# INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
# APPRAISAL STAGE

**Report No.**: ISDSA13234

**Date ISDS Prepared/Updated:** 09-Nov-2015

**Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed:** 12-Nov-2015

## I. BASIC INFORMATION

### 1. Basic Project Data

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Country:** | Turkey | **Project ID:** | P151739 |
| **Project Name:** | Turkey Geothermal Development Project (P151739) | | |
| **Task Team Leader(s):** | Shinya Nishimura,Pierre Audinet | | |
| **Estimated Appraisal Date:** | 30-Oct-2015 | **Estimated Board Date:** | 04-Feb-2016 |
| **Managing Unit:** | GEE03 | **Lending Instrument:** | Investment Project Financing |
| **Sector(s):** | Other Renewable Energy (80%), General energy sector (20%) | | |
| **Theme(s):** | Climate change (20%), Infrastructure services for private sector development (80%) | | |
| **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: | 352.30 | Total Bank Financing: | 250.00 |
| Financing Gap: | 0.00 | | |

| **Financing Source** | **Amount** |
|---|---|
| Borrower | 62.50 |
| International Bank for Reconstruction and Development | 250.00 |
| Clean Technology Fund | 39.80 |
| Total | 352.30 |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Environmental Category:** | F - Financial Intermediary Assessment |
| **Is this a Repeater project?** | No |

### 2. Project Development Objective(s)

The Project Development Objective is to scale up private sector investment in geothermal energy development in Turkey.

### 3. Project Description

The project proposes to achieve the Objective by providing support to overcome the barriers, as per following; (i) by reducing the risks taken on by the private sector in the exploratory phases, and (ii) by providing access to long-term financing for the resourcedevelopment phases.

Component 1: Risk Sharing Mechanism for Resource Validation (USD 39.8 million, CTF grant)

This component aims to promote private sector development of renewable geothermal energy projects in the early stage geothermal exploratory and confirmation drilling stages by sharing the risk of failing to validate a geothermal resource among two parties: the administrator of a Risk Sharing Mechanism (RSM), capitalized by a CTF contingent recovery grant, and the geothermal developer (i. e. the beneficiary). In case a well fails to yield outputs at a level of well productivity pre-agreed between the RSM and the beneficiary, the RSM will cover a pre-defined percentage of the drilling expenditures incurred by the beneficiary. This percentage will be 40 percent for projects located within the administrative boundaries of Aydin, Denizli and Manisa in the Aegean region (or whose largest share of the project area is located in within those boundaries) and 60 percent in those located elsewhere in the country, which will encourage exploration in new areas, where the resource risk is generally higher given that limited or no previous exploration activities have been carried out by General Directorate of Mineral Research and Exploration (MTA).

The RSM will screen potential beneficiary applications based upon a clear and pre-defined set of technical, financial and corporate eligibility criteria to ensure that potential beneficiaries have carried out the appropriate surface exploration studies and have the necessary technical and financial capacity to complete the resource validation process (i.e. exploration and confirmation drilling) they plan to undertake. Selected beneficiaries will apply a pre-established well testing methodology, which will provide the results (i.e. enthalpy and flow) against which success and failure will be determined.

In case of failure, the RSM will cover the agreed percentage of the beneficiaries' drilling program expenditures (60 or 40 percent depending upon the location of the concession as explained above). In the case of success, the beneficiary will be required to contribute to the RSM a "success fee" of 10 percent of the planned incurred expenditures, as a way to reduce the rate of depletion of the RSM capital and maximize the number of projects to be supported. This percentage has been established to balance on the one side the capacity of the RSM to revolve its funds around the largest number of projects and on the other side, the willingness to pay of beneficiaries. The capacity of the RSM to revolve its funds is influenced in large part by the expected success rates to be achieved, currently estimated at 55 percent in the exploration phase in Turkey.

This component also includes a technical assistance component for (i) capacity strengthening of the geothermal team at the GDRE to supervise implementation of the RSM, and (ii) consultancy support to GDRE to facilitate implementation of the RSM (GDRE will hire a consultant to establish and operate the RSM, and to help ensure that MENR is technically capable to take over RSM operations before the end of the project).

The General Directorate of Renewable Energy (GDRE) and the General Directorate of External Relations and EU Affairs (GDEU) of the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources (MENR) will be the implementing agencies for the RSM.

Component 2: Loan Facility for Resource Development (US$ 250 million, IBRD loan)

This component aims to address the financing gap that license holders face today in the resource development stages of geothermal project development by providing debt financing to encourage and support both license holders and financiers investing in (i) the capacity/production drilling stage and (ii) the steam gathering and power plant construction stage.

The Project will capitalize a credit line to financial intermediaries (FIs) with an IBRD loan, which will be co-financed with FIs' own resources. The FIs will on-lend at market rates, but offer longer tenors than currently available in the market, to geothermal developers at the capacity drilling stage and at the construction stage. FIs will also provide co-financing to the Facility from its own resources. Once the capacity drilling stage is completed, the borrower (i.e. the project sponsor) shall be required to publicly disclose basic information about its potential project. The information will be disclosed through the project website that will be created for the RSM. This disclosure is intended to expand the financing opportunities of the project sponsor and to avoid market distortion through limits on access to information. The details of the disclosure will be included into the loan agreement between the financial intermediary and the sub-borrower.

The Loan Facility for Resource Development will be open to any geothermal development that has reached the capacity drilling stage, regardless of whether it benefited or not from the Risk Sharing Mechanism under Component 1. Once the capacity drilling is completed, the FI may proceed to provide additional funds to the sub-borrowers for the construction of the geothermal facility.

The Industrial Development Bank of Turkey (TSKB) and the Development Bank of Turkey (TKB) will be the financial intermediaries implementing this Component. A share of TSKB's and TKB's co-financing for this component will be dedicated to capacity strengthening on geothermal specific technical support. Specifically, this may include support of consultants for technical assessment, due diligence and monitoring of investments, who would be available to the FI's team on a needs basis and at their request.



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

Exact location of the sub-projects to be supported under both components is currently unknown.

## 5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Arzu Uraz (GSURR)

Esra Arikan (GENDR)

Zeynep Durnev Darendeliler (OPSPF)

| 6. Safeguard Policies | Triggered? | Explanation (Optional) |
|---|---|---|
| Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01 | Yes | The project has been assigned Category 'FI' in accordance with World Bank safeguard policy OP/BP/GP 4.01 (Environmental Assessment), this has been confirmed by the Quality unit as well. Under the first component there will be exploration-drilling activities, which will be conducted by 3-4 different drilling companies. Under the second component private companies will borrow from |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | TSKB or TKB (FIs of the project) for capacity drilling activities. It is estimated that both the exploration and capacity drilling phases of the project will be categorized as 'B' under OP 4.01, as the types of potential impacts are expected to be limited and be relatively easy to assess and mitigate through careful siting and good drilling practices. Sub-projects (exploration and development) in critical or sensitive natural habitats will be excluded, and the details about screening projects accordingly will be explained in the environmental framework document.<br><br>Main environmental issues related to exploration and capacity drilling phases will be: site preparation, topsoil management and prevention of soil contamination, storage and disposal of drill muds, managing the prevention of contamination of aquifers, monitoring of gas emissions (CO2, H2S, etc.) from the wells, management and monitoring of geothermal water discharges (during exploration - Component 1 and capacity drilling - Component 2) and monitoring of water quality in the vicinity of drilling area, monitoring noise during drilling works, construction of access roads, closure of wells/rehabilitation of areas if the wells are identified to be unsuccessful, etc. It is not possible to assess the potential risk of ground water contamination by geothermal activities in advance of the project as the implementation sites have not yet been determined. However, it is known that if geothermal drilling is carried out according to best practices regarding use of drilling fluids and well casing there is very unlikely that geothermal water can contaminate ground water aquifers.<br><br>The direct environmental impacts of exploratory drilling (Component 1) are expected to be minimal, although the predictable drilling expansion and power plant development following successful exploration must be regarded as a linked (induced) impact. The ESMF for Component 1 outlines the best practices in exploration, drilling and well management to be followed by the sub-borrower and the monitoring protocols to be followed for adequate supervision. For sub-projects that did not benefit from the risk sharing mechanism under Component 1 but are applying for capacity drilling financing under Component 2, the ESMF provides guidance for TSKB and TKB to carry out a simple “due diligence” audit to confirm that the exploratory phase was carried out in an acceptable manner, consistent with national laws and the |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | principles of the WB Safeguard Policies. The gaps between national environmental screening and assessment procedures and WB safeguard policies have been detailed in the ESMF, and the ESMF specifies that where there are differences the more stringent requirements will apply. The ESMF also provides guidance on risk screening of proposed sub-projects (including assessment of potential cumulative impacts), mitigation measures to reduce/ manage potential adverse impacts, and recommendations for "best practice" technologies such as re-using CO2 and excess heat for productive purposes.<br><br>The locations and the scope of sub-projects will be identified during the project implementation and relevant environmental assessment documents will be prepared according to sub-project categorization. As detailed in the ESMFs, it is expected that for component 2 sub-projects will be reviewed by TSKB or TKB for having national environmental clearances and then necessary environmental assessment documentation in line with OP 4.01 requirements will be completed by the sub-borrower. Sub-project partial EAs/EMPs will be submitted to WB for prior review and after getting no-objections these will be disclosed in client's/sub-borrower's websites and will be included in the corresponding bidding documents and/ or contracts of the investment projects. The environmental and social management framework (ESMFs) have also been prepared by the clients (all 3 FIs) and disclosed (in DRAFT form) both in country and in Infoshop.<br><br>The TA component of the project will also need to comply with OP 4.01 and therefore it will be ensured that the TORs for the consultants to be hired for TA studies covers the safeguard issues related to OP 4.01. |
| Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04 | Yes | The exploration and capacity drilling activities (component 1 and 2) may take place in rural areas which are potential natural habitats. Therefore, the policy is considered to be triggered to be on the safe side. According to this policy, the projects which do not create any significant adverse impacts on natural habitats and that are not placed in critical natural habitats will be eligible for financing. In general, impacts on ecological resources can be low to moderate and localized during exploration, drilling and plant operations. Activities such as site clearing and grading, road construction, well drilling, ancillary facility construction, and vehicle traffic have the potential to affect ecological resources by |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | disturbing habitat, increasing erosion and runoff, and creating noise at the project site. Issues related to impacts on natural habitats will be detailed in the EAs and ESMPs that will be prepared for the sub-projects under Component 1 and 2. |
| Forests OP/BP 4.36 | No | |
| Pest Management OP 4.09 | No | |
| Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11 | No | Sub-projects will not be conducted in culturally sensitive areas. But in any case, whether or not they are in historic areas, any sub-project ESMPs/partial EAs will include procedures and responsibilities for managing accidentally discovered or chance find cultural artifacts. Consideration of such concerns is provided in the works contracts that will include requirements that the contractor is obliged to look for chance finds and immediately stop work at the contested location and alert responsible authorities in case of chance finds, and only continue works after official approvals from the responsible authorities are secured. Since the national regulations on the conservation of cultural properties are strict, it is not anticipated that any additional requirements would arise from the World Bank safeguard policies. |
| Indigenous Peoples OP/ BP 4.10 | No | |
| Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12 | Yes | The footprints of a geothermal power plants requires land acquisition for the power plant itself, multiple wells, the network of interconnecting pipework, a transformer station, electricity transmission lines to connect to the grid, access roads and administrative offices. Accordingly, the World Bank Operational Policy 4.12 on Involuntary Land Acquisition has been triggered.<br><br>In Turkey, the general practice is for the private developers initially to approach land owners through a willing buyer-willing seller process. This land acquisition is considered voluntary as the company has some flexibility for the siting of wells, and uses this power to avoid involuntary land acquisition where it can and to avoid impacts on residential plots. Barring voluntary sale, the private developer needs to apply to the Provincial Administration for expropriation procedures during the exploration and productions stages, or to EMRA and the Ministry of Finance during the generation stage. In short, expropriation will be conducted by multiple parties and at |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | different times. Likely, when the developer is accessing World Bank financing, some of the land acquisition will have been completed, for which the developer will conduct a social audit and a mitigation plan if necessary, and some of the land acquisition will take place during project financing, for which the developer will prepare a RAP outlining how the involuntary land acquisition will take place.<br><br>Since the sub-projects are not known at this time, three Resettlement Policy Frameworks (RPFs) were prepared by GDRE, TSKB and TKB in compliance with the policy. The RPFs outline in detail the expropriation procedures for geothermal development in Turkey, World Bank's OP 4.12 policy on involuntary resettlement, a gap analysis, steps to bridge these gaps and institutional responsibilities.<br><br>The RPFs have been prepared by the clients and disclosed (in draft form) in country and in Infoshop. |
| Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37 | No | |
| Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50 | No | FI is responsible for ensuring that the projects financed are located/depending on national waterways only. The waterways identified as NOT an international waterway (do not trigger OP 7.50) in Turkey are namely: Susurluk, North Aegean, Gediz, Kuçuk Menderes, Buyuk Menderes, Western Mediterranean, Antalya, Sakarya, Western Black Sea, Yesilirmak, Kizilirmak, Konya Kapali, Eastern Mediterranean, Seyhan, Ceyhan, Eastern Black Sea, Burdur, Afyon, Orta Anadolu, and Van. The ESMFs provide additional guidance on this policy. In addition, there are three transboundary aquifers in Turkey. The first, known as "Svilegrad/Orestiada" is in the northern border area between Bulgaria-Greece-Turkey. The second, known as "Evros/Meric" is along the Greece-Turkey border while the third, known as the "Topolovgrad karst waterbearing massif" is on the Bulgaria-Turkey border. FIs will also be responsible for avoiding these aquifers during drilling works. |
| Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60 | No | |

## 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:**

A. Exploration phase: Impacts from surface exploration activities are expected to be minimal or non-existent. Potential impacts from exploratory drilling activities will be similar to those of production/capacity drilling and are discussed below.
B. Resource Development and Power Plant Development Phases: Most potential environmental and social impacts of geothermal development are associated to the resource and power plant development phases.

These impacts include:
-Fluids involved in geothermal drilling and production : Effluents of geothermal development projects can be classified as i) drilling fluids; ii) spent geothermal fluids; iii) reject water from injection wells; iv) well cleaning water (for clogging); and v) domestic waste water.
-Drilling Mud (water based or oil based)
-Groundwater :Potential impacts on groundwater during the different phases of a geothermal project can range from low to high. Survey activities would typically have little or no impact on groundwater. If geothermal drilling is carried out according to best practices regarding use of drilling fluids and well casing there is very unlikely that geothermal water will contaminate ground water aquifers.
-Surface water sources : Impacts on water resources during the different stages of project development would range from low to high. Surface exploration activities will have little or no impact on surface water.
-Solid waste:- Geothermal exploratory drilling projects do not generate substantial amounts of solid waste. Apart from drilling mud, other wastes produced by drilling include used oil and filters, spilled fuel, spent and unused solvents, scrap metal, pipe dope, etc.
-Noise : Primary sources of noise associated with exploration and drilling wells include drill rig operations, seismic surveys, blasting, earth-moving equipment (related to road, well pad, and sump pit construction), and vehicle traffic.
-Air emissions : Presence and concentration of potential air pollutants varies depending on the characteristics of the geothermal resource. Hydrogen sulfide and mercury are the most toxic air pollutants contained in geothermal fluids but geothermal fluids also contain environmentally sensitive gases such as carbon dioxide and methane. Release of these gases can lead to occupational health and safety problems, especially in confined spaces within power plants and well head cellars and during initial discharge.
-Well blowouts and pipeline ruptures : Although not common, well blowouts can occur during the drilling and operation stages of a geothermal project.
-Land use : In general, impacts on land use due to geothermal activities are temporary and localized. These activities could create a temporary disturbance in the immediate vicinity of surveying or drilling sites.
-Well abandonment : At the end of operation of a well or if a well fails to provide thermal groundwater, therefore wells will be closed with concrete.
-Expropriation : From social point of view, development of geothermal resources may involve occupation of large areas depending on the scale of project (i.e. number of wells, length of pipelines, and size of power plant and separator stations). Hence, a land acquisition process is implemented.
-Other social impacts and community health and safety: The construction period creates impacts on the current infrastructure such as roads and irrigation.
- Occupational Health and safety: Major health and safety issues in geothermal projects comprise the potential for exposure to i) geothermal gases; ii) confined spaces; iii) heat; and iv) noise. In addition, the use of acids for well cleaning will be conducted by taking all precautionary measures

and by using protective equipment.

All of the above mentioned potential impacts and suggested mitigation measures&monitoring arrangements have been discussed in the Environmental and Social Management FW (ESMF) document which was disclosed publicly. In addition, impacts relevant to the sub-projects will be assessed via sub-project EA documents.

The footprint of a geothermal power plant requires land acquisition for the power plant itself, multiple wells, the network of interconnecting pipework, a transformer station, electricity transmission lines to connect to the grid, access roads and administrative offices. Land acquisition occurs gradually, starting with only a few well areas (about 0.5 hectares each) for the exploration drilling and ending with the full footprint described above for a plant in operation. When developers are having well areas expropriated, the remaining land of the owner may be left with "holes" and not viable for livelihoods or farming. Similarly, the lattice of interconnecting pipes (about 2 meters wide, insta lled above ground) can have a more significant impact compared to just the base area for land acquisition due to dividing farmers' plots and cutting off access for people, animals and machinery. Potential impacts of piecemeal expropriation on the livelihoods of farmers is assessed in the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF). In these cases, expropriation of all of the owner's land or other mitigation measures may be necessary.

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

Extracting geothermal fluids could also cause drawdowns in connected aquifers, potentially affecting flow from geothermal springs. The potential for these types of adverse effects is moderate to high depending on the hydrological conditions. This impact (if arises) will be reduced through extensive aquifer testing and proper geothermal development planning. Monitoring wells should also be opened to monitor water levels. In terms of the quantity of resource, cumulative impacts that are caused by multiple producers (i.e. sponsors) using the same reservoir are important, and should be taken into consideration when there are two or more geothermal projects in same geothermal reservoir.But this issue is already assessed for the technical feasibilities of the projects happening in the same area.

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

Project alternatives will be assessed by each project sponsor and will be detailed in the ESMPs prepared during their application under Component 1 and 2.

**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.**

The main counterpart for the first component will be MENR, which will hire an expert consultant to establish and operate the Risk Sharing Mechanism. This consultant will be a firm with adequate skills to manage application rounds; to screen applicants according to pre-established financial and technical criteria, including environmental and social; to prepare legal agreements between the Mechanism and the applicants; to review claims of a failed well by applicants, and to recommend the execution of payments to the DGRE. The Operations Manual for the Mechanism will outline all the procedures to be followed by DGRE and by the consultant. The institutional capacity of GDRE and their consultants to implement WB's safeguard policies as well as the actual implementation of the ESMF will be monitored by the WB team during the project preparation and implementation phases.

TSKB and TKB will be the FIs bank for the second component. Both have significant experience regarding implementing national and WB policies in environmental and social safeguards.

An Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has been prepared by each borrower (GDRE, TSKB and TKB) to set a technical guidance in organizing and handling environmental and social assessment and management for projects whose specific location and characteristics (e.g. dimensions, design) are yet to be defined. The ESMFs present the necessary compliance requirements for prospective investments to achieve approval of national laws as well as the provisions of the World Bank Operational Policy 4.01.

Since the sub-projects are not known at this time, three Resettlement Policy Frameworks (RPFs) were prepared in compliance with the policy. The Resettlement Policy Frameworks prepared by GDRE, TSKB and TKB outline in detail the expropriation procedures for geothermal development in Turkey, World Bank's OP 4.12 policy on involuntary resettlement, a gap analysis, steps to bridge these gaps and institutional responsibilities. During project implementation, GDRE, with support of the RSM consultant, and TSKB/TKB will screen sub-projects for financing, ensure the preparation of a social audit and/or RAP as necessary by the private developer, and submit for World Bank review and clearance prior to financing of infrastructure. GDRE, TSKB and TKB will also oversee and supervise the implementation of these RAPs. TSKB and TKB fully understand the World Bank's social safeguards requirements and have high capacity to monitor social impacts thanks to a longstanding relationships with several international finance institutions. GDRE is currently not familiar with such safeguard policies. Accordingly, the RSM consultant will be required to possess capacity to oversee and implement the ESMF and RPF and to build capacity in GDRE as necessary.

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

For all Category A and B sub-projects proposed for WB financing, the borrower consults project-affected groups and NGOs about the project's environmental aspects and takes their views into account. For meaningful consultations between the borrower and project-affected groups and local NGOs on all Category A and B projects proposed for WB financing, the borrower provides relevant material (in local language) in a timely manner prior to consultation and in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to the groups being consulted. Detailed description of public consultation process is provided in the ESMF documents.

Formal public consultation meetings will be help during preparation of RAPs with affected people. More broadly, community support will be sought through timely consultations and sub-project level grievance redress mechanisms will be set up to resolve concerns as they arise. Both consultations and grievance mechanisms will take into account the different needs and concerns of men and women.

## *B. Disclosure Requirements*

| **Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other** | |
|---|---|
| Date of receipt by the Bank | 12-Oct-2015 |
| Date of submission to InfoShop | 12-Oct-2015 |
| For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors | 00000000 |

| "In country" Disclosure | |
|---|---|
| Turkey | 05-Oct-2015 |
| *Comments:* The project has 3 implementing agencies (FIs) which are DG Renewable Energy, TKB and TSKB. The ESMF has been disclosed as 'Draft' by all of the FIs on their respective websites. Date of in country disclosures are: October 5, 2015 (for TSKB); October 15, 2015 (for DGRE); October 19, 2015 (for TKB). | |
| **Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process** | |
| Date of receipt by the Bank | 12-Oct-2015 |
| Date of submission to InfoShop | 12-Oct-2015 |
| "In country" Disclosure | |
| Turkey | 05-Oct-2015 |
| *Comments:* The project has 3 implementing agencies (FIs) which are DG Renewable Energy, TKB and TSKB. The RPF has been disclosed as 'Draft' by all of the FIs on their respective websites. Date of in country disclosures are: October 5, 2015 (for TSKB); October 15, 2015 (for DGRE); October 19, 2015 (for TKB). | |
| **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 [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ] |
| If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report? | Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ] |
| Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan? | 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 degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank? | Yes [ ] No [ ] NA [ × ] |
| **OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement** | |
| Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/ process framework (as appropriate) been prepared? | Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ] |
| If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan? | Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ] |
| Is physical displacement/relocation expected?<br><br>Provided estimated number of people to be affected | Yes [ ] No [ × ] TBD [ ] |

| | |
|---|---|
| Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)<br><br>Provided estimated number of people to be affected | Yes [ ] No [ × ] TBD [ ] |
| **The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information** | |
| Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop? | Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ] |
| 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 [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ] |
| **All Safeguard Policies** | |
| Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies? | Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ] |
| Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost? | Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ] |
| Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies? | Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ] |
| Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents? | Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ] |

## III. APPROVALS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Task Team Leader(s): | Name: Shinya Nishimura,Pierre Audinet | |
| ***Approved By*** | | |
| Safeguards Advisor: | Name: Agnes I. Kiss (SA) | Date: 09-Nov-2015 |
| Practice Manager/ Manager: | Name: Ranjit J. Lamech (PMGR) | Date: 12-Nov-2015 |