

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

Additional Financing

Report No.: PIDISDSA21768

Date Prepared/Updated: 26-Jul-2017

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country:	Lesotho	Project ID:	P162397
		Parent Project ID (if any):	P119432
Project Name:	Lesotho Smallholder Agriculture Development Project Additional Financing (P162397)		
Parent Project Name:	Lesotho Smallholder Agriculture Development Project (P119432)		
Region:	AFRICA		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	12-May-2017	Estimated Board Date:	15-Sep-2017
Practice Area (Lead):	Agriculture	Financing Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Borrower(s)	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security		
Implementing Agency	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security		
Financing (in USD Million)			
Financing Source			Amount
International Development Association (IDA)			10.00
Financing Gap			0.00
Total Project Cost			10.00
Environmental Category:	B-Partial Assessment		
Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):	The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate		
Other Decision:			
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

The Kingdom of Lesotho is a small mountainous country characterized by extensive land degradation and erratic climatic conditions. It has a population of 2.1 million people of whom around 57% live

below the poverty line and 34 percent fall below the extreme poverty line (CPF, 2016). The country is also beset with high unemployment rates and a high incidence of HIV/AIDS. This interaction of socio-economic factors and environmental constraints results in low agricultural productivity with maize yields averaging only 800 kg/ha leading to food and nutrition insecurity.

Variations in the Kingdom's topography and micro-climate shape its ecological zones—the lowlands, the foothills, the highlands, and the Senqu (Orange) River Valley. Annual precipitation is highly variable, both temporally and spatially, ranging from 500 mm to 760 mm. Temperatures are also highly variable, ranging from -10°C to 30°C . Agriculture accounts for less than 10 percent of the country's gross domestic product, but it provides employment for as many as 63 percent of the country's population. The crop sector's contribution to agriculture GDP declined by 17.2% in 2015, with the main crops of maize, sorghum, and wheat planted on more than 85 percent of the cultivated area. Livestock contributes 30 percent of total agricultural output, including domestic production of pigs and poultry and extensive production of wool and mohair on rangelands in the hill and highland areas.

The IPCC categorizes Lesotho as one of the countries highly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. The country has a temperate climate with subalpine characteristics, having four distinct seasons, and experiences regular droughts, floods, frosts, snow, hailstorms, and strong winds. Frequent droughts result in poor harvests and large livestock losses to rural farmers. Dry spells also create food shortages and can lead to an increase in invasive plants and destructive insects. Strong winds and floods also pose devastating threats to Lesotho's agricultural sector; as a result, there are large swings in output, with maize yields ranging from a high of more than 1.5 t/ha in 1977 to only 170 kg/ha in 2011.

The impact of climate change on crop and livestock production systems, and consequently livelihoods, may be severe if existing cropping and land use systems remain unchanged. Lesotho is over-reliant on rain-fed agriculture for food production and has a large rural population engaged in undiversified subsistence farming. Climate change and increasing climate variability may be reflected in reduced crop yields and increased incidence of crop failure. There is also likely to be a decrease in forage production and a decline in the carrying capacity of the rangelands, which will have negative impacts on livestock production resulting from reduced animal vigor and fertility. As animal condition deteriorates, the quality of animal products, especially wool may decline. Furthermore, there may be a higher incidence of livestock pests and diseases which will have negative implications for animal production.

Less than 1 percent of crop production in Lesotho is under irrigation and almost all subsistence and smallholder farming is rain-fed. The development of medium to larger irrigation schemes is expensive and may not be suitable due to the demanding topography and geology, and lack of local scheme management skills and experience is a serious limitation. The fragile soils also demand very careful irrigation management. Thus, while water is available, it is being allocated for other purposes and farmers have yet to productively exploit their country's water resources. Small-scale water harvesting schemes are seriously lacking and yet these remain viable adaptation options for smallholders in the face of expected climate change impacts on water resources.

The commercial farming sector in Lesotho remains underdeveloped. Full-time commercial farmers are still few in number, and specialized agribusiness firms are equally scarce. Lesotho stands in stark contrast with neighboring South Africa, where production, processing, and distribution of food is carried out by commercial producers and agribusiness firms.

Opportunities continue to exist in Lesotho for developing commercially viable smallholder agriculture.

Demographic changes, compounded by rising incomes and accelerating urbanization, and improved access to South African markets, are fueling changes in consumption patterns that are creating new opportunities for agricultural producers and processors. Local and regional demand is projected to continue to strengthen in the coming years for fresh fruits and vegetables; for meat and processed livestock products (sold through local market stalls, small and medium-scale butcheries, and large-scale meat wholesalers); for milk and dairy products; and, for processed foods and products (dried fruits, processed meat and animal feed).

Continued support to smallholders and close coordination at the national, district and community levels is still needed. Strategies for strengthening smallholder capacity must take into account the communities' stated needs and aspirations and align them with targeted innovations to create resilience and sustainability. However, guidance is needed to help farmers gradually re-orientate their farming approaches to produce for markets and to be resilient to the imminent impacts of climate change in fragile and highly vulnerable production systems.

Two options for scaling-up the SADP were considered: (i) increase counterpart funding; and (ii) seek additional IDA 17 financing. Given fiscal restrictions, the Government of Lesotho is unable to increase counterpart funding for the SADP. Therefore, additional IDA 17 financing was identified as the most appropriate mechanism to enable expansion of the SADP's activities to new districts. With the AF, the SADP's objectives, which include increasing marketed output among project beneficiaries in Lesotho's smallholder agriculture sector, can be expanded in more districts in the country, contributing to government efforts to develop smallholder agriculture. The proposed scale-up can be completed by February 28, 2020 – representing a cumulative implementation period of less than ten years. The original closing date is March 31, 2018.

The AF for the Smallholder Agricultural Development Project (SADP II) will continue to support smallholder farmers in targeted areas of Lesotho – Botha-Bothe, Leribe, Berea, and Mafeteng, rural Maseru, Mohale's Hoek, and Quthing – with the goal of helping them exploit opportunities to increase their productivity in a changing climate and diversify into market-oriented agriculture, and to improve the enabling environment for agribusiness activities. Project support will continue to be driven by market opportunities and perceived commercial viability of enterprises and products. These three additional border districts with good potential and accessibility to markets, have a rural population of almost 500,000 people (about 100,000 households); a cropped area of about 80,000 ha; and ready access to Maseru and South African markets due to their location along the border. The addition of these three districts will result in all of the more productive lowlands and foothill areas being included in the project. It is expected that at least an additional 18,000 beneficiaries will benefit from the AF in addition to the 55,000 already reached under SADP.

The overall zones of intervention for this project have been identified and prioritized to complement current activities supported under the Smallholder Agriculture Development Project (SADP) and to consolidate and support the achievements under SADP. SADP supports smallholder farmers in targeted areas of Lesotho, with the goal of helping them exploit opportunities to diversify into market-oriented agriculture. SADP is driven by market opportunities and perceived commercial viability of enterprises. The proposed Additional Financing will focus on continuing to increase the capacity of farmers in Lesotho, smallholder and commercial, to build more productive climate resilient commercial agricultural systems.

The incremental benefits of this AF are expected to be extensive. For example, by initiating the process of discussing food quality and safety standards in Lesotho, the GoL and the international community can begin to finance and provide the focused expertise and funds needed to undertake

actions in setting standards and strengthen capacity to enforce them.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

Rural and agricultural sector. Manufacturing and mining contribute the largest shares to GDP in Lesotho, but agriculture remains important as a major provider of employment and source of food. About 70-80 percent of Lesotho's people live in rural areas, and more than three-quarters of these are engaged in agriculture – mostly traditional, low input, low output, rain-fed cereal production and extensive animal grazing. In the past, remittances from mineworkers were a major source of rural livelihoods, providing vital cash needed to purchase agricultural inputs and productive assets or to invest in household assets and housing, but remittances have declined steadily over the past decade as the number of Basotho employed in the South African mining sector has declined substantially from more than 100,000 20 years ago to less than 30,000 at present. Despite the economic growth that has been achieved in recent years, income-generating opportunities remain limited and are generally confined to urban areas and wage employment in the industrial sector especially in garment production.

Because the urban economy has limited ability to absorb new labor market entrants, the rural economy in general and agriculture in particular will continue to play a major role in Lesotho's development strategy for the foreseeable future. Agricultural development faces a number of challenges; however, most significant are difficult agro-climatic conditions and limited availability of irrigable arable land. The country's limited production potential is not fully exploited due to poor farming practices, limited use of quality seeds, inappropriate crop selection and lack of diversification. Agricultural productivity is further undermined by unsustainable land management practices that in many cases have led to declining soil fertility and severe soil erosion. If agriculture were commercially viable, these constraints could likely be overcome through well-targeted investments, but the development of market-oriented crop and livestock production enterprises faces a number of constraints such as limited small-scale irrigation, lack of access to finance, and limited supply of produce of the required quality.

Institutional Context:

The successful transformation of Lesotho's smallholder agricultural sector will continue to depend on sustained support in the form of technical advisory services, improved technology, and investment capital, among other factors. This support has come from three main sources: (i) public service providers, (ii) producer organizations, trade associations, and other industry groups; (iii) NGOs and donor-funded programs. SADP II will continue to benefit from the current institutional arrangement of having the PMU embedded within the main service provider in this sector - MAFS, which has proven efficient as an implementation and communication strategy. The Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation continue to be implementing partners in NRM projects along with the Ministry of Water Affairs. Producer groups such as piggery and poultry associations, as well as wool and mohair grower's associations are also important partners and can prove instrumental in setting standards, prices and spreading knowledge towards increasing marketed output; however, much still needs to be done for this to be realized. NGOs and donors provide services in support of agricultural development. Most technological innovations continue to be introduced by both national and international NGOs, donor-funded projects and programs, and by private entrepreneurs in some cases.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Original Project Development Objective(s) - Parent

To increase marketed output among project beneficiaries in Lesotho's smallholder agriculture sector.

Current Project Development Objective(s) - Parent

Increase in marketed output among project beneficiaries in Lesotho's smallholder agriculture sector and, in the event of an Eligible Crisis or Emergency, to provide immediate and effective response to said Eligible Crisis.

Proposed Project Development Objective(s) - Additional Financing

To increase marketed output among project beneficiaries in Lesotho's smallholder agriculture sector.

Key Results

D. Project Description

The proposed AF offers a well performing vehicle to scale up smallholder agricultural productivity to other districts in Lesotho – reinforcing a key component of the CPF pillar on private sector jobs, in line with Lesotho’s National Strategic Development Plan. The AF provides combined multi-faceted support in the form of technical advisory services, improved technology, and investment capital that are key to meeting the government’s goals in the new districts. The AF will be allocated to expand project activities to three additional border districts with good potential and accessibility to markets, namely rural Maseru, Mohale's Hoek and Quthing. The addition of these three districts will result in all of the more productive lowlands and foothill areas being included in the project. It is expected that at least an additional 18,000 beneficiaries will benefit from the AF in addition to the 55,000 already reached under SADP.

Component Name:

Component 1: Increasing Agricultural Market Opportunities.

Comments (optional)

Component Name:

Component 2: Increasing Market-oriented Smallholder Production- Climate Smart Packages for Smallholders.

Comments (optional)

Component Name:

Component 3: Project Management.

Comments (optional)

Component Name:

Component 4: Contingent Emergency Response Component (CERC)

Comments (optional)

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

The activities to be financed by the Additional Financing include small-scale gravity irrigation schemes, small-scale water harvesting structures such as weirs and tanks for households or community groups, small-scale investments in livestock operations (such as piggery), cultivation of high value crops, wool and mohair production, production of tree seedlings and horticulture, processing and storage, rangeland management, climate smart agriculture, gully reclamation and catchment

conservation. Although a list of potential sub-projects is known, the specific sub-project locations are not yet known. The project is designed as demand driven and, therefore, the exact locations will only be known at the time when the applications are received by the PMU through the Competitive Grants Programme. This will take place during the implementation phase of the project.

The Additional Financing will be scaled up in three (3) additional districts which have been identified as suitable for agriculture and have good potential for accessing markets, namely (i) rural Maseru, (ii) Mophale's Hoek, and (iii) Quthing located in the southern lowlands agro-ecological zone. ..

Topographically, Lesotho is predominantly mountainous, with the mountain zone covering approximately 65% of the total land area. The land is mostly characterized by steep slopes with fragile soil formations which are extensively degraded. Only 9% of Lesotho's land is arable and over 80% of this is found in the lowlands, where it is not only used for agriculture, but rather for other purposes such as housing. They typically have rich black soils or sandy loams in the valleys where the major agricultural activities occur. The southern lowlands, where the new districts are located, are characterized by poor soils and low rainfall and cover the western part of the country, occupying about 2,700 km² which is 9% of the total surface area. Generally, the lowland soils are the duplex type which are prone to erosion, and have poor moisture retention capacity. They are thus liable to rapid loss of top soil. The region forms the main livestock grazing area in the country. Although the soils are much less susceptible to erosion, inadequate grass cover combined with the steep slopes, and torrential rains result in massive erosion in this zone. It will be important to include sub-projects that will control runoff and control soil erosion such as sustainable landscape management, gully reclamation, catchment management and small-scale infrastructure such as gabions and check dams.

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Kisa Mfalila, Social Safeguards Specialist

Majbritt Fiil-Flynn, Social Safeguards Specialist

II. IMPLEMENTATION

The AF will benefit from the institutional arrangements established under Parent Project which established a Project Management Unit (PMU) However, the capacity of the existing Project Management Unit (PMU) to implement, monitor and report on environmental and social safeguard issues during the implementation of the Parent Project was inadequate. With the guidance of the World Bank, the PMU is currently in the process of recruiting a dedicated environmental and social specialist who will oversee the screening of sub-projects to determine the level and degree of risk and impacts, ensure that site-specific ESMPs are prepared and mitigation measures are implemented, monitored and reported on in the progress reports, and which will eventually strengthen the capacity of the PMU. Further safeguard training will be provided by the World Bank staff throughout the implementation phase to ensure adequate capacity is retained.

III. SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The Additional Financing to the Lesotho Smallholder Agriculture Development Program will maintain the Environmental Category B classification of the Parent

		<p>Project. Environmental risks and impacts inherent to the agriculture and agribusiness industry are largely related to effluent discharges from use of pesticides/herbicides in controlling weed infestation, use of fertilizer to increase crop productivity, pollution of soil and water resources from runoff, occupational health and safety of workers, efficient use of water and energy resources, and solid waste disposal. The review of the ESMF of the Parent Project indicates that the instrument is adequate for the Additional Financing in terms of identifying potential environmental impacts that will likely occur from implementing the project activities, the proposed measures to mitigate the impacts and monitor the implementation, the pest management approaches to be used to ensure sustainable use of fertilizers and pesticides, and community health and safety issues. The ESMF also contains adequate and very clear screening procedures and methodologies to guide the PIU in the screening, assessment, review, approval, implementation and reporting of environmental issues for the sub-projects.</p>
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	<p>The project will not support sub-projects that have the potential to adversely alter or impact natural or critical habitats as defined under OP 4.04. Therefore, the policy is not triggered.</p>
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	<p>The project will not support sub-projects located within forested areas or plantations as defined under OP 4.36. Therefore, the policy is not triggered.</p>
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	<p>The Pest Management Policy is triggered to allow for the use of agrochemicals, as needed, using licensed professions and in a manner described in the Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP). The initial screening of the potential sub-projects to be funded under the AF, indicates that the risk of pesticides use is minor to moderate due to the small amounts of pesticides currently being used in the sub-projects of the Parent Project. The ESMF prepared for the Parent Project, incorporates an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) which provides guidance on the sustainable application of fertilizers and pesticides taking into consideration the soil type and slope to</p>

		ensure protection of watershed and groundwater. The use or purchase of significant amounts of pesticides will be excluded in the screening process described in the ESMF.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	The AF will not support physical cultural resources but in some of the districts that the project will be implemented, artifacts from historical cultural resources have been found. The ESMF of the Parent Project have included Physical Cultural Resources Chance Find procedures for handling chance finds that might occur during the implementation of the sub-projects.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	OP 4.10 is not triggered as there are no indigenous people within the project area of influence.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	It is not anticipated that there will be any land acquisitions as a direct result of the project. However, communities are expected to continue to pool their land or provide voluntary land donations of communal land. This potentially impact livelihood through affecting access, for example for grazing and water. The existing RPF will be applied to screen and guide implementation.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	OP 4.37 is not triggered as the project will not finance construction or rehabilitation of dams, nor will it rely on the performance of an existing dam or a dam under construction, as defined in the policy.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The project is not expected to affect international waterways and, therefore, OP 7.50 is not triggered.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The project will not finance any activities located in any known areas under territorial dispute as defined in OP 7.60. Therefore, the policy is not triggered.

IV. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

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

The activities to be financed by the Additional Financing include small-scale gravity irrigation schemes, small-scale water harvesting structures such as weirs and tanks for households or community groups, small-scale investments in livestock operations (such as piggery),

cultivation of high value crops, wool and mohair production, production of tree seedlings and horticulture, processing and storage, rangeland management, climate smart agriculture, gully reclamation and catchment conservation. The sub-projects are similar to those that are already being financed under the Parent Project, and therefore the AF will maintain the Environmental Category B classification of the Parent Project. Environmental risks and impacts inherent to the agriculture and agribusiness industry are largely related to effluent discharges from use of pesticides/herbicides in controlling weed infestation, use of fertilizer to increase crop productivity, pollution of soil and water resources from runoff, occupational health and safety of workers, efficient use of water and energy resources, and solid waste disposal. The anticipated risks and impacts are expected to be small-scale in nature and scope, limited to the project sites and can be addressed with known mitigation measures. Overall, there are no large scale, significant or irreversible impacts that have been identified.

The PMU will use the ESMF of the Parent Project – which describes the screening, reviewing, implementing and monitoring procedures – to assess the risks and impacts and prepare the appropriate mitigation measures during the implementation phase. Review of the ESMF of the Parent Project indicates that the instrument is adequate for the Additional Financing in terms of identifying potential environmental impacts that will likely occur from implementing the project activities, the proposed measures to mitigate the impacts and monitor the implementation, the pest management approaches to be used to ensure sustainable use of fertilizers and pesticides, and community health and safety issues. The ESMF also contains adequate and very clear screening procedures and methodologies to guide the PIU in the screening, assessment, review, approval, implementation and reporting of environmental issues for the sub-projects.

Review of the environmental performance of the Parent Project:

The team has been continuously reviewing the environmental performance the Parent Project through regular missions to the sub-project sites, and the overall environmental performance of the Parent Project is moderately unsatisfactory. Some of the issues identified under the parent project relate to, for example, improper handling of solid and liquid waste, insufficient monitoring of water access, improper handling of agrochemicals. A detailed time bound action plan has been agreed with the Borrower to remedy any environmental issues and avoid them reoccurring in the future

Climate Vulnerability

There is a need for climate vulnerability to be considered particularly during the siting of subprojects. One poultry subproject is located on a mountainside exposed to severe wind and cold, and consequently many of the chickens died. Recently, a number of horticulture tunnels were damaged due to strong winds, hail and rain, and although these conditions were reportedly a one-off event, tunnels that were located in less sheltered terrain were more severely damaged than those that were somewhat sheltered. The siting of subprojects taking into account climatic factors is therefore important in ensuring sustainability of the investments.

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

The sub-projects to be supported under the AF will not generate indirect and/or long term impacts in the sub-project areas. It is, however, anticipated that some of the sub-projects that entail landscape restoration and management, will result into long term positive and beneficial impacts.

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

In accordance with the RPF, voluntary land contributions will only be permitted where the land is communal land. If private use the communal land contributed under the project exists, then the private users must either benefit directly from project activities or be provided suitable alternatives. Such arrangements must be fully documented and are subject to informed consent procedures.

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.

The Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) prepared for the Parent Project by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security will serve as the key environmental safeguard instrument for the project. Review of the ESMF by the project team indicate that the instrument is adequate for the Additional Financing in terms of identifying potential environmental impacts that will likely occur from implementing the project activities, the proposed measures to mitigate the impacts and monitor the implementation, the pest management approaches to be used to ensure sustainable use of fertilizers and pesticides, and community health and safety issues. The ESMF also contains adequate and very clear screening procedures and methodologies to guide the PIU in the screening, assessment, review, approval, implementation and reporting of environmental issues for the sub-projects

With the guidance of the World Bank, the PMU is currently in the process of recruiting a dedicated environmental and social specialist who will oversee the screening of sub-projects to determine the level and degree of risk and impacts, site-specific ESMPs are prepared and mitigation measures are implemented, monitored and reported on in the progress reports, and which will eventually strengthen the capacity of the PMU. Further safeguard training will be provided by the World Bank staff throughout the implementation phase to ensure adequate capacity is retained. The first task to be carried out by the PMU environmental specialist will be to undertake an environmental audit for all ongoing sub-projects to assess the extent to which the World Bank Safeguard Policies are complied with and make recommendations on how environmental risks and impacts will be mitigated.

All other institutions that will be involved in implementing the AF have previously implemented World Bank funded projects or are currently involved in implementation of other World Bank programs. As such they are familiar with World Bank safeguard policies and have gained experience in the implementation and oversight of Bank projects.

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

The safeguards documents (ESMF and RPF) were subject to discussions with various groups of stakeholders at district and national level, including relevant government agencies, national and international NGOs, and farmer associations during appraisal of the original project in

2011. In addition, beneficiary farmers and communities will receive appropriate training, as they will participate in screening, verification and mitigation measures (as relevant).

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	03-May-2011
Date of submission to InfoShop	11-Jun-2011
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	30-May-2011
Date of submission to InfoShop	11-Jun-2011
"In country" Disclosure	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	30-May-2011
Date of submission to InfoShop	11-Jun-2011
"In country" Disclosure	
If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.	
If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why::	

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment						
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
OP 4.09 - Pest Management						
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>

Is a separate PMP required?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement						
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is physical displacement/relocation expected?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TBD	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TBD	<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:Ijeoma Emenanjo
 Title:Sr Agricultural Spec.

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name:Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
 Contact:Hon. Semano Sekatle
 Title:Minister Development Planning
 Email:ntebohenglaliapeng@yahoo.com

Implementing Agencies

Name:Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
 Contact:Jules Cesaire YAGANZA
 Title:Directeur du Departement Techniques Industrielles et Exploit
 Email:motselebanem@agric.gov.ls

VI. 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>

VII. Approval

Task Team Leader(s):	Name:Ijeoma Emenanjo	
<i>Approved By:</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Nathalie S. Munzberg (SA)	Date: 27-Jul-2017
Practice Manager/Manager:	Name: Mark E. Cackler (PMGR)	Date: 30-Jul-2017
Country Director:	Name:Janet K. Entwistle (CD)	Date:31-Jul-2017