

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

Report No.: PIDISDSA17863

Date Prepared/Updated: 02-May-2016

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country:	Nigeria	Project ID:	P158535
		Parent Project ID (if any):	P096572
Project Name:	North East Food Security and Livelihood Emergency Support Project (P158535)		
Parent Project Name:	THIRD NATIONAL FADAMA DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (FADAMA III) (P096572)		
Region:	AFRICA		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	11-Apr-2016	Estimated Board Date:	07-Jun-2016
Practice Area (Lead):	Agriculture	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (100%)		
Theme(s):	Nutrition and food security (40%), Rural markets (5%), Rural non-farm income generation (5%), Rural services and infrastructure (40%), Global food crisis response (10%)		
Borrower(s):			
Implementing Agency:	National Fadama Coordination Office		
Financing (in USD Million)			
	Financing Source	Amount	
	BORROWER/RECIPIENT	0.00	
	International Development Association (IDA)	50.00	
	Financing Gap	0.00	
	Total Project Cost	50.00	
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):	The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate		
Other Decision:			

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

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

2. Nigeria recently became the largest economy in Africa after rebasing its GDP in 2014. With an abundant and diversified agricultural base, Nigeria's economy has a very large agricultural sector accounting for about 22 percent of the rebased GDP and employing about 70 percent of the labor force. Until the early 1970s, Nigeria was self-sufficient in food production with a small surplus for export and agriculture was the main foreign exchange earner. However, the sector stagnated thereafter for a number of reasons, key among them was the discovery, exploitation and exports of oil that resulted in a subsequent policy shift and resources allocations from agriculture to the oil-industry. Since agriculture employs an overwhelming share of the Nigerian labor force, stagnation of the sector resulted in increased poverty incidence.

3. The new Government that took office in 2015 has prioritized national food security in staple foods while also supporting development of value chains in agriculture. There have been concerted efforts in recent years to increase agricultural productivity, reduce poverty and increase rural incomes (particularly via agricultural transformation), but improved nutritional outcomes has remained only an implied outcome and not an explicit one. Mal-nutrition remains a serious problem, especially in the northern parts of the country and among the (mostly rural) poor.

4. The North East (NE) region was renowned for its large agricultural potential, with 80% of the population engaged in farming and contributing significantly to the regional and national GDP. Over the past two decades, however, the region has regressed with low education levels, limited access to healthcare and other basic amenities, and low GDP per capita. A once promising zone now trails the other regions of Nigeria across all socio economic indicators. The North East region in most recent times has also borne the brunt of human casualty, loss of properties and diminished livelihoods emanating from the Boko Haram terrorist insurgency. The six States selected as beneficiary of this proposed AFII have been hard-hit, resulting in a State of Emergency that has involved more intense military presence in those States.

5. Poverty incidence is highest in the North East than in any other regions of the country, with headcount estimates in North East of 50.2 percent while in the South West it was only 16 percent (2012/2013 GHS survey).

Sectoral and institutional Context

6. Agriculture, fishery and livestock are the dominant economic sectors in the North-East of Nigeria, but unemployment, especially among young men, is very high: Agriculture production capacity is impaired in the region due to the high state of insecurity that prevents any activity to take place, including supply of seeds/fertilizer, provision of advisory services by agriculture extension officers, timely farm maintenance activities and transport of harvest. Conflict and instability in Northern Nigeria have impacted all segments of the crop, livestock and agricultural services. Restriction in food availability and access in Borno, Yobe and Adamawa States has generated localized food crises of acute food insecurity during the lean period. As a result, food insecurity has increased dramatically, not only among the internally displaced people but also

within the hosting communities. The human insecurity situation and the associated massive displacement of communities have greatly exacerbated household food insecurity and malnutrition in the region, especially among young children and women.

7. There are about 1,818,469 Internally Displaced People (IDPs) out of which 94 percent expressed willingness to return to their places of origin and practice agriculture. Majority of these IDPs declared that agriculture was their main source of livelihood. Majority of displaced people are living in communities depend on their hosts for food assistance. The host communities who continue to bear an enormous responsibility of providing support for the IDPs have some of the highest levels of poverty and malnutrition in the country. About 2,690,946 across the three North East states will be in food crisis situation and will need humanitarian assistance (1,627,266 in Borno, 940,750 in Yobe and 122,930 in Adamawa state). Revamping the agricultural production system will therefore require addressing the food crisis first.

8. In summary, the insurgency has impacted economic activity in general and agricultural activity in particular through multitude of channels: (i) reduced human mobility that hampered the free movement of inhabitants outside protected areas; (ii) reduced access to farm land, inputs and markets; (iii) increased theft: the agriculture sector became a target for insurgents in need of cash and food; (iv) increased prices for transportation, inputs and products; (v) debilitation of important infrastructures such as community irrigation schemes, rural feeder roads and market posts; (vi) emigration of the population to settle outside NE; and (vii) existence of mined fields with explosive that make it difficult movement and starting economic activities: The reduction in mobility resulted in higher transportation cost and this coupled with decline in farm inputs, farm inputs became expensive, thereby limiting access to inputs.

9. Due to the conflict sustained in the recent past (and still continuing with isolated flashpoints), the states of the NE have seen a marked erosion of the low level capacity that exists before the conflict. NGOs and CSOs operating demonstrate a very low capacity due to outflow of capable manpower out of these states. While low level capacity is now a characteristic feature of institutions and organizations operating in the region and is a shared problem across the six states, the FADAMA project has a structure in the region that will be important in supporting the project implementation. At state level, FADAMA has the structure to ensure that project implementation and coordination is supported very closely. A dedicated desk to coordinate project activities in the NE will be established within FADAMA project coordination office. Donors are now moving the region and this could help in ameliorating institutional capacity by crowding-in capacity improvement and TA to agencies involved in the restoration of NE livelihood. The project also plan to actively seek the partnership of universities and higher level learning institutions to provide support in project implementation and mainly in monitoring.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Original Project Development Objective(s) - Parent

The development objective of Fadama III Project is to increase the incomes of users of rural land and water resources on a sustainable basis.

Proposed Project Development Objective(s) - Additional Financing

The new PDO will be: to increase the incomes for users of rural lands and water resources in a sustainable manner and to contribute to restoration of the livelihoods of conflict affected

households in the selected area in the North East of the Recipient's territory?

Key Results

In terms of the outcomes there would be significant enhancement in the targets of existing performance indicators related to production, productivity and value addition. Some new indicators related to value added outputs would be added. The results framework will be adjusted. While the results on: PDO level indicators and core indicators on beneficiaries will be maintained and targets increased, new Results Indicators on (c) No of farmers receiving food vouchers, (d) Number of Households provided with livelihood support and (e) Number of households provided at least 60 days of employment. There would be a general increase in target numbers and Intermediate Indicators will include new interventions, such as food assistance and cash for work

D. Project Description

The proposed additional financing aims to respond to the urgent food and livelihood needs of families whose livelihood have been devastated by conflicts in the six States of Borno, Adamawa, Yobe, Taraba, Bauchi and Gombe. The AF will focus on selected activities that will be implemented quickly and set these conflicted affected states agricultural sector on strong footing towards a further sustainable development in the medium to long-term horizon. These activities include. (i) restoration of the agricultural production activities through provision of starter packs to affected households, including required agricultural inputs and on-farm and post-harvest productive assets, to support economic opportunities with special focus on women and youth. It will also finance the related advisory and extension services; including provision of food assistance to cope with the lean period while awaiting the first harvest(ii) rehabilitation and investment on rural infrastructure (fences, markets, post-harvest equipment, storage facilities including aggregation centers, production pens and houses for livestock, rural network of roads); this will be done through cash-for-work approach to dispense cash in exchange for labor and participation in construction of community infrastructure (iii) social mobilization and capacity building of farmers and local communities through the locally based indigenous organizations through training, peer learning and mentoring by more established organizations (iv) Incremental cost for project management, monitoring and evaluation, technical assistance for quality delivery and impact assessments including functional reviews and third party monitoring; a well-communicated complaints handling system and supporting consultations and updating the North East development strategy, including studies for the preparation of a longer-term program aimed at economic restructuring and diversification of the region's agricultural economy; drawing largely from the findings of the Recovery and Peace Building Assessment (RPBA) in the North East, Nigeria.

Component Name

Food Security, Livelihoods Support & Community Infrastructure Investment

Comments (optional)

This is a new component to take care of additional activities proposed under the Additional Financing

Component Name

Project Implementation Support

Comments (optional)

This component is aligned with Component 6 on Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation of the parent project

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

It is expected that the Additional Financing Project will cover the remaining 6 states of the Conflict affected North East of Nigeria and all the six the states currently implementing the Fadama III Project .

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Amos Abu (GEN07)

Michael Gboyega Ilesanmi (GSU01)

II. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

NFCO has strong management capacity with fully trained staff, solid Procurement, Management and Monitoring & Evaluation systems including the existence of well-established Fadama Community Associations and Groups which could provide a formidable bases of delivering project activities. The project design which allows the movement of resources directly to the communities without passing through the government system is also a positive strategy to deliver results. The SFCO will be strengthened where necessary with suitably qualified and experienced Specialists. These additional experts would be recruited according to transparent and competitive procedures satisfactory to the Government and the Bank. There are no changes in the procurement administration, and environmental and social safeguard arrangements. The 18 month procurement plan has been cleared by the Bank. No new safeguard policies are triggered, however, all the instruments prepared for the original project have been updated and disclosed accordingly.

III. Safeguard Policies that might apply

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The project is classified as environmental Category B and requires a partial Environmental Assessment (EA). Due to the small-scale and dispersed nature of the eligible investments, no large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts are foreseen. Beyond financing agricultural inputs, investments will small scale civil works such rehabilitation of existing rural infrastructure (rehabilitation and investment on new infrastructure - fences, markets, storage facilities including aggregation centers, production pens and houses for livestock, rural network of roads) as well as purchasing productive equipment that will require socio-environmental management. An Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has been prepared to guide demand-driven project implementation in prioritizing

		environmentally sustainable and climate smart investments and agricultural practices.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	The project will involve elements of excavation from the construction of small dams and earth roads, therefore it is not inconceivable that cultural relics may be found. Chance find procedures that would be adopted by the project and the Additional Financing is contained in the ESMF
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	There are no indigenous peoples in the project area.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/ BP 4.12	Yes	The project interventions will avoid where possible adverse impacts on people, land and other economic resources and livelihoods. In situations where this cannot be avoided, the borrower will, based upon the principles and objectives spelt out in the updated Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF), prepare site specific Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) to address the needs of persons who will be affected by loss of economic activities, land acquisition and/or relocation. The preparation of these safeguards documents will be inclusive and participatory, promoting community ownership and social accountability. The RAPs will be reviewed and cleared by both the project safeguards team and the Bank. The RPF of the parent project will be re-disclosed in country and at the Infoshop prior to prior to Board Approval
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	Yes	The project may involve the construction, strengthening or modification of small dams, weirs and water impoundments. For this reason, the safety of dams policy (OP 4.37) is triggered, even though the project is not supporting any large dams. The ESMF provides guidance, and qualified engineers will be engaged for design and supervision.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	Yes	OP 7.50 is triggered for AF2 because it may finance the construction, strengthening or modification of small dams, weirs and water impoundment. However, it was established that the scope of activities to be financed was captured in the notification undertaken for the parent project. Going by the implementation record of the parent project, the abstraction of groundwater for the purposes of the project is unlikely to have any adverse impacts

		on water quality or quantity in the Niger or Lake Chad basins.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/ BP 7.60	No	

IV. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

<p>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</p> <p>The Project, including the AF is not envisaged to cause a potential large scale, significant and /or irreversible or cumulative impacts. The environmental risks and the environmental category of this additional financing will continue to be B, implying that potential environmental and social impacts will be less adverse, easily remediable and site-specific. However, the project may involve the construction, strengthening or modification of small dams, weirs and water impoundment. For this reason, the safety of dams policy (OP 4.37) is triggered, even though the project is not supporting any large dams. The ESMF provides guidance, and qualified engineers will be engaged for design and supervision. In the same vein, OP 7.50 is triggered for AF2. However during project design, it became clear that the scope of activities to be financed by the AF2 was already fully captured in the notification undertaken for the parent project. This conclusion was reached taking into account the following factors: (i) that the geographic area in which AF2 will finance activities was conveyed as part of the FADAMA III notification which was national in scope; (ii) that the nature of activities to be financed under the AF2 is the same as those that have been financed under the parent project to date, and that no new types of activities that involve the use or potential pollution of international waterways will be financed; (iii) that the end of the implementation period for AF2-financed activities coincides with the closing date of FADAMA III. As designed, the project activities will be demand driven. Going by the nature of activities financed so far under the parent Fadama III project, the only water related activities demanded and funded in the 36 states during the 9 years of operation was 612 boreholes and 322 open wells totaling 934 numbers out of 15,596 items funded under the infrastructure component. This represents about 6% of the investment under the infrastructure component. In monetary terms, Road rehabilitation alone consumes about 60% of the total allocation under this component. What was committed to water related activities was thus less than 2% of the total project cost of \$250Million. The same trend of demand driven activities is expected under the AF2. The ESMF provides guidance, and qualified engineers will be engaged for design and supervision. The client has processed and formally disclosed site specific safeguard instruments that were prepared during the implementation of the parent Fadama III project. In terms of compliance with Safeguards under the parent project, nationally a total of 45,475 site specific ESMP were Prepared, 44,518 ESMP Screened, 44,275 ESMP Approved, 39,057 ESMP Implemented and 12,345 Generic. Level of compliance in the 6 states of the North East was also encouraging. The North East States had a total of 5,416 ESMP Prepared, 5246 ESMP Screened, 5,246 ESMP Approved, and 4,216 ESMP Implemented.</p>
<p>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</p> <p>This Project falls into Environmental category B as no adverse long-term impacts are anticipated. No long-term adverse impacts were identified in the updated and revised safeguards instruments: Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF); Resettlement Policy Framework</p>

<p>(RPF); and Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP). Further, as this is an emergency response project, we rely on the conclusion of the officials of the Federal Ministry of Water resources on water requirement and its sustainable use that the implementation of the Fadama Additional Financing in Nigeria will be so insignificant as to affect the ground water regime in the riparian states</p>
<p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p>
<p>Not applicable.</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>Nigeria has demonstrated its commitment to mitigating adverse social and environmental impacts in the implementation of a range of World Bank projects. There are adequate legal and institutional frameworks in the country to ensure compliance with World Bank safeguards policies. The ESMF, IPMP and RPF that were prepared during the original project have been updated and will be re-disclosed in country and at the Infoshop for the purposes of this additional financing. These safeguards instruments have provided mechanisms to identify impacts beyond the generic ones for which standard mitigation measures are built and to be applied during the implementation phase. The safeguards impacts identified are not expected to have any long-term or cumulative impacts. Environmental protection clauses will be included in the contract documents for small-scale infrastructure like rehabilitation and/or construction of feeder and Fadama access roads, culverts and bridges, aggregation storage facilities and markets. The project may involve the construction, strengthening or modification of small dams, weirs, or water impoundment for small scale irrigation. For this reason, the safety of dams policy (OP 4.37) is triggered, even though the project is not supporting any large dams. The ESMF provides guidance, and qualified engineers will be engaged for design and supervision. The Safeguards unit resident in the PMU prepared the ESMF and has prepared ESMPs for the investments being financed in the parent project. The safeguards unit already has demonstrated satisfactory goodwill and capacity to address impacts of projects funded activities. Fadama III supervision has shown that the project's capacity to implement the ESMF, IPMP and RPF properly is adequate.</p> <p>Environmental protection criteria. Experience demonstrates that, because of their small scale, most of the subprojects financed under Fadama III do not have a significant effect on the environment. Nevertheless, the detailed environmental checklist, developed and used in the LDP process for subproject screening and qualification, will be maintained and updated for this Project. Further, an environmental specialist will be maintained at the SFDO to provide additional technical assistance on environmental matters as well as provide training to increase environmental awareness of Facilitators and the Beneficiaries</p>
<p>5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.</p>
<p>The key stakeholders are the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, NFCO , State Ministries of Agriculture and Agencies of the participating that will implement the project, LGAs, NGOs, Donor partners; other relevant institutions and participating communities.</p> <p>Relevant stakeholders have been informed of the project; however public consultation will be an on-going activity taking place throughout the entire project process. Community participation and consultation are an integral selection of community infrastructure and services to be supported under the project</p>

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	07-Apr-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	04-May-2007
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	04-May-2007
Date of submission to InfoShop	04-May-2007
"In country" Disclosure	
<i>Comments:</i>	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	07-Apr-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	04-May-2007
"In country" Disclosure	
<i>Comments:</i>	
If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.	
If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:	
ESMF, IPMP and the RPF, have been reviewed and updated to cover both the activities of the parent project and of the proposed AF2	

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 [] No [×] NA []
OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats	
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes [] No [×] NA []
If the project would result in significant conversion or	Yes [] No [] NA [×]

degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?	
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"/>]
Is physical displacement/relocation expected? Provided estimated number of people to be affected	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] TBD [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods) Provided estimated number of people to be affected	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] TBD [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.36 - Forests	
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.37 - Safety of Dams	
Have dam safety plans been prepared?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have the TORs as well as composition for the independent Panel of Experts (POE) been reviewed and approved by the Bank?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Has an Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) been prepared and arrangements been made for public awareness and training?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
OP 7.50 - Projects on International Waterways	
Have the other riparians been notified of the project?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

If the project falls under one of the exceptions to the notification requirement, has this been cleared with the Legal Department, and the memo to the RVP prepared and sent?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Has the RVP approved such an exception?	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"/>]

V. Contact point

World Bank

Contact: Adetunji A. Oredipe

Title: Senior Agriculture Economist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name:

Contact:

Title:

Email:

Implementing Agencies

Name: National Fadama Coordination Office

Contact: Adetayo Adewumi

Title: National Project Coordinator

Email: adetayojoe@yahoo.com

VI. For more information contact:

The InfoShop
The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 458-4500
Fax: (202) 522-1500
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/infoshop>

VII. Approval

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Adetunji A. Oredipe	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Johanna van Tilburg (SA)	Date: 28-Apr-2016
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Simeon Kacou Ehui (PMGR)	Date: 28-Apr-2016
Country Director:	Name: Rachid Benmessaoud (CD)	Date: 02-May-2016