



**The World Bank**

Fourth Additional Financing for the Agriculture Competitiveness Project (P170853)

---

## Combined Project Information Documents / Integrated Safeguards Datasheet (PID/ISDS)

---

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 24-Sep-2020 | Report No: PIDISDSA28872

**BASIC INFORMATION****A. Basic Project Data**

Country Moldova	Project ID P170853	Project Name Additional Financing for the Agriculture Competitiveness Project	Parent Project ID (if any) P118518
Parent Project Name Moldova Agriculture Competitiveness Project	Region EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA	Estimated Appraisal Date 16-Nov-2020	Estimated Board Date 01-Dec-2020
Practice Area (Lead) Agriculture and Food	Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing	Borrower(s) Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment	Implementing Agency Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry, Ministry of Finance
GEF Focal Area			
Land degradation			

## Proposed Development Objective(s) Parent

The Project Development Objective is to enhance the competitiveness of the agro-food sector by supporting the modernization of the food safety management system, facilitating market access for farmers, and mainstreaming agro-environmental and sustainable land management practices.

## Components

Enhancing food safety management

Enhancing market access potential

Enhancing land productivity through sustainable land management

Project Management

Contingencies

Compensatory Sales Support Grants

**PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US\$, Millions)****SUMMARY**

Total Project Cost	13.11
Total Financing	13.11
of which IBRD/IDA	0.00



Financing Gap	0.00
---------------	------

**DETAILS****Non-World Bank Group Financing**

Counterpart Funding	10.00
Borrower/Recipient	2.00
Local Beneficiaries	8.00
Trust Funds	3.11
Global Environment Facility (GEF)	3.11

Environmental Assessment Category

B-Partial Assessment

Decision

The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate

Other Decision (as needed)

**B. Introduction and Context**

Country Context

1. Moldova is a low middle-income country in a state of economic transition. The country is endowed with black soils and has a relatively favorable climate, making agriculture an essential occupation in rural areas and one of the pillars of the country's economy. At the same time, a legacy of intensive and unsustainable agricultural practices, indented by expansive and over exploitative use of land resources, and poor adaptability of cultivation practices to soil characteristics and conditions, have resulted in rampant land degradation and soil fertility decline, reducing the functional integrity and climate resilience of the country's agri-ecosystems. The main culprits of land degradation are: (i) pervasive application of intensive tillage systems; (ii) continued limited application of soil conservation technologies, crop rotation and soil regeneration techniques; (iii) deficient cultivation practices - overploughing and/or ploughing down slopes, and (iv) use of heavy machinery resulting in soil compaction and perched groundwater tables. Ubiquitous fragmentation of land ownership and use compounds the problem as it hampers catchment-level approaches to soil and water conservation and application of crop rotation techniques. Finally, rural poverty and high cost of housing heating options resulted in illegal cutting and destruction of forested shelterbelts and communal forests (80% of shelter belts and 15% of communal forests).



2. Subsequently, land degradation manifests itself in accentuated soil erosion and the ensuing loss of soil fertility, acceleration of landslide and ravine-forming processes and (particularly in the central part of the country) and pronounced desertification (particularly in the southern parts). All these aspects adversely affect agriculture productivity and rural incomes. It is estimated that about 36 percent of the country's agricultural land (some 950,000 hectares) are subject to varying degrees of soil erosion, of which about 13 percent in advanced stages of erosion. Land erosion is advancing at an average rate of around 8,000 hectares per year. Soil quality is also affected by annual humus losses of between 5 to 7 tons/hectare, and by a continuous reduction in soil nutrient reserves by 150 to 180 kilograms/hectare/year, thus disturbing the nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium balance of the soil. Active landslide processes reduce the area of productive agricultural land on average by 1,000 hectares per year. Total annual losses to the national economy due to these adverse processes are estimated at about US\$300.0 million.

#### Sectoral and Institutional Context

3. Despite the worrisome context described above, Moldova continues to benefit from a high agronomic potential and a proven comparative advantage for agricultural production based on the sector's favorable endowment - productive soils, mild climate, favorable topography, and a long-standing tradition of agricultural production. Based on the country's strong commitment towards a paradigm shift in the agriculture sector from production volumes to competitiveness, since 2012, the Government of Moldova (GoM) has successfully pursued the implementation of the Moldova Agriculture Competitiveness Project (MACP), for which it secured US\$60.0 million in IDA financing (four separate credits) and US\$4.4 million in GEF 5 financing. One of the project's main conceptual emphases is on sustainable land management (SLM), as a means of increasing land productivity, conservation of essential community natural resources, and increasing climate resilience of the country's agricultural systems.

4. Since 2012, with IDA and GEF 5 financing, the project focused on building capacity for SLM management (locally and nationally), propagating on-farm SLM practices, and rehabilitating anti-erosion shelterbelts. The activities of the component were successfully implemented along the following areas (i) strengthening of human, institutional and technical capacity (both locally and nationally) for the implementation of SLM activities, (ii) providing financial support in the form of matching investment grants to farmers for piloting the adoption of SLM practices and technologies, and (iii) providing investment support for the rehabilitation of anti-erosion shelterbelts with the purpose of maintaining and enhancing land productivity.

5. All initially planned activities have been properly and fully implemented, results indicators exceeding initial targets, and environmental and socio-economic benefits trending high, as attested by a comprehensive impact assessment. Specifically, 2,200 hectares (ha) of shelterbelts have been rehabilitated, and the equipment which was procured for these purposes has been utilized efficiently by two mobile mechanized agro-forestry squads<sup>1</sup>. The area protected by robust anti-erosion rehabilitated shelterbelts exceeded 64,000 ha. The component's SLM grant scheme has been implemented through

<sup>1</sup> Following completion of the project tasks, the machinery was distributed to several state forestry enterprises and continues to be used in ongoing afforestation activities.



seven calls for proposals that yielded 257 applications, 192 of which received grants in a total amount of US\$2.4 million. The average share of the matching grant in the total SLM-related investment constituted 27 percent. At present, the total on-farm area benefitting from SLM practices supported by the project is 58,650 ha, which considerably exceeded the target value of 10,000 ha. The project has implemented massive awareness campaigns reaching more than 1,400 farmers (40% participation of women) via a range of delivery methods and tools (most importantly summer field schools) in order to proliferate knowledge generated by the project on conservation agriculture and good agriculture practices.

### C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

#### Original PDO

6. The Project Development Objective is to enhance the competitiveness of the agro-food sector by supporting the modernization of the food safety management system, facilitating market access for farmers, and mainstreaming agro-environmental and sustainable land management practices.

#### Current PDO

7. There are no changes to the PDO.

#### Key Results

8. The expected key outputs and results would be: (i) strengthening of the enabling environment for achieving Moldova's Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) commitments through SLM activities; (ii) rehabilitation of 2,000 hectares of anti-erosion shelterbelts for a protected area of approximately 50,000 hectares; (iii) introduction of SLM practices on a cultivated area of at least 50,000 hectares; (iv) generating local socio-economic benefits for approximately 5,000 beneficiaries; and (v) implementing an awareness and outreach campaign on SLM and LDN.

### D. Project Description

9. Notwithstanding significant initial efforts under MACP, Moldovan farmers still face difficulties in accessing SLM best-practice experience and information, while weaknesses in national and particularly local capacity to address land degradation are still pervasive. While lack of knowledge is becoming less of a factor, proper channeling of such knowledge to land users, relevant national and local authorities, civil society organizations, and other stakeholders continues to be a challenge. Finally, cost of adoption of soil conservation technologies to farmers is also an issue due to high incremental financial requirements. The country has limited financial resources to continue propagating SLM practices, hence the Government of Moldova's determination to secure additional resources for scaling up MACP's original SLM activities.

10. The proposed AF responds to an endorsement letter from the GoM, dated September 09, 2018, for a GEF 7 grant under the Land Degradation Focal Area to support scaling up of activities aimed at strengthening the enabling environment, generating and sharing knowledge, and mainstreaming SLM practices, and the broader soil protection, conservation and ultimately LDN agenda.



11. The proposed Additional Financing (AF) will continue MACPs original thematic thrust of attenuating land degradation and increasing agricultural productivity through the application of productivity enhancing SLM activities. It would make a further concerted push on the private sector and maximizing finance for development dimensions, relying heavily on private sector actors' participation in switching towards SLM practices and technologies, heavily co-financing investments, as well as actively participating in knowledge sharing and dissemination programs. All this would ensure that the proposed AF is well-aligned with the GEF 7 Land Degradation strategic vectors along the cross-cutting objective of harnessing private capital and expertise to finance SLM investments.

12. Based on the rationale described above, the proposed AF would provide GEF funding for the: (i) allocation of US\$100,000 for supporting the LDN enabling environment under *Component 1: Enhancing Food Safety Management*; (ii) allocation of US\$2.65 million for scaling up the original SLM activities under *Component 3: Enhancing land productivity through sustainable land management*; and (iii) allocation of US\$350,000 for supporting project coordination, management, and monitoring and evaluation under *Component 4: Project Management*. The total project cost will increase from US\$83.94 million to US\$94.94 million, based on the addition of US\$3.1 million of GEF funding, US\$8.0 million beneficiary contributions, and US\$2.0 million GoM counterpart funding.

13. The implementation of the AF would result in continued reduction of soil and ground water pollution from agricultural production, increases in the robustness of natural resource ecosystems, enhanced climate adaptation resilience, and ultimately improved rural livelihoods. The proposed AF would build upon the original efforts aimed at strengthening human, institutional and technical capacities (both locally and nationally) for the implementation of SLM activities and provide financial incentives for investments aimed at mitigating negative impacts of land degradation on the functional integrity of ecosystems. Furthermore, the proposed AF would aim to strengthen the country's LDN enabling environment through engendering policies, supporting capacity building, and increasing awareness amongst farmers, local communities and the general public. The proposed AF is well-aligned with both GEF 7 Land Degradation focal area objectives: (1) Enhance on-the-ground implementation of SLM using the LDN tool and (2) Create an enabling environment to support voluntary LDN target implementation. The AF's outcomes would also be linked to the country's commitments under the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification convention target 15.3 "By 2030, combat desertification, restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods, and strive to achieve a land degradation neutral world". This target is also contributing to the Sustainable Development Goal 15.

## E. Implementation

### Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

14. The proposed AFs institutional and implementation arrangements will rely on the existing architecture of MACP. An existing inter-ministerial Steering Committee, established through the Government Decision #878 of September 9, 1999 (as revised to include the relevant up-dates for MACP), will continue to perform overall supervisory, coordination and strategic guidance functions. The project's implementation agency is the Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment (MARDE), with the country's Food Safety Agency being an essential beneficiary/stakeholder for the project's food



safety activities. For fiduciary support, an existing project management unit – the Consolidated Agriculture Project Management Unit (CAPMU), will be responsible for disbursement, financial management, procurement, monitoring and evaluation, safeguards, and citizens engagement. CAPMU will also support MARDE in inter-ministerial coordination of project management activities.

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

The project will be implemented countrywide.

**G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team**

Mohamed Ghani Razaak, Social Specialist

Cesar Niculescu, Environmental Specialist

**SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY**

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	
Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03	No	
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	No	
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	



## KEY SAFEGUARD POLICY ISSUES AND THEIR MANAGEMENT

### A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

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

The proposed AF would provide supplementary resources for Component 1: Enhancing food safety management and Component 3: Enhancing Land Productivity Through Sustainable Land Management in order to scale up the project's original activities aimed at the proliferation and broad-based application of SLM practices and promoting LDN principles in the country's agriculture systems. More specifically, the proposed AF would sustain the original project's broader push to increase the competitiveness of the agriculture sector through continued strengthening of human, institutional and technical capacity (both locally and nationally) for the implementation of SLM activities; (ii) financial incentives to farmers for the adoption of sustainable land management; and (iii) investment support for the rehabilitation of forested anti-erosion shelter belts for the purpose of maintaining and enhancing the productivity of agricultural land.

The original project has triggered the following three WB OPs: OP 4.01 on Environmental Assessment, OP 4.09 on Pest Management and OP 4.11 on Physical Cultural Resources. No additional WB OPs are triggered under the proposed AF.

OP 4.01 has been triggered as the original project supports a series of activities which generate environmental and social impacts. The required mitigation measures for the project activities are standard and widely used in construction practices. They are comprehensively described in the current version of the project's Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF).

OP 4.09 has been triggered for to reflect the possible increase in pesticide use due to the increased intensity of cropping supported by the original project's grant schemes and/or due to the promotion of conservation agriculture. The ESMF includes measures (section VI) to raise awareness and educate potential beneficiaries regarding safe pesticide handling and use of integrated pest management practices to enhance sustainability and reduce human and environmental exposure to dangerous products.

OP 4.11 has been triggered to accommodate a GoM decision to house the then newly established Food Safety Agency in a building which was on the National Registry of State-Protected Monuments. The building required essential reconstruction and restoration works and the project provided necessary support to ensure its functionality.

The original project's safeguards, and stakeholder and citizens engagement arrangements are compliant with Bank requirements. Throughout implementation both safeguards performance, stakeholder and citizens engagement activities have been evaluated as satisfactory. CAPMU possesses solid capacity for environmental and social safeguards work, as demonstrated by compliant implementation of complex activities, such as the restoration of a national cultural monuments and the construction of BIPs and food safety laboratories.

Environmental safeguards performance was significantly enhanced by the activities of Component 3: Enhancing Land Productivity through Sustainable Land Management, under which considerable financing was provided for methodological and practical implementation of good agriculture practices, which empowered farmers to proliferate sustainable land management practices, and, among other, reduce the use of pesticides and other agricultural chemicals.



The project has a fully functional Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) operated by the National Rural Development Agency (ACSA), that meets the requirements of the World Bank and registers grievances at the national, regional and local levels. The GRM has been extensively advertised to project beneficiaries and stakeholders as part of the project's public outreach and communication campaign. A GRM-related section is available on the project website. A total of 1,895 grievances/claims were received, mainly under Component 5: Compensatory Sales Support Grants, of which 161 were settled in favor of the claimants.

The high number of grievances was caused by the large pool of farmers who have claimed a right to be compensated under the project's compensatory grant schemes; nearly 10,000 farmers presented claims for compensations in 2015. Most of the grievances were in fact determined to be ineligible against the project's eligibility criteria, and in many cases fraudulent attempts to cash in. In fact, even many farmers who have received compensations, were subsequently disqualified as beneficiaries and related expenditures were declared ineligible. The data on eligibility and the overall credibility of the grievances was thoroughly verified by ACSA, a non-government and non-affiliated third-party entity, and eventually rechecked through another layer of monitoring. Subsequently, the World Bank did not receive any complaints from rejected grievants.

There have been no grievances registered or reported over the last 36 months. This could be explained by the fact that the project completed implementation of those components that were more grievance-prone, with the remaining activities are mostly focused on TA and investments with fewer institutional clients. The GRM has recently been strengthened and repurposed for the project's AFs.

The proposed AF is expected to have primarily positive environmental and social outcomes. Improved land management practices are likely to lead to prevention of soil degradation; increase of soil moisture retention; increase in biomass and organic matter of soils; increase of biodiversity, reduction of pesticide residue drifts, reduction of sediment loads into rivers; and a decrease of run-off and soil losses. This would result in a series of economic benefits: (a) increased soil productivity due to the adoption of SLM practices; (b) increased soil quality and value; and, (c) increased agricultural crops yields.

There are no potential large-scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts expected as a result of the AF project activities. However, the project's activities, if not adequately implemented, may cause some environmental impacts related to: (a) increased pollution of ground and surface waters due to soil erosion, use of fertilizers and pesticide, as well as the processing of agricultural products; (b) threats to human health and wildlife due to poor handling of fertilizers and pesticides; (c) increased siltation of water bodies due to soil erosion; and (d) solid waste resulting from pre-processing of agricultural products. Of note is that the AF will not finance the purchasing and/or application of pesticides, but it is possible that pesticide use will increase due to promoting conservation agriculture. To address the issues related to this OP, the ESMF includes measures to raise awareness and educate potential beneficiaries regarding safe pesticide handling and use of Integrated Pest Management to enhance sustainability and reduce human and environmental exposure to dangerous products. Such measures are described in the section VI of the ESMF.

The proposed AF's social risks and impacts are relatively minor and temporary and could be mitigated through appropriate measures. The social impacts induced from inconveniences related to the rehabilitation/reconstruction of shelter belts will be screened and addressed through site specific ESIA/ESMPs prepared according to the ESMF guidelines, elements of which include robust public awareness campaigns and a GRM established under the project.

The proposed AF does not envisage additional land acquisition that may result in any physical or economic



displacement. Neither the parent project nor the AF are triggering OP 4.12 (involuntary resettlement). Major civil works, such as the rehabilitation of the Food Safety Agency building and the construction of four Border Inspection Points and the construction/reconstruction of two regional food safety laboratories under the parent project have been completed within existing premises and land allotments. The ESMF indicates that no additional land is to be acquired for any AF activities.

2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area: The potential long term impacts are positive and relate to increased agricultural competitiveness, increased land productivity and enhanced climate resilience. The proposed AF will also bring long-term positive impacts in terms of conservation of the country's rich yet vulnerable soil, by improving land use and management practices. In addition, the proposed AF would allow the country to achieve its long-term programmatic LDN goals under the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification.

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.

Like the original project, the proposed AF is qualified as Category B, and triggers the same safeguards: OP 4.01 (Environmental assessment), OP 4.09 (Pest Management) and OP 4.11 (Physical Cultural Resources).

To address project-related potential negative impacts the borrower prepared an ESMF which specifies the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) requirements for the activities to be financed under the AF. The document covers the following: rules and procedures for environmental screening; guidance for preparing site-specific EIA and/or simple ESMPs (including an ESMP checklist for identified small-scale construction/reconstruction activities), possible mitigation measures, and requirements for monitoring and supervision of implementing of EIA/ESMPs. The ESMF contains also a series of measures to raise awareness and educate potential beneficiaries regarding safe pesticide handling and use of Integrated Pest Management. These measures are targeted at providing a framework for educating farmers on issues related to pesticide handling and promoting integrated pest management and thus, understanding and managing pest problems in the horticultural sector, reducing human and environmental health risks associated with pesticide use, and protecting ecosystem by conserving beneficial agents such as natural enemies of pests and pollinators to increase productivity.

The project-level GRM established under the parent project is available to project stakeholders and other affected parties to submit questions, comments, suggestions and/or complaints and provide any form of feedback on all project-funded activities. The GRM will be strengthened by establishing local authority level grievance redress outlets for citizens and other stakeholders to lodge their concerns and views.

In order to minimize risks of transmission associated with COVID-19 in relation to environmental and social safeguards activities, the ESMF contains specific World Bank mandated guidance on the implementation of such activities.

The ESMF is integrated into the Project's Operational Manual and will be used as part of all activities under the proposed AF activities. The ESMF specifies its implementing responsibilities and arrangements. The proposed AF will be implemented by MARDE which has extensive experience in successfully implementing World Bank projects.



CAPMU, which has nearly 20 years of experience in implementing World Bank and GEF projects will serve as a fiduciary agency. CAPMU has a highly qualified Environmental Specialist responsible for project safeguards issues. To date, CAPMU's environmental and social performances have been qualified as satisfactory. The World Bank team will continue to monitor closely the ESMF implementation, providing, if needed, relevant assistance. The implementation of the requirement of the ESMF and applicable site-specific ESMPs will remain under the direct responsibility of CAPMU.

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

The key stakeholders include small and medium agricultural producers, local power authorities, NGOs and academia specialized in sustainable land management and land degradation neutrality initiatives, and the citizens in the areas covered under the project.

Despite the Covid-19 lockdown in Moldova during the preparation of this AF, the continuous consultation and stakeholder engagement process under the parent project ensured that the project team was fully aware about the stakeholder view on the past and continued SLM investments in Moldova. Specifically, CAPMU, has engaged with key stakeholders to discuss the results of the soil conservation investments:

- Regional conferences with farmers and local government representatives (2014-2018);
- Informal communication with government agencies (throughout 2014-2020);

In addition, the AF is based on the National Land Degradation Neutrality Targets Program developed by national authorities in 2018 with extensive consultations of the civil protection and private sector.

- The National LDN Program 2018-2030

The National Working Group (LDN WG) was established for steering the LDN TS process and LDN mainstreaming into national planning documents. The national LDN WG provided a high-level multi-stakeholder platform to secure active participation of key stakeholders. The national LDN WG includes 20 experts and policy specialists, who were delegated as representatives from governmental organizations (line ministries, national land use planning, agriculture, environment and forestry, statistics), the private sector (farmer organizations, land-based companies), CSOs.

Government leadership and multi-stakeholder engagement created a collaborative and synergistic framework for monitoring and evaluation of the LDN implementation.

- Regional Conferences with Farmers and Local Governments

CAPMU organized three regional workshops in the northern and southern regions (Basarabeasca, Donduseni and Taraclia to discuss the implementation experience and detailed methodological guides developed during the implementation of the parent project that could be replicated by other farmers and local governments. The overwhelming conclusion from these conferences was that the demand for such investments exceeds the supply and there was need to continue to systematically invest into and share more widely information about SLM practices. CAPMU also organized also regional events for local community representatives that were largely informed about agro-forestry practices implemented within the parent project with the support of which more than 2,200 ha of forestry shelterbelts have been rehabilitated.

- Meetings with Government Agencies

Meetings with government agencies, such as Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment, Moldsilva, the national forestry agency, and the Institute for Forestry Development indicated that there was continued interest to invest in SLM practices following demand from key stakeholders and constituencies which resulted in an official endorsement letter from the Government of Moldova requesting \$3.45 million GEF financing to scale up SLM activities from the parent project.



While not all rural women are necessarily disadvantaged or vulnerable, the project will ensure that women, local female leaders, female entrepreneurs and national and local civil society organizations representing women will participate in all stakeholder engagement activities to ensure that the rural women who represent 30 percent of Moldova's entire population have full information and the ability to influence decisions about the opportunities under the project to ensure a more equitable distribution of benefits under the additional financing activities.

The Environmental Management Framework of the parent project was prepared by the client in 2012, and has been updated as the ESMF in 2020 to include the required social dimensions. The updated ESMF, which also covers aspects related to the proposed AF, was disclosed for consultation on the CAPMU's website on May 25, 2020 (in English and Romanian). The final version of the ESMF was subsequently posted on the CAPMU website and disclosed by the World Bank. The client has also prepared a Stakeholder Engagement Plan, in line with GEF 7 requirements, clarifying further the proposed AF's stakeholder engagement dimensions.

**B. Disclosure Requirements (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)****Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other**

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure	For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors
02-Feb-2012	22-Feb-2012	

**"In country" Disclosure**

Moldova  
18-Jan-2012

Comments

**Pest Management Plan**

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure
Yes		

**"In country" Disclosure**

Moldova

Comments

**C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level (to be filled in when the ISDS is finalized by the project decision meeting) (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)****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 4.09 - Pest Management**

Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?

Yes

Is a separate PMP required?

Yes

If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or SM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?

Yes

**OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources**

Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?

Yes

Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?

Yes

**The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information**

Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?

Yes

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

**CONTACT POINT****World Bank**

Anatol Gobjila  
Senior Agriculture Economist

**Borrower/Client/Recipient**

Ministry of Finance

Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Development and Environment

H.E. Octavian Armasu  
Minister of Finance

**Implementing Agencies**

Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry  
H.E. Eduard Grama  
Minister of Agriculture

Ministry of Finance  
H.E. Octavian Armasu  
Minister of Finance

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT**

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

**APPROVAL**

Task Team Leader(s):	Anatol Gobjila
----------------------	----------------

**Approved By**

Safeguards Advisor:	Agnes I. Kiss	06-Nov-2020
Practice Manager/Manager:	Frauke Jungbluth	09-Nov-2020
Country Director:	Ann Akhalkatsi	11-Nov-2020