



Combined Project Information Documents / Integrated Safeguards Datasheet (PID/ISDS)

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 27-May-2020 | Report No: PIDISDSA28152

BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country Moldova	Project ID P171284	Project Name Moldova Agriculture Competitiveness Project Additional Financing for Animal By-Products Management	Parent Project ID (if any) P118518
Parent Project Name Moldova Agriculture Competitiveness Project	Region EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA	Estimated Appraisal Date 25-May-2020	Estimated Board Date 15-Jul-2020
Practice Area (Lead) Agriculture and Food	Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing	Borrower(s) Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Finance	Implementing Agency Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry, Ministry of Finance

Proposed Development Objective(s) Parent

The Project Development Objective is to enhance the competitiveness of the agro-food sector by supporting the modernization of the food safety management system, facilitating market access for farmers, and mainstreaming agro-environmental and sustainable land management practices.

Components

Enhancing food safety management
Enhancing market access potential
Enhancing land productivity through sustainable land management
Project Management
Contingencies
Compensatory Sales Support Grants

PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US\$, Millions)

SUMMARY

Total Project Cost	15.00
Total Financing	15.00
of which IBRD/IDA	15.00
Financing Gap	0.00

DETAILS

World Bank Group Financing

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)	15.00
--	-------

Environmental Assessment Category

B-Partial Assessment

Decision

The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate

Other Decision (as needed)

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

1. The Moldova Agriculture Competitiveness Project (MACP) was approved by the World Bank (WB) Board of Executive Directors on May 1, 2012. The project was designed to support the country’s efforts in strengthening export competitiveness, attracting investment and enhancing access to premium food export markets. More specifically, the MACP set out to support reforms of the country’s food safety management system, efforts to enhance access to markets through investment financing (to stimulate upgrades in post-harvesting infrastructure) and institutional development support (to create and strengthen productive partnerships), and efforts to mainstream the use of good agricultural practices and sustainable land management. The objective of the first Additional Financing (AF) was to support farmers affected by export restrictions on a key market in order to avoid a collapse of the fruit growing sector. The objective of the second AF was to scale up activities of Component 2: Enhancing Market Access Potential.

2. The agri-food sector remains essential to meeting Moldova’s economic and export growth and social cohesion targets. Moldova’s predominantly agriculture-based economy records among the highest shares of agricultural production and agri-processing in the region. Food safety and quality systems remain essential in promoting economic growth, exports, public health considerations and environmental protection. Alignment with the EU *acquis* on SPS (as well as standards on other premium markets) continues to pose significant challenges for public systems in charge of food safety and quality, as well as for private producers, while entailing complex and costly transformations.

3. The country is also being hit hard by the COVID-19 pandemic. The expected near-term impact of the economy is overly negative, with a deep contraction in the second quarter of 2020, which will likely not be offset by the year’s end despite a recovery expected to begin with the third quarter¹.

¹ Moldova Assessment of COVID-19 Impact on Economy, April 28, 2020.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

4. In the current Moldovan food production context, one the biggest challenge - both for the public and the private actors - is the safe management and/or disposal of animal waste, particularly Animal By-Products (ABPs). The current methods and patterns of disposal of animal waste are not compliant with international best practice, resulting in high public health and environmental risks. The current systems of management and disposal (or rather pervasive lack thereof, particularly in the massive household animal husbandry segment) present a constant hygienic and health threat to the country's population by ways of polluting the soil and ground waters with dangerous microbes. Such a dynamic is particularly concerning in rural areas where disposal of ABPs, and particularly carcasses, is done in proximity to human habitats, agricultural land and the most ubiquitous source of drinking water – surface wells and springs.

5. The proposed AF and restructuring respond to a request from the Government of Moldova (GoM), dated February 19, 2020, for investment financing for tackling the ABP management agenda and to establish a comprehensive, EU-compliant system for the management of ABPs unintended for human consumption. The GoM values the specific outcomes of the MACP to date, considers that support for the ABP management agenda is well-aligned with the original MACP mandate to address governance and market access elements, and all key GoM counterparts are committed to the successful implementation of the project going forward.

6. The implementation of the proposed AF would likely serve as a stimulant for increased economic activity in the agriculture and food sectors (all activities related to animal husbandry and production of composite foodstuffs with elements of animal origin), as improvements in food safety will broaden prospects for increased and more diversified production both for domestic and export markets of diary, meat and derivative products. In addition to economic and trade benefits, addressing the lagging topic of safe disposal of ABPs will have multiple beneficial externalities for the environment and public health considerations.

5. The effects of the pandemic could result in lasting disruptions in the agriculture sector, including *inter alia* disruptions in local and foreign trade in domestic agricultural goods through loss of physical access to the marketplace and diminishing demand. In parallel to the effects of the pandemic, the agriculture sector has been affected by a serious drought that has spanned nearly ten months (July 2019 – April 2020), as well as pervasive late-spring frost in 2020, thus severely compromising winter field crops and fruit blooms, respectively. The full magnitude of the pandemic's impact on the agriculture sector is too early to discern, but it will likely be compounded by recent inclement weather.

7. The proposed AF is well-positioned to address the COVID-19 pandemic impact in the medium- and long-term response phases. Firstly, the focus on the ABP management agenda is firmly aligned with the strategic elements of the recently approved World Bank COVID-19 Strategic Preparedness and Response Program². The latter emphasizes the “one-health” approach to securing public health by focusing *inter alia* on the implementation of zoonotic disease control strategies and programs. Secondly, the proposed AF will create the space for the potential reactivation of Component 5 (*Compensatory Sales Support Grants*) in order to address emerging disruptions in the country's food supply chains, by

² Approved by the Board of Executive Directors of the World Bank on April 2, 2020



supporting, in a first phase, a COVID-19 agriculture sector impact assessment. Should the impact assessment reveal specific needs that can be feasibly addressed under the proposed AF, the World Bank and Government of Moldova (GOM) can discuss options for restructuring and reallocation of resources to Component 5.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Original PDO

8. The Project Development Objective is to enhance the competitiveness of the agro-food sector by supporting the modernization of the food safety management system, facilitating market access for farmers, and mainstreaming agro-environmental and sustainable land management practices.

Current PDO

9. There are no changes to the PDO.

Key Results

10. The project has successfully continued implementation of activities which lay the foundations for improving the marketability and market integration of horticultural produce through productive partnerships. It also continues to make significant contributions to efforts aimed at enhancing the technical functionality of the country's Food Safety Agency and its key divisions - national laboratories and border inspection points. Finally, the project's promotion of sustainable land management practices has provided extremely promising results in terms of impact on the quality of soils and productivity of land.

D. Project Description

11. The proposed AF would provide for the: (i) allocation of US\$14.8 million for scaling up the activities of *Component 1: Enhancing Food Safety Management*; and (ii) allocation of US\$0.2 million for *Component 4: Project Management*.

12. The proposed AF will include the following specific changes:

- (a) Component 1, Sub-Component 1.2: Technical Enhancement: The proposed AF would add several activity lines under Sub-Component 1.2 aimed at establishing a comprehensive ABP management system. The cost of Component 1 will change from the current US\$14.7 million to US\$29.5 million.
- (b) Component 4 will be supplemented with incremental funds to ensure proper project coordination and management, including ensuring continued financial auditing, the operation of the project's grievance redress mechanism, monitoring and evaluation, and other implementation enabling aspects. The cost of Component 4 will change from the current US\$2.6 million to US\$2.8 million.



13. Safe disposal of ABPs through systemic collection and incineration is a pressing need that requires substantial infrastructure for collection, transportation and storing, organizational upgrades and behavioral changes, and very likely the participation of the private sector in operating and managing ABP facilities. The proposed AF would, in a first phase, include a set of activities aimed at finalizing the selection of the best technical solution and operational/business scenario for an ABP management system, including identification and designation by the GoM of locations/sites of main ABP management facilities, and a flow and traffic study.

E. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

14. The proposed AFs institutional and implementation arrangements will rely on the existing architecture of MACP. An existing inter-ministerial Steering Committee, established through the Government Decision #878 of September 9, 1999 (as revised to include the relevant up-dates for MACP), will continue to perform overall supervisory, coordination and strategic guidance functions. The project's implementation agency is the Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment (MARDE), with the country's Food Safety Agency being an essential beneficiary/stakeholder for the project's food safety activities. For fiduciary support, an existing project management unit – the Consolidated Agriculture Project Management Unit (CAPMU)³, will be responsible for disbursement, financial management, procurement, monitoring and evaluation, safeguards, and citizens engagement. CAPMU will also support MARDE in inter-ministerial coordination of project management activities.

F. Project location and Salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

The project will be implemented countrywide.

G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Mohamed Ghani Razaak, Social Specialist
Cesar Niculescu, Environmental Specialist

³ CAPMU was established in 1999 through Government Decision 878 and has more than ten years of experience in providing fiduciary support in the implementation of Bank-financed projects in the rural sector in Moldova.

SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	
Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03	No	
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	No	
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	

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 proposed AF would provide supplementary resources for Component 1: Enhancing food safety management in order to scale up activities aimed at strengthening human, institutional and technical capacities of the country's food safety and quality management systems, as well as ensure regulatory harmonization and system compliance with European Union (EU) requirements. Alignment with EU acquis on sanitary and phytosanitary standards continues to carry significant implications for public institutions/systems in charge of food safety and quality, as well as for private producers. EU food safety regulations set some of the highest standards in the world, and compliance by Moldova's public and private players to these rigors remains a constant challenge and entails complex and costly transformations. In the current Moldovan food production context, probably, the biggest such challenge - both for the public and the private actors - is the safe management of animal waste, particularly ABPs . This was one of the key priorities identified in the framework of the Moldova-EU Association Agreement and the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement in relation to required institutional and technical enhancements of the country's food safety management system. The current methods and patterns of disposal of animal waste are not in compliance with the existing EU regulations, and this results in high risks to public and animal health. The present handling (disposal) of such waste is likely to result in serious and long-term environmental pollution.

The implementation of the proposed AF would serve as a stimulant for increased economic activity in the agriculture

and food sectors (all activities related to animal husbandry and production of composite foodstuffs with elements of animal origin), as improvements in food safety will broaden prospects for increased and more diversified production both for domestic and export markets of dairy, meat and derivative products. In addition to economic and trade benefits, addressing the lagging topic of safe disposal of ABPs will have multiple beneficial externalities for the environment and social/public health considerations. The current practices of management and disposal of ABPs, particularly in the massive household animal husbandry segment present a constant hygienic and health threat to the country's population by ways of polluting the soil and ground waters with dangerous microbes.

The original project triggered the following three WB OPs: OP 4.01 on Environmental Assessment, OP 4.09 on Pest Management and OP 4.11 on Physical Cultural Resources. No additional WB OPs are triggered under the proposed AF.

OP 4.01 is triggered as the project supports a series of activities which generate environmental and social impacts. The required mitigation measures for the project activities are standard and widely used in construction practices. They are already well prescribed in the current version of the Environmental Management Framework (EMF), which was prepared for the original project. As the proposed AF, would support similar types of activities as the original project, it is proposed that the exiting EMF be updated as an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) for the AF project.

OP 4.09 was triggered for the activities of the original project and reflected the possible increase pesticide use due to the increased intensity of cropping supported by the original project's grant schemes and/or due to the promotion of conservation agriculture. The ESMF includes measures (section VI) to raise awareness and educate potential beneficiaries regarding safe pesticide handling and use of integrated pest management practices to enhance sustainability and reduce human and environmental exposure to dangerous products.

OP 4.11 was triggered after the approval of the original project to accommodate a Government of Moldova (GoM) decision to house the then newly established Food Safety Agency in a building which was on the National Registry of State-Protected Monuments. The building required essential reconstruction and restoration works and and the project provided necessary support to ensure its functionality.

The original project's safeguards and citizens engagement arrangements are compliant with Bank requirements. Throughout implementation both safeguards performance and citizens engagement activities have been evaluated as satisfactory. CAPMU possesses solid capacity for environmental and social safeguards work, as demonstrated by compliant implementation of complex activities, such as the restoration of a national cultural monuments and the construction of BIPs and food safety laboratories. Environmental safeguards performance was significantly enhanced by the activities of Component 3: Enhancing Land Productivity through Sustainable Land Management, under which considerable financing was provided for methodological and practical implementation of good agriculture practices, which empowered farmers to proliferate sustainable land management practices, and, among other, reduce the use of pesticides and other agricultural chemicals.

The project has a fully functional Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) operated by the National Rural Development Agency (ACSA), that meets the requirements of the World Bank and registers grievances at the national, regional and local levels. The GRM has been extensively advertised to project beneficiaries and stakeholders as part of the project's public outreach and communication campaign. A GRM-related section is available on the MACP website. A total of 1,895 grievances/claims were received, mainly under Component 5: Compensatory Sales Support Grants, of which 161 were settled in favor of the claimants. There have been no grievances registered or reported over the last 36 months. This could be explained by the fact that the project completed implementation of those components that were more



grievance-prone, with the remaining activities are mostly focused on TA and investments with fewer institutional clients. As discussed below, the GRM will be strengthened and when necessary repurposed for the proposed AF.

The proposed AF is expected to have primarily positive environmental and social outcomes. Improved ABP management is likely to lead to improvements in both environmental and social conditions for rural inhabitants, as biological waste will no longer be discarded in an unsanitary and unsafe manner, and close to the source of origin, thus reducing public health and environmental risks. Nevertheless, the underlying processes for establishing a successful ABP management system, will require a concerted effort from a multitude of national, regional and local stakeholders, who must be consulted on the spatial, operational, environmental and financial aspects of an ABP management system, so as to increase awareness and participation by all relevant parties. To this end, the Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the execution of the feasibility work for the ABP management system would include specific requirements for public consultations/disclosure and proposals for remedial actions to be included into the project's environmental and social action activities.

There are no potential large-scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts expected as a result of the AF project activities. However, the project's activities, if not adequately implemented, may cause some environmental impacts related to: (a) increased air pollution; (b) threats to human and animal health due to poor handling of ABPs; and (c) increased ground and surface water pollution from ABP processing. Additionally, the AF would support the construction of ABP management facilities which also might generate solid waste, air pollution and health hazards. All these potential environmental impacts are readily identifiable, manageable in scale, and minimal in impact, if properly identified and effectively prevented and/or mitigated, by including specific requirements into the civil works contracts.

The social risks and impacts are relatively minor, temporary and construction-induced, and could be mitigated through appropriate measures. Some other risks identified include health and safety aspects in construction of an ABP management system. The locations will be carefully selected giving due consideration to social aspects. The construction induced social impacts will be screened and addressed through site specific ESIA/ESMPs prepared according to the ESMF guidelines, including robust public awareness campaign and a grievance redress mechanism (GRM) established under the project.

The proposed AF does not envisage additional land acquisition that may result in any physical or economic displacement. Neither the parent project nor the AF are triggering OP 4.12 (involuntary resettlement). Major civil works, such as the rehabilitation of the Food Safety Agency building and the construction of four BIPs and the construction/reconstruction of two regional food safety laboratories under the parent project have been completed within existing premises and land allotments. The ESMF indicates that no additional land is to be acquired for any infrastructure constructed/rehabilitated and that all activities of the proposed AF will be: (a) located on land already owned by GoM participating agencies; and that (b) such land will be screened to ensure that it is free of legal encumbrance, or informal use or occupation by others who lack formal title.

The proposed AF will support the design, construction and equipment for the establishment of the ABP management infrastructure, including incineration and/or rendering facilities, and collection and storage points for animal waste in identified locations/sites. The proposed AF will, in a first phase, include a set of activities aimed at finalizing the selection of the best technical solution and operational/business scenario for an ABP management system, including identification and designation by the GoM of locations/sites of main ABP management facilities. The selection of the technical option to be financed by the proposed AF will be based on the findings and results of the feasibility work, including recommendations on environmental and social aspects, in conformity with applicable national legislation and WB environmental and social safeguards. The operational environmental and social risks associated with the



proposed AF would be appropriately addressed through the application of the appropriate national environmental/social legislation and WB safeguards. To this end, the ToRs for the feasibility study would include specific requirements for evaluating and proposing appropriate mitigating measures potential environmental and social risks.

2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area: The proposed AF's potential long-term impacts are positive and relate to improved environmental and social conditions in rural areas, increased food safety, and increased agricultural competitiveness. By introducing sustainable ABP management practices, livestock producers, particularly in smallholder and backyard household animal husbandry systems, will get the opportunity to dispose of animal carcasses in a safe and hygienic manner, thus improving the livelihoods of their communities. At a country level, the proposed AF would enhance national food safety and quality management systems, and by extension, improve public and animal health outlooks. It would also provide a strong economic impetus to greater private sector participation in the food production space by opening access to lucrative external markets for products of animal origin.

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

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.

Like the original project, the proposed AF is qualified as Category B, and triggers the same safeguards: OP 4.01 (Environmental assessment), OP 4.09 (Pest Management) and OP 4.11 (Physical Cultural Resources).

To address project-related potential negative impacts the borrower prepared an ESMF which specifies the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) requirements for the activities to be financed under the AP. In relation to the proposed AF, this document covers the following: rules and procedures for environmental screening; guidance for preparing site-specific EIA and/or simple ESMPs (including an ESMP checklist for identified small-scale construction reconstruction activities), possible mitigation measures, and requirements for monitoring and supervision of implementing of EIA/ESMPs. The ESMF stipulates that all contracts for construction works will include requirements for implementation of the specific measures as per ESMP provisions and good construction practices. Environmental and social issues including the implementation of mitigation measures would be supervised by CAPMU through its dedicated safeguards and monitoring staff.

In addition, the ESMF contains a series of measures to raise awareness and educate potential beneficiaries regarding the benefits of an ABP management system. To this end, the proposed AF would support the implementation of a comprehensive outreach and awareness campaign aimed at inducing change in the behavior of generators of ABPs. A particular focus will be placed on smallholder and backyard household animal husbandry systems to ensure that these stakeholders have ample information on opportunities to safely dispose of animal carcasses and other types of ABPs. To ensure success, the outreach and awareness campaign will be implemented in close collaboration with local public authorities which have the best knowledge on the number of animals in backyard household systems and have the most salient interest in ensuring that livestock owners manage ABPs in a safe and responsible manner.

Also, public/stakeholder consultations will be carried out as part of site-specific instruments (ESIA/ESMP) preparation and implementation. The public consultations will aim to provide adequate information to stakeholders to ensure that their views and concerns on social and environmental aspects are properly reflected in the feasibility work on the

technical solution options. Special emphasis will be given to vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, if any, in the locations where the proposed AFs ABP infrastructure may be built.

The proposed AF aims for a proactive and regular engagement with potential stakeholders, including beneficiaries, smallholder backyard livestock and poultry owners, and local authorities, and be responsive to their views to ensure that processes for successful ABP management are properly established and taken on. The project-level Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) established under the parent project is available to project stakeholders and other affected parties to submit questions, comments, suggestions and/or complaints and provide any form of feedback on all project-funded activities. The GRM will be strengthened by establishing local authority level grievance redress outlets for citizens and other stakeholders to lodge their concerns and views. The contractors who will be engaged in the construction of ABPs, will also be requested to establish site-specific GRMs during construction, to address complaints from the public/stakeholders.

In order to minimize risks of transmission associated with COVID-19 in relation to environmental and social safeguards activities, the ESMF contains specific World Bank mandated guidance on the implementation of such activities.

The ESMF will be integrated into the Project's Operational Manual and will be used as part of all contracts involving proposed AF activities. As CAPMU will coordinate the implementation of these activities, the World Bank team will provide the necessary support, including additional training to the CAPMU team, so that they can promote compliance with the ESMF specifically for the activities of the proposed AF. Site-specific ESMPs will be integrated into the contracts for approved activities, both into specifications and bills of quantities and the contractors will be required to include the cost in their financial bids.

The ESMF specifies its implementing responsibilities and arrangements. The proposed Project will be implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment (MARDE). MARDE has extensive experience in successfully implementing World Bank projects. CAPMU, which has nearly 20 years of experience in implementing World Bank and GEF projects will serve as a fiduciary agency. CAPMU has a highly qualified Environmental Specialist responsible for project safeguards issues. To date, CAPMU's environmental and social performances have been qualified as satisfactory. The World Bank team will continue to monitor closely the ESMF implementation, providing, if needed, relevant assistance. The implementation of the requirement of the ESMF and site-specific ESMPs will remain under the direct responsibility of CAPMU, including responsibilities for supervision and monitoring of construction activities. Compliance with the ESMF and ESMPs and monitoring of the impact during the construction phase will be undertaken by the CAPMU Environmental Specialist as part of his contract supervisory duties.

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 include livestock producers, meat processors, smallholder farmers, local authorities, NGOs and the citizens in the areas covered under the project. The Environmental Management Framework of the parent project was prepared by the client in 2012, It has been updated as the ESMF to include the required social dimensions. The updated ESMF was disclosed on the CAPMU's website on May 25, 2020. The draft ESMF document would be revised accordingly, taking into account outputs from the consultation. The final version of the ESMF (Romanian) and its English version would be posted on the CAPMU website and submitted to the World Bank for disclosure. The ESMF will be used by the client during the project implementation.



B. Disclosure Requirements (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure	For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors
-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

"In country" Disclosure

Pest Management Plan

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure
--	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

"In country" Disclosure

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level (to be filled in when the ISDS is finalized by the project decision meeting) (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)



CONTACT POINT

World Bank

Anatol Gobjila
Senior Agriculture Economist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Ministry of Finance

Ministry of Finance
H.E. Octavian Armasu
Minister of Finance

Implementing Agencies

Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry
H.E. Eduard Grama
Minister of Agriculture

Ministry of Finance
H.E. Octavian Armasu
Minister of Finance

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 473-1000
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/projects>



APPROVAL

Task Team Leader(s):	Anatol Gobjila
----------------------	----------------

Approved By

Safeguards Advisor:	Nina Chee	27-May-2020
Practice Manager/Manager:	Frauke Jungbluth	28-May-2020
Country Director:	Ann Akhalkatsi	29-May-2020

Note to Task Teams: End of system generated content, document is editable from here. *Please delete this note when finalizing the document.*