

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: ISDSA17948

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 03-May-2016

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 04-May-2016

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	India	Project ID:	P151072
Project Name:	National Agricultural Higher Education Project (P151072)		
Task Team Leader(s):	Edward William Bresnyan		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	02-May-2016	Estimated Board Date:	16-Jun-2016
Managing Unit:	GFA12	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	Agricultural extension and research (50%), Tertiary education (30%), Agro-industry, marketing, and trade (10%), Public administration- Education (5%), Information technology (5%)		
Theme(s):	Education for the knowledge economy (35%), Managing for development results (5%), Rural services and infrastructure (30%), Improving labor markets (20%), Rural policies and institutions (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:	165.00	Total Bank Financing:	82.50
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
BORROWER/RECIPIENT			82.50
International Development Association (IDA)			82.50
Total			165.00
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Project Development Objective(s)

The proposed NAHEP would support participating Agricultural Universities and ICAR in providing more relevant and higher quality education to agriculture university students.

3. Project Description

Project Beneficiaries

NAHEP would target the 73 institutions that form the ICAR-AU System, consisting of State Agricultural Universities (61), Deemed Universities (5), Central Universities with Agricultural Faculty (4) and Central Agricultural Universities (3). Students would benefit from: (a) a movement from teaching- to learning-centered education, leveraging ICT and external partnerships; (b) effective stakeholder participation in curricula development, pedagogy options and course evaluation; (c) increased equity in educational access through vocation and technical certificate programs; and (d) an overall improvement in the learning and academic environment that would both expand and sharpen their skill set needed for future employment. Faculty would benefit from: (a) increased collaboration among Indian AUs and with other universities globally to raise research quality and its linkage to educational quality and relevance; and (b) training and capacity-building to improve the delivery of education and its learning outcomes

- Increased AU on-time graduation rates, disaggregated by gender and SC/ST;
- Increased cut-off scores for students in ICAR Entrance Tests, disaggregated by gender and SC/ST;
- Increased student placement rates, disaggregated by gender and SC/ST;
- Increased faculty research effectiveness; and
- Number of project beneficiaries, disaggregated by students/ faculty, gender and SC/ST (core indicator).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Component 1 - Support to Agricultural Universities (USD 146.4 million, of which IDA USD 73.2 million): would finance investments by participating AUs to improve the quality and relevance of agricultural education and research toward agricultural transformation. The component has three sub-components.

Sub-component 1a - Support to State-level AUs (USD 69.4 million, of which IDA USD 34.7 million) would specifically target reform-ready State-level AUs and support competitively selected and performance-based Institutional Development Plans (IDPs), financed through ICAR's existing Development Grant window. The IDPs under this subcomponent seek to improve: (a) learning outcomes and future employment for AU students; and (b) faculty teaching performance and research effectiveness. Through the IDPs, the AUs would identify and prioritize key challenges, propose interventions to respond to these challenges, and set timelines and indicators for measuring achievement of greater quality and relevance attributable to these interventions. The IDPs would also leverage other funding sources (e.g., existing or additional state-level funds, private sector, foundations) along with ICAR's Development Grant. NAHEP would finance each IDP through a subproject grant directly to the participating AU. Activities financed under each IDP would include: (a) capacity building and training for agreed governance reforms that promote AU autonomy and sustained accreditation; (b) updated infrastructure (i.e., minor civil works, goods) for research and teaching; (c) faculty development (i.e., training, consultant services); (d) networking with industry and other learning institutions, both national and international; (e) increased vocational education through the launching of certificate programs; (f) more effective student job placement; and (g) own-revenue generation for AUs. Each IDP would also specify a Twinning Plan with a recognized high-performing university, either in India or abroad.

Sub-component 1b - Centers for Advanced Agriculture Science and Technology - CAASTs (USD 46.2 million, of which IDA USD 23.1 million) would support competitively selected CAAST proposals by reform-ready AUs to establish multidisciplinary centers for teaching, research and extension on critical and emerging agricultural topics (e.g., globalization; climate change and resilience; land and water use efficiency; scalable technology; effective pedagogy and knowledge transfer; agro-industry; and agro-entrepreneurship). Multi-stakeholder consultations would inform the geographic locations and core themes for the proposed CAASTs, after which participating AUs would compete for CAAST funding. Approved AUs would be financed through a CAAST subproject grant directly to the participating AU. The sub-component would finance: (a) research and teaching equipment (i.e., goods); (b) faculty and scientist development fellowships, (c) student scholarships, primarily at the postgraduate level; and (d) costs associated with twinning arrangements with similar centers (e.g., universities, research centers) both outside and within India (i.e., training, consultant services, and non-consultant services).

Subcomponent 1c - ICAR innovation grants to AUs (USD 30.8 million, of which IDA USD 15.4 million) - would primarily support technical assistance and consultant services required to: (a) make AUs reform ready (i.e., attain accreditation) to permit their participation in subcomponents 1a and 1b; and (b) promote mentoring of non-accredited AUs by existing reform-ready AUs and other interstate and international academic partnerships.

The Project Implementation Plan, satisfactory to the Bank, would include detailed guidelines for developing, evaluating and implementing IDPs (under subcomponent 1a), CAAST subprojects (under subcomponent 1b) and innovation grants (under subcomponent 1c), including procedures for inviting, reviewing and ranking specific proposals, implementation and monitoring of approved subproject grants, and targeting methodology to ensure equitable AU access ? particularly among those in lagging states ? to each subcomponent.

Reform readiness: The Education Division/ ICAR uses the voluntary accreditation process as a determinant of an AU's reform readiness. Accreditation confirms that the given AU: (a) has clearly defined and appropriate objectives (i.e., leadership); (b) has established an enabling environment that makes achievements of these objectives possible (i.e., governance); (c) is substantially accomplishing its objectives (i.e., effectiveness); and (d) is organized, staffed and supported so as to ensure its continuation (i.e., sustainability). ICAR awards accreditation at three levels ? university, college, and program ? and bases its decision to accredit a given AU on three sources of evidence: (a) AU self-examination; (b) institutional peer review; and (c) final decision by the ICAR Accreditation Board (see Annex 2). NAHEP would support AUs in their efforts to attain accreditation through subcomponent 1c.

Subproject Cycle - IDPs, CAASTs and Innovation Grants:

- Following a dissemination campaign to create overall NAHEP awareness, interested AUs would define their institutional development goals and develop associated activities and outcomes (with technical assistance as required) into IDPs/ CAAST Proposals (or develop Innovation Grant proposals), which are submitted to the Education Division/ ICAR;
- IDPs/ CAAST Proposals (or Innovation Grants proposals) are evaluated by the Technical Committee for eligibility (i.e., reform ready, accreditation) and compliance with environmental, financial, institutional, social and technical guidelines (per the Project Implementation Plan);
- Subproject agreements are signed between AUs and the Education Division/ ICAR to support finance of approved IDPs/ CAASTs (or Innovation Grants) and specify the use of subproject

resources, and the rights and responsibilities of AUs and the Education Division/ ICAR;

- The Education Division/ ICAR transfers subproject resources to AUs for IDP/ CAAST (or Innovation Grant) implementation;
- AUs contract goods, works, consultant services and non-consultant services, in accordance with the approved IDP/ CAAST (or Innovation Grant) the norms established in the Project Implementation Plan, and prepare reports (e.g., Financial Utilization Certificates) which they submit to the Education Division/ ICAR to document the use of subproject resources.

Component 2 - Investments in ICAR Leadership in Agriculture Higher Education (USD 10.4 million, of which IDA USD 5.2 million) - would finance ICAR's internal reforms to enhance its effectiveness in: (a) coordinating, guiding and managing agricultural higher education across the ICAR-AU System; and (b) its interactions with AUs and key stakeholders nationwide through interventions that increase the quality and relevance of agricultural higher education. As the Education Division/ ICAR is responsible for national coordination and quality assurance of agricultural higher education, the component would leverage ICAR's comparative advantage in: (a) assessing systemic challenges across the ICAR-AU System; and (b) incubating solutions.

The component would finance goods, training, consultant services and non-consultant services such as: (a) change management services to aid the Education Division/ ICAR in its internal reform of the Development Grant; (b) technical assistance to participating AUs for developing and implementing IDPs, CAASTs and Innovation Grants; (c) partnerships between the Education Division/ ICAR and other globally recognized agricultural higher education institutions; (d) digital information systems for AU data collection, analysis and dissemination to improve quality metrics in agricultural higher education; (e) an improved curricula review process to tighten its relevance in today's dynamic job market; (f) enhanced methods to consolidate and disseminate global best-practices in agricultural higher education (e.g., national and global benchmarking); (g) institutionalization of stakeholder and advisory inputs to better inform research, education and extension across the ICAR-AU System; and (h) an External Advisory Panel, drawing on both national and international expertise relevant to agricultural higher education, to provide a vehicle for best-practice dissemination and adoption by participating AUs.

Component 3 ? Project Management and Learning (USD 8.2 million, of which IDA USD 4.1 million) - would support NAHEP project management, primarily through the Education Division/ ICAR, to administer, supervise, monitor and evaluate overall project implementation. The component would support: (a) an NAHEP Steering Committee that would provide strategic guidance to the Education Division/ ICAR throughout project implementation; (b) a Technical Committee to evaluate IDP, CAAST and Innovation Grant proposals; (c) a communication strategy to build awareness among AUs and other stakeholders regarding the objectives and activities of the proposed NAHEP; and (d) training and capacity-building for both ICAR and the AUs to achieve and sustain increased quality, relevance and effectiveness of agricultural higher education across the ICAR-AU System.

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

The proposed project would target the 73 institutions of the ICAR-AU System, consisting of State Agricultural Universities, Deemed Universities, Central Universities with Agricultural Faculty and Central Agricultural Universities. IDPs, CAASTs and Innovation Grants would finance goods, works, consulting services and non-consulting services for these AUs on existing campuses. All activities will take place on existing land and no new land acquisition is envisioned.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Anupam Joshi (GEN06)

Surbhi Dhingra (GSU06)

Vanitha Kommu (GEN06)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	This is triggered to screen the proposed investments against any potential adverse impacts.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The proposed project would not finance any activity that may endanger any critical (or other) natural habitat.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	The proposed project does not finance any activity that involves forests.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	Although the proposed project would not promote pesticides or chemical fertilizers, any residual risk emerging from using small amounts of pesticides or other agrochemicals on farmer's fields for research activities prescribed in the project (e.g., demonstration plots) would be addressed through the development of integrated pest management practices for the project as a part of the management plans.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	Small construction activities executed under the proposed project would primarily involve retrofitting existing buildings or developing laboratory extension facilities in existing university campuses. Thus, no excavations or deep digging would occur.
Indigenous Peoples OP/ BP 4.10	Yes	The policy is triggered given the project is country-wide and the beneficiaries would also include students belonging to Scheduled Castes (SCs) and Scheduled Tribes (STs) and other disadvantaged groups. A Social Assessment was carried out and an Equity Action Plan (EAP) / Indigenous People's policy Framework has been prepared..
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	No	This policy has not been triggered given that project shall not finance civil works involving compulsory land acquisition, involuntary resettlement, or causing restriction of access to natural resources. The project activities will focus on improving the quality and access of technical education and will only support minor repairs and refurbishments of existing infrastructure. There are no issues of encroachment in any of the public lands to be used.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	No dams are involved.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	No international waterways are involved.

Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	No disputed areas would be covered under the proposed project.
---------------------------------------	----	--

II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:

The project involves limited construction activities such as refurbishing/upgrading technical education facilities such as laboratories, library, etc. These activities are not expected to cause any significant environmental or social impacts. Likely environmental and social impacts, which will be limited in nature, may include temporary construction related impacts.

Environment: The negative impacts on environment are limited and localized (restricted to minor civil works within the premises of State-level AUs, and absence of safety norms in laboratories like safe disposal of hazardous wastes, etc.). However there are opportunities for integration across AU curricula of climate resilience, sustainable production systems, and overall reduction of the environmental foot print of Indian agriculture. Such integration can also be extended to faculty development (e.g., training and capacity-building), as well as ongoing and future research and extension programs.

Social: NAHEP would finance minor civil works such as refurbishing/upgrading higher education facilities such as classrooms, library buildings, etc. within the existing premises, and is not expected to cause any significant environmental or social impacts. Likely environmental and social impacts, which will be limited in nature, may include temporary construction-related impacts. No civil work involving compulsory land acquisition or involuntary resettlement shall be financed. Therefore, the World Bank's Operational Policy on Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12) has not been triggered. The project institutions, especially those in low-income states, are located in states and communities inhabited by tribal communities, and hence, Operational Policy on Indigenous Peoples (OP/BP 4.10) has been triggered.

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

The project is designated as Category B.

The project interventions, on the whole, will have a positive impact on the technical education sector, specific interventions envisaged under the project such as refurbishment/ retrofitting/major repair works of existing classrooms/laboratories/libraries may have some potential but limited adverse environmental impacts in the local context. Therefore, these activities are central to the approach and design from an environmental management and safeguards perspective for the project.

Some specific long-term environmental impacts are associated with the operation and management of the institutes/buildings itself. Appropriate water and sanitation facilities, disposal of wastes including management of e-wastes, energy use/efficiency, disaster preparedness and dealing with issues where institutes are exposed to noise or other sources of pollution require regular attention. However, such adverse impacts are not likely to be large-scale or irreversible in nature. These can be avoided/ minimized to a great extent and the positive outcomes from the project can be

enhanced substantially by putting appropriate institutional mechanisms, procedures and capacity in place, to deal with such issues.

The anticipated future activities such as minor civil works for improving and expanding existing facilities within the technical education campuses are likely to generate temporary employment opportunities for the local people. Expanded influx of students and teachers may also contribute to expansion of the local market, especially in the rural locations.

With proper management, the project interventions are not likely to cause any large scale, significant or irreversible damage to the natural, physical or social environment.

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

None.

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.

ICAR is well versed with the Bank's safeguards arrangements and has previously implemented several Bank-funded projects (e.g., National Agriculture Technology Project, National Agricultural Innovation Project). The safeguards performance for most of these projects was rated Satisfactory. Apart from Bank-financed projects, ICAR operates a series of research laboratories, which have standards in place for laboratory management and emergency protocols. Some amount of capacity building would be required to ensure that disposal of biological material and other laboratory chemicals adhere to prescribed norms.

A limited Environmental Assessment (EA) and Social Assessment (SA) study was undertaken by the Education Division/ ICAR for the proposed project with guidance from the Bank team. The study included a specific comprehensive questionnaire targeted at NAHEP project institutions to learn from their experiences as well drawing on an accumulation of practices from projects financed by the Bank with similar approaches. As part of the EA and SA, the current processes, systems and capacity of the implementation agencies from an environmental management perspective and social management approaches were also reviewed.

EMF - A limited Environmental Assessment (EA) study was undertaken by the Education Division/ ICAR for the proposed project, with guidance from the Bank team specialists. The study included a specific comprehensive consultation questionnaire targeting AU faculty and students. As part of the EA, the current processes, systems and capacity of ICAR from both an environmental management and social/ equity perspective were reviewed. To effectively plan, design and integrate environmental dimensions into the overall project preparation and implementation, an Environment Management Framework (EMF) has been prepared, and incorporated into the PIP. The draft EMF has been disclosed by the Education Division/ ICAR (www.icar.org.in) and shall be locally disclosed in each participating AU.

The Education division/ ICAR prepared an Equity Action Plan (EAP) / Indigenous People's Policy Framework (IPPF) for the purposes of OP/BP 4.10. The EAP addresses issues of gender equality and social inclusion with special attention to the needs of the Scheduled Tribe and the Scheduled Caste students and faculty members fulfilling the requirements of OP 4.10 with free, prior, informed consultation held with the primary stakeholders. The EAP/IPPF has been finalized using mostly qualitative research methodologies, including intensive stakeholder interviews and focus groups discussions with male and female students and faculties from various social

backgrounds, including ST and SC groups, and poor and disadvantaged communities. The EAP/ IPPF draws extensively on the experience of previously financed Bank's projects. The EAP/ IPPF identifies key issues and problems affecting academic performance and overall development of students and recommends a set of actions to address the same. Key recommended actions in the EAP/IPPF include: (i) improving the learning efficiency, English language skills, and non-cognitive skills of the students, especially those from socially and economically vulnerable groups including ST and SC, (ii) supporting faculty to improve their knowledge levels, pedagogical skills, and sensitivity to gender equality and social inclusion issues in educational institutions, (iii) encouraging and institutions of excellence to organize annual technology innovation forums to enable students from various colleges share experiences and innovations; (iv) promoting mentorship amongst students and teachers (to aid needy students and younger faculty members); and (v) supporting research scholars as a part of IDPs. The measures proposed in EAP/IPPF are linked with key performance indicators. The overall project also proposes to monitor carefully and report on the impact of project interventions on vulnerable groups, on a regular and timely basis so that corrective actions can be taken. The project will focus on low-income states, which will have a positive impact on equity.

Implementation Arrangements: Each participating AU will prepare and include the EAP/IPPF in the Institution Development Plan submitted for funding. There shall be institution level student-faculty committees to approve and monitor the implementation of the EAPs. The Dean/ Head of Department (HOP) will be generally the nodal officer responsible for implementing the EAP. The institutional arrangements will integrate professional capacity and expertise to plan and implement actions in fulfilment of the EAP/IPPF. The ICAR other project institutions will have a nodal officer responsible for monitoring and supporting the EAP implementation. The Bank task team and its safeguards specialists will carry out periodic field visits to and training support for the Education Division/ ICAR and the participating AUs as part of overall NAHEP implementation support.

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

Stakeholders: The primary stakeholders include the intended target population or beneficiaries of the project being supported through the proposed operation ? the State Agriculture Universities in India, as well as officials from the ICAR. This includes students, faculty, members of the Governing Body, tribal students and communities, and those likely to be affected by any temporary impacts.

Consultations: Stakeholder participation is central to design and implementation of the project and provides for information sharing, consultation and collaboration measures. Guidelines for consultation have been laid out in the EMF and the EAP/IPPF to ensure proper consultation and participation of stakeholders at the various stages, including preparation and implementation at the institute level. The key elements of strategy include: (i) consultations with primary stakeholders people during project planning and implementation, (ii) information disclosure and dissemination, (iii) grievance redress mechanisms, and (iv) feedback on project implementation (including EMF and EAP/IPPF) through third party monitoring.

In accordance with applicable Bank policies, consultations were carried out through an on-line survey with NAHEP project institutions- covering students and faculty, as part of the limited environment and social assessment process. The final round of public consultation will be held during the appraisal mission. The initial consultation indicates that the stakeholders strongly

support the proposed project. The feedback/inputs from these on-line discussions have been primarily used for preparing the environment management instrument (i.e. the Environment Management Framework) of the project. The project will continue to hold stakeholder consultations as a part of EMF and SMF implementation.

Disclosure: The draft EAP/IPPF has been disclosed on ICAR's website (www.icar.org.in) and has also been disclosed in the Bank's Infoshop. The Education Division/ ICAR - as well as each participating AU - will have a nodal officer responsible for monitoring and supporting the implementation of the EAP/IPPF.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	23-Apr-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	03-May-2016
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
India	03-May-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	20-Apr-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	03-May-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
India	03-May-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	23-Apr-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	03-May-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
India	03-May-2016
<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 4.09 - Pest Management	
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input 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 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: Edward William Bresnyan
Approved By	

Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Martien Van Nieuwkoop (PMGR)	Date: 04-May-2016
-------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------