

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: ISDSA12490

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 20-Jul-2015

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 25-Aug-2015

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Africa	Project ID:	P151083
Project Name:	AFCC2/RI-Great Lakes Trade Facilitation (P151083)		
Task Team Leader(s):	Paul Brenton, Charles Kunaka, Shiho Nagaki		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	20-May-2015	Estimated Board Date:	24-Sep-2015
Managing Unit:	GTC13	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	Other domestic and international trade (40%), General transportation sector (35%), General public administration sector (15%), Public administration-Industry and trade (10%)		
Theme(s):	Trade facilitation and market access (40%), Regional integration (25%), Other public sector governance (20%), Rural markets (15%)		
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?			No
Financing (In USD Million)			
Total Project Cost:	79.00	Total Bank Financing:	79.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
BORROWER/RECIPIENT			0.00
International Development Association (IDA)			79.00
Total			79.00
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Project Development Objective(s)

The Development Objective of this project is to facilitate cross-border trade by increasing the capacity for commerce and reducing the costs faced by traders, especially small-scale and women traders, at targeted locations in the borderlands.

3. Project Description

Project beneficiaries will primarily be cross border traders, especially women, air travelers and vulnerable families in borderland areas. The focus of the project is on small-scale cross border traders defined as those individuals who cross the border (often daily or multiple times each day) to conduct trade in goods and services for the purposes of earning a livelihood. As the large majority of these small-scale cross-border traders in the region are women, the project will have the potential to impact positively on gender dynamics. It will prioritize agriculture and trade in food products (the primary goods traded in border areas by small scale traders) by targeting border crossing points which form major bottlenecks in the link between farmers and regional markets. This should contribute to greater food security, higher employment in the agriculture, food processing and logistics sectors and improved incomes for many households. Trade in both goods and services can play a key role in generating jobs and hence provide genuine alternatives for people who may have otherwise sought their livelihoods in illegal commerce or violent activities. This, in turn, should strengthen the resilience of communities to outside shocks, strengthen social cohesion between trading communities and decrease the possibilities of violent mobilization. Thus, it is anticipated that the project will also benefit youth and other groups at risk of mobilization by creating new opportunities for employment. Better border management should diminish communities' resentment of border institutions (and with that of wider state authority), facilitate trade in goods with a positive impact on resilience against shocks and improve control of conflict goods and cut out a source of financing for political- or armed groups. Finally, an important beneficiary group will be state agents on all sides of the border. An important impact of the program will be to increase their professionalism, make it easier for them to implement their duties and strengthen their empathy with traders as well as their colleagues across the borders. And thus, by facilitating more organized trade, the project may also contribute to increased revenue collection.

The design of the project reflects knowledge and best practices from trade and development projects implemented by the Bank and other donors. In particular, the project will support coordinated interventions to (i) build appropriate infrastructure that improves conditions at borders and increases capacities to trade together with (ii) measures to simplify border crossing procedures and improve the standards of treatment of traders and officials and finally (iii) programs to introduce performance based management of agencies operating at the border.

The project will support specific infrastructure interventions at each border that reflect local conditions and requirements at that border post, as described below:

Component 1: The project will finance improvements to core trade infrastructure and facilities at specific land border crossing points, and an airport in Rwanda that is of regional importance. In addition, support will also be provided to ministries responsible for trade and commerce to finance the planning and construction of cross border markets in the border areas. The infrastructure improvements will be supported under three main sub-components:

Sub-component 1.1: Border infrastructure and facilities (US\$22.45 million):

The project will support improvements to infrastructure and facilities at priority border posts. The priority border posts have been identified and proposed by the authorities based on traffic volumes, importance to supply chains of goods traded most across the borders, relevance to conflict dynamics in the region and poor state to support cross-border trade. Selected facilities will be improved based on integrated designs for efficient and secure traffic flows of pedestrian, passenger and commercial vehicle traffic. The designs will seek to improve security of small scale traders, particularly through

separate or demarcated lanes for safe passage of pedestrian traffic, lighting and cameras, and providing warehousing so traders can safely store their goods and minimize losses in their supply chains. In addition, support will be provided to redesign access roads in the control zones and to provide parking facilities for vehicles as well as strengthening IT infrastructure and connectivity for customs and other agencies' management and processing systems (including cross-border connectivity).

Design and feasibility studies have been prepared for some border posts. However, the designs need to be reviewed and where necessary, optimized to ensure they meet the needs of all users, but especially small scale traders. The project will therefore finance consultancy services, works contracts and goods at the following proposed border posts (total estimated costs in brackets):

- (i) DRC: Petite Barrière (Goma) (US\$5.80 million) and Ruzizi I (Bukavu) (US\$6.00 million); and
- (ii) Uganda: Mpondwe (US\$5.00 million).

Due to the better state of existing infrastructure, but also resource constraints, interventions at the other border posts will be limited. The border posts where limited improvements will be financed are the following:

- (i) DRC: Bunagana (US\$1.75 million) and Kasindi (US\$1.70 million). The project will finance measures to improve security, the flow of traffic and to install surveillance and other systems for the border agencies. At Kasindi interventions may include paving of parking areas for trucks, improvements to the bridge linking the two sides of the border to provide for pedestrian traffic and carts and surveillance systems such as cameras. The interventions will be determined once the new structures that are being financed by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) are completed – expected by end of August 2015. It is only then that the exact scope of the IDA-financed project can be determined;
- (ii) Rwanda: Rusizi I (US\$0.8 million). Sub-component 1.4 below provides for the financing of a design and feasibility study for border facility improvements at Rusizi I in Rwanda. Subsequent to and based on guidance from the study, the project will finance under this sub-component (1.1) at Rusizi I limited works to improve traffic flow and handling, to complement the proposed interventions on the DRC side of the Rusizi I border. The works will be limited to those consistent with the broader design of the border post financed under Sub-Component 1.4; and
- (iii) Uganda: Bunagana (US\$1.40 million). The project will finance measures to improve the flow of traffic and to install surveillance and other systems that will support improved border management by border agencies and better safety for those working at and crossing borders.

Sub-component 1.2: Development of border markets and logistics platforms (US\$14.0 million):

The project will finance the construction of markets to facilitate market exchanges of agricultural products in the borderlands. Due to low security and poor infrastructure, cross border traders are often forced to travel long distances to market. Border markets will facilitate the selling and buying of goods at locations close to the border and serve also as logistics platforms to allow consolidation and transportation of products. They will enable the small scale producers to reduce post-harvest losses and to engage more in cross border trade without having to travel over long distances into neighboring countries. The project will finance consultancy services to provide technical assistance, works contracts and goods at high priority markets in the borderlands of the Great Lakes. However, the countries are at different levels of preparation for actual investments in markets as follows:

- (i) DRC (US\$6.0 million) - the exact locations of the markets will be decided by the authorities following consultations among key agencies. The project will finance two markets in key centers

such as Uvira, Bukavu and Goma. The precise locations will be determined to complement developments in neighboring countries (and especially alternating market days).

(ii) Rwanda (US\$5.0 million) - the Government of Rwanda has commissioned feasibility studies and designs for several markets. The exact sites of the markets in these locations are to be determined in consultation with district authorities with a focus on two districts, Nyamasheke and Rusizi.

(iii) Uganda (US\$3.0 million) - the project will finance a study (US\$1.0 million) on cargo flows and specific supply chains upon which a decision will be made on investments in specific markets. Based on the findings the project will finance one priority market along the border with DRC (US\$2.0 million). TMEA have indicated that they may finance, in parallel, an elaborate strategy for the border markets, which will complement the project interventions.

Sub-component 1.3: Upgrading Infrastructure at Kamembe airport in Rwanda (US\$14.2 million)
Support will be provided to the Rwanda Civil Aviation Authority (RCAA) to develop navigation infrastructure and improve security at Kamembe Airport. Kamembe is the closest operational air gateway for Bukavu, a city of 1 million people in DRC, which is only 7km away. While Bukavu has Kavumu as a local airport, there are only limited domestic flights at that airport. Kamembe, in contrast, has a comparative advantage over other airports in the region: both Goma (DRC) and Bujumbura (Burundi) airports are more than 100km from the Bukavu while Kamembe is 25 minutes flying time from Kigali, through which travelers can connect to the rest of the world. The majority of passengers passing through Kamembe are Congolese (about 90 percent), a significant proportion of whom source tradeable goods from the Middle East and ship them through Rwanda. The airport has great potential, with passenger traffic growing at an average of 15 percent per annum between 2006 and 2013, and at an average of 19 percent between 2010 and 2013. The RCAA will soon complete rehabilitation of the 60 year old runway which was in poor condition and posed a safety risk to passengers and increased costs for airlines. The project will complement the government investment in the runway and finance new navigational aids and weather equipment, aeronautical ground lighting, airport perimeter fencing and lighting and a transit cargo facility (US\$14.2 million). The improvements to the airport are a priority of the government and are part of the country's Strategic Transport Master Plan, which was elaborated in September 2012.

Sub-component 1.4: Feasibility studies (US\$3.7 million)

Support will be provided to DRC and Uganda for feasibility studies and detailed designs of border posts in order to advance preparation of the second phase of the project (SOP2) or interventions by governments or other development partners. The studies and designs will be on the following:

- (i) DRC (US\$3.0 million): two border posts, namely Kavimvira and Mahagi, two ports, Kalemie and Uvira on Lake Tanganyika and Kavumu airport near Bukavu;
- (ii) Rwanda (US\$ 0.3 million): Rusizi I border post. The project will finance a feasibility study and detailed design of the Rusizi I border post. Following the completion of the study and based on the findings, some priority but limited works will be financed as described previously under sub-component 1.1;
- (iii) Uganda (US\$0.4 million): Goli border post (counterpart of Mahagi in DRC).

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

Project site selection. The targeted border crossings have been selected as the priorities for support under this project on the basis of (i) cross-border flows of goods and people, (ii) strategic importance to the countries, (iii) relevance to the Great Lakes Strategy and creating stability in the GLR and (iv) critical nodes for cross-border connectivity. The five border crossings are as follows:

- (i) Mahagi (DRC) – Goli (Uganda)
- (ii) Kasindi (DRC) – Mpondwe (Uganda)
- (iii) Bunagana (DRC) – Bunagana (Uganda)
- (iv) Goma/Les Petites Barrières – Rubavu (Rwanda)
- (v) Bukavu/Ruzizi 1 (DRC) – Rusizi I (Rwanda)

The project would finance improvements to infrastructure and facilities at select border posts. As indicated designs remain to be reviewed and updated, and precise interventions remain to be decided. The focus would be on integrated designs for efficient yet secure traffic flows of pedestrian, passenger and commercial vehicle traffic. Priority infrastructure works should improve the security of small informal traders, particularly through lighting, ensuring safe areas and providing warehousing so traders can safely store their goods overnight. At some of the border crossing points it may be necessary to redesign access roads and to provide parking facilities for vehicles as well as IT provide connectivity to customs and other agencies' management and processing systems.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Yasmin Tayyab (GSURR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	This policy is triggered as the different investments will require the identification, mitigation and monitoring of potential adverse environmental and social impacts. An Environmental and Social Impact Assessment Framework (ESMF) has been prepared, disclosed and consulted on for activities in Uganda and Rwanda. For DRC ESIA's will be prepared when the investments are confirmed to identify the impacts for the specific investments. Preparation of these instruments is being deferred to within 12 months after effectiveness of the project under OP 10:00 paragraph 12. Pursuant to these appropriate project-specific assessments (ESIA) and plans (EMPs) will be prepared. Furthermore an environmental audit was prepared for the rehabilitation works on the runway at Kamembe Airport (Rwanda), hat will be financed by the Government.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	Some of the sites for interventions under the project will be in proximity to natural wetlands (e.g. Lake Kivu in Rwanda) and there are possible impacts on the wetlands, in particular if construction waste is not handled appropriately In this context, OP4.04 is triggered to ensure that the adjoining or nearby natural habitats are duly considered when preparing the ESIA's and Environmental & Social Management Plans for the project.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	There will be no investments involving impacts on forests or the right of communities to use, which are important wildlife habitat and/or would have impacts on them.

Pest Management OP 4.09	No	The project will not engage in pest management.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	The project will not finance any investments that might have impacts on such resources. Such investments will be excluded from the project financing during environmental screening that will be a part of the ESMF.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	There are no indigenous People in the project area.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	Given population density at the border posts project activities may lead to temporary or permanent displacement. For Rwanda and Uganda an RPF has been prepared for the activities given that precise location and types of activities remain to be decided. For DRC the preparation of RAPs is being deferred to within 12 months post effectiveness of the project, in accordance with OP 10:00 paragraph 12. Project activities will be screened to determine the extent of displacement, temporary and/or permanent loss of livelihood and access to services along with the technical designs. As needed, Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) will be prepared along with the feasibility and technical designs of the investments identified.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	There are no dams near the project sites.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The project is not expected to affect international waterways. With regard to the feasibility and design studies for the “customs and border management facilities” in Kalemie and Uvira, the actual port facilities already exist, and the project is not going to finance the actual port construction (but rather on-land structures that will be used to accommodate or support border control and customs officials). Hence the policy has not been triggered.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	An assessment was made as to the existence of a border dispute between DRC and Uganda in the area where Mahagi/Goli border posts are located. The authorities of the two countries did not allude to any tensions or territorial disputes that might affect the project. As such, OP 7.60 was not triggered.

II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

<p>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</p> <p>Given the fragile environment and the density of population around the border posts, the proposed investments will trigger environmental and social safeguard policies OP 4.01 Environmental</p>
--

<p>Assessment, OP/BP 4.04 Natural Habitats and OP 4.12 Involuntary Resettlement. Preliminary assessment through field visits to the border posts at Rusizi and Rubavu and Goma Gesenyi in Rwanda and Bunagana –Bunagana, Mpondwe - Kasindi in Uganda of the potential infrastructure does not indicate any large scale or irreversible social and environmental impacts. A Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) and an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has been prepared for Rwanda and Uganda for the border infrastructure not yet identified. While the land requirements are minimal; expropriation of land from private owners will potentially pose a challenge for the District governments to identify replacement land in the event of expropriation of land. The Rwanda and Uganda ESMF and RPF have been reviewed by the project safeguards experts and cleared the RSA on June 29, 2015. Safeguards documents for Rwanda have been disclosed and published on June 29, 2015 on the MINICOM website (http://www.minicom.gov.rw/index.php?id=165) and for Uganda the draft documents were disclosed on April 13, 2015 and final on June 29, 2015 on the website of the Ministry of Trade Industry and Commerce (http://www.mtic.go.ug/index.php?/External-Trade/great-lakes-trade-facilitation-project/).</p>
<p>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</p>
<p>NA</p>
<p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p>
<p>NA</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>Rwanda and Uganda have prepared Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) and an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) for the border infrastructure not yet identified and for the Airport at Kemembe in Rwanda. The finance for the airport investments include navigational equipment, landing lights and the construction of a security fence.</p> <p>For the proposed sub-project investments, specific environmental and social impact assessments (ESIA) will be done and Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) and environmental and social management plans (EMPs) will be prepared prior to commencement of all construction activities. All the above safeguard documents will necessarily include the feedback from consultations with the appropriate local, regional and national stakeholders. Further training in environmental management will be provided for the interventions that will be financed by the project.</p> <p>In Uganda and Rwanda, the project will provide additional consultant experts to support management of environmental and social impacts. The responsible ministries and implementing agencies do not have experience with managing Bank projects, for all implementing agencies, this is the first World Bank funded project and therefore the capacity to manage the environmental and social impacts is limited. Along with strengthening the capacity of the existing project staff, the project is providing additional safeguard consultant TA in Rwanda and Uganda to manage the environmental and social impacts.</p> <p>In DRC as a conflict affected country, deferment of safeguards preparation was provided as per OP 10.0 para 12. The preparation of the safeguards reports will be commissioned along with the feasibility studies and technical designs of the investments for the two border posts; the petite barrier in Goma North Kivu and Bukavu/Rusizi border in South Kivu. The preparation of the safeguards reports will be the responsibility of Cellule Infrastructure (CI) under the overall</p>

responsibility of the Ministry of Commerce. CI has been implementing IDA financed roads projects and has experience in preparing safeguards documents and managing the environmental and social impacts of the civil works.
5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.
The project has multiple stakeholders, such as the departments of customs, immigration, security police, small traders, business community, local governments and NGOs. All the above safeguard documents have been prepared in direct consultations with these stakeholders and include the feedback from the appropriate local, regional and national stakeholders.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	18-May-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	29-Jun-2015
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	00000000
"In country" Disclosure	
Rwanda	18-May-2015
<i>Comments:</i> http://www.minicom.gov.rw/index.php?id=165	
Uganda	13-Apr-2015
<i>Comments:</i> http://www.mtic.go.ug/index.php?/External-Trade/great-lakes-trade-facilitation-project/	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	18-May-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	29-Jun-2015
"In country" Disclosure	
Rwanda	18-May-2015
<i>Comments:</i> http://www.minicom.gov.rw/index.php?id=165	
Uganda	13-Apr-2015
<i>Comments:</i> http://www.mtic.go.ug/index.php?/External-Trade/great-lakes-trade-facilitation-project/	
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.	
If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:	

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment	
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"/>]
OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats	
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement	
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"/>]
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information	
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"/>]
All Safeguard Policies	
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"/>]

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Paul Brenton, Charles Kunaka, Shiho Nagaki	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Glenn S. Morgan (SA)	Date: 25-Aug-2015
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: David Bridgman (PMGR)	Date: 25-Aug-2015