Concept Note

Adaptative Social Protection in Africa: Resilience Against Climate-Related Shocks

Madagascar, Senegal and Tanzania | The World Bank (WB)

24 October 2017

GREEN CLIMATE FUND

GREEN CLIMATE FUND

Concept Note

The Green Climate Fund (GCF) is seeking high-quality projects or programmes.

Accredited entities may choose to submit a concept note, in consultation with the relevant national designated authority, to present the proposed project or programme idea in order to receive early feedback and recommendation.

Project/Programme Title:	Adaptive Social Protection in Africa: Resilience Against Climate-Related Shocks
Country/Region:	Madagascar, Senegal and Tanzania
Accredited Entity:	The World Bank
National Designated Authority:	Madagascar: Ms Nivohary Ramaroson Director, Bureau National de Coordination des Changements Climatiques Ministry of Environment, Ecology, Sea and Forests Senegal: Ms. Madeleine Diouf Sarr, Head, Climate Change Division, Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development Tanzania: Professor Faustin Kamuzora, Permanent Secretary, The Office of the Vice President

Please submit the completed form to fundingproposal@gcfund.org[1]

A. Project / Programme Information	
A.1. Project / programme title	Adaptive Social Protection in Africa: Fostering Resilience Against Climate-Related Shocks
A.2. Project or programme	Programme
A.3. Country (ies) / region	Madagascar, Senegal and Tanzania
A.4. National designated authority(ies)	**Madagascar:** Ms Nivohary Ramaroson, Director of the Bureau National de Coordination des Changements Climatiques, Ministry of Environment, Ecology, Sea and Forests **Senegal:** Ms. Madeleine Diouf Sarr, Head of Climate Change Division, Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development **Tanzania:** Professor Faustin Kamuzora, Permanent Secretary, The Office of the Vice President
A.5. Accredited entity	**The World Bank Group**
A.6. Executing entity / beneficiary	**Madagascar** : Intervention Fund for Development (Fonds d'Intervention pour le Developpement, FID) **Senegal**: National Social Protection Agency (Délégation Générale à la Protection Sociale et la Solidarité Nationale) **Tanzania**: Tanzania Social Action Fund
A.7. Access modality	Direct ☐ International ☒
A.8. Project size category (total investment, million USD)	Micro (≤10) ☐ Small (10<x≤50) ☒ Medium (50<x≤250) ☐ Large (>250) ☐
A.9. Mitigation / adaptation focus	Mitigation ☐ Adaptation ☒ Cross-cutting ☐
A.10. Public or private	public
A.11. Results areas *(mark all that apply)*	*Which of the following targeted results areas does the proposed project/programme address?* Reduced emissions from: ☐ Energy access and power generation (E.g. on-grid, micro-grid or off-grid solar, wind, geothermal, etc.) ☐ Low emission transport (E.g. high-speed rail, rapid bus system, etc.) ☐ Buildings, cities, industries and appliances (E.g. new and retrofitted energy-efficient buildings, energy-efficient equipment for companies and supply chain management, etc.) ☐ Forestry and land use (E.g. forest conservation and management, agroforestry, agricultural irrigation, water treatment and management, etc.)

[1] Please use the following naming convention for the file name: "[CN]-[Agency short name]-[Date]-[Serial number]" (e.g. CN-ABC-20150101-1).

	Increased resilience of: ☒ Most vulnerable people and communities (E.g. mitigation of operational risk associated with climate change – diversification of supply sources and supply chain management, relocation of manufacturing facilities and warehouses, etc.) ☒ Health and well-being, and food and water security (E.g. climate-resilient crops, efficient irrigation systems, etc.) ☐ Infrastructure and built environment (E.g. sea walls, resilient road networks, etc.) ☐ Ecosystems and ecosystem services (E.g. ecosystem conservation and management, ecotourism, etc.)
A.12. Project / programme life span	3.5 years
A.13. Estimated implementation start and end date	Start: 02 January 2018 End: 30 June 2021

B. Project/Programme Details	
The Fund requires the following preliminary information in order to promptly assess the eligibility of project/programme investment. These requirements may vary depending on the nature of the project/programme.	
B.1. Project / programme description (including objectives)	***The proposed program, "Adaptive Social Protection in Africa: Resilience Against Climate-Related Shocks" will:*** • Propel the climate-change adaptation of Social Protection systems in Madagascar, Senegal, and Tanzania starting with their social safety net programs; • Provide the poorest households with income support so that they can better cope with climate-related shocks and avoid ***harmful coping strategies*** (see below); • Fund initiatives to increase community/local level resilience against climate-related shocks through public works. ***Motivation*** The impacts of climate change and the resulting increase in the frequency and severity of natural disasters disproportionately affect the poor. It has been demonstrated in several cases that the poor are the most exposed and vulnerable to climate change impacts, often due to the combination of: a) Their location and relatively susceptible livelihoods b) Limited savings and access to finance that inhibits the ability of poor individuals to make the investments necessary to: i) Adapt to climate change, and/or ii) Respond to and recover from climate related disasters. Thus, poor households may be compelled to employ ***harmful coping strategies*** like taking out high interest loans that cannot be repaid; selling productive assets for immediate liquidity; removing children from school to work for additional household income, etc. All of those can have lasting and scarring effects on the affected individuals, households and society, threatening to undo years of hard-won development gains. Therefore, social protection, particularly social safety nets, are needed. Unfortunately, **formal social protection instruments**, while growing in coverage across the Africa region, tend to be small, fragmented, and largely donor-driven (although there are some notable exceptions) – and this is certainly the case in Madagascar and Tanzania, while Senegal is developing and consolidating its

national systems and programs. At the same time, the more widely utilized **"traditional" coping mechanisms** that are used by poor households to manage shocks – typically assistance provided by the family or the community in times of need - are often overwhelmed by severe covariate, climate-related shocks and do not provide sufficient protection. Consequently, **humanitarian relief** has become the most prevalent form of assistance for poor populations in many African countries. However, it is unpredictable, does not address underlying vulnerabilities, and often only reaches beneficiaries after lengthy pleas, by which time the worst impacts of negative coping may have been already felt. Moreover, climate change adaptation at the local level, among the most vulnerable communities, remains elusive across much of Africa.

A Successful Template: Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Program

A notable exception to the above is Ethiopia, where a national program has dramatically improved household resilience against climate-related shocks.

The Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) is a social safety net program for food insecure households in Ethiopia that provides cash and/or food transfers to chronically food insecure households in poor, rural villages. Households with able-bodied adults provide labor in the form of public works that contribute to the development of their communities.

Household Resilience. Through a risk financing mechanism, the PSNP can "adapt", i.e. quickly scale-up operations in response to drought, temporarily increasing the number of households in its case load and the amount and duration of the benefits delivered to households. When the risk financing mechanism was triggered in 2011 in response to drought in the horn of Africa, the PSNP expanded its coverage from 6.5 million beneficiaries to 9.6 million in 2 months, and extended the duration of the benefit provision the standard 6 months of a year to 9 months. In large part thanks to this intervention, Ethiopia was the only country in the region not to see an increase in its poverty rate due to the 2011 drought.

Community Resilience. At the same time, PSNP's public works / cash for work component allows local communities to undertake projects that are centered on climate change adaptation and resilience building, including projects that focus on increasing water security, reducing soil erosion and diversifying livelihoods. A series of impact evaluations have found that these projects have contributed to re-greening in previously arid parts of the country, increased biodiversity and water security and therefore greater resilience to drought in agricultural livelihoods.

These encouraging PSNP results have led other countries across the region to undertake efforts to design their own version of the PSNP. Among them are six countries in the Sahel region, namely Chad, Burkina Faso, Mali, Mauritania and Niger. Since 2014, they have been supported by the Sahel Adaptive Social Protection Multi-Donor Trust Fund program (the World Bank is the trustee), with initial contribution of US$75 million from the United Kingdom. Ethiopia PSNP as well as the Sahel Program provide a wealth of lessons to be utilized by the proposed GCF program for Madagascar, Senegal and Tanzania.

Adaptive Social Protection in Africa: Resilience Against Climate-Related Shocks for Madagascar, Tanzania and Senegal

The GCF grant funding will enable the already significant and sizeable engagements on social protection in Madagascar, Senegal and Tanzania to develop a climate change and disaster risk management component and provide assistance directly to the individuals most vulnerable to climate change. The grant funded Technical Assistance that will be provided by this GCF funding will enable the World Bank to work with their existing social protection counterparts – the executing entities / beneficiaries of this proposal – on designing the Adaptive Social Protection (ASP) interventions, in each of the respective countries. Likewise, from its engagements in

	ASP in Ethiopia and across the Sahel, the World Bank will utilize its convening power to bring lessons from other countries on ASP design and implementation to Madagascar, Senegal and Tanzania. Specifically, the proposed program on ASP will enable the beneficiary countries to enhance the capacity of their social safety nets programs in the following areas: 1) Cash for work (CfW) projects for local climate change adaptation and resilience building • Projects for cash for work engagements that are climate sensitive and center on improved watershed management, reduced soil erosion and livelihood diversification. 2) Improved capacity to respond to climate-related shocks through social protection • Operational as well as financial arrangements to quickly scale-up temporary income support to poor and near-poor populations in response to climate shocks, and to scale-down after the negative impact of the shock has been sufficiently mitigated. • Interface with relevant climate information systems, hazard maps and other early warning systems to trigger program scale-up • Development of landscape management plans to guide longer-term climate resilience through cash for work activities. • Mechanisms to identify those most vulnerable to natural hazards and climate change-related risks, ahead of time (commonly referred to as “poverty targeting mechanisms”). While technical assistance will be used by the accredited entity to assist each government in the establishment of these systems - where appropriate, and in parallel to ongoing projects financed by the World Bank as well as other relevant donors in each country - the largest share of this GCF funding (US$45 million – US$ 15 million per country) will be delivered directly to vulnerable beneficiaries through the ASP programs in each country.
B.2. Background information on project/programme sponsor	Global leaders together with the World Bank Group have set two goals for the world to achieve by 2030: • End extreme poverty by decreasing the percentage of people living on less than $1.25 a day to no more than 3% • Promote shared prosperity by fostering the income growth of the bottom 40% for every country The World Bank is a vital source of financial and technical assistance to developing countries around the world. We are not a bank in the ordinary sense but a unique partnership to reduce poverty and support development. The World Bank Group comprises five institutions managed by their member countries. Established in 1944, the World Bank Group is headquartered in Washington, D.C. and has more than 15,000 employees in about 120 country offices worldwide. **Financial Products and Services** The World Bank provides low-interest loans, zero to low-interest credits, and grants to developing countries. These support a wide array of investments in such areas as education, health, public administration, infrastructure, financial and private sector development, agriculture, and environmental and natural resource management. Some of our projects are co-financed with governments, other multilateral institutions, commercial banks, export credit agencies, and private sector investors. The World Bank also provides or facilitate financing through trust fund partnerships

	with bilateral and multilateral donors. Many partners have asked the Bank to help manage initiatives that address needs across a wide range of sectors and developing regions. **Innovative Knowledge Sharing** The World Bank offers support to developing countries through policy advice, research and analysis, and technical assistance. The World Bank's analytical work often underpins World Bank financing and helps inform developing countries' own investments. In addition, we support capacity development in the countries we serve. We also sponsor, host, or participate in many conferences and forums on issues of development, often in collaboration with partners.
B.3. Market overview	The "market" of social protection, particularly social safety nets, is rapidly growing. In the year 2000, only 72 among the developing and emerging countries had some kind of safety nets programs. By 2013, the number rose to 131. Most striking growth has taken place in Sub-Saharan Africa. In 2010, 21 countries in the continent (or about half) had some form of income support programs known as "unconditional cash transfer" in place; by 2016, the number had almost doubled and social safety nets are now implemented in 46 African countries. Worldwide, over 1 billion people in developing countries (or a fifth of the population) participate in at least one social safety net program (the estimates are based on a review of 475 programs in 146 countries carried out by the World Bank). Therefore, the global scale of social safety nets is close to the number of people (1.2 billion) living on less than $1.25 per day. But the glass is only 1/3 full—most of the extreme poor are not covered by social safety nets. Only 345 million are covered by social safety nets, according to the most recent estimates. About 870 million people in extreme poverty remain uncovered. There are two primary reasons for this. First, there are still many countries (both low-income and middle-income) that do not have scaled-up social safety net programs. Second, many social safety nets may not specifically target the income-poor, but instead have objectives of improving nutrition, protecting orphans, or providing old age security. Third, most of the existing safety net programs were not designed with climate change and natural disaster in-mind. External financing represents the main source of social safety net funding in most low-income countries. Among a sample of 30 African countries, Central African Republic, Malawi, Liberia, and Sierra Leone are the most dependent on external financing for social safety nets. Donor financing in these countries ranges between 80 and 100 percent of total spending. In Ethiopia, the flagship Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) is almost entirely externally-financed. However, low-income countries are increasingly putting these programs "on-budget," and social safety net spending in most middle-income countries comes largely from domestic resources. More than half of total spending is born by governments in Tanzania, Mozambique, Mauritania, Kenya, or Ghana for instance. Alternatives to social safety nets include remittances and energy subsidies, though these interventions tend to have limited impact on the poorest and most vulnerable. First, remittances do not close the gap. Globally, only less than 15 percent of the remittances reach the extreme poor. Second, many countries spend more on energy subsidies than on social safety nets. Energy subsidies, present in many countries, account for a substantial portion of their government spending. Energy subsidies benefit the entire population through reduced prices of energy for heating, transport, and lighting and through lower prices of energy-intense goods and services. But they mostly have an impact on the upper income groups of the population, who are more likely to be consuming electricity and fuels in larger quantities.
B.4. Regulation, taxation and insurance	Social safety nets are public programs implemented by the host government itself and therefore, all relevant domestic laws, regulations, tax policies apply. It is highly unusual to "insure" social safety nets.
B.5. Implementation arrangements	***Madagascar:***

	The Ministry of Population, Social Protection, and Promotion of Women (MPSPPW) oversees the country's social protection policy and programs. Concretely, the MPSPPW is in charge of coordinating, monitoring, and evaluating the programs under the government's social protection policy which was approved by Cabinet in 2015. The Intervention Fund for Development (*Fonds d'Intervention pour le Développement* – FID) is the country's first safety net and disaster response implementing agency with more 20 years of experience in delivering continued support to poor communities throughout Madagascar. FID plays an important role in designing and scaling up the country's social safety net programs under the overall social protection policy. The institution was established in 1993 as a private association of public interest with administrative and financial autonomy under the prime minister's office. It has benefitted from institutional stability, strong leadership, and solid operational and financial capacity and has been an effective mechanism for community development, carrying out labor intensive public works, and for responding to emergencies through the prompt implementation of CfW activities and the rehabilitating and reconstructing of basic infrastructures. The FID has successfully implemented several IDA-financed projects. The institution is supervised by a board of directors comprising nine members, including one chair nominated by the prime minister's office, and representatives from the Ministry of Finance, the MPSPPW and other relevant ministries, as well as mayors of local governments, representatives from civil society, and professional organizations. The implementation arrangements of the safety net programs are governed by operational manuals, which outline the processes and responsibilities of the implementing partners. The FID would be responsible for the Program's implementation in Madagascar, under the coordination and monitoring of the MPSPPW which collaborates closely with the Ministries of the Environment, Agriculture and others. ***Senegal:*** The Inter-Ministerial Committee for piloting the National Social Protection Strategy (Comité Interministériel de Pilotage de la Stratégie Nationale de Protection Sociale, CIP/SNPS) will oversee the Program's implementation in Senegal. The committee was established by Decree in 2012, and later amended to name as its co-presidents Minister of Finance and the Délégué Général of the DGPSN (General Delegation for Social Protection and National Solidarity, *Délégation Générale à la Protection Sociale et la Solidarité Nationale*). The CIP/SNPS is a multi-sectoral committee that includes, among others, representatives of the Ministries in charge of Finance, Education, Health, Women and Family, Employment, Agriculture, and the DGPSN. The CIP/SNPS is a high-level committee, mostly comprising of Ministers, and is responsible for overall decisions on the formulation and implementation of the country's social protection strategy. The CIP/SNPS will review and approve the strategic decisions regarding the Project implementation on an annual basis. A Social Safety Net Steering Committee (Comité de Pilotage des Filets Sociaux, CPFS) is in place and coordinates the Government's efforts in terms of social safety nets interventions. The CPFS is intersectoral and multi-stakeholder in nature, and involves technical representatives from all sectors involved in social safety nets. This CPFS will be responsible for the regular technical oversight of this program. In particular, it will evaluate the Project design and approve Project implementation plans and annual budget, and oversee the Project implementation. The DGPSN will have the overall responsibility for the Project's implementation. The DGPSN was created in 2012, and has built its experience through the implementation of the first phase of the PNBSF. The institutional and implementation arrangements for the Project will build on this experience, which involved central and local government institutions and established successful partnerships with development partners, such as UNDP, UNICEF and the World Food Program. In the future, if the institutional arrangements for the sector were to evolve, other

institutions in the sector could undertake some of the Project's activities. In this case, the Government, with the World Bank, would evaluate these institutions' fiduciary and implementation capacity, and the Project would need to be restructured.

The DGPSN will be responsible for all disbursements and procurement related to the Project in accordance with the World Bank's procedures. It will manage the operational accounts. The coordinator will supervise all activities related to the Project's implementation, included those implemented by various units in the DGPSN as well as Government structures at the central and decentralized level (regional, departmental, and community levels) from all sectors involved (see Annexes 2 and 3 for more details).

A Project Implementation Manual, covering all aspects of Project implementation, including the cash transfer program and all financial, administrative and accounting procedures, will be validated and adopted prior to effectiveness. The Project Implementation Manual will be regularly updated as needed (and will further define the modalities for the transfers to households with young children and elderly members). Any changes that concern activities supported by this Project will be agreed with the Bank prior to disbursement for these activities.

Tanzania:

The institutional and implementation arrangements for program implementation in Tanzania will build on progress already made within the Tanzanian Social Action Fund (TASAF) for Productive Social Safety Net (PSSN) implementation, with regards to operating within existing Government structures and under the direction of the Decentralization by Devolution Policy (the government if Tanzania is highly decentralized in structure) At National level, the proposed national social protection framework under preparation by the Government of Tanzania intends to mandate TASAF as one of the lead agencies for operationalizing social protection, while at Regional, Zanzibar and Project Authority Area (PAA) level existing Government entities will provide the main program staffing. The governance structure of the program will be enhanced through: activities to increase understanding of the program by stakeholders, including beneficiaries; a strengthened grievance procedure; strong community participation; a robust system for managing payments and; a rolling training program to ensure effective implementation.

At national level, TASAF is situated under the President's Office with oversight vested in the National Steering Committee (NSC). Members of the NSC are drawn from the public and private sectors and will take into account the sector ministries that have a safety net mandate. The NSC is responsible for setting policy, clearing the annual work plans and budgets, as well as reviewing the progress reports and monitoring the impacts of the PSSN activities. TASAF will be administratively restructured to ensure that the day-to-day operation including the PSSN is carried out in accordance with the Project Manual; and is answerable to the NSC. Sector Experts Teams (one for the mainland and one for Zanzibar) will be drawn from relevant line ministries and composed to technically support and coordinate relevant program activities. The existing Social Protection Thematic Working Group (SPWG) will continue to meet regularly on the broad range of social protection issues and programs in Tanzania. Development partners of PSSN and their Government counterparts will form a sub-committee of this working group to facilitate regular oversight of the program.

At regional level (on the Mainland), the Regional Administrative Secretary (RAS) will appoint a TASAF focal person from among the Regional Secretariat staff to liaise with PAA Directors in the respective region and get and consolidate implementation progress reports from PAAs. The RAS will strengthen accountability by reviewing trends in PSSN funded activities.

At PAA level the LGA Director will manage the PSSN (who will sign a Memorandum of Understanding with TASAF articulating roles and responsibilities) and the PAA Finance Committee (which has responsibility for approving and overseeing program

	interventions). The LGA Director will appoint a Focal Person or Coordinator for PSSN funded activities and an Accountant to handle financials matters (including the consolidation of public works payrolls). In Zanzibar, the PSSN will be coordinated by the Office of the Second Vice President (2nd VPO). The 2nd VPO will appoint Coordinators for Pemba and Unguja and a Focal Person in the officer of the 2nd VPO to oversee all PSSN activities. Unguja and Pemba will each have a Steering Committee (SC) that will perform similar functions to the LGA Finance Committee, and a Management Team with responsibilities similar to the PAA Management Teams. At Village level, the existing Village Council, Assembly and Shehia will play key roles in program oversight with specially constituted community committees playing operational roles. The basic and conditional cash transfer component will be managed by a Community Cash Transfer Management Committee (CCTMC) who will also have responsibility for conducting the initial household identification process as part of the program targeting. Public Works implementation will be managed by a Community Public Works Management Committee (CPWMC), which will be selected by the public works beneficiaries from amongst their number.

C. Financing / Cost Information

C.1. Description of financial elements of the project / programme

A breakdown of cost estimates is provided here:

Component	Sub-component (if applicable)	Amount	Currency of disbursement	Amount	Local currency
Component 1: Adaptive Social Protection transfers to targeted poor households in ***Madagascar***	n/a	15.0	million USD ($)	4,657.5	Million Malagasy Ariary
Component 2: Adaptive Social Protection transfers to targeted poor households in ***Senegal***	n/a	15.0	million USD ($)	8,208.1	Million CFA Francs (UEMOA)
Component 3: Adaptive Social Protection transfers to targeted poor households in ***Tanzania***	n/a	15.0	million USD ($)	32,195.3	Million Tanzanian Shillling
Component 4: Activities by the **accredited entity** to support the design, implementation and operationalization	n/a	3.0	million USD ($)	-	-

- *a financial model that includes projection covering the period from financial closing through final maturity of the proposed GCF financing with detailed assumptions and rationale*;

N /A: Well designed and implemented social protection schemes have high long-term economic and social returns as they break the intergenerational cycle of poverty rather than high financial returns in short and medium terms. Under the proposed programme, benefit payments will be dispersed as grants directly to targeted households, improving resilience to climate change and disasters among the most vulnerable. Unlike other proposals to the GCF, therefore, this proposal does not entail an investment and as such a “financial model” inclusive of sensitivity analysis is not appropriate.

- *a description of how the choice of financial instrument(s) will overcome barriers and achieve project objectives, and leverage public and/or private finance.*

The selected beneficiary countries are low-income countries (the exception being Senegal which is a lower-middle income country) in Sub-Saharan Africa: the average per capita income in each country is US$449 in Madagascar, US$1062 in Senegal and US$998 Tanzania (for comparison, OECD average is US$37,907). Most development banks, bilateral donors and international organizations would provide grant financing, particularly for humanitarian and human-development objectives such as education, health and social protection. As such, the selection of grant financing for the purpose of delivering benefits to vulnerable households is standard international practice and is fully justified.

		Financial Instrument	Amount	Currency	Tenor	Pricing
C.2. Project financing information	**Total project financing (a) = (b) + (c)**		**474.5**	million USD ($)		
	(b) Requested GCF amount	(i) Senior Loans (ii) Subordinated Loans (iii) Equity (iv) Guarantees (v) Reimbursable grants * (vi) Grants *	………………… ………………… ………………… ………………… ………………… 48.0	million USD ($)	( ) years ( ) years	( ) % ( ) % ( ) % IRR
		Large parts World Bank financing to these IDA countries is provided in the form of grants given the high levels of poverty of these countries. Funding for social safety nets and climate change is often provided entirely as grants, as is the case of Madagascar which is considered one of the poorest countries in the world. The other two countries are also low income countries and all are already making a huge effort to respond to climate change and provide the poorest with some support. We therefore propose that the GCF funds also be given as grants.				
		Total Requested (i+ii+iii+iv+v+vi)	**48.0**	million USD ($)		
		Financial Instrument	**Amount**	**Currency**	**Name of Institution**	**Seniority**
	(c) Co-financing	Grant Grant Grant Grant	300 (Tanzania) 75 (Madagascar) 51.5 (Senegal) **426.5** total	Options Options Options Options	IDA IDA IDA IDA & MDTF	

		Lead financing institution: International Development Association (http://ida.worldbank.org/)
	(d) Covenants	**None**
	(e) Conditions precedent to disbursement	**None**

D. Expected Performance against Investment Criteria	
Please explain the potential of the Project/Programme to achieve the Fund's six investment criteria as listed below.	
D.1. Climate impact potential *[Potential to achieve the GCF's objectives and results]*	The proposed program will provide poor and vulnerable households with income supplement and training to better adapt to and cope with the impact of climate change. This is the core of 'adaptive social protection'. Recent GFDRR reports[2] list ASP among the most useful interventions to help the poor and vulnerable adapt to climate change. EM-DAT[3] has recorded 54 climate-related disasters such as droughts and floods in the three countries during 2007-2017 affecting nearly 7 million people. Most of them are poor and vulnerable, disproportionately exposed to shocks like crop failures, resulting food price spikes, and increased incidence of diseases due to flood and rising temperature. More specifically: • High temperatures are a health hazard and affect labor productivity; • The impact of food/nutrition insecurity is acute as poor families spent as much as 60% of income on food; • Proportionally, they lose far more than the rich in terms of assets, income, human toll and socio-economic well-being. While the direct impact of the program is expected to be on increasing resilience of the poor and vulnerable to climate shocks, many climate impact outcomes are also expected, such as the ones proven by Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP). This program has demonstrated that public works programs that focus on combatting soil erosion and improving water management lead to vast re-greening and increased carbon capture. Similar results can be expected in the three proposed countries, as positive spillovers of PSNP type interventions that foster climate-smart landscape improvements and sustainable livelihood diversification, hence actively countering the impacts of climate change on communities. Table 1: Current safety net beneficiaries in Madagascar, Senegal and Tanzania Madagascar: 650,000 Senegal: 3,000,000 Tanzania: 1,375,000 **Total: 5,025,000** Direct impact in terms of number of beneficiaries: As per Table 1, the current number of beneficiaries in Madagascar are 650,000, in Senegal are three million and in Tanzania are 1.375 million poor people. The poor people are defined as those living beneath the international income poverty line of US$1.90 PPP.

[2] For example see: a) Hallegatte, Stephane, Mook Bangalore, Laura Bonzanigo, Marianne Fay, Tamaro Kane, Ulf Narloch, Julie Rozenberg, David Treguer, and Adrien Vogt-Schilb. 2016. *Shock Waves: Managing the Impacts of Climate Change on Poverty*; and b) Hallegatte, Stephane, Adrien Vogt-Schilb, Mook, Bangalore, and Julie Rozenberg. 2017. *Unbreakable: Building the Resilience of the Poor in the Face of Natural Disasters.* Both reports are part of Climate Change and Development Series by the Global Facility for Disaster Risk Reduction (GFDRR) and the World Bank.

[3] International Disaster Database: http://www.emdat.be/.

The GCF funding would allow scaling up the number of safety net beneficiaries by 800,000 while at the same time it would allow for climate sensitive landscape management in vulnerable and disaster affected areas.

Table 2: Estimated ASP beneficiaries in Madagascar, Senegal and Tanzania

Madagascar	125,000
Senegal	525,000
Tanzania	150,000
Total	**800,000**

Over the 3.5-year time frame for this engagement, it is estimated that the scale-up would cover an additional 125,000 people in Madagascar, 525,000 in Senegal and 150,000 in Tanzania (see Table 2). The differences in the number of beneficiaries per country stem from the different implementation modalities of the PSNP type programs: While in Senegal the beneficiaries only remain one year in the program, in Madagascar and Tanzania the selected families participate during three years.

D.2. Paradigm shift potential *[Potential to catalyze impact beyond a one-off project or programme investment]*

The paradigm shift from this program would be significant for each country, the region and globally, particularly with regard to response and recovery capabilities to climate shocks. Adaptive Social Protection represents a movement away from a sole reliance on ex-post, ad hoc humanitarian operations toward a pre-established, accountable and more efficient delivery system.

In instances where disasters are as frequent as they are in these countries, the challenge at hand is more developmental than humanitarian. That is, predictable and frequent droughts and other consequences of climate change can and should be better prepared for as part of a country's overall, long-term development and poverty reduction strategy.

Indeed, the humanitarian community has begun to signal that the current international model for responding to disasters is unsustainable and that a reduction in their caseload would re-route much needed resources toward the large-scale, less predictable crises that will continue to require humanitarian response. The implementation of disaster responsive safety nets in Madagascar, Senegal and Tanzania – like in Ethiopia - will directly contribute to this paradigm shift by assuming some of this caseload, simultaneously adding to the growing momentum behind this new approach, and to a body of knowledge that can be utilized for the extension of similar programs in other vulnerable and exposed countries across Africa and the rest of the world.

Moreover, this engagement is scalable and replicable in a number of ways. While these social safety nets programs will initially target the poor (i.e. those living beneath the formally poverty line such as the national poverty line) in each country, as capacity grows, they can be scaled up to reach those people living just above the poverty line that are vulnerable to falling into poverty as a result of the impact of climate change and disaster.

The potential for learning and replication of this GCF program in each country is also extremely high. In effect, this engagement is a replication of work already undertaken in Ethiopia, and work currently ongoing in various countries across the Sahel region that are building Adaptive Social Protection interventions (Chad, Mali, Niger, Mauritania, Niger - under a multi-donor trust fund engagement of the World Bank Group). In each instance the potential transformative effect of these programs has been noted, as have the impressive gains made through the Ethiopian PSNP. This GCF program will contribute to the growing body of knowledge on ASP design, implementation and results, that will encourage future similar engagements in other countries regionally and globally, that are vulnerable to climate change, have or are building robust SP systems and have sizeable poor and vulnerable populations.

Moreover, this engagement will enable each of the countries to disseminate their knowledge on ASP implementation at a number of fora, which the World Bank would support, and funding for which will in part be sourced from component 4 of this program.

	Additionally, the cash transfer Communities of Practice in Africa (francophone and Anglophone) provide additional opportunities for regular dissemination of lessons learned from this engagement that are applicable to other countries in the region. Many social protection and labor programs are fragmented and lack harmonization, which is hampering their effectiveness. The World Bank's Social Protection and Labor strategy's main objective is to help countries move from fragmented approaches to harmonized systems. It focuses on making these systems more inclusive for the vulnerable and more attuned to building people's human capacities and improving the productivity of their work. Through this approach, it seeks to make people better able to respond to crises and shocks. The aim is to support countries to move toward systematic approaches that have five "SMART" characteristics: **S**ynchronized across programs **M**onitored, evaluated, and adapted **A**ffordable, fiscally and in terms of cost-effectiveness **R**esponsive to crises and shocks **T**ransparent and accountable Through the adoption of SMART systems, the enabling environment for poverty and vulnerability reduction will be transformed in Madagascar, Senegal and Tanzania. The engagement in each country will strengthen the regulatory frameworks, from the national down to the local levels, for climate change adaption through productive and climate sensitive safety net programs. This will ultimately contribute to improve the coherence of each country's regulatory and programmatic framework in addressing climate change.
D.3. Sustainable development potential *[Potential to provide wider development co-benefits]*	The sustainable development potential can be classified into economic, social, environmental benefits and promoting gender-sensitive development as described below: • Economic co-benefits The current system of after-the-fact response to climate change and disasters in these countries is not sustainable. Responding in such a way often draws on resources allocated to other programs and sectors that are dedicated to longer-term development initiatives. This proposed system of pre-established, disaster responsive safety nets is sustainable by virtue of drawing on pre-established budget lines and contingent financing specifically for this purpose. Moreover, relative to the existing system, disaster responsive safety nets promise to increase cost efficiencies through preparedness. • Social co-benefits Negative coping strategies of vulnerable households typically include significant reductions in investments in human capital. Such strategies can entail removing children from school to assist in income generating activities for the family, and reduced investment in and access to medicines and nutrition. Through the provision of climate change and disaster responsive social protection, this program will provide alternative coping mechanisms that will lead fewer households to have to resort to negative coping strategies that have a lasting and scarring impact on household well-being as well as society and economic growth more broadly. • Environmental co-benefits The disaster responsive social safety net programs provide temporary income support to the affected beneficiaries. In some instances, this support will be in the form of an unconditional cash transfer, in other instances it may be in the form of conditional cash transfers – the condition being the provision of labor in return for income support often referred to as "cash for work" or simply "public works". If deemed an appropriate policy intervention, these public works social safety nets will tailor the projects that beneficiaries undertake to focus on building community resilience through improved water security and combatting soil erosion. In some cases, these public works

	projects have contributed to re-greening, crop diversification and increased bio-diversity. Such impacts have already been noted from prior public works projects in Ethiopia and this program would build on these achievements. • Gender-sensitive development impact Social protection interventions are highly sensitive to gender equality in implementation. Indeed, they are expressly concerned with catering to the most vulnerable, including the elderly, disabled, women and children. This is no different in the case of these disaster-responsive social safety nets. Indeed, in disaster contexts, research has found that females are often disproportionately impacted. Appropriate design features to mitigate this concern will be assessed through technical assistance and gender equality during implementation will feature prominently in both program monitoring and evaluation reporting. Usually, more than 50% of the ASP beneficiaries are female. For example in Madagascar, more than 70% of cash transfer recipients are female.
D.4. Needs of recipient *[Vulnerability to climate change and financing needs of the recipients]*	Globally, Madagascar, Senegal and Tanzania are ranked as the 29th, 30th and 55th countries most at risk of natural disaster respectively, according to the World Risk Index (WRI). According to the WRI, Madagascar and Tanzania are the 2nd and 3rd most "susceptible" countries to disasters in the world (high "susceptibility" is defined as a combination of poor public infrastructure, housing, nutrition, poverty and GDP/economic capacity). Each country is also highly exposed to the impacts of climate change, which threatens to increase the frequency of severe weather related events and undermine livelihoods based in agriculture – the predominant sector in each country. In this context, the need of these recipient governments is clear: first, to have the funding to engage in activities that build resilience to climate change - especially amongst their most vulnerable populations, and second, at the same time be better prepared to deliver what can at times be lifesaving interventions after disasters. Only by building the resilience to climate change, the governments can help protect hard-won development gains and achieve progress in poverty reduction. Such adaptive and resilience building activities at the community and household level require significant investments. Likewise, preparedness for post disaster response rests on pre-arranged financing arrangements and strong institutions to support social safety net program implementation and delivery in times of crisis and acute need. This program meets these acute needs of each recipient government, and also provides a modest amount of grant-funded technical assistance to leverage World Bank experience of working with other climate affected countries like Ethiopia, as well as South-South learning from countries to inform the necessary adjustments and further developments in their own policy and programme design. Concurrently, the countries need substantial amounts of grant funding to directly provide assistance to climate-change affected households, an assistance that will simply not be available without similar grant funding or humanitarian appeal.
D.5. Country ownership *[Beneficiary country ownership of project or programme and capacity to implement the proposed activities]*	Each of these countries is currently in the process of establishing regular social safety net programs that are aligned to their broader national strategies for long-term poverty reduction and development (please see the feasibility report in the Annex for further detail). The GCF funding of a separate disaster-responsive component of their cash transfer programs will be fully aligned with these broader national strategies, creating a separate but complimentary function that helps the program meet the specific challenge of natural disasters. As such, the developed system will be wholly under the ownership of the respective governments of Madagascar, Senegal and Tanzania as part of their broader social safety net programming. The World Bank has extensive experience in delivering projects in developing countries. This equates to an extremely high capacity to deliver, based on rigorous project processes, evaluation, quality and fiduciary controls. Any project approved by the World Bank is subject to guidelines pertaining to procurement and financial management. A team of World Bank experts assist clients during project preparation and implementation in following these guidelines and in meeting stringent standards of quality. The World Bank has a long and strong track record of engagement in each of the three countries: in Senegal, the Bank supports 17 projects totaling $816.42 million; in

	Madagascar 13 projects totaling $795 million nationwide; in Tanzania 23 projects totaling $3.23 billion. This highlights the specific institutional experience and capacity of the World Bank to deliver in the countries it supports. In addition, in all 3 countries, GCF funded programs will be implemented as an add-on component to projects already approved by the Board of Executive Directors of International Development Association. Therefore, assessments of implementation capacity including institutional arrangement, procurement, and financial management; social and environmental impact and safeguard plans, quality assurance measures, etc. have been already carried out. Detailed documentations are available at: • **Madagascar**: http://projects.worldbank.org/P149323/?lang=en&tab=overview • **Senegal**: http://projects.worldbank.org/P133597/?lang=en&tab=overview • **Tanzania**: http://projects.worldbank.org/P124045/?lang=en&tab=overview In **Madagascar**, the Intervention Fund for Development (FID) is implementing the country's social safety net programs and particularly the climate responsive Productive Safety Net program (PSNP) which seeks to strengthen the resilience of communities and poor households to climate change. The FID is supervised by a Board of Directors comprising nine members, chaired by the Prime Minister's office, with representatives from the Ministry of Finance, relevant ministries, as well as mayors of local governments, civil society representatives, and professional organizations. For the PSNP, the Government has signed a Convention among several ministries including the Ministries of the Environment, Agriculture, and of the Ministry of Population, Social Protection and Promotion of Women. In response to the recent El Nino drought, the FID, under the guidance of the Ministry of Population, Social Protection and Promotion of Women, managed to provide 65,000 drought-affected (more than 325,000 people) with cash transfers, nutrition services and livelihood recovery grants. FID is also involved in the recent hurricane ENAWO response rebuilding essential community based social and economic infrastructure. Based on this experience, and in a concerted way, the government is presently developing its Strategic Program for Climate which will help articulate a programmatic approach by building resilience in key geographical areas and sectors. In **Senegal**, the Government set up an Inter-Ministerial Steering Committee on Social Protection, which includes both civil society and development partners. The Social Protection Delegation (DGPSN) will also organize annual financial audits for the Project, annual reviews of progress, and a mid-term evaluation to guide the Project implementation. The mid-term review will involve Project's stakeholders and civil society in the review of performance, intermediary results, and outcomes. Furthermore, the Government recently made a renewed effort and prepared the *Plan Senegal Emergent*, which further highlights the importance of social protection, both to address poverty and to promote inclusive growth and increased productivity. The Government set up an Inter-Ministerial Steering Committee on Social Protection, which includes both civil society and development partners. The *Delegation Gindrale a la Protection Sociale et a la Solidarite Nationale* (DGPSN) helps define social protection policy, implement social protection programs, coordinate the National Social Protection Strategy, and participate in monitoring its implementation. The national social protection strategy has positioned social safety nets, resilience programs, and shock-responsive programs at the heart of its effort to address extreme poverty and climate-change exposure. In **Tanzania**, the Productive Social Safety Net (PSSN) includes a number of additional efforts to enhance implementation capacity, including the ability to enhance Project Authority Area capacity through the appointment of data entry clerks and the outsourcing of service provision to private or civil society sector service providers. The PSNP is accompanied by a process evaluation and household impact evaluations that track project progress, inform further scale up, calibrate processes, monitor beneficiary perception and feedback, and measure outcomes and results. With these objectives, the IDA-financed parent project finances the following activities: (i) A rigorous independent impact evaluation of the combined safety net intervention (public works plus cash transfers); (ii) regular process evaluations, (iii) beneficiary assessments; (iv) transparency and accountability assessments, including

	Community Score Cards and Citizen Report Cards, social audits and controls, feedback tools from beneficiaries and civil society. Community score cards, citizen report card exercises and reporting by mobile phones are utilized to empower communities and ensure accountability of the government.
D.6. Effectiveness and efficiency *[Economic and financial soundness and effectiveness of the proposed activities]*	The primary purpose of developing disaster responsive social safety nets is to increase efficiency and effectiveness in delivering services to affected households. The efficiency gains will be realized as compared to the existing system of ad hoc response to disasters which entails setting up systems for delivery, and financing mechanisms for those systems, after the fact – a process that takes time and is often characterized by a lack of transparency and coordination. The more effective approach proposed here entails establishing the necessary information systems and capacity ahead of time (including targeting mechanisms, national databases/registries, monitoring and evaluation, payment delivery plans, etc.) ensuring that the opposite is true: a timely, transparent and well-coordinated response. The World Bank supports countries in developing and implementing SSNs through a range of channels, including lending and knowledge products (economic and sector work, non-lending technical assistance, global knowledge sharing, and research and evaluation). All these tools provide opportunities for dialogue. They are usually used in combination to advance the SSN agenda in a country. These channels interact with the country's economic, political, and institutional conditions to enable the Bank to have an impact. Recently, the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) of the World Bank found that SSNs are a growing and evolving area of Bank work. This is reflected in Bank engagement as measured by lending, projects, knowledge products (particularly non-lending technical assistance), research studies and evaluations, and the use of lending instruments. The Bank's involvement in SSNs increased sharply in 2008 as these constitute one of the main mechanisms through which the Bank responded to the food, fuel, and financial crises. Indeed, lending for SSNs jumped from three percent of total Bank lending throughout much of the decade (FY00–08) to six percent (FY09–10). The Bank played a positive countercyclical role in financing SSNs, but the volume of its lending over the decade has been dominated by a small number of middle-income countries (MICs). Trust funds and the IDA crisis window have been critical in countering the asymmetry in Bank lending, enabling broader engagement in lower-income countries and an increase in the number of Bank-supported SSN programs, particularly in Africa. Best practices accrued throughout this engagement on safety nets globally will be applied to this GCF program and the activities therein.

E. Brief Rationale for GCF Involvement and Exit Strategy

The main value added of GCF involvement is the provision of grant funded financing to fiscally constrained countries so that governments are empowered to help the poorest and most vulnerable households better adapt to climate change and respond to climate shock. As outlined before, each country is undertaking reforms to strengthen their respective social protection systems and programs. That one of the most prominent shocks faced by households is climate shocks indicates that these social protection systems and programs should be capable of helping the poor and vulnerable manage these shocks. GCF financing will enable each country to do so through their SP system.

Indeed, the value of greater preparedness to respond to disasters is clear, as is the value of mitigating the impacts of climate change on the poorest to protect development gains. This is certainly clear to the governments of Madagascar, Senegal and Tanzania as expressed during multiple high level consultations with World Bank Social Protection staff during the preparation of their respective projects that center on social protection system building and strengthening.

However, the cost of appropriately addressing these challenges is notably high. Each country – each a low-income country – already possess limited steady-state resources. Furthermore, the already evident and forecasted impacts of climate change on these largely agrarian economies (the predominant sector that drives poverty reduction and GDP growth through increased productivity) threaten to stretch these resources even further. Similarly, the net loss of continued and repeated climate related disasters, and the implementation of a costly ex-post response to these disasters is equally challenging. Together, for all of these reasons, the governments in these respective countries are limited in their ability to implement appropriate interventions.

This GCF program for Adaptive Social Protection will directly address both of these significant challenges – climate change and climate disasters – contributing indirectly also to a healthier fiscal scenario over time in each country, with long term development gains protected (ultimately contributing to the GCF's exit strategy). The contribution of GCF is critical as the GCF grant based funding will provide a ring-fenced resource dedicated to the goals of adaptation, enhanced preparedness and improved response capacity that is currently not available to these government and that once disbursed for this purpose cannot be reallocated for other purposes as other needs arise.

Additionally, one significant value added of this program is the signaling effect that it would have in highlighting that the GCF recognizes the severe and negative impact of climate change on the world's poorest and vulnerable populations, and is prepared to protect their lives and livelihoods while supporting other efforts for greenhouse gas reduction, carbon sequestration, etc.

Effectively, the GCF intervention will provide the seed capital for the implementation of these programs – a necessary first push given the limited resources of these governments. This initial investment will be sustained by the resultant returns in terms of fiscal resources as well as the results that the programs will be able to demonstrate in reducing vulnerabilities and enhancing resilience among the poor and near-poor through pre-instituted program monitoring processes, and rigorous after-the-fact impact evaluations. Indeed, these M&E processes are embedded in each of the programs at present. This follows best practices established by similar social protection programs such as Ethiopia's Productive Safety Nets Program (PSNP).

It is anticipated that these results will be highly attractive for continued multi-donor investment, including by the World Bank and fostering the enabling environment for the eventual self-financing in the future.

F. Risk Analysis

The following risks and mitigation strategies have been identified in the implementation of the project:

Implementation Capacity constraints

The implementation of disaster responsive safety net programs represents a substantial increase in the roles and responsibilities for lower levels of government to deliver assistance to affected households. At the local level, this includes effectively mobilizing communities to identify beneficiaries and undertake participatory community planning; obtaining and maintaining adequate procurement and financial management capacity; and logistical capacity to ensure the timely delivery of transfers. Overall, the scale of resources flowing to the local levels will, in many cases, increase local government budgets significantly. Limitations in the capacity of government to effectively undertake all of these functions, at the scale necessary, represents a considerable risk to program implementation.

In order to address these concerns, local level government staff will undertake training and awareness creation program before core program implementation starts to ensure that all participating personnel are familiar with program objectives and procedures. Training needs assessment will be undertaken each year and training tailored to needs is provided such that as capacity shortfalls are identified, they can be met. Also, each social safety net program will have a Management Information System that will contain elements that will monitor ongoing program implementation. In order to address problems as they emerge, the respective Governments will need to develop rapid response capability at the regional and federal level. This will serve to identify early on any potential implementation bottlenecks and ensure that they are addressed in a timely fashion.

Leakage

As with any social protection program of this nature, there is a concern that individuals who are not from targeted, vulnerable households, will capture program benefits. Significant effort will be put into the programs to ensure that targeting, payment, work and complaints guidelines are followed, supported by social accountability measures carried out by community committees. These committees will receive training in the monitoring of these guidelines. Further, beneficiary names will be posted in a public place to maximize transparency and a grievance and appeals process will be established. All of these measures should significantly mitigate the risk of leakage.

Impact of Cash

The use of cash grants rather than food will likely have a significant impact on local economies, substantially increasing the money supply and potentially leading to temporary local inflation. While this needs to be monitored, experience shows that local price increases are usually temporary and disappear over time when beneficiaries get smarter about using their money. In several countries, the use of the cash is accompanied by behavioral interventions, promoting beneficiaries' financial planning and saving for concrete investments.

Stakeholder Risks: Strong pressure to rollout the programs nationwide and the risks of elite capture are the most significant stakeholder risks. Firm agreements have been reached on the roll-out plan for the programs, while a range of measures including targeting verification, effective grievance procedures, effective communication for development as well as social accountability measures will reduce the opportunities for elite capture.

Project Risk: The innovative nature of the program, alongside the above-mentioned capacity limitations are key project risks, and the substantial focus on capacity building, awareness raising, phased roll-out and strong monitoring and evaluation reflect efforts to mitigate these risks. In addition, there is a risk of delays in releasing funds or honoring pledges by other co-financiers with consequent impacts on implementation and reputational risk. To address this, program coverage has been calculated on the basis of only IDA funding. The design will allow adjustments to coverage as resources become available.

Implementing Agency Risks: Limited capacity of local level staff in financial management, procurement and safeguards, as well as the risk of disbursement delays to local levels may all affect program implementation. On-going efforts to strengthen local level capacity through recruitment and on-the-job training will be supplemented by significant capacity building activities under the Institutional Strengthening component. The phased project roll-out with the first year dedicated to capacity building and systems development will facilitate the development of systems and skills.

For detailed analysis please see annex: Environmental and Social Impact Assessment.
In summary, none of the proposed ASP interventions are expected to have any adverse environmental impacts. Indeed, as mentioned earlier, the cash for work element of the ASP intervention is explicitly designed to instigate positive environmental impacts in climate vulnerable locales. Usually, at least 50% of safety net beneficiaries are women.

Socially, the ASP program is expected to have significant positive social benefits through improved landscapes which increase fertility, and by generating livelihoods and local employment opportunities for climate vulnerable communities. The activities undertaken by beneficiaries under the cash for work programs will create community assets and community resilience. Consumption and income will be smoothed during lean seasons and disasters through the cash transfers. Moreover, investment in children will be explicitly encouraged (education, nutrition and health) through promotional activities and linkages to education, health/nutrition and early childhood development services as available.

G. Multi-Stakeholder Engagement

Please specify the plan for multi-stakeholder engagement, and what has been done so far in this regard.

H. Status of Project/Programme

1) A pre-feasibility study is expected to be completed at this stage. Please provide the report in section J.

2) Please indicate whether a feasibility study and/or environmental and social impact assessment has been conducted for the proposed project/programme: Yes ☒ No ☐
(*If 'Yes', please provide them in section J*.)

3) Will the proposed project/programme be developed as an extension of a previous project (e.g. subsequent phase), or based on a previous project/programme (e.g. scale up or replication)? Yes ☒ No ☐
(*If yes, please provide an evaluation report of the previous project in section J, if available.*)

I. Remarks

J. Supporting Documents for Concept Note

☐ Map indicating the location of the project/programme
☐ Financial Model
☒ Pre-feasibility Study
☒ Feasibility Study (if applicable)
☒ Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (if applicable)
☒ Evaluation Report (if applicable)

Note: All of the above are either included in the Project Appraisal Document (PADs) of corresponding parent/baseline projects financed by the International Development Association, and also found in the document repository for the projects as detailed below.

For Madagascar
General Information:
http://projects.worldbank.org/P149323/?lang=en&tab=overview
PAD:
http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/790201468179349494/pdf/PAD1198-PAD-P149323-IDA-R2015-0233-1-Box393189B-OUO-9.pdf
Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet:
http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/131821468052854769/pdf/AppraisalISDS-Print-P149323-03-19-2015-1426771721714.pdf
Resettlement Plan (in French):
http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/840631468046795047/pdf/RP17670FRENCH00Box385460B00PUBLIC0.pdf
Environmental Assessment (in French):
http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/858141468276362237/pdf/E47740FRENCH0P0Box385460B00PUBLIC0.pdf

For Senegal
General Information:
http://projects.worldbank.org/P133597/?lang=en&tab=overview
PAD:
http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/331891468304842737/pdf/839650PAD0P133010Box385177B00OUO090.pdf
Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet:
http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/808251468107951447/pdf/AppraisalISDS-Print-P133597-02-19-2014-1392838061554.pdf

For Tanzania
General Information:
http://projects.worldbank.org/P124045/?lang=en&tab=overview
PAD:
http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/704091468122078480/pdf/671160PAD0P12400900IDA0R20120007101.pdf
Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet:
http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/645041468777956984/pdf/P1240450Apprai021201201329867294703.pdf
Indigenous Peoples Plan:
http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/767151468131962138/pdf/IPP5470IPP0P12082B0AFR0IPPF0P124045.pdf
Resettlement Plan:
http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/906411468121127028/pdf/RP12330RP0P124020Box365782B0AFR0RPF.pdf
Environmental Assessment:
http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/786321468133161022/pdf/E28880v30EA0P100Box365724B02608634.pdf