

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: ISDSA15934

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 10-Dec-2015

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 24-Dec-2015

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Ethiopia	Project ID:	P151294
Project Name:	Ethiopia - Oromia Forested Landscape Program (P151294)		
Task Team Leader(s):	Stephen Danyo, Andre Rodrigues de Aquino		
Estimated Board Date:	31-May-2016		
Managing Unit:	GEN07		
Sector(s):	Forestry (90%), General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (10%)		
Theme(s):	Climate change (60%), Environmental policies and institutions (20%), Land administration and management (15%), Water resource management (5%)		
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:	50.00	Total Bank Financing:	0.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
Borrower			0.00
Carbon Fund			50.00
Total			50.00
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Project Development Objective(s)

The Program Development Objective is to improve the enabling environment for sustainable forest management and investment in the regional state of Oromia.

3. Project Description

OFLP would be Oromia's strategic programmatic umbrella and coordination platform for multi-

sector, multi-partner intervention on all forested landscapes in Oromia. The 10-year program would contribute to a transformation in how forested landscapes are managed in Oromia to deliver multiple benefits such as poverty reduction and resilient livelihoods, climate change mitigation, biodiversity conservation, and water provisioning. OFLP would foster equitable and sustainable low carbon development through a series of: (i) on-the-ground activities that address deforestation, reduce land-use based emissions and enhance forest carbon stocks; and (ii) state-wide and local enhancements to institutions, incentives, information, and safeguards management to upscale investment (enabling environment), including coordinating and leveraging multiple REDD-relevant interventions across the regional state.

OFLP would enable GoE to strategically mobilize, coordinate and scale-up funding programmatically from several different sources. The success of OFLP and the achievement of the Government's broader forest, land-use, and climate ambitions depend on OFLP's ability to leverage financial resources from existing and future REDD-relevant initiatives such as PSNP, SLMP, AGP, private sector activities, the CRGE Facility, bilateral support, farmers' own investment, Germany's intended investment in Bale National Park through EWCA, and government budget. REDD-relevant initiatives also include REDD+ projects that are currently seeking carbon payments, which would be integrated (or 'nested,' as per the technical term) into OFLP, such as the Bale Mountains REDD+ project.

The WBG's two initial financing instruments for the GoE to implement OFLP currently include: (i) the US\$ 18 million mobilization grant; and (ii) the US\$ 50 million Emissions Reductions Purchase Agreement (ERPA). These are detailed below:

i. The 5-year mobilization grant would finance the establishment and initial implementation of the state-wide jurisdictional Program. The grant financing would support GoE to strengthen its state-level and local-level enabling environment and implement selected on-the-ground investment activities which would facilitate the achievement of ERs (and resulting ER payments) while also leveraging greater financial resources from multiple sources. The grant would in particular finance: (i) TA among all woredas across the state (such as landscape management coordination, land-use planning support, and safeguards management); and (ii) forest investment and livelihoods support in deforestation hotspots with high carbon content (47 woredas).

ii. Emissions Reductions Payments of US\$ 50 million for verified carbon performance paid in a period of up to 10 years (2016-2026). These payments would be available once the Program achieves, verifies and reports on results in terms of reduced emissions in compliance with agreed safeguards due diligence. The ER payments would be distributed according to a Benefit Sharing Mechanism (BSM) and used primarily to ensure the sustainability of the land-use interventions promoted to reduce deforestation (including activities in the agriculture, energy and forestry sectors), as well as to scale up the interventions to other geographical areas within Oromia. This climate financing would be channeled through an Emissions Reductions Purchase Agreement (ERPA) to be signed between GoE and WBG in 2016. The envelope for these payments could grow as OFLP becomes operational and generates results, and as other ER buyers show interest in OFLP.

The OFLP geographic boundary would be all forests in Oromia. The Program would monitor and account for positive and negative changes in forest cover and associated GHG emissions reduction within all 277 rural and semi-rural woredas the regional state boundaries of Oromia (i.e., the "accounting area of the Program"). As per the 2013 EMA map and the National REDD+ Secretariat's proposed forest definition, this includes 8.7 million hectares of forest, spread over all of

Oromia's rural and semi-rural woredas. The stakeholders that would benefit from ER payments would be defined as per the BSM currently under preparation by the GoE.

Monitoring forest cover and forest cover changes would follow methodologies that are being established at the national level, and in line with international best practices. The data generated by OFLP would feed into the national forest cover monitoring system and UNFCCC reporting more broadly.

Program Components

OFLP would have three components. The US\$ 18 million mobilization grant would finance activities under two components over a 5-year period: (1) Enabling investments; and (2) Enabling environment. These funds would be channeled to GoE as a recipient executed (RE) grant. The third component would consist of US\$ 50 million of ER Payments for verified emissions reductions as they are delivered over a 10-year period (the components overlap in time).

Component 1. Enabling Investments (US\$ 11.57 million RE grant, 5-year period)

Component 1 would finance investment in participatory forest management (including livelihoods support and selected nature-based community enterprise development) and reforestation in deforestation hotspots in sites to be selected, as well as extension services, and land-use planning state-wide at state and local levels.

Component 2. Enabling Environment (US\$ 6.42 million RE grant, 5-year period)

Component 2 would finance complementary activities to improve the effectiveness and impact of institutions, incentives (i.e., policies, marketing, BSM), information (i.e., strategic communications, MRV) and safeguards management at state and local levels. This component would enhance the enabling environment to help scale up and leverage action on the ground to reduce deforestation and forest degradation.

Component 3. Emissions Reductions (ER) Payments (US\$ 50 million ERPA, 10-year period)

ER payments would be delivered once results are achieved, verified by a third party, complied with safeguards requirements and formally reported to the WB. The ER payments could begin once the ERPA is signed and emissions reductions occur, are verified and reported to the WB. Based on the design of the MRV system, it is expected that reporting and verification of emissions reductions can occur every two years. The ER payments would be managed by the GoE and distributed to the beneficiaries according to the BSM, which would aim to incentivize greater uptake of sustainable land use actions. The BSM will need to be formally adopted by the GoE before any ER payment can be made. In addition, it should be noted that the ER payments will not cover the full cost of implementing changes in landscape management. The ER payments will provide some return that offsets some of the costs of improving the landscape for the wider benefit of all.

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

The OFLP geographic boundary would be all forests in Oromia. The region is located between 3024' 20"-10023'26" N latitudes and 34007'37"-42058'51" E longitudes. Oromia is Ethiopia's largest regional state in terms of land area (around 28.5 million hectares, roughly the size of Italy), population (over 30 million people) and forest cover (approximately 8.7 million ha in total, around

47 percent of the country's total forested area). The Program would monitor and account for positive and negative changes in forest cover and associated GHG emissions reduction within all 277 rural and semi-rural woredas the regional state boundaries of Oromia (i.e., the "accounting area of the Program"). However, specific sites to be financed by the grant under Component 1 are not yet known.

Based on the national forest definition, 274 of Oromia's 277 rural and semi-rural woredas include some forest. Most of Oromia's high forest (moist montane forests) is found in the Bale forested landscape in the southeast and the Jimma/Wollega/Ilubabor forested landscape in the west. Bale serves as the water tower for the eastern drylands in the Somali region and the country of Somalia, drylands where mobile pastoralism is the predominant livelihood system and which is highly vulnerable to drought.

The forests in Oromia region provide critical ecosystem services to the country and to the region. It harbors globally important biodiversity with endangered endemic species such as the Abyssinian wolf and the mountain Nyla. Oromia's western forest are home to endemic coffee (Coffee Arabica) that has high potential as a value-added export, and harbor wild varieties of the species. Important rivers also originate in or are affected by Oromia's forests, including those flowing into the new Renaissance Dam under construction.

Forest loss and degradation are increasing in Oromia. Deforestation in Oromia has been particularly intense in western (in the Zones of West Wollega, Qeleme Wollega, Ilu Aba Bora) and eastern parts of the regional state (in the Zones of Bale and Guji). In Oromia as a whole, nearly 157,000 ha of forest was lost between 2000 and 2013, or around 12,000 hectares lost every year. This has resulted in over 46 million tons of CO₂ equivalent emitted into the atmosphere over this period, or around 3.5 million tons annually (calculated based on Hansen et al, 2013 and DetNorske Veritas, 2015).

OFLP would have positive role in reversing deforestation through activities described under Component 1 which include, among others, support to land-use planning; rehabilitation of forests through afforestation, reforestation, participatory forest management; and assisted natural regeneration. The state-wide activities under Component 2 would also have beneficial impacts through establishing and implementing the OFLP strategic framework. Sub-component 2.4 would, in particular, finance activities to enhance safeguards management at regional and local levels.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Asferachew Abate Abebe (GENDR)

Chukwudi H. Okafor (GSURR)

Dereje Agonafir Habtewold (GENDR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The Program (OFLP) activities are expected to have significant positive impacts on targeted forested areas. However, OP/BP 4.01 is triggered as some of the local-level activities under Component 1 could have limited adverse environmental and social impacts and risks; these activities could potentially include construction and rehabilitation of physical structures for catchment

		<p>management such as afforestation/reforestation, area closures, check-dams, water harvesting structures, agricultural intensification (including small-scale water irrigation that may necessitate applying agrochemicals), and access roads. Component 3 may have also adverse environmental and social impacts, specifically in relation to benefit sharing. Since the scope and nature of the activities and the specific sites for implementing them are not yet known, the specific instrument proposed for analyzing potential environmental and social risks is Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), which has addressed the environmental and social issues identified in the National REDD+ SESA report and the OFLP drivers of deforestation and forest degradation study.</p> <p>The ESMF would be used to develop a site specific Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) prior to the commencement of activities under Component 1. The ESMF includes standard methods and procedures, along with appropriate institutional arrangements for screening and reviewing program activities and monitoring the implementation of mitigation measures to prevent adverse and cumulative impacts. The effective use of the ESMF would be regularly reviewed and audited.</p>
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	<p>Overall, the Program is expected to have significant positive impacts on natural habitats, as it will support the maintenance and rehabilitation of forest areas and their function; and local communities will be involved in design, implementation and monitoring of program activities. Activities that involve the significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats will not be supported. To this effect, program activities will be screened and impacts will be avoided on natural habitats using appropriate preventive and mitigation measures identified in the ESMF of the Program.</p>
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	<p>The Program activities are expected to have significant positive impacts on targeted forests in Oromia by reducing deforestation and forest degradation, while contributing to improve the livelihood of forest-dependent communities. Generally, potential impact of the Program activities on natural forests will be addressed using the findings of the ESMF for the OFLP. The ESMF provides detail procedures to screen program activities for potential adverse environmental and social impacts, and to take measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate such impacts.</p>

Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	Pesticides are being used by forest dependent and surrounding communities in the forested areas of the Program. Therefore, the ESMF includes a guideline for preparation of an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Plan to address related environmental and social impacts of Program activities.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	The Program could finance activities in areas potentially containing physical cultural resources (PCR) such as holy sites, sacred groves, sacred forests, etc.). The ESMF has included provisions and a set of procedures to screen program activities for such impacts and to deal with chance finds.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	OP/BP 4.10 is triggered. The Program conducted a Social Assessment as part of the SESA study and in depth consultation process with the Program beneficiaries and the Program affected peoples, including underserved and vulnerable groups to seek broad support for the Program from these groups. The output of the Social Assessment as part of the SESA study summarized the key findings of the social assessment including the process used to foster free, prior, and informed consultations to garner broad community support for the Program, including the provision of grievance redress and benefit sharing issues. The identified mitigation actions are incorporated in the Program as a Social Development Plan.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	OP/BP 4.12 is triggered as the implementation of the Program activities may involve acquisition of land and /or restriction of access to legally designated parks, protected areas, or forest management/reforestation areas. Therefore, in addition to the ESMF, Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) and Process Framework (PF) are prepared, consulted upon and disclosed to ensure that appropriate measures are in place to address any issues which might arise from potential land acquisition and/or restriction of access to legally designated parks, protected areas, or forest management/reforestation areas under the Program. OFLP would not finance land acquisition (if required), which is the responsibility of GoE.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	Yes	The Program triggered OP/BP 4.37. There could be potential small scale irrigation. No new construction or rehabilitation of large dams is anticipated to be financed by the Program. In cases of small dam construction (less than 4.5 meters) as part of small scale irrigation schemes, the Program will use the FAO's 'Manual on Small Earth Dams, A Guide to Siting, Design and Construction' and the Ministry of

		Agriculture's guidelines on the construction of small dams as well.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	

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:

General

OFLP is Category B. The Program triggered eight out of the ten safeguard policies: Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01), Natural Habitat (OP/BP 4.04), Forests (OP/BP 4.36), Pest Management (OP/BP 4.09), Physical Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11), Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12), Indigenous Peoples/Underserved and Vulnerable peoples (OP/BP 4.10), and Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4.37). Overall, the Program would have positive environmental and social impacts through its enabling investment activities under Component 1 which includes participatory forest management and reforestation in deforestation hotspots, extension services, and land-use planning state-wide at state and local levels. The enabling environment under Component 2 would have beneficial impacts through complementary activities to improve the effectiveness and impact of institutions, incentives (i.e., policies, marketing, BSM), information (i.e., strategic communications, MRV) and safeguards management at state and local levels. This component would enhance the enabling environment to help scale up and leverage action on the ground to reduce deforestation and forest degradation. Component 3 of the Program would have also beneficial impacts through a robust safeguards system that will be established in the Grant period, and continue to be strengthened during the ERPA period to ensure that the Program's citizen engagement, equitable sharing of program benefits, GRM and safeguards risks management steps are sustained beyond the Grant period; and GoE will allocate adequate resources (human and financial) for safeguards implementation/due diligence.

The OFLP area provides a wider range of interrelated co-benefits in biodiversity conservation, adaptation, ecosystem services, social and broader economic benefits. It is clear that the forest dwellers and other forest dependent communities, including downstream users, are highly dependent on the co-benefits of the forest ecosystems and other natural resources for their livelihoods. The presence of these co-benefits could enable the OFLP to have more beneficial impacts than the carbon benefits. It is also useful to note that the carbon benefits should play a catalytic role to ensure the sustainability and multiplier effects of the Program.

Environment:

Some of the local-level investment activities under Component 1 may have limited adverse environmental risks; these activities could potentially include construction or rehabilitation of physical structures for catchment management such as afforestation/reforestation, area closures, check-dams, water harvesting structures, agricultural intensification (including small-scale irrigation that may necessitate applying agrochemicals), and access roads. Component 3 may have also adverse environmental and social impacts, specifically in relation to benefit sharing. Hence,

grievance can arise at different administrative levels of the region in relation to benefits and other issues of OFLP. Unless grievances are timely and correctly resolved, it scales up and may reach the level that brings failure in the implementations of OFLP. Therefore, environmental and social risks from activities under Components 1 and 3 can be avoided or mitigated using the OFLP safeguards instruments, including the ESMF and the Social Assessment (as part of the ongoing SESA).

Social:

OFLP's anticipated social impacts have triggered OP/BP.4.12 and OP/BP.4.10, and the program has put in place mitigation measures acceptable to the WBG to mitigate these impacts. On OP/BP.4.12, based on the fact that specific sites are not known, OFLP adopted a framework approach as a precautionary measure to preclude and manage social safeguard risks. Accordingly, RPF and PF are prepared (involving participating communities, PFMs, cooperatives, civil society organizations and community actors), consulted upon and will be disclosed publicly to cover impacts on land acquisition and restriction of access to natural resources. In the Bale Mountains National Park, where a potential resettlement may occur the Government will need to apply the WBG safeguard policies to ensure that global good practice is followed in precluding and managing any potential physical and/or economic displacement.

On OP/BP.4.10: the RPF is complemented by a Social Assessment (as part of the SESA) study to assess key socio-economic factors that require consideration, identify vulnerable and underserved groups that meet the OP/BP. 4.10 requirements that may be excluded and mitigate any adverse impacts as well as ensure that these people benefit from the program in a sustainable manner. The findings of the Social Assessment (as part of the SESA) and a detailed summary of the main issues raised by the beneficiaries during the consultation process, used in fostering broad community support, and provision of grievance redress, benefit sharing, monitoring and proposed solutions as related to vulnerable and underserved groups have been included as social risk mitigation measures and outlined in the Social Development Plan.

Grievance Redress Mechanism: Communities and individuals in OFLP operation sites who believe that they are adversely affected by the program may submit complaints to existing program-level grievance redress mechanisms or the WBG's Grievance Redress Service (GRS). OFLP Grievance Redress Mechanism builds on the Ethiopian Grievance Redress Mechanisms as part of a robust risk mitigation measure. The program would support citizen's complaints or grievances in a formalized, transparent, cost-effective, and time-bound manner. All program-affected people would be informed about how to register grievances or complaints, including specific concerns on any OFLP activities. The OFLP GRM ensures that complaints received are promptly reviewed to address program-related concerns.

Gender: The OFLP will mainstream gender equality in sharing program benefits and strengthen grievance redress as part of citizen engagement aimed at listening to stakeholders and seeking their consensus on OFLP-related activities. OFLP activities would be gender sensitive, including such aspects as household energy demand management, household livelihoods support activities, community forest tenure piloting, and the scaling up of PFM structures. The OFLP benefit sharing mechanism design process, safeguards implementation, community participation and citizen engagement issues, would also include efforts to ensure and enhance female involvement. M&E indicators would be disaggregated by gender to inform OFLP's adaptive management. The gender aspects of OFLP will address the strategic and practical needs of women while ensuring equity in the process. All proposed enabling environment and investment activities will be screened through

<p>the gender lens to test practical mainstreaming. The ESMF has been publicly disclosed in-country and in the World Bank Group's Info Shop as per WBG requirements on October 14 and 19, 2015, respectively.</p>
<p>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</p>
<p>While individual Program activities/subprojects are not yet identified, there will be support for local-level activities described under Component 1 of the Program. These activities/subprojects are expected to support landscape management through rehabilitation, small civil works, afforestation and reforestation, assisted natural regeneration, and PFM. It is not anticipated that there will be indirect environmental and social impacts.</p>
<p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p>
<p>The only alternative is a "no project" alternative. The "no project" alternative would devoid forest dependent communities from improving their livelihoods by boosting improved landscape management, forest ecosystem services, participatory forest management, non-timber forest products market linkage, agricultural productivity, etc. Therefore, this alternative was discarded as it was not a viable option.</p>
<p>4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.</p>
<p>The capacity of institutions at federal, regional and woreda levels is generally low to effectively implement safeguards. Therefore, the program allocated over 1.63 USD to build the capacity of relevant institutions at all levels.</p>
<p>In addition, to preclude and manage safeguard risk, a robust safeguard system will be established in the Grant period, and continue to be strengthened during the ERPA period to ensure that the program's citizen engagement, equitable sharing of program benefits, GRM and safeguards risks management steps are sustained beyond the Grant period; and GoE will allocate adequate resources (human and financial) for safeguards implementation/due diligence. Further, the capacity building efforts of OFLP will be complemented by CRGE Facility implementation which is in the process of establishing a country-wide system for mainstreaming environmental and social concerns into development. OFLP capacity building efforts will also be complemented by the ongoing Promoting of Basic Services (PBS) Project that has a well-funded component focused on Risk and Safeguard Management Capacity to boost Woreda level ability to manage environmental and social risks. With this component over the next three years (a) development of Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) Operational Manual, including training modules for Woreda level staff, (b) training for about 200 Woreda level staff in the basic sectors, and (c) customizing the ESMS Operational Manual to regions (at least in four regions) will be carried out. A three-year "Enhancing Shared Prosperity through Equitable Services) PforR, which was approved by the World Bank Board on 15 September 2015, will further strengthen this capacity building effort. Lastly, the GoE is expected to allocate US\$1.68 million from the ER payment to cover administrative costs during the ERPA period.</p>
<p>5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.</p>
<p>Key stakeholders include: (i) communities, forest dwellers and users, farmers, herders, cooperatives, and water users who would benefit from OFLP interventions directly or downstream; (ii) federal institutions such as MEF, MoFED, MoA, MoWIE, and EWCA; (iii) Oromia regional state institutions such as the Vice President's Office, OFWE and bureaus of</p>

agriculture, water, irrigation and energy, rural land and environmental protection, local governments and other public institutions that would either directly implement OFLP and/or benefit from it; (iv) other regional states that could learn from OFLP as they advance their own forest programs and/or REDD+ pilots; (v) community-based organizations and NGOs delivering services to farmers; and (vi) private sector entities involved in providing services such as inputs and extension or in commercial endeavors such as coffee and other forest products. Institutional capacity is slowly strengthening; some of the main challenges include weak multi-sector coordination, overlapping mandates, and inadequate staffing at all levels.

During the preparation of the safeguards instruments for the OFLP, all concerned stakeholders have been consulted in a timely, culturally-appropriate and inclusive manner. Moreover, the Executive Summary of the ESMF, Social Assessment (as part of the SESA), RPF, and PF will be translated into Afaan Oromoo and other local languages and disclosed locally in all the offices of the OFWE, and will also be disclosed in country (at the web sites of the OFWE and MEFDCC) and in the Bank's Infoshop.

Community Participation and Citizen Engagement During Implementation: OFLP would focus on increasing community engagement and participation in forest management and decision-making. It would do so by seeking to: a) increase capacity of the forest dependent communities and citizens to make their own decisions about the community-led planning process; b) increase the capacity and responsiveness of regional and woreda administrations to respond to citizen demand, and c) support channels where citizens and various levels of government can work together in the context of implementation and monitoring of community-led forest management. Citizen feedback and a series of consultations with community members, government officials, and representatives of CSOs will continue during implementation.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	14-Oct-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	16-Oct-2015
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	00000000
"In country" Disclosure	
Ethiopia	14-Oct-2015
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	16-Oct-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	19-Oct-2015
"In country" Disclosure	
Ethiopia	16-Oct-2015
<i>Comments:</i>	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	19-Oct-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	19-Oct-2015

"In country" Disclosure	
Ethiopia	16-Oct-2015
<i>Comments:</i> SESA (Social Development Plan is included as part of SA)	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	14-Oct-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	16-Oct-2015
"In country" Disclosure	
Ethiopia	14-Oct-2015
<i>Comments:</i> Pest management plan is included in ESMF	
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 type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats	
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?	Yes [<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources	
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"/>]
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 type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement	

Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Is physical displacement/relocation expected? Provided estimated number of people to be affected	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	TBD [<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>]	TBD [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.36 - Forests			
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.37 - Safety of Dams			
Have dam safety plans been prepared?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have the TORs as well as composition for the independent Panel of Experts (POE) been reviewed and approved by the Bank?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Has an Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) been prepared and arrangements been made for public awareness and training?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information			
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
All Safeguard Policies			
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
--	---

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Stephen Danyo, Andre Rodrigues de Aquino	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Johanna van Tilburg (SA)	Date: 15-Dec-2015
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Timothy H. Brown (PMGR)	Date: 24-Dec-2015