

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: ISDSA1107

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 25-Dec-2014

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 26-Dec-2014

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Tanzania	Project ID:	P123134
Project Name:	Dar es Salaam Metropolitan Development Project (P123134)		
Task Team Leader(s):	Andre A. Bald		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	01-Dec-2014	Estimated Board Date:	02-Mar-2015
Managing Unit:	GSURR	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	Urban Transport (60%), General water, sanitation and flood protection sector (30%), Sub-national government administration (10%)		
Theme(s):	City-wide Infrastructure and Service Delivery (40%), Urban services and housing for the poor (30%), Municipal governance and institution building (20%), Urban planning and housing policy (10%)		
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:	330.30	Total Bank Financing:	300.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
BORROWER/RECIPIENT			25.30
International Development Association (IDA)			300.00
Nordic Development Fund (NDF)			5.00
Total			330.30
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Project Development Objective(s)

The objective of the Project is to improve urban services and institutional capacity in the Dar es

Salaam Metropolitan Area and to facilitate potential emergency response.

3. Project Description

Component 1: Priority Infrastructure. This component will finance improvements and constructions of: (i) priority roads – local and feeder roads in the urban core to alleviate congestion hotspots, and support public transit, mobility and connectivity to low-income communities, especially improving accessibility to the BRT system; and (ii) primary and secondary drainage systems – including bank stabilization, detention ponds, connection to the secondary network etc. around five river basins of Dar es Salaam. In addition, a zero-sum sub-component will support, at GoTs request and the Bank’s concurrence, activities (assessments, technical assistance, works, and purchase of equipment) resulting from natural or man-made disasters, including public health crisis.

Component 2: Upgrading in Low-Income Communities. This component will finance the upgrading of low-income communities in all three municipal councils, by improving basic services including: (i) roads and road related infrastructure (roads, bridges/culverts, footpaths, traffic lights etc.); (ii) environmental related works (storm water drainage, sanitation, tertiary solid waste collection, street lights); and (iii) community related amenities (parks, markets and bus stands); as well as strengthening community-level initiatives and capacities related to the upgrading.

Component 3: Institutional Strengthening, Capacity Building, and Urban Analytics. This component will support: (i) development of metropolitan governance arrangements and systems; (ii) municipal finances and technical capacity through own source revenue collection and development and integration of GIS; (iii) integrated transport and land-use planning; (iv) operations and maintenance systems; (v) urban analytics; and (vi) strengthening of urban planning systems.

Component 4: Implementation Support and Monitoring & Evaluation. This component will enable the key implementing agencies (PMO-RALG, DLAs and DART Agency) to execute the project. It will include operational costs for the direct project management and supervision functions, including procurement, accounting, financial management, safeguards, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), audit of project accounts, meetings and workshops, and impact assessments. Resources for further project preparation are included. In addition, funds are allocated for critical maintenance equipment required for long term sustainability of priority infrastructure as well as for the organizing and implementing of IEC initiatives at ward, sub-ward and community level.

Safeguards instruments focused on Component 1a, 1b and Component 2, with identified institutional strengthening and capacity building activities for environmental and social management included under Component 3.

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

The project will be implemented only within the Dar es Salaam region of Tanzania. The three municipal councils which form the region are Ilala Municipal Council, Kinondoni Municipal Council, and Temeke Municipal Council, which will be responsible for project implementation. The Dar es Salaam City Council will have a central role on metropolitan institutional issues, and the Prime Minister’s Office – Regional Administration and Local Government (PMO-RALG) will have an overall project coordination and oversight role through a Project Coordination Unit (PCU)

Dar es Salaam’s growth has been shaped by informality – and this has resulted in sprawl, the proliferation of unplanned areas, and the loss of valuable right of ways. An estimated 80 percent of land in Dar is ‘informal’ – meaning it is not planned, and residents lack title. Much of the city is in

low-lying areas, and the undulating topography makes it difficult to move water between the flat areas to the (undeveloped) major drainage canals. Thus most of Dar is highly vulnerable to flooding even from minor storm events: combined with the growing population, encroachment in hazardous areas, and more frequent and intensive storm events, the city's physical form is driving social vulnerability to environmental hazards.

Environmental screening during the ESIA process found conditions in the project areas of the three municipalities included significant environmental issues including poor sanitation (e.g. open dumping and mismanagement of refuse), degraded surface water drainage areas (e.g. river and stream basins, drainage canals), frequent flooding and standing polluted water during rain events (facilitating the spread of water-borne illnesses and vector diseases), air pollution due to vehicle emissions and dust from poor road conditions, and substandard infrastructure. No sensitive sites of ecological or cultural significance in the project area were found in the environmental screening.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Amy Faust (GSURR)

Helen Z. Shahriari (GSURR)

Jane A. N. Kibbassa (GENDR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	Overall, the project's infrastructure works described above in Section I.3 are expected to improve environmental quality in Dar es Salaam, including relieving traffic congestion and air quality as well as reducing flooding and improving sanitation and public safety. OP 4.01 is triggered given potential negative impacts on the environment and communities, which are outlined in more detail in Section II.A.1. An overall ESMF has been prepared, as well as six ESIA's for the drainage and road works. The ESIA's have found that impacts are site-specific and largely able to be addressed through design, good engineering practices, and proper supervision, and investments would pose no large-scale or irreversible negative environmental and social impacts. The negative impacts of roads, drainage, and upgrading were found to be consistent with a Category B safeguards classification. The ESMF and ESIA's have been consulted upon and disclosed before appraisal.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The ESIA's found that no natural habitats would be degraded or converted.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	The project does not involve forests or forestry.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	The Project does not involve pest management
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	It is possible that sites of architectural or spiritual significance (e.g. graveyards, religious facilities) could be impacted by the project and/or that there could be

		chance finds during excavations. While the ESIA's have not found direct impacts on sensitive Physical Cultural Resources, the ESMPs include chance find procedures.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	There are no Indigenous Peoples in the project area.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	<p>OP 4.12 is triggered since some infrastructure works will require involuntary resettlement, including partial impacts on properties (residences and businesses), full relocation of households, and livelihoods impacts (e.g. mobile street vendors and hawkers).</p> <p>The following instruments have been prepared, consulted upon and disclosed before appraisal: (i.) a Resettlement Policy Framework and (ii.) five Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) for the drainage packages that have advanced designs.</p> <p>The Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) will guide any future investments, given DMDP is taking a phased approach. Moreover, there are a number of subprojects for which the final designs are not fully ready (e.g. upgrading works that will be selected by communities at a later stage).</p>
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The drainage works in Component 1b would involve stormwater detention ponds, which were assessed for potential triggering of OP/BP 4.37 if they could be defined as small dams. It was determined that while these could be considered as small dams, they are small enough in size that no dam safety issues as defined in the policy would be caused if there were to be a breach. The drainage component ESMPs include safety measures and management procedures for detention ponds, including both design elements such as fencing and site control as well as awareness raising through signage and community outreach.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	NA
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	NA

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:

The investments to be carried out under Components 1a, 1b and 2 will involve small- to medium-scale municipal works. Environmental and social due diligence has found that investments would

pose no large-scale or irreversible negative environmental and social impacts, and are consistent with a Category B safeguards classification including when resettlement and cumulative impacts of the project as a whole are considered.

DMDP will be implemented in two phases: Phase I will consist of drainage works, which have final detailed designs, and three road sections having advanced designs with minor environmental impacts and no resettlement (Component 1a and 1b). During this phase a design review on the remaining roads and upgrading works (currently at a preliminary design stage) will also be undertaken, in part to amend designs in order to minimize resettlement. Phase II will include the remaining road segments and upgrading activities (Component 1a and 2).

Environmental impacts

DMDP infrastructure works are expected to improve key aspects of environmental quality in Dar es Salaam, including relieving traffic congestion which will result in improved air quality, as well as reducing flooding and improving sanitation and public safety. The project road works will contribute to lowering greenhouse gas emissions through reduced vehicle idling and planning such as building capacity for Transit Oriented Development. DMDP drainage works and upgrading in low income communities will improve urban resilience to current and future climate variability through both traditional drainage infrastructure as well as piloting green infrastructure investments such as storm water detention ponds that can be preserved and utilized as green space during dry spells.

The ESIA identified the positive and negative impacts of road, drainage, and upgrading activities during the mobilization, construction and operational phases of sub-projects, and included mitigation measures for the most significant impacts in the ESMPs.

In the mobilization phase stakeholder consultations found resettlement and compensation would be the most significant impact. Stakeholders were concerned that compensation would be fair and done in advance of works. These impacts and how to mitigate them are covered through the RAPs and RPF, which are cross-referenced in the ESIA and ESMF. These safeguards instruments are described in more detail in Section 4 below, and consultation and disclosure outlined in Section 5.

The most significant environmental and social risks identified during the construction phase are impacts typical of construction works in urban areas, namely nuisances due to dust, noise and vibration, interruption of public utilities that require relocation from work sites (electricity, water, telecommunications), occupational and community health and safety, flooding from poor drainage, soil erosion due to vegetation removal, and increased waste. Drainage works in particular will need to ensure that contaminated dredged sediments and existing solid waste in existing drains and canals will require treatment and safe transport and disposal at the Pugu dumpsite. It has been agreed that contractors will need to plan to treat and transport waste safely and avoid negative impacts on communities.

Negative impacts during the operational phase are largely issues of public safety. For roads under the local roads and upgrading components, this includes the likelihood of increased accidents resulting from higher speeds and more traffic on paved roads, which was highlighted in stakeholder consultations. Road designs include good practices for pedestrian facilities and traffic calming, especially near schools. For upgrading, works are small scale in nature and no major impacts have been noted aside from typical construction impacts. For drainage, there are risks of flooding if drains and retention ponds are not properly maintained, and DMDP has a strong focus

on building capacity for operations and maintenance. Additionally, efforts of community engagement around sanitation, including drain maintenance and solid waste management, are included at the DLA and ward level in those areas with DMDP subprojects. Community sensitization was pointed out as key for mitigating the most significant safety and health risks for all subprojects.

The ESIA's have found that impacts can be mitigated through (i) the application of good engineering and construction management practices, (ii) close supervision and monitoring of contractors' performance, and (iii) close consultation with, and monitoring by, local communities. Subproject-specific ESMPs have been prepared for each bidding package, which include both general and site-specific mitigation measures for the mobilization, construction and operation phases.

Involuntary Resettlement

Overall resettlement impacts are largely due to road widening in order to provide wider carriageways, install roadside drains, and provide pedestrian walkways. Some resettlement will also be required for drainage works, for example to enlarge existing drainage channels. Infrastructure designs considered elements to minimize impacts on resettlement for all types of works. For example, the drainage component assessed several design alternatives, which resulted in the selection of storm water detention ponds that both reduced resettlement impacts as well as overall project costs. Additionally, a preliminary design review was held during the appraisal mission to examine the road works under Component 1a and Component 2, which originally had significant resettlement impacts given high design standards (i.e. wide road rights of way). This design review resulted in a reduction of total resettlement costs by nearly 50%.

Between the three components, approximately 1,497 households would have partial impacts by the civil works (verandas, septic tanks, partial demolition). The number of fully affected households that would require permanent relocation is approximately 535, with the majority of resettled households resulting from the priority roads component. The total amount of compensation is estimated at approximately US \$25 million.

Road works under Component 1a and Component 2 that involve resettlement will not start construction for more than one year after DMDP is effective. This will allow time for a thorough design review with the potential to further reduce resettlement impacts, as well as provide capacity building for updating and carrying out the RAPs and identifying funding sources for compensation payments.

Drainage works under Component 1b are the only works that will initiate the bidding process after project effectiveness, therefore the drainage RAPs have been finalized for appraisal and reviewed and cleared by the Bank. The total number of affected properties for Component 1b, where advanced designs have been prepared, has been estimated at approximately 1,041. Drainage works would involve permanent relocation of a total of 107 households in the five drainage basins combined, with approximately US\$5 million in compensation costs. The three municipal councils have already set aside these funds in their budgets, as committed during the appraisal mission.

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

The long term impacts of the project activities are expected to be positive and result in improvements to environmental quality in Dar es Salaam including relieving traffic congestion

and air quality, job creation and increased incomes, improved drainage resulting in reduced health risks and infrastructure sustainability, and improved access to community facilities. The ESIA found that most impacts would result from the construction phase, however the mitigation measures during the operation phase will be particularly critical in terms of public safety for drainage infrastructure, to avoid negative impacts of improper management including management of detention ponds and ensuring that drainage infrastructure is maintained to avoid future flooding. Future encroachment by informal settlements on road and drainage infrastructure is a particular risk for both public safety and resettlement costs in the case of future investments.

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

Each municipal ESIA included an alternatives analysis that assessed the no-project alternative, alternative sites, and alternative designs. In each case the no-project alternative was rejected, given the risks of a business-as-usual situation for the condition of existing road and drainage infrastructure would outweigh the temporary costs of construction. Site alternatives were assessed through using criteria such as environmental impact and number of negatively affected households. Lastly, design alternatives were evaluated such as storm water detention ponds vs. larger drainage channels. The preferred options from the alternatives analysis were in part based on minimizing resettlement, public safety, and maximizing environmental benefits (e.g. using retention pond sites for public use while dry).

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.

Resettlement Action Plans

For resettlement instruments the following instruments have been prepared: (i.) a Resettlement Policy Framework (ii.) five Resettlement Action Plans for the drainage packages that have advanced designs, and (iii) preliminary RAPs for the roads and upgrading works that are in the design phase, which have been prepared for each municipality (i.e. six preliminary RAPs). These works will be subject to a design review, which will inform an update of the RAPs for Component 1a and Component 2 as needed. The final RAPs will then be sent to the Bank for review and clearance prior to compensation payments.

The Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) will guide the RAP update and any future investments, given DMDP is taking a phased approach. Moreover, there are a number of subprojects for which the final designs are not fully ready (e.g. upgrading works that will be selected by communities at a later stage). The RPF was the guiding framework for the RAPs already prepared, and will be applied to all future DMDP investments, to ensure that all PAPs will be compensated for their losses at replacement cost and provided with rehabilitation measures to assist them to improve or at least maintain their pre-project standards of living. The RPF gives special attention to women and vulnerable groups to ensure that they benefit from the investments and that their special needs are addressed.

Cash compensation was the method preferred by project affected people during RAP consultations, as the PAPs believe they can rent or purchase residences and businesses in Dar es Salaam without difficulty in terms of local market pricing; in other cases, land and asset losses are minor to moderate, and manageable. The three municipalities are responsible for ensuring budget for all resettlement and associated compensation costs in the RAPs, with assistance from PMO-RALG to secure funds. Securing sufficient funds has been cited as a significant challenge by the municipalities, which is in part why lower impact projects were selected for the first round of tendering. Together the municipalities have committed US \$5.8 million for compensation costs in

their current budgets, which is sufficient to cover the resettlement costs of the drainage works which will be tendered in first phase of DMDP civil works. This budget allocation was confirmed with the municipalities and PMO-RALG during appraisal.

In order to ensure that adequate and timely funds are available for compensation, local governments plan to secure loans from commercial banks for resettlement costs. These loans would be backed by the central government, which has a firm commitment outlined in a letter describing these arrangements. This will be signed by the Permanent Secretary of PMO-RALG, and submitted to the Bank prior to Negotiations. PMO-RALG will also assist the municipalities to explore other sources of funds from central government sources, and the municipalities would also explore own source revenues as a supplement to loans. DMDP includes activities to increase local government revenue collection, an approach that has been piloted and shown to be successful in the Tanzania Strategic Cities Project. After 2-3 years of implementation DMDP will seek ways to ring-fence some of these gains for resettlement compensation, or payback of the commercial loans.

Environmental and Social Impact Assessment

ESIAs were carried out for each of the three components in each DLA including mitigation measures in Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs), therefore six ESIAs have been prepared and consulted upon by the client. This approach was taken given the DLAs are responsible for safeguards oversight for projects in their jurisdiction, and the three components will be separate bidding packages. The ESIAs for the drainage and roads components are ready for implementation, and the ESIAs for the upgrading component are at a preliminary stage and may be updated during the design review of the works packages.

An overall Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) was also prepared to account for future works and guide any updates to the ESIAs, which includes standard Environmental Codes of Practice (ECOPs) that apply to typical impacts of road, drainage and upgrading works. The ESMF adapts the institutional framework and grievance mechanisms designed under other urban projects under implementation in Tanzania, which have been shown to function well in other municipalities. These have been consulted with the DLAs and their inputs taken into account in the design as a first step toward sensitization for safeguards implementation. Funds for institutional strengthening and capacity building for environmental and social management will be included under Component 3.

Capacity

The ESIA process found that capacity for safeguards implementation is generally low, though preparation of DMDP has included focal points for safeguards, including environmental focal points and municipal valuers who were fully involved in preparation of the RAPs. The study on Institutional Strengthening of Dar es Salaam Local Authorities conducted during project preparation found that councils do have an Urban Development, Natural Resources and Environment department, which as a whole oversee the environmental issues in the Municipality. For resettlement, each DLA does have municipal valuers and community development officers, however there is a lack of experience in carrying out and monitoring ESMPs and RAPs, posing an implementation risk.

Recognizing that the municipalities have limited experience with infrastructure projects of this size and scale, significant resources have been built into DMDP to address environmental and social impacts and resettlement issues.

PMO-RALG will have a top-level quality assurance and project monitoring role, including budget for a full time international resettlement specialist and international environmental specialist, dedicated to supporting the 3 municipalities for the first 3 years.

Each municipality will have a dedicated Project Implementation Unit, including focal points for environment, land, and community development issues. The PIU will be responsible for setting up Municipal Resettlement Committees and Municipal Grievance Committees in each municipality, which will include technical specialists as well as ward- and community-level representatives. Each PIU will have a package of project management support (from an international firm) that will include expertise on resettlement and environmental issues, mapped directly to the municipal PIUs. These firms will include a community liaison/communications specialist, who will in part be responsible for addressing issues before they would escalate to the level of the grievance handling committees.

Within the PIU, the environmental specialist will review contract bids, coordinate on regulatory compliance issues, conduct monitoring field visits, and consult with local authorities and communities. The social specialist will ensure implementation of the RAPs (including that compensation is paid before works begin), liaise with project affected people, and ensure the RPF is applied to works in later phases, and monitor grievances. These specialists will prepare quarterly monitoring reports to be submitted to PMO-RALG, NEMC and the Bank.

A Construction Supervision Consultant (CSC) will be responsible for day-to-day monitoring of construction activities, and reporting to the PIU and PMO-RALG on a quarterly basis. The CSC includes an environmental engineer and land specialist that will monitor adherence to the ESMPs and RAPs, and may choose to contract an independent environmental and social monitoring consultant.

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

Preparation of the RAPs, ESIA's and ESMPs has undergone an extensive consultation process with relevant stakeholders, including communities, local authorities, public utilities, the National Environmental Management Council (NEMC), and water basin authorities. Consultations with relevant authorities and communities have been ongoing throughout project preparation, and summarized in the ESIA's and RAPs. These have been both to obtain views on the potential impacts of the three works components, as well as consult with Project Affected People as part of the resettlement exercise. The RPF includes procedures for the local authorities to carry out public consultations, information disclosure, and grievance redress as projects are implemented.

The following safeguards documents have been cleared by the Bank and were disclosed in the InfoShop on December 15, 2014 and made available in Tanzania in hard copy in the three municipal offices and PMO-RALG, and soft copies on PMO-RALG's website on December 15, 2014: ESIA's for Component 1a (Priority Roads – no resettlement is involved in the first three roads to be tendered), ESIA's and RAPs for Component 1b (storm water drainage). The overall ESMF and RPF were disclosed on December 16, 2014. The remaining safeguards documents will be reviewed, cleared, and disclosed by the Bank when they are finalized during project implementation, which will be required prior to tendering any sub-project bidding packages.

Workshops with local authorities to review and agree on the mitigation measures, institutional

framework, capacity building plan, and grievance procedures were held on October 9, 2014 and November 28, 2014.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	10-Dec-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	16-Dec-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Tanzania	17-Dec-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	10-Dec-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	16-Dec-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Tanzania	17-Dec-2014
<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 4.11 - 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(s):	Name: Andre A. Bald	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Regional Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Alexandra C. Bezeredi (RSA)	Date: 25-Dec-2014
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Rosemary Mukami Kariuki (PMGR)	Date: 26-Dec-2014