

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET  
APPRAISAL STAGE**

**Report No.: ISDSA12284**

**Date ISDS Prepared/Updated:** 19-Mar-2015

**Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed:** 19-Mar-2015

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**1. Basic Project Data**

<b>Country:</b>	Madagascar	<b>Project ID:</b>	P149323
<b>Project Name:</b>	Social Safety Net Project (P149323)		
<b>Task Team Leader(s):</b>	Andrea Vermehren		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	11-Mar-2015	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	28-May-2015
<b>Managing Unit:</b>	GSPDR	<b>Lending Instrument:</b>	Investment Project Financing
<b>Sector(s):</b>	Primary education (20%), Other non-bank financial intermediaries (10%), Health (10%), Other social services (60%)		
<b>Theme(s):</b>	Natural disaster management (15%), Social Safety Nets/Social Assistance & Social Care Services (50%), Social Inclusion (10%), Education for all (15%), Nutrition and food security (10%)		
<b>Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?</b>			No
<b>Financing (In USD Million)</b>			
Total Project Cost:	40.00	Total Bank Financing:	40.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
<b>Financing Source</b>			<b>Amount</b>
BORROWER/RECIPIENT			0.00
International Development Association (IDA)			40.00
Total			40.00
<b>Environmental Category:</b>	B - Partial Assessment		
<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	No		

**2. Project Development Objective(s)**

The Development Objective of the Project is to support the Government in increasing extreme poor households' access to safety net services, and lay the foundation for a social protection system.

### 3. Project Description

The project will be implemented over a 4.5 year period from August 2015 – December 2019. A Project Preparation Advance (PPA) is prepared to ensure that first payments for the expansion of the HDCT pilot can be made in September 2015, just prior to the new school year.

Component 1: Building a safety net for the poor in selected rural areas (US\$ 30.2 million).

The objective of this component is to build an effective safety for extreme poor households in selected areas. The component will include three safety net modalities to address different vulnerabilities and risks faced by extreme poor households in Madagascar: i) a Productive Safety Net (PSN) will provide cash for work (CfW) activities for targeted poor communities in areas of the country where there is a potential to address environmental and soil degradation, and increase local agriculture production; ii) a Human Development Cash Transfer (HDCT) expanded pilot will provide conditional cash transfers (CCT) to support extreme poor households in areas that have particularly low human development outcomes; and iii) a post-disaster window will support poor households and communities in areas affected by disasters as a result of natural hazards. It is noteworthy that all safety net beneficiary households included in the HDCT or PSN programs will receive a similar cash amount per year, regardless of the safety net program that they participate in. The component will be implemented by the FID.

Subcomponent 1.1: Establishment of a Productive Safety Net (PSN) (US\$14.7 million)

This subcomponent would offer regular cash for work opportunities during the lean season to the poorest families of the selected communities over a three-year period, with the aim of smoothing their consumption and supporting them in developing productive activities. Around 28,500 households would participate in the program for three years. The PSN would adopt a community-based landscape approach. Planning of PSN activities would be done at the level of small landscapes composed of several villages, and activities would be planned and implemented sequentially over a period of three years in order to address soil conservation, water harvesting, reforestation and terracing in a durable manner. PSN activities would be labor-intensive and at least 70 percent of the funding for the subprojects would be used to pay cash to beneficiaries. The remaining financing would cover non-wage costs, such as small equipment and material inputs, as well as supervision costs. Beneficiary households would be selected through a combination of community-based pre-selection and a Proxy Means Test (PMT) survey whose combined result would be validated by the communities. Around 30 percent of the households of each selected village would be able to join the program. Extreme poor and labor-constrained households would participate in the program through direct cash transfers with no obligation to work. The daily wage rate would be kept below the market rate for unskilled labor (Malagasy Ariary (MGA) 3000 per day) to ensure that only the poorest households have an incentive to join the program. Participating households would work 80 days a year each year for three years. The cash-for-work activities will be implemented based on a five year landscape development plan that will be developed jointly by the FID, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Social Protection and other relevant government representatives and stakeholders, in partnership with communities. The methodology for this joint planning is spelled out in a detailed operational manual developed with technical assistance from the World Bank. The five year plans are updated annually taking into consideration the activities implemented during the previous year and ensuring that past sub-projects are properly maintained and used. This methodology will ensure a combination of a long term productive development vision of the selected area with immediate improvements of household's living conditions in the short term.

## Subcomponent 1.2: Expansion of the Human Development Cash Transfer pilot (US\$11.5 million)

This component would provide cash transfers of about US\$12 MGA 20,000 per month (over a three year period) to selected, extremely poor families with children 0-12 years of age, in selected regions of Madagascar. The geographic areas of intervention are determined based on human development indicators, on the availability of schools, the national nutrition program and demographic criteria. The cash transfers would consist of two elements: Each selected family would receive a base payment of Ar. 10,000 per month to support the family's income, and caregivers would be encouraged to enroll in the national nutrition program, attend parenting workshops and adopt good practice parenting behaviors. In addition, families with children of primary school age would receive for each child enrolled and attending school regularly (80 percent of school days) MGA 5,000, for up to two children in primary school. Thus, the highest amount possible for any family to receive is MGA 20,000 per month. In addition, families with primary school children will receive a one-time payment of MGA 20.000 in September of the first year they enroll their children in primary schools to ensure that they can enroll their children. Payments would be made bimestrial through financial intermediaries (such as micro-finance institutions, mobile payment providers, etc.) where possible, to promote financial inclusion. FID has already successfully piloted the HDCT program whose first transfer took place in September 2014 (just prior to the start of the new school year). The pilot included the main elements of a safety net including (i) targeting, (ii) enrolment (for information about co-responsibilities of beneficiaries), (iii) transfer (through financial intermediary institutions), (iv) co-responsibility monitoring (through social organizers and "lead mothers"), and (v) case management (which includes complaints, family updates, etc). The pilot is accompanied by a public information campaign that informs key stakeholders about the program as well as the specific roles and responsibilities. The FID also contracted a firm to evaluate the effectiveness of the combined geographic, community and proxy-means-test based targeting process. The evaluation revealed that the inclusion and exclusion errors of the HDCT and the CfW programs are only between 5% and 10%. For the HDCT, the inclusion error was 5.1% while it was slightly higher for the Cash for Work program at 7.1%. The difference might stem from the fact that the self-registration of potential beneficiary households which may lack information and awareness of the program. However, the households selected as beneficiaries: 88% of the cash for work beneficiaries and 92% sites of the HDCT beneficiaries were found to be the poorest and most vulnerable households in their communities with their average consumption per capita lower than the consumption per capita of non-beneficiary households. The evaluation also pointed to some areas of improvement in the targeting process, particularly related to communication and the clarity of the community pre-selection criteria. In addition, the FID has contracted a firm to carry out a process evaluation of the HDCT pilot to inform management of any implementation issues in a timely manner. The results of this process evaluation are expected in June 2015. The scalable effectiveness trial for the HDCT program will include a robust impact evaluation using a cluster randomized trial to test not only the effectiveness of the cash transfer program, but also the value-added of a set of behavioral nudges delivered primarily through the elected leader mothers. Results would be assess among mothers to assess the impacts on ONN and parenting workshops and the adoption of improved parenting practices. Child level outcomes would also be assessed to assess impacts on child development outcomes related to school readiness – including nutritional and cognitive outcomes—as well as on school enrollment and attendance. The impact evaluation will include not only a review of short-term and intermediate outcomes across villages with and without the HDCT program, but will also test the effectiveness of a small set of behavioral 'nudges' designed to improve take up and outcomes.

### Subcomponent 1.3: Early recovery response to natural disasters (US\$4 million)

The subcomponent would enable the Government of Madagascar to provide financing for disaster response through CfW activities and the rehabilitation and reconstruction of damaged infrastructure in affected community. Funding of up to US\$2 million will be made available for the rehabilitation of basic infrastructure (e.g. schools) that will be rebuilt in a cyclone proof way, with designs developed by the Ministry of Education. In addition, quick income earning opportunities will be offered to the poorest members of the affected communities through CfW activities for clean-up and rehabilitation activities, at a daily rate of MGA 3,000 of up to 45 days of work. 75 percent of the project cost will be used towards wage costs, while the remaining 25 percent would be used towards non-wage costs (small equipment and capital inputs, and supervision costs). FID will budget US\$1 million for overall disaster response each year. In case that there are only minor disasters during one year, the remaining funds can be used to rehabilitate the backlog of damaged community infrastructure from previous disasters. Activities will be selected and coordinated by the National Bureau for Disaster Risk Management (Bureau National de Gestion des Risques et Catastrophes, BNGRC). FID has been the main government institution providing fast income and reconstruction support to affected communities. As such, FID is a member of the Coordination Unit for the Disaster Interventions (Cellule de Réflexion pour les Interventions en post Catastrophes, CRIC) which brings together fast intervention institutions such as the World Food Program, the Red Cross, UNICEF, Local Governments etc.

Component 2: Strengthening the safety net administration, monitoring and social accountability (US \$6.5 million).

This component would provide the financing for improved safety net administration. It will include (i) establishing the targeting system including the roll out of the Proxy Means Test as an objective instrument for beneficiary identification, (ii) creating a beneficiary registry for the PSN and the HDCT, (iii) rolling out electronic payment systems for safety net beneficiaries, (iv) strengthening of FID's management information systems to be able to process the safety net program data on an ongoing basis, (v) control and social accountability mechanisms, as well as (vi) safety net program administration, and financial audits. The component would be implemented by the FID.

Component 3: Building the institutional capacity for monitoring and evaluation of the Social Protection System (US\$3.3 million).

This component aims at strengthening the institutional capacity of the Ministry of Population, Social Protection and Promotion of Women (MPSPPW) to manage the coordination, monitoring and evaluation of social protection system. The Ministry is responsible for the coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the social protection system including policy, programs and projects. The overall objective of this component is to strengthen the Ministry's capacity for laying the foundation of a social protection system. The main expected results of this component include the enhanced coordination of social protection sector through (i) the creation of a social protection committee ; (ii) annual report of main social protection program (iii) the harmonized approach to social safety net (targeting, registry, etc.), and (iv) the evaluation of selected social protection programs. The activities are designed to support the Ministry in coordinating the implementation of national social protection policy. The component will be implemented by the MPSPPW. To achieve the goals, this component will support coordination and monitoring of activities of the implementing agencies of main social protection programs and projects. The main activities of this subcomponent are: for coordination: (i) harmonization of the design of social safety net, especially public work (targeting, wage, registry,

complaints, etc.); (ii) elaboration of convention between stakeholders; (iii) creation of social protection committee. To improve the monitoring of the sector, the component would support, inter alia, (i) the creation of a database with the main social programs and projects including objectives, type of transfer, beneficiaries, performance indicators, etc.; (ii) the mapping of the main programs, and (iii) the establishment of a beneficiary registry of the programs implemented by Ministry.

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

The project will be implemented nation-wide precisely in selected poor geographic regions of Madagascar's south and east. The selection of geographic areas of intervention was determined based on the following criteria, namely: poverty status, availability of functioning schools and the national nutrition program, as well as the productive potential.

#### **5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists**

Cheikh A. T. Sagna (GSURR)

Marie Diop (GSURR)

Paul-Jean Feno (GENDR)

<b>6. Safeguard Policies</b>	<b>Triggered?</b>	<b>Explanation (Optional)</b>
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The policy is triggered because of the project intended activities foreseen in component 2, which will rehabilitate or rebuilt school infrastructure in a cyclone proof way, with designs developed by FID and the Ministry of Education, as well as rehabilitate the back log of damaged community infrastructure that has been accumulated from past disasters. Because of the site specific nature of the project, and its intended localized impacts, the Borrower has prepared an ESMF, built from similar active projects conducted by FID before in Madagascar. Once ready, the ESMF will be consulted upon and cleared by the Bank prior to its public disclosure both in country and at the InfoShop before appraisal.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The project is not being implemented in natural habitats and does not affect them.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	The project does not involve forests or forestry and does not affect them.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	The project does not involve pest management. The Project will promote organic fertilizers (manure and composts) without using chemical fertilizers and pesticides (which would in any case be very expensive, inaccessible to the poor beneficiaries and not available in all project areas)
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	It is unlikely that there are physical cultural resources in the project area, nevertheless, in the likelihood that such an encounter occurs during project implementation, provision of chance finds approach is been embedded in the ESMF that the borrower will apply as mitigation

		measures to avoid any potential adverse impacts on these physical cultural resources.
Indigenous Peoples OP/ BP 4.10	No	The Policy is not triggered due to the fact that, although the project has a national coverage, given the budget constraint, the identified project activities in component 2 (rehabilitation and/or rebuilding of school and other local infrastructures affected by the cyclones) will be rather implemented in the following geographical regions, namely, center-south, extreme-south and south-east located far away from the South-West where the Mikea community live.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	The Policy is triggered due to the civil works activities to be carried out under the rehabilitation and reconstruction of damaged infrastructure after disasters and Productive Safety Net. Although up until now FID has been genuinely dealing with such small scales issues, the matter fact is that under this project, the volume of activities likely to lead to issues of land acquisition remains yet unknown. Given the unknown footprint of the project, the Borrower has prepared an RPF to set forth the basic principles and prerogatives to be followed once details characteristics of the project sites are known. Like the ESMF, the RPF has been consulted upon and cleared by the Bank prior to its public disclosure both in-country and at the InfoShop before appraisal.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	N/A
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	N/A
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	N/A

## II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

### A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

#### 1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:

Parts of the activities financed under the Project are expected to have no environmental and social safeguard aspect as they focus on cash transfers, capacity building & training, as well as the provision of technical assistance, materials, equipment and operational costs.

The proposed project will finance the Productive Safety Net (PSN) activities and some civil works activities, namely reconstruction/rehabilitation of small scale rural infrastructure damaged by natural disasters. In the aftermath of a disaster, existing community infrastructure like classrooms/schools, health centers, market places and feeder roads could be rehabilitated. This part of the project activities could produce some adverse negative impacts. Likely adverse impacts include air, soil and water pollution, loss of vegetation, soil erosion, traffic accidents, and potential loss of

livelihoods and/or land required for future infrastructure investments.

In contrast, the cash for works activities meant to provide cash to targeted poor families in exchange for their participation in small group community work activities may not expose them to significant risks of HIV/AIDS, or cause damage to the existing physical and social environment. These Productive Safety Net (PSN) activities will be carried out at the level of small landscape areas composed of several villages. The activities will be planned through a participatory process, and implemented sequentially over a period of three years with the objective of fostering soil conservation, water harvesting, reforestation and terracing in a sustainable manner. The Project will promote organic fertilizers (manure and composts) without using chemical fertilizers and pesticides (which would in any case be very expensive, inaccessible to the poor beneficiaries and not available in all project areas). The activities will include training and capacity building of beneficiaries in soil conservation, terracing) for which the beneficiaries will be provide with small equipment. The reforestation activities will adopt an approach of mixing arboriculture and cassava or corn in the existing parcels of the beneficiary households to increase productivity and soil fertility in identified areas. The areas for the reforestation activities will be zones surrounding the villages with existing local species and small density of less of 500 plants per subproject which are grown in small community nurseries. The reforestation aims to reduce soil erosion and, in the longer term, also contribute to the local economy. The proposed activities/subprojects will be undertaken through a consultative and participatory process meant to foster ownership and social accountability.

Overall, the potential adverse environmental and social risks and impacts of the proposed sub-projects are expected to be small in scale and site specific, albeit minor, typical of category B projects. Three safeguard policies are triggered: OP/BP 4.01 (Environmental Assessment), OP/BP 4.12 (Involuntary Resettlement) and OP/BP 4.11 (Physical cultural Resources), of which two standalone safeguards instruments are prepared to mitigate the potential environmental and social risks and impacts of the project, namely Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) to be public disclosed both in-country and at the Infoshop prior to appraisal, once cleared and approved by both the Country and the World Bank.

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

The planned sub-projects are not expected to incur any potential indirect and/or long term impacts resulting from the reconstruction/rehabilitation of small scale sub-projects. It is not expected to have long term adverse environmental and social impacts on future activities in the potential project areas. Overall project impacts are considered modest and will be site specific and easily manageable. The implementing agency FID has experience and has implemented sub-projects in the past in a satisfactory manner, including under the ongoing Madagascar Emergency Infrastructure Preservation and Vulnerability Reduction Project (P132101) financed by IDA.

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

Given that this project is somewhat a continuation or extension of an ongoing Madagascar Emergency Infrastructure Preservation and Vulnerability Reduction Project (P132101) financed by IDA, project alternatives are not considered since most of the activities are identical or of the same nature and/or scale.

**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.**

Since the exact physical locations of future civil works activities, namely reconstruction/rehabilitation of small scale rural sub-projects as well as their potential localized adverse environmental and social impacts and risks could not be identified prior to the appraisal of the proposed project, the Borrower has prepared two standalone safeguards instruments: (i) an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF); and (ii) a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF).

The ESMF outlines an environmental and social screening process for future sub-projects to ensure that they are environmentally and socially sound and sustainable. The ESMF also includes: (i) a basic

description of the natural and physical environment of the targeted project intervention zones in the country; (ii) a clear and coherent process to assess environmental and social impacts of subprojects to be financed which were improved with the lesson learned and the best practices developed by the current IDA financing; (iii) guidelines to adequately mitigate (avoid, minimize or reduce) any environmental and social impacts from financed subprojects; (iv) an environmental and social management Plan (ESMP) with an estimated budget and timeline; (v) public consultations and stakeholder participation with women, youth and vulnerable groups, municipalities and members of the local communities; (vi) a grievance redress mechanism that provides clearer guidance on how potential grievances will be handled throughout the project cycle; (vii) a monitoring and evaluation mechanism; (viii) a set of Social and Environmental Clauses (SEC) for private construction firms' compliance with safeguards measures outlined in these instruments and (ix) clear instructions on how possible findings of physical cultural resources will be managed and will be dealt with during Project implementation using chance-finds approaches in compliance with OP/BP 4.11 – Physical Cultural Resources. The RPF outlines the policies and procedures to be followed in the event that resettlement action/compensation plans will need to be prepared to mitigate potential adverse social impacts due to land acquisition.

At the project level, the FID has extensive experience in implementing IDA operations as noted with the ongoing Madagascar Emergency Infrastructure Preservation and Vulnerability Reduction Project (P132101) financed by IDA. FID Social and Environmental safeguards focal points is therefore tasked with ensuring compliance with environmental and social safeguards policies for all activities financed under the Project. This arrangement will be maintained but scaled up under the new Social Safety Net Project with the additional hiring/nomination of one person to oversee the social aspects, including gender during project implementation. The Two World Bank safeguards specialists will provide the 2 focal points with the needed support by strengthening their social and environmental technical capacity.

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

Key stakeholders include: women, youth and vulnerable groups, the beneficiary municipalities and local communities, including possible private firms to be procured to undertake some of the activities. The proposed Social Safety Net Project preparation process included a participatory consultative process. Extensive public consultations have been conducted during the preparation of ESMF and RPF to take into account the views and perceptions of communities and various stakeholders regarding the design and scope of the project. FID has extensive experience engaging public consultations and also in the Bank's disclosure policy. During the implementation of the proposed project, the FID will initiate the public consultations as early as possible and will provide all relevant materials in a form and language (s) acceptable and accessible to all beneficiaries involved. Once cleared by the Bank, the ESMF and RPF, will be publicly disclosed both in-country and at the Infoshop prior to appraisal.



**B. Disclosure Requirements**

<b>Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	23-Feb-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	06-Mar-2015
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	00000000
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
Madagascar	27-Feb-2015
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	23-Feb-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	06-Mar-2015
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
Madagascar	27-Feb-2015
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>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.</b>	
<b>If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:</b>	

**C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level**

<b>OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment</b>	
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"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources</b>	
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"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement</b>	
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"/> ]
<b>The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information</b>	
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"/> ]
<b>All Safeguard Policies</b>	
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"/> ]

### III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Andrea Vermehren	
<b><i>Approved By</i></b>		
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name:	Date: