

Document of
The World Bank

Report No: 60949-NA

RESTRUCTURING PAPER
ON A
PROPOSED PROJECT RESTRUCTURING
OF THE
GEF TRUST FUND GRANT NO. TF055983
FOR THE
NAMIBIAN COAST CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PROJECT
DATED: OCTOBER 17, 2005
TO THE
REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA

April 14, 2011

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

EMP	Environmental Management Plan
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEO	Global Environment Objective
ICZM	Integrated Coastal Zone Management
IP	Implementation Performance
ISDS	Integrated Safeguard Data Sheet
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
NACOMA	Namibian Coast Conservation and Management Project
NIMPA	Namibian Islands Marine Protected Area
NPC	National Planning Commission
OP/BP	Operational Policies/Bank Procedures
PCO	Project Coordinating Office
PDO	Project Development Objective
PF	Process Framework

Regional Vice President:	Obiageli Katryn Ezekwesili
Country Director:	Ruth Kagia
Sector Manager / Director:	Idah Z. Pswarayi-Riddihough
Task Team Leader:	Jean-Michel G. Pavy

NAMIBIA
NAMIBIAN COAST CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PROJECT

CONTENTS

	Page
A. SUMMARY	4
B. PROJECT STATUS.....	4
C. PROPOSED CHANGES	4

NAMIBIAN COAST CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PROJECT RESTRUCTURING PAPER

A. SUMMARY

1. This paper is in support of a Level 1 restructuring of the above referenced project. The proposed changes are (1) the triggering of a new safeguard, OP/BP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement and (2) one year extension of the closing date of the Grant Agreement to April 30, 2012. These changes will be effected through an amendment of the GEF Grant Agreement. The Government of Namibia, through the National Planning Commission (NPC) has formally requested the extension by letter dated November 8, 2010.

B. PROJECT STATUS

2. The Namibian Coast Conservation and Management Project's (NACOMA) combined Project Development Objective (PDO) and Global Environment Objective (GEO) is "*Strengthened conservation, sustainable use and mainstreaming of biodiversity in coastal and marine ecosystems in Namibia*".

3. The NACOMA is a \$28.74 million project with a grant contribution from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) of \$ 4.90 million. The GEF Grant agreement became effective on October 17, 2005. The Mid Term Review was organized from March 8 – 20, 2009. To date cumulative GEF disbursements amount to \$3.76 million with \$ 1.13 million currently undisbursed from the grant (77% overall disbursement). The Project is being implemented by a Project Coordination Office (PCO) that reports through the Director of Environmental Affairs (DEA) in the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) to the Permanent Secretary of MET as the chair of the Project's Steering Committee.

4. Overall performances regarding outcome (PDO) and implementation (IP) are rated as "Satisfactory". The Project is meeting most of its outcome targets which include, for example, a current 85% increase in km² under conservation regime; a number of important terrestrial and marine ecosystems under effective management; and 50% of coastal biodiversity better incorporated into planning, policy, institutions and investments at national, regional and local levels. There is no overdue audit.

C. PROPOSED CHANGES

Safeguards

5. This is a Category B Project. The initial design triggered OP/BP4.01 on Environment Impact Assessment. An Environmental Management Plan (EMP) was adopted to address, inter alia, the potential environmental issues that had been identified during preparation.

6. The OP/BP 4.12 on involuntary resettlement was not triggered when the Project was prepared. It was only triggered during Project implementation because of restriction

of access to natural resources due to the inclusion of new terrestrial and marine protected areas in the Project in November 2008 and February 2009. Those protected areas were proposed following the conclusion of the Project-funded Integrated Coastal Zone Management planning process. However, since the Project was not restructured at that time, the team considered that it should be done now as a condition of the requested extension of the Grant Agreement's Closing Date. A new Integrated Safeguard Data Sheet (ISDS) has been approved and disclosed to reflect the applicability of OP 4.12..

7. At the Bank's request in 2009, the recipient prepared a Process Framework (PF). The PF proposes a process that ensures that eligible affected persons are assisted in their efforts to restore or improve their livelihoods while contributing to maintain the environmental sustainability of protected areas included in the Project. It also provides a description of the institutional arrangements through which the communities will participate in the management of the natural resources and monitoring as well as criteria and procedures to be followed in case restriction of access to marine and terrestrial resources.

8. In September 2010, a Bank mission reviewed compliance with OP 4.12, particularly regarding (1) the institutional arrangements for implementation of the PF and (2) the strengthening the planning and decision-making capacity of all protected area stakeholders. The mission concluded that the PF required improvement. An up-dated and improved PF has been submitted by the Ministry of Environment to the Bank on March 24, 2011 to include: (1) reference to all terrestrial and marine protected areas to which the PF applies; (2) a specific consultation process for marine protected areas (Appendix A); (3) an update on the status of protected area management plans; (4) generic ToRs of proposed Park Consultative Fora (PCF); (5) proposed regulations for the Dorup National Park, the new park created in 2010 along the Namib coast; and (6) a monitoring plan. It was approved and disclosed in country and at INFOSHOP on April 5, 2011.

Closing date

9. Despite the satisfactory outcome and implementation performance, some key Project achievements are lagging behind and will require additional time to be fully completed. The PCO has proposed a detailed action plan with task descriptions, time lines and performance indicators. This plan has been appraised following the September 2010 mission and found acceptable by the Bank. It will allow the completion of the outstanding Project activities and achieve the intended Project outcomes.

10. The proposed one year extension of the Closing Date would be the first extension of the Project's Closing Date.

11. The extension is considered important to (1) finalize the policy and develop subsequently the legislation for integrated coastal zone management ("ICZM"), (2) finalize and disseminate a biodiversity status report and a national coastal communication and knowledge management system to support the ICZM, (3) complete micro-projects financed out of already approved matching grants, and (4) operationalize the national

coastal management mechanism, including implementation of the PF and strengthen the planning and decision-making capacity of all coastal protected area stakeholders.

12. The development of the ICZM policy was delayed due to the need to implement a detailed, comprehensive and time-consuming communication strategy that took longer than originally anticipated to implement. The communication strategy has now been completed and a draft White Paper has been submitted for final review to the MET. The final ICZM policy has been presented to the Cabinet which is expected to approve it before June 2011.

13. Two biodiversity mainstreaming and monitoring activities require additional time: (1) finalization of a biodiversity status report; and (2) completion and implementation of a knowledge management system. The assessment of existing coastal and marine biodiversity data and identification of a cost-effective data collection sharing mechanism were delayed due to capacity constraints in the PCO. This has been corrected. The PCO is now again fully staffed. A senior technical adviser and an M&E expert have been tasked with finalizing these outstanding activities.

14. Three of the six Matching Grant micro-projects, i.e. the Namib Botanical Garden, the Anieb Bird Watching Project and Protected Area Signage are currently in the process of implementation. The three other Matching Grant micro projects, the Hardap Regional Council Training and Capacity Building and Tourism Project, and particularly the Kuseb Delta Development Trust and the Khorixas Cultural and Tourism Centre are located in remote coastal areas and focus on involving local communities. Implementation of these micro-projects was delayed due to technical capacity constraints at local level which have now been overcome, i.e. at the community and Regional Council level. Also, the PCO contracted a consultant with community-driven development skills. All micro-projects have now been started. The community trusts have been established and the feasibility studies and business plans have been completed to pave way for the current implementation envisaged for completion December 2011. The implementation of the environmental management plans, facility construction and community trainings will, however, require additional time and is one major reason that a 12 month extension of the Project's Closing Date until April 30, 2012 is requested.

Restructuring	Status: Submitted to SECPO
Restructuring Type: Level one	
Last modified on date : 04/07/2011	

1. Basic Information	
Project ID & Name	P070885: NA-GEF Coast Consvr & Mgmt (FY06)
Country	Namibia
Task Team Leader	Jean-Michel G. Pavy
Sector Manager/Director	Idah Z. Pswarayi-Riddihough
Country Director	Ruth Kagia
Original Board Approval Date	09/01/2005
Original Closing Date:	04/30/2011
Current Closing Date	04/30/2011
Proposed Closing Date [if applicable]	04/30/2012
EA Category	B-Partial Assessment
Revised EA Category	B-Partial Assessment-Partial Assessment
EA Completion Date	05/17/2005
Revised EA Completion Date	

2. Revised Financing Plan (US\$m)		
Source	Original	Revised
BORR	19.64	19.64
GEFU	4.90	4.90
GFIN	2.00	2.00
GFRA	0.50	0.50
GGER	1.70	1.70
Total	28.74	28.74

3. Borrower		
Organization	Department	Location
National Planning Commission		Namibia

4. Implementing Agency		
Organization	Department	Location
Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET)		Namibia

5. Disbursement Estimates (US\$m)		
Actual amount disbursed as of 04/14/2011		3.76
Fiscal Year	Annual	Cumulative
2011	0.39	4.15
2012	0.75	4.90
	Total	4.90

6. Policy Exceptions and Safeguard Policies	
Does the restructured project require any exceptions to Bank policies?	N
Does the restructured projects trigger any new safeguard policies? If yes, please select from the checklist below and update ISDS accordingly before submitting the package.	Y

Safeguard Policy	Last Rating	Proposed
Environmental Assessment (OD 4.01)	X	X
Natural Habitats (OP 4.04)		
Forestry (OP 4.36)		
Pest Management (OP 4.09)		
Physical Cultural Resources (OP 4.11)		
Indigenous Peoples (OD 4.20)		
Involuntary Resettlement (OP 4.12)	X	X
Safety of Dams (OP 4.37)		
Projects in International Waters (OP 7.50)		
Projects in Disputed Areas (OP 7.60)		

7a. Project Development Objectives/Outcomes
Original/Current Project Development Objectives/Outcomes
Development/Global: Strengthened conservation, sustainable use and mainstreaming of biodiversity in coastal and marine ecosystems in Namibia

7b. Revised Project Development Objectives/Outcomes [if applicable]

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATASHEET
RESTRUCTURING STAGE**

I. Basic Information

Date prepared/updated: 04/07/2011

Report No.: AC6090

1. Basic Project Data

Country: Namibia	Project ID: P070885	
Project Name: Namibian Coast Conservation and Management Project		
Task Team Leader: Jean-Michel G. Pavy		
Estimated Appraisal Date: March 7, 2005	Estimated Board Date: September 1, 2005	
Managing Unit: AFTEN	Lending Instrument: Specific Investment Loan	
Sector: General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (50%); Central government administration (25%); Sub-national government administration (25%)		
Theme: Environmental policies and institutions (40%); Biodiversity (40%); Other environment and natural resources management (20%)		
IBRD Amount (US\$m.):	0.00	
IDA Amount (US\$m.):	0.00	
GEF Amount (US\$m.):	4.90	
PCF Amount (US\$m.):	0.00	
Other financing amounts by source:		
BORROWER/RECIPIENT		19.64
FINLAND, Govt. of (Except for Min. for Foreign Affairs)		2.00
FRANCE, Govt. of (Except for Min. of Foreign Affairs-MOFA)		0.50
GERMANY, Govt. of (Except for BMZ)		1.70
		23.84
Environmental Category: B - Partial Assessment		
Repeater []		
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)	Yes []	No [X]

2. Project Objectives

The combined Project development and global objective is to assist Namibia to conserve, use sustainably and mainstream the biodiversity of the Namibian coast.

Outcome indicators

OI 1. Increase in km² and number of terrestrial and marine ecosystems of biodiversity importance under effective management by year 5 compared to baseline situation.

OI 2. Increase in the number of people engaged in sustainable use activities by year 5 compared to baseline.

OI 3. Coastal biodiversity better incorporated into planning, policy, institutions and investment at national, regional and local levels by year 5 compared to baseline.

3. Project Description

The Project has four components: (i) Component 1: Policy, Legal, Institutional and Planning Framework for Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) conducive to Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use; (ii) Component 2: Targeted Capacity Building for ICZM conducive to Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use; (iii) Component 3: Targeted Investments in Critical Ecosystems for Biodiversity Conservation, Sustainable Use and Mainstreaming; and (iv) Component 4: Project Management and Performance Monitoring.

Component 1: Legal, Institutional, Policy and Planning Framework for Integrated Coastal Zone Management

The objective of this component is to fill the current gap for mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and management into policy, legal and institutional structures affecting the sustainable development of the coastal zone. Such a policy should fall within existing national, regional, local and sectoral frameworks. The Namibia Coastal Management White Paper will provide an overarching and comprehensive framework to support integrated planning and decision-making affecting coastal lands and waters, based on the carrying capacity of the Namibian coast as a whole. It will be based on a highly participatory approach involving the identified stakeholder groups in multiple consultations and meetings.

Subcomponent Intermediate Outcome Indicators:

- 1.1.1 Option Paper on policy and legal aspects developed and disseminated;
- 1.1.2 Formal determination of line ministries related to the amendment or development of new legislation and policies obtained;
- 1.1.3 ICZM legislation drafted and submitted for gazetting;
- 1.2.1 Consultative process and documentation on clarification of institutional mandates developed and implemented;
- 1.2.2 Environmental Policies and Management Plans for coastal authorities (Henties Bay, Swakopmund, Walvis Bay and Lüderitz) developed;
- 1.3.1 Coastal Policy (White paper) published and endorsed by Cabinet; and
- 1.4.1 Operational modalities for National Permanent Coastal Zone management (CZM) Mechanism developed and financial sustainability strategy and action plan related to ICZM developed and implemented.

Component 2: Targeted Capacity Building for ICZM Conducive to Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use

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

Subcomponent Intermediate Outcome Indicators:

2.1.1 Training conducted at central, regional and local levels in needed skills such as (a) Participatory approaches & mediation; (b) EIA and SEA; (c) M&E, including principles, approaches, tools (GIS and mapping) and effective data use; (d) Sustainable resource-based economic development; and (e) Law enforcement and prevention;

2.2.1 Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) and Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources agreement on coastal and marine biodiversity data hub operational;

2.3.1 Awareness about Integrated Coastal Zone management (ICZM) among line ministries, coastal Regional Councils, Local authorities and local communities increased by 70% compared to baseline; and

2.3.2 Regional coastal profiles for all 4 regions developed.

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

This component uses targeted investments and activities to address on-the-ground gaps in coastal biodiversity conservation and sustainable use throughout the Namib coastal and marine ecosystems rooted in under- and un-protected biodiversity hotspots. These activities will be complemented by MET's Strengthening Protected Area Network of Namibia (SPAN) Project, which addresses management and sustainability issues in targeted national terrestrial parks.

Subcomponent Intermediate Outcome Indicators:

3.1.1 Three new coastal terrestrials Protected Areas (PA) and 1 Marine protected Areas (MPA) zone created;

3.1.2 Seven management plans (3 existing PAs, 3 new PAs and MPA) for ecosystems of biodiversity importance in place and in line with local development plans;

3.2.1 Investments through Matching Grants are approved and completed; and

3.2.2 Enforcement of Management Plans strengthened.

Component 4: Project Coordination and Reporting

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

Subcomponent Intermediate Outcome Indicators:

4.1.1 Ninety percent of project activities identified in annual work plans satisfactorily implemented; and

4.2.1 Monitoring reports (incl. annual audit) are produced and disseminated in accordance with PIM and annual work plan schedule.

4. Project Location and salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis

The Government of the Republic of Namibia (GRN) is implementing the Project with support from a MET Project Coordination Office (PCO) based in Swakopmund responsible for day to day project management and coordination. A Project Steering Committee (SC) guides MET and its project team in the implementation of the project. It comprises MET (chair) and Ministry of Regional Local Governments, Housing and Rural Development (deputy-chair), Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, Ministry of Mines and Energy, Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry, Ministry of Work and Transport, Communication, National Planning Commission and Chief Executive Officer (CEOs) of Kunene, Erongo, Hardap and Karas Region. The Integrated Coastal Zone Management Committee (ICZMC) provides inputs and advice to the SC as defined in the financing agreement. It comprises the regional councils of the four coastal regions, coastal focal points from MET, MRLGHRD, MFMR, MME, MAWF and MWT and coastal local authority representatives from Swakopmund, Walvis Bay, Henties Bay and Lüderitz and non-institutional stakeholders and co-opted entities. A Scientific Group (SG) provides scientific input as requested by SC, ICZMC or MET/project team and was put in place to assist in screening matching grant proposals, develop indicators for coastal zone management monitoring mechanisms and to contribute to targeted capacity building efforts.

The up-dated definition of the project's intervention zone, the Namibian coastal zone, is taken from the final draft Coastal Policy: Landward/eastern boundary indicating 10-25 fog days per year and seaward boundary core coastal zone of 12 nautical mile territorial waters and 200nm EEZ. The inland coastal zone boundary is based on the principle that environmental and socio-economic considerations must go hand in hand.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Ms Claudia Sobrevila (AFTEN)

Mr Mohamed Arbi Ben-Achour (AFTCS)

6. Safeguard Policies Triggered	Yes	No
Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01)	X	
Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04)		X
Forests (OP/BP 4.36)		X
Pest Management (OP 4.09)		X
Physical Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11)		X
Indigenous Peoples (OP/BP 4.10)		X
Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12)	X	
Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4.37)		X
Projects on International Waterways (OP/BP 7.50)		X
Projects in Disputed Areas (OP/BP 7.60)		X

II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts: OP 4.01

Insufficient capacity related to EA, particularly for those required in a coastal/marine environment has been identified during appraisal. To a limited extent this finding is still relevant due to the pending EMA regulations (to be approved in 2011) and overall limited capacity at local and regional levels. However, a Coastal Zone Management Policy is under development with a White Paper finalized. Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) have been completed for the Northern as well as for the Southern regions. SEA principles have been integrated in the Namibia Coastal Management Policy (White Paper) and related local and regional planning processes. It should be noted that the project's EMP features are embedded in the Matching Grant screening and supervision tools.

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

OP 4.12

OP/BP 4.12 was triggered during project implementation because of restriction of access to natural resources due to the inclusion of new terrestrial protected areas (PA) in the project in November, 2008 and in February, 2009. At the Bank request, the recipient prepared a Process Framework (PF).

The PF describes the participatory process by which: (1) the criteria for eligibility of affected persons will be determined; and (2) measures to assist the affected persons in their efforts to improve or restore, in real terms, to pre-displacement levels, their livelihoods while maintaining the sustainability of targeted protected areas.

The PF establishes a process and mechanisms by which (1) potentially affected individuals participate in the project activities, in particular the natural resource

management process, (2) determines measures necessary to achieve resettlement policy objectives, if any, (3) ensures that these impacts are reflected in the monitoring and evaluation (M & E) system and (4) ensures that no one is worse off from the project.

The PF is implemented through Action Plans which involves (1) a participatory planning approach (including a communication and consultation process) that PAs follow, and which include direct PA beneficiaries but also the larger community that the PA members belong to; (2) a targeting strategy that ensures that #affected individuals#, if any, are identified; and (3) an integrated project M&E system to ensure that no one is worse off by the project initiative of supporting PAs.

Already the design of several Action Plans have been initiated (1) one includes the establishment of a more permanent communication program and to expand the Dune Belt Contingency Management Committee (CMC) into a Park Consultative Forum, (2) another takes into consideration communication constraints with the Topnaar Community residing in the Namib-Naukluft Park with the aim to improve the trust relationship with the community and ensuring that the remaining Process Framework activities are completed in time and efficiently, and (3) a further being designed to provides a specific grievance procedure for marine protected areas.

The PF, which is dated March 31, 2009, was reviewed by ASPEN on June 2, 2009 and disclosed in-country (NACOMA webpage) and in INFOSHOP on June 09, 2009. An updated version has been cleared by ASPEN on April 2, 2011 and disclosed in coastal offices of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, the Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources, the coastal local authority offices and the coastal regional authorities# offices as well as in INFOSHOP on April 5, 2011. The PF is expected to be reviewed from time to time during implementation to assess whether it is still accommodating the specific reality of an emerging protected area management system with variable users, beneficiaries and restrictions. Any further revision would be subjected to the Bank clearance and to a new full disclosure process both in country and at Infoshop.

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

Project-funded activities are likely to have neither any major adverse impact on the environment or on livelihood. If any, environmental and social impacts are expected to be minimal, site-specific, easy to mitigate, and technically and institutionally manageable through the Environment management Plan (EMP) or a Process Framework.

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

N/A

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 recipient has prepared an Environmental Management Plan (EMP), which was reviewed and approved by ASPEN, and was disclosed at InfoShop and in-country prior to

Project appraisal. The EMP has been developed on the basis of preparatory stakeholder workshops held during project preparation in Namibia, review of documents relating to the NACOMA project, World Bank EA Policy OP4. 01, and similar Namibian EA requirements, and consultations with key stakeholders on the coast.

To ensure that the intent of OP 4.12 is indeed carried out through the Project Participation Plan a specific grievance or appeals process has been included in the PF for terrestrial protected areas and the same will be done for the NIMPA, with an agency identified to receive appeals. This has been prepared in case there is a group of stakeholders that feels its interests are being curtailed by a restriction on access, and that the additional elements of a process framework should be formulated and agreed on. If the complainant is not thus satisfied, he or she would then have recourse to a disinterested agency that has responsibility for protecting the rights of citizens in the area. Bank supervision includes a special effort to determine whether any such situations have emerged and, if so, whether the Project and the Government has properly handled the situation according to OP 4.12 (last specific safeguard compliance supervision mission carried out in September 2010, see section 1.)

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

5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people. Key Project stakeholders are line ministries such MET, MFMR, MME, MAWRD, MWT, MRGLH, and regional and local governments involved in CZM, as well as the private sector around biodiversity hotspots and the respective management committees of the coastal and marine protected areas. Additional key players are research institutions, members of an established CZ scientific group, provide technical input to the SC as well as training institutions, CBOs and NGOs.

The mentioned above, stakeholders have taken an essential role in Project design through numerous meetings and workshops, in which Project design was decided upon and related decisions took place. To ensure that the Project engages in effective information dissemination, consultation, and stakeholder participation during implementation, a Project Participation Plan, describing stakeholder involvement and participation processes per component, has been finalized during project appraisal.

B. Disclosure Requirements Date

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other:	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	01/13/2005
Date of "in-country" disclosure	03/08/2005
Date of submission to InfoShop	02/23/2005
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process:	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	No
Date of receipt by the Bank	03/24/2011
Date of "in-country" disclosure	04/05/2011
Date of submission to InfoShop	04/05/2011
Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework:	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	N/A
Date of receipt by the Bank	
Date of "in-country" disclosure	
Date of submission to InfoShop	
Pest Management Plan:	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	N/A
Date of receipt by the Bank	
Date of "in-country" disclosure	
Date of submission to InfoShop	
* If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources, 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 (to be filled in when the ISDS is finalized by the project decision meeting)

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment	
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Sector Manager (SM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement	
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Sector Manager review the plan?	Yes
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information	
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's	Yes

Infoshop?

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

All Safeguard Policies

Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies? Yes

Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost? Yes

Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies? Yes

Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents? Yes

D. Approvals

<i>Signed and submitted by:</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
Task Team Leader:	Mr Jean-Michel G. Pavy	04/04/2011
Environmental Specialist:	Ms Claudia Sobrevila	04/05/2011
Social Development Specialist Additional Environmental and/or Social Development Specialist(s):	Mr Mohamed Arbi Ben-Achour	04/05/2011
<i>Approved by:</i>		
Sector Manager:	Ms Dahlia Lotayef	04/07/2011
Comments:		