

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

**Report No.:** PIDISDSA15889

**Date Prepared/Updated:** 17-Feb-2016

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**A. Basic Project Data**

<b>Country:</b>	Niger	<b>Project ID:</b>	P155846
		<b>Parent Project ID (if any):</b>	P123399
<b>Project Name:</b>	Adaptive Social Safety Nets Project (P155846)		
<b>Parent Project Name:</b>	Niger Safety Net Project (P123399)		
<b>Region:</b>	AFRICA		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	15-Dec-2015	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	22-Mar-2016
<b>Practice Area (Lead):</b>	Social Protection & Labor	<b>Lending Instrument:</b>	Investment Project Financing
<b>Sector(s):</b>	Other social services (80%), General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (10%), General water, sanitation and flood protection sector (10%)		
<b>Theme(s):</b>	Social Safety Nets/Social Assistance & Social Care Services (70%), Nutrition and food security (15%), Climate change (15%)		
<b>Borrower(s):</b>	Ministry of Economy and Finance		
<b>Implementing Agency:</b>			
<b>Financing (in USD Million)</b>			
	<b>Financing Source</b>	<b>Amount</b>	
	BORROWER/RECIPIENT	0.00	
	IDA Grant	22.50	
	Adaptation Fund	8.40	
	Total Project Cost	30.90	
<b>Environmental Category:</b>	B - Partial Assessment		
<b>Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):</b>	The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate		
<b>Other Decision:</b>			

<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	No
------------------------------------	----

**B. Introduction and Context**

**Country Context**

Niger is one of the poorest countries in the world, with a poverty headcount ratio estimated at 48% in 2011 and the country ranking last on UNDP’s 2013 Human Development Index. Poverty is associated with low levels of food consumption and high levels of chronic and temporary food insecurity. This deep food insecurity results from the interaction between (i) a low agricultural productivity; (ii) a hostile climatic environment; (iii) the country’s high vulnerability to shocks; (iv) one of the highest fertility and population growth rates in the world (7.6 children per woman and 3.9 percent growth in 2012); (v) limited economic access to food because of low incomes relative to market prices; (vi) poor health and nutritional status of the population; and (vii) poor nutrition, sanitation and health practices. Vulnerability to food insecurity has been exacerbated by the recent food crises of 2001, 2005, 2008 and 2010 that were caused by recurrent droughts, high international food prices, and waves of political instability in the region. Key development challenges contributing to this persistent food insecurity include demography, climate change and variability, inappropriate farming practices, water scarcity, land degradation and soil erosion.

**Sectoral and institutional Context**

As a result, over the years, food security has remained a key priority for the government and social protection has gained relevance in the national strategy for vulnerability and poverty reduction. The National Dispositive for the Prevention and Management of Food Crisis (DN) was created in 1998 in the Prime Minister’s Office with support from technical and financial partners (PTF) to establish an institutional architecture to address recurrent crisis. The DN has evolved since its creation and now comprises a food crisis unit, an early warning unit, a humanitarian response unit and a safety nets unit. However, capacity issues remain, with a direct impact on the effectiveness of the government ability to anticipate and respond to shocks. There are numerous safety nets projects in Niger in the form of cash based transfers, food aid, school feeding, vouchers, subsidized sales or free distributions of products, health related assistance and labor intensive public works. However, the impact of these programs in reducing chronic food insecurity is limited as most of this assistance is channeled towards short-term emergency programs.

In 2011, the US\$70 million parent project was approved by the World Bank to address the structural causes of food insecurity. The Project Development Objective is to “establish and support a safety nets system which will increase access to poor and food insecure households to cash transfer and cash for work programs”. The project became effective on May 19, 2011, with a closing date of June 30, 2017. It was designed to target 140,000 beneficiary households (or 1,050,000 people) through four components: (i) the establishment of a safety nets system with integrated targeting, registration, payment mechanisms and a management information system; (ii) cash transfers to poor and food insecure households with accompanying measures to invest in human capital; (iii) cash for work to provide short term income support to individuals affected by temporary acute food insecurity; and (iv) project management. A rigorous impact evaluation was built in to measure project impact on beneficiary households.

After three years of implementation, the project has established targeting, registration and payment systems for selected food-insecure households. It has also provided cash transfers to 73,634 beneficiary households, trainings to improve early childhood development practices, support to organize beneficiaries into small savings groups, and has facilitated cash-for-work micro-projects that contribute to environmental protection and natural resources management while transferring income to beneficiaries. Findings from the impact evaluation of the pilot project that informed the design of the SNP have confirmed the intervention's positive impact on savings and on investments in longer term income generating activities.

Despite the progress achieved towards increasing the income of poor households, the overall context remains that of high vulnerability to food insecurity and shocks. The main challenges affecting the government ability to build resilience among vulnerable populations are: (i) the scarcity of knowledge on the scope of vulnerability and poverty; (ii) limited capacity to effectively anticipate and promptly respond to shocks; (iii) the lack of innovative approaches and tools that can more effectively address the structural causes of food insecurity; and (iv) the weakness of coordination mechanisms between numerous actors and multiple interventions in social protection, disaster risk management and climate resilience.

In terms of best practices to promote resilience and reduce vulnerability in food insecure contexts, the use of a safety net is now admittedly a critical contribution to disaster risk management and climate risk resilience, both ex ante to prevent and mitigate the impact of disasters for current beneficiaries and ex post, to be scaled up to help poor and vulnerable populations to cope with the impacts. The proposed AF is consistent with the country assistance strategy in that it seeks long-term solutions to poverty reduction challenges and chronic food insecurity. The AF will also complement Bank Executed activities funded by DFID through the Adaptive Social Protection Trust Fund to provide a comprehensive package of knowledge activities, technical assistance and capacity building that are geared towards exploring synergies between Climate Resilience (CR), Disaster Risk Management (DRM) and Social Protection (SP) in order to make the existing social protection system more adaptive and responsive to shocks while building households resilience.

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

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

The PDO is to “establish and support a safety nets system which will increase access of poor and food insecure households to cash transfer and cash for work programs”.

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

The project development objective is to establish and support an effective and adaptive safety net system that will increase access of poor and vulnerable people to cash transfer and cash for work programs.

#### **Key Results**

The following key outcome indicators have been identified:

1. Households with access to the safety net programs established by the Project (broken down by households with access to the cash transfer programs; Households receiving emergency cash transfer assistance in response to shocks; households with access to the cash for work programs; and households benefiting from productive and behavioral accompanying measures)

2. Direct project beneficiaries (of which % Female beneficiaries)
3. Beneficiaries who receive payments according to the frequency specified in the PIM
4. Target households who are poor
5. National coordination mechanisms to facilitate a better response to shocks are established

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

The proposed AF will be financed by USD\$15 million in IDA grant, USD\$7.5 million in IDA credit, and USD\$8.4 million in grant from a DFID-funded Regional Adaptation Trust Fund for resilience in the Sahel.

These funds would support the costs associated with scaling up activities to enhance the impact of a well performing operation. To this end, the AF would (i) continue ongoing activities in the regions of Dosso, Maradi, Tahoua, Tillabéry and Zinder, and expand the geographical coverage of the project to the regions of Diffa, Agadez and Niamey where populations are vulnerable to economic, political, social and security-related shocks ; (ii) introduce accompanying measures to strengthen the impact of the cash transfers and the cash for work on resilience; (iii) strengthen national capacity for crisis prevention and response; (iii) increase the efficiency of the safety nets system, including its ability to be rapidly scaled up in times of crisis. The parent project will be restructured to extend the closing date by two years until June 2019, therefore aligning it with the closing date of the additional financing and allowing time for all target indicators to be reached. The results framework will be modified to ensure that all activities accurately capture project operations and reflect the new activities.

##### **Component Name**

Establishment of an effective and resilient safety nets system

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

##### **Component Name**

Cash transfer for food security

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

##### **Component Name**

Cash for work for resilience

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

##### **Component Name**

Project management

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

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

The Project will be mostly located in rural communities in the regions of Agadez, Dosso, Maradi,

Niamey, Tillabery, Tahoua and Zinder. The Safety Net Unit will be located in the capital city of Niamey.

**F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists**

Cheikh A. T. Sagna (GSU01)

Dahlia Lotayef (GEN07)

**II. Implementation**

**Institutional and Implementation Arrangements**

The proposed additional financing will continue to be implemented by the Safety Nets Unit (Cellule Filets Sociaux or CFS). The CFS was created through a decree (arête N. 0236/PM of 16 Dec, 2011) as a unit of the National Dispositive for the Prevention and Management of Food Crisis. It is under the direct auspices of the Prime Minister’s Office. The Unit is responsible for managing funds made available by the GoN and other partners for implementing safety nets projects. Three sub-units comprise the CFS: (i) a Steering Committee, CP (from the French acronym Comité de Pilotage), (ii) a Technical Management Unit, UGT (from the French acronym Unité de Gestion Technique), and (iii) regional offices, AR (from the French acronym Antennes Régionales). The CFS coordinates project implementation through its main office in Niamey and 5 regional offices ( Dosso, Maradi, Tahoua, Tillabery and Zinder). Contractors (including public and private firms as well as non-government organizations and individual consultants are recruited to facilitate project implementation. The additional financing proposes to expand current project activities in the regions of Diffa, Agadez and Niamey, using the same framework approach.

**III. Safeguard Policies that might apply**

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The policy is triggered due to the foreseen activities in the cash for work component, which are expected to results in some impacts and risks that are mostly site specific and easily manageable, typical of category B projects. Since this is an expansion of current parent project activities in three new regions, the Borrower will make use of the same safeguards instruments, namely an environmental and Social management framework (ESMF), updated to capture the context and realities in the new targeted areas. The ESMF will provide the same basic principles and prerogatives to be followed once details of the physical footprint of the project intervention areas will be known; in light of which borrower will, wherever deemed necessary, prepare a site specific Environmental and Social management Plan (ESMP) or an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, depending on the scope, type and nature of the given activity. Once the ESMF is been updated, it will be re-disclosed both in-country and at the InfoShop prior to the implementation of project activities.

Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	Some project activities will be using pesticides, even though at the lower scale, for which the borrower will elaborate a Pest Management Plan to mitigate any potential risk/impact in the targeted regions.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	
Involuntary Resettlement OP/ BP 4.12	Yes	The policy is triggered due to the potential temporary occupation of sites that might be involved in some of the project foreseen activities related to cash for work, which could result in the involuntary resettlement of project affected persons, whether or not PAPs have to move.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/ BP 7.60	No	

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

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

<p><b>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</b></p> <p>Social: The project aims to reduce vulnerability to food insecurity and build resilience among the poorest households through: (i) regular cash transfers to extremely vulnerable households and accompanying measures; and (ii) cash for work to vulnerable populations during the lean agricultural season and/or in response to temporary shocks. The additional income provided through the project will help the targeted households improve access to food as well as invest in human capital and productive assets. The social risks for the project continues to revolve around: (i) exclusion and inclusion errors in the targeting, which could cause tension regarding the selection of beneficiaries; (ii) Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12) under Component 3 on cash for work and in particular, potential resettlement issues and restriction of access to some sites linked with land rehabilitation works and other small community works.</p> <p>Environment: The Project remains under environmental classification B, as the cash for work projects may only have a limited and localized environmental and social impacts given their small scope (material investment to each micro project will not exceed 20% of total wages and non-wage costs). The list of micro-projects can be broken down into two categories. Category one focuses on environmental (and social) projects comprises activities such as construction of small terraces and earth banks (half-moons or demi-lunes), repairs of dunes, firebreaks, reforestation and tree planting, rehabilitation and protection of lakes and water points). Category two includes small infrastructure rehabilitation activities and rehabilitation and repairs of koori banks, construction</p>
--

<p>and rehabilitation of livestock vaccination corridors, cleaning and rehabilitation of village water wells, rehabilitation and maintenance of community infrastructures and sanitation projects. Both categories of projects could restrict access of populations and livestock to the work site, possibly creating conflict between the herders and farmers or within the same livelihood group. The rehabilitation works may create some risks to the physical safety of the workers. The trees planted could increase risks of future deforestation or wild fires, and rehabilitation of open water sources may increase risks for water borne diseases in the area. Pollution and loud noises can be expected during the implementation of activities, for which appropriate mitigation measures will be embedded to ensure proper management.</p> <p>Under the cash transfer and the cash-for-work components, support will be provided to design and implement accompanying measures to explore alternative livelihoods options and increase agricultural productivity. In partnership with the Climate Smart Agriculture Program, the project may support, albeit on a small scale, the use of improved agricultural inputs including fertilizers, improved seeds, irrigation agriculture and pesticides that will require site specific environmental and social impacts assessment to ensure potential adverse effects are properly mitigated.</p>
<p><b>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</b></p>
<p>The Project is only expected to have limited short-term negative impacts as described above, and for which appropriate mitigation measures will be proposed to ensure proper handling.</p>
<p><b>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</b></p>
<p>Not relevant.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>
<p>Mitigation of environmental risks: World Bank safeguard policy 4.01 on Environmental Assessments has been triggered. The Environmental Safeguards Management Framework (ESMF) developed for the parent-project and disclosed on February 18, 2011 will be updated, taking stock of good practices and lessons learned, and re-disclosed. The UGT will continue to use the Social and Environmental screening procedures to identify, assess, evaluate, mitigate and monitor the likely risks and impacts of the project and its related sub-projects. All key stakeholders involved in the Project will be systematically sensitized and trained on the processes.</p> <p>Based on lessons learned during the implementation of the parent operation, an environmental specialist will be recruited as a full time staff within the project to provide technical oversight. Tools and trainings developed and adopted will continue to be used to address risks arising during micro-projects implementation (described under question 1). Protective gear will be provided to workers, along with adequate trainings on worksite safety measures. For activities such as tree planting, implementing agencies will have to facilitate some sensitization campaigns to prevent excessive tree cutting and wildfires. A community management plan would have to be developed for activities that could entail resource management (for instance water points, or rehabilitated lakes). Partnership will continue with the National Office for Environmental Studies and Impact Evaluation (or BEEI the French Acronym for the Bureau d Evaluation Environnementale et d'Etudes d' Impacts) that will monitor the micro-projects to ensure the respect of local social and environmental norms.</p> <p>Likewise, the World Bank operational safeguard Policy OP 4.09 on Pest management has been</p>

triggered to take into consideration the accompanying socioeconomic measures geared towards increasing agricultural productivity. An Integrated Pest Management Plan will be elaborated, consulted upon by the borrower and publicly disclosed thereafter, both in-country and at the InfoShop before appraisal. The Project will adopt the same mitigation measures as set forth in the Climate Smart Agriculture project, which aims to ensure the impact of climate change is mitigated, adaptation measures implemented and resilience is built into the production landscape. This implies ensuring that modern efficient utilization of pesticide and fertilizer will be introduced and farmers trained in their applications. Further, strict control mechanisms will be put in place to avoid potential adverse impacts such as pollution from agricultural runoffs.

Mitigation of social risks: World Bank operational safeguard policy OP 4.12 on involuntary resettlement has been triggered. In order to minimize adverse impacts associated with the risks of land acquisition leading to population resettlement due to civil works involved in the cash for work activities, the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) for the parent-project will be updated and publicly disclosed, both in-country and at the InfoShop before appraisal, and will ensure that NGOs responsible for the execution of the micro projects will: (i) develop a site-specific resettlement action plan (RAP) for all micro projects affecting a minimum of 50 individuals; and (ii). These site specific resettlement action plans (RAPs) will be elaborated by the client in close partnership with the UGT according to a process detailed in the RPF. Specifically, information regarding the potential impacts of the micro projects will be shared with affected populations; micro projects will be defined and the potential for reinstatement assessed; and the action plan (s) will be developed and submitted to the UGT for approbation. These action plans will be financed within the budget allocated by the Project to each sub-projects. Compensation of populations affected could be made in cash and/or in kind, after due consultations with all key stakeholders. Mechanisms to estimate the value of the compensation are described in the RPF. In addition, the RPF describes the process according to which the Project will monitor and evaluate compliance with the safeguard measures.

Concerning the risk related to targeting, the methodology adopted will continue to ensure transparent identification and registration of beneficiary households by combining: (i) geographical mapping of poverty in consultation with technical institutes and local authorities; (ii) PMT data collection conducted by an independent third party; and (iii) the use of a MIS system to ensure the transparent identification and registration of the beneficiary households for the cash transfers. In addition, the list of beneficiaries targeted in each village is publicly disclosed to ensure transparency. Finally, the grievance redress mechanism (GRM) established under the parent operation will continue to provide a vehicle for addressing complaints that arise during implementation. To address the potential risk of Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12) under Component 3, the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) developed for the parent operation will be updated and disclosed in country and at InfoShop before appraisal.

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

Key project stakeholders include the NGOs and firms involved in implementation, representatives of relevant line ministries who will be involved in the technical validation of the micro-projects selected for implementation; community representatives, and representatives from the BEEI. A workshop will be scheduled to disclose the safeguard instruments to the public (including these stakeholders).

***B. Disclosure Requirements***



<b>Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	07-Feb-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	17-Feb-2016
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Niger	18-Feb-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	18-Feb-2011
Date of submission to InfoShop	18-Feb-2011
"In country" Disclosure	
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Pest Management Plan</b>	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	No
Date of receipt by the Bank	07-Feb-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	17-Feb-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
Niger	18-Feb-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.</b>	
<b>If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:</b>	

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

<b>OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment</b>	
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes [ <input 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 type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP 4.09 - Pest Management</b>	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement</b>			
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 type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input checked="" 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"/> ]
<b>The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information</b>			
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>All Safeguard Policies</b>			
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to 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: Carlo Del Ninno  
Title: Senior Economist

Contact: Fanta Toure  
Title: Social Protection Specialist

### Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name: Ministry of Economy and Finance  
Contact: Saidou Sidibe  
Title: Minister of Economy and Finance  
Email:

**Implementing Agencies**

Name:  
Contact:  
Title:  
Email:

**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: Carlo Del Ninno,Fanta Toure	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Johanna van Tilburg (SA)	Date: 17-Feb-2016
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Stefano Paternostro (PMGR)	Date: 17-Feb-2016
Country Director:	Name: Paola Ridolfi (CD)	Date: 18-Feb-2016