



Combined Project Information Documents / Integrated Safeguards Datasheet (PID/ISDS)

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 24-Nov-2022 | Report No: PIDISDSA35159



BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country Eastern and Southern Africa	Project ID P179954	Project Name Kenya Development Response to Displacement Impacts Project Additional Financing 2	Parent Project ID (if any) P161067
Parent Project Name Development Response to Displacement Impacts Project (DRDIP) in the Horn of Africa	Region EASTERN AND SOUTHERN AFRICA	Estimated Appraisal Date 05-Dec-2022	Estimated Board Date 19-Dec-2022
Practice Area (Lead) Social Sustainability and Inclusion	Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing	Borrower(s) The Republic of Kenya	Implementing Agency Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), State Department for the Development of the Arid and Semi-arid Lands (ASALs)/Ministry of East Africa

Proposed Development Objective(s) Parent

Project Development Objective (from Project Appraisal Document)

The Project Development Objective is to improve access to basic social services, expand economic opportunities, and enhance environmental management for communities hosting refugees in the target areas in the Recipient's territory.

Components

Component 1 – Social and Economic Infrastructure and Services

Component 2 – Environmental and Natural Resource Management

Component 3 - Livelihoods Program

Component 4 - Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Knowledge Sharing

Component 5 - : Support to IGAD for Expansion of the Regional Secretariat on Forced Displacement and Mixed Migration

PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US\$, Millions)

SUMMARY



Total Project Cost	3.40
Total Financing	3.40
of which IBRD/IDA	0.00
Financing Gap	0.00

DETAILS

Non-World Bank Group Financing

Trust Funds	3.40
Free-standing Single Purpose Trust Fund	3.40

Environmental Assessment Category

B-Partial Assessment

Decision

The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

- Kenya continues to be one of the largest refugee-hosting countries in the world.** As of June 2022, Kenya hosted 555,183 refugees and asylum seekers, mainly from Somalia (53 percent), South Sudan (25 percent), the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) (nine percent) and Ethiopia (six percent). Most refugees in Kenya live in camps in Dadaab in Garissa County (42 percent) and in Kakuma in Turkana County (42 percent), with the remainder living in Nairobi. Most refugees in Dadaab are from Somalia, camp while Kakuma mostly hosts South Sudanese.
- The refugee-hosting areas in Kenya’s north and northeast are remote and difficult to access and suffer from high levels of poverty, insecurity, difficult terrain, service delivery deficits and limited economic opportunities.** While Kenya’s economy showed considerable resilience during the pandemic, recovery is uneven and masks significant disparities and pockets of deprivation, likely to have been worsened by COVID-19. Poverty remains far higher in Kenya’s north and northeast counties, where around 7 out of 10 households are poor, compared with 3 out of 10 in the rest of the country. Although poverty fell in these counties during 2005-15, the decline was slower than in the rest of the country, so the gap has remained relatively constant. New estimates suggest that the gap for the north and northeast actually widened through 2019. It is likely that this trend continued during the pandemic. Some non-income disparities remain extreme. For example, primary net enrollment is 42 percent in Garissa compared to a high of 97 percent in Nyeri County. A long-running drought in the north and northeast has exacerbated environmental and socio-economic challenges, further compounded by the inflationary effects of the war in Ukraine. The current drought has left 4.2 million people in



Kenya requiring humanitarian assistance, with 4.1 million needing food aid. The three Kenya DRDIP counties of Turkana, Garissa and Wajir have been amongst the most heavily affected by the drought conditions.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

3. **The ongoing large-scale presence of refugees places an additional strain on the communities in the project areas.** The inflow of refugees into areas already facing major development challenges has: (a) triggered competition—direct and indirect—for basic social services such as health, education, and water; (b) degraded the physical and natural environment because of high pressure on biomass to meet energy and construction needs; and (c) had mixed impacts on livelihood opportunities.

4. **Climate change is likely to cause additional weather extremes in the coming years.** Kenya’s northern and northeastern areas are hot and arid. Moderate drought events are recorded on average every three to four years and major droughts every ten years. Since 2000, prolonged droughts have become more common. Temperatures in Kenya are projected to continue rising by 1.7°C by the 2050s and by approximately 3.5°C at the end of the century. Increased heat will result in significant implications for human and animal health, agriculture, and ecosystems. Repeating patterns of floods and droughts in the country have had large socio-economic impacts and high economic costs.

5. **The Kenya Development Response to Displacement Impacts Project or Kenya DRDIP (P161067) was approved on April 26, 2017, and became effective on June 20, 2017.** The project is part of the broader DRDIP regional operation (P152822) that also covers Djibouti, Ethiopia and Uganda. The project closing date was extended from April 30, 2022, to April 30, 2023, in February 2022. At approval, the project comprised a credit of US\$100 million to the Government of Kenya (IDA60210-KE) and a grant of US\$3 million to the Inter-governmental Authority on Development (IGAD), the peak inter-governmental body in the Horn of Africa (IDA-D1840). An Additional Financing of US\$8.18 million in grant funds through the Kenya DRDIP MDTF was added to the project and became effective on January 30, 2019.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Original PDO

Project Development Objective (from Project Appraisal Document)

The Project Development Objective is to improve access to basic social services, expand economic opportunities, and enhance environmental management for communities hosting refugees in the target areas in the Recipient's territory.

Current PDO

The PDO will not change under this Additional Financing.

Key Results

6. The following key indicators will continue to be used to track progress toward the PDO.
 - Beneficiaries with access to social and economic services and infrastructure (number)



- Direct project beneficiaries (number)
- Beneficiaries of economic development activities that report an increase in income (number)
- Land area where sustainable land management practices have been adopted as a result of the project (hectares)

D. Project Description

7. **The Kenya Development Response to Displacement Impacts Project in the Horn of Africa (DRDIP)** pioneered the long-term, government-led development response to forced displacement in Kenya. The project has enhanced access to services, helped to address environmental impacts of the refugee presence and developed a model for livelihood in refugee-hosting areas.

8. This Additional Financing and restructuring will: (a) provide US\$3.4 million in additional money for infrastructure subprojects to respond to price increases triggered by the COVID-19 pandemic; (b) extend the closing date of the project from April 30, 2023, to December 31, 2023 to provide time to complete ongoing activities; and (c) extend the closing date of a grant to the Inter-governmental Authority on Development under component 5 of the project from December 31, 2022 to December 31, 2023.

9. The project supports refugee-hosting communities in five sub-counties in Kenya (Turkana West in Turkana; Wajir South in Wajir; and Lagdera, Dadaab and Fafi in Garissa) through activities under five components, as follows:

- *Component 1 – Social and Economic Infrastructure and Services:* The component supports improvements in access to quality basic services including education, primary and secondary health services, water supply, sanitation, and hygiene for the host communities, primarily through investments in community-based infrastructure;
- *Component 2 – Environmental and Natural Resource Management:* The component addresses the environmental impact of the protracted refugee presence, which has resulted in deterioration of the natural resource base due to deforestation, degradation of grazing lands, loss of wildlife, soil erosion, open disposal of solid waste, and uncontrolled abstraction of groundwater for domestic consumption and livestock;
- *Component 3 – Livelihoods Program:* The component supports interventions to improve the productivity of traditional and non-traditional livelihoods and strengthen the resilience of communities;
- *Component 4 – Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), and Knowledge Sharing:* The component seeks to ensure effective project management, coordination and M&E.
- *Component 5 – Support to IGAD for Expansion of the Regional Secretariat on Forced Displacement and Mixed Migration:* The component supports regional coordination and learning between IGAD member states and DRDIP countries for comprehensive displacement-sensitive government-led development support for refugee returnees, IDPs, and host and return communities. It also provides technical support on development responses to forced displacement to the Government of Somalia.

E. Implementation



Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

10. **Implementation arrangements will remain the same, with the project Implementing Agency (IA) being the State Department for the Development of Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs).** With the reorganization of the administration after the 2022 General Election in Kenya, the State Department is now part of the Ministry of East African Community, Regional Development and ASALs. ASALs has established a National Project Implementation Unit (NPIU) to implement the project, working with a County Integrated Project Implementation Unit (CIPIU) in each of the target counties. The project has also hired Facilitating Partners (FPs), which are local non-governmental organizations (NGOs), to support community organization and social mobilization.

F. Project location and Salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

Like the parent project, the AF will be implemented in host communities around Dadaab and Kakuma refugee camps in Garissa, Wajir and Turkana counties. During preparation of the parent project, the Client prepared framework documents for the in a consultative manner, including (a) an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) to ensure that a process of identifying, assessing, and mitigating environmental and social impacts is integrated in the development of the specific subprojects; (b) a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) to clarify the principles, legal and institutional procedures for resettlement and rehabilitation to be applied to investments; (c) expanded Social Assessments (SA), specifically for Wajir and Garissa counties, to ensure the project interventions benefit as well as avoid any potential adverse effects on vulnerable and marginalized groups (VMGs); and (d) a Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Framework (VMGF) was prepared as the overwhelming majority of the project beneficiaries in Wajir and Garissa Counties are ethnic Somalis and in Turkana people around the Kakuma refugee camp are Turkana who qualify as VMGs according to the Constitution of Kenya and as IPs per OP 4.10. These instruments were finalized and disclosed in accordance with the Bank's Operational Policy on Safeguards and the requirements of the Kenya National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) and National Land Commission (NLC). The Bank's environmental and social experts as well as the RSA reviewed the consulted upon instruments. The existing instruments are applicable to this AF operation, as the activities financed by the AF and project areas are included in them. The ES instruments have been revised accordingly and were re-disclosed in-country and on the World Bank external website on July 12, 2018. The existing instruments reviewed at AF remain applicable to the operation given that the AF 2 will cover only cost overruns. Supported projects are the same as parent project and not expected to lead to largescale, significant or irreversible E&S impacts. When new subprojects and their locations/sites are identified under the KDRDIP, the Client will prepare site-specific safeguard instruments including ESIA/ESMPs and RAPs/ARAPs which will be consulted upon, cleared by the World Bank, and then disclosed in-county and at the Bank's external website prior to commencement of any civil works.



G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Margaret Auma Ombai, Social Specialist
Ben Okindo Ayako Miranga, Environmental Specialist

SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	
Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03	No	
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	Yes	
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	Yes	
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	

KEY SAFEGUARD POLICY ISSUES AND THEIR MANAGEMENT

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:

The project continues to be classified as Category B for the IDA Credit supported activities. Seven out of the ten safeguard policies remain triggered: Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01), Pest Management (OP/BP 4.09), Physical Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11), Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12), Indigenous Peoples (OP/BP 4.10), Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4.37), and International Waterways (OP/BP 7.50). Overall, the project would have positive environmental impacts through its activities under Component 2 which includes, among others, integrated natural resources management.

Environment: Some of the local-level investment activities under Component 1 and 2 may have limited adverse



environmental risks and impacts. These activities could potentially include: (i) expansion/construction of small infrastructure, (ii) construction/rehabilitation of physical structures for water catchment management, etc., and (iii) land-based livelihood activities which could have limited adverse environmental and social impacts. The infrastructure works under component 1 will pose civil works/ construction related impacts including health and safety considerations, vegetation clearance and soil erosion, impacts on PCRs, dust pollution, water pollution, management and disposal of construction waste, etc. Component 2 and 3 are expected to be positive through alleviating pressures on the poor that lead to unsustainable exploitation of natural resources and environmental degradation. The existing Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) is applicable to the AF operation with minor revisions to reflect the increased scope of the project, as the activities financed by the AF and project areas are included in the instrument. The ESMF has been revised accordingly and was re-disclosed in-country and on the World Bank external website on July 12, 2018. The ESMF reviewed at AF remain applicable to the operation given that the AF 2 will cover cost overrun. Supported projects are the same as parent project and not expected to lead to largescale, significant or irreversible E&S impacts.

Social: The project's anticipated social impacts has triggered OP 4.12 and in line with the Bank's safeguard policies, the project has put in place mitigation mechanisms acceptable to the World Bank. For impact on potential land take and/or restrictions in access to communal natural resources, a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) has been prepared under the parent project, consulted upon and disclosed. The existing RPF is applicable to the AF operation with minor revisions to reflect the increased scope of the project, as the activities financed by the AF and project areas are included in the instrument. The RPF has been revised accordingly and was re-disclosed in-country and on the World Bank external website on July 12, 2018. The existing RPF reviewed at AF remain applicable to the operation given that the AF 2 will cover cost overrun. The Bank's OP 4.10 is triggered as the project counties are inhabited by Vulnerable and Marginalised Groups that meet the characteristics defined under OP 4.10. A Social Assessment (SA) was undertaken under the parent project and this informed the development of a Vulnerable and Marginalized Group Framework (VMGF). Both the SA and VMGF were prepared, consulted upon and disclosed under the parent project. The existing SA and VMGF are applicable to the AF operation with minor revisions to reflect the increased scope of the project, as the activities financed by the AF and project areas are included in these instruments. The SA and VMGF have been revised accordingly and were re-disclosed in-country and on the World Bank external website on July 12, 2018. The existing SA/VMGF reviewed at AF remain applicable to the operation given that the AF 2 will cover cost overrun. The project includes cost effective and accessible grievance handling mechanism to ensure that any related project issues and concerns are resolved using due process.

The project's safeguards performance has been rated 'Moderately Unsatisfactory' since the ISR of February 2021. The downgrade was based on the following reasons: (a) insufficient social risk management processes as required by OP 4.12 and OP 4.10; (b) weak E&S safeguards management capacity of the NPIU; and (c) a weak project level Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), (d) Inadequate and non-inclusive stakeholder engagement, and (e) exclusion of some community groups from accessing project benefits. Other challenges were mostly related to poor documentation of safeguards process and instruments, low level of awareness of the project GRM amongst target communities and weak uptake channels. However, following an intensive capacity building of the NPIU and CIPIU E&S staff, coupled with close monitoring of safeguards activities by the Bank's task team, the NPIU has now put in place an action plan to improve the performance rating. Some of the measures that have been put in place include: (a) GRM action plan has been developed; (b) environmental and social risks screening of sub-projects has improved; (c) the project management information system (MIS) is now designed to capture key social and environmental issues; and (d) an additional NPIU safeguards staff has been recruited. Since the November ISM, notable progress has been made on the agreed actions resulting to the revision of the safeguards performance rating to Moderately Satisfactory as described in section A.4 below.



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

It is anticipated that the project including the AF will improve access to social services, expand economic opportunities and enhance environmental management for host community in the targeted areas, with no indirect and/or long-term negative impact in these areas. It is anticipated that the project including the AF will result in long-term positive safeguard impacts in the project area because of the project's emphasis on ensuring sustainable environmental management of natural resources and reduction in the unsustainable exploitation of natural resources, including mitigation of risks and other challenges faced by affected households. Social divisions could be exacerbated if inclusion and cohesiveness are not carefully promoted and potential conflicts mitigated. Possible indirect or long term impacts include further depletion of the water table if not managed e.g. irrigation projects and fragmentation of the rangeland if sub-projects are not well planned.

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

The "no project" alternative would deprive host communities already impacted negatively by refugee influx, the opportunity to improve access to basic social services, expand economic opportunities, and enhance environmental management. To ensure safeguards due diligence during implementation, the parent project deployed more expertise at all levels; and the planning of sub-projects will involve full participation of beneficiary communities; and the project's activities will avoid land acquisition. Conflict mitigation measures are already in place under the parent project alongside strong and trusted grievance redress mechanisms. Siting of infrastructure would need to mitigate changes in settlement patterns and other activities that further fragment the rangeland and interfere with migration and marketing routes. Water development would be carried out within a comprehensive water management plan and promote water efficiency and harvesting.

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.

During the November 2022 ISM, the project's safeguards performance rating was revised from Moderately Unsatisfactory to Moderately Satisfactory on the basis of progress made in the following areas: i) enhanced safeguards capacity at national level where one environmental safeguards specialist and 2 social safeguards specialist are now in place at the National Project Implementation Unit (NPIU); ii) at the NPIU level, there is a clear division of safeguards responsibilities, each of the 3 safeguards staff (2 social and 1 environmental) is responsible for E&S risk management in a specific county that are participating in the Project, iii) the capacity of the social mobilisers and community facilitators has been strengthened to support the CIPIU in in E&S screening and ES compliance monitoring; iv) NPIU is availing resources for engagement of Project Implementation Support Team (PIST) and NEMA licensed ES lead experts to support the development of E&S risk management instruments; v) with the support of WB safeguards team ESMP templates have been developed for various sub-projects and are being applied to guide the NPIU and CIPIU teams on environmental and social risk assessment and preparation of E&S instruments, and vii) regular bi-weekly safeguard meetings between the project team and the WB safeguards team to closely follow up on safeguards performance and pending corrective actions. In addition, the project has fully implemented the corrective action plan designed to strengthen the project GRM, and progress in this regard include; i) optimized use of CFs and SMs to support the Village Grievance Redress Committees (VGRCs) in logging and handling of grievances, ii) reactivating the GRM uptake channels (for instance providing specific mobile telephone line) for logging complains for each county, and iii) enhanced documentation and management of grievances as evidenced by GRM reports shared with the Bank. In addition, the project will also harness synergies and collaborate and cooperate with other complementary WB financed projects implemented in the same counties, these include (Off-grid Solar Energy Access Project - P160009;



Water and Sanitation Development Project - P156634; and Climate Smart Agriculture Project – P154784).

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

The key stakeholders remain communities hosting refugees in Dadaab and Kakuma. Thus, people living in areas where civil works and other activities will be undertaken could be impacted by the project, which may result in small scale resettlement or disruption of livelihoods, or which may result in environmental damage. Adverse impacts are believed to be minimal in scope and nature and should be easily mitigated. Consultations are carried out during project identification, screening and preparation of ESIA/ESMPs. Public consultations will continue throughout project implementation with all potentially affected people and explain clearly what they may expect in terms of assistance to ensure that no one is left worse off as a result of the Project. Other stakeholders include relevant sector ministries at the national and county levels, the National Environment Management Agency (NEMA), the Department of Refugee Affairs, the Frontier Counties Development Council (FCDC), UNHCR, and County Governors.

B. Disclosure Requirements (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure	For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors
-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

"In country" Disclosure

Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure
-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

"In country" Disclosure

Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure
-----------------------------	-----------------------------------



"In country" Disclosure

Pest Management Plan

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?

Date of receipt by the Bank

Date of submission for disclosure

"In country" Disclosure

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level (to be filled in when the ISDS is finalized by the project decision meeting) (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)



CONTACT POINT

World Bank

Matthew Stephens
Senior Social Development Specialist

Annette Akinyi Omolo
Senior Social Development Specialist

Samuel Lule Demsash
Senior Social Development Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

The Republic of Kenya
Dr. Julius Muia
Principal Secretary
pstreasury@gov.ke

Implementing Agencies

Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)

State Department for the Development of the Arid and Semi-arid Lands (ASALs)/Ministry of East Africa



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):	Matthew Stephens Annette Akinyi Omolo Samuel Lule Demsash
----------------------	---

Approved By

Safeguards Advisor:	Peter Leonard	11-Dec-2022
Practice Manager/Manager:	Helene Monika Carlsson Rex	11-Dec-2022
Country Director:	Boutheina Guerhazi	11-Dec-2022