

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

**Report No.:** PIDISDSA18305

**Date Prepared/Updated:** 24-May-2016

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**A. Basic Project Data**

<b>Country:</b>	Ethiopia	<b>Project ID:</b>	P158770
		<b>Parent Project ID (if any):</b>	P146883
<b>Project Name:</b>	ET - Productive Safety Nets APL IV (EPSN 4) Additional Financing (P158770)		
<b>Parent Project Name:</b>	ET Productive Safety Nets Project 4 (PSNP 4) (P146883)		
<b>Region:</b>	AFRICA		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	25-May-2016	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	30-Jun-2016
<b>Practice Area (Lead):</b>	Social Protection & Labor	<b>Lending Instrument:</b>	Investment Project Financing
<b>Sector(s):</b>	Other social services (92%), Public administration- Other social services (8%)		
<b>Theme(s):</b>	Social Safety Nets/Social Assistance & Social Care Services (80%), Social Protection and Labor Policy & Systems (10%), Improving lab or markets (10%)		
<b>Borrower(s):</b>	Ministry of Finance and Economic Cooperation		
<b>Implementing Agency:</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources		
<b>Financing (in USD Million)</b>			
<b>Financing Source</b>		<b>Amount</b>	
BORROWER/RECIPIENT		110.00	
International Development Association (IDA)		100.00	
US Agency for International Development (USAID)		300.00	
AUSTRALIA Australian Agency for International Development		12.00	
GERMANY BMZ		36.00	
CANADA Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)		25.00	
UK British Department for International Development (DFID)		122.00	
EC European Commission		75.00	
JAPAN Gov. of (excl. Ministry of Finance - PHRD Grants)		19.00	

NETHERLANDS Netherlands Development Association	17.00
SWEDEN Swedish Intl. Dev. Cooperation Agency (SIDA)	12.00
Financing Gap	572.00
Total Project Cost	1400.00
<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

Ethiopia is a large and diverse country. It is located in the Horn of Africa and is a land-locked country with an area of 1.1 million km<sup>2</sup> (about the size of Bolivia). Its bio-physical environment includes a variety of contrasting ecosystems, with significant differences in climate, soil properties, vegetation types, agricultural potential, biodiversity and water resources. Ethiopia is a country of many nations, nationalities and peoples, with a total population of 91.7 million (2012). Only 17 percent of the population lives in urban centers, the great majority of them in Addis Ababa. At a current annual growth rate of 2.6 percent, Ethiopia's population is estimated to reach 130 million by 2025, and is projected by the UN to be among the world's top ten, by 2050. Ethiopia is vulnerable to terms of trade shocks from international food and fuel prices, and to large domestic weather related shocks as the 2011/12 East Africa drought demonstrated. Ethiopia has a federal, democratic government system, established in the early 1990s, with nine autonomous states (regions) and two chartered cities. Decentralization of governance to the regional and district (woreda) levels has been actively pursued, intensively since 2003. The Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) has been in power in Ethiopia since 1991. EPRDF comprises four regionally-based parties from the four major regions (Amhara, Oromia, Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples (SNNPR), and Tigray). The long-serving Prime Minister, Meles Zenawi, (from Tigray) died in August 2012, and was succeeded by Hailemariam Desalegn (from SNNPR) who has pursued largely the same policies. Ethiopia has experienced strong economic growth over the past decade. Economic growth averaged 10.7 percent per year in 2003/04 to 2011/12 compared to the regional average of 5.0 percent. Growth reflected a mix of factors, including agricultural modernization, the development of new export sectors, strong global commodity demand, and government-led development investments. Private consumption and public investment have driven demand side growth, with the latter assuming an increasingly important role in recent years. On the supply side, growth was driven by an expansion of the services and agricultural sectors, while the role of the industrial sector was relatively modest. More recently annual growth rates have declined slightly, but still remain at high single-digit levels. Growth in the export of goods has also moderated in recent years and a

decline was observed in 2012/13 for the first time since 2008/09. There have been bouts of high inflation in recent years and, while inflation is currently much lower, keeping it down remains a major objective for monetary policy. Ethiopia is one of the world's poorest countries, but has made substantial progress on social and human development over the past decade. The country's per capita income of US\$470 in 2013 is substantially lower than the regional average of US\$1,257 and among the ten lowest worldwide. Ethiopia is ranked 173 out of 187 countries in the Human Development Index (HDI) of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). However, high economic growth has helped reduce poverty, in both urban and rural areas. Since 2005, 2.5 million people have been lifted out of poverty, and the share of the population below the poverty line has fallen from 38.7 percent in 2004/05 to 29.6 percent in 2010/11 (using a poverty line of close to US\$1.25/day). However, because of high population growth the absolute number of poor (about 25 million) has remained unchanged over the past fifteen years. Ethiopia is among the countries that have made the fastest progress on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and HDI ranking over the past decade. It is on track to achieve the MDGs related to gender parity in education, child mortality, HIV/AIDS, and malaria. Good progress has been achieved in universal primary education, although the MDG target may not be met. The reduction of maternal mortality remains a key challenge. GoE is currently implementing its ambitious Growth and Transformation Plan II (2015 – 2020) which sets a long-term goal of reaching lower middle-income country by 2025, with growth rates of at least 11.2 percent per annum during the plan period. To achieve the GTP goals and objectives, GoE has followed a development model with a strong role for the government in many aspects of the economy. It has prioritized key sectors such as industry and agriculture, as drivers of sustained economic growth and job creation. The GTP also reaffirms GoE's commitment to human development. Development partners have programs that are broadly aligned with GTP priorities.

### **Sectoral and institutional Context**

Ethiopia's improvements reflect a strong commitment of the Government to eradicating extreme poverty and achieving shared prosperity through investments in agriculture, social protection, health, education and other pro-poor sectors. Spending on pro-poor sectors increased from 52 percent of general government expenditure in FY03 to 70 percent in FY12 (MOFEC). The Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) and Household Asset Building Program (HABP) have represented an important contribution to the GoE's pro-poor development agenda, amounting to approximately 9% of pro-poor spending and 1.1% of GDP.

While progress has been made, food insecurity, malnutrition and vulnerability remain high. Twenty-nine percent of the population are absolute poor (World Bank, MOFEC), and an estimated 43 percent (46 percent of the rural population) are vulnerable to absolute poverty. Furthermore, although the PSNP has provided an important safety net for many poor rural households, nearly half (12.2 million) of the 27 million people identified as vulnerable to absolute poverty and food insecurity live in non-PSNP woredas. This reflects the fact that while geography is one important determinant of vulnerability, much vulnerability is determined not by geography but by individual access to assets, lifecycle events and other factors.

Launched in 2005, the PSNP, funded by the GoE and Development Partners, provides food and/or cash transfers to food insecure households in chronically food insecure woredas in exchange for labor-intensive public works. Labor-poor households receive unconditional direct support transfers. The PSNP is embedded in the GoE's strategy and policy for food security and eradication of extreme poverty, and represented a pivotal shift from annual emergency food aid

appeals to a planned approach to food security and predictable drought risk management. IDA's support to PSNP (2005-2015) was through an APL with four phases. The Development Objective of this APL series was to reduce household vulnerability, improve resilience to shocks and promote sustainable community development in food insecure areas of rural Ethiopia. This is achieved through: (i) provision of timely, predictable, and appropriate transfers to beneficiary households, thereby enabling effective consumption smoothing and avoiding asset depletion; (ii) creation of productive and sustainable community assets that contribute to the large-scale rehabilitation of severely degraded areas; (iii) stimulation of local markets; (iv) more effective responses to drought shocks to avoid increasing destitution among affected households; and (v) support to critical interventions that build assets, promote increased productivity, and encourage diversification at the household level.

APL Phase I (2005-2006, US\$70 million, ICR (satisfactory)) focused on transition from emergency relief to a productive and development-oriented safety net. It accomplished the following: (i) provision of predictable, multi-annual resources to the Government; (ii) replacing food with cash as the primary medium of support; (iii) provision of resources for critical capital, technical assistance, and administrative costs to effectively support the public works; (iv) strengthened community involvement by supporting community targeting and local-level participatory planning as core principles of the program; and (v) related public works activities to the underlying causes of food insecurity, especially with respect to soil and water conservation measures. It put in place the essential elements of the new productive safety net program.

APL Phase II (2007-2009 US\$175 million, Additional Financing US\$25 million, ICR: (satisfactory)) (i) improved the efficiency and predictability of transfers by continuing to build capacity of government institutions and strengthening resource planning and mobilization; (ii) strengthened program governance by enhancing existing targeting and grievance systems and introducing more transparency in program procedures; (iii) increased the productivity of public works through a systematic focus on community planning using integrated watershed management techniques; (iv) strengthened monitoring and evaluation systems; and (v) developed more efficient financing instruments for risk management to ensure a more predictable and timely response to shocks. This phase saw significant expansion and some important improvements in program design and implementation.

APL Phase III (2010-2015, US\$480 million and additional financing US\$370 million) focused on integration and consolidation of program performance to maximize the program's long term impacts on food security by ensuring effective integration and coordination with other critical interventions. Phase III has: (i) introduced initiatives to further improve the timeliness and predictability of transfers, through closer performance monitoring and provision of incentives; (ii) further strengthened public works, particularly focusing on oversight, coordination and monitoring; (iii) strengthened program accountability through a number of additional (bottom-up and top down) monitoring and accountability mechanisms; and (iv) supported Government to improve the HABP.

PSNP has contributed significantly to improved food security in Ethiopia over the past 10 years, consistently meeting its development objectives. In the highlands regions, PSNP clients saw their average months of food security rise from 8.4 months per year in 2006 to 10.1 in 2012. The public works program addresses root causes of vulnerability in PSNP communities by supporting the

development of a productive watershed and linking rural communities to small towns where they can access inputs, markets, and services. Further, PSNP public works have led to important improvements in rural infrastructure and have contributed to improved access to education and health services, enhanced water retention and reduced soil and water run-off; and protected land in area enclosures, which increases soil fertility and carbon sequestration. The capacity of local governments to implement participatory planning and implementation has been significantly strengthened through the program. PSNP has also provided important disaster response through contingency budgets at woreda and regional levels and a federal Risk Financing Mechanism. HABP has implemented important capacity building activities including market value chain analysis, inputs and farm technologies provision, M&E and training of trainers. 1,059,044 households have received technical advice; and as a result 812,655 of them have prepared business plans based on market and technical analysis of respective livelihood zones. HABP has been shown to contribute to the increase in food security: the impact evaluation shows that in 2010, PSNP and HABP together increased food security 2.5 times more than PSNP alone.

PSNP Phase 4 was launched building on the successes of APL III.

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

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

The Program Development Objective is: Increased access to safety net and disaster risk management systems, complementary livelihoods services and nutrition support for food insecure households in rural Ethiopia. This will be achieved through 1) support for building core instruments and tools of social protection and DRM systems, 2) delivery of safety net and enhanced access to livelihoods services for vulnerable rural households, and 3) improved program management and institutional coordination. The project will also contribute to the higher level objectives of (i) improved household food security, livelihoods and nutrition, and (ii) enhanced household and community resilience to shocks. This is consistent with the higher level objectives of the ongoing APL series supporting the PSNP.

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

The Program Development Objective is: increase access to effective safety net and disaster risk management systems, and complementary livelihood and nutrition services for food-insecure households in the Recipient's rural areas.

#### **Key Results**

The Results Framework has been slightly modified to reflect the lessons learned to date. This has involved the removal of four superfluous intermediate results indicators. However, this makes no changes to the monitoring of safeguards compliance.

### **D. Project Description**

The Additional Financing builds on the ongoing PSNP 4 in order to scale up and strengthen the response of the PSNP to both new and core beneficiaries, following the design of the Parent Project. The Additional Financing will scale-up the PSNP in response to the ongoing drought in Ethiopia.

#### **Component Name**

Systems Development

**Comments (optional)**

Support to the social protection and DRM systems will include strengthening the targeting of the Program, putting in place a national household registry, improving management information system (MIS), early warning triggers and response mechanisms and capacity development.

**Component Name**

Productive safety nets and links to livelihoods services

**Comments (optional)**

Three sub-components are delivering key services to the targeted households: (a) safety net transfers to chronically food insecure households and support to a scalable response mechanism for transitory needs; (b) sustainable community assets and human capital investments; and, (c) enhanced access to complementary livelihoods services for client households through crop and livestock production, off-farm income generating activities, and labor/employment linkages.

**Component Name**

Institutional and Management Development

**Comments (optional)**

This component will support sustainable capacity development and institutional strengthening to implement PSNP 4.

The PSNP 4 is firmly aligned with the World Bank Group's Country Partnership Strategy (FY13-16), specifically Pillar Two (Enhancing resilience and reducing vulnerabilities), which aims to support Ethiopia in improving the delivery of social services and developing a comprehensive approach to social protection and risk management. The recently completed Strategic Country Diagnostic recognizes the centrality of the PSNP to rural poverty reduction in Ethiopia. The Program is also anchored in Ethiopia's National Social Protection Policy and is a key instrument to achieve the National Disaster Risk Management Policy.

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

As in the previous phases of the PSNP, the Public Works program will continue to be developed by the communities based on a watershed development approach, using the integrated, multi-sector landscape management approach of the government's Community-Based Participatory Watershed Development Guideline (CBPWDG) and Rangeland Management Guideline. These Public Works sub-projects, together with activities related to household asset-creation, will comprise an annual program of several thousand small-scale and micro-scale sub-projects carried out in food-insecure rural areas across all regions of Ethiopia, to be rolled out over time. PW sub-projects will be small-scale, and their impacts will be site-specific and limited. They will include Natural Resource Management sub-projects including soil & water conservation, social infrastructure including community roads, health posts, school renovation and Farmers Training Centers, community water projects and livelihoods-based subprojects such as small-scale irrigation.

The condition of the community watershed determines to a large extent the ability of its residents to engage in household asset-building and income-generating activities such as cereal or vegetable production, animal fattening, beekeeping, etc. Thus as the watersheds become developed, community PW Action Plans typically show an increasing emphasis on livelihoods-

related subprojects. The design of PSNP IV will facilitate this gradual change of focus.

The Climate Smart Initiative (CSI) developed during PSNP III has determined that the PW program has an important role to play in mitigating the effects of climate change, and reducing the vulnerability of already food insecure communities. Thus climate change requirements are incorporated in the procedure for planning PW under PSNP IV. The requirements for Disaster Risk Management (DRM) in terms of both risk mitigation and adaptation are also incorporated in the new design of PSNP IV.

The community PW action plans will be more nutrition-sensitive by incorporating into the community PW planning process subprojects designed to increase access to a more diversified diet, enable production of nutrient rich crops, increases production of complementary food, etc. Nutrition sensitive PWs subprojects will be accompanied by behavior change communication.

Based on livelihood groups, the rural areas in which the Public Works and livelihoods investments will be implemented have been classified by the Ethiopian Development Research Institute (EDRI) as the 'Five Ethiopias' consist of: (a) drought prone highlands; (b) moisture reliable cereals areas; (c) moisture-reliable enset areas; (d) humid moisture-reliable lowlands; and (e) pastoral areas.

Each Public Works sub-project will be screened utilizing an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), which builds upon the PW ESMF procedure used in PSNP III. Livelihoods investments at household level will be implemented in all of these regions and will be subject to the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) procedure as outlined in the ESMF.

## **F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists**

Chukwudi H. Okafor (GSU07)

Ian Leslie Campbell (GSP01)

## **II. Implementation**

### **Institutional and Implementation Arrangements**

The Additional Financing will be implemented through the institutional structures established for the PSNP 4. The PSNP 4 is implemented through Government systems, with Food Security Coordination line agencies at every level accountable for oversight and coordination, and implementation undertaken by line ministries, Government agencies and other partners at all levels. These arrangements are cemented in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Government and development partners. The roles and responsibilities of implementing partners are described in detail in the Program Implementation Manual (PIM).

Following the national elections that were held in May 2015, the Government reorganized its Ministries. These changes had limited impacts on the institutional arrangements for the PSNP, as the Food Security Coordination Directorate (FSCD) remained within the Ministry of Agriculture (which was renamed the Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources or MoANR). The Food Security Coordination Directorate joined the Rural Job Opportunities Directorate, which together create the Rural Job Opportunities and Food Security Sector in MoANR. The Livelihoods Implementation and Coordination Unit, which was under the Agricultural Extension Directorate in the Ministry of Agriculture has been moved to the Food Security and Rural Job Opportunities Sector to strengthen

the overall management of the Livelihoods Component. This change will be reflected in the Project.

The Early Warning and Response Directorate (EWRD), which was together with the Food Security Coordination Directorate in the Disaster Risk Management and Food Security Sector of the Ministry of Agriculture, has moved to a newly established National Disaster Risk Management Coordinating Commission. The change in name and status of this implementing agency will be reflected in the Project. The responsibility of the EWRD for the PSNP remains focused on food management and early warning systems, with no changes in the staffing or institutional arrangements for these parts of the Directorate.

### III. Safeguard Policies that might apply

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	<p>Many of the PW subprojects, though intended to impact the environment positively, will have some potential for negative environmental impacts if not designed and implemented following good practice. Thus given that there will be a large number of such projects, OP 4.01 is triggered. The Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) Screening process already in place refers for Special Attention any subprojects with one or more of the following features: (i) Involves disposal of medical waste, (ii) Likely to use pesticides or other agrochemicals, (iii) Incorporates a dam, (iv) involves land acquisition, or loss of assets or access to assets. For sub-projects with medical waste, a GOE Medical Waste Management Guide for Rural Health Clinics will be applied, and was disclosed under APL II. For sub-projects likely to use pesticides, see OP 4.09 below. Sub-projects with a dam are required to be designed by a qualified engineer, and constructed by a qualified contractor under the supervision of a qualified engineer. Dams in excess of 10m are ineligible (see OP 4.37 below). For sub-projects involving land acquisition, see OP 4.12 below. After this initial screening, the ESMF procedure further screens the principal features of each subproject to ascertain whether it is of Environmental Concern. This is then followed by preliminary environmental and social screening to identify any site-specific potential impacts that might warrant an EIA.</p> <p>The approach to PSNP 4's ESMF procedures for Livelihoods investments is to identify any household level activities which might give rise to negative cumulative environmental or social impacts if carried out at scale in each woreda. This identification is</p>



		made by drawing up a woreda environmental profile highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the ecosystem and social issues in that woreda, and matching the strengths and weaknesses to the types of activity that households are likely to wish to undertake. The result of this analysis, in which the PW woreda staff participate, is a list of HABP activities which should not be allowed in order to meet compliance with OP 4.01. The state of the bio-physical and social environment of the woreda and the appropriateness of the negative list is reviewed on an annual basis under the ESMF Monitoring System.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	All sub-projects that might trigger OP 4.04 are eliminated at Screening stage.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	All sub-projects that might trigger OP 4.04 are eliminated at Screening stage.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	This policy is triggered under the assumption that successful small-scale irrigation projects might lead to greater agricultural activity which may require pest control management efforts. For this purpose, the GOE Integrated Pest Management Plan Guide was disclosed under APL II.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	OP 4.11 is triggered and because although deemed unlikely in view of the small scale of the subprojects, the possibility of ►( chance-finds►( cannot be ruled out. The policy is addressed in the ESMF screening process at three stages: (i) Any subproject located within a known cultural heritage site is earmarked as a sub-project of Environmental Concern, to be referred to the Regional Environmental Protection Authority, who will decide if an EIA is required, (ii) Assessment for potential disturbance to cultural or religious sites is carried out as part of the site specific sub-project Screening, which also contributes to a decision whether to earmark a sub-project for possible EIA, (iii) Inclusion of assessment of potential cultural heritage impacts in the EIA of sub-projects, where EIA is found to be necessary, and (iv) Monitoring of sub-project implementation by DAs and wereda staff, in liaison with the Regional Bureau of Tourism and Culture.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	It was determined that some of the people in the project area meet the criteria of OP 4.10 and, therefore, PSNP 4 triggered this safeguard policy. An

		Enhanced Social Assessment and Consultation reflecting the requirements of OP 4.10 was undertaken under a TOR agreed between the World Bank and MoA. The findings of the Enhanced Social Assessment and Consultation, including measures to ensure the provision of grievance redress; benefit sharing issues; and the identified mitigating measures have been incorporated into the design of PSNP4, and detailed in the Social Development Plan in the Annex of the PAD.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/ BP 4.12	Yes	PW subprojects involving the physical movement and resettlement of households are not eligible under the PSNP 4, and are eliminated during the screening process. However, cases may occur that involve change of land use or restriction of access to communal assets at both community and household level. Where such loss of assets or access to assets is involuntary, the procedures under OP 4.12 will be implemented. For this purpose a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) developed by Government for the parent project continues to apply. However, such subprojects continue to remain ineligible for PSNP 4, and are thus being screened out, until the upgrading of the Public Works monitoring system necessary to track OP 4.12 compliance.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	Yes	Any subproject that might incorporate a dam more than 10 metres in height will be ineligible for the PSNP PW programme, and will be specifically eliminated in the first stage of the sub-project Screening process. Smaller dams will be constructed subject to implementation of the FAO dam safety measures in Ethiopia, which forms part of the ESMF.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	Yes	This policy is triggered because of the small-scale irrigation projects expected in watersheds of three international waterways. For PSNP 4 (the parent project), Government and the Bank notified the concerned countries in accordance with this policy. No additional notification is required.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/ BP 7.60	No	All sub-projects that might trigger OP 7.60 are eliminated at Screening stage.

#### IV. 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:**

From an environmental and social safeguard standpoint, the proposed operation is a Category B project, since impacts of the project, for the most part, will be minimal, site-specific and manageable to an acceptable level.

#### Productive Safety Net Program

One of the key objectives of the PSNP is to address the underlying causes of food insecurity, to which land degradation is universally agreed to be a major contributor, particularly in highland areas. Thus the design of the PSNP public works program is intended to have environmentally positive impacts. Under the previous phases, these activities, which include, for example, soil and water conservation and improvement of community infrastructure, have already been shown to constitute a vehicle for significant positive environmental transformation and enhanced productivity.

Nonetheless, negative impacts may occur if the locations or designs of the community activities do not follow good environmental practice, or if they are incompatible with optimum overall management of the watershed. Such impacts, which would be limited in scale and site-specific, could include, for example:

#### Community Road Construction and Rehabilitation Impacts

- (¢ Alteration of drainage patterns and increased flooding and soil erosion from road construction and materials excavation sites
- (¢ Right of way removal of vegetation and natural habitats
- (¢ Sedimentation of aquatic systems from soil erosion and runoff
- (¢ Impact of increased human use on adjacent habitats and wildlife
- (¢ Involuntary or voluntary displacement or loss of land or resources or access to resources normally used by individuals or the community for cultivation, livestock grazing, fuelwood, etc.
- (¢ Stagnant pools at excavation sites that create breeding sites for mosquitoes
- (¢ Potential for disturbance of cultural and historic sites and resources
- (¢ Increased in and out population migration due to improved access
- (¢ Unplanned, haphazard land use development created by improved access
- (¢ Temporary displacement or loss of access or livelihood due to construction detours

#### Small-scale Irrigation Development Impacts

- (¢ Changes in natural drainage patterns upstream and downstream
- (¢ Depletion of surface or groundwater sources
- (¢ Deterioration in soil quality due to poorly managed irrigation; potential waterlogging and salinization of soils, leading to agricultural abandonment and land degradation
- (¢ Runoff from irrigated fields and potential for agricultural chemicals to pollute water bodies
- (¢ Abstraction effects on source streams and related aquatic ecosystems
- (¢ Lowering of water quality due to agricultural runoff
- (¢ Increased pest and disease control problems due to the promotion of monoculture
- (¢ Reduced biodiversity due to focus on cash crops
- (¢ Potential for disturbance of cultural and historic sites and resources, and damage to nearby

sites resulting from changes in the water table or salinization.

- (☒ Stagnant waters and disease vectors arising from poorly managed irrigation systems
- (☒ Increased use of agricultural chemicals with related human health concerns

#### Watershed Treatment and Water Harvesting Impacts

- (☒ Increased access can aggravate soil erosion problems, especially in higher gradient topography
- (☒ Poorly maintained drainage controls and in-stream structures can lead to eventual failures and increased flooding problems
- (☒ Reduced downstream nutrient levels from dams that reduce stream transport of organic material and sediment
- (☒ Social tensions arising from issues and rights of water allocation
- (☒ Mosquito and related health concerns arising from stagnant pools
- (☒ Impacts on cultural and historic sites and resources through changes in the water table
- (☒ Social problems arising from poorly managed regenerated catchment areas
- (☒ Afforestation and Revegetation Impacts
- (☒ Effects of some tree species (e.g., eucalyptus) in reducing groundwater levels
- (☒ Long term effects of forest harvesting on hydrologic systems and stream characteristics
- (☒ Possible reduction in tree and plant species diversity arising from the introduction of new plantations and re-vegetation schemes
- (☒ Effects of monocultures on ecosystem diversity, function and sustainability
- (☒ Changes in habitat characteristics and potential effects on endemic wildlife species
- (☒ Social problems arising from issues related to the ownership and user of new forests
- (☒ Effects of grazing bans on the cost of rearing livestock and shift of grazing pressures to other areas

#### Livestock, Pasture and Water Points Development Impacts

- (☒ Compaction of soils from increased activity around new water sources
- (☒ Potential contamination of water sources and needs for controls on human use
- (☒ Concentrations of livestock at specific watering sites/routes that result in overgrazing of vegetation and related land degradation
- (☒ Potential social tensions over access to pastoralists water sources
- (☒ Drinking Water Sources Development Impacts
- (☒ Increased water withdrawals could exceed groundwater recharge rates in some areas
- (☒ Development of springs may affect availability of downstream water supply
- (☒ Physical impacts of increased human traffic near water stations
- (☒ Potential contamination of open wells by livestock and human uses
- (☒ Reduced availability of aquatic ecosystems due to water abstraction
- (☒ Increased dependence on new water supply systems that prove to be unreliable
- (☒ Sanitation and health concerns associated with the operation of new drinking water sources
- (☒ Land use and social issues and tensions over the siting of and access to new water sources

#### School, Health Posts or Farmers Training Centres Construction, Rehabilitation or Expansion Impacts

- (¢ Site disturbance and potential drainage alterations from construction activities and
- (¢ expansion of facilities
- (¢ Involuntary or voluntary displacement or loss of lands or resources or access to resources normally used by individuals or the community for cultivation, livestock grazing, fuelwood, etc.
- (¢ Water shortages due to increased demands on existing sources
- (¢ Increased production of human and medical wastes and potential for contamination of waterbodies and groundwater
- (¢ Increased timber harvesting on nearby lands for construction materials
- (¢ Construction impacts on sensitive wildlife habitats and aquatic systems
- (¢ Increased pollution from site development and operations, including medical waste
- (¢ Sanitation and health issues related to increased human presence and medical waste disposal
- (¢ In-migration and settlement generated by rehabilitated facilities

### Component 3: Livelihoods Support through Three Pathways

Since each household-level activity will be at micro-scale, and as the procedures under this Component will include the assessment of the agro-ecological suitability of the activity, including screening for potential negative impacts, no significant site-specific negative impacts are expected from individual household-level activities. The only environmental or social concerns might be potential cumulative negative impacts in the longer term of large numbers of households adopting new activities in fragile environments over a number of years. This might include, for example, an increase in livestock ownership with resultant potential over-grazing and environmental degradation, or a falling water-table in a woreda due to large numbers of households adopting shallow-well irrigation.

#### Safeguards Issues

This project triggers seven safeguard policies: The Environmental Assessment Policy (OP 4.01), related to the possible impacts mentioned above, for which an ESMF has been developed and disclosed; the Pest Management Policy (OP 4.09), predicated on the possibility of small quantities of pesticides being employed in small, community-level irrigation projects; the Physical Cultural Resources Policy (OP 4.11), because although deemed unlikely in view of the small scale of the sub-projects, the possibility of ➤( chance-finds➤( cannot be ruled out; the Indigenous Peoples Policy (4.10), which is applied under the present agreement between GoE and the WB, for which an enhanced Social Assessment and Consultation reflecting the requirements of OP 4.10 has been undertaken; the Involuntary Resettlement Policy (4.12), predicated on the possibility that although sub-projects potentially involving physical relocation are ineligible, there might occur cases involving change of land use or loss of assets or reduction of access to assets. In such cases the procedures of OP 4.12 will be implemented, for which a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) has been developed and disclosed; the Safety of Dams Policy, predicated on the possibility that although dams of more than 10 metres in height are ineligible, smaller dams might have safety issues, for which compliance with the FAO Small Dams Safety Measures in Ethiopia is required; and the International Waterways Policy (OP 7.50), because of small-scale irrigation projects that may be implemented in watersheds of international waterways.

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

Activities under PSNP 4 include watershed development interventions and improved farming and land-use management systems, under the community watershed development approach of the government. These are expected to make contributions to positive environmental regeneration and transformation, which is one of the objectives of the PSNP. As stated above, any potential long-term or cumulative impacts that might have been caused by PSNP PW activities such as infrastructure will be detected through the Screening and mitigating procedures, and addressed. At the same time, potential long-term cumulative impacts that might have been caused by the implementation of large numbers of similar Livelihoods Strengthening activities will be managed by annual monitoring of impacts at woreda level, and corrective action taken. In view of this, no indirect or long-term negative impacts are anticipated from the project.

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

The principal project design alternative considered was to provide the cash or food on a predictable basis, but as direct support, i.e., not to undertake physical public works. This would have avoided incurring any negative impacts from infrastructure sub-projects. However, this option was rejected, due to (i) potential large-scale dependency, with attendant negative social impacts; and (ii) because it would not offer the opportunity to carry out environmental rehabilitation of the watersheds through Soil and Water Conservation (SWC) sub-projects, which is necessary for improved livelihoods. In addition, the creation of new community infrastructure assets, which are also essential to meet the objectives of the project, would not be achieved.

**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 1994 Constitution of Ethiopia proclaims that all citizens shall have a right to live in a clean and healthy environment, and that Government and citizens have a duty to protect the environment, and the design and implementation of programs and projects shall not damage or destroy the environment. The Constitution incorporates a number of other provisions relevant for the protection, sustainable use and improvement of the environmental resources of the country. It reflects a view of environmental concerns in terms of fundamental human rights, and provides a basis for the formulation of national policies and strategies on environmental management and protection. It assures that no development activity shall be disruptive to the ecological balance, and that people concerned shall be made to give their opinions in the preparation and implementation of environmental protection policies and programs.

The Constitution also:

- a) Maintains land under the ownership of the Ethiopian people and the government but protects security of usufruct tenure;
- b) Reinforces the devolution of power and local participation in planning, development and decision taking by regions and woredas;
- c) Ensures the equality of women with men;
- d) Ensures the appropriate management as well as the protection of the well-being of the environment
- e) Maintains an open economic policy;
- f) Recognizes the rights of groups identified as ►( Nations, nationalities and Peoples►( having a common culture or similar customs, mutual intelligibility of language, belief in a common or related identity, a common psychological make-up, and who inhabit an identifiable, predominantly contiguous territory.
- g) Recognizes the rights of pastoral groups inhabiting the lowlands.

A series of legal proclamations form the basis for the environmental assessment and management framework in Ethiopia: the Proclamation on the Establishment of Environmental Protection Organs (No. 295/2002); the Proclamation on Environmental Impact Assessment (No. 299/2002); the Proclamation on Environmental Pollution Control (No. 300/2002); and the Proclamation on Solid Waste Management (No. 513/2007). The EIA Directive 1 of 2008, Directive to Determine Projects Subject to EIA, determines the categories of project subject to EIA Proclamation 299/2002.

There are two key public institutions that are directly responsible for monitoring environmental compliance: the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) and Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), which have decentralized to the regional level. In the case of MoA, decentralization has gone further to the woreda and kebele levels. There exists a critical mass of capacity within the (MoA) and MoEF at the federal and decentralized levels to manage environmental and social safeguard issues.

Since 2005 the borrower has taken, and continues to take, extensive measures to build capacity for the implementation of safeguard policies, as follows:

All the regions in which PSNP 4 is being implemented, have developed institutional capacity for implementing the ESMF.

There are now Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists working in all of the PW units at federal and levels and trained and woreda staff for overseeing ESMF screening. As a result, ESMF screening rates are now running at, or are close to, 100% in all PSNP regions. Investment in continuous training of regional and woreda staff and around 6,000 Development Agents is seen as key to this success and has sustained the technical capacities of each level in the implementation not only of the ESMF but of community-based watershed planning and the development of PW plans. Nonetheless, ESMF Screening of PWs in pastoral areas has not yet reached the standard of quality achieved in the highland areas and further training is being given to address this issue.

Under PSNP 4, the regular PW monitoring system covers not only ESMF Screening but also the implementation of mitigation measures specified at the time of Screening. While the PW Reviews have found that most mitigation measures have been implemented, the fact that some water and community road sub-projects in highland areas have resulted in negative environmental impacts highlights the need to continue to improve the implementation of ESMF mitigation measures for these types of sub-project. The implementation of mitigation measures in lowland areas has not yet been fully reviewed.

Under PSNP 4 joint government-donor monitoring of ESMF implementation is conducted, followed by corrective measures if required. This monitoring will be undertaken through (i) The PW component of the PSNP 4 M&E system, which tracks the nature and extent of implementation of the ESMF, and (ii) Twice-annual joint Government-donor PW Reviews, in which samples of PW sub-projects countrywide are examined for quality, sustainability, impact and ESMF compliance. Any rectification works (both labour and nonlabour) required will be conducted using Project resources in the form of repair and rehabilitation works under the next annual PW programme of activities. Ensuring that this happens is the responsibility of the DA involved in the community PSNP PW planning process, and the NR Expert in the NR Woreda Case Team. Given the large number of new public works subprojects in each year (35,774 in 2015/2016), and

the short subproject implementation cycle, subprojects likely to require the Resettlement Policy Framework continue to be ineligible and are being screened out, pending the planned strengthening of the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) and expansion of the compliance monitoring system. However, arrangements are already underway for training the Development Agents on the implementation of OP 4.12, and a draft GRM manual has been developed. These are all essential steps for satisfactory management and monitoring of such subprojects in the future. The Enhanced Social Assessment and Consultation Action Plan continues to be implemented in compliance with OP 4.10. Specifically: (i) reviewing and strengthening targeting in pastoral areas; (ii) undertaking a five-year review of the Roving Appeals Audits to inform the draft GRM Manual; (iii) implementing an Expanded Social Accountability Pilot in 19 woredas (including Somali and Afar); and (iv) increasing communications and improving the awareness of both clients and non-clients.

There has been a number of monitoring missions to pastoral areas with the aim of improving project performance for pastoral groups, and two specialists in pastoral communities have been taken on in NRMD and allocated to the PWCU. In addition, a contextual assessment of the application of gender provisions in pastoral areas is underway in order to be able to modify the PIM to be more appropriate for women and children, particularly in vulnerable and marginalized groups.

All woredas during PSNP 4 where the Livelihoods component is being implemented have developed Woreda Environmental Profiles and ➤( Negative Lists➤( limiting the types of activities that can be undertaken in order to meet compliance with the World Bank safeguard policies.

Staff of the Regional EPAs and the woreda Environmental (Natural Resources) focal persons participate in the annual awareness-creation and training courses for the PSNP Public Works, which includes ESMF training of NR Experts in the Woreda NR Case Teams. These training courses, which were upgraded by the expanded federal PWCU, are provided by teams drawn from MoA at Federal and Regional level, with technical assistance from the Natural Resources Management personnel of MoA, the regional Environmental Protection Bureaus and agencies such as WFP. The woreda-level trainees in turn train the DAs at the local level. The cost of implementing the ESMF training are covered partly by the PSNP 4 Management Budget at federal, regional, woreda and kebele levels, and partly by the regular government staffing and overhead budgets at all levels.

In order to address projects that might include the renovation or extension of medical clinics in the public works program, the Government's Waste Management Guide for Rural Health Clinics is published and disclosed, in accordance with OP 4.01.

To address the possible use of small quantities of pesticides in small-scale irrigation schemes, the Government Guide for Integrated Pest Management in Small-Scale Irrigation Schemes is published and disclosed under APL II, in accordance with the ESMF and OP 4.09.

The Physical Cultural Resources safeguard policy is addressed by being integrated into the ESMF screening process at three stages: (i) Any sub-project located within a known cultural heritage site is earmarked as a sub-project of Environmental Concern, to be referred to the Regional EPA, who will decide if an EIA is required, (ii) Assessment for potential disturbance to cultural or religious sites is carried out as part of the site-specific sub-project Screening, which also contributes to a decision whether to earmark a sub-project for possible EIA, (iii) Inclusion of assessment of potential cultural heritage impacts in the EIA of sub-projects, where EIA is found to be necessary,



and (iv) Monitoring of sub-project implementation by DAs and woreda staff, in liaison with the Regional Bureau of Tourism and Culture.

The International Waterways policy OP 7.50 is triggered because some of the public works may be small-scale irrigation projects located in watersheds of international waterways. The World Bank, on behalf of Government, has notified the concerned riparian governments in accordance with this policy, covering the five-year period of PSNP 4. The Task Team's assessment is that the Project will not cause appreciable harm to any of the Riparians concerned.

**Safeguard Policies Not Triggered by PSNP 4**

The Natural Habitats and Forests safeguard policies are not triggered because (i) Land not already converted to settlement, cultivation or community grazing is not incorporated in the watershed areas covered by the community watershed development plans; (ii) PW activities involving land conversion are ineligible for PSNP funding; (iii) The DA screens out (for separate EIA) any activity within a National Park or other designated wildlife area or buffer zone, and any activity in a Priority Forest Area, and any activity that might involve draining of, or disturbance to, a wetland. OP 7.60 (Projects in Disputed Areas) is not triggered because any PW activity proposed in, or adjoining, a disputed area is ineligible for PSNP funding and is specifically eliminated by the ESMF Screening process.

**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 are the beneficiary households, and those involved in the implementation of the program. The provisions of the ESMF are incorporated into the training materials used at woreda and kebele levels, which will reach some 1.5 million beneficiary households, and are regularly updated according to community and government staff feedback. Consultation on the safeguard policies have taken place through the annual training programmes, twice-yearly Public Works Reviews, and the participatory community public works planning meetings conducted annually by the DAs in over 10,000 watersheds during the nine years of APL I, II and III. The PSNP 4 Enhanced Social Assessment and Consultation, ESMF and RPF were the subject of extensive consultation among stakeholders including at community level, and the reports and requirements of these consultations are incorporated in the final documents as disclosed in the World Bank Info Shop and Country Office public-access library, and through the Ministry of Agriculture at federal level, and regional levels, as well as through the Ministry of Environment and Forests.

The original Social Accountability Pilot was completed in early 2015, including the production of Guidelines for the implementation of Social Accountability in the PSNP. An Expanded PSNP Social Accountability Pilot is now underway, incorporating a focus on monitoring impacts of the PSNP on marginalized and vulnerable groups. PSNP staff are also involved in the development of guidelines for consultation with vulnerable groups, which in future will be used by frontline staff of projects such as the PSNP.

***B. Disclosure Requirements***

<b>Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	07-Jul-2014

Date of submission to InfoShop	10-Jul-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
Ethiopia	10-Jul-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	07-Jul-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	10-Jul-2014
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
Ethiopia	10-Jul-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	07-Jul-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	10-Jul-2014
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
Ethiopia	10-Jul-2014
<i>Comments:</i> The document is the Enhanced Social Assessment and Consultation, as required in the case of Ethiopia for OP 4.10.	
<b>Pest Management Plan</b>	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	12-Aug-2009
Date of submission to InfoShop	12-Aug-2009
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
Ethiopia	13-Aug-2009
<i>Comments:</i> The Integrated Pest Management Procedure was re-disclosed in-country in the ESMF on 7/10/14. Pest Management Plans (PMPs) will only be produced if necessary at subproject level.	
<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 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 type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources</b>			
Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples</b>			
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"/> ]
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Is physical displacement/relocation expected?  Provided estimated number of people to be affected	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	TBD [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)  Provided estimated number of people to be affected	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	TBD [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.37 - Safety of Dams</b>			
Have dam safety plans been prepared?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]
Have the TORs as well as composition for the independent Panel of Experts (POE) been reviewed and approved by the Bank?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]
Has an Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) been prepared and arrangements been made for public awareness and training?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP 7.50 - Projects on International Waterways</b>			
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 [ ] No [ ] NA [ × ]
Has the RVP approved such an exception?	Yes [ ] No [ ] NA [ × ]
<b>The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information</b>	
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 [ ]
<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 [ × ] 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 [ ]

## V. Contact point

### World Bank

Contact: Sarah Coll-Black

Title: Sr Social Protection Specialis

### Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name: Ministry of Finance and Economic Cooperation

Contact: Ato Fisha Aberra

Title: Director, International financial Institutions Cooperation

Email: infopr@mofec.gov.et

### Implementing Agencies

Name: Ministry of Agri culture and Natural Resources

Contact: Ato Berhanu W/Michael

Title: Director, FSCD

Email: berhanuw@yahoo.com

**VI. For more information contact:**

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

**VII. Approval**

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Sarah Coll-Black	
<b><i>Approved By</i></b>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Maman-Sani Issa (SA)	Date: 25-May-2016
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Dena Ringold (PMGR)	Date: 25-May-2016
Country Director:	Name: Carolyn Turk (CD)	Date: 26-May-2016