

<b>Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet (ISDS)</b>	
<b>Section I – Basic Information</b>	
Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: February 22, 2005	Report No.:AC1171
<b>A. Basic Project Data</b>	
A.1. Project Statistics	
Country: Namibia	Project ID: P070885
GEF Focal Area: Biodiversity, OP#2	Global Supplemental ID:
Project: Namib Coast Biodiversity Conservation and Management (NACOMA) Project	TTL: Christophe Crepin
Total project cost (by component, GEF only): <b>Component 1:</b> 0.91 million USD; <b>Component 2:</b> 1.52 million USD; <b>Component 3:</b> 1.52 million USD; <b>Component 4:</b> 0.95 million USD; <b>Total:</b> 4.9	
Appraisal Date: March 7-18, 2005	Grant amount (US\$m): 4.9
Board Date: June 24, 2005	
Other financing amounts by source <sup>1</sup> :	(US\$m)
EU: RURAL POVERTY REDUCTION SUPPORT PROGRAM	6.0
EU: UPGRADING NAMIBIA MARITIME & FISHERIES INSTITUTE AT WALVIS BAY	6.0
FINLAND: SUPPORT TO THE NAMIBIAN DECENTRALISATION PROCESS	1.3
FRANCE: DECENTRALIZATION AND IT SUPPORT TO RC	0.8
MULTI: BENGUELA ENVIRONMENT FISHERIES INTERACTION & TRAINING (BENEFIT) PROGRAM	0.4
GERMANY: GTZ BIODIVERSITY AND DESERTIFICATION IMPLEMENTATION SUPPORT	2.0
MULTI: SUCCULENT KAROO BIODIVERSITY ASSESSMENTS AND MANAGEMENT TOOLS (SKEP)	1.0
JAPAN: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT FUND (JSDF)	1.95
NAMIBIA: CENTRAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS	36.34
Managing Unit: AFTS1	Sector: General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (100%)
Lending Instruments: Specific Investment Loan	

<sup>1</sup> Includes co-financing and matching funds.

Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency recovery)? Yes? [ ] No? [X]

Environmental Category: B

## A.2. Project Objectives

### *Project development (and global) objective and key indicators*

#### **Project development/global objective**

The Project development/global objective is: **Conservation, sustainable use and mainstreaming of biodiversity in coastal and marine ecosystems in Namibia strengthened.**

#### **Outcome indicators**

- i. X km<sup>2</sup> and number of terrestrial and marine<sup>2</sup> biodiversity hotspots under effective management as defined by NAMETT<sup>3</sup> by year 5 compared with baseline situation.
- ii. Flow of local economic benefits from activities linked to ecosystem and biodiversity management on the coast has increased by year 5 compared with baseline situation.
- iii. Biodiversity related aspects are incorporated into all up-coming sector policies (tourism, fisheries, mining, urban development and water management) at national, regional and local levels by year 5.

*(c) How would the project contribute to: The recipient's higher level objectives for the sector and for poverty reduction? The relevant CAS objective(s)?*

The proposed Project will contribute to the objectives of Namibia's National Development Plan (NDP) 2<sup>4</sup> and Vision 2030, including cross cutting issues, such as enabling capacity-building of stakeholders and institutions, and most importantly - environmental sustainability. In particular, the Project will support efforts under NDP 2 to mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in the emerging decentralization process by developing relevant institutional capacities of regional and local government as well as key national level players.

The **Rural Profile and Strategic Framework (RPSF)**, prepared by the Namibia National Planning Commission with the EU as a governing framework for rural

<sup>2</sup> In the project context, marine hotspots are meant to be MPAs: MPAs are here defined based on IUCN's definition (Resolution 17.38 of the IUCN General Assembly, 1988, reaffirmed in Resolution 19.46, 1994): "Any area of intertidal or subtidal terrain, together with its overlying water and associated flora, fauna, historical and cultural features, which has been reserved by law or other effective means to protect part or all of the enclosed environment."

<sup>3</sup> "Effective management" would be assessed through use of the Namibian adapted WWF/WB PA tracking tool (NAMETT), a score card for PAs and MPAs.

<sup>4</sup> It is expected that throughout and even after NACOMA's implementation phase, integrated coastal zone management will become a component of NDP 3 and associated RDPs.

development programs in Namibia, identifies decentralization of rural institutions as a key area, which requires the close attention of the Government. The Project will address the issue of decentralization of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use-related functions by serving as a pilot for decentralization of specific functions of the MET and contributing strongly to implementation of the MET Department of Environmental Affairs' (DEA) biodiversity and desertification programs in coastal areas.

While there is no **country assistance strategy (CAS)** for Namibia at present, the Bank is working with the Government of Namibia to prepare a **Country Economic Memorandum (CEM)** that will support the Government's objectives by providing in-depth analysis and guidance to develop a pro-poor growth strategy that will address the concerns related to inequality as well as growth. Such a framework would also strengthen the partnership between the Bank and Namibia and form the basis for addressing the key challenges of achieving sustainable growth, and reducing poverty and inequality by capitalizing on the achievement of the Government and the comparative advantages of the Bank. The NACOMA Project is in line with the CEM framework as it contributes to the dialogue between the Bank and the GRN, promotes the building of capacity amongst national and local governments and broadens the income base within the coastal regions.

### A.3. Project Description

Below is a summary of the four interlinked components and sub-components of the NACOMA Project:

#### **Component 1: Policy, Legal and Institutional Framework for Sustainable Ecosystem Management of the Namib Coast**

*Sector issue addressed, expected outcome and main activities:*

The objective of this component is to fill the current gap for mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and management into policy, legal and institutional structures affecting the sustainable development of the coastal zone. Such a policy should fall within existing national, regional, local and sectoral frameworks, i.e. Vision 2030, NDP2, RDPs, NBSAP and NAPCOD, all of which call for sustainable development of the coastal zone of Namibia. This component focuses on enhancing Namibia's policy, legal and institutional framework resulting in the development of a coastal zone policy, a formal White Paper, that sets out the rationale for a national coastal policy, comprising a common vision for Namibia's coast, policy context and objectives and strategies for implementation based on the principles of biodiversity conservation and integrated coastal zone management.<sup>5</sup> The Namibia Coastal Management White Paper will provide an overarching and comprehensive framework to support integrated planning and decision-making affecting coastal lands and waters, based on the carrying capacity of the Namibian coast as a whole. It will be based on a highly participatory approach involving the identified stakeholder groups in multiple consultations and meetings.

*Primary target group:*

<sup>5</sup> According to the CBD definition of IMCAM.

National (mainly MET, MFMR, MME, MAWRD, MWTC, MRGLH), regional and local governments involved in CZM.

*Sub-components:*

- I.1. Review of Existing Laws and Support for Appropriate Legislation
- I.2. Clarification of Institutional Mandates
- I.3. Development of Policy Framework
- I.4. Development of Coastal profiles

*Specific outcomes:*

- (i) Policy and legal framework relevant to coastal zone management clarified and, following a prioritization process, harmonized.
- (ii) Roles and mandates of line ministries, RCs and LAs clarified with regard to conservation and sustainable use of coastal biodiversity and definitions in place for coastal zone planning and management.
- (iii) A collaborative vision for the conservation and sustainable use of the Namib coast developed and used as basis for a draft comprehensive coastal zone policy framework, the Namibia Coastal Management Green Paper and a first draft White Paper.
- (iv) Regional coastal information available and used regularly in local and regional decision-making processes.
- (v) Increased budget allocations for ICZM related issues by relevant line ministries, including from improved capture of the rent linked to the resource base.

**Component 2: Targeted Capacity-Building for Coastal Zone Management and Biodiversity Conservation**

*Sector issue addressed, expected outcome and main activities:*

Capacity building has been identified as one of the main bottlenecks for sustainable development in Namibia (see Vision 2030, NDP 2 mid-term review and National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA) reports). Moreover, it is widely recognized that the lack of capacity at the national, regional and local levels for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, including its mainstreaming, stems from (i) a shortage of qualified staff and restricted budget for additional positions; (ii) limited resources and time for training activities; (iii) uncoordinated sectoral efforts; (iv) the slow decentralization process; (v) limited understanding of coastal biodiversity and linkages to development planning and management; and, finally, (vi) weak and fragmented communication channels between

---

<sup>6</sup> NACOMA will look at the coastal-related inter-sectoral links and integration of planning efforts at national, regional and local scales, while the UNDP/GEF supported SPAN Project will focus on PA-specific management and operational plans.

the various stakeholders.

This component will fill the capacity gap at the local, regional and national levels in support of integrated coastal zone management biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, including mainstreaming of coastal biodiversity and resources into development planning and key economic activities.

*Primary target group:*

Local, regional and national government (MME, MET, MFMR, MRGLH, MWTC, MAWRD), ICZMC members and RDCCs involved in CZM.

*Sub-components:*

II.1. Training for ICZM

II.2. Biodiversity Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism

II.3. Coastal Biodiversity Knowledge Management

*Specific outcomes:*

(i) Capacity and resources of RCs, LA, MET, MME, MAWRD, MFMR and MWTC are strengthened to undertake functional and strategic coast-relevant planning and decision-making process conducive to biodiversity conservation and mainstreaming thereof into RDPs, NDPs and investment decisions (e.g. by RDCCs).

(ii) The ICZMC has been strengthened and is fully operational.

(iii) Enhanced knowledge related to coastal biodiversity and sustainable use including mainstreaming into development planning and coastal zone management through improved communication channels at local, regional and national level.

(iv) Enhanced awareness of the importance of coastal zone resources and ICZM among stakeholders and local communities.

**Component 3: Targeted Investments in Critical Ecosystems for Biodiversity Conservation, Sustainable Use and Mainstreaming**

*Sector issue addressed, expected outcome and main activities:*

The Project has been designed to seek a balance between support for an enabling environments (e.g. management plans) for investments in established and new conservation areas and mainstreaming efforts in coastal and marine production landscapes through the participatory approach supported by the ICZMC and at the regional level by the RDCC, making use of the regional coastal profiles and existing national, regional and local development and biodiversity priorities (e.g. RDPs, NBSAP) and their implementation.

This component uses targeted investments and activities to address on-the-ground gaps in

coastal biodiversity conservation and sustainable use throughout the Namib coastal and marine ecosystems rooted in under- and un-protected biodiversity hotspots. These activities will be complemented by MET's SPAN Project, which addresses management and sustainability issues in targeted national terrestrial parks.<sup>6</sup>

The Project, through this component, will focus on a combination of coastal and marine biodiversity priority sites:

1. Terrestrial coastline hotspots that are currently under-protected or un-protected including Ramsar sites and other wetlands of biodiversity value that lack tools for management; and
2. The creation of marine protected areas; though none currently exist, they are urgently needed and other unprotected islands and near-shore sites.

*Primary target group:*

Local, regional and national government (MET, MAWRD, MFMR, MME, MWTC) involved in CZM, local communities and private sector around biodiversity hotspots.

*Sub-components:*

III.1. Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Management Plans

III.2. Implementation of Priority Actions under the Management Plans

*Specific outcomes:*

- (i) Strengthened and mainstreamed network of coastal and marine conservation areas with defined and improved management plan and under implementation.
- (ii) Enhanced biodiversity status in critical ecosystems of Namibia's coastal and marine area.
- (iii) Co-management of conservation areas (including buffer zones) consistent with conservation and sustainable uses objectives.

#### **Component 4: Project Management and Performance Monitoring**

*Sector issue addressed, expected outcome and main activities:*

This component reflects the incremental need for an operational project coordination structure. The Project, through this component, will support the establishment and operationalization (through staffing, office infrastructure and Project management-related capacity building) of a slim Project Management Unit (PMU) housed in the Erongo Regional Council. The Erongo Regional Council hosts currently the ICZMC Secretariat as well as the NACOMA preparation coordinator.

*Primary target group:*

Project Management Unit staff.

*Sub-components:*

IV.1. Project Office and Management

IV.2. Project Reporting and Information

*Specific outcomes:*

A successful Project implementation according to Project Implementation Manual, EMP and annual work plans.

A.4. Project Location and salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (see map attached):

The following proposed definition of an intervention zone aims to provide a workable scale for coastal planning and management, in particular related to aquaculture expansion, terrestrial mining concessions, downstream fish processing, expansion of settlements, salt refining, tourism and agriculture upstream from important river mouths.

NACOMA's proposed intervention area runs the full length of the coast, from the median line of the Kunene River to the **north** to the Orange River Mouth to the **south**. These correspond to Namibia's existing international boundaries. The western and eastern boundaries have been defined to include all identified biodiversity hotspots, critical species habitats, coastal ecosystems and distinctive coastal landscapes, and include the main areas where current and predicted activities and development cumulatively impact on coastal ecological function and biodiversity. At sea (**western** boundary), the NACOMA intervention area follows an internationally-recognized boundary (territorial sea at 12 nautical miles) as it is extensive enough to include the biodiversity-rich near-shore islands and rocks to the north and south of Lüderitz, including the furthest one (Hollams Bird Island, 10.7 nautical miles from land). It also encompasses the areas most likely to be affected by the mainly near-shore activities and processes identified during NACOMA Project preparation, e.g., shore- and shallow-water diamond mining out to a depth of 150m. This provisional limit will be re-assessed during the first year of NACOMA implementation to take account of possible coastal impacts from offshore oil drilling, fisheries and other processes or activities in the EEZ, as well as marine impacts from coastal activities. On land (**eastern** boundary), the intervention area will be delimited by the eastern boundary of coastal urban municipalities and outside urbanized, by an arbitrary line around 2-3 km from the coast. This needs to be adjusted to take in fragile habitats (e.g. unprotected dune belts) as well as important landscape features. In estuaries and river mouths, areas of jurisdictional and management uncertainty, the boundary will need to extend at least to the limit of salinity and if necessary, further inland. The riparian 'strip' will be broad enough to include associated wetlands and fragile watersheds and areas subject to riparian mining concessions or major agriculture. One option would be to follow the boundaries of local authorities with territory adjacent to these rivers.



<b>B. Check Environmental Category A <input type="checkbox"/>, B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>, C <input type="checkbox"/>, FI <input type="checkbox"/></b>		
<i>Comments:</i>		
<b>C. Safeguard Policies Triggered</b>		
	Yes	No
<a href="#">Environmental Assessment (OP/BP/GP 4.01)</a>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<a href="#">Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<a href="#">Pest Management (OP 4.09)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<a href="#">Cultural Property (draft OP 4.11 - OPN 11.03-)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<a href="#">Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<a href="#">Indigenous Peoples (OD 4.20)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<a href="#">Forests (OP/BP 4.36)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<a href="#">Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4.37)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<a href="#">Projects in Disputed Areas (OP/BP/GP 7.60)*</a>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<a href="#">Projects on International Waterways (OP/BP/GP 7.50)</a>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

---

\* *By supporting the proposed project, the Bank does not intend to prejudice the final determination of the parties' claims on the disputed areas*

## Section II – Key Safeguard Issues and Their Management

### *D. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues.*

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

**Environmental.** The classes of eligible micro-activities under component 3 together with the list of ineligible activities, identified by stakeholders during project preparation, indicate project-funded activities that are likely to have no adverse impacts on the environment, or minimal impacts that are site-specific, easy to mitigate, and technically and institutionally manageable. These activities will largely focus on biodiversity conservation and rehabilitation, sustainable use of prioritized ecosystems, targeted IEC activities and targeted research activities, all supporting the project's aim to positively affect the environment. However, as small-scale physical works may be funded by the project, NACOMA is classified as an environmental safeguard category "B" project. As a consequence, an EMP was requested by ASPEN to ensure that the project's on-the-ground activities are carried out in line with World Bank EA Policy OP4.01 and similar Namibian EA requirements, and to ensure that all possible negative impacts are considered and mitigation measures are spelled out prior to the implementation of any on-the-ground activities.

**Social.** Following comments made during Project preparation regarding the possibility of involuntary resettlement (OP 4.12) following the establishment of new protected areas, it has been concluded that the recipient should prepare no process framework at this stage. This conclusion was based on the following:

- i. The purpose of OP 4.12 is largely served by the Project's Participation Plan (PPP), which provides for full and informed participation by all stakeholders, including minority groups, in the development of management arrangements for the coastal resources, such as designation of new protected areas, if any, and changes in the uses and restrictions of those that already exist.
- ii. It is not certain whether the project will even include any activities that would necessitate a process framework.

It was further agreed that in the unlikely event where any such activities be included in the project, the PPP could be supplemented with additional elements of a process framework, specific to the particular area in which access is to be restricted. These would consist of: (a) a process whereby compensatory measures will be formulated and agreed on for persons whose livelihoods are adversely affected; (b) grievance procedures; (c) legal/administrative procedures; and (d) monitoring arrangements.

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

Project-funded activities are likely to have no adverse impacts on the environment, or minimal impacts that are site-specific, easy to mitigate, and technically and institutionally

manageable.

D.3. Describe the treatment of alternatives (if relevant).

N/A

D.4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.

The recipient has prepared an Environmental Management Plan (EMP), which was reviewed and approved by ASPEN, and will be disclosed at the World Bank InfoShop and in-country prior appraisal. The EMP has been developed on the basis of preparatory stakeholder workshops held during project preparation in Namibia, review of documents relating to the NACOMA project, World Bank EA Policy OP4.01 and similar Namibian EA requirements, and consultations with key stakeholders in the coast.

To ensure that the intent of OP 4.12 is indeed carried out through the PPP, an additional item will be built into the PPP and implementation arrangements. That will be a grievance or appeals process, with an agency identified to receive appeals (the Project Management Unit), in case there is a group of stakeholders that feels its interests are being curtailed by a restriction on access, and that the additional elements of a process framework should be formulated and agreed on. If the complainant is not thus satisfied, he or she would then have recourse to a disinterested agency that has responsibility for protecting the rights of citizens in the area. Bank supervision will include a special effort to determine whether any such situations have emerged and, if so, whether they have been properly handled according to OP 4.12.

The Government of Namibia, specifically the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, has gained experience with applying safeguard policies for project development based on another recently approved project (the Integrated Community-based Ecosystem Management – ICEMA project), for which an Environmental and Social Assessment and Management Plan, a Resettlement Policy Framework, and a Indigenous Peoples Development Plan were prepared and disclosed by the MET. Adequate technical and legal capacity and expertise exist in Namibia for developing mitigation and management plans, as well as relevant environmental monitoring.

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

As described in section A.3 (Project Description), key stakeholders are National (mainly MET, MFMR, MME, MAWRD, MWTC, MRGLH), regional and local governments involved in CZM, as well as the private sector around biodiversity hotspots. Additional key players in the project are research institutions, which will be considered as members of a newly established CZ scientific group, providing technical input to the SC as well as training institutions, CBOs and NGOs.

The mentioned above, stakeholders have taken an essential role in project design through numerous meetings and workshops, in which project design was decided upon and related decisions took place. To ensure that the project engages in effective information

dissemination, consultation, and stakeholder participation during implementation, a Project Participation Plan (PPP), describing stakeholder involvement and participation processes per component, will be finalized during project appraisal, following which it will be disclosed in country and integrated into the PIM. A draft annex describing the PPP is available and is annexed to the Project Document.

<b><i>F. Disclosure Requirements Date February 22, 2005</i></b>		
<i>Environmental Management Plan:</i>		
Date of receipt by the Bank	01/13/2005	
Date of “in-country” disclosure	02/25/2005 (anticipated)	
Date of submission to InfoShop	02/25/2005 (anticipated)	
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors		
Not Applicable		
<i>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process:</i>		
Date of receipt by the Bank	Not Applicable	
Date of “in-country” disclosure	Not Applicable	
Date of submission to InfoShop	Not Applicable	
<i>Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework:</i>		
Date of receipt by the Bank	Not Applicable	
Date of “in-country” disclosure	Not Applicable	
Date of submission to InfoShop	Not Applicable	
<i>Pest Management Plan:</i>		
Date of receipt by the Bank	Not Applicable	
Date of “in-country” disclosure	Not Applicable	
Date of submission to InfoShop	Not Applicable	
<i>Dam Safety Management Plan:</i>		
Date of receipt by the Bank	Not Applicable	
Date of “in-country” disclosure	Not Applicable	
Date of submission to InfoShop	Not Applicable	
If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why.		
Not applicable		
<b>Section III – Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level</b>		
<b>(To be filled in when the ISDS is finalized by the project decision meeting)</b>		
<b><i>OP/BP 4.01 - Environment Assessment:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	X	
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit review and approve the EA report?		No
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	X	
<b><i>OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?		X
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?		N/A
<b><i>OP 4.09 - Pest Management:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?		N/A
Is a separate PMP required?		N/A
If yes, are PMP requirements included in project design?		N/A
<b><i>Draft OP 4.11 (OPN 11.03) - Cultural Property:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>

Does the EA include adequate measures?		N/A
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on physical cultural resources?		N/A
<b><i>OD 4.20 - Indigenous Peoples:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Has a separate indigenous people development plan been prepared in consultation with the Indigenous People?		N/A
If yes, then did the Regional Social Development Unit review and approve the plan?		N/A
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit?		N/A
<b><i>OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Has a resettlement action plan, policy framework or policy process been prepared?		N/A
If yes, then did the Regional Social Development Unit review and approve the plan / policy framework / policy process?		N/A
<b><i>OP/BP 4.36 – Forests:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?		N/A
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?		N/A
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?		N/A
<b><i>OP/BP 4.37 - Safety of Dams:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Have dam safety plans been prepared?		N/A
Have the TORs as well as composition for the independent Panel of Experts (POE) been reviewed and approved by the Bank?		N/A
Has an Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) been prepared and arrangements been made for public awareness and training?		N/A
<b><i>OP 7.50 - Projects on International Waterways:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Have the other riparians been notified of the project?		N/A
If the project falls under one of the exceptions to the notification requirement, then has this been cleared with the Legal Department, and the memo to the RVP prepared and sent?		N/A
What are the reasons for the exception?		N/A
Please explain:		
Has the RVP approved such an exception?		N/A
<b><i>OP 7.60 - Projects in Disputed Areas:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Has the memo conveying all pertinent information on the international aspects of the project, including the procedures to be followed, and the recommendations for dealing with the issue, been prepared, cleared with the Legal Department and sent to the RVP?		N/A
Does the PAD/MOP include the standard disclaimer referred to in the OP?		N/A
<b><i>BP 17.50 - Public Disclosure:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?		Not yet

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?		Not yet
<b><i>All Safeguard Policies:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of the safeguard measures?	X	
Have safeguard measures costs been included in project cost?	X	
Will the safeguard measures costs be funded as part of project implementation?	X	
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures?	X	
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?		Not yet
<i>Signed and submitted by:</i>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Date</u>
Task Team Leader:	Christophe Crepin	
Project Safeguards Specialist:	John A. Boyle	
<i>Approved by:</i>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Date</u>
Regional Safeguards Coordinator:	Thomas E. Walton	
Comments:		
Sector Manager:	Richard G. Scobey	
Comments:		