

INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET

APPRAISAL STAGE

Report No.: ISDSA13631

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 13-Aug-2015

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 13-Aug-2015

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Ecuador	Project ID:	P152096
Project Name:	Supporting Education Reform in Targeted Circuits (P152096)		
Task Team Leader(s):	Marcelo Becerra		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	10-Aug-2015	Estimated Board Date:	30-Oct-2015
Managing Unit:	GED04	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	General education sector (100%)		
Theme(s):	Education for all (50%), Education for the knowledge economy (50%)		
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:	201.00	Total Bank Financing:	178.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
Borrower			23.00
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development			178.00
Total			201.00
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Project Development Objective(s)

The proposed Project Development Objective (PDO) is to improve enrollment in early education (Inicial II) and improve the persistence (survival) rate in lower secondary and upper secondary education levels in the targeted circuits.

3. Project Description

Component 1. Improving school services in targeted circuits (Total: US\$197 million, Bank: US\$ 175

million).

The objective of this component is to improve the actual and perceived quality of education services, accessed by students and families, which would lead to increases in enrollment and graduation from early child to upper secondary education. Moreover, a more efficient allocation of existing resources, both physical (e.g, infrastructure facilities, science labs) and in human resources, would produce efficiency gains. The four pillars to improve the quality of education services to be financed by the component are: (i) the reorganization of school supply, by consolidation of schools into “hubs”, upgrading the infrastructure and facilities; (ii) in-service and master level training of teachers and master level training for principals; (iii) the implementation of CEL at school level and; (iv) the enhancement of special education and programs for children with disabilities.

(a) Sub-Component 1.1. Infrastructure, Equipment and Furniture for Schools Hubs (Bank: US\$ 160 million). This sub-component would finance the construction, equipment, and furniture for around 32 schools “hubs” in the targeted circuits. The interventions would include new schools (Unidades Educativas del Milenio - UEMs) and renovated and expanded schools (“Repotenciaciones”). School hubs would encompass MINEDUC’s full standards for integrated schools “hubs”, including: infrastructure facilities to accommodate students throughout the “full education cycle”, encompassing from early education to upper secondary (bachillerato); physics and chemistry labs, language classrooms, pedagogic ICT equipment, school cafeteria, a sports field and facilities for school faculty and teachers. Transportation of students to “hubs” would be financed by the GoE, when applicable, based on MINEDUC’s criteria on distance and time of travelling. Is expected that around 50% of the students belonging to the targeted circuits (and about 70% of upper secondary students) would benefit from the new high quality facilities that foster retention by improving children’s daily experience at school and graduation by providing skills that are demanded by the labor market. Moreover, efficiency gains would result from the reorganization of the school supply into “hubs”, through the reduction of small schools and better utilization of physical resources (infrastructure, labs) and human resources, contributing also to increase enrollment.

(b) Sub-Component 1.2. Professional Development for Teachers and Principals (Bank: US\$8.5 million). This sub-component would finance: (i) in-service teacher training in the targeted circuits. This training would consist of a 330 hours on both content and pedagogic, to be provided by selected accredited higher education institutions. The training will be developed taken into account on teachers and students assessments and the provision will be prioritized to weakest performers; (ii) masters’ degrees in selected programs for teachers belonging to the targeted circuits, provided by select accredited institutions. Eligible subject would be: mathematics and physics, inclusive and special education studies, and bilingual and intercultural education; (iv) masters’ degrees in school management programs for principals and other schools authorities belonging to the targeted circuits, provided by select accredited institutions.

(c) Sub-Component 1.3. Academic Management System at School Level- CEL - (Bank: US\$5.5 million). This sub-component would finance the implementation of CEL in the targeted circuits, including the provision of personal computers, internet connectivity, and training to all public schools teachers.

(d) Sub-Component 1.4. Services for Students with disabilities and Special Education (Bank: US \$ 1 million). This sub-component would finance: (i) the provision of technical, didactic, and disability-specific materials at national wide scale; (ii) teacher training in areas that focus pedagogy on educational needs that arise in the course of a student’s individual development; (iii)

implementation of campaigns to raise awareness of the community to promote the enrollment of children with disabilities.

Component 2. Strengthening Planning, Management and Evaluation Capacity at MINEDUC (Total \$4 million; Bank \$3.0 million).

The objective of this component is to strengthening Planning, Management and Evaluation Capacity at MINEDUC, including: (i) the development of key modules of the management information system; (ii) enhancing PINIUECE and SECOB Project management capacity; (iii) carrying out two key impact evaluation on Program's outcomes.

(a) Sub-Component 2.1. Management and Information Systems (IBRD: \$ 1.5 million). This sub-component would partially support the completion and implementation of a fully integrated Education Management Information System (EMIS). Specifically, would finance the development of 4 integrated modules: (i) Institutions and School Management; (ii) School Supply Management; (iii) Project Management; (iv) Business Intelligence.

(b) Sub-component 2.2. Management, Monitoring and Specific Studies / Impact Evaluation (Bank: US\$1.5 million). This sub-component would finance: (i) key staff in GUEM and SECOB to strengthen Project's management capacity in financial management, procurement and monitoring and evaluation; (ii) two specific studies/impact evaluations: a quasi-experimental evaluation of the impact of the in-service training program for teachers on student learning; and the development of an analytical model to measure the direct and indirect effects of the consolidation of schools on students outcomes (dropout/retention/graduation; quality/learning assessments; equity; and efficiency gains on allocation of resources) and potential spillover effects on neighboring schools. Both evaluations would be led INEVAL, in coordination with MINEDUC.

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

Based on the Project's allocated budget, 22 targeted circuits have been selected, 17 circuits in Zone 5 and 5 circuits in Zone 2. These zones are among the most populated in the country and represent the ones with the highest number of students. Within each of these circuits there is an average of one to three proposed consolidated UEMs. It is estimated that up to six schools will either be consolidated or will send excess populations to each UEM. The 22 targeted circuits belong to 4 Provinces and 9 school districts that correspond to 12 cantons with a diverse range of poverty levels. All the cantons targeted by the project, with the exception of one, have levels of poverty higher than the national average: the poverty headcount of targeted cantons ranges between 70% in Babahoyo, Guaranda, Milagro, Montalvo, Pedro Moncayo, Quevedo, and Ventanas and over 90% in Baba, Mocache, Santa Lucia, and Valencia.

Indigenous Peoples are present in the Project's four provinces as well as in almost all of the targeted circuits with varying levels of alignment with the Bank's criteria for applying OP/BP 4.10 (collective attachment, language, self-identification, and customary organizations).

Indigenous Population in Participating Provinces (2001 Census)

Pichincha:

95,552 (Total IP Population)
 4.00% (IP Population as % of total Provincial Population)
 50.30% (Percentage of IPs in Province that live in Urban Areas)
 49.70% (Percentage of IPs in Province that live in Rural Areas)

Los Ríos:

5,518 (Total IP Population)
 0.08% (IP Population as % of total Provincial Population)
 40.60% (Percentage of IPs in Province that live in Urban Areas)
 56.40% (Percentage of IPs in Province that live in Rural Areas)

Bolívar:

40,094 (Total IP Population)
 1.30% (IP Population as % of total Provincial Population)
 5.00% (Percentage of IPs in Province that live in Urban Areas)
 95.00% (Percentage of IPs in Province that live in Rural Areas)

Guayas:

42,377 (Total IP Population)
 23.70% (IP Population as % of total Provincial Population)
 86.00% (Percentage of IPs in Province that live in Urban Areas)
 14.00% (Percentage of IPs in Province that live in Rural Areas)

The Project will finance civil works (school construction and expansion) for UEMs based on the model of school consolidation that will imply the closure of several small community based schools that cannot provide the same level of quality education that will be offered by the UEMs. The works will include renovations and remodeling of existing schools, including the construction of additional classrooms, laboratories, cafeterias, and recreational areas in targeted schools as well as the construction of new schools. To manage the environmental impacts of civil works, OP/BP 4.01 (Environmental Assessment) is triggered. The primary social risk that the Project's safeguards instruments will need to assess, avoid and mitigate is the closure of community based schools and the impacts resulting from the new school distances and large multi-grade level populations of the UEMs. At the same time the construction of new UEMs as well as the expansion of existing schools to create UEMs may require land acquisition although impacts are expected to be minimal as in most cases MINEDUC already owns and occupies the lands where UEMs are proposed. Whereas the Circuits for Bank financing have been identified, the specific UEMs to be financed will not be confirmed until the technical, social and environmental feasibility of each UEM is confirmed, that will be inclusive of participatory processes with the educational communities (school directors, teachers, parents, students, and community leaders) where schools will be closed or excess school population will be drawn. The purpose of these consultation processes will be to inform the final design of the UEM, its related transportation arrangements, and other services and governance for the UEM. An Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), Resettlement Policy Framework and Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework have been prepared and disclosed prior to appraisal. The social aspects of the ESMF, as well as the IPPF have been prepared based on the results and lessons learned from pilot social assessment and participatory community level processes that were carried out for three UEMs proposed for potential financing by the World Bank.

1. The selected circuits belongs to the four following provinces: (i) Province of Los Rios: District/Canton of Mocache-Quevedo; District/Canton of Babahoyo-Montalvo District/Canton of Valencia and District/Canton of Ventanas; (ii) Province of Bolivar: District/Canton of Guaranda; (iii) Province of Guayas: District/Canton of Milagro, and District/Canton of Santa Lucia (Guayas Province); (iv) Province of Pichincha: District/Canton of Valencia and District/Canton of Moncayo.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Dianna M. Pizarro (GSURR)

Raul Tolmos (GENDR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The Project does not foresee significant and irreversible environmental impacts and risks that could jeopardize the natural environment in its direct and indirect influential area. Civil works during construction of new schools and renovations and remodeling of existing ones might only generate typical focalized, reversible and manageable impacts. Subcomponent 1.1 on reorganization of school supply and expansion of school infrastructure both on school renovation and construction of new buildings. Given that list for all school and exact location of the schools to be constructed and renovated are not known an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) was prepared. Schools will be located in already populated urban and rural areas in two Costa region provinces (Los Ríos and Guayas) and two Andean provinces (Bolivar and Pichincha). A Social Management Chapter will be included in the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), which will document the key risks and impacts as well as opportunities that should be explored with each community where school closings will take place. It will outline the procedures required to respond to the aspirations and concerns of the affected communities.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	This policy should not be triggered because construction and renovation of schools will occur in built environments (rural and urban centers and their peri-urban areas) surrounded by productive landscapes (agriculture).
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	This policy should not be triggered because the project does not consider any changes to forest management or any works in forest areas in the zones designated for new construction.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	This policy should not be triggered because the project does not consider purchase, use or storage of pesticides.

Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	This policy should be triggered as some of schools to be built may require minor excavations in Andean areas of the Bolivar Province where chance finds could occur. The ESMF or EMPs will include the relevant national procedures in the case of chance-finds.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	<p>The Project has triggered OP/BP 4.10 as Indigenous Peoples that meet the four criteria of this Policy are present throughout the targeted circuits. Whereas issues may vary for urban and rural Indigenous communities, key risks related to the UEM process already identified include the social and cultural impacts of community school closures and the transport of children to the new UEMs. For Indigenous Peoples there is a particular concern that this will lead to loss of cultural and community identity and parent's direct role and connection and influence over teachers and the school setting. An Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) has been prepared and disclosed prior to appraisal. The IPPF was prepared based on a pilot social assessment and consultation process with Indigenous communities that are proposed to be consolidated into the Surupucyu Intercultural Bilingual hub school in Guaranda. The process resulted in the preparation of a social assessment and Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) for Surpucyu that holds the broad community support (as documented in the IPP) of the affected/beneficiary communities to be consolidated. This hub school will be one of the 14 proposed Guardians of Language schools that seek to promote the cultural identity of each of the 14 Ecuadorian Indigenous nationalities through the millennium hub model.</p> <p>The IPPF documents the key risks and impacts as well as opportunities that should be explored with each community where school closings will take place and the procedures necessary to respond to the communities aspirations and concerns through the preparation of Indigenous Peoples Plans (IPPs). The project will only support hub schools with Indigenous communities where free, prior and informed consultation is carried out, per the IPPF, and IPPs are achieved that document the principle issues, priorities and measures agreed upon between MINEDUC and the affected/beneficiary communities. The IPPs must demonstrate evidence of the broad community support of the affected/beneficiary communities for the consolidation process. The IPPF outlines the relevant legal framework, considerations for</p>

		consultation with Indigenous communities, procedures, institutional arrangements, and resources for meaningful consultation of Indigenous Peoples when they are involved in a hub school.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	OP/BP 4.12 has been triggered as land acquisition could potentially be necessary for some hub schools. Since specific sites are not known by appraisal, a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) was prepared and disclosed prior to appraisal. Based on prior experience, resettlement impacts are foreseen to be minimal as the majority of the lands proposed for new hub schools are already in the legal possession of MINEDUC or other public actors such as the Municipality. However, in order to plan for all potential situations, including the need for land acquisition from private parties, and/or the resettlement of informal occupants, the RPF has established a clear process for screening, identification and analysis of impacts, and mitigation and/or compensation through the preparation of Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs). The RPF includes a detailed analysis of different types of affected parties, impacts and potential compensation measures.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	This policy should not be triggered given that the project will not support the construction or rehabilitation of dams nor will support other investments which rely on the services of existing dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	This policy should not be triggered because the project will not affect international waterways as defined under the policy.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	This policy should not be triggered because the proposed project will not affect disputed areas as defined under the policy.

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 key issues that were raised during consultations were different among Indigenous rural communities and peri-urban or urban non-Indigenous communities. In peri-urban and urban areas the concerns were primarily focused on ensuring that the hub school would include measures to provide safe conditions for children both within and around the school environment. In these cases it was noted that in many cases parents are minimally involved in the education of their children and that drugs, alcohol, gangs and violence are very much part of the children's realities. Some of the primary areas of concern and requests included: (i) assurances that the hub school provide adequate security both at the school facilities and in key transportation routes to access the school (pedestrian and bus), (ii) that the hubs school provide psychological and extracurricular support

for children at risk or with learning disabilities, and (iii) that the hubs school implement measures to ensure that smaller children would not be exposed to risk of harm or abuse from older students. In the rural setting, Indigenous communities were primarily concerned with the new distances children would have to travel to access school (up to three hours walking each way in some cases if buses were not provided) as well as the loss of cultural identity and connection to their communities. In these cases parents are very involved in their children's education and the school environment- inclusive of the provision of healthy meals and mobilization of a range of health services, and community activities within the schools.

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

For Indigenous Peoples the only long-term impact due to school consolidation is the potential loss of cultural identity of Indigenous students if the hub school is not designed to fully incorporate the cultural elements that currently are present in existing community schools. These elements could range from the quality of the intercultural bilingual curriculum and the adoption of traditional dress for uniforms, to the types of foods served, languages spoken and the predominant social and cultural values promoted within the hub school environment.

In rural areas where UEMs imply important new distances for students, there is a potential for the reduction of parental control over their children's activities and behaviors within the school environment that could result in drug and alcohol abuse, teen-pregnancy, and other undesirable behaviors.

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

The Project will only finance UEMs where social viability is achieved through the preparation of social management plans that address the social risks and impacts highlighted by the affected/beneficiary communities through the community level social assessment and consultation processes. The Project will not finance UEMs that imply highly controversial school closures where communities have raised concerns around the consolidation process that are based on the physical and educational well-being of their students. However, some cases may present controversy that is not based on the physical and education well-being of the students. In these cases, the Bank will support the UEM, if it can be demonstrated that MINEDUC has carried out meaningful consultation processes with the affected/beneficiary communities in good faith and in accordance with the ESMF, and made every feasible attempt to address community concerns, and that such concerns have no relation to the physical or educational well-being of the relevant students.

UEMs affecting/benefiting Indigenous communities will only be supported if the Indigenous Peoples Plan holds broad community support.

This Project will only finance UEMs that can guarantee safe and reliable transportation for students that takes into account the ages and different levels of vulnerabilities of the beneficiaries. The Project will finance a transportation audit, and specific transportation arrangements and analysis of risk will be a key input into all consultation and social assessment processes.

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.

In regards to Social Management, the General Planning Coordination Unit (GPCU) that reports to the Undersecretary of School Administration will manage and supervise the implementation of the

IPPF and Social Management chapter of the ESMF. This Unit will ensure that each hub school carries out a stakeholder mapping, social assessment and consultation process with the key stakeholders (parents, teachers, directors, students, community leaders) of each school that will be closed or schools from which students will be transferred to the hub school. The social assessment and consultation processes will be directly organized and managed by the District staff with the support and supervision of the a national Social Development Specialist working within the GPCU, and in the case of Indigenous schools, with the support of the Subsecretary for Intercultural Bilingual Education (SEIB). District staff will undergo training to build their understanding, ownership and capacity to implement the IPPF and ESMF.

The participatory processes outlined in the ESMF and IPPF are fully in line with the LOEI's articles on citizen participation including Article 2 (paragraph O) where it commits to citizen participation in the organization, governance, functioning, decision making, planning, management and accountability regarding the issues inherent to the educational environment and its institutions and establishments. The Article also commits the government to promote and strengthen citizen capacity for effective participation; as well as in Article 6 (paragraph N) where it commits to guaranteeing the active participation of students, families and teachers in educational processes.

In the three pilot social assessments and consultation processes, MINEDUC explored several alternatives to respond to community concerns. These alternatives included the exclusion of schools that did not want to be consolidated due to significant distances, proposals to work with communities to ensure cultural identity and parent participation in the design and delivery of services of the UEM, commitments to work with local governments and other public entities to ensure safe access to UEMs, among other specific actions that are included in the Indigenous Peoples and Social Action Plans for the UEMs Surupucyu, Natalia Jarrín, and UNASUR.

The Ministry of Education's National Directorate for Physical Infrastructure (DNI), in collaboration with the Legal Department, will be charged with land acquisition and resettlement procedures. This unit has experience in land acquisition for UEM development. During project preparation the Bank team provided training to the relevant MINEDUC staff on the scope, principles, impacts covered, and requirements of the Bank's Involuntary Resettlement Policy and worked closely with this Unit in the preparation of the RPF. Land acquisition and resettlement are foreseen to be minimal under the Project as the vast majority of the proposed hub school sites (both new and expansion of existing infrastructure) are located on land already owned and under use by the MINEDUC.

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

From a social perspective the area of influence to be assessed for each UEM includes not only the UEM site but all of the communities affected by school closures for the consolidation. A stakeholder mapping will be carried out for each UEM proposed for Bank financing as the first stage of the social assessment process. At the minimum, key stakeholders include the students, parents, teachers, community leaders, and MINEDUC district and zone staff involved in the UEMs to be supported by the Project. Other stakeholders include land owners or occupants affected by land acquisition as well as the UEM surrounding communities that will be temporarily affected by construction activities and permanently affected by student traffic. They also may see an increase in their land values due to their location near the UEMs. The ESMF and IPPF include a list of all potential stakeholders that should be taken into account during social assessment and

consultation processes.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	12-Aug-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	12-Aug-2015
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	00000000
"In country" Disclosure	
Ecuador	12-Aug-2015
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	12-Aug-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	12-Aug-2015
"In country" Disclosure	
Ecuador	12-Aug-2015
<i>Comments:</i>	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	12-Aug-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	12-Aug-2015
"In country" Disclosure	
Ecuador	12-Aug-2015
<i>Comments:</i>	
If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.	
If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:	

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment			
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.11 - 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement		
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
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: Marcelo Becerra	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Reema Nayar (PMGR)	Date: 13-Aug-2015