

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: ISDSA1924

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 02-Sep-2014

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 03-Sep-2014

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Africa	Project ID:	P132123
Project Name:	South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Governance and Shared Growth Project 1 (P132123)		
Task Team Leader:	Xavier F. P. Vincent		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	09-Jul-2014	Estimated Board Date:	25-Nov-2014
Managing Unit:	GENDR	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
GEF Focal Area:			
Sector(s):	General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (100%)		
Theme(s):	Other environment and natural resources management (66%), Environmental policies and institutions (34%)		
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?			No
Financing (In USD Million)			
Total Project Cost:	91.00	Total Bank Financing:	75.50
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
BORROWER/RECIPIENT			0.00
International Development Association (IDA)			42.70
IDA Grant			32.80
Global Environment Facility - Cofinancing Trust Funds			15.50
Total			91.00
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Project Development Objective(s) / Global Environmental Objective(s)

A. Project Development Objective(s)

The Project Development Objective is to improve the management effectiveness of selected priority fisheries at regional, national and community level.

B. Global Environmental Objective(s)

The Global Environment Objective is to improve the management effectiveness of selected priority fisheries at regional, national and community level.

3. Project Description

Component 1. Enhanced regional collaboration (Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, Somalia, South Africa, Tanzania, Yemen, France - IOC: US\$3.0 million IDA). All SWIOFC countries will participate in this first component, implemented by the IOC. It will support the provision of a regional public good through regional coordination and cooperation for the management and sustainable development of fisheries in the SWIO. Sub-component (1.1) (Enhancing capacity for managing priority regional fisheries and challenges) will support engagement with all SWIOFC countries to start developing a regional strategy to increase national and regional benefits from priority regional fisheries, collaboration on trans-boundary living marine resources, and address shared challenges. It will also support implementation of a core regional work plan toward implementing this strategy. Sub-component (1.2) (Regional coordination and collaboration) will support the further development and consolidation of institutional arrangements for regional fisheries collaboration, through the SWIOFC and the IOC. The sub-component will also support regional knowledge management and exchange.

Component 2. Improved governance of priority fisheries (Comoros: US\$5.5 million IDA and US\$3.5 million GEF; Mozambique: US\$16.2 million IDA and US\$7.0 million GEF; Tanzania: US\$17.4 million IDA and US\$5.0 million GEF). The component primarily targets policies, strategies, institutions and legal frameworks, and actions by the public sector necessary to improve priority fisheries management and performance, as well as regional marine environmental health and resilience to climate change. It will be backed by activities aimed at understanding the resource base, and building human and institutional capacity necessary to implement fisheries policies and management plans. Three closely-linked and mutually supportive activities, directed to both the public sector and coastal communities, are envisaged: (2.1) Knowledge and management of priority fisheries; (2.2) Improving the performance of public institutions and assets; and (2.3) Information, communication and awareness.

Component 3. Increased economic benefits from priority fisheries (Comoros: US\$2.4 million IDA; Mozambique: US\$12.4 million IDA; Tanzania: US\$10.0 million IDA). The component primarily targets increasing the value addition and diversifying fishers' livelihoods to reduce poverty and pressure on the region's fisheries, improving the regional business climate, enabling the private sector productivity and investment, and supporting public investments critical to a viable private sector. Measures decided by the co-management plans developed under component 2 will be implemented here, including compensation for potential access restrictions. The Project will support the following sub-components: (3.1) Improved business and investment climate; (3.2) Expansion of opportunities for priority fisheries and value addition; and (3.3) Planning and investment in strategic infrastructure.

Component 4. Project management and coordination (IOC: US\$2.0 million IDA grant; Comoros: US

\$1.6 million IDA; Mozambique: US\$1.3 million IDA; Tanzania: US\$3.5 million IDA) will support regional Project coordination and implementation, country-level implementation and management, and monitoring and evaluation at regional and country level. It will operate through Regional and National Steering Committees (RSC/NSCs) and Regional and National Implementation Units (RIU/NIUs), through the following sub-components: (4.1) Project management at regional level; and (4.2) Project management at country level (Comoros, Mozambique, and Tanzania).

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

Known areas for investment likely to trigger safeguard policies:

- Mozambique: Coastal and marine areas, with specific focus on the Sofala Bank for the shrimp management plan (northern Inhambane Province, Sofala Province, Zambezia Province and Southern Nampula Province).
- Comoros: Coastal and marine areas of the three islands Grande Comore (Ngazidja), Anjouan (Ndzuwani) and Mohéli (Mwali).
- Tanzania: Coastal and marine areas within Marine Protected Areas/Marine Conservation Areas and where rehabilitation of existing fisheries infrastructure might take place. The specific areas that will receive support for co-management enhancement will be Mkinga, Tanga Town, Pangani, Bagamoyo and Lindi Rural.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

George Campos Ledec (GENDR)

Helen Z. Shahriari (GURDR)

Cheikh A. T. Sagna (GURDR)

Ann Jeannette Glauber (GENDR)

Paul-Jean Feno (GENDR)

Paulo Jorge Temba Sithoe (GENDR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	Yes	Overall, the environmental and social impacts of the project are expected to be positive. However, small-scale, localized negative effects may arise during the implementation of the limited site specific civil works envisaged under the project. These may include rehabilitation or expansion of fisheries infrastructure (landing sites, markets, office buildings). Safeguards management can be adequately handled through good engineering practices for design and construction. In light of the above, this project has been classified as a Category B project, which requires a partial assessment of social and environmental impacts. Since the locations and impacts of the potential civil works cannot be clearly defined at this stage, an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has been prepared by the Borrowers for each proposed project in the

		<p>participating three countries. The preparation of the ESMFs involved extensive various stakeholders consultation and participation. In addition to providing a set of implementable mitigation measures captured under the embedded environmental and social Management Plan (ESMP), the ESMF provides social and environmental screening procedures along with an environmental and social check-list to be applied on each proposed subproject, as well as a set of environmental and social clauses (ESC) to be embedded in Contractors Contracts for consideration during project implementation. Moreover, the ESMF provides also an institutional arrangement mechanism, a monitoring and evaluation mechanism, a conflict resolution/grievance redress mechanism, as well as an estimated budget to allow safe and adequate implementation of the ESMF/ESMP.</p>
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	<p>As stated above, the overall environmental and social impacts of the proposed project are expected to be overwhelmingly positive and the project expected impacts on Natural Habitats would also be significantly positive, through efforts to improve participatory conservation and management of key fisheries habitats. Nonetheless, potential civil works could have minor small-scale impacts on Natural Habitats. Likewise, additional expansion of areas under management could have variant impacts on livelihoods (see OP/BP 4.12 below). Provision is been made in the ESMF to adequately address such expectation. Any subproject funded under the project will be screened for their potential to cause negative impacts to natural habitats under the ESMF procedures. If sub-projects are likely to cause irreversible or significant damages to habitats they will be excluded from project funding.</p>
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	The project does not involve forests.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	<p>While no procurement of pesticides or pesticide application is currently envisaged for Bank-funded project activities, it is possible that aquaculture activities supported through the SWIOFish Tanzania project may choose to use aquatic herbicides or antibiotics. This policy is</p>

		therefore triggered. While use of pesticides is considered unlikely and should be discouraged in any discussions about project design, the Tanzania ESMF document project screening, implementation and monitoring process addresses this risk and includes specific guidelines on the use of pesticides. In addition to this, the ESMF includes a list of: 1) recommended pesticides; 2) banned pesticides; and 3) pesticides whose use is subject to the Prior Informed Consent (PIC) procedures in Tanzania.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/ BP 4.11	Yes	Since project activities are largely going to take place in near-shore and off-shore waters or in rural areas, it is unlikely that cultural resources will be impacted. However, natural features and landscapes with some level of cultural significance might be adversely impacted by the project. Therefore, to the extent that some of the possible infrastructure investments that may occur under the project, such as rehabilitation or expansion of landing sites, markets, office buildings, may be located in coastal towns or where there are historical sites, care will need to be taken to avoid development plans that may impact these cultural resources. The ESMFs have assessed this possibility and included a “chance finds” procedure to be applied during both sub-project screening processes and during implementation of Environmental and Social Clauses embedded in Contractors contracts.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	There are no Indigenous Peoples in the project areas.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	The project is not expected to involve land acquisition leading to involuntary resettlement of project-affected persons (PAPs), as project infrastructure would take place on already existing sites. However, because the project proposes to strengthen the effective management and protection of natural resources in near-shore or off-shore waters as well as potentially expand areas under protection, these access restrictions, be it seasonal, temporary or permanent, there may be negative impacts on livelihoods for some individuals in some coastal communities, at least in the short-term. In fact, footnote 6 of OP 4.12 suggests that where restrictions to access of resources are taking place under community-

		<p>based projects, such as fisheries co-management arrangements, the policy would not apply. However, it is reasonable to assume that some decisions taken to restrict access to fisheries will be initiated by government, and will not fall solely within the discretion of the local communities. Therefore, this policy has been triggered and, as part of project preparation, a Process Framework (PF) has been developed for each of the three participating countries, and extensively consulted upon to ensure people views and concerns are fully taken into consideration in the final project design. The PFs established a process whereby individuals, households or communities who may lose some or all of their livelihoods from fishing or fisheries-related activities, as a result of project investments, are able to participate in a process to minimize such negative impact on project affected communities livelihood and living condition, precisely by (i) designing the fisheries resource restrictions; (ii) determining measures necessary to restore or improve their livelihood conditions , and (ii) implementing and monitoring relevant project activities. The PF include institutional arrangement, capacity building, grievance redress mechanism and an estimated budget for PF implementation. Special attention will be given to women, youth and other vulnerable groups whose livelihood are intrinsically linked to the fishing activities.</p>
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	N/A
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	<p>Project activities will not be located in a river, canal, lake or similar body of water that forms a boundary with another state. While no direct impacts on riparian systems are expected, the project does involve management changes in some bays and straits that are close to borders of other SWIO countries. In consultation with LEGEN it has been decided that this policy will not be triggered.</p> <p>The project does involve significant monitoring and enforcement investments that may also be of benefit to the neighboring countries under regional initiatives to better manage the resources. Furthermore, the project will support the</p>

		<p>improved management of migratory and transboundary fish stocks between SWIO countries, which is mainly related to the migration patterns of large pelagic fish such as tuna, billfish and shark.</p> <p>South West Indian Ocean riparian countries were informed of the project during their Regional Fisheries Body (South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission or SWIOFC) sessions and gave consent to the concept note and to the preparation of the first phase of investment (project), and remain associated and kept informed of progress.</p>
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	Project activities will not be located in disputed areas. In consultation with LEGEN it has therefore been decided that this policy will not be triggered.

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:

Given the project objectives of improving governance in the fisheries management sector through better data collection, sectoral governance and institutional reform, stronger enforcement of conservation measures, and renewed emphasis on co-management strategies, the overall environmental and social impacts of the project are expected to be positive. However, the proposed sub-projects on the construction/expansion/rehabilitation of fisheries infrastructures (landing sites, markets, office buildings) and the potential use of aquatic herbicides or antibiotics could generate some minor adverse environmental and social impacts. The ESMFs and draft Environmental and Social Assessments (ESA) prepared by the respective Governments of the three countries pursuant to OP4.01 confirm that large-scale, significant and/or- irreversible environmental impacts are not expected. The ESA documents, however, do point out that some potential negative small-scale and localized environmental and social impacts from project investments may occur, and which should be taken care of in the design of the project and its implementation arrangements. These negative impacts include seasonal, temporary or permanent access restrictions that may be implemented for certain fisheries or in specific geographic locations, short-term reduction in income to artisanal fisheries engaged in illegal or unsustainable fishing activities due to strengthened fisheries Monitoring, Control and Surveillance, and localized environmental and possible social impacts from infrastructure rehabilitation, upgrading or construction such as air, soil and water pollution, loss of vegetation, coastal erosion, increase in HIV AIDS and safety (accidents on the work camps). Through the ESMFs, the proposed project has provided an environmental and social screening form that will be applied by qualified personnel, precisely Environmental and Social Focal Points (ESFPs), in each participating country task-team, at the planning stage of future investments. Given that any adverse environmental and social impacts from implementation of the proposed project are generally expected to be site-specific, not significant, and not irreversible, this project has been designated as a Category 'B' Partial Assessment. The project has triggered the following Safeguards policies: OP/BP 4.01

<p>(Environmental Assessment); OP/BP 4.04 (Natural Habitats); OP/BP 4.09 (Pest Management); OP/BP 4.11 (Physical Cultural Resources); and OP/BP 4.12 (Involuntary Resettlement). Because the exact nature and location of investments may not be determined up front, i.e. prior to appraisal, the respective governments prepared and consulted upon an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and a Process Framework (PF).</p>
<p>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</p>
<p>The potential environmental and social impacts are likely to be small-scale and site-specific, thus easily remediable and reversible and no significant long-term impacts are expected during project implementation. However, it is possible that there will be some long-term negative impacts to some individuals, households or communities in the coastal region. Fisheries resource management will be changing from what is in most cases a largely open access regime to a regulated or limited access regime. There are already significant levels of impoverishment in many coastal communities, which rely on fishers for a significant portion of their subsistence income and food sources. If productive assets are lost in the form of restrictions, it would weaken community and family institutions, social network, traditional authority, and family structures. The only potential cumulative impacts may derive from many new micro, small, or medium-size enterprises undertaking similar activities near environmentally sensitive areas.</p>
<p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p>
<p>N/a</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>Since the precise physical locations and potential localized adverse environmental or social impacts of project investments are not yet known, and will not be identified prior to appraisal, and to ensure compliance with the World Bank's safeguards policies triggered, each of the respective governments have completed an ESMF and overall Environmental and Social Assessment (ESA) as part of project preparation. The overall objective of the ESA is to evaluate the biophysical and socio-economic impacts of the proposed project; more precisely with the development of an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and a Process Framework (PF) to manage these impacts in a way that meets the core requirements of both the national regulations and World Bank Safeguard policies.</p> <p>ESMF: The ESMF provides the basis for the preparation and approval of necessary environmental and social work, as needed for the subproject investments supported through the Project. Part of the ESMF is an Environmental and Social Screening Form (ESSF) to be used by the safeguards focal point of the National Project Implementation Unit (NIU) as a checklist to effectively assess the viability of all proposed sub-projects under the project. The ESMF also contains: (i) mitigation of impacts of the potential subprojects to be financed; (ii) capacity assessment including recommendations of specific measures to strengthening safeguards capacity at the Implementing Agencies; (iii) informing stakeholders involved in the implementation of the project and public consultation; (iv) clear procedures for sub-project preparation, review and approval; (v) institutional responsibilities for implementation of the ESMF as well as environmental and social monitoring; the timing for the implementation of measures and the estimated costs for environmental and social measures. The three separate ESMF and PF documents were extensively consulted upon, reviewed by project safeguards specialists and submitted to Bank for review, clearance and publication.</p>

PF: Due to the possible implementation of various access restrictions to marine resources, which could lead to various social impacts for some fishery communities, the OP/BP 4.12 requires the development of a PF as part of the project preparation process. The PF primarily pertains to Component 2 of the project, Improved Governance of Priority Fisheries. It is likely that research on priority fisheries to be conducted under this component will determine that access to some species and/or to some coastal or marine locations will need to be limited to ensure long-term sustainability of the ecosystems and species. The purpose of the PF is to establish a process whereby members of potentially affected communities are able to participate in the design of fisheries resource restrictions, determine measures necessary to achieve livelihood restoration and implement and monitor relevant project activities. The rotating credit and savings schemes and capacity building activities promoted under component 3 will be the main vehicle used by the PFs to address fishers, households and communities affected by access restrictions with project-affected persons (PAPs) getting priority assistance over other self-help groups in fisher communities that may form on their own. The PF provides guidance on how to use the existing co-management framework for fisheries that is to be strengthened under the project as the vehicle for ensuring that those affected by restrictions in access to traditional fishing grounds, marine parks, etc., through access controls on marine resource uses introduced under the project have a participatory process to address potential income loss and ways to replace lost livelihoods. Like the ESMFs, the PFs were extensively consulted upon, and have been reviewed by project safeguards specialists and submitted for Bank's clearance and publication.

The NIUs will bear overall responsibilities for compliance with safeguard activities to national and Bank policies. The supervision of safeguards implementation will be done as part of the overall project implementation by the NIUs in conjunction with the responsible Line Ministries. The NIUs will assign two safeguards focal points (one for social issues and one for environmental issues) to be trained by the project Social and Environmental Safeguards Specialists. These Environmental and Social Focal Points (ESFP) will be in charge of coordinating the implementation of the ESMFs and PFs including gender, handicaps and vulnerable groups, the monitoring (control and audit) of social and environmental aspects and be an interface between the project, local authorities and other stakeholders. To ensure effective Bank supervision, the NIUs will prepare and update reports on the implementation of the safeguards instruments to be submitted prior to Bank Implementation Support Mission (ISM). The supervision of safeguards implementation will be done as part of the overall project implementation by the NIUs and as part of the Bank's biannual ISMs.

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

The key stakeholders include coastal artisanal fishing communities These communities include small-scale commercial fishers, fish and seaweed farmers, households where fishing makes up a substantial part of their livelihoods and subsistence fishers. Other stakeholders include producer and professional organizations, industry or fisher organizations, local co-management institutions, the central and regional fishery services, and the association of sellers in the localities. During project preparation and the development of the ESMFs and PFs, public consultation and participation were conducted by the project team and consultants, which included various field visits and stakeholder meetings. The NIUs will be responsible for the public disclosure of the PF and ESMF documents in country media and locations accessible to beneficiaries, (ii) the implementation of communication and sensitization campaigns on programs financed by the project before, during, and after the works, as part of the information, education and

communication activities financed under the proposed project.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	20-Aug-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	22-Aug-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Comoros	06-Aug-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Mozambique	07-Aug-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Tanzania	22-Aug-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	20-Aug-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	22-Aug-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Comoros	06-Aug-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Mozambique	07-Aug-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Tanzania	22-Aug-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	NA
Date of receipt by the Bank	NA
Date of submission to InfoShop	NA
"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 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"/>]
OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats	
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"/>]
OP 4.09 - Pest Management	
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"/>]
OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources	
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"/>]
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement	
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"/>]
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"/>]
--	---

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader:	Name: Xavier F. P. Vincent	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Regional Safeguards Advisor:	Name:	Date:
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name:	Date: