

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

Report No.: PIDISDSA17485

Date Prepared/Updated: 25-May-2016

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country:	Nepal	Project ID:	P157607
		Parent Project ID (if any):	P095977
Project Name:	Additional finance to Road Sector Development Project (P157607)		
Parent Project Name:	Road Sector Development Project (P095977)		
Region:	SOUTH ASIA		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	20-May-2016	Estimated Board Date:	16-Jun-2016
Practice Area (Lead):	Transport & ICT	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	Rural and Inter-Urban Roads and Highways (80%), Public administration-Transportation (20%)		
Theme(s):	Rural services and infrastructure (40%), Managing for development results (20%), Natural disaster management (40%)		
Borrower(s):	Government of Nepal represented by Ministry of Finance		
Implementing Agency:	Department of Roads		
Financing (in USD Million)			
	Financing Source	Amount	
	BORROWER/RECIPIENT	10.00	
	International Development Association (IDA)	5.00	
	IDA Credit from CRW	50.00	
	Total Project Cost	65.00	
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):	The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate		
Other Decision:			

Is this a Repeater project?	No
------------------------------------	----

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

Nepal is a land-locked country characterized by topographic extremes. The southern "Terai" region sits close to sea level while the northern "mountain" region contains the world's highest peaks. About 25% of Nepal's 27.8 million people classify as poor. Average per capita income in 2014 was about US\$ 760. Nepal has made remarkable progress in poverty reduction and human development by halving the percentage of people living on less than US\$ 1.25 a day between 2003/2004 and 2010/2011. Several important social-sector indicators relating to education, health and gender also improved over this period. Nepal has successfully transitioned away from its decade long "people's war" that officially ended in 2006. A new constitution was promulgated in September 2015 which envisages a federal model of government and a stronger role for states / provinces in delivering basic services.

Despite heartening progress, Nepal faces many development challenges. Most recently, political unrest and instances of violence followed the new constitution. Trade along the border with India suffered disruptions between September 2015 and February 2016. These events followed on the heels of devastating earthquakes that struck Nepal in April and May of 2015. Disrupted trade limited the availability of fuel, construction materials, and other imported items needed for reconstruction. Nepal's post-quake recovery has suffered considerable delays as a result.

Sectoral and institutional Context

Aside from Nepal's political challenges, poor and insufficient infrastructure is the single most important economic bottleneck to growth in Nepal. Deficient infrastructure services hold back job growth, increase the cost of doing business, and reduce Nepal's attractiveness for investment. The World Economic Forum's 2014/15 Global Competitiveness Report ranked Nepal 132nd out of 144 countries in overall quality of infrastructure. Nepal needs to be investing somewhere between 8 and 12 percent of GDP per annum until 2020 in order to address its infrastructure gap. Energy and transport alone account for approximately 2/3rds of required investment. Improved transport linkages are particularly critical for reducing the cost of doing business in Nepal. For example, the international Finance Corporation's 2014 'doing business' survey observes that the average cost of importing or exporting a 20 ft shipping container from Kathmandu is about US\$ 2,295. This is 28% higher than the average for all countries in South Asia. Roughly 61% of estimated export costs relate to inland transportation and handling which hints at the impact that transportation has on the cost structures of Nepal's private enterprises.

Nepal's transport sector remains vulnerable to climate change and seismic events. The hill and mountains that characterize project locations are susceptible to extreme precipitation, earthquakes, and landslides that can result in severed connectivity, loss of life, and damage to property. The medium and long term local effects of climate change in Nepal remain uncertain. However, global level predictions indicate that mountainous regions are likely to undergo significant changes. The International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), states that "there is high confidence that changes in heat waves, glacial retreat, and/or permafrost degradation will affect high-mountain phenomena such as slope instabilities, landslides, and

glacial lake outburst floods. There is also high confidence that changes in heavy precipitation will affect landslides in some regions." Strengthening the resilience of Nepal's road and bridge network, particularly through improved maintenance of assets, more resilient upfront construction, and improved capacity to respond to unforeseen events, is important for adapting to whatever eventualities climate change will bring for Nepal.

RSDP's objective is "for the residents of beneficiary districts to have all season road access thereby reducing travel time and improving access to economic centers and social services." IDA's original support to the Road Sector Development Project (RSDP) in the amount of SDR 27.89 million was signed on January 31, 2008 with an envisaged closing date of June 30, 2012. A first Additional Financing in the amount of SDR 48.3 million was signed on March 4, 2011 with a closing date of June 30, 2015, later extended to June 30, 2016 for Credit No. 5002-NP. This first Additional Financing scaled-up activities to enhance the impact of the original project intervention and specifically included: (i) an additional 408 km of road upgrading; and (ii) an additional 2,100 km of road maintenance; and (iii) further support for institutional development relating to human resources, road safety, quality management, and IT systems.

RSDP has been the cornerstone of the Association's support to Nepal's Strategic Road's Network for the past three IDA funding cycles. The primary focus of RSDP's civil works has been to develop connectivity in the Far-Western and Mid-Western regions which are among the poorest and least connected areas of Nepal. A key aim of RSDP has been to connect eight remote district headquarters with all-weather roads. The project's key results to date include: (i) increasing the share of beneficiaries within a 20 minute walk to an all-weather road from 8% of the population to 15% of the population in target districts; (ii) reduction of journey times by approximately 35%; (ii) upgrading and rehabilitation of 680 km of roads; (iii) periodic maintenance of 2,608 km of roads.

RSDP's technical assistance to Nepal's Department of Roads (DOR) and Ministry of Physical Infrastructure and Transport (MoPIT) has also been critical to supporting development of the Strategic Road Network (SRN). This has included the following: (i) development of a Priority Investment Program (PIP) in 2007 and subsequent ex-post review of that program in 2014/15; (ii) development of the Bridge Management System (BMS) which enabled the IDA- supported Bridges Improvement and Maintenance Program (BIMP, P125495) to use a results-based approach under the Association's new Program for Results (PforR) instrument; and (iii) development of a department-wide Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF). Most recently, RSDP supported the DOR to undertake a rapid condition assessment of 389 quake affected bridges in the Central and Western Development Region to identify the extent of damages and options for remediation.

RSDP's structure consists of two components as follows:

Component I (Road Upgrading): which includes (i) road upgrading; (ii) periodic maintenance; and (iii) road safety works; and

Component II (Institutional Strengthening and Project Implementation Support): which includes training and development and support to increase capacity relating to the management of Nepal's Strategic Roads Network and project-specific incremental tasks.

To date, RSDP's implementation progress and progress towards achieving the Project Development Objective (PDO) are both rated as "moderately satisfactory." RSDP's original IDA grant (H339-NP) and subsequent IDA grant and IDA credit provided under the first Additional Financing (i.e. Credit 4832-NP, Grant H629-NP) have fully disbursed the allocated amounts. IDA's remaining commitment from the first Additional Financing (IDA Credit 5002-NP) has disbursed 43.5% of the committed amount as of April 30, 2016. It is unlikely that the available funds will be fully utilized by the current closing date of June 30, 2016 due to delays resulting from post-earthquake instability and trade disruptions along the border with India. These have now been substantially resolved. This second Additional Financing will extend the closing date of IDA Credit 5002-NP to July 17, 2017 to provide additional time to complete the construction of ongoing works.

The Association's last implementation support and review mission of RSDP between February 29 and March 4, 2016 confirmed that the project is in substantial compliance with legal covenants and that implementation of fiduciary frameworks is acceptable. The review also concluded that the implementation of safeguards activities remain satisfactory and there were no major safeguards issues. There are no outstanding audit reports under RSDP or under any other transport sector project in Nepal. The overall project risk rating for RSDP is "moderate."

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Original Project Development Objective(s) - Parent

The Project Development Objective is for the residents of beneficiary districts to have all season road access thereby reducing travel time and improving access to economic centers and social services.

Key Results

(i) reduced bridge vulnerability; (ii) enhanced resilience of RSDP roads; (iii) enhanced access as reported by beneficiaries.

D. Project Description

This Additional Financing (AF) will provide additional resources of US\$ 55.0 million equivalent to the ongoing Nepal Road Sector Development Project (RSDP, P095977 IDA Credit Nos. 4832-NP, 5002-NP and IDA Grant Nos. H-339-NP, H-629-NP). Of the above, IDA Credit No. 5002-NP is currently the only remaining active credit supporting the parent operation. The Association's total support to the AF will consist of US\$ 5 million of IDA commitment plus an additional US\$ 50 million equivalent from the IDA Crisis Response Window to support the following: (i) Road and bridge works (including road safety enhancements); (ii) Post-earthquake reconstruction and resilience enhancements to Nepal's Strategic Roads Network; and (iii) Technical assistance to improve investment planning and implementation capacity within the institutions that manage Nepal's Strategic Roads Network.

This scope of works constitutes both a scale up of project activities and a restructuring of components to address post-quake needs, further capacity development, and resilience enhancements. The Government of Nepal (GON) originally requested additional financing for the project through a letter from the Ministry of Finance (MoF) to the Bank dated May 18, 2015. In addition to IDA's contribution to support for the AF, GON would also contribute US\$ 10.0 million for a total AF project size of US\$ 65.0 million.

Component Name

Component I: Road and Bridge Development (formerly Road Development)

Comments (optional)

Component I will support: (i) upgrading of approximately 20 km of RSDP with slope stabilization works and all weather surfacing, where needed; (ii) construction of 33 bridges along gaps in SRN roads and replacement of three earthquake damaged modular steel bridges with permanent structures in the Central Development Region; (iii) major maintenance of approximately 55 existing SRN bridges and quake affected bridges; (iv) road safety audits of all SRN highways to inform the identification of high priority road safety investments for inclusion in an updated Priority Investment Program; and (v) minor maintenance of approximately 300 bridges (11,000 meters) in the Central and Western Development Regions as identified during an IDA-supported post-quake assessment of bridges in the summer 2015.

Component Name

Component II: Institutional Strengthening and Project Implementation Support

Comments (optional)

Component II will continue to support technical audits of the civil works carried out under the Project (sub-component 2.ix) and implementation support (sub-component 2.x). The Additional Finance will also support technical assistance and training to improved planning of DOR's capital investment program and the execution of physical works projects, including: (a) training and capacity development for DOR/MoPIT staff; (b) updating the PIP for the further development of the Strategic Roads Network; (c) carrying out of beneficiary outreach and feedback collection activities. It will also support the undertaking of pre-investment studies for the preparation of one or more high-priority follow-up projects in the road sector as identified in the updated PIP (sub-component 2.xi).

Component Name

Component III: Resilience Enhancements

Comments (optional)

A new Component III under this second Additional Finance will support: (i) provision and staging of 2,000 meters of modular steel bridges; and (ii) provision and staging of heavy equipment at DOR's five heavy equipment division locations (for example: cranes, dozers, mix plants, and excavators) for rapid response to unforeseen failures along the Strategic Roads Network. Bailey bridges and equipment to support emergency repairs will be staged at DOR's five regional offices or any other strategically suitable locations in order to provide access to different parts of the SRN and to strengthen overall resilience of the network.

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

RSDP covers 10 original districts that will continue to benefit under the additional finance include districts in the Far-West and Mid-West hilly regions of Nepal, including: Darchula, Baitadi, Kalikot, Dailekh, Surkhet, Bajhang, Jumla, Rukum, Salyan and Jajarkotin. Additional Financing will also undertake bridge works in a total of 25 districts beyond RSDP's original 10. These include: Rupandehi, Nawalparasi, Palpa, Chitwan, Syangja, Tanahu, Kaski, Lamjung, Gorkha, Dhading, Parsa, Bara, Makwanpur, Nuwakot, Rasuwa, Sindhupalchok, Kathmandu, Lalitpur, Bhaktapur, Kavre, Dolakha, Ramechhap, Sinduli, Okhaldhunga, Solukhumbu, and any other

district agreed with the Association. The mountainous/hilly terrain in many districts is physically fragile, and landslides/ soil erosion are common. There are a number of streams/ rivers and local water springs in the region. The dominant land use in the project regions is mixture of agriculture, forest, and scattered settlements. Community forests are common and managed well. Nepal is rich in ethnic diversity. The project areas are inhabited by people of various cultures and castes. None of the proposed activities are envisaged to directly affect any Indigenous communities.

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Annu Rajbhandari (GEN06)

Jun Zeng (GSU06)

II. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

The RSDP Project Coordination team (PCT) within the Department of Roads (DOR) will implement the project under the Ministry of Physical Infrastructure and Transport (MoPIT). Implementation will rely heavily on field-based RSDP offices or DOR's divisional offices that are based near construction sites. RSDP field offices are already equipped with project vehicles and other logistics (e.g. computers) that will be required for implementation. DOR's planning branch will be responsible overseeing the technical design standards, norms, and safeguards applied to the project (via the ESMF) in close coordination with DOR's bridge branch which manages technical standards relating to bridges. The RSDP PCT will be responsible for awarding project contracts and carrying out day-to-day supervision of works. DOR's E-procurement system has proven effective at reducing bidder collusion and intimidation and will serve as the means for procuring civil works under the RSSP operation. The implementation approach to all safeguards related aspects of RSSP will be identical to the ongoing RSDP operation. Similarly, fiduciary arrangements will be the same as under RSDP. The Association will manage project supervision in tandem with ongoing supervision activities for RSDP.

III. Safeguard Policies that might apply

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	Construction activities within or in close vicinity of the existing Road Right of Way may have limited impacts on air quality, water quality, soil erosion, health & safety etc.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	No construction works envisaged in protected area/ natural habitat.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	Triggered as precaution. Slope stability works and some of bridge construction works may require tree felling in areas adjacent to RoW, if the site is in forest area.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	Not applicable.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	Existence of PCR has not been reported within RoW or in close vicinity. ESMF and Addendum have provision for managing "chance find."
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP	Yes	There are IP groups present in or have collective

4.10		attachment to the project area. The issue will be addressed through ESMF implementation. Vulnerable Community Development Framework (VCDF) is part of the ESMF, and covers indigenous people.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/ BP 4.12	Yes	Proposed project activities such as slope stabilization and New Bridge may cause additional land taking. The issue will be addressed through ESMF implementation. The existing ESMF contains Resettlement Framework (RPF).
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	Not applicable.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	Not applicable.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/ BP 7.60	No	Not applicable.

IV. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

<p>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</p> <p>The Environmental and Social Safeguards performance of the RSDP parent operation (original project) has been rated as satisfactory. The proposed additional financing includes four major Components: (i) Component I - road and bridge development; (ii) Component II - institutional strengthening and project implementation support; and (iii) Component III - resilience enhancements.</p> <p>Based on the information available at this stage, none of the activities of the proposed project (RSDP AF II) are envisaged to have large scale, significant and/or irreversible or unprecedented social or environmental adverse impacts. However, site-specific limited adverse impacts are likely which will need to be thoroughly assessed, documented and managed adhering to the DoR ESMF and the Addendum (applicable to the Bridges - BIMP) which have been prepared and approved as per standard provisions of the World Bank and those of the GON. Common environmental issues likely to be encountered include slope stability/landslides/ erosion, degradation of river/ stream water, construction period disturbances including dust pollution and spoil disposal, health and safety, etc. The disposal of excavated materials, location of drain outlets, drainage management, and quarrying operations are important.</p> <p>As most of the activities for the road upgrading and bridge works are limited to the existing Right of Way (RoW), no adverse impacts on the ethnic/Indigenous communities, physical cultural resources, community assets or private properties, natural habitat, and forest are envisaged. However, slope stabilization, construction of bridges on the existing roads, maintenance of bridges, and storage of parts/ components for modular bridges may have limited environmental and social adverse impacts which will require site specific documentation and mitigation. This includes safeguard assessments, preparation of the required site plans and their implementation according to the provisions of the ESMF.</p>
<p>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities</p>

in the project area:
There is no long-term adverse impacts envisaged due to the project implementation.
3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.
N/A (there are no adverse long term impacts envisaged)
4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.
The borrower (GON) has an approved ESMF in place, including an addendum applicable to the IDA-supported Bridges Improvement and Maintenance Program Bridge component (BIMP, P125495). They both have been reviewed and cleared by the Bank, and will be applicable to the proposed project (RSDP AF II). DOR has experience of implementing its existing Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) for both bridges and road investments. Previous IDA supported operations have helped develop the ESMF to cover impacts of both road and bridge works. The safeguard performance of the parent project has been rated satisfactory. Each of the roads supported in the original project has been screened for potential environmental impacts, and specific instrument such as IEE/ EMAP, RAPs, VCDPs etc. have been prepared and implemented successfully. Bridge maintenance activities are planned for the first year of implementation. All of them have been screened and found having low social and environmental safeguard risk, and hence do not require will require additional safeguard documents.
5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.
The GON approved ESMF and ESMF Addendum 2013 applicable to this project has been already disclosed during the earlier phase of the project and is available online via the website of the Department of Roads which is the implementing agency of this project. Community consultations with and information dissemination to the project affected people shall be conducted during the preparation and implementation stages of the project. The existing ESMF together with the Addendum sufficiently covers environmental and social requirements and provide guidance for road and bridge related activities proposed under the AF. Procurement plan shows that maintenance and rehabilitations of the bridges are planned for the first year of implementation; each of which has been screened which concluded that none of the proposed maintenance work requires specific/ separate environmental safeguard document because of low social and environmental safeguard risk. Client will continue screening and preparing specific documents, as required, for the activities/ subprojects that will be implemented in the second year or later.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	09-Jul-2007
Date of submission to InfoShop	12-Sep-2007
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	

<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	09-Jul-2007
Date of submission to InfoShop	12-Sep-2007
"In country" Disclosure	
<i>Comments:</i>	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	09-Jul-2007
Date of submission to InfoShop	12-Sep-2007
"In country" Disclosure	
<i>Comments:</i>	
If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.	
If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:	

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment	
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples	
Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement	
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Is physical displacement/relocation expected?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] TBD [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Provided estimated number of people to be affected	

Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] TBD [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Provided estimated number of people to be affected	
OP/BP 4.36 - Forests	
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information	
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
All Safeguard Policies	
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

V. Contact point

World Bank

Contact: A.K. Farhad Ahmed

Title: Sr Transport. Spec.

Contact: Dominic Pasquale Patella

Title: Sr Transport. Spec.

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name: Government of Nepal represented by Ministry of Finance

Contact: Dr. Baikuntha Aryal

Title: Joint Secretary

Email: baryal@mof.gov.np

Implementing Agencies

Name: Department of Roads
Contact: Mr. Sanjaya Kumar Shrestha
Title: Project Director
Email: sanjayashrestha@dor.gov.np

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: A.K. Farhad Ahmed, Dominic Pasquale Patella	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Zia Al Jalaly (SA)	Date: 24-May-2016
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Karla Gonzalez Carvajal (PMGR)	Date: 24-May-2016
Country Director:	Name: Takuya Kamata (CD)	Date: 25-May-2016