



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

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 25-May-2021 | Report No: PIDISDSA32055

**BASIC INFORMATION****A. Basic Project Data**

Country Congo, Democratic Republic of	Project ID P176360	Project Name STEP Third Additional Financing	Parent Project ID (if any) P145196
Parent Project Name DRC Eastern Recovery Project	Region AFRICA EAST	Estimated Appraisal Date 29-Apr-2021	Estimated Board Date 04-Jun-2021
Practice Area (Lead) Social Protection & Jobs	Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing	Borrower(s) Democratic Republic of Congo	Implementing Agency DRC Social Fund (FSRDC)

Proposed Development Objective(s) Parent

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

Components

1. Community Support
2. Livelihoods and Employment Generation
3. Capacity Building
4. Project Management
5. Contingency Emergency Response

PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US\$, Millions)**SUMMARY**

Total Project Cost	250.00
Total Financing	250.00
of which IBRD/IDA	250.00
Financing Gap	0.00

DETAILS**World Bank Group Financing**

International Development Association (IDA)	250.00
---	--------



IDA Grant	250.00
Environmental Assessment Category	
B-Partial Assessment	
Decision	
The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate	

Other Decision (as needed)

B. Introduction and Context

- This US\$250 million equivalent Additional Financing (AF) to the Eastern Recovery Project in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) responds to the Government’s request for support to face the combined effects of the COVID-19 crisis and a new inflow of refugees.** The parent Project is known locally as *Projet pour la Stabilisation de l’Est de la RDC pour la Paix (STEP)* and is the main social protection instrument to respond to DRC’s overlapping crises.
- This third operation (STEP 3) will foster an integrated approach – education, health, and social protection – to protect human capital of both refugees and host communities.** An immediate focus will be to strengthen the project in North Ubangui and expand it to South Ubangui, two provinces where refugees from the Central African Republic (CAR) have recently arrived in large numbers again.

Country Context

- The current level of vulnerability and poverty is unprecedented in DRC’s history, jeopardizing peacebuilding and development efforts.** The fast-growing DRC population is repeatedly exposed to covariate shocks with devastating economic and social consequences. Two-thirds of the population lives below the poverty line. About 20 million people need humanitarian assistance (United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) 2021).
- Political instability, poor governance, and weak state institutions are the main factors that explain the persistent poverty in DRC** (WB 2018). Despite the action of the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the DRC (MONUSCO), parts of the territory continue to be disputed by violent armed groups. Chronic conflict and high levels of violence have had a devastating impact: as an example, two million children in eastern DRC do not have access to education due to the conflict that has destroyed or damaged schools. Gender-Based Violence (GBV) is prevalent (United Nations Population Fund 2020) and represents a significant barrier to women’s full engagement in social and economic life.
- DRC hosts over 527,000 refugees, one of the largest numbers in Africa.** Almost all refugees live in rural areas and 72 percent live outside camps; 63 percent are children (UNHCR 2021). Refugees are concentrated in remote and insecure border areas, where they account for a large share of the local population. In particular, DRC’s refugees include about



200,000 from CAR, primarily located in rural areas of the northwest; 50,000 of them have arrived in the last quarter. The COVID-19 pandemic has weakened coping mechanisms among refugees and host communities, as many people have lost their sources of livelihoods. Population movement and additional pressure on social services is also increasing exposure to diseases, including COVID-19.

6. **The COVID-19 pandemic has taken a toll in the DRC, as it has globally, and is impacting negatively its people and its economy.** There have been 29,000 COVID-19 cases and 750 deaths in DRC since the declaration of the pandemic (World Health Organization (WHO) 2021). The Government swiftly declared a state of emergency, implementing strict containment measures including the closure of schools. COVID-19 is expected to hit DRC's economy hard, with a projected contraction of 0.8 percent in the country's GDP in 2020. The socio-economic impacts of the containment measures have included increased loss of employment and income for people and decrease in revenues for businesses in both the formal and informal sectors (DRC National Statistics Institute (INS) 2020). Nearly 75 percent of low-income households in DRC reported having lower income in January 2021 than pre-pandemic.

7. **Despite these formidable challenges, the country experienced its first peaceful transfer of power in 2018 and may be at a turning point.** Support for the Government's efforts to address overlapping crises may catalyze more sustainable pro-poor policies, e.g. free primary education, and initiate a cycle of positive, self-reinforcing initiatives to increase the resilience of the country and its population. A dynamic response to shocks like the COVID-19 pandemic and a new refugee influx is key to protecting the poor and vulnerable, including refugees, and preventing the reform effort from derailing at a critical juncture for the country's peaceful development.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

8. **A child born in the DRC today will be 37 percent as productive when she grows up as she could be if she enjoyed complete education and full health.** With a Human Capital Index (HCI) score of 0.37 percent, DRC ranks 135 out of 157 countries (WB 2020). DRC is below the average for the Sub-Saharan Africa region and slightly below the average for low income countries. This low HCI is similar for girls and boys. Congolese children spend an average of 9.1 years in school and 43 percent of children are malnourished. A lack in health and education infrastructures characterizes the situation in many of the provinces. Households have limited to no financial risk protection from catastrophic health expenditures. The school fees system burdens the poor and the most vulnerable households and limits children's access to school, yet progress has been made with the free primary education reform, implemented with WB financing. Despite investing in human capital being a pillar of DRC's new National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP, 2019-2024), the COVID-19 pandemic now threatens to reverse any progress in human capital.

9. **Initial data simulations suggest that COVID-19 may reverse years' worth of human capital progress.** In education, early data indicate that school closures (affecting 18 million DRC children) combined with family hardship are significantly affecting the accumulation of human capital for the current generation of school-age children. 30 percent of households who did not enroll their children in school for 2020-2021 state a lack of money as the main reason (INS 2020). In the health and nutrition sector, COVID-19's disruption of health services, losses in income, and worsened nutrition are expected to increase child mortality and stunting, with effects that will be felt for decades to come (WB 2020).

10. **In the social protection sector, some progress on policy and institutional development has been made over the recent years, with sustained financial and technical support from the international community.** In 2017, the Government adopted a comprehensive Social Protection National Policy. Last year, MINAS developed a Standard Eligibility Questionnaire for social programming, a first step toward the harmonization of social protection instruments. bilateral donors, UN agencies, and international NGOs have engaged in the recovery and resilience agenda.



11. **However, DRC has no national social protection system to identify and register vulnerable people.** There is not a national registry yet and safety net programs remain fragmented, poorly funded, and with limited impact. They cover just two percent of the country's population, below the five percent average in Central Africa (WB 2018). The unit cost for delivering social safety net services is high due to limited physical and technological infrastructure, constrained access to the vulnerable population because of insecurity, and lack of country delivery mechanisms. Total spending on social safety nets is low even by regional standards: only about 0.7 percent of GDP is invested in social safety nets, virtually all of it funded by international organizations through emergency programs (WB 2019).

12. **The WB, in consultation with UNCHR, has concluded that the refugee protection framework continue to be adequate.** DRC has ratified most international conventions on refugees, including (i) the 1951 Geneva Convention and its additional protocol of 1967 and (ii) the 1969 African Union Convention. In its 2018 Letter of Development Policy, the Government commits to promoting the socio-economic inclusion of refugees at the provincial and local levels, allowing refugees to access all services and giving them the right to move and work. The National Commission for Refugees (CNR) is the key Government institution responsible for the legal and administrative protection of refugees and the coordination of related government programs.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Original PDO

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

Current PDO

The project development objective is to improve access to livelihoods and socio-economic infrastructures in selected vulnerable communities in the DRC.

Key Results

13. **The AF will enable the project to reach an additional 350 communities with a high density of refugees,** bringing the total number of STEP beneficiary communities to 1,780. The additional communities will be selected in North Ubangui and South Ubangui, two northwestern provinces which are the most affected by a combination of poverty and forced displacement. These provinces are hosting the new inflow of CAR refugees.

14. **While the AF will help the overall population of these communities, it will specifically support 175,000 direct beneficiaries and 875,000 indirect beneficiaries.** This will bring total project beneficiaries to more than 3.3 million. The direct users of the improved social infrastructures (students, patients, etc.) are projected at 70,000 individuals, while the safety net program will cover 105,000 individuals. Calculations of indirect beneficiaries are based on the household size of direct beneficiaries, accounting for possible duplicates, e.g. schooling of multiple children from the same household.

15. **The achievement of the PDO will continue to be measured against the following Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for the additional financing:**

- a. Number of vulnerable communities benefiting from the project (+350)
- b. Number of improved community infrastructures (+700)
- c. Total amount of social transfers distributed by safety net programs (+US\$35 million)
- d. Number of persons enrolled in the social registry (+630,000)



16. **All indicators will continue to be disaggregated by gender, status, and location as needed and the methodology for data collection and analysis (using remote supervision) will remain the same.**

D. Project Description

17. **Building on STEP's operational delivery model, this AF will provide a timely response by rapidly expanding social safety nets and protecting human capital in refugee hosting areas.** STEP 3 will contribute to preventing a reversal of the still fragile progress made in human development in recent years, while providing much-needed emergency support to refugees and host communities at high risk of negative outcomes from the COVID-19 pandemic.

18. **STEP 3 is a straight scale-up, also addressing the financing gap created by activation of the CERC.** The parent project (STEP 1) was set up as a crisis response instrument, and the following restructuring (STEP 2) reinforced that feature. Consequently, there is no need for changing the project's components and activities.

19. **Revised Component 1: Community Support** (additional US\$58.0 million equivalent; new total: US\$261.0 million equivalent) will finance the maintenance, rehabilitation and/or construction of additional priority social infrastructures in 350 targeted communities in North Ubangui and South Ubangui. Component 1 will also sustain support to local governance through the CLDs.

20. **Revised Component 2: Livelihoods and Employment Generation** (additional US\$127.0 million equivalent; new total: US\$342.0 million equivalent) will expand the coverage of STEP's social safety net to an extra 100,000 direct beneficiaries, among host communities and refugees, in North Ubangui and South Ubangui. US\$50 are to replenish funds that had been reallocated to the CERC.

21. **Revised Component 3: Capacity Building** (additional US\$0.0 million equivalent; total: US\$57.1 million equivalent) structures the social protection sector through a partnership between MINAS, FSRDC, and CNR. STEP 2 financing already includes provisions for CNR to coordinate the development action of the sectoral ministries to promote refugee inclusion.

22. **Revised Component 4: Project management** (additional US\$15.0 million equivalent; new total: US\$59.9 million equivalent) finances all additional costs related to the management, audits, communication, and M&E of the project, including the opening of a new FSRDC office in South Ubangui. The overall project's management cost remains capped at 10 percent of the financing.

23. **Revised Component 5: CERC** (additional US\$50.0 million equivalent new total: US\$100.0 million equivalent) allows the government to quickly reallocate and mobilize funds in the event of an emergency. It is anticipated that the government will request activation of the CERC immediately after the effectiveness of STEP 3 to expand the coverage of the emergency cash transfer in Kinshasa in response to COVID-19.

E. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

24. **The overall implementation arrangements of the project will remain the same, with FSRDC as the Project Implementation Entity under a subsidiary agreement with the Ministry of Finance.** The FSRDC team is in place in North Ubangui and it can deploy rapidly to South Ubangui. Dedicated staff will be recruited for the new provincial team. As in



each STEP benefiting province, a Provincial Consultative Committee will serve as a steering committee in South Ubangui. The project will also continue to support CLDs in communities where it intervenes.

25. **Drawing from lessons learned under the parent project, STEP 3 will continue to emphasize close coordination with humanitarian and peace actors.** Aside from operational effectiveness, the goal of this effort is to avoid the creation of a dual social protection system, whereby one is operated by international actors and another by the Government. It is especially true for crises like the COVID-19 pandemic and support for refugees. UNHCR, with whom the project is already coordinating action, will be a key partner. Furthermore, the team will engage with other relevant sectors, in particular education and health, around the design of key delivery mechanisms.

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

STEP 3 will be implemented in two provinces of DRC: North Ubangui and South Ubangui, which are located in the northwest of the country. The selected provinces have a high number of poor, important infrastructure needs, and are affected by forced displacement. The project has adopted a revised geographic targeting strategy to concentrate activities in areas where the project can have a stronger development impact. Sub-provincial areas will be selected using a project targeting index (PTI). The PTI will allow to identify priority zones according to a vulnerability score, which will be calculated based on poverty levels, displacement, and access to infrastructures. Security, access, as well as colocation with other WB-funded or donor-funded projects, constitute weights in the PTI. The 350 additional communities benefiting from STEP 3 will be selected in these priority zones. All project’s sites for public works and community infrastructure undergo an environment and social screening. An environmental and social management plan (ESMP) is conducted before works start. The project’s climate change and disaster risk screening revealed that the key relevant vulnerability for this region is seasonal flooding.

G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Christophe Ngongo Muzyumba, Environmental Specialist
Shamard Ya Jua Mungu Shamalirwa, Social Specialist

SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The proposed operation is a category B project. This policy is triggered because the activities of component 1 (Community Support) and component



2 (Livelihoods and Employment Generation) of the project may induce negative environmental and social risks and impacts. The potential environmental and social risks and impacts remain those of the on-going project and include : (i) health and safety for workers and beneficiaries; (ii) air pollution; (iii) exclusion and inclusion errors in beneficiary selection; (iv) risks pertaining to the protection of beneficiaries, including GBV and SEA/SH and refugees; (v) disturbance of social cohesion and livelihood of indigenous people; (vi) involuntary resettlement and temporary restriction of access during civil works. These activities will not induce major or irreversible environmental and social impacts. In order to identify the impacts of the project and to propose the appropriate mitigation measures, the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) approved and disclosed for STEP 2 (in 2020) will be updated and redisclosed to reflect the inclusion of Sud Ubangui. The updated ESMF will consider risks and approaches tailored to operating in the COVID-19 context, including risks and mitigation measures applicable to SEA/SH and GBV, occupational health and safety, road safety, labor, social inclusion, stakeholder engagement. In addition, it will include any changes in national environmental laws and regulations, the environmental challenges associated with Sud Ubangui and GRM requirements.

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	No	The distribution of assets to rural households was discontinued. Therefore, the safeguards policy on pest management (OP/BP 4.09) does no longer be triggered.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	This policy is triggered as the proposed works might involve, excavation, which may result in chance finds of physical cultural resources. Thus, this policy will be addressed in the Environmental and Social Assessment, and “chance finds” procedures should be part of every civil works contract, even where risks are deemed low.



Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	There are communities of Indigenous Peoples (IPs) in all six provinces targeted by the project. An Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) that was prepared for the parent project has been updated with information on IPs in all six provinces.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	The project does not plan any subprojects that will involve large-scale permanent economic or physical displacement, however there may be some temporary displacement caused by works. A Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) developed for the parent project has been updated to include the new activities and provinces covered by the Additional Financing.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	

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:

Environmental and social risks and impacts of this AF, including COVID-19 specific risk considerations, are assessed and managed in accordance with OP/BP 4.01 utilizing existing instruments for the original project. The safeguard assessments related to activities that would be financed with the proposed AF have taken into account risks and approaches in place at the time of AF preparation, tailored to operating in the COVID-19 context, including risks and mitigation measures applicable to SEA/SH and GBV, OHS, labor, social inclusion and stakeholder engagement.

The proposed operation is a category B project as defined in OP 4.01 (Environmental Assessment). The on-going project is categorized as B and the proposed AF does not trigger new safeguard policies. In addition to OP/BP 4.01, the following policies were triggered: (i) Physical Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11); Indigenous Peoples (OP/BP 4.10); and (iii) Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12).

The potential environmental risks and impacts of the project will be limited, site-specific, and manageable to an acceptable degree, if the monitoring safeguards already in place are complied with and continue to be operational. These risks were also assessed in detail during the preparation of the original project and subsequent additional financings and continue to be relevant for the proposed operation. As such, the main social risks relate to: (i) exclusion and inclusion errors in beneficiary selection; (ii) risks pertaining to the protection of beneficiaries, including Sexual Exploitation and Abuse and Sexual Harassment (SEA/SH) and refugees; (iii) disturbance of social cohesion and livelihood of indigenous people; and (iv) temporary restriction of access during civil works. In general, the project is expected to have a positive impact for the whole population in the targeted areas thanks to the inclusive impact of the



activities. The improvement of small-scale community infrastructure through appropriate construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance will have minimal impact on the environment. None of activities financed by the proposed AF is expected to induce irreversible and significant adverse environmental and social impacts.

The latest version of the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) was disclosed in-country and on the WB's external website on June 18, 2020, following the activation of the original Project's Contingent Emergency Response Component (CERC) to support the Government's social response to COVID-19 in Kinshasa. The Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) and the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) were disclosed in-country and on the Bank's external website on March 16, 2020 and March 17, 2020 respectively. FSRDC has also adopted a SEA/SH Action Plan informed by a project-specific risk assessment and with reference to specialized structures in SEA/SH cases. Simplified Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMP) have been prepared and implemented in the field for each sub-project under the original project, both for the community infrastructure and public works. These activities are small, costing less than \$200,000. Simple ESMPs are filed in the project office. Any proposed sub-project that would require a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) is rejected.

The existing instruments, namely the ESMF, IPPF, and RPF, documents and systems will be used to screen, assess, and manage risks and impacts related to the AF activities. All the safeguards instruments, including the SEA/SH Action Plan, have been updated to reflect the inclusion of South Ubangui and will be redisclosed prior to negotiations. These instruments are updated to take into account (i) the recommendations on the considerations of the specific risks related to COVID-19 using available guidance in implementation design and (ii) guide teams in implementation of the AF in new beneficiary communities during implementation once completed. These guidance includes:

- World Bank COVID-19 Stakeholder Engagement Plan;
- COVID-19 relevant Consultation Guidelines;
- World Bank COVID-19 procedures for protecting workers to improve labor conditions;
- World Bank COVID-19 procedures for protecting workers (as relevant, refer to LMP Template for COVID-19 Response, and/or COVID-19 Considerations in Construction /Civil Works Project)
- WHO and other appropriate COVID-19 related Guidelines that are already part of the national COVID-19 response guidelines; and
- Good Practice Note on Addressing Sexual Exploitation and Abuse/Sexual Harassment (SEA/SH) in Social Protection and Jobs Investment Projects Financing.

A strong Grievances Redress Mechanism (GRM) is in place and effective. Under the original project, the GRM has received a total of 362 cases: 249 general complaints (e.g. enquiry on targeting, delay in works, request for additional funding, etc.), 107 sensitive complaints (e.g. collective grievances about delay in payments, local corruption, disturbances of neighbors because of works) and six highly sensitive complaints (e.g. GBV and SEA/SH, corruption on procurement, fatalities, threats to staff, etc.). Environment and Social Incident Reports are filed on a timely basis whenever an incident occurs and reflect the challenging operating environment.

2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area: Negative environmental and social impacts are expected to be minimal to moderate. No adverse, indirect or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities are expected in the project areas; on the contrary, project investments may foster sound environmental and social practices.

3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts. Not relevant.



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.

The original project is in compliance with Safeguard requirements and the Safeguards rating has been rated Moderately Satisfactory for the past three years.

The WB team, including the Environmental and Social Specialists, carries out regular (remote and onsite) implementation support mission. Environmental and Social Specialists in the team work closely with FSRDC helping the implementation agency to monitor, identify risks, impacts as well as providing inputs into mitigation measures and training activities.

STEP 3 will continue to be implemented by FSRDC. FSRDC has gained capacity in working with Bank requirements regarding environmental and social safeguards policies through the implementation of the several WB projects, including the DRC - Gender Based Violence Prevention and Response Project (P166763).

FSRDC has two safeguards specialists within the national coordination as well as a GBV specialist, who oversees the work of safeguards assistants in each provincial offices to ensure proper implementation, monitoring, documentation, and reporting on the mitigation measures identified in the ESMF. The original project has a robust Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) for maintaining public accountability, responding to complaints and preventing conflicts; including specific procedures and a response protocol, to treat GBV complaints ethically, safely, and confidentially. Each provincial office has a dedicated GRM assistant. Local Development Committees, which are key partners with the project at the local level, also contribute to identifying, preventing, mitigating and responding to adverse social and environmental impacts. Each community has the support of two environment focal points, one for infrastructure and the other for safety nets. All project staff, contractors and beneficiaries have to sign an OHS Code of Conduct, including provisions against SEA/SH. Furthermore, labor-related risks are covered by the OHS provisions in existing safeguard instruments. The AF activities will follow the health safety protocols that are in place and that were updated during the 2018-2020 Ebola crisis, COVID-19 risk mitigation measures in line with good practice notes will also be followed. Finally, the addition of (i) a social registry, (ii) a systematic remote monitoring system, and (iii) near real-time community perception surveys in the project design also contribute to measuring – and course-correcting as needed – potential social and environmental adverse risks.

The ongoing project is already implementing GBV mitigation activities and a SEA/SH Action Plan has been prepared for the expanded activities and provinces covered by the AF. FSRDC has a safeguards specialist within the national coordination and a GBV specialist to oversee the GBV/SEA/H Action Plan and ensure that GBV/SEA/H risks in relation to planned project activities are being adequately addressed and mitigated. FSRDC will also ensure that social safeguards staff have adequate experience in gender-sensitive programming and in GBV/SEA/H prevention and response.

Besides the GBV/SEA/H Action Plan, the RPF and IPPF will be the main instruments to address social safeguards risks. To mitigate potential risks related to involuntary resettlement, the RPF will include steps that take into account the specific needs of displaced and returning populations, and integrate provisions for addressing possible land and other socioeconomic points of contention in an equitable, consultative and peaceful manner. Meanwhile, the IPPF will include steps for the identification of indigenous populations in the targeted project communities as well as in the vicinity of sub-project sites, and detail procedures that ensure indigenous populations are properly consulted, while feedback mechanisms are established to allow for prompt action in case their rights are not respected or they are denied their fair share of project benefits. FSRDC understands that both the RPF and IPF have the potential to play an important role in conflict prevention and management. The parent project's Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) will



be retained and expanded into the new province, subject to modifications as needed based on consultations with local stakeholders.

Local Development Committees are the key partners of the project in each benefiting communities. As part of its targeting procedures, the project also implements outreach campaigns. A GRM is in place that allows the public and beneficiaries to interact with the project easily. GRM meetings are organized frequently and reports of cases sent to the FSRDC. The Bank team is also regularly informed on the GRM management and project incidents. These include mostly inquiries on frequency and date of payments for beneficiaries and contractors, which are handled by FSRDC provincial offices. Last, and as a measure of strengthening robustness of social accountability measures at the local level, community perception surveys are carried out every month in all benefiting communities as a complement to the GRM. The Project will strengthen its approach to ensure that the GRM is inclusive of and accessible to refugees

No new environmental risks are expected to arise from works on community infrastructure (small scale), which will be maximizing the use of local materials and labor and have minimal effect on the environment. FSRDC recruits environmental specialists in all its sub-offices, including the new sub-office in Sud Ubangui, to ensure proper implementation, monitoring, documentation, and reporting on the mitigation measures identified in the ESMF to be updated, which will include the province of Sud Ubangui.

At the national level, the Congolese Environment Agency (Agence Congolaise de l'Environnement, ACE) of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD) is responsible for the evaluation and approval of all environmental and social studies as well as monitoring their implementation, in compliance with national regulations. ACE has knowledge and experience for projects under Bank's safeguard policies. However, it is limited by weak capacities in human, material and financial resources. Hence the difficulty in monitoring the implementation of environmental and social studies of projects in the field. Furthermore, both the MEDD and the ACE have no clear mandate regarding their roles in the management of social risks management within the ESA process, such as community risk management, gender-based violence, child abuse and exploitation issues. Participation and citizen engagement are often found to be poor at both the national and local level, despite decentralization efforts. The Bank has diligently implemented a participatory approach through its various investments, whereby civil society (vocal and active), as well as the local institutions and leaders, are invited to meetings during the design of projects. The Bank further continues to provide, as needed, capacity building sessions for the projects' coordination units and other stakeholders involved in the management of project-related environmental and social risks.

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

Potentially affected people have been consulted to update the safeguards instruments.

Measures already in the operations manual reduce discrimination, promote participation of the most vulnerable and encourage refugee integration. The project will continue to work with specialized local structures to target vulnerable groups. The operations manual includes procedures to ensure that consultations with women and other vulnerable groups in targeted communities are conducted in safe and enabling environments, such as in sex-segregated groups and with female facilitators, in order to obtain their inputs on planned activities, potential risks and impacts in the context and in connection with project interventions, and understand their risks for sexual exploitation and abuse and sexual harassment (SEAH) in project intervention areas. The project makes available support services, as well as safe and accessible channels for reporting SEAH incidents. Where displaced population and host communities are concerned, appropriate sensitization and communication mechanisms will be implemented to involve them in



decision-making. UNHCR will support this effort given their mandate. A social assessment on issues specific to forced displacement was completed by the Bank in January 2020 (Social Assessment of the Dynamics of Forced Displacement in North Kivu and Ituri And Responses by the Eastern Recovery Project (STEP)) and the findings have been incorporated into the project’s approach to working with displaced populations. Local stakeholders (authorities, civil society organizations, beneficiaries and affected groups, etc.) will participate in any consultation throughout the project’s life cycle. Activities will be designed and implemented in close consultation with local and provincial authorities, communities, vulnerable groups (e.g. displaced populations, indigenous groups, etc.), and other relevant stakeholders.

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 06-May-2021	Date of submission for disclosure 06-May-2021	For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors
--	--	--

"In country" Disclosure

Congo, Democratic Republic of

06-May-2020

Comments

https://www.mediacongo.net/article-actualite-86710_resume_du_cges_actualise_pour_le_financement_additionnel_du_projet_pour_la_stabilisation_de_l_est_de_la_rdc_pour_la_paix_capital_humain_step_hc.html

Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process

Date of receipt by the Bank 06-May-2021	Date of submission for disclosure 06-May-2021
--	--

"In country" Disclosure

Congo, Democratic Republic of

06-May-2021

Comments

https://www.mediacongo.net/article-actualite-86712_resume_du_cpr_actualise_pour_le_financement_additionnel_du_projet_pour_la_stabilisation_de_l_est_de_la_rdc_pour_la_paix_capital_humain_step_ch.html



Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework

Date of receipt by the Bank

06-May-2021

Date of submission for disclosure

06-May-2021

"In country" Disclosure

Congo, Democratic Republic of

06-May-2021

Comments

https://www.mediacongo.net/article-actualite-86711_resume_du_cpppa_actualise_pour_le_financement_additionnel_du_projet_pour_la_stabilisation_de_l_est_de_la_rdc_pour_la_paix_capital_humain_step_ch.html

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 (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)

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment

Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?

Yes

If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?

Yes

Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?

Yes

OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources

Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?

Yes

Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?

Yes

OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples



Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?

Yes

If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?

Yes

If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?

NA

OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement

Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?

Yes

If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?

Yes

Is physical displacement/relocation expected?

No

Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)

No

The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information

Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank for disclosure?

Yes

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



All Safeguard Policies

Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?

Yes

Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?

Yes

Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?

Yes

Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?

Yes

CONTACT POINT

World Bank

Paul G. A. Bance
Senior Operations Officer

John A. Elder
Operations Adviser

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Democratic Republic of Congo
Honore Tshiyoyo
Cellule de coordination des projets
minfinrdc@micronet.cd

Implementing Agencies

DRC Social Fund (FSRDC)
Ruphin Bo-Elongo
Coordinator
ruphinboel@fondsocial.cd



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):	Paul G. A. Bance John A. Elder
----------------------	-----------------------------------

Approved By

Safeguards Advisor:	Peter Leonard	25-May-2021
Practice Manager/Manager:	Paolo Belli	25-May-2021
Country Director:	Issa Diaw	27-May-2021