



Note to Task Teams: The following sections are system generated and can only be edited online in the Portal.

Project Information Document/ Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet (PID/ISDS)

Concept Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 27-Jun-2017 | Report No: PIDISDSC21833



BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country Turkey	Project ID P161915	Parent Project ID (if any)	Project Name Sustainable Cities Project 2 (P161915)
Region EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA	Estimated Appraisal Date Jan 15, 2018	Estimated Board Date Mar 15, 2018	Practice Area (Lead) Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience Global Practice
Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing	Borrower(s) ILLER BANKASI ANONIM SIRKETI	Implementing Agency Iller Bankasi	

Proposed Development Objective(s)

The Project Development Objective is to improve the access to targeted municipal services in participating municipalities and utilities.

Financing (in USD Million)

Financing Source	Amount
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	120.00
Total Project Cost	120.00

Environmental Assessment Category F-Financial Intermediary Assessment	Concept Review Decision Track II-The review did authorize the preparation to continue
--	--

Note to Task Teams: End of system generated content, document is editable from here.

Other Decision (as needed)



B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

1. **Turkey's economic performance since 2000 has been impressive, both before and after the 2008/09 global financial crisis.** Macroeconomic and fiscal stability were at the heart of its economic performance, enabling increased employment and labor incomes, making Turkey an upper middle-income country as well as the world's 17th largest economy. Poverty incidence more than halved during the 2002-14 period, from 44 percent to 18 percent of the population, and this decrease was shared across both urban and rural areas. Extreme poverty fell even faster, from 13 to 3.1 percent. During this time, Turkey witnessed dramatic urbanization, opened up to foreign trade and finance, harmonized many of its laws and regulations with EU standards and greatly expanded access to public services. Turkey quickly rebounded from the 2009 global financial crisis, enjoying high growth rates until 2015, with its GDP growing on average by 7.4 percent between 2010 and 2015, dwarfing the growth rates recorded in major peer countries. Since 2015, Turkey is facing a more challenging environment with slow growth in Europe and a deteriorating geopolitical environment in parts of Eastern Europe, Central Asia and the Middle East that negatively impacted the economy: Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) inflows to Turkey decreased from US\$17 billion in 2015 to US\$10.4 billion by 2016, and private investments were delayed. This resulted in a significantly lower growth rate of just 2.9 percent in 2016 and the non-agricultural unemployment rate rose from 12.1 percent in January 2016 to 14.3 percent in December 2016. The influx of Syrians under Temporary Protection (SuTP) reached almost three million in 2016, and created new social, economic and political demands, particularly in urban centers where the majority of SuTP are living.

2. **Domestic political developments in 2015 and 2016 presented further challenges.** National elections in June and November 2015, a change in Prime Minister and a cabinet reshuffle in May 2016, an attempted coup in July 2016, as well as changes of public officials following the coup attempt, have all affected the government's reform momentum. To address the mounting challenges, the government launched new reforms in 2016, aimed at improving the investment and business climate in Turkey. The government also continues to take action to promote savings, improve social security and pension systems, and establish a sovereign wealth fund, as well as housing and dowry account schemes. Sustained implementation of these reforms, together with further reform measures to address continuing structural vulnerabilities and revitalize private investment, will be needed for Turkey to resume its strong growth and convergence with other OECD countries.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

3. **Cities and urbanization have played a key role in Turkey's economic achievements. The urbanization process has also been inclusive with a rising share of urban growth and job creation in the country's smaller cities.** Over the course of the last 70 years, Turkey has experienced a dramatic and transformative urbanization experience. While the country's total population increased by 7.9 percent between 2007 and 2015, the urban population¹ increased by 20.4 percent during the same period. What distinguishes Turkey from many other developing countries is that it harnessed the benefits of rural-urban migration as reflected in the structural shifts during the peak period of urbanization (1960-2013). During that time, the

¹ Defined as living in settlements with a population of over 20,000



industrial and service sectors contribution to GDP rose exponentially, from 17.6 percent to 27 percent, and from 26 percent to nearly 64 percent, respectively. These structural shifts and productivity gains paid dividends for Turkish citizens over the last three decades, as per capita GDP more than doubled from \$5,986 (1980) to \$10,515 (2014²), prior to falling to \$9,125 in 2015. In addition, the period 2000-2012 witnessed a rising share of urban population growth in secondary and smaller cities like Bursa, Mersin, Kocaeli, Kayseri, and Gaziantep³. These smaller cities have created jobs at a similar rate as the three biggest cities in the country between 2010 and 2013. For example, 15.7% for Gaziantep, Balikesir, Malatya and Aydin; and 16.8% for Istanbul, Izmir and Ankara.

4. As urban population increased, cities have sprawled, exceeding their mandated boundaries, and challenges associated with quality of service and subsequent long term financial and environmental sustainability of cities have emerged. Turkey's built up area increased by 53% from 2000-2013; with the growth of secondary cities contributing disproportionately. While Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir grew at 74%, 82%, and 71% respectively; Gaziantep, Diyarbakir and Erzurum area grew by 263%, 253%, and 277%.⁴ Quality and long term financial and environmental sustainability of services such as water, sanitation services and urban transport remain a concern. In the water sector only 52% of drinkable and usable water was treated in 2010, non-revenue water is estimated at approximately 50%, and significant efficiency challenges remain in the wastewater sector⁵. In the urban transport sector expansion of public transport services remains a concern. To address required expansion of coverage and improve quality of service, cities will continue to require large-scale infrastructure investments. Coherent infrastructure planning and prioritization will be key in achieving sustainability.

5. To address these challenges, Turkey has revised national policy frameworks and legislation. Leveraging them, and addressing planning gaps, is the next step in operationalizing the sustainability agenda. In December, 2012, the Government amended the Metropolitan Municipality Law (#6360), elevating 14 cities to metropolitan status⁶, while expanding their territorial boundaries (and those of 16 existing metropolitan municipalities) to their provincial limits; thus allowing these municipalities to extend the formulation of policies and planning to the municipality's regional and economic footprint. The Government's Integrated Urban Development Strategy and Action Plan (KENTGES) 2010-2023 provides guidance on a vision and strategy for policy and plan formulation for these and other municipalities. In addition, the 'Sustainable Cities Approach for Local Administrations (SCALA)' paper (March, 2015) provides a framework for city sustainability and identifies several existing spatial and environmental planning instruments that could be used for planning for a more sustainable city. Even though Turkey has an extensive existing urban planning and regulatory framework, there are missing elements.⁷ Spatial Plans often do not contain coherent transport planning principles, ecological dimensions as well as energy efficiency considerations such as is provisioning for green space, solid waste management planning and effective GIS systems that help plan the delivery and operation/maintenance of critical infrastructure. As a result, many cities do not have well-developed, multi-year

² Current USD Dollars, Source: World Development Indicators.

³ An increase of about one percentage point for each city in its share of the urban population, source TUIK 2000 Census Data and ABPRS (2012) in Rise of the Anatolian Tigers: Turkey Urbanization Review, World Bank 2015.

⁴ Analysis of the Global Human Settlements Layer developed by the European Commission indicates that Turkey's built up area has grown by 53% between 2000 and 2013. For example, Istanbul area grew by 74%, Ankara area grew by 82%, Izmir area grew by 71%, Gaziantep area grew by 263%, Diyarbakir area grew by 253%, and Erzurum area grew by 277% (data from the Geospatial Unit of the World Bank).

⁵ Turkey 10th Development Plan. P 129

⁶ To the existing 16 metropolitan municipalities created between 1984 and 2012.

⁷ Plans are not integrated so several different plans may be produced each with its own prioritized investments. Plans are often not costed; thus reflecting a 'wishlist'. Identified planned investments are also rarely linked to an assessment of the municipal finances.



capital investment plans with a pipeline of prioritized investment projects. Ensuring comprehensive integrated planning linked to prioritized investments are key elements to long term financial and environmental sustainability of cities.

6. **Within this context, the Government of Turkey requested financing from the World Bank and the European Union for a Sustainable Cities Program.** Both the EU and the World Bank are well placed to respond to this request. The EU has a history of supporting Turkey to align with the EU environmental, climate change, energy and transport *acquis*. The World Bank brings experience in sustainable metropolitan management and planning and has had a long-term engagement in the municipal sector in Turkey.

7. **In response, a proposed program, aimed at supporting the sustainability of Turkish cities, and financed through a series of projects (SOP) was designed.** The Program's framework recognizes three dimensions of sustainability (environmental, economic/financial, and social) and also identifies spatial, environmental, and financial planning instruments that are part of a comprehensive and integrated planning process that would move cities along a sustainability spectrum from planned to healthy, and finally to smart cities.⁸ The SOP instrument is suitable as it will allow for the provision of financing to a single borrower (Ilbank) for sub-national lending to a gradual number of municipalities/utilities that are interested in a sustainable cities project approach to municipal development. It also allows all municipalities/utilities to access financing for prioritized investments for sustainable urban development on a phased-in basis and at a pace consistent with their readiness and ability to meet eligibility requirements. A first project in the series has been approved by the World Bank Board on 20 December, 2016.

Relationship to CPF

8. **The project is consistent with the proposed World Bank Group (WBG) Country Partnership Framework (CPF) for Turkey (2017-2020)**⁹. Objective 8 of the proposed CPF proposes continued WBG support to improve the sustainability and resilience of cities. Under this objective, the Sustainable Cities program aims at putting in place a cascade approach through a public-private investment coordination platform to maximize financing. The coordination platform includes a national level 'leg' that sustains constructive dialogue with the central government on policy and regulatory changes to modernize the existing municipal financing and investment framework and improve the enabling environment¹⁰.

9. It also includes a local level 'leg' that supports cities to become more creditworthy to mobilize private finance, as well as to access concessional finance and focus public funding where it is most needed. IBRD's cooperation with Ilbank to support municipalities in improving urban planning, infrastructure and capital investment planning¹¹, and efforts to strengthen municipal financial capacity (including creditworthiness)¹² are part of the local level interventions to support the Objective. These would also enable the WBG to expand its support to cities, including in frontier and underserved regions, with the ultimate cascade goal of enabling them to secure financing directly from the capital markets for their crucial infrastructure needs.

⁸ See paper on 'Sustainable Cities Approach for Local Administrations'. April 2015.

⁹ To be presented to the World Bank Group Board on August 29, 2017

¹⁰ Such as under the MFM work on Local Government Development Financing and Use of Municipal Bonds and Sukuks. and through the Turkey Municipal Finance Creditworthiness Academy Financed by PPIAF

¹¹ Supported under Component A: Sustainable Cities Planning and Management under SCP 1 and financed through EU-IPA Funds

¹² Included under the Turkey Municipal Finance Creditworthiness Academy financed by PPIAF



10. **The proposed operation aligns well with the 10th National Development Plan (2014-18), under the “Livable Spaces/Sustainable Environment” pillar and contributes to the EU IPA II “Multi-annual Action Program for Turkey on Environment and Climate Action”.** The Government Development plan calls for improvements in the structure and functioning of the development planning system by working on key issues such as spatial planning, local administrations and land and water resource management. SCP design is particularly relevant to supporting these national initiatives and objectives. EU’s IPA II Multi-Annual Action Program for Turkey is a cornerstone of the enhanced coordination between the World Bank and the EU in Turkey.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Note to Task Teams: The PDO has been pre-populated from the datasheet for the first time for your convenience. Please keep it up to date whenever it is changed in the datasheet.

11. The Project Development Objective is to improve the planning capacity of and access to targeted municipal services in participating municipalities and utilities. The PDO is identical to the Program Development Objective since each project in the series targets individual or groups of municipalities/utilities in ensuring improved efficiency and sustainability of service delivery.

Key Results (From PCN)

12. PDO Indicators will be identified based on the investments proposed under the project. Sectors eligible for investment include but are not restricted to public transport, water and sanitation, solid waste management, and energy. In the water sector, it is anticipated that the sub-borrower will be the utility company, with a guarantee provided by the municipality.

D. Concept Description

13. Operationalizing the Sustainable Cities Framework is premised on municipalities/utilities undertaking comprehensive and integrated planning (including spatial, social, environmental, and infrastructure planning) to identify investments for sustainable urban development and subsequently prioritize these investments through a Capital Investment Plan.

14. Consequently, the Program assists cities through: (a) planning for sustainable infrastructure service needs through comprehensive and integrated municipal planning; (b) developing capital investment plans linked to urban plans in an effort to mobilize long-term financing that is essential in responding to investment priorities; and (c) financing infrastructure service requirements, particularly of the new Metropolitan Municipality Law of December 2012, to expand territorial service coverage.

15. The Municipalities and Utilities targeted for intervention in this second project in the SOP would have already developed sustainable urban development plans linked to capital investment plans, or are in the process of receiving assistance in planning for sustainable urban development and in subsequently developing a capital investment plan. (Note that this could have been supported under SCP 1: Component A or by a different Donor or self-financed by the municipality).



16. Consequently, although the first project in the SOP consisted of three Components, this second project in the series is likely to consist of two Components.

17. The three components of SCP 1 included:

- a) **Component A: Sustainable City Planning and Management Systems** aimed at supporting reforms including policies and legislation that improve sustainable urban development planning including technical assistance support (i) to municipalities/utilities for planning (including urban planning and capital investment planning) and management and for the preparation of feasibility studies, environmental assessments and engineering designs for municipal sub-projects; and (ii) to Ilbank for management of the grant and capacity building;
- b) **Component B: Municipal Investments** which financed demand driven municipal investments and;
- c) **Component C** which financed Project Management.

18. It is expected that this project will consist of:

- a) **Component A – Municipal Investments** which will finance demand driven municipal infrastructure investments. Sectors eligible for investment include but are not restricted to public transport, water and sanitation, solid waste management, and energy. In the water sector, it is anticipated that the sub-borrower will be the utility company, with a guarantee provided by the municipality. The component will finance goods, works and consultant services. Participating municipalities and investments have not been identified as yet, as they must go through a screening process which was developed under SCP 1. However, Ankara, Antalya, Bolu and Mugla municipalities have indicated their interest to participate in the project.
- b) **Component B – Project Management** which will finance goods and consultancy services for project management, monitoring and evaluation, outreach and communication and hiring of local technical consultants for the engineering supervision of Component B.

Note to Task Teams: The following sections are system generated and can only be edited online in the Portal.

SAFEGUARDS

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

Participating municipalities have, as yet, not been identified as the municipality will be subject to a screening process to determine eligibility. However, Ankara, Antalya, Bolu and Mugla municipalities have indicated their interest in participating in the Project. SCP II is the second in a series of projects (SOP).

Although the physical characteristics of the sub-projects remain unknown, information provided by interested municipalities show that some sub projects may require land acquisition. Subject lands can be of private or public status. The majority of the sub projects financed under in SCP-I have avoided land acquisition through using existing rights of way, public roads or municipality owned land for the improvement or construction of infrastructure facilities.



B. Borrower’s Institutional Capacity for Safeguard Policies

The project will be implemented by Iller Bank, which has implemented Bank-financed operations, including in applying environmental and social safeguards, for over 10 years. The Environmental and Social Framework (ESMF) of the ongoing SCP I will be updated to reflect the proposed project design. As under SCP I, municipalities would be responsible for sub-project environmental and social assessments while Iller Bank exercises supervisory oversight. The proposed environmental category for the Project is Financial Intermediary (FI), since the project will be implemented by Iller Bank and subproject investments will be identified on a demand-driven basis. Category A sub-projects will be eligible for financing, as they were under SCP I. As the borrower and FI, Ilbank has gained extensive experience in implementing similar projects under the Municipal Services Project (MSP) and its AF and under SCP I. Ilbanks technical staff have attended several safeguard training programs provided by the Bank. For the proposed project, it is expected that Iller Bank will take a greater responsibility in reviewing Category B sub-project safeguards documents, with WB undertaking selective prior-reviews (first 2-3). For Category A sub-projects, it is expected that WB will review and clear all safeguards documents. A Land Acquisition and a Resettlement Policy Framework (LARPF) was prepared by Iller Bank and approved by the World Bank for the SCP I in 2016. For SCP II, the LARPF will be updated. Iller Bank staff are familiar with and have regularly applied the Bank's social safeguards policies (OP4.12). The sub-borrower municipality's eligibility to access project financing will depend on their creditworthiness (to be assessed by Iller Bank) and the inclusion of the proposed sub-project into the project investment plan of the Government of Turkey (through the Ministry of Development). The municipality's are generally well staffed with, although may sometimes lack environmental and social staff who are experienced in international standards. The Bank team will evaluate capacity during appraisal. ESIA preparation is conducted by professional independent firms (accredited by Min of Environment) and WB team will ensure that municipalities are supervising compliance with ESIA/ESMPs either hiring env&soc specialists in house or require to do this in the TOR of supervision consultants.

C. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Arzu Uraz, Social Safeguards Specialist
Esra Arikan, Social Safeguards Specialist

D. Policies that might apply

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The project will include municipal investments for the delivery of public goods, such as water, wastewater, solid waste, urban transport, energy. The impact of these investments will be largely positive. However, temporary environmental impacts (wastewater discharge, generation of dust and noise, etc.) are expected during construction and operation phases. Relevant environmental issues associated with the construction and operation of each type of subproject will be elaborated in the ESMF document to be prepared by Iller Bank and approved by the World Bank. The existing ESMF prepared for SCP-I will be used as a basis for the preparation of the ESMF for the



	<p>Project. It will be updated and further elaborated (as required) during project preparation, by taking into account the expected environmental and social impacts and mitigation measures related to sub-project investments proposed under SCP II. Moreover, the ESMF update will include potential social impacts such as social conflict, labour-influx, risks of exclusion, land acquisition etc.</p> <p>Site-specific issues/impacts will be determined by Ilbank during the screening process, as described in the ESMF. Sub-project ESIA, partial ESIA, and ESMPs will be prepared by the municipalities.</p> <p>Like in SCP-I, which is still in early implementation phase, a grievance redress and feedback mechanism will be set up to ensure that beneficiary feedback and grievances are addressed by a three-level in-country mechanism consisted of municipalities/utilities, Ilbank and its PMU, and Responsible Court of First Instance and that the actions taken are reported publically to ensure transparency and accountability. All the municipalities/utilities have their own active GRMs called 'White Tables' that tracking grievances, both online and through a toll-free number. As in SCP-I, SCP-II, will continue with the current 'White Table' mechanism in the municipalities/utilities by identifying grievances/feedback related to the sub-investments under SCP.</p>
<p>Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Although most of the sub-projects will be implemented in urban areas, the policy is triggered in the event that a project site is selected in a natural habitat as defined by the policy. The ESMF of the project will state clearly that any investment in a critical natural habitat will be ineligible and the ESMF will also stipulate that any impact on other natural habitats should be identified in the respective ESIA/partial ESIA/ESMP of the sub-project.</p>
<p>Forests OP/BP 4.36</p> <p>No</p>	<p>The proposed project will not involve any activities which would require triggering the policy. Any activity which may lead triggering this policy will be ineligible for financing and this issue will be made clear in the</p>



		ESMF document to be prepared.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	The proposed project will not involve any activities which would require triggering the policy. Any activity which may lead triggering this policy will be ineligible for financing and this issue will be made clear in the ESMF document to be prepared.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	Sub-projects have yet to be identified however, the policy is triggered. The ESMF will address the national laws and regulations concerning investments in culturally sensitive areas and will identify measures if any gaps are observed between national regulations and OP 4.11. The ESMF will include language to the effect that concerns related to physical cultural resources will be assessed in detail (if necessary) within the sub-project ESIA/ESMPs. All construction contracts with excavation works will have chance find provisions as a requirement of the contractor. Chance find procedures will be discussed in the ESMF document and sub-project environmental and social assessment documents.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	The Project will not trigger OP/BP 4.10 since there are no indigenous peoples in Turkey.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	Sub-projects are not yet identified. However social impacts are expected to be similar to those identified in SCP I. Relevant social impacts associated with the construction and operation phase of each subproject and corresponding entitlement and mitigation measures will be elaborated in the updated LARPF produced by Iller Bank and approved by the World Bank prior to appraisal. The LARPF will also clearly detail the institutional implementation arrangements between Iller Bank and the municipalities, and revise the reporting format for monitoring as necessary. The municipal investments may have temporary and permanent land acquisition, and potential minor economic resettlement impacts. Physical displacement is not expected. Site-specific impacts will be determined by Iller Bank and the municipalities, and sub-project RAPs will be prepared and implemented by the municipalities. Iller Bank will provide close support to municipalities during the RAP preparation and supervise the implementation of RAPs. Since there will not be many RAPs expected, after municipalities complete RAPs, Ilbank will review and then send to Bank's no-objection. No sub project will be initiated



unless physical and economical losses are compensated, PAPs are properly informed of the project(s) and their entitlements as well as their rights to lodge grievances. In addition, Iller Bank will ensure that vulnerable groups are identified and informed as well as ensuring that relevant stakeholders are addressed and involved throughout the project life.

Lessons Learnt from previous projects: There were two LARPFs for MSP I and the MSP AF, and sub-borrower municipalities prepared safeguards documents such as Land Acquisition Reports and Land Progress Reports in accordance with the disclosed RPFs. The sub-projects under the original financing and additional financing were primarily constructed on public land that had no social issues. In MSP AF, there were only minor land acquisition impacts necessitating private land acquisitions in Mersin and Denizli municipality sub-projects. Land acquisition and compensation processes were completed in compliance with the requirements. There was no physical resettlement in sub-projects. Iller Bank improved its safeguards implementation throughout the project and through attending various safeguards training offered by the Bank staff.

Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	Yes	Initial sub-project screening will be conducted prior to Appraisal. If it appears that identified sub-projects will depend on an upstream dam as a water resource, requirements of OP 4.37 will be followed. Prior to Appraisal, the existing procedures of dam safety of DSI (State Hydraulic Works- as the owner of water reservoirs and dams) will be assessed.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The policy on international waterways is not triggered, and there will be a positive list of hydrological basins in Turkey in the ESMF document. This will guide Iller Bank and the municipalities for the eligible locations of the municipal activities.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	

E. Safeguard Preparation Plan

Tentative target date for preparing the Appraisal Stage PID/ISDS

Sep 20, 2017



Time frame for launching and completing the safeguard-related studies that may be needed. The specific studies and their timing should be specified in the Appraisal Stage PID/ISDS

Prior to appraisal, updated ESMF, updated LARPF, and Executive Summary of ESMF will be prepared by the Borrower and sent to WB for clearance. If sub-projects are identified and detailed designs are available before appraisal, then ESIA's/RAPs will also be required prior to appraisal. Subsequently, the documents will be disclosed in country (for ESMF Executive Summary the disclosure should occur 120 days prior to the Board date) and then on Bank's external website. For disclosure of ESMF and LARPF, as per the practice under MSP-AF and SCP 1, consultations for the ESMF and LARPF could occur with borrowing municipalities during project appraisal (i.e once municipalities have been identified). The ESMF will define the consultation procedures for sub-projects according to sub-project category. For site-specific safeguards documents, public consultations will be held on ESIA's and RAPs and these documents will be disclosed in country including Ilbank website, municipality/utility website and displayed in related headmen-offices of the region where the sub-projects are located.

CONTACT POINT

World Bank

Soraya Goga, Joanna Mclean Masic
Lead Urban Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

ILLER BANKASI ANONIM SIRKETI
Necla Ackca
Project Manager
nakca@ilbank.gov.tr

Implementing Agencies

Iller Bankasi
Necla Akca
Project Manager
nakca@ilbank.gov.tr



FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

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

APPROVAL

Task Team Leader(s):	Soraya Goga, Joanna Mclean Masic
----------------------	----------------------------------

Approved By

Safeguards Advisor:	Maged Mahmoud Hamed	29-Jun-2017
Practice Manager/Manager:	David N. Sislen	29-Jun-2017
Country Director:	Johannes C.M. Zutt	03-Nov-2017

Note to Task Teams: End of system generated content, document is editable from here.