

<b>Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet (ISDS)</b>	
<b>Section I – Basic Information</b>	
Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: October 18, 2004	Report No.:AC1028
<b>A. Basic Project Data</b>	
<b>A.1. Project Statistics</b>	
Country: Romania	Project ID: P087807
Project: Romania: Mine Closure, Environment and	TTLs: John E. Strongman and Anis A. Dani
Total project cost (by component):	
Component A Mine Closure and Environmental Improvement	71.9
Component B Socio-economic Regeneration	68.3
Component C Operating Costs	6.1
Contingency	2.8
Front End Fee	0.6
Total	149.7
Appraisal Date: October 4, 2004	Loan/Credit amount(\$m): IBRD: 120
Board Date: December 16, 2004	
Other financing amounts by source:	Government 29.7(\$m.)
Managing Unit: COCPD	Sector: Mining and other extractive (100%)
Lending Instruments: Specific Investment Loan	
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency recovery)? Yes? <input type="checkbox"/> No? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Environmental Category: B	
<b>A.2. Project Objectives</b>	
<p>The development objective is to strengthen the Government's ability to undertake mining sector reform by (i) building MEC capacity for closing uneconomic mining enterprises through support for closing complex mines and ancillary enterprises in an environmentally sustainable manner; and (ii) providing support to the National Agency for Programs Development and Implementation for the Reconstruction of the Mining Regions (NAD) for socio-economic regeneration of the mining regions.</p> <p>This project is the second Bank operation supporting the restructuring of the Romanian mining sector. The first project involved support for closure of 31 mines, social mitigation support for redundant mine workers through creation of 10,000 alternate jobs, and institutional development to build Government capacity to manage the mining sector through a new mining law, finalization of a Mine Closure Manual, and specialized studies on subsidy management, strategic environmental assessment, and poverty and social impact analysis. The second project builds on the lessons of the first loan by focusing attention on more complex mines (e.g. sulphur), initiating implementation of SEA recommendations, and job creation through ALMPs aimed at individual job seekers to improving the environment for economic growth and social regeneration in the mining regions.</p>	

The Mine Closure and Environment component of the project aims to:

- (i) Complete the closure and rehabilitation of mine sites where production is terminated and thereby reduce environmental impacts and the environmental legacy of the mining sector in line with accession requirements for EU, and return former mine land to other social and economic purposes.
- (ii) Improve the mining sector environmental performance.

The Socio-Economic Regeneration component is designed to:

- (i) Scale up the job creation measures implemented under the first loan.
- (ii) Support local development activities through community capacity building and financing of economic infrastructure and social services;

Strengthen the Borrower's capacity to implement the socio-economic regeneration program.

Key performance indicators are:

- Subsidy monitoring system shows decline in level of subsidies to meet EU target dates;
- Hard budget constraints on mining companies to prevent accumulation of additional arrears for state and municipal taxes, and electricity tariffs;
- Number of mines and mining enterprises closed in an environmentally sound manner
- Area of land rehabilitated and handed over to other users or back to the community
- Number of jobs created by the project
- Number of beneficiaries from employment and training incentives scheme (ETIS);
- Number of additional loans, and amount disbursed by micro-credit program
- Repayment rate of micro-credit loans
- Number and value of sub-projects implemented under SDSMC
- Number of community groups in mining settlements mobilized through successful Small Grants Scheme (SGS) implementation
- Number of mining settlements that are able to access resources from other programs for local development activities.

The project is contributes to the Bank's CAS objective of supporting the Government's program:

*The Government's program lays the basis for a pragmatic approach to reforming the economy and raising living standards by improving the quality of Government services and creating an attractive business environment. ...Bank Group assistance will support a broad set of structural and sectoral reforms to accelerate growth and pave the way for Romania's eventual accession to the EU.*

The project is designed to support the Mining Strategy by tackling critical bottlenecks in the reform process that have slowed down mining sector restructuring through measures that improve social and economic opportunities for the poor (i.e. those impoverished by

sector restructuring) that will enable the Government to move forward on critical and irreversible steps of the sector restructuring program. This approach was identified as one of the key recommendations of the CDF process.

The project also contributes to the structural agenda by helping to create conditions that will enable the Government to close uneconomic mines and phase out quasi-fiscal deficits that undermine the sustainability of the energy sector. Loss-making mining companies remain a major source of arrears to the utility companies, especially electricity. However, subsidies to mining companies and arrears have continued, ostensibly to protect jobs in the mining regions. By shifting focus from social mitigation to socio-economic regeneration in mining regions, the project creates the basis for accelerating the reform program.

### A.3. Project Description

A. The Mine Closure and Environmental component (total cost US\$72 million and loan amount of US\$58 including contingencies) of the Project will:

- (i) Support the closure and environmental rehabilitation of mines and/or mine processing facilities at 20 sites as well as other sites to be identified; and
- (ii) Help start implementation of the recommendations of the Sector Environmental Assessment which was conducted in 2002.

*Physical Works.* The government has proposed 20 sites from 7 regions for closure based on criteria agreed with the World Bank including size, technical complexity, cost, environmental and social impact. While production has previously been stopped at many of these sites, the sites have never been closed and properly remediated. Mine buildings, equipment and environmental liabilities will be addressed in the closure process and the land will be reclaimed to allow use for beneficial new purposes. Nine of the 20 sites are located in the Jiu Valley where land for development and agriculture is scarce. The project will coordinate closely with the proposed World Bank supported Jiu Valley regional development project on the timing of the closures to assist in the optimum transfer of the land for new uses. These are also sites where subsidies have been high and closure will thus assist in reducing mining sector subsidy needs. The sites include coal, lignite, copper, polymetallic (copper, gold, lead), and sulfur mines, as well as mine processing facilities. One site, the Caliman Sulphur mine, will be especially challenging due to its size and environmental issues, and accounts on its own for almost 20% of the mine closure component. The physical works to close the mines and environmental rehabilitation works will take from 2 to 4 years per site. The mine closure activities will also provide a short term boost to the local economy as most workers and supplies are procured locally.

*Technical Support.* The first Mine Closure and Social Mitigation Project (MCSMP) built a legal and technical base for mine closure in Romania that will be utilized in the new project. In addition to the 20 sites to be closed under the Project the Government is closing an estimated additional 120 sites using its own procedures and sources of funds.

The Governments closure procedures have been modified in line with the procedures used in the Bank project and are considered in line with good international practice. Technical assistance, through technical audits to ensure international best practice on physical closure and environmental works, will be continued under the Project. As in the first project, training will be provided to transfer knowledge on closure practices from the Project to the broader Government closure program implemented by the Consolidated Group for Mine Closure (CGMC). The project will also assist in the preparation of technical mine closure manuals for salt and uranium mines. An application for donor trust funds has been made to fund preparation of these manuals.

*The environmental sub-component* (total cost US\$0.95 million and loan amount US\$0.81 million) seeks to improve environmental performance in the mining sector. A Sector Environmental Assessment (SEA) was conducted in 2001 and was extended and updated in 2003 under the MCSMP and the new Project will implement some of the SEA's key recommendations. The sub-component will prepare (a) a manual for implementation of an environmental management system in the mining sector; (b) a manual for environmental protection procedures in the mining sector; (c) guidelines for integrated monitoring of environmental impacts generated by mining activities; and (d) and implement an environmental monitoring pilot project in two sites, Calimani and Baia de Aries.

#### **B. Socio-Economic Regeneration:**

The Socio-Economic Regeneration (SER) component of the Project will scale up the job creation activities piloted by the MCSMP and will add sub-components to foster local conditions for economic growth and social regeneration based on the lessons learned. The total base cost of this component will be US\$68 million, excluding contingencies, of which US\$57 million will be from the loan. The main objectives of the SER component are to:

1. Scale up the job creation measures implemented under the first loan.
2. Support local development activities through community capacity building and financing of economic infrastructure and social services;
3. Strengthen the Borrower's capacity to implement the socio-economic regeneration program.

Since the sector restructuring process started in 1997, unemployment indicators in mining regions have tended to lag behind other regions in Romania, justifying targeted support to mining communities. The following three job creation activities are being implemented under the MCSMP and will be scaled up under the proposed project.

1. Employment and Training Incentives Scheme (ETIS): The scheme provides a financial incentive to potential employers to hire unemployed workers, enabling expanding businesses to hire and retrain unskilled workers. The ETIS is expected to create employment for an estimated 8,000 people.
2. Micro-Credit Scheme: After initial delays to enact a new law and regulations for micro-credit, implementation proceeded rapidly under MCSMP through two Romanian NGOs that manage \$3.6 million in revolving funds for the first loan. The average cost of job creation under the first loan has been \$1,720. The micro-credit scheme will support an estimated 10,000 jobs under the second project.
3. Workspace Centers: Ten Workspace Centers were created under the MCSMP in former mine buildings. The project will finance management contracts for three years to administer the Centers, incubate new businesses and provide enterprise support training to aspiring entrepreneurs.

Subsequently, the Workspace Centers will be handed over to local governments under new management arrangements to be developed during this project. The project will also finance purchase of common equipment to facilitate functioning of enterprises at the Workspace Centers. The Workspace Centers will incubate 180 new enterprises, while an estimated 6,000 jobs will be stimulated through this subcomponent.

A second series of activities (4-7) is aimed at supporting local development activities through community capacity building and financing of economic infrastructure and social services.

4. Social Development Schemes for the Mining Communities (SDSMC): The MCSMP was restructured in the first quarter of 2004 and \$5.5 million of savings from the mine closure activities was re-allocated to finance Social Development Schemes among mining communities. This sub-component is implemented by the Romanian Social Development Fund, which has a track record of success in implementing two previous Bank loans, under a collaboration arrangement for implementation of this sub-component. The SDSMC will be scaled up and will continue to be the responsibility of the RSDF, as a sub-component of the socio-economic regeneration program.
5. Municipal Infrastructure: Infrastructure facilities within and to mining communities have been in a state of decline since the mining industry collapsed. The Borrower has requested financing to enable mining municipalities to finance municipal infrastructure schemes to be identified through a process of community consultation and local development planning in mining localities that will be severely affected by sector restructuring.
6. Small Grants Scheme (SGS): The project will scale up the micro-projects piloted by DfID under the MCSMP to implement micro-projects aimed at human resource development and improving the welfare of women and youth, and building social capital among local communities. The social capital benefits of the DFID pilot have encouraged the Borrower to request this sub-component under the loan which will give priority to proposals that benefit women and youth groups.
7. Community Capacity Building: The project will contract local consultants to facilitate a process of community mobilization and dialogue among local government, intended beneficiaries and other stakeholders in the local development process, and to help prepare proposals and finance technical feasibility studies for other sub-components of the loan. This process will help to identify and select priority infrastructure and social service investments that may be supported by activities 4-6 above.

A third series of activities (8-10) are intended to strengthen the institutional capacity of the Borrower to implement the socio-economic regeneration component.

8. Social Impact Monitoring: NAD will commission annual Social Impact Monitoring and additional specialized studies to inform strategic planning and project review at NAD and MEC, with the support of the Anti-Poverty Commission (CASPIIS).
9. Public Information: Effective communication with local communities in mining regions and transparency will be crucial to successful implementation of the project. A consultant shall be recruited to help NAD develop its public information strategy, while service providers shall be contracted to develop appropriate materials for dissemination.
10. Institutional Development & Staff Training: This sub-component will include capacity building for NAD, PMU-SER and RSDF, and the cost of MIS technical services and equipment for this component.

#### C. Project Operating Costs

The third component consists of the support for the operating costs of the two project implementing agencies namely (i) the Project Management Unit (PMU) which will manage the Mine Closure and Environmental component will also be responsible for consolidating project accounts; and (ii) the Project Management Unit for Socio-Economic Regeneration (PMU-SER) which will coordinate all the sub-components related to Socio-Economic Regeneration (SER). Total base costs (excluding contingencies) for incremental operating expenses are estimated at US\$6.1 million, (loan amount US\$3.3 million), consisting of US\$2.3 million in project costs (\$1.2 million loan) for the PMU, and \$3.8 million in project costs (\$2.1 million from loan proceeds) for the PMU-SER and partner organizations involved in the SER program.

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

The project is located in 7 mountainous mining regions to the north and west of Bucharest including Jiu Valley, Brad, Zlatna, Baia de Aries, Borsa, Bucovina, and Balan . The 20 mines and mine processing facilities to be closed include hard coal mining, hard coal processing facilities, copper and polymetallic mining and mine processing facilities, and sulphur mining. The mine closure and environmental remediation process will typically include demolition and removal of mine buildings and equipment, management of environmental liabilities including stabilization and rehabilitation of waste rock dumps, rehabilitation of surface areas including tailings dams, and water treatment where necessary (e.g. Caliman sulphur mine). Environmental management plans (EMPs) for each of the sites are being prepared. Four of the proposed mine sites have a total of 11 tailings management facilities (TMFs) which trigger the Dam Safety Safeguard. The project will reduce risk of failure at these TMFs and will ensure that adequate post closure monitoring plans are also in place for TMFs closed under the project. The sites to be closed under the project have been inspected by the Romanian experts and are being maintained and operated in line with Romanian regulatory requirements. At the request of the Bank an independent dam specialist, who also works on the Romania Hazard Risk Mitigation project and is familiar with dam safety issues in Romania, also made site visits and conducted a rapid risk assessment of the TMFs to be included in the project. The specialist considered all of the sites to be included in the project to be stable and to be low risk for major failure. However, the specialist identified possible water management issues at 4 of the sites, which if not addressed could result in harm to the local ecology. The results of the rapid risk assessment, which include recommendations for small works to address the water management issues at these 4 sites, were provided to Government who are taking appropriate actions.

The municipal infrastructure component will finance subprojects that potentially could involve involuntary resettlement. Land acquisition is currently governed by Law 33 (1994), and MEC has a good track record of implementing involuntary resettlement in the past. The Borrower has communicated their intention to exclude any subprojects that require acquisition or private property from the loan. Nonetheless, it has been considered prudent to prepare a land expropriation/resettlement framework that describes the procedures to be followed in the event that during implementation involuntary resettlement is found to be necessary for any subproject. The land expropriation/resettlement framework has been adapted from that prepared for the Romania Transport Restructuring Project. The policy framework serves to ensure that the procedures to be followed for resettlement, should it ever be necessary, will also be consistent with Bank policy. An Environmental Framework for Municipal Infrastructure was also prepared.

***B. Check Environmental Category*** A [ ], B [X], C [ ], FI [ ]

*Comments:* In concurrence with ECCSD Safeguards Unit, the project has been assigned environmental Category B (Partial Assessment). The basis for this rating is that the main environmental issues associated with the project related to the physical closure of the mines. The social safeguard screening category is SF.

***C. Safeguard Policies Triggered***

	Yes	No
<a href="#">Environmental Assessment</a> (OP/BP/GP 4.01)	[X]	[ ]
<a href="#">Natural Habitats</a> (OP/BP 4.04)	[ ]	[X]
<a href="#">Pest Management</a> (OP 4.09)	[ ]	[X]
<a href="#">Cultural Property</a> (draft OP 4.11 - <a href="#">OPN 11.03-</a> )	[ ]	[X]
<a href="#">Involuntary Resettlement</a> (OP/BP 4.12)	[X]	[ ]
<a href="#">Indigenous Peoples</a> (OD 4.20)	[ ]	[X]
<a href="#">Forests</a> (OP/BP 4.36)	[ ]	[X]
<a href="#">Safety of Dams</a> (OP/BP 4.37)	[X]	[ ]
<a href="#">Projects in Disputed Areas</a> (OP/BP/GP 7.60)*	[ ]	[X]
<a href="#">Projects on International Waterways</a> (OP/BP/GP 7.50)	[ ]	[X]

**Section II – Key Safeguard Issues and Their Management**

***D. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues.***

D.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 project will support physical mine closure and rehabilitation activity, including some Tailing Management Facilities. An infrastructure component is also included and as such the possibility of involuntary resettlement needs to be considered. Environmental Management Plans for sites to be closed and rehabilitated have been prepared as have an Environmental Framework for the unidentified mines and Environmental Framework and Involuntary Resettlement Framework for Municipal Infrastructure.

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

The mining restructuring entails a downsizing of the labor force by 32,300 during the period 2004-07. While this is not covered by the safeguard policies, they pose a moderate risk to achieving the project development objective. The Borrower has adequate systems in place to compensate redundant mining workers through generous severance payments, unemployment benefits and early retirement packages. The project will monitor the delivery of these entitlements during implementation. In addition, the project is making a significant investment in restoration of livelihoods through the SER sub-component, the impacts of which will be assessed annually.

\* By supporting the proposed project, the Bank does not intend to prejudice the final determination of the parties' claims on the disputed areas

Another impact could be triggered by land expropriation for infrastructure works. The Borrower has communicated their intention to exclude any subprojects from the municipal infrastructure sub-component that require acquisition of private property from the loan. Nonetheless, it has been considered prudent to prepare a policy framework that describes the procedures to be followed in the event that during implementation involuntary resettlement is found to be necessary for any subproject.

**D.3. Describe the treatment of alternatives (if relevant)**

If no action is taken to close the mine and mine processing facilities in an environmentally acceptable manner the environmental impacts of mining would remain and could worsen. Waste dumps would erode and create negative environmental impacts, contaminated water would be released, untreated, into the waterways and the land area could not be utilized for other useful economic activity.

**D.4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.**

Based on the MCMSP the Borrower capacity is considered adequate. Closure of mines is expected to be carried out by CGMC which was responsible for mine closure under MCSMP and has a demonstrated, reliable capability in this regard. The Socio-economic regeneration activities are carried out by NAD who have also demonstrated reliable capacity in this regard in implementing the social mitigation activities under the MCSMP.

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

The EMPs for each site will be subject to consultation in each affected area. A Women in Mining workshop, to discuss and incorporate the impacts and needs of women affected by the project, was conducted in October 6<sup>th</sup> 2004 and it was decided to continue this process with similar decentralized workshops in 4-6 mining regions. The EMPs and Environmental and Involuntary Resettlement Frameworks have been publicly disclosed.

***F. Disclosure Requirements Date***

*Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other:*

Date of receipt by the Bank	09/21/04	or Not Applicable
Date of "in-country" disclosure	10/07/04	or Not Applicable
Date of submission to InfoShop	10/07/04	or Not Applicable
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	NA	or Not Applicable

<i>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process:</i>		
Date of receipt by the Bank	09/28/04	or Not Applicable
Date of “in-country” disclosure	10/07/04	or Not Applicable
Date of submission to InfoShop	10/07/04	or Not Applicable
<i>Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework:</i>		
Date of receipt by the Bank	NA	or Not Applicable
Date of “in-country” disclosure	NA	or Not Applicable
Date of submission to InfoShop	NA	or Not Applicable
<i>Pest Management Plan:</i>		
Date of receipt by the Bank	NA	or Not Applicable
Date of “in-country” disclosure	NA	or Not Applicable
Date of submission to InfoShop	NA	or Not Applicable
<i>Dam Safety Management Plan:</i>		
Date of receipt by the Bank	NA	or Not Applicable
Date of “in-country” disclosure	NA	or Not Applicable
Date of submission to InfoShop	NA	or Not Applicable
If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why.		
<b>Section III – Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level (To be filled in when the ISDS is finalized by the project decision meeting)</b>		
<b><i>OP/BP 4.01 - Environment Assessment:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	X	
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit review and approve the EA report?	X	
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	X	
<b><i>OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?		X
If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?		X
<b><i>OP 4.09 - Pest Management:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	NA	
Is a separate PMP required?	NA	
If yes, are PMP requirements included in project design?	NA	
<b><i>Draft OP 4.11 (OPN 11.03) - Cultural Property:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Does the EA include adequate measures?	NA	
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on physical cultural resources?	NA	
<b><i>OD 4.20 - Indigenous Peoples:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Has a separate indigenous people development plan been prepared in consultation with the Indigenous People?	NA	
If yes, then did the Regional Social Development Unit review and	NA	

approve the plan?		
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit?	NA	
<b><i>OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Has a resettlement action plan, policy framework or policy process been prepared?	X	
If yes, then did the Regional Social Development Unit review and approve the plan / policy framework / policy process?	X	
<b><i>OP/BP 4.36 – Forests:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	NA	
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	NA	
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?		
<b><i>OP/BP 4.37 - Safety of Dams:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Have dam safety plans been prepared?	NA	
Have the TORs as well as composition for the independent Panel of Experts (POE) been reviewed and approved by the Bank?	NA	
Has an Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) been prepared and arrangements been made for public awareness and training?	NA	
<b><i>OP 7.50 - Projects on International Waterways:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Have the other riparians been notified of the project?	NA	
If the project falls under one of the exceptions to the notification requirement, then has this been cleared with the Legal Department, and the memo to the RVP prepared and sent?	NA	
What are the reasons for the exception?	NA	
Please explain:		
Has the RVP approved such an exception?	NA	
<b><i>OP 7.60 - Projects in Disputed Areas:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Has the memo conveying all pertinent information on the international aspects of the project, including the procedures to be followed, and the recommendations for dealing with the issue, been prepared, cleared with the Legal Department and sent to the RVP?	NA	
Does the PAD/MOP include the standard disclaimer referred to in the OP?	NA	
<b><i>BP 17.50 - Public Disclosure:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	X	
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?	X	
<b><i>All Safeguard Policies:</i></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of the safeguard measures?	X	

Have safeguard measures costs been included in project cost?		X
Will the safeguard measures costs be funded as part of project implementation?		X
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures?		X
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?		X
<i>Signed and submitted by:</i>		
	<u>Name</u>	<u>Date</u>
Task Team Leaders:	John E. Strongman and Anis A. Dani	Signed October20 2004
Project Safeguards Specialist 1:	Bernard Baratz (for Environment)	
Project Safeguards Specialist 2:	Maninder Gill (for Involuntary Resettlement)	
Project Safeguards Specialist 3:		
<i>Approved by:</i>		
	<u>Name</u>	<u>Date</u>
Regional Safeguards Coordinator:	Ron Hoffer	Signed October20 2004
Comments:		
Sector Manager:	Peter A. van der Veen	[October 20, 2004]
Comments:		