

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET  
APPRAISAL STAGE**

**Report No.: ISDSA1072**

**Date ISDS Prepared/Updated:** 25-Nov-2014

**Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed:** 26-Nov-2014

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**1. Basic Project Data**

<b>Country:</b>	Nicaragua	<b>Project ID:</b>	P148809
<b>Project Name:</b>	Caribbean Coast Food Security Project (P148809)		
<b>Task Team Leader:</b>	Augusto Garcia		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	20-Oct-2014	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	30-Jan-2015
<b>Managing Unit:</b>	GFADR	<b>Lending Instrument:</b>	Investment Project Financing
<b>Sector(s):</b>	General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (60%), Agro-industry, marketing, and trade (20%), Health (10%), Public administrati on- Agriculture, fishing and forestry (10%)		
<b>Theme(s):</b>	Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise support (40%), Nutrition and food security (40%), Rural non-farm income generation (10%), Managin g for development results (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>			
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	33.90	<b>Total Bank Financing:</b>	0.00
<b>Financing Gap:</b>	0.00		
<b>Financing Source</b>		<b>Amount</b>	
Borrower		0.00	
Global Agriculture and Food Security Program		33.90	
Total		33.90	
<b>Environmental Category:</b>	B - Partial Assessment		
<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	No		

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

The proposed project development objective is to enhance food and nutritional security in select communities of the Caribbean Coast of Nicaragua.

The PDO will be achieved by (a) enhancing productive and marketing capacities of farmers and rural enterprises through supporting the design, financing and implementation of Innovation Development Plans (IDPs); and (b) providing cross-cutting services to IDP beneficiaries in the areas of technology generation/transfer and nutrition education and communication.

### 3. Project Description

Component 1: Innovation Development Plans (IDPs) for strengthening productive and marketing capacity (US\$31.85, GAFSP Grant US\$26.50 million). This component will enhance the productive and marketing capacities of farmers and rural enterprises. It will do so by supporting the participatory design of business proposals known as Innovation Development Plans (IDPs), and financing their implementation. These IDPs will support groups of beneficiaries organized in different ways and to achieve goals related to production improvements, innovations, and the consolidation of market opportunities. The beneficiary mobilization and design of the IDPs, and the types of IDPs to be financed are briefly described below.

Beneficiary mobilization and design of IDPs. MEFFCA will identify and mobilize eligible beneficiaries through local consultations and promote the participatory design of IDPs investments. The activities will include inter alia: (i) the carrying out of communication and dissemination campaigns in targeted areas; (ii) technical support for the design of IDP proposals, including rapid and participatory value-chain assessments and territorial diagnostics; (iii) the provision of training to officials of eligible municipalities and technical service providers on critical areas of IDP preparation, implementation and monitoring; (iv) financial, social, environmental and technical assessments associated with IDP investments; (v) strengthening organizational and business capacities of producer groups, communities and small rural producer organizations as well as broad activities fostering smallholder linkages to markets; and (vi) the mobilization of technical assistance (TA) for sanitary and phytosanitary surveillance/services required to support the IDPs during the production and processing stages.

Typology of IDPs. The IDPs will receive project financing to cover investments for natural and non-natural resource-based activities and services with nutrition considerations. Natural resource-based IDPs will focus on the promotion of sustainable production, processing and/or commercialization improvements and innovations around family agriculture (including livestock) and artisanal fisheries. Non-natural resource-based IDPs will support innovative small and micro family and community enterprises and will strengthen their capacity to access markets and self-employment opportunities, emphasizing opportunities for women and young adults. The specific targeting and eligibility criteria for each IDP category are included in the Operational Manual, reflecting the particularities of the target groups and the different types of support. Four types of IDPs will be supported by the project:

(i) Family agriculture (including livestock). IDPs will seek to improve productivity that is diversified and climate smart. A mix of short-, medium- and long-term investment models will be supported (short term: vegetables and food crops; medium term: diversification through perennial crops; long term: agro-forestry/silvopastoral systems). Producers will be supported in the purchase and use of quality inputs (e.g. certified or improved seed/seedlings), the purchase of equipment and the adoption of good production/management practices and technologies (e.g. storage). For producers with commercialization potential, market linkages will also be supported.

(ii) Artisanal fisheries (and aquaculture). These IDPs will support improvements in production through financial and technical support to small-scale fisheries. The project will finance the

acquisition of equipment and boats suitable for small-scale fisheries; it will facilitate access to fishing supplies and seed capital. It will also support the adoption of environmental management practices; it will fund activities to add value to the production and encourage the establishment of partnerships between processing plants and beneficiary families.

(iii) Agricultural/agro-industrial ventures. These IDPs will focus on supporting agricultural/agro-industrial ventures from organizations of producers seeking to improve processes of value addition at the farm and collective level (selection, cleaning, washing, etc.) and fostering market linkages (partnerships/agreements with buyers).

(iv) Non-agricultural microenterprises. These IDPs will support gender-sensitive TA and training for production, marketing, business and environmental management, and investments in equipment/supplies needed to strengthen the productive capacity of microenterprises.

Component 2: Strengthening service provision for sustainable production, food security, and nutrition (US\$6.42, GAFSP Grant US\$4.10 million). This component will strengthen sectoral capacities for the provision of services in support to IDP beneficiaries in two broad areas:

(i) Technology generation/validation and transfer. These are activities to improve productivity and quality of agriculture production. The component will therefore enhance the institutional capacity of the Nicaraguan Institute of Agricultural Technology (INTA) to generate/validate and transfer sustainable technologies, encourage methodologies to support demand-driven approaches and farmer-to-farmer exchanges, and promote the adoption of sustainable production technologies and practices. The main activities include: (i) rehabilitation of two INTA Technological Development Centers in the Caribbean Coast and (ii) training of technical professionals and local lead producers (promoters) to support technology transfer to farmers benefiting from the IDPs.

(ii) Nutrition education and communication and nutrition-sensitive agriculture. These are activities to promote nutritional education and communication for diversified production and consumption. The component will finance nutrition education and communication activities that will promote improved feeding and food handling practices with specific emphasis on pregnant and breastfeeding women and children. Activities related to nutrition education and behavior change communications (BCC) will aim to raise awareness and knowledge about nutrition and the role of agriculture in improving nutrition outcomes, ensuring that appropriate channels are used to reach out both women and men.

Component 3: Project management, monitoring and evaluation (US\$3.73, GAFSP Grant US\$3.30 million). This component will finance incremental and operating costs, equipment and goods for MEFFCA, including a comprehensive M&E system. Activities will include project reporting, monitoring and evaluation with gender-differentiated aspects (monitoring IDPs, baseline, final evaluation, and rapid impact evaluation), financial management (including project audits) and procurement

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

The project area is the Caribbean Coast region of Nicaragua, given its high poverty rate, high profit potential and opportunities for efficiency gains. The project will target approximately 246 indigenous and mestizo communities in the municipalities of Puerto Cabezas, Bonanza, Rosita, Waspam, Siuna, Prinzapolka, Waslala, and Mulukuku in the North-Caribbean Autonomous Region (RACN), and Bocana de Paiwas, Bluefields, Kukra Hill, El Tortuguero, La Desembocadura de Rio Grande, Laguna

de Perlas, and La Cruz de Rio Grande in the South-Caribbean Autonomous Region (RACS).

The project municipalities were selected based on their high levels of poverty and malnutrition. Agricultural potential and the existence of similar projects were also considered in the selection of these 15 municipalities. The same criteria (poverty, malnutrition, agricultural or non-farm potential, and equitable geographic coverage) will guide the selection of beneficiary communities at the intra-municipal level.

In terms of surface extension, the project area covers a mayor part of the country's protected areas, including for example the Bosawás Biosphere Reserve and Indio-Mañz Biological Reserve. The project area suffers from ongoing environmental degradation due to the rapidly advancing agricultural frontier and other land use changes that are partly induced by immigrants from other parts of the country who are generally perceived as merely interested in short-term economic gains. Further, negative impacts of increasing climate variability and the overall low technical capacity amongst the population add to environmental vulnerability of the project area. Indigenous and Afro-Nicaraguan peoples living in the project area are expected to benefit from the project activities.

### 5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Jason Jacques Paiement (GSURR)

Tuuli Johanna Bernardini (GENDR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	Yes	Regarding socio-environmental management and safeguards needs, the project is classified as Category B and requires a partial Environmental Assessment (EA). Due to the small-scale and dispersed nature of the eligible investments, no large scale, significant and/or irreversible negative environmental or social impacts are foreseen. Beyond financing agricultural or other productive inputs, investments can entail minor facility/storage works and purchasing equipment that will require socio-environmental management. An Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has been prepared to guide demand-driven project implementation. Compared with the general baseline situation, the project is designed to promote an overall positive environmental impact through promotion and application of climate-smart agriculture and sustainable production/ fishing practices. The ESMF includes a negative list to secure exclusion of any large scale, significant and/or irreversible negative environmental or social impacts. Particularly, no activity that would imply advancing the agricultural frontier will be eligible for project funding.

Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	The project area includes various protected areas, including the Bosawás Biosphere Reserve and Indio-Mañz Biological Reserve. The project can fund activities that would impact positively said areas or other natural habitats, e.g. by engaging in sustainable use of their resources through participatory identification and development of alternative livelihood sources for people who depend on said areas for subsistence. Any project-funded activity that would impact a protected area requires that said area has a valid Management Plan and that the activity is compatible with the same. The ESMF includes a negative list that will exclude any activity that could lead to conversion or degradation of natural habitats.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	OP/BP 4.36 is triggered taken the project's focus on rural areas and a potential of IDPs related with sustainable forestry being proposed for project funding. Forestry doesn't belong to the core activities financed by the project, but taken its demand-driven nature and the local context and threats, awareness raising and capacity building on sustainable forestry and use of non-timber forest products (NTFP) will be embedded into IDPs design. Financing of timber production or harvesting is not expected, but the non-farm income activities could entail small investments for manufacture of articles made of legally logged wood. Project activities aim at reducing pressure to deforest for agriculture and/or livestock purposes and promoting agroforestry. Due to demanding socio-environmental management needs and lack of support at the community level, financing palm oil production with project funds will not be eligible.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	The project will finance agricultural activities where baseline conditions involve different types of agrochemicals and levels and practices of their usage. The project will promote Integrated Pest/ Crop Management through project-provided extension services. The ESMF provides the necessary initial guidance for said management. During implementation, concrete cases will need to be assessed in detail and managed accordingly.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/ BP 4.11	Yes	The project design does not particularly aim at financing activities related with physical cultural

		resources. However, taken its demand-driven nature and location in primarily indigenous territories, OP/BP 4.11 is triggered to make sure that component 2 on non-farm rural livelihoods will be able to address potential PCR/tourism-related IDPs. The project will only allow positive impacts on PCRs; the ESMF's negative list will exclude any activity that could lead to their degradation or destruction. The ESMF also guides for applicable archaeological chance find procedures.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	OP 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples will apply, as roughly 20 percent of eligible beneficiaries are likely to be indigenous or afro-descendent. As the exact nature and location of the project funded activities within the selected 15 municipalities of the Atlantic region will only be determined during project implementation, an Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) was prepared. During project implementation, the IPPF will assist MEFCCA to determine whether Indigenous Peoples or Afro-descendants are present in any of the project areas, and if so, to ensure that the interested communities support the proposed activities as well as any additional measures required to maximize their culturally appropriate benefits and/or avoid potentially adverse impacts.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	No	Due to the limited physical footprint of the proposed investments, no land acquisition or displacement of assets will be required. All technical assistance and equipment investments will be restricted to either lands privately owned by the participating producers and/or unoccupied municipal or communal lands.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The project will not finance any mayor dam and is not expected to finance IDPs that would depend on an existing dam.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	Project activities supporting artisanal fisheries and aquaculture will be located in coastal lagoons and, thus, no such activities will be located in the Wangki or Coco River Basin nor affect the riparian country of Honduras. Both the Legal Agreement and the Operational Manual will include a provision stating this.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	There are no disputed areas within the project area.

## 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:

Regarding socio-environmental management and safeguards needs, the project is classified as Category B and requires a partial Environmental Assessment (EA). Due to the small-scale and dispersed nature of the eligible investments, no large scale, significant and/or irreversible negative impacts are foreseen. Instead, it has a remarkable potential for environmental value added. This potential will be promoted through a special emphasis on socially appropriate capacity building and TA on environmentally friendly and climate-smart agricultural practices (e.g. agro-silvopastoral systems). Compared with the general baseline situation, the project is designed to promote an overall positive environmental impact. Despite the positive expectations on the project's direct environmental impacts, its environmental risk is considered substantial as it promotes improved gains from agricultural production and could thus cause undesirable indirect impacts. Further yet overall minor environmental risks relate with potential small scale contamination derived from inadequate or even prohibited use of agrochemicals or deficient management of animal manure. Soil degradation might also occur in case sustainable agricultural practices were not followed. Taken the vulnerability of the project area to environmental degradation and related negative impacts of climate variability, it is critical that environmental sustainability and use of locally validated good practices are key factors in designing and approving IDPs and planning for the related capacity building and TA.

Regarding social risks, the project will operate within multiple complex social, geographic and political orders that present a substantial risk that local elites could attempt to capture project benefits thereby preventing the poorest from participating in the design of the IDPs that are expected to contribute to enhance their food and nutrition security. To manage this risk, the project will do two things: i) implement a communications and public engagement plan to improve access to and feedback about project related information and activities, and ii) implement a participatory IDP design process with opportunities for beneficiary inputs at key decision points. Furthermore, there will likely be considerable pressures from community leaders and local beneficiaries for the project to achieve quick results, which in turn could lead to frustration and conflict if such expectations are not met. The communications plan will also be crucial to manage the additional risk that normal project planning and implementation time frames could cause expectations to turn to frustrations. The project will also use feedback mechanisms such as local radio talk shows in order to understand evolving expectations during implementation, and to address these in a proactive manner.

OP 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples will apply, as roughly 20 percent of eligible beneficiaries are likely to be indigenous. As the exact nature and location of the project funded activities within the selected 15 municipalities of the two Caribbean Coast regions will only be determined during project implementation, an Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) was prepared. The IPPF will assist MEFCCA to determine whether Indigenous Peoples are present in any of the project areas, and if so, to ensure that the interested communities support the proposed activities as well as any additional measures required to maximize their culturally appropriate benefits and/or avoid potentially adverse impacts. A draft IPPF was presented during regional public consultations with potential beneficiaries in Siuna, Bilwi, Waspam, and Bluefields. Participants raised concerns during these consultations including the range of eligible productive activities, the role of local

<p>officials in the administration of project funding, and the need for complementary investments in access roads, communications and capacity building. These concerns have been addressed by the inclusion of broad sectorial eligibility requirements, inviting local officials to participate in the Regional Coordination Comities that review PDIs, and coordinating the locations of project investments with other World Bank and development partners' investments in the two regions.</p>
<p><b>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</b></p>
<p>The Government of Nicaragua is investing in roads and telecommunications throughout the Atlantic regions. This infrastructure should contribute to supporting long term food and nutrition security by reducing transport costs and improving access to markets, services and information.</p>
<p><b>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</b></p>
<p>Not really relevant due to the small-scale and dispersed nature of the eligible investments. In every case, as the financed activities will be demand driven and not known during project preparation, considering alternatives only becomes relevant during project implementation. Regarding alternatives in terms of land use, all infrastructure and equipment investments will be restricted to either lands privately owned by the participating beneficiaries and/or unoccupied municipal and communal lands. This restriction on the available land use alternatives is aimed at avoiding adverse impacts caused by potential involuntary taking of land.</p>
<p><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></p>
<p>The project's main implementing agency will be the Ministry of Family Economy (MEFCCA), which was created by Presidential Decree in 2012 on the basis of the previously existing Rural Development Institute (IDR). The MEFCCA is also the main implementing agency of PRORURAL's National Agro-Industry Program and has extensive experience implementing large rural development projects with financing from International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), as well as bilateral donors. Nonetheless, its experience with World Bank projects is rather recent; based on one of the components of the Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise Development Project (P109691).</p> <p>The MEFCCA has leaded the preparation of the ESMF and IPPF through an inter-institutional technical working group composed by three of the project's supporting agencies: the Ministry of Agriculture (MAG), Nicaraguan Institute of Agricultural Technology (INTA), and Nicaraguan Institute of Fisheries (INPESCA). MAG and INTA have extensive experience with World Bank projects and implementing relevant safeguard policies, and all four agencies have an Environmental Unit. All of them have also institutional presence in the two Caribbean regions, yet limited to certain areas and reduced staff. The World Bank project team actively engaged with the referred technical working group throughout the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) process to refine the data collection and analysis instruments, consultation schedules and the disclosure of the final product - an Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF). MEFCCA and the supporting agencies will use the ESMF to manage environmental and social impacts during project implementation, as pertinent to their respective scope of activities.</p> <p>To promote efficient implementation of the ESMF, MEFCCA will contract three additional Social/Gender Specialists; two specialists will be based in its delegations in the RACN and RACS and one specialist will support monitoring and evaluation of the project's social impacts and mitigation measures from MEFCCA's national office in Managua. Regarding environmental management,</p>



<p>MEFCCA will recruit two environmental specialists based on its delegations in the RACN and RACS. At the central level, the Environmental Unit of MEFCCA will be responsible for leading and coordinating the project's environmental management.</p> <p>The initial ESMF implementation will include contracting a technical consultant to compile/prepare a regionally adapted Manual for Good Environmental Practices, including guidance for climate-smart agriculture. At project mid-term, the project will contract an external environmental audit at project midterm, as deemed necessary.</p>
<p><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></p>
<p>Project stakeholders include: male and female small- and medium-size landholders, male and female rural laborers, existing producers organizations, youth, and artisanal fishers with no or limited assets and equipment. It is estimated that the project will support approximately 14,000 families, of which approximately 4,800 are afro-descendent and indigenous communities and approximately 9,000 are mestizos.</p> <p>The Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF), including a draft Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF), was presented during regional public consultations with potential beneficiaries in the towns of Siuna, Bilwi and Bluefields between April and October 2014, as documented in detail in the ESMF. The ESMF was disclosed in-country and by the Bank InfoShop prior to project appraisal and updated prior to negotiations. The communications plan, participatory IDP methodology and grievance redress system will provide additional opportunities for stakeholder feedback during project implementation.</p>

### **B. Disclosure Requirements**

<b>Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	14-Nov-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	25-Nov-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
Nicaragua	25-Nov-2014
<i>Comments:</i> The final draft ESMF was disclosed in the following institutional website: <a href="http://www.economiafamiliar.gob.ni/images/documentos/GAFSP-PAIPSSAN%20Nov%202014%20rev%20BM%20Nov25.pdf">http://www.economiafamiliar.gob.ni/images/documentos/GAFSP-PAIPSSAN%20Nov%202014%20rev%20BM%20Nov25.pdf</a>	
<b>Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	14-Nov-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	25-Nov-2014
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
Nicaragua	25-Nov-2014
<i>Comments:</i> The final draft ESMF was disclosed in the following institutional website: <a href="http://www.economiafamiliar.gob.ni/images/documentos/GAFSP-PAIPSSAN%20Nov%202014%20rev%20BM%20Nov25.pdf">http://www.economiafamiliar.gob.ni/images/documentos/GAFSP-PAIPSSAN%20Nov%202014%20rev%20BM%20Nov25.pdf</a>	
<b>Pest Management Plan</b>	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes

Date of receipt by the Bank	10-Oct-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	17-Oct-2014
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
Nicaragua	25-Nov-2014
<i>Comments:</i> The final draft ESMF was disclosed in the following institutional website: <a href="http://www.economiafamiliar.gob.ni/images/documentos/GAFSP-PAIPSSAN%20Nov%202014%20rev%20BM%20Nov25.pdf">http://www.economiafamiliar.gob.ni/images/documentos/GAFSP-PAIPSSAN%20Nov%202014%20rev%20BM%20Nov25.pdf</a>	
<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 4.04 - Natural Habitats</b>	
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP 4.09 - Pest Management</b>	
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input checked="" 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 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples</b>	
Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	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"/> ]
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.36 - Forests</b>	
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 checked="" 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:	Name: Augusto Garcia	
<b>Approved By</b>		
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Laurent Msellati (PMGR)	Date: 26-Nov-2014