

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
ADDITIONAL FINANCING**

Report No.: ISDSA12475

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 18-Mar-2015

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 20-Mar-2015

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Africa	Project ID:	P153466
		Parent Project ID:	P100406
Project Name:	LVEMP APL-1 Additional Financing (P153466)		
Parent Project Name:	Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project Phase II (P100406)		
Task Team Leader(s):	Stephen Ling		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	18-Mar-2015	Estimated Board Date:	26-May-2015
Managing Unit:	GENDR	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	Agricultural extension and research (70%), General water, sanitation and flood protection sector (30%)		
Theme(s):	Water resource management (30%), Other rural development (30%), Other environment and natural resources management (20%), Biodiversity (10%), Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise support (10%)		
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?			No
Financing (In USD Million)			
Total Project Cost:	22.50	Total Bank Financing:	22.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
BORROWER/RECIPIENT			0.00
International Development Association (IDA)			20.00
IDA Grant			2.00
Cooperation in International Waters in Africa			0.50
Total			22.50
Environmental Category:	A - Full Assessment		

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

2. Project Development Objective(s)

A. Original Project Development Objectives – Parent

The Project development/global environmental objectives (PDO/GEO) are to: (i) improve collaborative management of the transboundary natural resources of Lake Victoria basin for the shared benefits of the EAC Partner States; and (ii) reduce environmental degradation to improve the livelihoods of communities, which depend on the natural resources of Lake Victoria basin.

B. Current Project Development Objectives – Parent

The objectives of the Project are to contribute to: (i) the improvement of the collaborative management of the trans-boundary natural resources of the LVB among the Partner States; and (ii) the improvement of environmental management of targeted pollution hotspots and selected degraded sub-catchments for the benefit of communities who depend on the natural resources of LVB.

C. Proposed Project Development Objectives – Additional Financing (AF)

3. Project Description

The ISDS for LVEMP APL-1 (P100406) is being updated on the preparation of an Additional Financing (P153466) of US\$ 22.5 million. The structure of the project and the safeguards instruments and arrangements remain the same, but the ISDS has been updated to reflect progress in implementation of the safeguards frameworks.

The project has four components: (i) Strengthening governance of water and fisheries resources; (ii) Investing in pollution control and prevention measures; (iii) Raising public awareness and participation; and (iv) Project coordination and management.

Component 1: Strengthening institutional capacity for managing shared water and fisheries resources
 Subcomponent 1.1: Harmonization of policies and regulatory standards: One of the envisioned project outcomes was the elaboration and adoption of a Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) for LVB. The initial responses to the request for proposals for this work revealed that the scope and timeframe, as well as cost, of this activity was much beyond what had been envisioned during project preparation. The MTR thus agreed that the development of the WRMP for LVB is a longer term objective that will take place in two stages: the first one implemented under the current project (Phase I), with the remaining work to be undertaken under the future Phase III. As such, the current project will contribute to the elaboration of the WRMP for LVB. Specific activities under this project aim to consolidate the information necessary for the elaboration of the WRMP by gathering existing information as well as identifying the gaps and addressing them to allow the Partner States to initiate the steps towards actual elaboration of the WRMP. Activities under this first step include: (i) assessing the current status and use of the water resources, both surface and groundwater, in the basin; (ii) assessing threats to the water resources and ecosystems; (iii) estimating water demand (present and future) for all consumptive and non-consumptive uses of water, based on a defined planning horizon of 30 years; (iv) identifying and assessing other development imperatives such as land use, navigation, fisheries, tourism, etc; and (v) carrying out an institutional assessment,

stakeholders" analysis and identifying needs for capacity building .

Subcomponent 1.2: Ecosystem monitoring and applied research: The restructuring is simplifying the project by eliminating support for multi-disciplinary research programs. As originally planned, implementation of this activity would pose a heavy demand on the time and attention of the National Project Coordination Team since it involves a very different set of stakeholders and a large number of smaller and diversified activities that demand intense implementation support and require close supervision and monitoring. This activity could be supported under the potential next phase (APL III) and project preparation activities for APL III should advance the planning for such activity so that a call for proposals could be launched as soon as APL III becomes effective.

Component 2: Point source pollution control and prevention

Subcomponent 2.1: Rehabilitation and improvement of wastewater treatment facilities: Considering the time remaining until the project closing date and the delays experienced, primary focus will be on financing feasibility studies and detailed engineering designs for construction or rehabilitation of sewage treatment plants. When such designs become available the Bank will consider whether the project would move forward with actual works depending on capacity and remaining time available for their implementation, and the two-year extension of the closing date should allow for completion of at least some of the envisioned works. The selection of consultants to carry out feasibility studies for wastewater treatment facilities is underway in Uganda (review of proposals), Kenya (request for proposals) and Tanzania (TORs for engineering designs and ESIA), and Annex 3 includes benchmarks that each national implementing team is expected to meet by December 2012.

Component 3: Watershed management

Subcomponent 3.1: Natural resources conservation and livelihoods improvement: This subcomponent was envisioned to be fully implemented through a traditional CDD approach, but identification and preparation of more complex subprojects involving infrastructure has proven to be a challenge due to the existing low capacity at the local level. In addition, communities tend to prioritize subprojects focused on basic infrastructure and improved income, instead of subprojects that primarily aim at reducing environmental stresses in LVB. To facilitate project implementation and ensure that this subproject will achieve its objectives, it was agreed during the MTR to propose the introduction of a modality of implementation of activities through co-management between the Focal Point Ministry and local governments, NGOs, CBOs, and communities. The necessary funding will come from proceeds already available in this subcomponent for implementation of watershed management through CDD sub-projects, a portion of which will now be reallocated for implementation of watershed management activities through co-management.

Subcomponent 3.2: Community capacity building and participation: To support local governments, communities, NGOs, CBOs, in the preparation of solid subproject proposals for review and approval/rejection by the NTAC, and also in the successful implementation of sub-projects, it is proposed to allow for the use of Project proceeds to hire external technical assistance.

Component 4: Project coordination and management

This component will provide resources necessary for the effective coordination, and monitoring and evaluation of the project activities. At regional level, these tasks will be carried out by the LVBC, while at the national level they will be the responsibility of the National Project Coordination Teams (NPCTs). This component will have three sub-components: project coordination; internal communication; and monitoring and evaluation.

Sub-component 4.1: Project coordination

This sub-component would finance the incremental operating costs of the various committees, including the Regional Policy Steering Committee (RPSC), National Project Steering Committee (NPSC), and the National Technical Advisory Committee (NTAC). In addition, this component would meet the capital and operating costs of the Regional Project Coordination Team (RPCT) to be located in the LVBC Secretariat; and the NPCTs, which will be mainstreamed in the Focal Point Ministries (FPMs). The National Project Coordinators (NPCs) could be employed on competitive basis to coordinate project implementation activities during the first two years. This sub-component would also strengthen the financial and procurement management functions in the LVBC and NPCTs to enhance project's resources management and accountability. Finally, funds would be available to recruit a few incremental staff, such as secretaries and drivers, under the operational costs category.

Sub-component 4.2: Internal communication

This sub-component will finance the development of communications system for improving sharing of data and information among the implementing agencies. This would enhance sharing of existing technical knowledge and implementation experiences, at the regional, national, local, and community levels. Specifically, the sub-component's outputs will include an: (i) internal communications system to facilitate information sharing; and (ii) information sharing protocol among LVBC, member countries, and implementing agencies.

Sub-component 4.3: Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

This sub-component would provide resources for the establishment of the regional and national GIS-based M&E and Management Information System (MIS); and the collection, analyses, storage, and dissemination of the project's implementation performance, outcomes, and impact data and information. To accomplish the M&E functions, LVBC and each FPM will hire and/or assign a qualified M&E specialist. The project will maintain sets of indicators for M&E, capturing the ILBM governance indicators, and GEF's indicators for international waters projects, and the socio-economic status of participating communities. This sub-component will ensure that monitoring reports, including quarterly and annual project implementation progress, procurement, financial and audit reports are produced regularly.

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

The project will be implemented through local governments and authorities in both urban and rural areas in the Lake Victoria Basin (LVB). Lake Victoria, with a surface area of 68,800 km² is the second largest freshwater body in the world, and it is a transboundary resource shared by Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda. Rwanda and Burundi are a part of the upper watershed that drains into Lake Victoria through the Kagera river. Its catchment area of 194,000 km² is shared by five countries: Burundi (7 percent), Kenya (22 percent), Rwanda (11 percent), Tanzania (44 percent), and Uganda (16 percent).

Lake Victoria Basin is home to some 35 million people. LVB has immense ecological values and is greatly valued for its social and economic potential. The potential based on the human resource, rich agricultural soils, abundant water resources, minerals, fisheries, wetlands, diverse forest resources, wildlife and tourism potential and a rich biodiversity. Besides, its water serves vital multipurpose functions for domestic uses, hydropower generation, agricultural and industrial uses, and medium of transport and climate modulation. Despite its potential, the Basin is threatened by ecological and environmental degradation, widespread poverty, high population growth and unsustainable pressure on existing resources.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Jane A. N. Kibbassa (GENDR)

Yasmin Tayyab (GSURR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	Yes	
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	Yes	
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	

II. 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 additional financing would support continued expansion of ongoing investments, i.e. additional watershed management subprojects in existing focal areas, construction of sanitation and sewerage facilities that were designed but not implemented under the original project due to funding constraints, and expansion and deepening of cleaner production programs.</p> <p>While the project is conceived and designed to have significant positive environmental and social impacts, construction and/ or rehabilitation of investments, and community subprojects may pose negative impacts. Therefore the key safeguards policies issues raised by the project include: water, soil and air pollution; loss of vegetation; loss of livelihoods and access to assets, conversion or degradation of natural habitats and protected areas like wetlands. In addition, the project activities may lead to both consumptive and non-consumptive use of international waters which may slightly vary the quantity, although the project interventions are in fact likely to improve the quality of water through control of pollution in selected hotspots and catchments. None of the potential impacts are expected to be significant and /or irreversible as the investments will not be</p>

<p>on a large scale, and provisions for effective environmental and social management have been made under the project. The original project was rated as Category A due to the environmental sensitivities of the Lake Victoria Basin and the possibility of significant impacts related to wastewater management systems. An Inspection Panel investigation had been requested into the methods used for removal of water hyacinth in the first phase, LVEMP I. The Category A rating is maintained for the Additional Financing. However, none of the sub-projects or investments to date would qualify at Category A activities, and it is unlikely that the activities during the Additional Financing will either.</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 is not expected to incur any potential indirect and or long term impacts due to future investments.</p>
<p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p>
<p>The project will support part of the East African Community’s (EAC) Lake Victoria Basin Commission Program, therefore a discussion of alternatives would not have been relevant. However, in keeping with the principle of subsidiarity, where existing CDD instruments would be used to address the watershed rehabilitation, LVEMP II will seek to catalyze and top-up those instruments. The project will not create additional and/or parallel systems where programs of local government or ongoing CDD instruments, such as the Western Kenya Community-Driven Development and Flood Mitigation (WKCDD&FM), and Natural Resources Management Projects (NRM), Kenya; Tanzania Social Action Fund Phase II (TASAF II), and Participatory Agricultural Development and Empowerment Project (PADEP), Tanzania; and Local Government Management Service Delivery Project (LGMSDP), Uganda; would be adapted to meet the project’s sustainable natural resources and environmental management objectives.</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>The ESMFs and RPFs prepared for the second phase of the Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project (LVEMP II) remain relevant and adequate and provide strategic and operational guidance for the integration of environmental and social considerations into the planning and implementation of the LVEMP II activities under the additional finance for Kenya and Tanzania. The ESMF in all instances has been applied for the initial screening of the proposed project activities for any negative environmental and social impacts which would require attention prior to project implementation. Based on the frameworks, the borrowers have each prepared or are preparing: (i) Environmental and Social Assessments (ESIAs); (ii) Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs); (iii) and Environmental and Social Management Plans for all investments in the pipeline. The World Bank’s OP 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples (IPs) was triggered for Kenya with regards to Component 3 (Watershed Management) due to the presence of Ogiek IP communities in part of the upper catchment areas of the Nyando watershed. Since actual sub-project sites had not been identified, an Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) was developed and disclosed in 2008 to ensure that: (i) communities would not be adversely affected; and (ii) measures would be developed and implemented to mitigate potential negative impacts. Nevertheless, the IPPF includes a number of undertakings that would require significant policy interventions and multi-agency actions regarding ancestral and land rights, that are beyond the remit of the project to implement and that could not realistically be completed within the time horizon of the project. These measures, while desirable on their own account, are not related to the mitigation of anticipated project impacts. Given the agreed focus of the restructured project on project</p>

investments that will be concentrated in lower catchment areas closer to Lake Victoria, the project will not, to the best of Management's knowledge, implement activities in areas where IPs are present. However, as outlined in the IPPF, should a component and/or subcomponent have social impacts (whether positive or negative) on IP communities, an Indigenous Peoples Plan will be prepared that complies with the full array of guidelines and implements comprehensive mitigation strategies.

The Natural Habitats and Safety of Dams policies are covered under each ESMF. Adhering to the recommendations of the ESMFs, the project will support activities designed to enhance the East African countries environmental and social management capacity. It is expected that the experiences and capacities in the client countries obtained from implementing other CDD activities will be used. In addition capacity building activities will be part of the environment and social management process in the 5 countries.

Overall safeguard compliance and management has been improving over the last four years of implementation. Mechanisms for coordination and overall safeguards oversight are well established in partner countries. Environmental and Social screening has been carried out for both CDD and CMI subprojects and Environmental and Social Management Plans are in place. In addition, ESIA's for CDDs and CMIs have been conducted where needed, based on the type/nature, location, sensitivity and scale of the project and magnitude of its potential environmental and social impacts. Implementation of mitigation measures is carried out as part of the project implementation plan. The last Implementation Support Mission confirmed that final ESIA's and RAPs for the CMI and sanitation investment sub-project, including screening reports for CDDs have been disclosed locally on LVEMP website in Mwanza Tanzania <http://www.lvemp2.go.tz/Project%20report.html> and Kisumu Kenya www.lvemp2kenya.org. In Uganda, the project is at an earlier stage of implementation and no ESIA's or RAPs have yet been completed, although screening has been conducted for CDDs that are already underway. The Bank task team supervises safeguards implementation closely through dedicated safeguards review missions (the last of which was conducted in November 2014), and continues to provide additional support and training as required by the project teams.

Eleven ESIA's / EAs and 4 RAPs have been prepared for specific investments are disclosed via the Bank Infoshop to date. More detailed information is provided below.

In Tanzania, the borrower has conducted environmental and social screening of 341 CDDs and Environmental and Social Impact Assessment for 21 Co Management Interventions (CMIs). In addition ESMPs for 165 CDDs has been prepared and are under implementation. Assessment of 2 CMIs that were approved in August 2014 is in progress, all projects have been registered with NEMC. The safeguards assessment status for specific investments in the pipeline is as follows:

- i. ESIA and RAP for the Construction of Simplified Community Sewerage System in Mabatini and Igogo area of Mwanza City completed and disclosed.
- ii. Contract for the consultant to update ESIA for the construction of House connection at Kirumba, Kitangiri, Pasiansi, Iloganzala, Nyamanoro and Igogo area to Mwanza Sewerage System has been signed, and the study as commenced.
- iii. Draft ESIA report for the Construction of artificial wetland in Mwanza City, at Mwanza City abattoir as part of rehabilitation of Mwanza city abattoir is waiting for site verification by

NEMC.

- iv. Environmental and Social Screening for the construction of 14 public toilets in Mwanza, Musoma and Bukoba including at fish landing sites has been finalized. ESMP is being prepared.
- v. ESIA completed and RAP is being finalized for the updated design for Bukoba Sewerage collection system.
- vi. ESIA and RAP for Musoma Sewerage System is being updated due to slight change in design.
- vii. Approval of Environmental Assessment for the construction of Rehabilitation of Water Laboratories in Mwanza, Musoma and Bukoba is pending incorporation of comments by NEMC
- viii. ESIA and RAP is complete for the construction of Magu solid waste disposal site.

Similarly in Kenya, the investments in the pipeline have applied the ESMF and RPF to prepare the appropriate reports. Environmental and social screening for all 225 CDDs has been conducted. EIA has been prepared for 106 CDDs and ESMP for 119 provides sufficient mitigation measures for the subprojects' implementation. The safeguards assessment status for specific investments in the pipeline is as follows:

- i. ESIA and ESMP completed and implemented for the rehabilitation of Homa Bay, Bomet, Kisumu sewerage facilities
- ii. EIA and ESMP in place for the 17 Bio toilets.
- iii. ESMP in place for the Rehabilitation of the water Quality laboratory.
- iv. ESIA and ESMPs in place for all the CMIs. RAPs are not yet complete.

Under the Additional Financing, households that meet the criteria of Project Affected Households as per the RPF will continue to be identified as part of the planning process. This inventory of project affected households will be mandatory to ensure compliance with the RPF and inclusion of these households as the main targeted beneficiaries of the CDD livelihood sub-projects will be a requirement to ensure that the incomes of these households is restored. A safeguards status report has been produced and disclosed at the InfoShop.

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

The key stakeholders in all the three APL1 countries – Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda, include government both at national and local levels, National Environment Management Authorities, Development Partners, target communities, NGOs and CBOs active in the Lake Victoria basin, and the private sector. These stakeholder groups were consulted during preparations of the relevant safeguards policies documents, and additional consultations with the potentially affected persons has been carried out during the environmental and social screening process as outlined in the ESMF. Further the Nile Basin countries were notified of the proposed project in December 2007.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	15-Feb-2008
Date of submission to InfoShop	14-Mar-2008
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	////
"In country" Disclosure	
Kenya, Uganda & Tanzania	06-Mar-2008
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	15-Feb-2008
Date of submission to InfoShop	14-Mar-2008
"In country" Disclosure	
Kenya, Uganda & Tanzania	06-Mar-2008
<i>Comments:</i>	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	15-Feb-2008
Date of submission to InfoShop	14-Mar-2008
"In country" Disclosure	
Kenya, Uganda & Tanzania	06-Mar-2008
<i>Comments:</i>	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	15-Feb-2008
Date of submission to InfoShop	14-Mar-2008
"In country" Disclosure	
Kenya, Uganda & Tanzania	06-Mar-2008
<i>Comments:</i>	
If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.	
If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:	

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment	
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats	
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
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 [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP 4.09 - Pest Management	
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples	
Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?	Yes [<input 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"/>]
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input 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 type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Has the RVP approved such an exception?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]

The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information	
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
All Safeguard Policies	
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Stephen Ling	
Approved By		
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Magda Lovei (PMGR)	Date: 20-Mar-2015