



The Republic of Uganda

Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries

Uganda Emergency Desert Locust Response Project



Stakeholder Engagement Plan

April, 2020

Table of Contents

1. Introduction/Project Description.....	2
2. Stakeholder identification and analysis	4
2.1 Methodology.....	4
2.2 Affected parties.....	5
2.3 Other Interested Parties	6
2.4 Disadvantaged/vulnerable individuals or groups	6
3. Stakeholder Engagement Program	7
3.1 Summary of stakeholder engagement during project preparation.....	7
3.2 Summary of project stakeholder needs, methods, and tools for stakeholder engagement.....	7
3.3 Proposed strategy for information disclosure and consultation process.....	8
3.4 Future of the project.....	8
4. Resources and responsibilities for stakeholder engagement activities.....	8
4.1 Resources	8
4.2 Management functions and responsibilities	9
5. Grievance Mechanism	9
6. Monitoring and Reporting	10

1. Introduction/Project Description

The Government of Uganda (GoU) responded with an emergency plan through a series of budgetary support and were largely successful in combating the first wave of infestation. However, it was also recognized that response efforts did not go far enough as resources were very limited. Survey and control teams were ill-prepared and inadequately trained and awareness of the affected communities was very weak. The problem was further compounded by weakened ties with the regional locust control bodies (Desert Locust Control Organization for Eastern Africa–DCCO-EA) that left member countries such as Uganda unable to effectively coordinate through surveillance and monitoring of breeding grounds and control of locust populations that could arise to swarming levels leading to migration and invasion of territories beyond the traditional breeding areas. In the absence of effective coordination, Uganda remains vulnerable to a cycle of reactionary measures which may prove far more costly.

Component 1: Surveillance and Control Measures. Sub-component 1.1: Pest surveillance. In order to improve locust and other pests surveillance, MAAIF together with the District LGs will mobilize communities and establish a locust surveillance system based at three levels: (i) community; (ii) district; and (iii) national to undertake continuous surveillance, mapping monitoring and reporting on the Desert locusts spread in invaded and locust prone districts through utilization of the existing structures in MAAIF and Local Governments. The current NUSAF III structures will be adopted at community level. **Sub-component 1.2: Control measures.** Appropriate control measures will be undertaken to reduce locust populations and prevent their spread to new areas. Locust control measures will be undertaken mainly through targeted ground and aerial control operations. Whenever possible and facilitated by effecting surveillance and reporting, these would be aimed at neutralizing hopper bands on the ground before they develop into adult swarms, to minimize the need for aerial spraying requiring conventional pesticides. While the focus would be on ground sprays, these would be supplemented by aerial spray operations. **Sub-component 1.3: Early Warning Systems.** The proposed project will support the establishment and operation of early warning systems will entail investment in the following areas: (i) strengthening of the capacity of the early warning unit of MAAIF; and (ii) development of Early Warning Management Information System The proposed project will support the capacity enhancement of MAAIF’s early warning unit to undertake tasks envisioned in the early warning systems by facilitating acquisitions of needed equipment, software, human resources, and capacity training of the core technical staff in the early warning unit of the MAAIF. **Sub-component 1.4: Risk reduction and management.** Monitoring and assessing environmental and human health risks associated with locust control will be undertaken to inform implementation of health, environmental and safety measures to reduce risks to an acceptable minimum. Monitoring of control operations is necessary to assess whether adverse effects occur and under what circumstances so that they can be mitigated. Activities will include: i) testing of human health and soil and water for contamination from use of insecticides; ii) estimating the cost and the effects of the locust control on crop, pastures and livestock production; iii) optimizing the selection of control strategies, protection measures, and insecticides based on situational and environmental assessments; and providing safety and awareness training for spraying teams and other locust control personnel. Public awareness campaigns and a robust communication strategy will keep the public informed about possible environmental and health effects of insecticides, before, during and after locust control operations.

Component 2: Livelihoods Protection and Restoration – This component will strengthen the coping mechanisms and livelihoods support for affected communities and vulnerable households; and, develop coping mechanisms to increase production and productivity to mitigate reduction of incomes and revenues in agriculture. The overall objective of this component is to protect lives and human capital and to restore livelihoods of affected households and communities (including small holder, agro-pastoral and

pastoral farmers). This component will be implemented through two sub-components namely: Livelihoods Restoration Support (LRS) and Labor-Intensive Public Works (LIPW). **Sub-Component 2.1: Livelihoods Restoration Support (LRS).** Through this sub-component, Government will; 1) implement the Village Revolving Fund (VRF) that involves strengthening existing savings and investment groups at village level by provision of grants to boost their capital base. Under the VRF, a total of US\$ 10,000 will be availed to support initial cluster of four groups (each with average of 30 members) per village. 2) Implement the Household Income Support Project (HISP) that involves providing grants to invest in livelihood activities for household income earnings in targeted communities. This includes boosting commercial production such as in crops, livestock, beekeeping and fisheries. Under the HISP, the active poor are targeted through the Participatory Rural Appraisal methodology and are organized to work in groups. Each group is supported with a grant of \$5,000 to \$10,000 to invest in selected market-driven enterprises. **Sub-Component 2.2: Labor-Intensive Public Works (LIPW).** This sub-component will involve provision of seasonal income transfers to poor and vulnerable households in return for their participation in labor-based works purposely to avail cash and smoothen their consumption during the lean period. The activity also results in the creation of physical assets of value to the local communities. The LIPW implementation and the LRS complement each other. The LIPW will provide temporary employment to the most vulnerable households for a period of 54 days with daily wages of UGX: 5,500. Key areas of interventions will be in physical water and soil conservation activities, agro-forestry technologies and practices, agribusiness technologies and to a smaller extent access and market infrastructure. A 10% direct transfer shall be provided for poor and vulnerable households and groups such as women and youth without labor to participate in public works and when they do not have enough and reliable support in the village. The beneficiary households will be required to form smaller savings groups at village to utilize their savings as revolving capital as well as to qualify to benefit from the VRF.

Component 3: Coordination, and Preparedness. The objective of this component is to strengthen national capacities for surveillance, response mechanisms, and ongoing preparedness for preventing future locust infestations by supporting improved coordination strategies for effective surveillance, and prevention. Therefore, this component will finance activities related to the regional and national coordination for surveillance, and prevention measures countering the recurrence of locust crises. **Subcomponent 3.1. Regional level coordination.** The regional dimension of the locust problem requires commitment from nations to manage a joint problem. Under this subcomponent, the proposed project will support activities aimed at strengthening the regional coordination capacity, strategies, method, and funding contributions to the regional level surveillance and control of desert locust. **Subcomponent 3.2. National Level Coordination.** Under this subcomponent, the proposed project will support activities aimed at building and strengthening the national and sub-national coordination capacity of government agencies to execute locust management activities. **Subcomponent 3.3. Preparedness to counter the recurrence of locust crisis.** The successful prevention of desert locust plagues relies on regular monitoring, accurate analysis of risks, detection, and prediction. This subcomponent will finance activities related to maintaining preparedness, including capacity building and training, and research to improve the knowledge of the DL insect biology and behavior.

Component 4: Project Management: Government has established structures to guide and coordinate the National Desert Locust Management strategy. The structures in place at national level include the Inter-Ministerial Committee headed by Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, the Inter-Ministerial Technical Committee and the national Desert Locust Control Task force. The National Task force at MAAIF is headed by the Permanent Secretary is responsible for coordinating all technical operations for Desert Locust Control. Several sub-committees were formed to support the coordination efforts of the national taskforce. Desert Locust control operations will also make use of the government structures already existing in local governments to better streamline the coordination at district level. This component will have two sub-

components 1) Project Administration and 2) Enhancing Transparency, Accountability and Anti-corruption.

2. Stakeholder identification and analysis

Several stakeholders, important to this project have been identified and analyzed in respect to location, interest, mandate, influence and vulnerability; and including level of literacy and potential mode of engagement (Table 2). It is important to note, invasion of the desert locust in Uganda is an emergency as such, and key stakeholders in the intervention are provided for under National Environment Act 2019 under Section 95.

This criterion is explained below.

- a. The location criteria is used to with reference to the villages and communities impacted by the desert locusts;
- b. Interest criteria has been used in analysis to refer to the level of concern and significance of concern arising from the locusts invasion in the areas impacted by the locusts;
- c. Mandate refers to consideration for the level of directive reasonability the stakeholder has in respect to the project/control of the locust. For instance, with reference to veterinary/livestock aspects, MAAIF (Directorate of Animal Resources) and the District Veterinary Office has the mandate. This is usually considered together with influence which implies the ability or powers to influence project activities; and
- d. Vulnerability refers to levels of susceptibility that stand to compromise or make a stakeholder unable to meaningfully participate in planned stakeholder engagements including other project activities or outcomes such as the inability to resettle themselves, interpret messages, open bank accounts, and restore livelihoods among others. This can be a function of literacy, age, gender, physical barriers, relation to land tenure, income and livelihood activities.

The approach used to identify stakeholders in relation to the criteria involved:

- a. Review of project relevant documents including ToRs, FAO Guidelines and in particular, project concept notes and interventions documentation serve as useful guides. Reference was also made to District and Sub-County Development Plans with a focus on food security;
- b. Consultations with District and sub-county leadership and technical staff in order to identify and categorize stakeholders including vulnerable social groups;
- c. Consultation with the project proponent and other project development partners in the areas of the project; and
- d. In-house brainstorming sessions with the Client and exchanges with the Work Bank Uganda Country Office Environmental and Social Safeguards and Agricultural Units.

2.1 Methodology

Stakeholder analysis will help to know the perceptions, interests, need, and influence of actors on the project. Identifying the appropriate consultation methodology for each stakeholder throughout the project lifecycle is necessary. In order to meet best practice approaches, the project will apply the following principles for stakeholder engagement:

- **Openness and life-cycle approach:** public consultations for the project will continue during the whole project lifecycle from preparation through implementation. Stakeholder engagement will be free of manipulation, interface, coercion, and intimidation;
- **Informed participation and feedback:** information will be provided and widely distributed among all stakeholders in an appropriate format; conducted based on timely, relevant, understandable and accessible information related to the project; opportunities provided to raise concerns and assure that stakeholder feedback is taken into consideration during decision making;
- **Inclusiveness and sensitivity:** stakeholder identification will be undertaken to support better communications and building effective relationships. The participation process for the projects is inclusive. All stakeholders are always encouraged to be involved in the consultation process. Equal access to information is provided to all stakeholders. Sensitivity to stakeholders' needs is the key principle underlying the selection of engagement methods. Special attention is given to vulnerable groups, particularly women headed households, youth, elderly and the cultural sensitivities of diverse ethnic groups.

Stakeholders of the proposed project can be affected parties, interested parties and vulnerable groups and discussed below.

2.2 Affected parties

The categories of stakeholders mapped out here are considered to be key in the Uganda Desert Emergency response project. They are considered to have high influence and mandate/interest in respect to the project, project area and potential impacts and project implementation. These require regular engagements and consultations throughout the project implementation and include;

- a. Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries -Directorate of Crops
- b. Ministry of Water and Environment (MoWE): Directorate Water Resources Management (DWRM) and Wetlands Management Department (WMD) and Uganda National Meteorological Authority (UNMA), NEMA and NFA.
- c. Ministry for Health (MoH).
- d. Uganda Police Force-Fire and Rescue Services.
- e. Ministry of Defence-Uganda People Defence Forces-UPDF
- f. Ministry of Gender Labor and Social Development
- g. Office of the Prime Minister-OPM – NUSAF 3
 - ❖ Ministry for Karamoja Affairs, State Minister for Teso Affairs, Department for Disaster Management
- h. National Environment Management Authority-NEMA
- i. Uganda Wildlife Authority-UWA
- j. National Forestry Authority-NFA
- k. Districts and sub-counties
 - ❖ District Political Leadership, District Technical Staff, Disaster Management Coordination Committees-DDMC , Sub-counties, Sub-counties political leadership (LC III chairpersons), Sub-county Technical Staff
- l. Cultural leaders/elders/opinion leaders;
- m. Local communities, Farmers, Pastoralists,
- n. Development Partners (World Bank, and FAO); and

- o. Vulnerable and marginalized social groups in the project areas (*Ik* in Kotido and *Benet* in Mt. Elgon/Sebei) with high interest but low influence will be identified, supported and encouraged to participate and be consulted as primary level stakeholders.
 - ❖ Development Partners (those supporting development interventions in areas of desert locust) World Bank, GIZ, FAO, CARE, DFID, USIAD

2.3 Other Interested Parties

These are considered to have either high interest but low mandate or high mandate but low interest. These will require to be initially consulted and regularly kept informed. Several government ministries and agencies; CSOs working in the region in areas of livelihood support, conflict resolution, psychosocial support, human rights and vulnerability, environmental conservation and social services support. These fall under this category. However, other tertiary stakeholders will require to be monitored for any concerns and relevant information shared where necessary prior and over the project implementation period.

2.4 Disadvantaged/vulnerable individuals or groups

Disadvantaged or vulnerable individuals or groups are those peoples or groups highly vulnerable to potential project impacts and often do not have a voice to express their concerns or understand the impact and risk of the project. They may be disproportionately be impacted or further disadvantaged by the project as compared with any other groups due to their vulnerable status, and usually require special arrangement to ensure their equal representation in the consultation and decision-making process associated with the project. Their vulnerability may stem from person's origin, gender, age, health condition, economic deficiency and financial insecurity, disadvantaged status in the community (e.g. minority groups), dependence on other individuals or natural resources, etc.

Awareness raising and stakeholder engagement with disadvantaged or vulnerable individuals or groups on the project must consider such group's or individuals' sensitivities, concerns and cultural differences to ensure a full understanding of project activities and benefits. Engagement with these vulnerable groups and individuals often requires the application of specific measures and assistance aimed at the facilitation of their participation in the project related decision making so that their awareness of and input to the overall process are commensurate to those of the other stakeholders.

Within the proposed Project, the vulnerable or disadvantaged groups may include, but not limited to, the following:

- Historically underserved and disadvantaged communities in this case the IK Karamoja and a vulnerable group in Sebei Region.
- Elderly, Female headed households, Refugees and internally displaced persons, People with disabilities, Poor people, including ex-pastoralists, the uneducated youth and disarmed youth of Karamoja.

Vulnerable groups within the communities affected by the project will be further confirmed and consulted during Environmental and Social Assessment preparation through dedicated means, as appropriate.

3. Stakeholder Engagement Program

3.1 Summary of stakeholder engagement during project preparation

The project is being processed as an emergency project under OP 10 paragraph 12, there is no dedicated stakeholder consultation beyond public authorities and experts at the MAAIF.

3.2 Summary of project stakeholder needs, methods, and tools for stakeholder engagement

The speed and urgency with which this project has been developed to meet the growing threat of Locust invasion in the country, combined with recently-announced government restrictions on gatherings of people has limited the project's ability to develop a complete SEP before this project is approved by the World Bank. This initial SEP was developed and shall be disclosed prior to project appraisal, as the starting point of an iterative process to develop a more comprehensive stakeholder engagement strategy and plan. It will be updated periodically as necessary, with more detail provided in the first update planned after project approval.

Some of the most common methods of stakeholder consultation to be used will include (i) use of phone and email; (ii) interviews (one-to-one); (iii) distribution of leaflets and pamphlets; (iv) public meetings; (v) group discussion; (vi) use of local radios; and (vii) newsletters. When deciding the frequency and appropriate engagement technique to consult particular group of stakeholders, the following three criteria must be taken into consideration; (i) the extent of impact of the project, (ii) the extent of the influence of the stakeholder on the project, (iii) the culturally appropriate and acceptable engagement and information dissemination.

The project will follow the FAO (2003) guideline, during the campaign planning phase, detailed stakeholder's communication strategy will be prepared and put in place in which the following issues are addressed:

- Location of treatments, general information on potential risks of pesticides, precautionary measures, re-entry intervals, pre-harvest intervals, etc.
- Appropriate and effective type of communication method to reach the target groups (e.g. radio, television, newspapers, extension service, locust survey/control teams).
- Means of informing the public in case of emergencies (e.g. insecticide spills, human intoxications, etc).
- Reach all affected villagers in the operation area including medical information sources in case of intoxications.

The project's detailed engagement strategy will be prepared as part of the Risk Communication and Community Engagement Strategy within one month of effectiveness and consequently this SEP will be updated to outline how the above points will be addressed by the Project. Consultations will be done when the final ESMF, Social Assessment and ESIA/ESMPs will be prepared. An indicative outline of the Community Communication and Outreach Guideline is included in Annex-1.

3.3 Proposed strategy for information disclosure and consultation process

The strategy for information disclosure and consultation may vary depending on the regional and local context. However, it will be important that the different activities are inclusive and culturally sensitive, thereby ensuring vulnerable groups outlined above will have the chance to participate in the Project benefits and contained from potential pesticide risks. This can include, among others, household-outreach activities, group discussion, use of local radios of different languages, and the use of verbal communication or pictures, etc. While country-wide awareness campaigns will be established, area specific communication and awareness raising consultation might be conducted when combating infestation of locust in a given locality.

Stakeholder engagement will remain an ongoing process. The MAAIF and other implementing agencies like NUSAF will conduct proper consultation with the community members and other concerned stakeholders before, during and after the spray of pesticide using communication channels outlined above or deemed appropriate. During preparation and implementation of component 2, on livelihood restoration, communities will be consulted and their full participation sought guided by NUSAF community approach and structure. In addition, consultations will be conducted during the preparation of ESIA and ESMF/ESMPs. The draft and final ESIA, ESMF and SEP will be disclosed prior to formal consultations.

The approaches taken will thereby ensure that information is meaningful, timely, and accessible to all affected stakeholders, use of different languages including addressing cultural sensitivities, as well as challenges deriving from illiteracy or disabilities, tailored to the differences in geography, livelihoods and way of life. The project will also ensure the establishment of a Grievance Redress Mechanism.

3.4 Future of the project

Stakeholders will be kept informed as the project develops, especially regarding guidelines on operations inline with health and safety procedures and taking into consideration the COVID -19 guidelines and restriction during the period. This will include reporting on project environmental and social performance and implementation of the stakeholder engagement plan and grievance mechanism. This will be important for the wider public, but specifically critical for the directly impacted community members.

4. Resources and responsibilities for stakeholder engagement activities

4.1 Resources

The MAAIF will be responsible for the implementation of the activities in this SEP. The Locust Response Project will allocate adequate resource for the implementation of the SEP. Include for development of safeguards tools like ESIA, livelihoods assessment, community consultation and training of experts. These studies will inform the project approach of SEP. The financing will be further used for producing communication materials, including local radio content, and traditional information sharing channels for effective information sharing with communities pre, during and post spraying and documentation.

4.2 Management functions and responsibilities

It is noted that, effective and meaningful operationalization of the SEP will rest with MAAIF who are by mandate, project implementers and they therefore retain main responsibility for the planning and implementation of the activities of this SEP and GRM. In particular, the Directorate of Crop Resources especially its Department of Crop Protection shall be responsible for the quality SEP and will take a lead in the implementation of the SEP. It may require MAAIF to retain services of a Specialist to coordinate all stakeholder engagement activities as well as take a responsibility to recruit competent community Liaison officers (CLOs) to support the implementation of the activities underscored in this SEP. NUSAF will also take an active part in facilitating stakeholder engagement as guided by this SEP for the component 2 on livelihood restoration that they will be implementing. While Inspectorate of Government responsible for monitoring effective and efficient project implementation will also take part in implementing this SEP. The districts and subcounty technical teams will as well take part in the implementation of this SEP.

The stakeholder engagement activities will be documented through quarterly and annual progress reports and shared with the World Bank.

5. Grievance Mechanism

The project will prepare a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) through which, the project affected as well interested persons, local communities and the public are able to raise issues on the project. The GRM should guarantee privacy and confidentiality on the part of the aggrieved party.

The main objective of a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) is to assist resolve complaints in a timely, effective and efficient manner. Project-level GRMs can provide the most effective way for people to raise issues and concerns about project that affect them. The project-level GRM will be culturally appropriate, effective, accessible and should be known to the affected population. MAAIF will conduct awareness raising for the affected communities about the presence of the GRM and inform their right to file any concerns, complaints and issues they have related to the project.

Grievances and concerns are bound to arise from the onset of the project given the inherent fears and misgivings in the community regarding use of pesticides as evidenced from earlier efforts by GoU to conduct indoor spray to control malaria in the country¹ revealed. The activities and the operations in the project are likely to be seen to present some undesirable social-economic and environmental impacts, which may irritate or cause feelings of discomfort and fear among the different stakeholders. Therefore, the need for a GRM that can be used by the communities and the public to communicate their fears and concerns on the project during project implementation.

It is therefore important to note that, managing grievances becomes an integral part of the stakeholder engagement strategy for, and beyond the implementation of the emergency desert locust control project

¹ The findings of a study on Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices about Malaria and its control in rural northwest Tanzania indicated that about half of the study participants had heard of in-door residual spraying (IRS) campaigns. Meaning that the other 50% had no idea about IRS. However even those who indicated that, they had heard about IRS were mixing it with aerosol spray used in adult knock down destruction of mosquitoes in dwellings and resting areas and equally feared that, the pesticides would equally have a knock-down effect on humans and would be reluctant to accept their houses sprayed (Wandawa Patrick PP (2011): *Perspectives on Community's Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices about Indoor Residual Spraying in Kabale District MSc. Thesis Makerere University*).

operations. The proposed GRM is in line with MAAIF RPLRP² and it is considered sufficient. The GRM suggested is also within existing legal system, and only provides an additional readily accessible opportunity to promptly resolve grievances at the local level.

The GRM is important since it provides a transparent and credible process for fair, effective and lasting outcome. It also builds trust and cooperation as an integral component of broader community consultation that facilitates corrective actions. Specifically, the GRM:

- Provides affected people with avenues for making a complaint or resolving any dispute that may arise during the project implementation;
- Ensures that appropriate and mutually acceptable redress actions are identified and implemented to the satisfaction of complainants; and
- Avoids the need to resort to judicial proceedings.

Grievance redress committee will be established at village level/ sub county level to the district and national level to ensure accessibility and transparency of the GRM. If an effective and functional grievance redress committee exists at village, sub county and District, the existing GRM will serve as a location addressing grievances related to the project with provision of appropriate training for the committee members regarding the requirement in the project.

MAAIF will develop and implement GRM guideline that details the procedure, timing, indicative committee members, etc. Resources will be allocated for the GRM. The complaints recorded, resolved and referred will be reported quarterly and annually together with the environmental and social implementation performance report.

6. Monitoring and Reporting

Monitoring of the stakeholder engagement activities is important for several reasons such as:

- a. ascertaining whether planned stakeholder engagements and other related activities are progressing as planned;
- b. whether intended outputs are being realized; and
- c. For the effectiveness and efficiency of SEP to be evaluated, challenges to be identified and rectified in time.

In the course of project implementation, the SEP will be periodically updated, as necessary, consistent with the requirements of ESS10, in a manner acceptable to the Bank. Any major changes to the project related activities and to its schedule will be duly reflected in the SEP. MAAIF will prepare and submit to the Bank quarterly and annual SEP implementation reports including ESHS performance and other environment and social instruments of the Project, including the grievance mechanism. The quarterly summaries will provide a mechanism for assessing both the number and the nature of complaints and requests for information, along with the Project's ability to address those in a timely and effective manner.

Information on public engagement activities undertaken by the Project during the year will be conveyed to the stakeholders in following ways: (i) publication of a standalone annual report on project's stakeholder engagement; and (ii) Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) will also be included and monitored by the project on a regular basis as part of the Community Communication and Outreach Guideline.

²RPLRP Complaints Handling and Grievance Redress Mechanism, MAAIF

Regular monitoring of stakeholder engagement activities will be undertaken by the Ministry. It is also advised that, for purposes of transparency and independency of outcome, an independent NGO should be procured by the Project to conduct outcome evaluation of the implementation of this SEP at the end of the Project.

Further details will be outlined in the updated SEP, to be prepared within 1 month of effectiveness, including the establishment of detailed stakeholder's communication guideline.

Annex-1: Indicative Table of Content for Community Communication and Outreach Guideline

1. MAAIF Locust Strategic Communications Guideline

1.1. Purpose and background

1.2. Goal and key audiences

2. MAAIF Principles for Effective Communications

2.1 **Accessible:** (defining the parameters of communication accessibility, identification of effective channels, making information available using effective channels and devising effective channels for historically underserved and vulnerable groups)

2.2 **Actionable:** (defining the parameters of communication actionability, moving audiences toward action: the communications continuum, designing a behavior change campaign and encouraging action during a health emergency)

2.3 **Credible and Trusted:** (outlining the defining criteria for trusted communication, establishing technical accuracy, transparency, coordination with partners and communicating as one MAAIF message)

2.4 **Relevant:** (identification of relevant communication content, knowing the audience, listening the audience, tailoring the message to the audience, motivating the audience to take part and provide feedback).

2.5 **Timely:** (ensure timely communication, communicate what is known at the right time (than leaving stakeholders to speculate) and keep the conversation in continuum.

2.6 **Understandable:** (use simple language, relate the message with stories stakeholder's context, use visual and familiar language.

3. **Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning:** (ensure tentative monitoring indicators using the principles of effective communication).

4. **Communication Functions at MAAIF and other implementing entities:** ensure adequate exploration of the various communication functions and units at the MAAIF, including the changes used and how such functions would be relevant to the proposed project.

5. **Annexes:** stakeholder engagement planning, documentation, monitoring indicators and reporting templates