

**COMBINED PROJECT INFORMATION DOCUMENTS / INTEGRATED  
SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET (PID/ISDS)  
ADDITIONAL FINANCING**

**Report No.:** PIDISDSA19643

**Date Prepared/Updated:** 28-Sep-2016

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**A. Basic Project Data**

<b>Country:</b>	Madagascar	<b>Project ID:</b>	P160554
		<b>Parent Project ID (if any):</b>	P149323
<b>Project Name:</b>	AF Social Safety Net Drought Response (P160554)		
<b>Parent Project Name:</b>	Social Safety Net Project (P149323)		
<b>Region:</b>	AFRICA		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	07-Nov-2016	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	10-Nov-2016
<b>Practice Area (Lead):</b>	Social Protection & Labor	<b>Lending Instrument:</b>	Investment Project Financing
<b>Borrower(s):</b>			
<b>Implementing Agency:</b>	ONN/PNNC-SEECALINE, FID		
<b>Financing (in USD Million)</b>			
	<b>Financing Source</b>		<b>Amount</b>
	International Development Association (IDA)		15.00
	IDA Credit from CRW		20.00
	Financing Gap		0.00
	Total Project Cost		35.00
<b>Environmental Category:</b>	B - Partial Assessment		
<b>Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):</b>	The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate		
<b>Other Decision:</b>			
<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	No		

## **B. Introduction and Context**

### **Country Context**

Madagascar is one of the poorest countries in the world with respect to both the breadth and depth of poverty. Almost 78 percent (2015) of Madagascar's population of 24.2 million people live on less than US\$1.90 per day. These 19 million people make Madagascar the country with the sixth highest number of poor in the world. A stunningly high proportion of close to 60 percent of the population is estimated to be extremely poor based on the minimum food intake methodology. This means that close to 13 million Malagasy people live on resources that fall below the cost of about 2,100 calories a day. Madagascar also has the world's fourth highest rate of chronic malnutrition, with almost half of all children under five stunted.

The South is the poorest and most isolated part of the country. Three regions belong to the South: Androy, Anosy and Atsimo Andrefana. An analysis of the socio-economic situation of the eight drought-affected districts of the South confirms the severe underperformance of the region in all human development related aspects. Almost half of the children ages 6 to 10 never go to school, alphabetization rates for people ages 15 and higher are much lower at 43,7 percent against 71,6 percent at the national average, and average food consumption per capita is about 1/3 lower than the national average. Vaccination rates for children 12 to 23 months are between 31 percent and 37 percent, compared to a national average of 51 percent. The South is also characterized by a fragile social and political context (e.g. trafficking of cattle/gold/gems, abuse of human rights) with increased insecurity due to roaming gangs and a general sense of lawlessness.

### **Sectoral and institutional Context**

The South is one of the most under-served regions of the country with respect to public investment. The Public Expenditure Review (PER) of the health and education sectors conducted by the World Bank and UNICEF in 2014/15 shows that the poorest regions have the lowest amount of spending on these key sectors (see Annex VII). The low amount of education and health expenditure in rural areas as compared to urban areas is indicative of large inequities in the distribution of public resources, mostly driven by the inequitable distribution of investments and human resources across the country. Cuts in public spending to social sectors during the crisis resulted in large increases in out-of-pocket household spending, in particular on education. This had far-reaching consequences for children's enrollment in primary schools and learning outcomes, as well as the utilization of health services. Furthermore, investments in economic infrastructure (roads, water, electricity etc.) have been largely absent in the last decades. Instead, a substantial amount of humanitarian aid has been brought into the country to support the population of approximately 6.4 million people, largely through food aid.

In addition to the already harsh living conditions in this region, the more recent phenomenon of El Niño caused a prolonged, severe drought, particularly affecting the South. The population of this region has already suffered through several successive years of poor crop yields, starting with a major locust invasion in 2013. The last two years have seen droughts that are more severe and broader in scope than predicted. Poor crop yields and the subsequent decimation of livestock have had a devastating impact on the population in the South. The Ministry of Agriculture in collaboration with the World Food Program (WFP), the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and UNICEF have been assessing the situation periodically over the past year. According to data collected in late February 2016, they estimated that:

- (€ 1,140,000 people are in a situation of food insecurity (about 80 percent of the population of the Southern districts), of which more than half are in a situation of severe food insecurity. This is 14 percent higher than in March 2015;
- (€ 45,000 children between 6 months and 5 years suffer from Moderate Acute Malnutrition (MAM); 10,000 suffer from Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) with faster rising trends in the past year;
- (€ In a number of communes, moderate acute malnutrition of children is now above the 15-percent mark signaling an emergency in terms of nutritional outcomes. In some pockets of the Androy region, large food consumption gaps are likely, in line with Emergency (IPC Phase 4) expected outcomes between October 2016 and January 2017 ;
- (€ Crop yields will be nil for maize and at 20 percent of the historical average for cassava, the main staples of the poor in the South.

The AF will provide cash transfers, livelihood recovery grants and nutrition services to over 65,000 extreme poor households (approximately 300,0000 people) in the most drought-affected communities of the regions of Androy and Anosy of Madagascar. Over time, the AF will transition from emergency response to early recovery through safety net and nutrition services that will be increasingly aligned with the ongoing safety net services and enhanced community-based nutrition services of other regions, thus moving towards a more development oriented approach.

The AF will scale up the following components of the SSNP over a three year period:

➤(€ Subcomponent 1.3: Early Recovery Response to Natural Disasters (original \$4 million, additional \$30.9 million) - scale-up through cash transfers, nutrition treatment and prevention services, and livelihood recovery grants. In light of the high rate of moderate acute malnutrition among children under five and the fact that the initial credit of the IDA-funded Emergency Support to Critical Education, Health and Nutrition Services Project (➤( PAUSENS➤( , P131945) will close in December 2016, the subcomponent will include financing for key nutrition interventions;

➤(€ Component 2: Strengthening Safety Net Administration, Monitoring, and Social Accountability (original \$6.5 million, additional \$3.1 million)- scale-up funding for project management; and

➤(€ Component 3: Building the institutional capacity for coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the social protection system (original \$3.3 million, additional \$1 million) ➤( scale-up to strengthen the Government➤( s presence in the South of Madagascar.

## **C. Proposed Development Objective(s)**

### **Original Project Development Objective(s) - Parent**

The project development objective (PDO) is to support the government in increasing the access of extremely poor households to safety net services and in laying the foundations for a social protection system.

### **Key Results**

The following are the key results indicators being measured as part of the Additional Financing:  
PDO LEVEL INDICATORS:

- a) REVISED: Direct project beneficiaries: end target revised upward to include additional population to be targeted by the AF
  - b) NEW: Pregnant/lactating women, adolescent girls and/or children under age five-reached by basic nutrition services (number): added to account for new nutrition activities under the AF
- Breakdown Indicators:
- Children under age five treated for moderate or severe acute malnutrition (number)
  - Pregnant/lactating women, adolescent girls and/or children under age five- reached by basic nutrition services (number)

#### INTERMEDIATE LEVEL INDICATORS:

- a) NEW: Percentage of safety net beneficiaries in the South using the livelihood grant for productive activities: added to account for new safety nets activity in the South under the AF
  - b) NEW: Children 0 to 59 months monitored at the community nutrition sites: added to account for nutrition activities under the AF
  - c) REVISED: Beneficiaries of Safety Nets programs (number): End target revised upward to include additional population to be targeted by the AF
- Breakdown Indicator:
- Beneficiaries of Safety Nets programs - Female (number)

### **D. Project Description**

The AF will scale up the activities under the "Early Recovery Response to Natural Disasters Subcomponent (1.3) of the Social Safety Net Project. It includes the following new activities:

- a. The payment of cash transfers to about 65,000 drought-affected households (300,000 people) in the selected five districts. Based on updated beneficiary lists of the nutrition program, the FID will enroll eligible households for the cash transfer program in October 2016 so that first cash payments can start in November 2016 to about 45,000 pre-identified households with children 0-5 years of age. Monthly payments will be made to the female head of the household. An additional 20,000 households with children 6-12 will be enrolled in 2017 to receive payments as soon as possible. All cash payments will be delivered through third party entities such as microfinance institutions, mobile banking agents, or NGOs, based on a competitive selection process. The cash transfers will evolve in the second year into conditional cash transfers linked to health and/or education services where available and will continue over a two year period. To harmonize the emergency cash program with the regular Human Development Cash Transfer (HDCT) Program implemented under Component 1.2 of the project, the cash transfer will be reduced to the level provided under the ongoing HDCT program with bi-monthly payments to the female household head.
- b. Beneficiary households will also receive livelihood recovery grants to allow for the purchase of inputs/assets for livelihood recovery. The first livelihood grants will be made available during the first three months of the emergency response (during November 2016 to January 2017) due to the fact that this time coincides with the planting season in the south, and that the precipitation forecast for the coming season is favorable. FAO, USAID and others are working on ensuring the provision of seeds. A second and larger livelihood recovery grant will be provided to beneficiaries in 2017, based on some orientation in business development and as far as possible in collaboration with micro-finance organizations. Beneficiaries will be accompanied

over several months by local organizations to follow through on the livelihood activities.

c. Funding for emergency response in light of an expected strong cyclone season due to La Nina in 2017. The AF will also include up to US\$ 2 million to prepare for emergency response to the expected effects (floods, cyclones, etc.) of La Nina. Activities include, as previously under subcomponent 1.3, cash for work activities as well as the rehabilitation of damaged small-scale social infrastructure.

d. Support for community-based nutrition services for treatment and prevention to about 74,000 children under five years of age and 19,000 pregnant/lactating women. During the first year of the project, nutrition services will focus primarily on providing a treatment and management package for moderately acute malnourished children (MAM). This includes screening of children, messaging on MAM to primary caregivers, six two-month treatment cycles for children under five who have MAM which includes lipid-based food supplementation (Plumpy-Sup) for the child, a protective food ration for the family to ensure compliance of the MAM treatment, and household level follow-up of families with cases of MAM. In addition, there will be referral from the community nutrition sites to health facilities for treatment of SAM cases. In year two and year three, treatment of MAM cases will focus on a screening of children, messaging on MAM to primary caregivers, lipid-based food supplementation for the child, and household level follow-up of families with cases of MAM. A more comprehensive nutrition package will be also be gradually scaled-up to include preventative services. This package will harmonize with other parts of the country and is currently being refined as part of the preparation of the new HNP IDA operation. These activities may include (but not limited to) a) growth monitoring, b) behavior change communication around reproductive, maternal and child health/nutrition (RMCHN), acute malnutrition and chronic malnutrition, c) intensive counseling, d) food diversification education including culinary demonstrations, d) early stimulation activities for children 0-30 months to increase impact on early child development outcomes and e) scale-up of effective prototypes currently being tested around behavior change, including messaging to mothers, more effective behavior change communication models at the community nutrition sites, training/coaching of service providers and women ( s cooperatives/income-generating modalities (for more detail, see Annex II).

Components 2 and 3 of the SSNP will be also be scaled up under the AF. US\$3.1 million will be added to Component 2 of the SSNP to ensure proper management of the safety net activities under the AF. This will include the opening of an additional FID office in the South (Fort Dauphin ) and a satellite office in Ambovombe, as well as funding for logistics, training of trainers, communication, payment fees etc. Furthermore, Component 3 will get an additional US\$ 1 million to enable the MPSPWP to carry out its coordination, monitoring and evaluation function in the South. This includes the rehabilitation of the two local offices, provision of transport, operating costs and technical assistance to enhance the Ministry's presence in the region and facilitate coordination, particularly between the humanitarian and the development partners. It also includes funding for program monitoring and evaluation.

**Component Name**

**Comments (optional)**

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

Anosy and Androy regions

**F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists**

Paul-Jean Feno (GEN07)

Peter F. B. A. Lafere (GSU01)

**II. Implementation**

**Institutional and Implementation Arrangements**

Subcomponent 1.3 and Component 2 are implemented by the Government of Madagascar through the Intervention Fund for Development (FID). The nutrition activities that will be included under the component 1.3 as part of the AF (for a total amount of \$8.5 million) will be implemented by the Project Implementation Unit (PNNC) of the National Community Nutrition Program (ONN) under the leadership of the National Nutrition Office (ONN). This is the same entity that is managing the implementation of the nutrition component of PAUSENS. The MPSPWP is responsible for the implementation of Component 3, as under the SSNP. As such, all three institutions will carry the fiduciary responsibilities for their respective activities. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the FID, ONN and the MPSPWP outlines the roles and responsibilities of the involved institutions, as well as the mechanisms for coordination, communication and monitoring.

**III. Safeguard Policies that might apply**

<b>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

#### 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:**

There are no potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts associated with the original project or with the activities proposed for the additional credit.

The majority of activities financed under the AF are expected to have no environmental and social safeguard impacts as they consist of small cash transfers, capacity building & training, as well as the provision of technical assistance, materials, equipment and operational costs. The scaling up of Components 2 and 3 of the Project is not expected to lead to any additional environmental or social safeguards impacts.

The proposed AF will significantly scale up Component 1.3 "Early Recovery Response to Natural Disasters" and would use similar instruments such as cash transfers and complementary measures like nutrition services. Under this component, the AF activities are expected to have in siting environmental and social safeguard impacts as they focus on rehabilitating and reconstructing damaged infrastructures in the affected communities to respond to rapid-onset disasters like those produced by cyclones and flooding. 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.

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, other health or safety hazards, or cause damage to the existing physical and social environment.

Parts of the activities financed under this AF is similar with the parent project (P149323). No new environmental risks are expected to arise and the amendment is not foreseen to trigger any new safeguard measures.

Overall, the potential adverse environmental and social risks and impacts of both the original project and the proposed AF are expected to be small in scale and site specific, typical of category B projects. The proposed AF remains Category B. The same three safeguard policies from the original project maintained triggered: OP/BP 4.01 (Environmental Assessment), OP/BP 4.12 (Involuntary Resettlement) and OP/BP 4.11 (Physical cultural Resources) and the current Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) for the parent project are sufficient and manage the risks and potential impacts under the proposed AF. These Safeguard framework instruments of parent project (ESMF and RPF) were approved by the Bank and disclosed on 27-Feb-2015 in the country and to infoshop 06-Mar-2015 before Appraisal.

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

As in the activities under the original project, the planned activities under the AF are not expected to incur any potential indirect and/or long term impacts.

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

The proposed project activities for the AF are of the same nature and/or scale as the original

project and adverse impacts are expected to be minimal. No alternatives have been considered.
<b>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.</b>
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 will only be identified during implementation of the proposed project, the Borrower disposes the safeguard instruments of the original project which are the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF); and its 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 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.
<b>5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.</b>
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 original 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. The ESMF and RPF of the parent project will be re-disclosed both in-country and at the Infoshop prior to effectiveness of the AF.

### **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	30-Sep-2016
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Madagascar	30-Sep-2016
<i>Comments:</i> The relevant documents for the AF would be disclosed prior to appraisal.	
<b>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	23-Feb-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	30-Sep-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
Madagascar	30-Sep-2016
<i>Comments:</i> The relevant documents for the AF would be disclosed prior to appraisal.	
<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 type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input checked="" 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"/> ]
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]    TBD [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Provided estimated number of people to be affected		
<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 type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input checked="" 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"/> ]

## V. Contact point

### World Bank

Contact: Andrea Vermehren  
Title: Lead Social Protection Specialist

Contact: Jumana N. Qamruddin  
Title: Senior Health Specialist

### Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name:  
Contact:  
Title:  
Email:

### Implementing Agencies

Name: ONN/PNNC-SEECALINE  
Contact: Christian RANAIVOSON  
Title: National Director  
Email: chri.ranaivoson@gmail.com

Name: FID  
Contact: Rasendra Ratsima  
Title: Directeur General  
Email: "FID - Rasendra RATSIMA" <dirgen1@fid.mg>,

## VI. 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>

## VII. Approval

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Andrea Vermehren, Jumana N. Qamruddin	
<b><i>Approved By</i></b>		
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Dena Ringold (PMGR)	Date: 28-Sep-2016
Country Director:	Name: Cristina Isabel Panasco Santos (CD)	Date: 29-Sep-2016