

**COMBINED PROJECT INFORMATION DOCUMENTS / INTEGRATED
SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET (PID/ISDS)
ADDITIONAL FINANCING**

Report No.: PIDISDSA17495

Date Prepared/Updated: 02-May-2016

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country:	Nigeria	Project ID:	P157898
		Parent Project ID (if any):	P090644
Project Name:	Community and Social Development AF-2 (P157898)		
Parent Project Name:	Community and Social Development Project (P090644)		
Region:	AFRICA		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	20-Apr-2016	Estimated Board Date:	07-Jun-2016
Practice Area (Lead):	Social Protection & Labor	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	Other social services (56%), Public administration- Other social services (25%), General education sector (7%), General water, sanitation and flood protection sector (6%), Rural and Inter-Urban Roads and Highways (6%)		
Theme(s):	Other social protection and risk management (50%), Social Protection and Labor Policy & Systems (25%), Participation and civic engagement (13%), Rural services and infrastructure (12%)		
Borrower(s):	Coordinating Ministry of Finance and Economy		
Implementing Agency:	Federal Ministry of Finance		
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?			Yes
Financing (in USD Million)			
Financing Source		Amount	
BORROWER/RECIPIENT		0.00	
International Development Association (IDA)		75.00	
Total Project Cost		75.00	
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Appraisal Review	The review did authorize to proceed with Negotiations, in principle		

Decision (from Decision Note):	
Other Decision:	
Is this a Repeater project?	No

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

Nigeria is of central importance to achieving political stability and sustained economic growth in West Africa and the African continent. Despite healthy economic growth over the past decade, the recent oil price shock and the Boko Haram (BH) insurgency in the Northeast have contributed to a slow-down in the Nigerian economy. GDP growth averaged 5.3 percent during 2011-2014, and was recorded at 6.2 percent in 2014, with most contributions coming from manufacturing, construction, trade, and services. Nigeria's economy grew at only 2.8 percent in 2015.

States in Nigeria have been adversely affected by the combination of the recent oil price shock and the Boko Haram insurgency. Nigerian states are heavily dependent on Federation Account (mostly oil) allocations where almost 85 percent of their revenues come from Federation Account allocations. Most states have had to reduce the size of their budgets and a total of 25 out of 36 states passed 2015 budgets that were on average 10 percent below those approved in 2014. This situation resulted in a number of states accumulating salary arrears, prompting the Federal Government to put together a financial bailout package. In the conflict-affected Northeast of Nigeria, this situation has severely curtailed the ability of the 6 states of Borno, Yobe, Adamawa, Taraba, Bauchi and Gombe to meet the large humanitarian demand from Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and to deliver basic social such education, health and to restore essential infrastructure.

The Boko Haram insurgency in Northeast Nigeria is affecting the poor and the vulnerable population in the Northeast. The BH insurgency which unfolded at a time of severe fiscal crisis and a decline in the Nigerian economy has disrupted economic and social activities and has negatively affected the productive capacity, employment, and livelihoods of over 6 million people. The Northeast states were unevenly affected with Borno, Yobe and Adamawa severely impacted while Bauchi, Gombe and Taraba mainly bearing the humanitarian and economic burden of the spill-over of IDPs into their administrative boundaries. Furthermore, the economic impact of the insurgency has also transcended the geographic borders of the country, impairing cross-border trade with Niger, Chad and Cameroon which has long been strong in the Northeast region.

Also, regional trade between Lake Chad Basin countries and Nigeria has been largely affected leading in some areas to shortages of food items and other commodities and variability in prices. The Nigerian military has recently recorded several key counter-insurgency successes recapturing all the territories occupied by Boko Haram. A regional offensive in late 2015 led by joint forces from Nigeria, Niger, Chad and Cameroun drove Boko Haram from much of the territory it held in Northeast Nigeria. However, the militants have since struck back with suicide bombings and hit and run attacks on civilians, threatening livelihoods and hindering aid agencies' efforts to deliver

food.

Sectoral and institutional Context

The human, social and economic losses resulting from the BH insurgency are overwhelming. The insurgency has led to the loss of over 20,000 lives, the displacement of over 1.8 million people (nearly 80 percent were women, children and youth), and the complete destruction of entire towns and villages. The conflict has disrupted economic and social activities and has negatively affected the productive capacity, employment, and livelihoods of over 6 million people. This situation has exacerbated the existing socio-economic disparities in the Northeast and has further added a burden on a population already considered among the most vulnerable in the country. The conflict has also triggered a humanitarian crisis with displacement increasing the population's vulnerability to sexual and gender based violence. A number of areas in the Northeast remain fragile experiencing sporadic terrorist attacks, thus discouraging the return of IDPs and refugees. Also, the severe damage to infrastructure and social facilities added to the protracted disruption of educational and health services has negatively affected the developmental outcomes of an entire generation.

The region has witnessed a 20-30 percent decrease in crop yields and declining livestock productivity. The amount of land being used to grow food has dropped by almost 70 per cent over the past year as violence disrupted farming activities. Livestock was significantly reduced following major thefts by Boko Haram insurgents as well as through displacement loss where cattle had to be left behind. Limited food availability and restricted access to farms and markets in Borno, Yobe and Adamawa have generated acute food insecurity in a number of localities during the lean period. As a result, food insecurity has increased dramatically among the IDPs but also within the host communities, according to FAO. An increasing number of IDPs in the northeast living with host families are moving to camps as food becomes increasingly scarce.

It is estimated that the region suffered from an accumulated output loss of US\$ 8.3 billion between 2011 and 2015. Borno State alone suffered from the largest loss as output fell by US\$ 3.5 billion between 2011 and 2015, while food prices rose by nearly 7.5 percent. The combination of output loss and increase in prices implies a significant reduction in welfare of the people. Poverty rates rose from 47.3 percent in 2011 to 50.4 percent in 2013. The recently completed Northeast Nigeria Recovery and Peace Building Assessment (RPBA) estimates nearly US\$ 9.0 billion in damages across all six states. Two-thirds of the damages are in Borno (US\$ 5.9 billion), the most affected state, followed by Adamawa (US\$ 1.6 billion) and Yobe (US\$ 1.2 billion). The impacts on agriculture (US\$ 3.5 billion) and housing (US\$ 3.3 billion) make up three-quarters of the overall impacts.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Original Project Development Objective(s) - Parent

Development objectives. The project development objective is to sustainably increase access of poor people to social and natural resource infrastructure services. The key performance indicators are: - Increased number of poor people (of which 70% are women) with access to social services. - Increased number of poor people with access to natural resources infrastructure services. - Increased percentage of participating Local Governments that are incorporating Community development plans in their budget.

Current Project Development Objective(s) - Parent

The project development objective is to increase access by the poor to improved social and natural resource infrastructure services in a sustainable manner throughout Nigeria.

Proposed Project Development Objective(s) - Additional Financing

The new PDO is to increase access by the poor to improved social and natural resource infrastructure services in a sustainable manner throughout Nigeria and particularly by internally displaced people and vulnerable individuals and communities in the North East of Nigeria.

Key Results

Development objective indicators:

1. Poor communities with access to social services (of which IDPs constitute more than 10% of residents)
2. Poor communities with access to natural resource management services (of which IDPs constitute more than 10% of residents)
3. Annual Local Government budget in participating States incorporating community development plans increases yearly
4. Direct project beneficiaries, including IDPs (measured by the number of poor people with access to social services)

D. Project Description

The proposed additional credit would will support the provision of public goods, social and economic infrastructure, as well as natural resource management infrastructure services and the utilization of such services by all community members, as well as special considerations for groups of the poor and vulnerable including settlers such as IDPs in host communities and the poor in host communities themselves.

The ongoing project has four components. Component 1 involves Federal coordination with a continued focus on CDD policy and strategy assessment and formulation, technical support, monitoring and impact evaluation. Components 2 (State level coordination), 3 (Community Driven Investment) and 4 (Support to the vulnerable groups) will remain as in the current project, however, the additional resources will go only to the North East States mainly for Components 3 and 4 and the focus will be on the communities mostly affected by the recent conflict and terrorist attacks, targeted vulnerable groups of households (IDPs, returnees and host families) in the poor communities. The use of local support groups to assist the targeted groups and communities in articulation and implementation of the interventions will also be explored.

Component Name

Component 1: Overall Project Support and Coordination

Comments (optional)

Component Name

Component 2: Capacity Building and Partnerships Development in State Ministries and LGAs

Comments (optional)

Component Name

Component 3: Community-Driven Investments Facility

Comments (optional)

Component Name

Component 4: Vulnerable IDP Groups Investments Facility

Comments (optional)

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

One Federal unit and about 28 States Agencies in Nigeria: in Abia, Adamawa, Anambra, Bayelsa, Bauchi, Benue, Borno, Cross River, Ebonyi, Ekiti, Enugu, Gombe, Imo, Jigawa, Kaduna, Katsina, Kebbi, Kogi, Kwara, Nasarawa, Niger, Ondo, Ogun, Osun, Oyo, Plateau, Taraba, Yobe and Zamfara. Sub-projects are expected to be small in size and site-specific.

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Joseph Ese Akpokodje (GEN07)

Michael Gboyega Ilesanmi (GSU01)

II. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

The CSDP additional finance would operate at two levels: Federal, and State. At the Federal level, the Coordination and Program Support Component 1 - will be supervised by Federal Ministry of Finance through a restructured Federal Project Support Unit. The restructured Federal Project support unit (FPSU), reporting to the FMF, will be responsible for implementation of the activities at the Federal level of the project. There is also a multisectoral Program Advisory Committee chaired by the FMF and serviced by the FPSU. The FPSU will be the collaboration point for the various Federal Sectoral Ministries to mainstream support for the CDD agenda, such as NAPEP, National Bureau of Statistics, National Planning Commission, Ministries of Women Affairs, Environment, Intergovernmental affairs (for Local Govt.), Education, Health, Water Resources.

At the State level, the State Government Agency set up by law, or any act of the Government in agreement with the World Bank is responsible for implementing the capacity building and partnership, community investment and vulnerable groups investment components (Component 2, 3, & 4). The State Agency will continue to work in collaboration with the FPSU/FMF, but operate independently. As in the parent project the State Agency will have an advisory board or a technical committee and a Management Unit. The Board will include representatives from civil society and the government. The management unit headed by a General Manager who will supervise activities of staff within 3 major departments of the Agency: via: Operations, Finance and Administration, and Monitoring and Evaluation. The law or agreement used in establishing the agency will insulate the agency and specifically the management unit from undue political or administrative interference.

III. Safeguard Policies that might apply

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	<p>Eligible activities in the CDPs include, among others, rehabilitation, extension or construction of primary schools, health centers, water points, water reservoirs; drifts and stock routes, boreholes; and small socio-economic infrastructure for community use (public goods) such as markets and storage; vocational training centers (skill development centers); and natural resource management facilities such as community reforestation, woodlots or community-managed measures for firewood utilization or planting of windbreaks, physical and biological measures for lowering soil erosion and environmental degradation, community sanitation, including treatment of human and livestock waste, agro-forestry, water catchments systems, drainage systems or local management of solid wastes; and community energy efficiency, including promotion of equitable access to energy-efficient stoves or biogas pits.</p> <p>Due to the anticipated potential environmental and social impacts that may result from the implementation of the above project activities, OP/BP 4.01 is triggered. However, the exact locations of the proposed projects are not known in sufficient details at the time of project preparation. The project's original Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has been updated.</p>
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	<p>The conservation of natural habitats, like other measures that protect and enhance the environment, is essential for long-term sustainable development. The Bank does not support projects involving the significant conversion of natural habitats unless there are no feasible alternatives for the project and its siting, and comprehensive analysis demonstrates that overall benefits from the project substantially outweigh the environmental costs. If the environmental assessment indicates that a project would significantly convert or degrade natural habitats, the project includes mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank. Such mitigation measures include, as appropriate, minimizing habitat loss (e.g. strategic habitat retention and post-development restoration) and establishing and maintaining an ecologically similar protected area. The Bank accepts other forms of mitigation measures only when they</p>

		are technically justified. Should the sub-project-specific ESMPs indicate that natural habitats might be affected negatively by the proposed sub-project activities with suitable mitigation measures, such sub-projects will not be funded under the CSDP AF. The ESMF includes preliminary measures for avoiding or mitigating impacts on natural habitats.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	This policy applies to the following types of Bank-financed investment projects: (a) projects that have or may have impacts on the health and quality of forests; (b) projects that affect the rights and welfare of people and their level of dependence upon or interaction with forests; and (c) projects that aim to bring about changes in the management, protection, or utilization of natural forests or plantations, whether they are publicly, privately, or communally owned. The Bank does not finance projects that, in its opinion, would involve significant conversion or degradation of critical forest areas or related critical habitats. If a project involves the significant conversion or degradation of natural forests or related natural habitats that the Bank determines are not critical, and the Bank determines that there are no feasible alternatives to the project and its siting, and comprehensive analysis demonstrates that overall benefits from the project substantially outweigh the environmental costs, the Bank may finance the project provided that it incorporates appropriate mitigation measures. Sub-projects that are likely to have negative impacts on forests will not be funded under CSDP AF project. As the AF is financing some community forestry sub-projects, the ESMF includes measures for managing forests sustainable.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	The project does not raise potential pest management issues or finance the development the procurement of pesticides, pesticide application equipment or the use of pest management practices.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	The project does not trigger this policy as there are no physical cultural assets in the project area and the project will not finance works that affect or involve them.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	There are no indigenous peoples in the project area.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/ BP 4.12	Yes	The project interventions will avoid where possible adverse impacts on people, land and other economic resources and livelihoods. In situations where this

		cannot be avoided, the borrower will, based upon the principles and objectives spelt out in the updated Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF), prepare site specific Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) to address the needs of persons who will be affected by loss of economic activities, land acquisition and/or relocation. The preparation of these safeguards documents will be inclusive and participatory, promoting community ownership and social accountability. The RAPs will be reviewed and cleared by both the project safeguards team and the Bank. The RPF of CSDP was revised for the Additional Financing 1 to address potential adverse social and environmental impacts of the new component 4I. The RPF has been revised and updated to cover the interventions of and states in which the proposed AF 2 will be implemented.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	NA
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	NA
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	NA

IV. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

<p>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</p> <p>The project is categorized as B and OP 4.01 ? Environmental Assessment and OP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement are triggered. The type of activities to be supported under Components 3 and 4 include, among others, rehabilitation, extension or construction of primary schools, health centers, water points, water reservoirs; drifts and stock routes, boreholes; and small socio-economic infrastructure for community use (public goods) such as markets and storage; vocational training centers (skill development centers); and natural resource management facilities. None of these activities are expected to generate substantial adverse social and environmental impacts. To date, the vast majority of sub-projects have been micro-projects for which environmental and social measures have been prepared, based on the ESMF, however no Resettlement Plan been prepared till date.</p> <p>In the meantime, since the range, scale, locations and number of micro-projects will emerge from the participatory process, the environmental and social impacts of the micro projects, as well as possible negative impacts in terms of environmental degradation, land acquisition, loss of economic activities and/or possible displacement are not known. Therefore, the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) for the Additional Financing have been updated.</p>
<p>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</p>

No long term or cumulative negative environmental and social impacts of sub-projects are envisaged.
3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.
No alternatives have been considered.
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>As with the parent project and the AF1, the exact locations and the types of activities that will be funded under the AF 2 project are not yet known in sufficient details. To this end, the existing ESMF has been updated to include the geographic coverage of the NE and the improved livelihood aspect of the AF project. Two instruments namely: (i) An Environmental Management Framework (ESMF) and a (ii) Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) have been updated to include the geographic coverage of the NE.</p> <p>a) Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01): Safeguards policy OP 4.01 is triggered, in component 3 and 4, and since the exact locations and impacts of the sub-projects have not been identified; the original ESMF has been updated. The ESMF ensures that the principles and procedures for the development of in-country capacity and compliance with local regulations are established and it serves as the basis for environmental assessment of all micro-projects to be carried out under the CSDP ?AF project. The ESMF provides guidance for preparation of ESIA's, ESMPs, and environmental audits. It includes a screening process that is consistent with both World Bank operational policies and Nigeria Environmental regulations, and a chapter on project processing that describes the responsibilities.</p> <p>As in the parent project, the additional financing is a Category B project, resulting from the site specific environmental and social impacts associated with small infrastructure projects associated with the CDD micro-projects. The micro-projects have been implementing environmental and social measures, based on the ESMF. For the AF, the environmental and social micro-projects are expected to be minimal, site specific and manageable to an accepted level. However, in those cases where environmental impacts are more substantial, ESIA's and/or ESMPs will be prepared, consulted upon and disclosed.</p> <p>An environmental safeguards audit was prepared for the parent project to ascertain how well the ESMF and RPF instruments have been complied with and to identify recent challenges in safeguards implementation with the aim of proffering solutions to such challenges and providing guidance for improvement where necessary. This audit carried out in the 26 CSDP rated the project?s performance with respect to environmental safeguards compliance as credible and satisfactory. In the audit, reference was made reference to the use of a limited safeguard instrument used to assess the development of a CDD project for the Bembridge in Cross River State that attracted criticism from some stakeholders because of concerns about induced impacts (e.g. logging, poaching) on two parks. However, the appropriate instrument, an ESIA, has been prepared for the CDD project with an ESMP that prescribed appropriate mitigation measures that are now been implemented. The ESIA, following consultation with stakeholders, has been disclosed. The environmental audit has also been disclosed.</p> <p>The audit also recommended the following: (i) Two additional safeguard policies namely, OP 4.36 ? Forests, and OP 4.04 ? Natural Habitat should be included to the already triggered safeguard instruments - OP 4.01 ? Environmental Assessment and OP 4.12 ? Involuntary Resettlement; (ii)</p>

Adequate provision should be made for the implementation of safeguards instruments in the various states through such capacity-building measures as training; and (iii) Adequate site visits to administer the adequate safeguards instrument for each CDD project.

(b) Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12): OP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement is triggered. To date, no RAPs have been prepared; the safeguards audit of CSDP (parent project) implementation confirmed that there have been no instances of Involuntary Resettlement. Most micro-projects have not involved land take; in some cases, communities have voluntarily donated community land for the micro- projects. However, since the range, scale, locations and number of micro-projects will emerge from the participatory process, the social impacts of the micro projects, as well as possible negative impacts in terms of land acquisition, loss of economic activities and/or possible displacement are not known. Therefore, the borrower has updated the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF), in line with national and World Bank policies. This instrument will guide implementation under the project. RAPs will be prepared, consulted upon and disclosed as and when necessary. The environmental audit has confirmed the adequacy of the safeguards instruments and approach. The safeguards implementation capacity for the project states and LGAs will be reinforced and strengthened in both existing and new project sites while any new state joining the project will be required to set up a safeguards unit in the PIU.

Consultation Process: Stakeholder consultation was carried out during project preparation, however, additional consultations and more detailed assessment will be carried out as needed in the course of the selection of specific project sites. The safeguards instruments (ESMF and RPF) for the parent project and AF1 has been updated by the Borrower according to National and World Bank policies and disclosed in-country in Nigeria and in the World Bank's InfoShop. The Environmental Safeguards Audit for the parent project has also been disclosed in-country and in the World Bank's Infoshop

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

The key stakeholders are the Federal Project Support Unit, State Agencies of the 28 states that will implement the project, LGAs, NGOs, other relevant institutions and participating communities.

All the relevant stakeholders have been adequately informed of the project. There are no major concerns raised during the consultations.

Public consultation will be an on-going activity taking place throughout the entire project process. Community participation and consultation are an integral part of CDP planning process and sub-project identification and screening process

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	31-Jan-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	20-Feb-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	

Nigeria	19-Feb-2014
<i>Comments:</i> The ESMF was disclosed in 2 newspapers: "The Guardian" and "Leadership"	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	31-Jan-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	20-Feb-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Nigeria	19-Feb-2014
<i>Comments:</i> The RPF was disclosed in 2 newspapers: "The Guardian" and "Leadership"	
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 [] No [×] NA []
OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats	
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes [] No [×] NA []
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 [] No [] NA []
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement	
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes [×] No [] NA []
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [×] No [] NA []
Is physical displacement/relocation expected?	Yes [] No [×] TBD []
Provided estimated number of people to be affected	
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)	Yes [] No [×] TBD []
Provided estimated number of people to be affected	
OP/BP 4.36 - Forests	
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	Yes [×] No [] NA []

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"/>]
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"/>]

V. Contact point

World Bank

Contact: Foluso Okunmadewa

Title: Lead Specialist

Contact: Antonia T. Koleva

Title: Social Protection Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name: Coordinating Ministry of Finance and Economy

Contact: Haruna Mohammed

Title: Director, IERD

Email: ishay2k2006@yahoo.com

Implementing Agencies

Name: Federal Ministry of Finance

Contact: Abdul Karim Obaje

Title: National Coordinator, CSDP

Email: obaje@mail.ru

VI. For more information contact:

The InfoShop
The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 458-4500
Fax: (202) 522-1500
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/infoshop>

VII. Approval

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Foluso Okunmadewa, Antonia T. Koleva	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Johanna van Tilburg (SA)	Date: 03-May-2016
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Stefano Paternostro (PMGR)	Date: 03-May-2016
Country Director:	Name: Rachid Benmessaoud (CD)	Date: 05-May-2016