Project Information Document (PID)

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 23-Apr-2022 | Report No: PIDA33852

BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country	Project ID	Project Name	Parent Project ID (if any)
Eastern Africa	P178566	Food Systems Resilience Program for Eastern and Southern Africa	
Region	**Estimated Appraisal Date**	**Estimated Board Date**	**Practice Area (Lead)**
AFRICA EAST	26-Apr-2022	16-Jun-2022	Agriculture and Food
Financing Instrument	**Borrower(s)**	**Implementing Agency**	
Investment Project Financing	Ministry of Finance, Ethiopia, Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), Ministry of Economy and Finance, Madagascar, Center for Coordination of Agricultural Research and Development for Southern Africa (CCARDESA)	Ministry of Agriculture, Ethiopia, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, Madagascar, IGAD Agriculture and Environmental Division, Center for Coordination of Agricultural Research and Development for Southern Africa (CCARDESA)	

Proposed Development Objective(s)

To increase the resilience of food systems and preparedness for food insecurity in project areas.

Components

(Re-)building Resilient Agriculture Production Capacity
Supporting the Sustainable Development of Natural Resources for Resilient Agricultural Landscapes
Getting to Market
Promoting a Greater Focus on Food Systems Resilience in National and Regional Policymaking
Project Management

PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US$, Millions)

SUMMARY

Total Project Cost	1,028.60
Total Financing	1,028.60

of which IBRD/IDA	938.10
Financing Gap	0.00

DETAILS

World Bank Group Financing

International Development Association (IDA)	938.10
IDA Credit	454.05
IDA Grant	484.05

Non-World Bank Group Financing

Counterpart Funding	25.00
Local Beneficiaries	25.00
Other Sources	65.50
MULTIPLE DONORS	65.50

Environmental and Social Risk Classification

High

Decision

The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate

Other Decision (as needed)

B. Introduction and Context

Regional Context

1. **The food systems of Eastern and Southern Africa (AFE) are some of the most vulnerable in the world.** AFE is home to over 656 million people, many of whom are extremely poor and face significant challenges accessing adequate, safe, and nutritious food every day. The region's food systems are generally beset by low levels of agricultural productivity, a severely degraded and stressed natural resource base, pronounced gender inequities in food and resource access, and relatively low levels of food trade and regional market integration. AFE is also among the regions most affected by fragility, conflict and violence (FCV) as well as the effects of climate change. And food system shocks—including ones precipitated by extreme weather, pest and disease outbreaks, political and market instability, and conflict—are generally becoming more frequent and severe, putting more people at risk of being affected by both chronic and acute forms of food insecurity. Shocks to global food and energy systems have the potential to impact food systems in the entire Africa region. Together, the increasing weight of food system shocks in the region and the interdependent nature of the above challenges underscore the need to enhance regional food systems' resilience to recover from setbacks.

2. **In recent years, the vulnerability of AFE's food systems has translated into a deteriorating food security situation.** Over 40 percent of AFE's population lives on less than US$1.90 PPP per day, and as of 2019, nearly two-thirds was affected by moderate-to-severe food insecurity—27 percent of the population, severely so.[1] AFE accounted for one-fifth of all severely food insecure people in the world in 2019 (18 percent of those affected by moderate-to-severe food insecurity), and the situation has been deteriorating. Between the periods 2014–2016 and 2018–2020, the number of severely food insecure people in AFE grew by roughly 22 percent (SOFI 2021).[2] Just since 2019, extreme weather, conflict, and the corona virus disease-2019 (COVID-19) pandemic have pushed nearly 50 million additional people into acute food insecurity across Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), with 120 million now affected versus 73 million in 2019. In AFE specifically, the share of undernourished people was projected to increase from 21 percent in 2019 to 29 percent in 2030—and as of 2020, it had already increased to over 25 percent. In 2018–2020, undernourishment affected over 131 million people in AFE—an estimate that excludes multiple countries for which data were not available.[3] This year alone, an estimated 66.4 million people in AFE are projected to experience food stress or find themselves in a food crisis, emergency, or famine (IPC2+) by July 2022.

3. **In addition, the war in Ukraine has delivered a major shock to global food, fuel and fertilizer markets, which is expected to further affect food and nutrition insecurity**. Russia and Ukraine together represent between 25 and 30 percent of the global wheat market, while Russia (and Belarus) are also major exporters of fertilizers. In 2021, Russia was the largest natural gas-exporting country in the world, and the second-largest crude oil and condensates-exporting country. The disruptions from the conflict (sanctions, breakdowns in supply, etc.) had an immediate impact on global fuel and food prices. Oil prices have increased by about 90 percent compared to March 2021. Wheat prices have increased by 50 percent since early February 2022 and 80 percent since March 2021, and they are now at an all-time high.

4. **A major long-term contributor to food insecurity in AFE is the changing climate.** Climate change has already increased the frequency and severity of extreme weather events across SSA and accelerated the cycle of food production shocks. Across SSA, drought- and flood- related shocks to the food system that occurred once every 12.5 years on average in 1982–2006 occurred every 2.5 years in 2007–2016. Agriculture in AFE is particularly vulnerable to drought considering that about 90 percent of crop production is rainfed[4]. Climate change also affects pest and disease vectors with the potential to harm crops and animals, and major locust outbreaks have plagued the Horn of African (HoA) in recent years.

5. **Violent conflict has surged since 2010, food and water insecurity being both a consequence and a cause of conflict.** AFE harbors some of Africa's most protracted conflicts, and these have left a number of countries in a fragile state. Increased internal competition for land and water, particularly between pastoralists and crop producers, is a significant source of conflict, such as one evidenced in South Sudan. In turn, physical insecurity dissuades investment and disrupts the distribution systems that move food from surplus to deficit areas, while open conflict destroys infrastructure and other capital stocks essential for income growth. As violence intensifies, accompanying uncertainties cause food production shifts from commercial orientation towards more of a subsistence one, due to restrictions in accessing farmland and markets, while hindering regional

[1] Note that World Bank (WDI 2022) poverty data are available for only 17 of 26 AFE, and the latest data year ranges from 2015–2019. For those countries, the weighted average poverty rate was nearly 43 percent. 2019 food insecurity data were available for 20 of 26 AFE countries.

[2] The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2021.

[3] The estimate, based on SOFI 2020, is based on data from 18 AFE countries. https://www.fao.org/3/cb4474en/cb4474en.pdf.

[4] World Bank. *The African Continental Free Trade Area: Economic and Distributional Effects.* Washington, DC: World Bank.

integration and trade.

6. **In AFE, the effects of food insecurity on women are dire, and frequently come on top of inequalities in access to health care, markets, and income.** Meanwhile, the impacts of climate change on food and agriculture have been shown to worsen gender-based violence (GBV). For example, more than two-thirds of women in Malawi indicated a decrease in food availability due to increases in the price of commodities. In Rwanda, women were more likely than men to indicate that their household's food production did not meet their food needs. Across the region, female farmers lacked access to productive assets, input and output markets, and information, even before the pandemic began. Although these vulnerabilities have made women and girls more food insecure over the past years, there have been some notable signs of progress. In South Africa and elsewhere, social assistance targeting women directly has enhanced economic stability and improved their nutritional outcomes by enhancing their agency and control over resources. Experience generally shows that investment in women's access to markets, their better integration into value chains, and the removal of institutional, legal, and regulatory barriers to their productive activities can all greatly improve women's capacity to absorb shocks.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

7. **Agricultural productivity in AFE remains low by international standards and has not been the primary driver of sector growth.** Cereal yields in SSA rose by 38 percent in the 38 years from 1980 to 2018, or roughly half the rate observed in South and Southeast Asia. Over the past several decades, agricultural growth in SSA has been owed more to agriculture's expansion than to its intensification, with studies suggesting that only about one-quarter of growth in crop output has been attributable to yield growth.

8. **Agriculture's expansion has been damaging to the region's forests, water resources, soils, and biodiversity.** In fact, the agricultural sector has been the leading driver of soil degradation, land-use change, and forest and biodiversity loss in AFE and the wider region. And in recent decades, the rate of deforestation in AFE has largely exceeded the global average. Between 1990 and 2006, while the world lost an average of 0.1 percent of its forests each year over, AFE lost an average of 0.3 percent per year. Poor agricultural land management practices have also been harmful to ecosystem services, leading among other things to a decline in soil fertility, carbon sequestration, and groundwater recharge, and to the degradation of watersheds. Desertification and soil degradation affect about 29 percent of the land area in the Nile Valley and the HoA. And across SSA, the native vegetation carbon stocks suppressed by current uses of pasture are equivalent to 113 gigatons of carbon dioxide—more than twice the global emissions of all greenhouse gases.[5]

9. **In turn, the conversion of forests and grasslands into cropland and pasture, the degradation of soil and water resources, and the loss of ecosystem services, have put downward pressure on agricultural productivity.** For example, large volumes of sediment have progressively silted up irrigation systems, lakes, reservoirs, and pastoral watering points, affecting communities' livelihoods and the productivity of cropland and pasture. Land degradation costs an average of US$108 per person per year, or 9 percent of gross domestic product (GDP), in land productivity losses related to a combination of human-induced soil erosion, acidification, nutrient leaching, and compaction. Small-scale farmers suffer the most because poor soil conditions, climate and weather variability, land tenure insecurity, and limited access to markets pressure them to make short-term tradeoffs that compromise long-term gains. Land degradation reduces options to meet both food demands and environmental needs sustainably. Overall, agriculture has driven the region's natural resources endowment to decline on a per capita basis, further stressing its food production capacity in a context of rapid demographic

[5] Based on vegetative cover, this estimate (31 Gt of C) by Hayek et al. 2021 in *Nature Research* does not account for the loss of soil carbon stores.

growth and climate change. In fact, the interaction of land degradation with climate change represents one of Africa's biggest and most urgent challenges. Yet these interactions have not been a central focus of adaptation planning.

10. **Investments in knowledge solutions and the diffusion of climate-smart technologies are needed to close existing productivity gaps in environmentally sustainable and risk-ready ways.** Important opportunities exist within AFE to strengthen agricultural innovation systems, reorient agricultural research and development (R&D) to meet emerging climate challenges, modernize agricultural extension services, and build innovation capacity throughout the food economy. The high level of uncertainty implied by climate change points particularly to the need to build up the capacity, within different parts of the food system, to innovate. At the same time, there is a need to ensure that research and technology development be responsive to farmers' and other end-users' circumstances and needs, have a path to commercialization and diffusion, and can ultimately reach farmers and be put into use effectively. In that respect, acting at both the national and regional levels can help increase the relevance and reach of innovation.

11. **There is significant scope for improving the management of natural capital in the region, thereby strengthening the very foundations of resilient food production and rural livelihoods.** Improved soil and water management is critical for food systems resilience. More efficient irrigation can help support agricultural productivity and diversification under a changing climate. Soil is widely and significantly degraded, yet of critical importance to agricultural productivity, water-use efficiency, water quality management, and carbon storage. A multitude of agroecological farming practices involving managed grazing, reduced tillage, cover cropping, permaculture, polyculture, landscape features, and more, can contribute to promoting soil health and build soil organic matter and carbon storage capacity. The International Water Management Institute (IWMI) estimates that 29 percent more irrigated land will be required by the year 2025 to sustain food production and reduce poverty on the African continent. Studies generally point to lower rates of food insecurity in irrigator households compared to non-irrigator ones. Scaling up investments in irrigation and water storage infrastructure, and watershed or landscape management interventions that promote "natural storage," are needed to unlock the region's full agricultural and economic potential. Importantly, the needs of pastoralists also need to be considered in agricultural and water management planning, given its importance to food security and livelihoods in dryland areas. Improving the management of natural resources can also help diffuse conflict driven by competition over land and water resources.

12. **Efforts to foster a more favorable enabling environment can help boost the region's small but budding agribusiness sector, contributing to efficiencies in food production and supply, more and better jobs, and a stronger economic footing from which to weather shocks.** A vibrant business sector can help develop things like digital platforms and technologies, agricultural advisory services, professional farming and logistics services, farm input and equipment supply, aggregation and coordination services, agrifintech, and more. While trade can also help expand agrifood business opportunities, it can also help stabilize food availability and access across the region's markets in a context of increasingly frequent and intense climate and other shocks. In that respect, the removal of physical and regulatory barriers to (intraregional) agricultural trade holds particular promise for ensuring food security and food systems resilience, especially under a changing climate.

13. **More generally, the food systems resilience agenda calls for strengthening food systems governance and policy at the national, subnational, and regional levels.** On the one hand, strong public policies and institutions are needed to use and leverage public and private resources more effectively. In that respect, efforts are needed to align resources with evidence-based priorities; coordinate efforts across sectors, agencies, levels of government, and polities; enable knowledge-sharing and learning; and identify and pursue spending synergies. Building food systems resilience at every level, from rural communities to urban agglomerations

across AFE, will ultimately rest on strengthening food systems governance, working with regional organizations, national and subnational ministries, cities, and civil society. On the other hand, regional and cross-regional partnerships, coalitions, and investments in public goods are another way of amplifying scarce public resources in support of food systems resilience in AFE.

14. **Momentum to address food systems resilience is building at the regional level.** In 2019, the African Food Security Leadership Dialogue (AFSLD) was convened in Kigali, bringing together African leaders and development partners and raising the ambition for joint action to solve the region's food security challenges. Key priorities identified by the AFSLD include food systems adaptation to climate change, leveraging science and digital technology, and strengthened collaboration among development partners. It emphasized the need to implement existing agricultural and food security commitments including the African Union (AU) Agenda 2063, and the Malabo Declaration. The proposed Program is designed to respond specifically to these aspirations by providing a comprehensive framework to intervene at both the national and regional levels.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Development Objective(s) (From PAD)

To increase the resilience of food systems and preparedness for food insecurity in participating countries .

Key Results

15. The Food Systems Resilience Program (FSRP)—referred to in this document as "the MPA," or "the Program"—aims both to tackle the underlying structural challenges of food insecurity and reduce beneficiaries' sensitivity to unpredictable climate, crisis, and conflict events. It aims to achieve this by building resilient food production capacity, promoting the sustainable use of natural resources, enhancing food marketing, fostering resilience-focused public policies, and improving regional coordination.

16. The PrDO indicators include:

- Reduction in food insecure people in Program- targeted areas (percentage)
- Farmers adopting resilience-enhancing technologies and practices (number) (percentage of female farmers; percentage of climate-resilient technologies)
- Increase in land area under sustainable land management practices (hectares)
- Increased volume of agricultural production sold on domestic and regional markets (Percentage)
- Policy products adopted with program's support related to agriculture, natural resource management, and food system resilience (Number)

D. Project Description

Component 1: Responding to a Deteriorating Food Security Situation

17. **This component will provide short-term support to farmers and households to restore basic productive capacity following climate-related production. It will also provide support to participating countries in mitigating the impact of the global crisis and price spikes in food, feed and fertilizers on the most vulnerable populations.** The component will provide a range of support which the Bank has considerable experience with. This support may include procuring and distributing agricultural inputs, vouchers for the purchase of inputs from local markets if available, animal feed, and livestock; clearing and restoring affected areas or on-farm facilities; and facilitating access to fertilizers as short-cycle or rapid food production solutions. In some circumstances, the procurement for the import of food, feed and fertilizers may be necessary, either in the

context of managing strategic reserves or as a social protection adaptation measure. Financing for the labor-intensive restoration of infrastructure, engaging crisis-affected populations, will also made available to borrowers. Participating countries will also be able to either trigger a contingent emergency response under Component 6, restructure their existing project to include short-term activities under this subcomponent, or seek additional financing.

Component 2: (Re-)Building Resilient Agricultural Production Capacity

18. **Component 2 aims to strengthen the resilience of food supply to climate change and other shocks and stressors with a focus on agricultural production and related supporting services.**[6] It will build climate resilience and support agricultural producers' access to quality inputs, technology, and know-how, and a suite of upstream and downstream agricultural services. It will also support agricultural research and innovation systems, extension and advisory services, agricultural information systems, the provision and financing of high-quality inputs (like seed, fertilizer, and equipment) and risk management tools, quality assurance systems for farm inputs and outputs, productive infrastructure (like storage facilities, sheds, barns, and so on), and other publicly and privately provided goods and services with a particular focus on resilience. The component will support both the development of these services (including via public-private partnerships [PPP]), as well as farmers' ability to benefit from them—working not just with farmers but with the full "ecosystem" of stakeholders involved in primary food production. In addition to medium-term investment to increase resilience, it will provide short-term support in case of a rapidly deteriorating food security situation. Component 2 is organized around two subcomponents: *2.1: Developing National or Regional Agricultural Information Systems; and Subcomponent 2.2: Developing and Delivering Resilience-Enhancing Technologies and Services.*

Component 3: Supporting the Sustainable Development of Natural Resources for Resilient Agricultural Landscapes

19. **Component 3 will adopt a watershed or landscape approach** to enhance the sustainable and resilient use of natural resources for food systems and livelihoods within priority areas, consistent with the spatial, ecological, and socioeconomic contexts of the participating countries and responding to changing climatic conditions. The component is structured around two subcomponents. *Subcomponent 3.1: Identification and Validation of Interventions at the Local or Watershed Level* finances the planning of activities at the local or watershed level including knowledge, information, and institutional capacity building pertinent to the use of natural resources. *Subcomponent 3.2: Investments in Sustainable Natural Resources Management* finances investments in sustainable land, water, ecosystem services, and biodiversity management, and related knowledge. The component will finance technical assistance, analytical and advisory work, consultancies, goods, civil works, operating costs, training, community-led grants and revolving fund schemes, and policy and institutional reforms.

[6] Shocks are understood to be transitory adverse events such as natural disasters like floods, hurricanes, landslides, and acute drought events, crop, livestock, and human disease outbreaks, (armed) conflict, and significant market disruptions. Stressors are understood to be persistent adverse trends, examples of which include long-term droughts, desertification, and protracted conflict dynamics.

Component 4: Getting to Market

20. **Component 4 aims to improve physical and economic access to sufficient, safe, and nutritious food by improving agrifood producers' access to domestic and international markets and enhancing marketing infrastructure.** The component will help agricultural producers and agro-entrepreneurs create and capture more value from their agricultural products by supporting (i) producers' capacity to participate in domestic and international markets, including by helping them organize and meet market standards; and (ii) the development of well-functioning distribution, logistics, other marketing, and quality infrastructure. Component 4 is structured around two subcomponents. *Subcomponent 4.1: Strengthening Agrifood Value Chain* involves strengthening agrifood value chains in ways that will open new opportunities for rural producers, expand their access to domestic and international markets, and increase food supply in domestic economic and regional markets. *Subcomponent 4.2: Upgrading Agrifood Marketing Infrastructure* involves establishing or upgrading agrifood marketing infrastructure in ways that will increase value addition and market connectivity. To support these subcomponents, the Program will finance analytical and advisory work, TA, capacity building, matching grants, construction and rehabilitation work, and the crowding-in of private investments.

Component 5: Promoting a Greater Focus on Food Systems Resilience in National and Regional Policymaking

21. **Component 5 aims to promote a greater focus on food systems resilience in policymaking.** By elevating and "mainstreaming" this orientation within national governments and regional organizations, Component 5 aims to enhance public sector organizations' overarching capacity to anticipate and respond to various shocks and stressors more effectively. To do this, the component will work closely with national government agencies and regional organizations to support high-level policies, initiatives, institutional arrangements, and even budgeting decisions that have cross-cutting relevance to food systems resilience. It is in this high-level and cross-cutting focus that Component 5 distinguishes itself from the more thematically- or sector-focused policy efforts of Components 2, 3, and 4. Component 5 comprises three subcomponents. *Subcomponent 5.1: Making Food Systems Resilience a Priority in Public Policies and Spending i*nvolves bringing a food systems resilience focus to public institutions, policy, and spending at the national and regional levels. *Subcomponent 5.2: Building Institutional Capacity to Implement Resilience-Focused Policies* involves building the capacity of national governments to implement such policies. *Subcomponent 5.3: Supporting regional organizations to build food systems resilience transnationally* supports regional institutions to lead or facilitate relevant country and transnational initiatives. Component 5 will generally engage in these activities by funding analytical and advisory activities, technical assistance, consultative and multistakeholder collaboration processes, knowledge exchange, capacity building, and the procurement of goods and services.

Component 6: Contingent Emergency Response Component (CERC)

22. **This component will finance eligible expenditures in the event of an emergency precipitated by a disaster.** Activation of this component allows funds to be disbursed rapidly to reduce damage to infrastructure, ensure business continuity, and recover more rapidly from a disaster. Following a major disaster, the affected participating country may request that the World Bank channel resources from other MPA components into the CERC. As a condition for disbursement, an emergency response manual (ERM) will be developed for each country, stipulating the fiduciary, safeguards, monitoring, and reporting requirements related to invoking the CERC, as well as other coordination and implementation arrangements.

Component 7: Program Management.

23. **Component 7 will finance all aspects of program management.** They include equipment and materials, training, compliance with fiduciary, procurement, and safeguards (environmental and social) requirements,

M&E and impact assessment, knowledge management and communications. At the national level, these activities will be performed by the project implementation units (PIUs).

Phase 1 Project Costs[7]

(Re-)Building Resilient Agriculture Production Capacity	348.0 million
Supporting the Sustainable Development of Natural Resources for Resilient Agricultural Landscapes	300.8 million
Getting to Market	215.0 million
Promoting a Greater Focus on Food Systems Resilience in National and Regional Policy Making	30.0 million
Project Management	135.3 million
TOTAL	**1,029.1 million**

Legal Operational Policies

	Triggered?
Projects on International Waterways OP 7.50	Yes
Projects in Disputed Areas OP 7.60	No

Summary of Assessment of Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts

24. **The overall environment and social risk of the MPA is rated *high*.** The MPA will have significant positive environmental and social outcomes as activities to be financed involve management of water resources for resilient and sustainable water supply for productive food systems and water and soil moisture conservation investments, as well as support for productive sustainable livelihoods including from natural resources and enhancing access to market through capacity building and quality physical investments, amongst others. However, there are also various environmental, social and health and safety risks that need to be properly managed.

25. **The environmental risk of the Program is rated as substantial.** Activities to be financed under Components 1 and 2 ("[Re-]Building Resilient Agricultural Production Capacity") could lead to an increased demand for agrochemicals and will require management of wastes that may be generated from animal healthcare services. The Program will also finance the rehabilitation and construction of small-scale irrigation schemes (Component 3); and the construction and rehabilitation of market infrastructure (Component 4) for value addition, food safety and reduced food loss and waste (for example, storage, cold chain, processing, and marketing). The latter can result in various environmental, health and safety risks and impacts including: (i) the inappropriate use and disposal of agrochemicals including pesticides as well as agricultural research laboratory chemicals; (ii) health and safety risks and impacts during construction works and agricultural research laboratory activities; (iii) the inappropriate use of water resources through overuse and agrochemical contamination, which

[7] The participating countries and organizations of Phase 1 are: Ethiopia, Madagascar, IGAD and CCARDESA

can affect water quantity and quality in neighboring communities and downstream; (iv) the physical and chemical degradation of soils due to unsuitable land management techniques; (v) impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems of agricultural activities including agricultural water usage and pollution, and the introduction of invasive species ; and (vi) air, construction, waste, noise, water, and other environmental pollution linked to the construction of small-scale infrastructure such as storage facilities and small-scale irrigation schemes, although environmental pollution is expected to be site-specific and small in scale in the context of the Program.

26. **Agricultural activities produce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions including methane, nitrous oxide, and carbon dioxide at different stages in the production cycle.** However, the activities to be financed by the Program are expected to be community driven development (CDD) type activities and hence no significant emissions are expected. The small irrigation schemes to be financed by the Program will meet the Bank's requirements for small dams. The Program will be implemented in existing agricultural lands and hence will not lead to conversion of natural habitats. Considering the nature of the activities to be financed by the Program, the environmental risk of the Program is rated as substantial at this stage.

27. **The Program's social risk level is rated high**. The intended beneficiaries of the proposed program are expected to benefit through increased food systems resilience and ability to respond to shocks. The MPA will also result in the creation of job opportunities (including for youth and women), increased agricultural yields, increased access to diverse food and nutrition, improved livelihoods, improved access to markets, improved access to finance, and an improved skill and knowledge base. The social risks of the Program are considered high due to the nature and scope of the proposed activities as well as the range of contextual risks that exist across Eastern and Southern Africa (those risks including conflict, social tensions around rights to land and natural resources, and the risk of exclusion).

28. **Components 2, 3 and 4 include various types of civil work that could lead to land acquisition and possibly involuntary resettlement.** Under those components, the Program may invest in agricultural infrastructure, small-scale irrigation schemes, small dams, water points, market infrastructure, and roads. Social risks related to involuntary resettlement include physical resettlement, the loss of land or access to land, the loss of access to natural resources, economic displacement, and the loss of other assets (such as crops, structures, and water points) at either the individual, household or community levels. Affected people are also at risk of exclusion (especially vulnerable groups such as women, people living with disabilities and the elderly), inadequate consultation and engagement, a lack of compensation at replacement cost, and a lack of access to grievance redress mechanisms. Investments may also be implemented in areas where Indigenous People / Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities (IP/SSAHUTLC) are present. Members of these communities may reside in or have collective attachment to land in Program areas. These realities will need to be considered in the planning and implementation of investments, and Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) may be needed for activities on such land, which may be complicated to achieve. Program activities may also create or exacerbate existing conflicts or tensions between groups over the use and rights to land (e.g. pasture and cropland), natural resources (water points, dams), and access to project benefits, which will need to be considered in project planning and implementation through engagement strategies and, if needed, security management planning. The livelihood strategies of IP/SSAHUTLC as well as other disadvantaged and vulnerable groups will need to be considered when designing project activities to ensure their inclusion in decision making and access to benefits.

29. **Other social risks are associated with not only civil work but also other Program activities.** For example, social risks may be associated with the provision of extension services, and the capacity building of farmers and other beneficiaries. These risks include: (i) insufficient community and other stakeholder engagement (including the potential exclusion of vulnerable individuals or groups); (ii) elite capture of project benefits; (iii) the exclusion

of vulnerable groups or individuals from project benefits due to poorly designed, disseminated, or nontransparent beneficiary selection processes or eligibility criteria; (iv) social tension and conflict induced by competition over agricultural resources including irrigation water, and by ongoing contextual security risks in conflict-affected areas; (v) labor influx and associated risks including community health and safety, transmission of diseases; (vi) sexual exploitation and abuse and sexual harassment (SEA/SH), and other forms of GBV either as a result of labor influx or changes in power dynamics in homes among men and women; (vii) failure to comply with labor standards, including due to the use of child labor (a known risk in the agricultural sector); (viii) operational concerns due to remoteness and insecurity, namely in relation to the monitoring and supervision of social risks and grievance management; and (ix) weak implementation capacity, especially at the grassroots level characterized by limited functional structures and trained manpower. The propagation of COVID-19 during the implementation of Program activities has also been identified as a cross-cutting risk.

30. **Technical assistance activities at the country and regional levels are classified as 'Type 2 Supporting the formulation of policies, programs, plans, strategies or legal frameworks' and 'Type 3 capacity building activities' as defined in the OESRC Advisory Note Technical Assistance and the Environmental and Social Framework.** The aim is to build resilience through technical assistance, capacity building, and institutional strengthening activities that will help enhance the ability of selected entities and communities to prepare for, respond to, and develop food systems resilience. As such, direct environmental and social risks in a defined physical footprint are not expected. Nevertheless, the Project will ensure that consultancies, studies, capacity building, training and any other TA activities are carried out in accordance with the relevant requirements of the ESF. Any outputs from the TA activities, shall also be consistent with the ESF.

31. **To identify and manage the potential environmental, social, health, and safety risks, the relevant national Ministry of Agriculture (or implementation agency) will prepare the required environmental and social instruments.** Environmental and social instruments to be prepared include i) a stakeholder engagement plan (SEP) and ii) an environmental and social commitment plan (ESCP). Additional instruments will also be prepared as required depending on the proposed activities including (but not limited to):: (i) an environmental and social management framework (ESMF) to screen project activities and guide the development of site-specific instruments; (ii) an integrated pest management plan (IPMP) to mitigate potential risks and impacts associated with the application of pesticides; (iii) a resettlement framework (ReF) to guide the development of site specific resettlement plans; (iv) an IP/SSAHUTLC framework or plan; (vi) labor management procedures; (vii) SEA/SH action plans; and (viii) security management plans. These plans will also include any client capacity building requirements needed to enable the management of the identified environmental and social risks. Furthermore, site-specific risk management instruments and plans will be prepared during project implementation, following the requirements of the framework documents. Those instruments and plans will include environmental and social management plans (ESMPs), environmental and social impact assessments (ESIAs), and resettlement plans (RPs), depending on the nature and scope of project activities selected by the participating countries. Associated facilities, if any, will be clearly identified in the course of project preparation at the national level and the ESMF will also cover the potential risks and mitigation measures of the associated facilities.

32. **Risks associated with the implementation of the TA by participating regional entities** relate to inclusion, ensuring the requirements of the ESF are fully reflected in TA activities, access to information, consideration of vulnerable groups; contextual issues (e.g. drought, climate change or overexploitation of natural resources) and cumulative impacts. To address these risks the regional entities will prepare (i) SEPs and (ii) ESCPs.

E. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

Country Level Implementation

33. **At the country level, project implementation will be the responsibility of the respective borrowers and** conducted through either newly established PIUs or ones already in place. In Ethiopia, for example, project implementation will be handled by the PIU of the Food Systems Resilience Project (P176167) and in Madagascar by the PIU of the Sustainable Landscape Management Project (P154698). Where needed, country-based implementation structures will be strengthened through the recruitment of additional staff and consultants who will be made responsible for program management tasks including administration, M&E, communication, procurement, financial management, and safeguards. The latter will include ones relating to GBV, sexual exploitation and abuse, and sexual harassment (SEA/SH). In each PIU, experts from the different relevant technical disciplines (such as agronomy, integrated landscape management (ILM), water management, irrigation, hydrometeorology) will be contracted as needed.

34. Each country will establish a national steering committee to provide policy and project implementation guidance. The committee will meet at least two times per year to, among other actions, review and approve the draft annual work plan and budget (AWPB), and to review the annual report and the status of implementation progress. This SC will include representatives of the ministries of agriculture, water, and environment. Each country will also prepare a detailed project implementation manual (PIM) that will incorporate all operational details at the national level including a description of technical and M&E activities, as well as administrative, Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) and fiduciary procedures.

35. At the local level, communities will be involved in the selection of priority activities, and validation and implementation of the activities. Investments will be identified, prioritized, and selected through joint-agency (multi-ministerial) visits in the communities. Seeing the different state actors aligned and presenting a unified interface with the communities is also an important element of restoring communities' trust in the government agencies. To support these efforts, NGOs or facilitators working with local organizations (or both) will be hired, depending on the country context.

36. Given the broad geographic coverage of the proposed Program, the implementation arrangements used by participating countries will necessarily vary. Participating countries facing FCV or natural disaster conditions may need to take advantage of alternative implementation arrangements, particularly if they first need to stabilize the food security situation to enable the longer-term work on food systems resilience. In such cases, member countries can choose to contract with an UN agency to implement their project in part or in whole. Output agreements already negotiated between the World Bank and several UN organizations will enable participating governments to sole source–contract an agency, which would then report to the PIU as it carries out the contract. In the event of extreme insecurity or fragility in a participating country, full UN implementation may be warranted. In rare cases, the Program will accommodate such an arrangement to the extent that it can help stabilize the system and enable the country to move to a resilience agenda. Such an arrangement would be managed in coordination with the relevant World Bank country management unit, regional vice president, and the Operational Policy and Country Services (OPCS) vice presidential unit.

Regional Level Implementation

37. The regional activities will be implemented by various regional organizations including, but not limited to, IGAD, CCARDESA, AUC, ASERECA, and SADC's Food Agriculture and Natural Resources (FANR). In the first Phase,

regional activities will be implemented by IGAD and CCARDESA. Each participating regional organization will have its own financing agreement with clear accountability and monitor and coordinate the implementation of their respective parts of the Program. These organizations have managed World Bank-funded projects in the past and have the capacity to deal with fiduciary arrangements, including procurement and financial management, and have experience with the World Bank's ESF.

Bank's Coordinating Role

38. At the World Bank level, the MPA will be monitored by a Bank team comprising a task team for the overall MPA, and country task team leaders. The Bank team will facilitate coordination among Bank country task teams and focal points in operational and technical units as needed. It will also monitor the implementation of individual projects and keep World Bank management and the Board of Executive Directors informed. In doing so, the Bank team will operate as a unified cross-country team to address key issues. It may for example help align the implementation of different country-level operations, monitor Program achievements and its use of key indicators, facilitate knowledge exchange and communication, develop harmonized reporting mechanisms and identify gaps in monitoring, report to and coordinate with different partners and stakeholders, and develop adaptive strategies.

Results Monitoring and Evaluation Arrangements

39. To provide timely and reliable information to facilitate informed decision-making in program management, an M&E framework for the Program has been developed. At the country level, results frameworks will be developed and include both Program-level and country-level indicators. The latter will be based on the project activities that participating countries decide to pursue.[8] The data will be disaggregated by gender wherever possible. In addition to being an important management tool, the M&E system will be a valuable source of learning and a knowledge management mechanism.

40. The regional partners and national PIUs will be responsible for the internal monitoring of program outcome and output indicators as defined. Each M&E unit, as well as all key implementing entities, will produce semi-annual progress reports along with notes synthesizing information on risks, resilience, and food security at the level of program beneficiaries. Within each country, the results-based M&E activities will be built on its existing M&E system and arrangements of implementing ministry including knowledge management guided by program knowledge management strategy and comprehensive M&E manual. The main program M&E activities include: (i) where applicable, establishment of program specific MIS using existing client countries' online M&E MIS system platform and will be linked with the implementing agency's broader data base system; (ii) the Program will use the Geo-enabling Initiative for Monitoring and Supervision (GEMS) KOBO Toolbox to collect real-time and geo tagged data for the program investment mapping and monitoring. GEMS is also useful for establishing a baseline for carbon accounting and understanding changes in carbon sequestration in soils and on land. That information can contribute to assessments of the potential to mobilize climate finance to sustain funding beyond the life of the Program; (iii) in each country's PIM, detailed M&E requirements will be included based on the PrDO and intermediate results and indicator to guide the overall M&E system implementation; and (iv) a baseline survey will be conducted during the onset of program implementation, and additional surveys will be held at the midterm review (MTR) stage and Program completion. External consultants will be recruited to conduct these surveys and evaluations in every participating country and regional organization. MPA participants will be encouraged to share their M&E insights and experience to ensure continuous learning at the

[8] Results frameworks have already been developed by Phase 1 countries.

Program level.

41. The World Bank will explore additional technical assistance to carry out rigorous impact evaluation at country or Program level. Potential focus areas include the food security and resilience impacts of sustainable land and water management practices, climate-smart technology adoption, and regional trade facilitation. This activity will involve setting up a data system to track key market, productivity, and food security indicators at a high frequency in order to capture responses to climate shocks and evaluate the extent to which Program interventions support the capacities of target communities to absorb these shocks and recover.

CONTACT POINT

World Bank

Pierre Olivier Colleye
Sr Agricultural Spec.

Laura Bonzanigo
Senior Water Specialist

Stephen Paul D'Alessandro
Sr Agricultural Spec.

Tahira Syed
Senior Rural Development Specialist

Vikas Choudhary
Senior Agriculture Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Ministry of Finance, Ethiopia
Abebe Tadesse Feyisa
Director
abebetadessef@gmail.com

Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)
Workneh Gebeyehu
Exective Director
workneh.gebeyehu@igad.int

Ministry of Economy and Finance, Madagascar
Mrs. Rindra Hasimbelo Rabarinirinarison
Minister
ministrerindra@mef.gov.mg

Center for Coordination of Agricultural Research and Development for Southern Africa (CCARDESA)
Cliff Dlamini
Executive Director
cdlamini@ccardesa.org

Implementing Agencies

Ministry of Agriculture, Ethiopia
Keberu Belayneh
Project Director
keberu.belayneh@yahoo.com

Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, Madagascar
Mrs. Fanja Andriantsoa Raharinomena
General Secretary
andriantsoafanja@gmail.com

IGAD Agriculture and Environmental Division
Daher Elmi
Director
daher.elmi@igad.int

Center for Coordination of Agricultural Research and Development for Southern Africa (CCARDESA)
Cliff Dlamini
Executive Director
cdlamini@ccardesa.org

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

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

APPROVAL

Task Team Leader(s):	Pierre Olivier Colleye Laura Bonzanigo Stephen Paul D'Alessandro Tahira Syed

	Vikas Choudhary	

Approved By

Practice Manager/Manager:		
Country Director:	Boutheina Guermazi	26-Apr-2022