

**COMBINED PROJECT INFORMATION DOCUMENTS / INTEGRATED  
SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET (PID/ISDS)  
ADDITIONAL FINANCING**

**Report No.:** PIDISDSA15282

**Date Prepared/Updated:** 16-Sep-2015

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**A. Basic Project Data**

|  |  |                                    |                              |
|--|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>Country:</b>  | Africa   | <b>Project ID:</b>                 | P157303                      |
|  |  | <b>Parent Project ID (if any):</b> | P145196                      |
| <b>Project Name:</b>   | Additional Financing to Eastern Recovery Project (P157303)   |                                    |                              |
| <b>Parent Project Name:</b>  | DRC Eastern Recovery Project (P145196)   |                                    |                              |
| <b>Region:</b>   | AFRICA   |                                    |                              |
| <b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>   | 16-Oct-2015  | <b>Estimated Board Date:</b>       | 11-Dec-2015                  |
| <b>Practice Area (Lead):</b>   | Social Protection & Labor  | <b>Lending Instrument:</b>         | Investment Project Financing |
| <b>Sector(s):</b>  | Other social services (30%), General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (25%), Rural and Inter-Urban Roads and Highways (20%), General education sector (15%), General water, sanitation and flood protection sector (10%) |                                    |                              |
| <b>Theme(s):</b>   | Conflict prevention and post-conflict reconstruction (100%)  |                                    |                              |
| <b>Borrower(s):</b>  | Ministry Of Finances   |                                    |                              |
| <b>Implementing Agency:</b>  | DRC Social Fund  |                                    |                              |
| <b>Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?</b> |  |                                    |                              |
| <b>Financing (in USD Million)</b>  |  |                                    |                              |
| <b>Financing Source</b>  |  |                                    | <b>Amount</b>                |
| BORROWER/RECIPIENT   |  |                                    | 0.00                         |
| International Development Association (IDA)  |  |                                    | 34.00                        |
| IDA Grant  |  |                                    | 16.00                        |
| Total Project Cost   |  |                                    | 50.00                        |
| <b>Environmental Category:</b>   | B - Partial Assessment   |                                    |                              |
| <b>Appraisal Review Decision (from</b>   | The review did authorize to proceed with Negotiations, in principle  |                                    |                              |

|                                    |    |
|------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Decision Note):</b>             |    |
| <b>Other Decision:</b>             |    |
| <b>Is this a Repeater project?</b> | No |

## B. Introduction and Context

### Country Context

Over the past three decades, the eastern provinces of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) have been host to an explosive mix of weak governance, widespread poverty, natural resource mismanagement, land disputes and the exploitation of ethnic divisions for political and economic gain by foreign and Congolese armed groups, creating an instability that has frequently spilled over into outright violent conflict. The cumulative impact has been catastrophic. Conflict related deaths since 1998 are estimated to exceed 5.4 million, while millions of others have been plunged into a state of acute vulnerability due to displacement, dispossession, the breakdown of communal and social bonds, and the loss of livelihoods.

DRC ranked second to last in the 2014 Human Development Report of UNDP, with a human development index of .338, lower than the sub-Saharan Africa average of .502. Access to basic social services and infrastructures (in particular roads and power distribution) is limited across the country, including the eastern provinces. Indeed, years of civil war have caused a breakdown in the social contract and reinforced the isolation of many parts of the east, creating a haven for armed groups and holding back the economic and social development that are crucial for long-term stability.

One of the most vulnerable groups are displaced populations. DRC now hosts one of the largest internally displaced populations in the world. This internal displacement has steadily grown over time to the point where approximately 10 percent of the eastern DRC's population is currently displaced. The number of internally displaced persons (IDPs) has almost tripled, from about 1 million in 2006 to a peak of 3.8 million in 2008 and now hovering at around 2.8 million. Because they are the focal point of military activity and military responses, North and South Kivu host the largest numbers of IDPs—900,000 (August 2014) and 618,000 (September 2014), respectively; Katanga also hosts a large number of IDPs (607,000 as of the end of August 2014), primarily in the northern part (Tanganyika).

As illustrated by the figures above, internal displacement in DRC is extremely dynamic, and the overall numbers mask the extent of re-displacement and return. Many IDPs have moved from location to location multiple times. In addition, despite the increasing overall figures for IDPs, in almost every year several hundreds of thousands of IDPs return to their original home areas.

The insecurity in eastern DRC has also lead to large numbers of people leaving the country as refugees. As of December 2013, a total of 563,376 DR Congolese were counted as refugees abroad, of which 66 percent (371,339) resided in Great Lakes Region neighboring countries. As of Dec 2013 most of the Congolese refugees in the region were in Uganda (29 percent), Rwanda (13 percent), and Tanzania (12 percent). The refugee situation is also dynamic. The number of registered refugees is consistently high, but each year tens of thousands of Congolese refugees

return to their country.

Despite the problems in DRC, it hosts refugees from other countries. As of January 2015, there were an estimated 129,440 Rwandan, 75,000 Central African and about 10,000 Burundian refugees in the DRC. They mostly live in isolated rural areas in North Kivu, South Kivu, and Maniema, among the local population. The current crisis in Burundi is swelling the number of Burundians seeking refuge in DRC.

The displaced face tremendous challenges during displacement and upon their return. They can also constitute potential triggers for further conflict as they represent additional claims on often scarce resources, and are vulnerable to recruitment into armed groups. In addition, displacement entails an additional strain on already poor hosting communities. The challenge for DRC is how to define and implement longer-term support for the displaced in a context of evolving security and humanitarian needs and how to achieve viable and sustainable return and re-integration processes for those IDPs and refugees who are able to go home.

### **Sectoral and institutional Context**

Across the GLR there is a relatively robust policy and legal framework in place to protect those affected by conflict-induced displacement. The DRC, among other countries, has signed and ratified the UN Refugee Convention, has signed the African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of IDPs in Africa and has laws and protocols that are consistent with these conventions. The government also has in place some laws that protect and establish responsibilities for the care of displaced persons. Notably, the Government of DRC is currently seeking to strengthen the legal basis with a new law on internal displacement. Additionally, the National Refugee Commission of the Interior Ministry and the Department of Humanitarian Action of the Ministry in charge of social affairs share a distinct mandate for forced displacement, and are responsible for monitoring and advocating compliance to these legal frameworks.

Additionally, various government frameworks exist to support the return of refugees but there is no clear allocation of responsibilities concerning IDPs (the new law should clarify the situation). The national Stabilization and Reconstruction Program and the provincial Priority Action Plans all include activities for IDPs. However, implementation depends primarily on the international community, with lack of public resources severely hampering government action. The International Security and Stabilization Support Strategy (14S), developed in 2008 and revised in 2012, provides a framework for international actors to support early socio-economic recovery and conflict prevention in areas of return.

The signing of the Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework for the DRC and the Region (PSC Framework) in February 2013 represents an important foundational agreement that affirmed the commitment of the governments in the Great Lakes Region—including DRC—to work together to address these common security and economic challenges. The PSC Framework stipulated in particular a supporting role for the World Bank. Thus in 2013, the World Bank launched the Great Lakes Regional Initiative (GLR Initiative), designed to support the achievement of the PSC Framework goals. This initiative envisages regional development assistance under two pillars: (i) addressing vulnerability and improving community resilience; and (ii) promoting economic cooperation and regional integration. Those affected by forced displacement (refugees, IDPs, returnees and hosting communities) were identified as a priority group under the first pillar and corresponding financing was committed to the GLR Displaced Persons and Border Communities Program. The objectives of this Additional Financing are intended to contribute the fulfillment of

wider peace building initiatives for the DRC and the region.

Within the World Bank itself, one of the four goals of the DRC CAS is to support “the country's transition out of fragility, with a focus on addressing the developmental deficits that help to perpetuate violence and conflicts in the eastern provinces”. Thus, the CAS fourth pillar concentrates on peace building and stabilization with two objectives: (a) strengthening governance and the provision of essential state functions; and (b) improving community resilience through the expansion of socioeconomic opportunities and strengthening local conflict management capacities. This focus on conflict and fragility in the eastern DRC provinces links the World Bank’s work to the revised I4S , and the Government’s Stabilization and Reconstruction Plan for War-Affected Areas, as well as UN Security Council Resolution 1925 (2010) that establishes security forces and seeks to consolidate state authority in eastern DRC. The proposed operation particularly supports I4S through its Return, Reintegration and Socio-Economic Recovery pillar, which envisages activities contributing to conflict risk reduction, conflict transformation and peaceful co-existence to create the conditions for future development.

### **C. Proposed Development Objective(s)**

#### **Original Project Development Objective(s) - Parent**

The project development objective is to improve access to livelihoods and socio-economic infrastructure in vulnerable communities in the eastern provinces of DRC.

#### **Key Results**

### **D. Project Description**

The project development objective (PDO) is to improve access to livelihoods and socio-economic infrastructure in vulnerable communities in the eastern provinces of DRC. The PDO will remain unchanged for the AF, but vulnerable communities will be defined as displaced persons and host communities. Hence, while the original project targeted a host of vulnerable people including those affected by forced displacement, the incremental funding available in the context of the regional program will be reserved to those affected by forced displacement. As a result, activities in the area already covered by the Eastern Recovery Project –North Kivu, South Kivu, and part of Oriental province (Haut-Uélé, Bas-Uélé and Ituri districts)– will be intensified to accommodate a specific focus on the displaced and their host communities, while two additional districts will be added in light of the intense population movements they have been witnessing because of the conflict –Tanganyika district in northern Katanga and Tshopo district in south-western Oriental province.

The three components of the original project were designed keeping in mind the specific circumstances of displaced people and are performing in a satisfactory manner, therefore they will remain essentially the same. A brief description of their content is provided below.

Component 1: Community Support (original US\$31 million; AF US\$20 million). This component focuses on strengthening community resilience through: (a) improving access to community social and economic infrastructure; (b) facilitating and improving inclusive community participation processes; and (c) strengthening local conflict prevention and resolution mechanisms. Implementation of the AF will pay particular attention to displaced populations and

host communities in line with the criteria outlined in the PIM. With a ceiling of \$100,000 per sub-project, a total of about 300 communities would be covered by the original financing for this component; the AF will allow an additional 180 communities to benefit. Community priorities include rehabilitation and construction works in the health, education, water and sanitation, trade (markets) and transport (small bridges) sectors. Communities affected by forced displacement may have different priorities from other groups of beneficiaries, and project implementation will be tailored to these differences through community-driven development mechanisms.

Component 2: Livelihoods and Employment Generation (original US\$31 million; AF US\$20 million). This component will support employment creation through two sub-components that will provide short-term employment as well as sustainable livelihood options.

- Subcomponent 1: labor-intensive public works (original US\$19 million; AF US\$15 million). Road rehabilitation is the main activity supported by this sub-component, as it has been identified as a key element of stabilization and development. Five urban centers have been targeted, and at least two more will be added with the AF. In rural areas, the implementing agency, together with MONUSCO, has selected strategic corridors where road rehabilitation will not only serve to improve rural households' access to social services and markets but also contribute to stabilization. The selected corridors coincide with the areas that have the heaviest concentration of displaced people, most of whom have settled only 15-20 km from their village of origin, often along main road, where they feel more secure. The additional funding will make it possible to select additional corridors and intensify work in the present ones.
- Subcomponent 2: Strengthening Agricultural Value Chains (original US\$10 million; AF US\$7.5 million). The agricultural value chain sub-component is designed to increase the food security and incomes of agricultural households along the same strategic corridors targeted for the rural roads rehabilitation under the sub-component above. Project support will address constraints all along the selected value-chains (on-farm productivity, post-harvest handling, storage and processing) in an effort to strengthen the hand of small-scale farmers and get more profits returning to farmer households and villages.

Component 3: Capacity Building and Project Management (Original US\$17million; AF US\$10 million). This component covers capacity building of local partners and project management. With the AF, efforts to build the capacity of local stakeholders in conflict management (including mediation) will be stepped up and expanded. Of particular importance will be the inclusion of the so-called "death triangle" in northern Katanga. Additional funding will also make it possible to open an office in this area (in Kalemie) and to strengthen staff in the other provincial offices.

**Component Name**

Component 1: Community Support

**Comments (optional)**

**Component Name**

Component 2: Livelihoods and Employment Generation

**Comments (optional)**

**Component Name**

### Component 3: Capacity Building and Project Management

#### **Comments (optional)**

#### **E. Project location and salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)**

The physical environment of the target provinces is characterized by forests (Province Oriental, 350.000 km<sup>2</sup>), savanna, highlands/mountains and hills (North Kivu, South Kivu and northern Katanga). Rainfalls of 1000 to 2000 mm a year make the hilly landscapes sensitive to erosion; landslides are frequent. This situation induces potential risks for afforestation and soil erosion in conjunction with agriculture and road rehabilitation works. The four provinces cover a total area of over 1 million km<sup>2</sup> --Province Oriental alone is about the size of Spain. It should be noted that the recent decentralization decisions have split the largest provinces in several provinces, and these include Province Orientale and Katanga. As a result of the July 2015 law on decentralization, the provinces where project activities are planned are the following seven: Haut-Uélé, Bas-Uélé, Ituri, Tshopo, North Kivu, South and Tanganyika.

In a number of areas, especially around and in the north of Lake Kivu, soils are constituted by rich volcanic soil, and enable a large variety of crops. Those areas are characterized by lush vegetation and an extended growing season due in part to high altitude (1500 m at the lakeshore) and the volcanic nature of the soil. Agriculture, extensive livestock production, and mining are the predominant sources of livelihood. Major crops produced include: cassava (manioc), corn, potatoes, beans and bananas; coffee and tea are the cash crops. Artisanal mining is an important source of cash (e.g., diamonds). Ownership of land is a recurrent source of conflict. Population density is twice national average, about 71/km<sup>2</sup>.

Project activities will be implemented in a mix of low and high-risk areas in the old provinces of North Kivu, South Kivu, Orientale and Katanga. Low-risk areas are more stable and therefore positive outcomes are more certain, but the impact in terms of improved stability would be smaller; high-risk areas include zones only recently stabilized, prone to destabilization or adjacent to conflict zones where it may prove very difficult to carry out project activities but the stabilization impact would be considerable.

This project is classified as environmental category B as both community sub-projects and employment creation activities may have the potential of some localized environmental and social impacts. An Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) developed under the Emergency Social Action Project (last revised and disclosed in May 2011) served as a basis to prepare and disclose the ESMF of the Eastern Recovery Project. Other safeguards documents including a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) and an Indigenous People Planning Framework (IPPF) have been prepared and disclosed during implementation. In addition, an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) was prepared to mitigate the impact of agricultural activities which may induce the use of pesticides, and it was disclosed before negotiations of the original project.

#### **F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists**

Abdoulaye Gadiere (GENDR)

Lucienne M. M'Baipor (GSURR)

## II. Implementation

### Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

The AF would use the current institutional and fiduciary arrangements of the original Eastern Recovery Project, which is being managed by the DRC Social Fund. The Social Fund is an autonomous government agency that has successfully managed the Emergency Social Action Project (2004-13), a US\$101.8 IDA-financed operation to improve basic infrastructure using a CDD approach as well as to finance labor-intensive public works. To prepare for the Eastern Recovery Project, the Social Fund: (a) updated its financial management and procurement procedures manual; (b) improved its multi-projects and multi-sites accounting software; and (c) updated the terms of reference for its internal audit function. Independent external auditors have been hired and perform yearly financial and technical audits. Procurement is carried out by specialized staff in accordance with World Bank procedures, and yearly procurement plans are regularly updated.

### III. Safeguard Policies that might apply

| Safeguard Policies                     | Triggered? | Explanation (Optional)  |
|--|------------|---|
| Environmental Assessment<br>OP/BP 4.01 | Yes        | Under Component 1, the construction or rehabilitation of community infrastructures such as schools, health centers and water points may have some adverse impacts. Under component 2, road rehabilitation and soils and water conservation works, as well as the removal of urban garbage could also have negative effects on the environment. Since the exact locations of the activities are not yet identified, the relevant instrument would be an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF). The ESMF developed under the Emergency Social Action Project (last revised and disclosed in May 2011) was updated, adapted and disclosed in August 2014. |
| Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04            | No         |   |
| Forests OP/BP 4.36                     | No         |   |
| Pest Management OP 4.09                | Yes        | Agricultural activities such as on-farm productivity, post-harvest handling, storage and processing could involve the use of pesticides. In fact, even if the project will not finance directly the purchase of chemical pesticides and fertilizers and will actively discourage their use, it will support activities that may involve the use of chemical pesticides by the beneficiaries. Consequently, an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) has been prepared, reviewed and disclosed prior the Board of the parent project (January 2014).  |

|  |     |  |
|--|-----|--|
| Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11         | No  |  |
| Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10                  | Yes | There are Batwa communities (“Pygmy”) in all four targeted provinces and in many cases they cohabitate with the majority Bantu communities. Batwa people tend to be regarded as inferior by other ethnic groups and in agriculture they are often used as “serfs”. This situation has given rise to grievances that have escalated into bloody confrontations in northern Katanga. |
| Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12            | Yes | Components 1 and 2 of the project will induce land acquisition by funding road rehabilitation works and small scale community infrastructure works (health centers, schools, latrines, etc.).  |
| 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  |  |

#### IV. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

##### A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</b></p> <p>Project investments are not expected to induce large scale or irreversible environmental and social impacts. Given the topography of the targeted provinces, however, components 1 and 2 may induce localized, adverse long-term environmental and social impacts due to potential soil erosion triggered by road rehabilitation works and agriculture on slopes. Most adverse impacts are, however, expected to be site specific and limited in scope and time. Component 2 of the project, particularly the strengthening of agricultural value chains, may exacerbate the agriculture workload on indigenous Batwa people as “serfs”, and increase their vulnerability, unless adequate social assessments are carried out prior to sub-project funding and mitigation measures such as Indigenous People’s Plans (IPP) are prepared and implemented.</p> <p>Social: Risks or negative social impacts of the project revolve around: (i) fueling resource-based conflicts; (ii) exclusion and inclusion errors in beneficiary selection; and (iii) involuntary resettlement (OP/BP 4.12), especially potential resettlement issues and restriction of access to some sites linked with construction/rehabilitation works. In particular:</p> <p>(i) Components 1 and 2 will be implemented in areas affected by conflict characterized by worsening social and economic conditions, deteriorating social capital, population displacements, localized resource-based conflicts, inter-ethnic tensions (often linked to resource-based disputes), destruction of infrastructure, and reduced access to social services. The project aims to encourage social cohesion and conflict resolution through economic activities and a participatory approach, but current patterns of population displacement and the lack of government capacity to mediate and manage land ownership disputes could constitute points of contention. The project will train</p> |
|---|



local authorities in conflict management and mediation techniques.

(ii) Exclusion and inclusion errors could occur in assessing and selecting beneficiaries for Component 2. In particular, given the high rate of underemployment/joblessness and widespread vulnerability, it can be expected that demand for temporary employment in public works will far outstrip supply, leaving many legitimate job-seekers out. The main challenge, therefore, would be to find selection mechanisms that minimize real or perceived errors of inclusion and that are considered fair, so as not to fuel discontent and possibly exacerbate conflict.

(iii) While project activities are not expected to necessitate large scale physical relocation of population groups, they could have implications for the livelihoods options of formerly displaced populations returning home during implementation.

Environmental: Project activities under both components will finance small-scale community infrastructure works. This is expected to include the construction/rehabilitation of key public social infrastructures (schools, health centers, water points) for component 1, while under component 2 activities will include road maintenance, micro-irrigation and rehabilitation of agricultural feeder roads through labor-intensive methods, as well as construction of small agro-processing facilities. Farmer field schools will also be established to promote efficient and sustainable agricultural techniques; the use of chemical pesticides and fertilizers will be discouraged.

Possible negative environmental impacts are expected to be short-term. For example, the rehabilitation of open water sources may temporarily increase risks for water borne diseases in the surrounding area, while pollution and loud noises can be expected during part of the construction works for community micro-projects. The only long-term negative environmental impact could be linked to water and sanitation sub-projects (e.g., construction of latrines for a school), if the water table is affected. On the other hand, a number of positive and lasting environmental impacts can be expected as a result of reforestation activities under component 2, sanitation works under component 1 (e.g., the construction of latrines) and component 2 (cleaning of urban open drainage system), and rehabilitation of open water sources.

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

No adverse, indirect or long term impacts are expected due to anticipated future activities in the project area, to the contrary, project investments may foster the beginning of sound environmental and social practices. Given the topography of the targeted provinces, however, components 1 and 2 may induce localized, adverse long-term environmental and social impacts due to potential soil erosion triggered by road rehabilitation works; e.g., downstream impacts of culverts on farms, and farming of slopes.

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

Road rehabilitation works will be informed by environmental assessments and environmental social management plans. Likewise, the selection of agriculture investments will be subject to environmental and social assessments.

One alternative project arrangement considered to minimize risks of fueling conflict consisted in recruiting international NGOs specializing in conflict management to conduct lengthy assessments to guide the choice and design of micro-projects (p. ex.: some international NGOs active in the project area spend up to two years analyzing the context before starting any concrete activity at the community level). This option was dismissed because it would not be responsive to a context in

which the needs for access to basic social services should be urgently addressed. This is not to say that there will be no conflict assessment or focused efforts on conflict management. Rather, the project will make it possible to test different conflict-sensitive approaches, preferably relying on local actors.

**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.**

At the national level, DRC has a legislative and regulatory framework which is conducive to good environmental management. In addition, DRC has signed a number of international treaties and conventions. However, implementation capacity is weak. Environmental policies and their compliance are governed by the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Tourism (Ministère de l'Environnement, de la Conservation de la Nature et du Tourisme or MECNT). The MECNT has three departments in charge of environmental monitoring and management: i) Le Groupe d'Etudes Environnementales du Congo (GEEC); ii) le Centre National d'Information sur l'Environnement (CNIE); and iii) La Cellule Réglementation et Contentieux Environnementaux (CRCE). The GEEC is responsible for safeguards compliance of all projects in the country, but with emphasis on environmental category A projects. The unit is understaffed and has limited capacity. Despite several donor-funded capacity building initiatives, the unit still largely relies on donor funds to carry out its field supervision duties.

At the project level, the preparation and implementation of the Bank funded Emergency Social Action Project known as PASU (2004 to 2013), helped the project implementing agency, the FSRDC, to lay a sound institutional foundation for preparing, managing and monitoring potential adverse environmental and social impacts of Bank-funded projects. The FSRDC prepared and implemented the safeguards instruments of PASU. The current project triggers the same safeguard policies as PASU, consequently the safeguards instruments to be prepared for the current project will be a sequel of PASU's. The safeguards instruments prepared for PASU include: an Environmental Safeguards Management Framework (ESMF); a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF); and an Indigenous People Planning Framework (IPPF). These three instruments were revised and re-disclosed in May 2011 in connection with an Additional Financing provided to continue and expand IDA-funded activities, and they were used until June 30, 2013, when the project closed. The ESMF, RPF and IPPF used for the Emergency Social Action project have been updated and re-disclosed for the Eastern Recovery Project (see details below) and are appropriate for the present Additional Financing. In addition, an Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPMP) was prepared, reviewed and disclosed prior the Board presentation of the original project, as mandated by OP 4.09.

The ESMF includes screening procedures to identify, assess, evaluate, mitigate and monitor the impact of project activities as well as templates of relevant tools. These assessments will involve consultations with key stakeholders and will inform the design of specific resettlement and environment protection action plans. Once the action plans have been drafted, public consultations will be held and community systems to handle grievances will be established. All key stakeholders involved in the Project will be sensitized and trained on the mitigation measures. Depending on the findings of the social screenings and assessments to be carried out, a resettlement action plan (RAP) and or an Indigenous People's Plan (IPP) may be prepared.

A wide array of tools and trainings will be developed and adopted to address corresponding risks arising during micro-projects implementation. Based on the nature of the risks, some communities may require the provision of ear protection, protective headgear, gloves, masks, and safety shoes

for workers to mitigate safety and health concerns; in addition, adequate trainings on work site safety measures will be provided to the workers on the first day of work for component 2. For activities such as tree planting, implementing agencies will have to facilitate some sensitization campaigns to prevent subsequent excessive tree cutting and wildfires. A community management plan would have to be developed for activities that could entail resource management (for instance water points, or rehabilitated lakes). Finally, communities would have to be trained to minimize health risks that would be associated with the undue consumption of rehabilitated open water sources.

The RPF and IPPF will be the main instruments to address social safeguards risks. To mitigate potential risks related to involuntary resettlement, the RPF includes steps to take into account the specific needs of displaced and returning populations, and integrate provisions for addressing possible land and other socioeconomic points of contention in an equitable, consultative and peaceful manner. A conflict specialist has been recruited and supports the FSRDC on these issues, with help from the Bank's Great Lakes Support Facility. The IPPF includes steps for the identification of indigenous populations in the targeted project communities and in the vicinity of sub-project sites, and details procedures that will ensure that indigenous populations are properly consulted --and feed-back mechanisms are established-- to allow for prompt action in case their rights are not respected or they are denied their fair share of project benefits. The implementing agency understands that both RPF and IPPF have the potential to play an important role in conflict prevention and management, considering that land disputes are a major conflict trigger.

As for the risk related to exclusion/inclusion errors in targeting, it will be primarily addressed through self-targeting by setting the wages slightly below market rate to discourage less vulnerable people from participating. At the same time, quotas and ring fencing will be set to ensure the participation of more vulnerable groups (such as women and displaced people). Finally, an effective grievance system accessible and easy to use by the communities will be established to provide a vehicle for addressing complaints and grievances that arise during the implementation process.

The implementing agency has already hired an environmental and social safeguards specialist who will work in close collaboration with staff in the provincial offices to ensure full compliance with safeguards.

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

Sub-projects will be designed and implemented in close consultation with local communities, vulnerable groups (including displaced and returning populations, indigenous groups, and youth), local and provincial authorities and other stakeholders. Sub-projects under component 1 will be developed by the target beneficiary communities themselves, with support from partner NGOs and the FSRDC, and this will include the consultative development of mitigation measures for environmental and social impact. Local enterprises will be recruited to undertake works under component 1 and 2, under supervision from community committees.

***B. Disclosure Requirements***

| <b>Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other</b> |             |
|---|-------------|
| Date of receipt by the Bank                                 | 25-Nov-2014 |
|   |             |

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| Date of submission to InfoShop  | 01-Dec-2014 |
| For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors  | ////        |
| <b>"In country" Disclosure</b>  |             |
| Congo, Democratic Republic of   | 28-Nov-2014 |
| <i>Comments:</i> Publication on the website of the implementing agency in November 2014, followed by dissemination in the field (Bukavu, Goma and Kisangani) during training for project stakeholders in April and May 2015.  |             |
| <b>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</b>  |             |
| Date of receipt by the Bank   | 27-Aug-2014 |
|   |             |
| Date of submission to InfoShop  | 16-Sep-2015 |
| <b>"In country" Disclosure</b>  |             |
| Congo, Democratic Republic of   | 01-Sep-2014 |
| <i>Comments:</i> Publication on the website of the implementing agency in September 2014, followed by dissemination in the field (Bukavu, Goma and Kisangani) during training for project stakeholders in April and May 2015.   |             |
| <b>Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework</b>  |             |
| Date of receipt by the Bank   | 27-Aug-2014 |
|   |             |
| Date of submission to InfoShop  | 17-Sep-2015 |
| <b>"In country" Disclosure</b>  |             |
| Congo, Democratic Republic of   | 08-Sep-2014 |
| <i>Comments:</i> The IPDF was submitted to the Bank in August 2014. Following receipt of a complaint from an NGO, the document was rediscussed during consultations in the field (in Beni), and then revised and re-disclosed. Hence the late submission to InfoShop. The initial version of the Framework was made available on the implementing agency website in September 2014. Given the ongoing conflict between Bantous and Pygmy people in the Tanganyika district, in-depth dissemination of the framework is planned within the context of capacity building for local stakeholders on conflict management and mediation. |             |
| <b>Pest Management Plan</b>   |             |
| Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?  | Yes         |
| Date of receipt by the Bank   | 23-Jan-2014 |
|   |             |
| Date of submission to InfoShop  | 24-Jan-2014 |
| <b>"In country" Disclosure</b>  |             |
| Congo, Democratic Republic of   | 24-Jan-2014 |
| <i>Comments:</i> The Plan was put on the implementing agency website prior to the Board date, as required. Dissemination in the eastern provinces (Goma, Bukavu and Bunia) took place in December 2015. More in-depth dissemination will be carried out with local stakeholders in the strategic corridors targeted for the value chain development sub-  |             |

|   |
|---|
| component when activities will be launched.   |
| <b>If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.</b> |
| <b>If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:</b>  |
|   |

**C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level**

|   |   |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|
| <b>OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment</b>   |   |  |  |
| Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?   | Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] | No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            | NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            |
| If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?   | Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] | No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            | NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            |
| Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?  | Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] | No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            | NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            |
| <b>OP 4.09 - Pest Management</b>  |   |  |  |
| Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?  | Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            | No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            | NA [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] |
| Is a separate PMP required?   | Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] | No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            | NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            |
| If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist? | Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] | No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            | NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            |
| <b>OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples</b>  |   |  |  |
| Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?  | Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] | No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            | NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            |
| If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?  | Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] | No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            | NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            |
| If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?  | Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            | No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            | NA [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] |
| <b>OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement</b>  |   |  |  |
| Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?   | Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] | No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            | NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            |
| If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?  | Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] | No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            | NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            |
| Is physical displacement/relocation expected?   | Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            | No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] | TBD [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]           |
| Provided estimated number of people to be affected  |   |  |  |
| Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)  | Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]            | No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] | TBD [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]           |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Provided estimated number of people to be affected   |   |
| <b>The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information</b>  |   |
| Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?   | Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] |
| 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 [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] |
| <b>All Safeguard Policies</b>  |   |
| Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?                  | Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] |
| Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?   | Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] |
| Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?                             | Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] |
| Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?                           | Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] |

## V. Contact point

### World Bank

Contact: Maurizia Tovo

Title: Lead Social Protection Specialist

### Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name: Ministry Of Finances

Contact: Honore Tshiyoyo

Title: Cellule des Coordination des projets

Email: minfinrdc@micronet.cd

### Implementing Agencies

Name: DRC Social Fund

Contact:

Title: General Coordinator

Email: fondsocialdrc@fondsocial.cd

## VI. For more information contact:

The InfoShop

The World Bank

1818 H Street, NW

Washington, D.C. 20433

Telephone: (202) 458-4500

Fax: (202) 522-1500

Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/infoshop>

## VII. Approval

|                               |  |                   |
|-------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Task Team Leader(s):          | Name: Maurizia Tovo                      |                   |
| <b><i>Approved By</i></b>     |  |                   |
| Safeguards Advisor:           | Name: Johanna van Tilburg (SA)           | Date: 04-Nov-2015 |
| Practice Manager/<br>Manager: | Name: Penelope Jane Aske Williams (PMGR) | Date: 04-Nov-2015 |
| Country Director:             | Name: Ahmadou Moustapha Ndiaye (CD)      | Date: 13-Nov-2015 |