and documentation and promotion of good and bad practices of collaboration among Provinces, DDAs, LLGs and Wards that influence the quality of service delivery. DPLGA staff will be supported to work with District, LLG and Wards to review and identify (a) specific capacity and processes required at LLG and District levels to facilitate project planning and implementation at local levels, and (b) effective incentives and arrangements for harmonizing LLG, district, and provincial level plans and budgets (both investments and recurrent costs). DPLGA staff will also be supported to prepare reports of such findings to inform future policies on local service delivery arrangements. At the provincial level, capacity building activities will be conducted to strengthen linkages with the activities being supported in respective DDAs and LLGs. For example, training would be provided on consolidating development needs from communities at the district and provincial levels and analyzing the recurrent costs of new investments. At DDA, LLG, and ward levels, capacity building will be aimed at increasing their capacity to manage public resources at the local level, including improved ward planning, review and evaluation of specific ward plans, grant management to communities, basic financial management and procurement, reporting, and monitoring of community projects. District Administrators (DA) and LLG Advisors would be the key focal points for work at this level. Ward recorders will also be trained to serve as a key member of ward development committees and/or community project teams.

12. **This component will also support the updating of tools and training materials.** They will enhance social accountability initiatives (e.g. participatory planning meetings, public education to improve budget literacy, public feedback mechanisms, and participatory performance monitoring) to strengthen downward accountability and responsiveness of service provinces. These tools will be included in the Project Operations Manual and covered by the capacity building modules explained in the previous paragraph, hence are expected to be applied throughout the ward development grant cycles. Training and capacity building support to help improve the participation and inclusion of traditionally marginalized groups (including women, youth, and persons with disabilities) would be articulated and financed as well. For all activities, data (gender disaggregated) will be maintained and analyzed on a regular basis to understand the levels of participation and effectiveness of the project activities in building local government capacity.

Component 3: Project Management

13. **The third component will finance incremental costs of the implementing agency for project management, specifically coordination and supervision of implementation activities, financial management, annual audits, and monitoring and evaluation.** The current Project Management Unit (PMU) from RSDLGP is expected to be retained and will implement RSDP. The PMU would also be responsible for coordinating funds from other potential sources that may fund the project in the future. Vehicles and office equipment would be purchased for the PMU and Provincial Project Office (PPO) teams to be established in the new provinces. An external firm would be contracted under this component to design and undertake an assessment of the project upon completion, which would include an independent technical audit.

Citizen Engagement

14. **Applying a community-driven development (CDD) approach, the Project contains various citizen engagement mechanisms.** There are four specific steps through which citizen engagement is facilitated: (a) updating of ward development priorities and preparations of the expressions of interest for ward development grants by Ward Development Committees (WDCs); (b) development of the full sub-project proposals by WDCs; (c) implementation and monitoring of sub-projects through community project teams (CPTs); and (d) development and implementation of the operations and maintenance plan for the sub-projects. Community



meetings will be organized, especially for steps (a), (b), and (d), and community helpers will facilitate effective participation of community members. The outcomes of these steps will reflect the input and decisions collectively made by community members, and are therefore also expected to close citizen feed-back loops. In order to enhance the engagement of traditionally less influential community members, separate pre-meetings with women, youth and people living with disabilities will be organized to strengthen their understanding of the processes, confidence, and voice during the ward-level planning meetings.

Component Name:
Preparation and implementation of ward development grants

Comments (optional)

Component Name:
Capacity building of national and sub-national entities

Comments (optional)

Component Name:
Project Management

Comments (optional)

For Official Use Only

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

The project is expected to cover five provinces: Western Province, Central Province, West Sepik, Simbu, and East New Britain. Four local level governments (LLGs) are covered by RSDLGP in each province, reaching 200 wards.

Western Province is the largest and least densely populated province in PNG. It comprises more than half of the country’s border with Indonesia. There are several large rivers that run through the province including the Fly River and its tributaries including the Strickland and Ok Tedi rivers, the largest lake in Papua New Guinea Lake Murray is also in Western Province. The Tonda Wildlife Management Area in the south-western corner of the province is a wetland of international importance and the largest protected area in Papua New Guinea. Central Province occupies the southern side of the Owen Stanley Ranges and the area of coast from Bereina in the north to Gaire Village in the south. It is the home of Varirata National Park, which covers an area of approximately 1,000 hectares. West Sepik Province borders with Indonesia and is mountainous in the interior, with jungles in the lowlands. Sissano Lagoon, located near the town of Aitape was previously devastated by a tsunami in 1998, which killed 2000 people. Simbu Province is a province with very rugged mountainous terrain and has limited natural resources. Mount Wilhelm, the tallest mountain in Papua New Guinea, at 4,509m, is located on the border of Simbu. East New Britain forms the eastern part of the New Britain Island. Steep cliffs form some



sections of the coastline; in other coastal areas are flat and bordered by coral reefs. The highest point, at 2,438 m, is Mount Sinewit. Most of the terrain is covered with tropical rainforest and several large rivers are fed by the high rainfall. A major eruption of Tavurvur Volcano in 1994 destroyed the town of Rabaul.

Wards will be responsible for the identification and prioritization of community needs. The sub-projects will be developed through a participatory planning process that will be integrated into the preparation of Ward and LLG development plans and coordinated with DDA decisions and budget allocations. Typical sub-project grants are expected to include small-scale community infrastructure, technical assistance, and capacity building.

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Claire Marion Forbes

For Official Use Only

IMPLEMENTATION

Type here to enter text

SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	<p>The type and scale of physical investments under RSDP will be similar to those implemented in RSDLGP. A participatory planning process will take place at the ward and LLG level to prioritize small-scale social or economic investments and/or services (e.g. classrooms, health posts, water supply and sanitation systems, access roads, footbridges, jetties, solar power systems). Under Component 1, the potential negative environmental and social impacts related to development of small-scale infrastructure are mostly site-specific, short term and manageable, accordingly, under OP 4.01, the project is Category B. Each activity will be screened and depending on the scale of the subproject, standardized environmental codes of practice or EMPs will apply to civil works and construction activities.</p> <p>An Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), which was prepared for RSDLGP in 2013, was updated for RSDP. As the design of RSDP</p>



For Official Use Only

			is very similar to that of RSDLGP, the updated ESMF reflects lessons learnt from RSDLGP implementation.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No		The project will fund small scale rural services such as footpaths, footbridges, solar lights, and water supply systems, which will be located in village areas where human activity has already largely modified the natural habitats and landscapes. Accordingly, it is not proposed to trigger this OP.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No		The project will fund small scale rural services such as footpaths, footbridges, solar lights, and water supply systems, which will be located in village areas where human activity has already largely modified the environment. No impacts on Forests as covered by OP4.36 would occur as result of the project. Accordingly, it is not proposed to trigger this OP.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No		The project will fund small scale rural services such as footpaths, footbridges, solar lights, and water supply systems located in village. The project will not fund activities involving pest management.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes		Project siting is identified through a participatory process with community consensus to avoid known physical cultural resources such as sacred sites, structures of spiritual values to communities, objects and structures having high landscape values, etc. Chance find procedures are included in the updated ESMF.
			The project will be located in areas where Indigenous Peoples are the sole or the overwhelming majority of direct project beneficiaries. Accordingly a separate Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) or Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) is not proposed. Rather, in accordance with the provisions of OP 4.10, the elements of an IPP is included in the overall project design.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes		The ESMF and Project Operations Manual outline steps for an inclusive engagement, participatory community needs assessment process, screening criteria, and forms to document broad community support and consensus on the selected priority sub-projects. Community consultations will be facilitated and documented by suitably qualified personnel hired by the project at local levels. Ongoing monitoring and community consultations by such personnel will assess whether broad community support is maintained during implementation.



For Official Use Only

		<p>Each sub-project will be identified and driven by the recipient community. The participatory planning process will align to the principles of free, prior and informed consultation and ensure that the subproject will provide benefits that are culturally appropriate to the people. In addition to the selection criteria in the ESMF, the community driven nature of the sub-projects will further serve to ensure compliance with OP/BP 4.10.</p>
<p>Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The sub-projects will be identified and driven by the recipient communities. The project will not finance any activity that requires involuntary resettlement. Instead, for subprojects requiring land for new infrastructure, it is anticipated that land will be provided voluntarily. Sites will be identified through the participatory process with customary landowners and leaders, and areas with disputes will be avoided. A “clan land use agreement” will be entered into with correctly identified customary landowners. The rural nature of the project guarantees (as 97% of land in PNG is customary land, with the remaining 3% being in the large urban areas) that any such lands would be under communal ownership and the community nature of the sub-projects suggest that voluntary donation is a realistic expectation.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the client has prepared a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) which includes the Bank’s Voluntary Land Donation Protocol, and forms an integral part of ESMF. This document defines the manner in which land access is arranged for the project and establishes the necessary safeguards to ensure this is undertaken in a manner compliant with Bank requirements including necessary consultation and documentation arrangements.</p>
<p>Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Project will not finance construction or rehabilitation of any dam. The project is not dependent on any existing dam or dam under construction.</p>
<p>Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Western Province and West Sepik Province are located along the Border with Indonesia (West Papua). The Fly River forms part of the boundary between PNG and Indonesia and it is possible that the project will fund small scale infrastructure which may</p>



involve the use or potential pollution of the river; therefore, it is proposed to trigger this OP. As required under the OP, the GoPNG has prepared a riparian notification to the Government of Indonesia (expected to be transmitted in early September).

Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60

No

The project will not take place in disputed areas. Accordingly, it is not proposed to trigger this OP.

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:

RSDP will use a community-driven development (CDD) modality. Local level governments (LLG) and wards and project staff will play a key role in facilitating the participatory process. Project activities are small-scale infrastructure (aid posts, classrooms, etc.) in rural areas and pose low social environmental risk. Given the low capacity setting, proposed subprojects with medium or high risk will be screened out to avoid any social and environmental impacts (e.g. dams). Most of the anticipated sub-project activities will be Category C, with some Category B activities. Activities that require physical displacement (relocation or removal of houses, businesses or permanent structures), economic displacement (loss of livelihood, restriction of access to traditional lands or resources), and/or involuntary acquisition or leasing of customary land will not be eligible for RSDP funding. For subprojects involving small-scale infrastructure, customary land will be utilized via voluntary donation process (as guided by the RPF) and the CDD approach will ensure consensus is built through the preparatory stages.

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

The overall social and environmental impact of the RSDP is expected to be positive. The main expected benefits of the project are improved livelihoods and welfare of rural population in targeted provinces. More specifically, benefits may include better access to health and education facilities, drinking water, electricity, among others, which would have impacts on health conditions, school enrolment, and reduction in water-borne diseases. The project is also expected to have long-term benefits of reduced future costs of public service delivery, resulting from the introduction of new processes, capacity, and tools for managing public resources and services with increased transparency, accountability, and community ownership. No potential indirect and/or negative long term impacts are expected.

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

A Negative List has been included in the ESMF to ensure high-risk and sub-projects that cannot be feasibly delivered through a CDD modality will not be undertaken. All control measures are detailed in Environmental Codes of Practice which reflect, and are appropriate for, the local context. This approach will reduce the potential environmental and social impacts overall.

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.

For Official Use Only



The borrower updated and disclosed the safeguard documents (ESMF including RPF). The Capacity building will continue to be planned under the proposed project.

The project team and facilitators at the provincial and local levels will attend training which will incorporate key safeguard aspects into the curriculum. Training materials and sessions will include:

- Community Participation Process and Social Inclusion;
- Voluntary Land Donation;
- Environmental and Social Risks and Mitigations;
- Environmental Codes of Practice (ECOPs); and
- Committee Governance.

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

Wards will be responsible for the identification and prioritization of community needs. The sub-projects will be developed through a participatory planning process that will be integrated into the preparation of Ward and LLG development plans. LLG and district, administrations will be involved in the screening and approval of the sub-projects. LLG administrations, especially with the involvement of community development workers (CDWs) and rural infrastructure specialists (RISs), will also provide support to wards in preparing and implement the sub-projects. Program Management Unit (PMU), which will be hosted by DPLGA, and Provincial project offices (PPOs), which will sit in the offices of provincial administrations, will provide overall management and coordination support.

A summary of the updated Environmental and Social Management Framework, including the Resettlement Policy Framework was translated in tok pisin and disclosed by DPLGA. Prints were also made available at provincial and district administrations. A consultation meeting was organized by DPLGA at the central level with the relevant government and civil society stakeholders, and additional consultations at the provincial level with provincial, district, and civil society stakeholders.

For Official Use Only

B. Disclosure Requirements (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)

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
24-Aug-2016	26-Aug-2016	

"In country" Disclosure

Papua New Guinea
26-Aug-2016

Comments

Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission to InfoShop
24-Aug-2016	26-Aug-2016



"In country" Disclosure

Papua New Guinea
26-Aug-2016

Comments

Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission to InfoShop
24-Aug-2016	26-Aug-2016

"In country" Disclosure

Papua New Guinea
26-Aug-2016

Comments

For Official Use Only

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level (to be filled in when the ISDS is finalized by the project decision meeting) (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)

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 Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?

Yes

Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?

Yes

OP/BP 4.11 - 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?

NA

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 7.50 - Projects on International Waterways

For Official Use Only Have the other riparians been notified of the project?

No

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?

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

CONTACT POINT

World Bank

Kosuke Anan
Senior Social Development Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Department of Treasury

Implementing Agencies

Department of Provincial and Local Government Affairs
Gevo Mabone
Assistant Director, External Liaison
gmabone@dplga.gov.pg

For Official Use Only

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

The InfoShop
The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 458-4500
Fax: (202) 522-1500
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/infoshop>

APPROVAL

Task Team Leader(s):	Kosuke Anan
----------------------	-------------

Approved By



Safeguards Advisor:		
Practice Manager/Manager:	Bassam Ramadan	02-Sep-2016
Country Director:	Robert Johann Utz	07-Sep-2016

For Official Use Only