

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

**Additional Financing**

Report No.: PIDISDSA17842

Date Prepared/Updated: 13-Mar-2017

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**A. Basic Project Data**

<b>Country:</b>	Myanmar	<b>Project ID:</b>	P157231
		<b>Parent Project ID (if any):</b>	P146332
<b>Project Name:</b>	Additional Financing for the Decentralizing Fund to Schools Project (P157231)		
<b>Parent Project Name:</b>	Myanmar Decentralizing Funding to Schools (P146332)		
<b>Region:</b>	EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	23-May-2016	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	28-Apr-2017
<b>Practice Area (Lead):</b>	Education	<b>Lending Instrument:</b>	Investment Project Financing
<b>Borrower(s)</b>	Republic of the Union of Myanmar		
<b>Implementing Agency</b>	Ministry of Education		
<b>Financing (in USD Million)</b>			
<b>Financing Source</b>			<b>Amount</b>
Borrower			0.00
Myanmar Strategic Partnership			54.00
Financing Gap			0.00
Total Project Cost			54.00
<b>Environmental Category:</b>	B-Partial Assessment		
<b>Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):</b>	The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate		
<b>Other Decision:</b>			
<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	No		

**B. Introduction and Context**

**Country Context**

While resource-rich, Myanmar remains one of the poorest countries in Southeast Asia. Although

significant reforms have been introduced in recent years, the economy remains centered on extractive industries and agriculture. With a population of 51.4 million, the country has a per capita gross domestic product (GDP) of US\$1,233 (2014). In 2010, the rate of poverty was estimated to be between 25.6 percent and 37.5 percent, concentrated particularly in rural and conflict-affected areas. At least 70 percent of Myanmar's poor live in rural areas, and agriculture plays a critical role for both inclusive growth and poverty reduction, contributing close to 29 percent of output in 2015–2016. After two years of strong growth and macroeconomic stability, Myanmar faced a more difficult economic environment in 2015–2016 when economic growth eased to 7 percent from 8.5 percent in the previous year. Short-term vulnerabilities increased, including growing fiscal and current account deficits (5.2 and 7 percent of GDP, respectively), rising inflation (11.7 percent annual average), and exchange rate pressure (30 percent depreciation).

### **Sectoral and Institutional Context**

The Additional Financing (AF) activities are well aligned with the National Education Sector Plan (NESP) officially launched in February 2017. The NESP resulted from analysis, discussions and reflections carried-out by the Ministry of Education (MoE) in the context of a Comprehensive Education Sector Review (CESR) which lasted three and half years. This plan was designed in a participatory manner using strategic planning and evidence-based principles. The resulting document is ambitious, adequately identifies the main challenges of the sector, and proposes relevant ways forward. Among other things, it maintains decentralization of funding and responsibilities as a core priority for the MoE and include components of school grant and stipends. Furthermore, it brings forward the importance of tackling quality issues while continuing to make headway in terms of access.

Given the high performance of the ongoing project and objectives of the MoE to continue with the implementation of the school grants and stipends program, to scale up the early learning assessment program and to launch a new teacher mentoring and cluster program, this Additional Financing (AF) is being proposed. The AF's expands on the initial narrow scope of the project and supports a transition from a focus on outputs and access towards one on outcomes and quality.

The rationale for preparing AF is as follows:

- This is a well performing project. Implementation Status and Results Report (ISR) ratings for implementation progress (IP) and development objectives (DO) have been consistently rated as satisfactory since effectiveness and highly satisfactory in the last two ISR. There will be full compliance with key loan covenants, including audit and financial management reporting requirements, prior to negotiations.
- The addition of funding to this operation is timely. Through this AF, the new ministry leadership is reconfirming its ownership of the existing schools grants and stipends programs and moving quickly to adapt the current results-based funding mechanism to new priorities.
- Providing in-service continuous professional development to the approximately 90,000 primary school teachers (40 percent of all teachers in grades 1-5, who have been teaching for less than three years) is among MoE's highest priorities for improving the quality of teaching and learning in Myanmar. This justification is further strengthened by the fact that about 20 percent of all teachers were initially hired as daily wage teachers (DWTs or temporary contract teachers) .
- Adding grant funding to the project will move the ratio of credit to grant from its current 80–20 percent proportion to about 50-50 percent and thereby demonstrating that the initial IDA credit

funding has served to leverage additional investments in the education sector.

- The AF will also allow the donor partners to reorient the focus of the PDO and DLIs from an initial emphasis on design and outputs (for the existing programs) to one on program outcomes in the next two to three years.
- The support of a new program using the same DLI mechanism will allow the Bank, its donor partners, and the government of Myanmar to capitalize on the success of the results-based financing approach; it will also help demonstrate that the DLI financing mechanism can be adapted and expanded to support various government programs.

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

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

The objective of the Project is to help improve and expand Myanmar's School Grants Program and Student Stipends Program.

#### **Proposed Project Development Objective(s) - Additional Financing**

The proposed objective of the Additional Financing is to increase the share of children who complete their primary-level education, and to provide immediate and effective response in case of an Eligible Crisis or Emergency.

#### **Key Results**

The original PDO was appropriately narrow for the Bank's first investment in the education sector in Myanmar. The well-defined scope of the original PDO has led to a highly successful implementation, as measured against that narrow objective.

The new objective expands on this initial narrow scope, and also reflects the IDA contingent emergency response component added to the Project in accordance with the IDA IRM Guidance Note. The educational outcome objective included in the proposed revised PDO is one of the highest and most measurable objectives of the new government, as reflected in its election manifesto. Furthermore, it is consistent with the existing school grants and stipends programs, the assessment of learning outcomes, and the new teacher mentoring and cluster program.

#### **Changes to the Key Results Indicators**

The original results and DLIs for the project sought to monitor outputs under the school grants and stipends programs. For example, disbursements were linked to the amounts and timing of school grants and to the numbers of stipends paid to children at risk of dropping out. Under the AF, mirroring the original project design, indicators were added to monitor and link disbursement to outputs of the teacher mentoring and cluster program, reflecting the start-up nature of this program. Furthermore, disbursement will be linked to the measurement and reporting of township-level development outcomes of the programs such as within grade drop-outs, transition rates from primary to middle school, and completion rates (disaggregated by gender, disability and ethnicity when possible) as well as the measurement, reporting, and use of learning assessments.

New PDO indicators will be:

- a. The number of townships-level primary completion rates (disaggregated by sex) for (i) students receiving stipends, (ii) students having applied to receive the stipends, and (iii) for all primary-level students measured and reported;

- b. The number of learning assessments (EGRA / EGMA / written standardized assessments), representative at the R/S and national level, having been carried out and of which results (disaggregated by sex) were disseminated;
- c. The number of mentees receiving the support from mentors in accordance to the program guidelines.

#### **D. Project Description**

##### Change in Loan Closing Date(s)

The initial loan closing date was December 31, 2018. The new loan closing date will be March 31, 2021.

##### Change in Disbursement Arrangements

Disbursements will continue to be made based on achievement of well-defined progress indicators (DLIs), and results-based funding would be limited to agreed budget codes, which make up the eligible expenditures program (EEP, defined below). Each DLI will be monitored and reported on by MoE as part of the program and verified in “spot check” surveys. During appraisal, the government confirmed that their intention is to maintain the current ‘advance’ disbursement method as opposed to WB’s proposal to adopt a new disbursement method that allows ‘reimbursement’ of eligible government expenditures in lieu of the ‘advance’.

##### Change in Disbursement Estimates

The original IDA credit is expected to be fully disbursed during the original four-year project period. This means that the disbursement percentages of IDA and MDTF will be changed for the first year of the AF, while funding will be all MDTF in the last 3 years of the AF. Also, as previously mentioned, the new disbursement arrangements will contain a new “0” contingent emergency response disbursement category in the IDA Financing Agreement.

##### **Component Name:**

School grants and stipends

##### **Comments ( optional)**

The basic structure of the school grants and stipends programs will not change. MoE will continue to monitor implementation of these programs and introduce annual improvements and upgrades based on the lessons of implementation experience and the M&E findings (presented in MOE status report). For example, as mentioned, the school grants program is expected to finance more teaching and learning priorities at the school level, as opposed to maintenance and repairs. Improvements to the school grants and stipends programs will continue to be reflected in annual updates to MoE’s program guidelines and to the content of annual training programs.

##### **Component Name:**

Early Grade Learning

##### **Comments ( optional)**

The work around early learning assessment will be scaled to go from a focus on reading assessment only (Early Grade Reading Assessment, EGRA) to an inclusion of an Early Grade Math Assessment (EGMA) and/or an end-of-primary standardized written assessment adapted for the Myanmar context. It will also include the design and roll-out of an Early Reading Intervention aiming to provide teachers with tools to specifically improve student literacy in the Myanmar language in

early grades. Furthermore, in terms of coverage, the MoE intends to expand the number and types of regionally and nationally representative baseline and follow-up assessments. Finally, support will be provided to ensure that progress in learning outcomes over time, as measured through the above-mentioned assessment, will be u

**Component Name:**

Teacher mentoring and cluster program

**Comments ( optional)**

The new teacher mentoring and cluster support program will be designed, funded, implemented, and monitored in a similar way as the grants and stipends programs. MoE experts, with inputs from teachers, have prepared the general concept of the program, in collaboration with the WB and MDTF partners. Final design is one of the new DLIs for the AF. Additional DLIs developed for the AF will track the rollout of the program over time. As with the school grants and stipends, the parallel M&E program will be crucial for monitoring results and the quality of program implementation.

**Component Name:**

Contingent Emergency Response

**Comments ( optional)**

Zero component

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

**F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists**

Juan Martinez( GSU02 )

**II. IMPLEMENTATION**

To date, three years into implementation of the original project, the first nine DLIs have been achieved, and US\$68.8 million has been disbursed to Myanmar and allocated to townships and schools and, in the case of the stipends, to “at-risk” children and their families. IDA disbursements are US\$57 million and disbursements from the MDTF are US\$11.8 million.

Few changes will be made to arrangements for project oversight or implementation. The project will continue to be overseen by a Project Steering Committee (PSC) composed of senior MoE leadership, including women, which are meeting twice a year to review progress and endorse revisions to programs based on annual M&E activities.

Because of changes to the MoE internal structure and departmental responsibilities, the PSC will now be coordinated by the DBE in collaboration with the DERPT, rather than being led by DEPT. Implementation of activities will continue to be the responsibilities of the DBE and the DERPT, who will be responsible for the learning activities (through DMER) as well as general technical guidance, design, and delivery of trainings in the context of the teacher mentoring and cluster support program.

The level of resources devoted to the BETF for M&E and preparation/supervision of the programs for the AF will also be expanded to reflect these changes and will include additional funding to monitor mentoring, clusters, and teacher quality issues, as well as to help cover the costs of preparation and supervision of these programs.

### III. SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	<p>The program is classified as category "B". The school grants program which is under the parent program is a nationwide program for which all schools in the country are eligible indiscriminately. The project will “top up” additional capital to the national program through which grants will be provided to all schools in the country. The program supports schools to cover the cost of consumables, operational expenses and minor repair and maintenance of facilities and furniture which are prioritized in participatory manner by parents. The government has agreed to include a simple ECOP in its school grants guidelines to cover minor repairs and maintenance. No environmental impact is expected to arise; no civil works will be financed under this program.</p> <p>The stipend program is also a nationwide program and provides stipends to students. Primary grade 5, lower secondary and higher secondary students are eligible. Preliminary social assessment conducted before and at the time of initial implementation found that principles and procedures including eligibility criteria were not clearly established, and that there was a risk that some vulnerable groups such as female headed households and religious minorities could be excluded and cannot receive benefits from the program. It also found that access to education is restricted particularly for female students in remote areas because of traditional gender norms and safety concerns due to long distance to schools. Children of migrant workers and poor families often drop out due to financial difficulties. Since such vulnerable people will be affected by the project, the policy is triggered and measures to ensure that they receive project benefits are developed in Community Participation Planning Framework (CPPF).</p> <p>A total of 63 focus group discussions and 86 key informant interviews were conducted</p>

Public Disclosure Copy

Public Disclosure Copy

		during the preparation to assess potential risks and negative impacts of the project. Community Participation Planning Framework (CPPF) was developed to guide the implementation of the two programs to ensure that: i) the poor and vulnerable groups will benefit from the programs; and ii) negative impacts, if any, will be avoided or fully mitigated. Detailed operational guidelines have been prepared with full integration of the principles and process of the CPPF.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The project will not cause any degradation of natural habitats as defined under the safeguard policy.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	The project will not degrade critical forest areas as defined under the safeguard policy.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	The project will not involve any procurement of pesticides nor cause any increased use of pesticides.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	The project will not adversely affect sites with archaeological, historical, religious or unique national values.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	The programs are expected to continue to be implemented in townships where ethnic minorities are present. In preparation for Additional Financing (AF) of the proposed project. The Ministry of Education (MoE) has undertaken a lessons-learned review of the social assessment processes conducted during implementation years 1 and year-2. The aims were to further integrate key social considerations into the education programs supported by the project and to further combine analytical and participatory approaches under the programs. Additionally, using the outcomes from the Social Assessment (SA), a Community Participation Planning Framework (CPPF) was updated in line with the scope and proposed activities of the AF which sets out principles and procedures to address potential risks identified in line with OP 4.10. Informed consultations and permanent disclosure of program guidelines were carried out with key stakeholders including affected ethnic communities which ascertained their broad community support to the project.

		Feedback/Grievance mechanisms are in place and are improved every year, which helps establish and strengthen the participation of community members in School Committee (SCs) to monitor project implementation through regularly meeting stipend beneficiaries, receiving their feedbacks and checking that school grants are used as agreed between school management and SCs.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	No	The program will not support any civil works. No acquisition of private land, or loss of private assets including trees and structures, is anticipated.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The project does not involve any dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The project does not involve international waterways.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The project will not be located in any known disputed areas as defined in the policy.

#### IV. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

##### A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

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

No environmental impact is expected to arise from the program. The program supports schools to cover the cost of consumables, operational expenses and minor repair and maintenance of facilities and furniture which are prioritized in participatory manner by parents. The government has agreed to maintain the ECOP from the parent program which is already included in its school grants guidelines to cover minor repairs and maintenance; no civil works will be financed under the AF.

For Social Safeguards, MoE has undertaken a lessons-learned review of the social assessment processes conducted during implementation years 1 and year 2. The aims were to further integrate key social considerations into the education programs supported by the project and to further combine analytical and participatory approaches under the programs. Additionally, using the outcomes from the Social Assessment (SA), a Community Participation Planning Framework (CPPF) was updated in line with the scope and proposed activities of the AF which sets out principles and procedures to address potential risks identified in line with OP 4.10.

On the institutional side, during year 2 of the project, two notable contributions were introduced in the area of social assessment and consultation which are the key aspects of the CPPF: (i) states and regions undertook a consultative process for selecting townships that included needs-based criteria for designating priority townships. This process has generated ownership from education departments at national, township, and village levels; and (ii) a



bottom-up participatory approach was introduced which was characterized by a great ownership and institutionalization process, sustainable social assessment, and consultation at the township level to support the process of selecting schools and selecting students within schools for the stipends program. At the same time, the process was institutionalized at different levels.

Additionally, the social and quality assessment reports conducted by Save the Children contain analysis of risks related to the social context. The report notes that there are various reasons or sources for these risks, including the heterogeneous nature of states and regions, lack of technical knowledge related to implementing the programs, presence of armed groups in states and regions, and weak dissemination of information. A number of institutional risks have also been identified, including: (i) lack of communication and information dissemination; (ii) weak training for program implementation and monitoring; (iii) different capacities among different levels: village, township, and national; (iv) weak stakeholder participation; and (v) poor grievance management and communication problems.

The new government which came to power on April 1, 2016, and the new leadership of the MoE are expected to be committed to prioritizing social risks and giving priority to reducing or mitigating risk during the implementation of the project. The World Bank supervision visits and feedback from Save the Children indicate that the CPPF and social assessment approach has worked well and should be considered with satisfactory implementation in most areas. The M&E program has been effective in identifying lessons for both of these programs that will be used to improve performance in year three and beyond.

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

N/A

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

N/A

**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.**

Preparation activities for the implementation of year 3 and Additional Financing are now under way. The Additional Financing will include a project restructuring level 1 since the PDO will be changed and the program will be extended for two additional years. It is expected that appraisal will happen and be completed in June 2016.

Year 3 implementation of the ongoing stipends program will include 28 new townships, bringing the total to 55 townships of 330 total in Myanmar. 5 of these new townships will be located in critical conflict areas, specifically in the following states: Kachin, North Shan and Rahkine states. Armed groups, potentially religiously excluded groups and other relevant stakeholders are present in these states. The following activities are recommended to cover the Safeguards gaps: (1) Social Assessment has been completed by DBE-MoE based on lessons learned from year 1 and 2 to assess implementation experience and use the findings as a basis to update/ revise the CPPF. The updated CPPF will be disclosed before appraisal on MoE's

website.

The objectives of SA were to further integrate key social considerations into the education programs supported by the project and to further combine analytical and participatory approaches under the programs, including the analysis of potential negative impacts of stipend and school grant programs and risks associated with implementing the programs. By using the outcomes from the Social Assessment (SA), a Community Participation Planning Framework (CPPF) was updated in line with the scope and proposed activities of the AF which sets out principles and procedures to address potential risks identified in line with OP 4.10. Extensive consultations were also conducted at the township and Village levels (in almost 2,000 schools) with key stakeholders including representatives of vulnerable and ethnic groups which ascertained their broad community support to the project. No significant negative impact was found to entail from project implementation, however, risks that some vulnerable and ethnic groups may be excluded from project benefits were found to be present. The updated version of the CPPF will be finalized and disclosed prior appraisal. It sets out principles and procedures to address potential risks of exclusions identified in line with OP 4.01 and OP 4.10. The CPPF will provide the principles and procedures through which Social Assessment (SA) is being conducted annually in selected townships where the stipend and school grants programs will be newly rolled out. Ethnic and vulnerability screening will continue to be implemented in practical manner each year on the basis of the school calendar year.

School Committees (SC) are established at the school level based on the existing but significantly strengthened community participation mechanism. SC will participate in and monitor the implementation of the stipend and school grant programs. SC will comprise the school headmaster, teachers and parents, including those of vulnerable groups including ethnic minorities. SC will be empowered in the monitoring and grievance mechanisms to ensure that the stipend and school grants programs are implemented under the support of this program as per provisions of this CPPF.

Institutional and implementation arrangements.

The Department of Basic Education (DBE) under the MoE is assuming overall responsibility for the implementation of social assessment and school characteristics, including the CPPF. Regarding the stipend program, the DBE will carry out many activities provided under this CPPF in collaboration with Township Education Officers (TEOs) and Township Committees (TCs) at the township level, as well as the beneficiary schools.

Institutional Capacity Assessment

As an institution, MoE has worked with Bank for over 2 years and is becoming familiar with the Bank's environmental and social safeguard policies. In this short experience, MoE has demonstrated significant learning to increase its knowledge in social and environmental safeguards. During year 2 of the project, two notable contributions were introduced in the area of social assessment and consultation process which are the key aspects of the CPPF: (i) states and regions undertook a consultative process for selecting townships that included needs-

based criteria for designating priority townships, his generated ownership from education departments at national, township, and village levels; and (ii) a bottom-up participatory approach was introduced which was characterized by a great ownership and institutionalization process, sustainable social assessment, and consultation at the township level to support the process of selecting schools and selecting students within schools for the stipends program. At the same time, the process was institutionalized at different levels. The overall capacity of MoE is rated satisfactory; However, capacity building and technical assistance will be required for the MoE and DBE and townships officials to ensure proper implantation of the CPPF. The capacity building will be twice a year during the training process stipulated in the school calendar year.

During the project preparation, the Bank team provided a series of briefings and consultation sessions on the Bank's environmental and social safeguards policies to its counterparts in MoE. Numerous meetings and discussions of the Bank team with its counterparts in MoE have also provided many on-the-job training opportunities to the MoE project team.

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

During year-2, broad stakeholder consultation meetings with local and national interested groups were conducted at village, township and National levels during June 2015 and will continue during June 2016 based on the school calendar year. Both local authorities such as village heads and other relevant stakeholders at township level, as well as other agencies involved in education and ethnic minority issues, were invited.

Overall, participants expressed strong support to the project and to the CPPF measures that aim to ensure that the project will benefit vulnerable and ethnic groups.

We received written notification from the MoE on June 9, 2016 confirming that MoE is in the process of disclosing the SA and CPPF.

The DBE is responsible for developing and updating annually the Community Participation Plan (CPP). Detailed implementation arrangements are included in the revised national stipend program guidelines. Regarding the school grants program, the DBE will ensure that all schools receive grants as per national guidelines for the school grants program. The DBE will also monitor that all schools be treated fairly and transparently in the allocation of school grants. For implementing the program, the MoE follows the school calendar year which runs from June through March every year. Concerning the preparation of the guidelines, consultation and participation workshops have been conducted with relevant stakeholders in the country, including ethnic minority communities; as a result, for implementation year-3, guidelines have been updated for the stipends and school grants programs, and new guidelines are under development for the new mentoring component of the AF. To address potential grievances and monitor implementation of this CPPF and the CPP, the MoE is encouraging students and parents with questions or grievances to seek clarification and solutions through a grievance redress mechanism described in the revised guidelines. It is the DBE's intention to gather feedback and address complaints at the township level, to make key issues public, and to resolve issues in a transparent manner. Additionally, at the school, a School Committee

(SC) has been established to participate in and monitor the implementation of the stipend and school grants programs at the school level. The SC is comprised of the school headmaster, parents and teachers, as well as representatives from vulnerable groups - including ethnic minority groups. The SC includes representation of male and female parent members. The SCs are in the process of increasing their capacity in monitoring grievance mechanisms to ensure that the stipends and school grants programs are implemented under the support of this program as per provisions of this CPPF.

The qualitative assessment prepared by Save the Children and the social assessment report notes that extensive consultations held in all communities with vulnerable groups, including ethnic minorities, indicated strong appreciation and broad community support for both the stipends and school grant programs. There were no signs of discrimination against religious or ethnic minorities in the implementation of the programs. Respondents also reported that although the stipend amount is not very large, the program has shown positive signs of enabling students from poor families who face financial and other difficulties to enroll in school, stay in school, and return to school if they had dropped out. Stipend money has helped vulnerable families to cover student costs for school uniforms, an umbrella, shoes, school texts, notebooks and other supplies, lunches, snacks and transportation. Respondents also mentioned that getting an education was important for children. However, consultation with stakeholders revealed that poor and vulnerable groups, including ethnic minorities, often face greater challenges than just financial ones in enrolling their children in school and supporting them while they complete their education. At school and township levels, the education program cycle for the stipends and school grants selection has a systematic consultation and participation process built in at different stages. This includes: (1) Public information, dissemination and consultation process; (2) Formation of School and Township Committees; (3) Social assessment and school characteristics forms gathering of information; (4) Participatory preparation of school improvement plans; (5) Selection of stipends students; (6) Notification and public disclosure of selected students; and (7) Grievances attention.

### ***B. Disclosure Requirements***

<b>Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	03-Feb-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	19-Feb-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Myanmar	21-Feb-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	09-Jun-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	13-Jun-2016
"In country" Disclosure	

Myanmar	09-Jun-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.</b>	
<b>If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why::</b>	

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

<b>OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment</b>						
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" 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 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	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>

safeguard policies?						
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: Marie-Helene Cloutier  
Title: Senior Economist

### Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name: Republic of the Union of Myanmar  
Contact: Daw Si Si Pyone  
Title: Director General, Budget Department, Ministry of Finance  
Email: sisipyone@gmail.com

### Implementing Agencies

Name: Ministry of Education  
Contact: Myo Thein Gyi  
Title: Minister  
Email: drmyotheingyi@gmail.com

## VI. For more information contact:

The World Bank  
1818 H Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20433  
Telephone: (202) 473-1000  
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/projects>

## VII. Approval

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Marie-Helene Cloutier	
<i>Approved By:</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Peter Leonard (SA)	Date: 20-Jun-2016
Practice Manager/Manager:	Name: Harry Anthony Patrinos (PMGR)	Date: 21-Jun-2016

Country Director:	Name:Ulrich Zachau (CD)	Date:13-Mar-2017
-------------------	-------------------------	------------------

Public Disclosure Copy

Public Disclosure Copy