



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

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 03-Aug-2018 | Report No: PIDISDSA24990



BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country Uganda	Project ID P164101	Project Name Development Response to Displacement Impacts Project	Parent Project ID (if any) P152822
Parent Project Name Development Response to Displacement Impacts Project in the HoA	Region AFRICA	Estimated Appraisal Date 23-Jul-2018	Estimated Board Date 13-Sep-2018
Practice Area (Lead) Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience Global Practice	Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing	Borrower(s) Ministry of Finance and Economic Cooperation, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development	Implementing Agency IGAD, Agence Djiboutienne de Développement Social, Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Office of the Prime Minister

Proposed Development Objective(s) Parent

The Project Development Objective (PDO) is to improve access to basic social services, expand economic opportunities, and enhance environmental management for communities hosting refugees in the target areas of Djibouti, Ethiopia and Uganda.

The proposed regional project will embed the essential features of ensuring citizen participation and engagement in identifying and prioritizing developmental needs, including socio-economic infrastructure and livelihood opportunities to improve self-reliance of refugee hosting communities; improving social cohesion between refugees and refugee hosting communities; increasing citizen voice and role in development decision making; and eliciting greater demand for social accountability. The operational approach will be Community Driven Development (CDD) and will involve: (i) building and capacitating grassroots institutions; (ii) ensuring the voice of all communities is heard in decision making; (iii) strengthening decentralized government administrative functions; and (iv) investing in public service delivery and social mobilization to enhance social cohesion among beneficiary communities.

Components

- Social and Economic Services and Infrastructure
- Sustainable Environmental Management
- Livelihoods Program
- Project Management, and Monitoring and Evaluation
- Regional Support for Coordination, Capacity and Knowledge



PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US\$, Millions)

SUMMARY

Total Project Cost	150.00
Total Financing	150.00
of which IBRD/IDA	150.00
Financing Gap	0.00

DETAILS

World Bank Group Financing

International Development Association (IDA)	150.00
IDA Credit	87.50
IDA Grant	62.50

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

1. The proposed Additional Financing (AF) is in the amount of US\$ 150 million with US\$ 125 million from the IDA (International Development Association) 18 sub-window for refugees and host communities. Of this, US\$ 62.5 million is grant financing and US\$ 62.5 million is credit financing. The remaining US\$25 million is from national IDA allocation. The original project, referred to as Uganda Development Response to Displacement Impacts Project (DRDIP) or ‘the parent project’ with an IDA Credit of US\$ 50 million for Uganda was approved by the World Bank Board on May 31, 2016 and became effective on June 29, 2017. The project’s original closing date is June 30, 2021. Uganda DRDIP is being implemented by the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM), Government of Uganda (GOU) since July 1, 2017.

2. The Project Development Objective (PDO) of the parent project is “to improve access to social services, expand economic opportunities, and enhance environmental management for refugee hosting communities in the targeted areas of Uganda”. The PDO refers to the refugee hosting communities – a reference to both refugees and host communities. The parent project seeks to



address the social, economic, and environmental impacts of protracted refugee presence in the host communities through interlinked technical and investment components which remains relevant for the AF. Given that both the parent project and AF have host communities and refugees as project beneficiaries – with refugees being direct rather than secondary beneficiaries under the AF, and that the interventions and investment responses to the protracted and new refugee presence remain consistent across the parent project and the AF; the PDO remains unchanged.

3. The proposed AF is required to ensure a comprehensive developmental response to the significant increase in refugee numbers being hosted in Uganda since the design of the parent project. While the parent project was restructured in March 2018 to respond this increase and to expand the project to additional refugee hosting districts, there was no commensurate budgetary increase. Given the immense needs in both number and geographic coverage of the refugee influx, the parent project is expected to disburse resources rapidly. The project has already disbursed 30 percent of the Credit and will be completely disbursed by December 2019.

4. The parent project and AF have four major project components implemented in an integrated and sequential fashion, focusing on mobilization and capacity building for communities and local governments, and an implementation process that is responsive to community priorities. The components are focused on: (i) Improving Social and Economic Services and Infrastructure; (ii) Ensuring Sustainable Environmental Management including promoting the use of alternative and efficient energy sources; (iii) Livelihoods support program, to increase the income earning opportunities for community members; and (iv) Project Management, policy support, and Monitoring and Evaluation, designed to ensure effective delivery of the project and the development of sustainable systems and structures for the operation.

5. The proposed AF would continue to support the parent project activities, but would deepen investments in the project areas with the additional funds, and support a more comprehensive implementation approach with support in three additional areas. The AF will scale-up existing components and activities of the parent project to also include refugees as direct project beneficiaries, rather than secondary beneficiaries, along with the host communities.

6. This AF provides an opportunity to build on the gains made in the parent project to date, and further strengthen the design to adapt to the changing refugee and host community context in Uganda. As noted above, key additional components include a rapid response financing facility, which would allow the Government to respond quickly to future influxes of refugees and the associated pressure on local service delivery. A Strengthened Transparency, Accountability and Anti-Corruption (TAAC) component, managed by the Inspectorate of Government (IG) office, that will ensure that fraud, error, and corruption are routinely and independently prevented, identified or addressed. The specific focus on Social Risk Management (SRM) considers the social risk inherent in responding to forcibly displaced populations, and will systematically embed prevention and redress mechanisms within each component of the project.

Country Context

7. Uganda is the largest refugee hosting country in Africa, and the third largest, world-wide. Because



of ongoing conflicts and instability in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and South Sudan, official statistics from OPM and United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) estimate that Uganda is hosting over 1.4 million refugees and asylum-seekers. Since the design and approval of DRDIP in May 2016, significant changes have occurred in the context of refugees and their host communities in the country.

8. The ongoing violence in South Sudan and DRC has driven a fluid and fast-growing refugee crisis. In December 2015, there were 477,187 refugees and 35,779 asylum-seekers in Uganda. As of April 2018, this number has increased to an estimated 1,444,873 refugees and asylum seekers, of which South Sudanese and Congolese make up the majority. While a refugee verification and re-enrollment exercise in Uganda is ongoing, South Sudanese refugees in Uganda are estimated at 1.05 million out of the 2.5 million¹ throughout the region. The influx from South Sudan has subsided. Congolese refugees and asylum seekers currently make up 276,570. The majority of Uganda's refugee communities face protracted displacement and reside in settlements located predominantly in Uganda's poorest northern districts (table 1) - Adjumani, Arua, Koboko, Moyo and Yumbe in the West Nile sub-region, Lamwo in the Acholi Region, Hoima and Kiryandongo in the Bunyoro sub-region and Isingiro, Kamwenge and Kyegegwa in the South West sub-region. In addition, 98,317 refugees are also living in Kampala.

Table 1: Refugee settlements in 11 districts and Kampala

Districts	Settlements	Refugee numbers
Adjumani	21 settlements	241,084
Arua	Rhino Camp	220,461
	Imvepi	
Kampala	Kampala	98,317
Kiryandongo	Kiryandongo	56,583
Kyegegwa	Kyaka II	44,988
Hoima	Kyangwali	84,227
Isingiro	Nakivale	98,523
	Oruchinga	6979
Kamwenge	Rwamwanja	75,852
Moyo	Palorinya	163,721
Yumbe	Bidibidi	287,801
Lamwo	Palabek	35,487
Total		1,444,873

Source: Uganda Refugee Response Portal (OPM, UNHCR)

9. The high proportion of women and girls within the refugee population is a key protection challenge. According to UNHCR, children make up 54 per cent of all new arrivals, while women represent 23.5 percent and men 22.5 percent. Some forms of Gender Based Violence (GBV) are known to escalate in situations of forced displacement, including sexual violence, intimate partner

¹ <http://www.unhcr.org/south-sudan-emergency.html>



violence, child and forced marriage, female genital cutting, female infanticide, and trafficking for sexual exploitation and/or domestic labor. Host communities are at increased risk due to the presence of refugees. Furthermore, both refugee and hosting communities are affected by limited services available for prevention of and response to GBV risks.

10. The World Bank Group (WBG), in consultation with the UNHCR, has confirmed that Uganda's protection framework is adequate.² The UNHCR has provided the WBG with a positive assessment of Uganda's protection framework. Uganda is party to the 1951 Convention and the 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees. It has however made several reservations to the 1951 Convention, notably Article 7 (exemption from reciprocity), Article 8 (exemption from exceptional measures), Article 9 (exemption on provisional measures), Article 13 (movable and immovable property), Article 15 (right of association), and Article 32 (expulsion) whilst expressly acknowledging the principle of *non-refoulement*. Uganda had also made a reservation to the right to wage-earning employment (Article 17), but the right to work is still provided under the *2006 Refugee Act*.

11. The GOU acceded to the *1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons* in April 1965 without reservations. Nevertheless, it has not yet ratified the *1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness*. The country also ratified the broader, regional, *1969 Organization of African Unity (OAU) Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa* in 1987. In February 2010, Uganda ratified the *2009 African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons*.

12. The country has one of the most progressive refugee policy frameworks in the world. The *2006 Refugees Act* and *2010 Refugees Regulations* entitle refugees to the right to work, freedom of movement, and availability of Ugandan social services, including access to documents such as Refugee Identity Cards as well as birth, death, marriage, and education certificates. As a matter of policy, all refugees in gazetted settlements are provided with a subsistence agriculture plot (albeit of diminishing size due to overcrowding), but only a few refugees who are in settlements on communally-owned land have no more than a small kitchen garden. It should be noted that the land that is availed to refugees, especially in the West Nile sub-region, is donated by host communities in anticipation of better social services and economic opportunities. Refugees in Uganda can also own property and enter into contracts including land leases. Uganda's enabling policy environment for refugees provides some of the best prospects for self-reliance in the world (World Bank, UNHCR, OPM, 2016). The Government's commitment to these policies has been reiterated by the international community frequently.

13. In view of Uganda's own development challenges, the need for medium and long term socio-economic support to refugees and local populations is central to ensuring social cohesion and refugee protection. This is more important in view of the protracted stay of many of the refugees and the limited prospects for early resolution of the circumstances that generated each refugee population influx into Uganda. The Uganda National Development Plan (NDP II 2015/16 -2019/20) foresees the inclusion of refugees into national development planning processes through a

² IDA 18 refugee sub-window, Board consultation on Eligibility, AFR, MNA, SAR (September 19, 2017)



Government strategy, the *Settlement Transformation Agenda (STA)*. In response to the STA, the United Nations Country Team and the World Bank have adopted a multi-year joint strategic framework for self-reliance and resilience programming for refugee and host communities, with a focus on sustainable livelihoods and integration of social services - “Refugee and Host Population Empowerment (ReHoPE).” Peaceful coexistence initiatives, both between refugee groups and between refugees and host communities, constitute a policy priority.

14. The Government of Uganda has been a strong advocate of complementing humanitarian aid with longer term development investments benefitting both refugees and local communities, as documented in the Development Policy Letter of August 30, 2017. The success of this progressive multi-dimensional approach will depend on continued support for both the ongoing refugee emergency and longer-term development investments. A key objective is to strengthen the resilience of both refugees and local communities, particularly in the poorest districts of the country. This will require both institutional changes in implementation arrangements and investment in capacity development allowing line ministries and local authorities to play a more prominent role in the overall response.

15. Implementation of the Government’s prioritization and preservation of its progressive protection framework will be challenging considering increasing pressure from continued refugee inflows. The newly available resources under the IDA18 sub-window for refugees and host communities will support the Government’s strategy of a long-term vision to address the key challenges faced by refugees and host communities in Uganda. The aim of resources is to help secure the sustainability of the Government’s progressive policies and practices in line with the Board Eligibility Note of September 2017. WBG support focuses on (i) boosting resilience to refugee shocks, in part by supporting the integration of the refugee response in sectoral strategies and district development plans; (ii) enhancing self-reliance and long-term socio-economic development in areas that host refugees; and (iii) strengthening effective coordination of humanitarian aid and development assistance.

16. This AF therefore, contributes to the support envisaged as part of the Uganda Solidarity Summit of June 2017, wherein development partners including the WBG committed to providing funding to scale up priority programs aligned with STA and ReHoPE objectives and principles. Implementing the Government’s agenda extends beyond the IDA18 implementation period and will require greater synergy and strong coordination across government agencies as well as strong support from the international community for a more comprehensive humanitarian-development response.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Original PDO

17. The Project Development Objective (PDO) is to improve access to basic social services, expand economic opportunities, and enhance environmental management for communities hosting refugees in the target areas of Djibouti, Ethiopia and Uganda.

18. The proposed regional project will embed the essential features of ensuring citizen participation and engagement in identifying and prioritizing developmental needs, including socio-economic



infrastructure and livelihood opportunities to improve self-reliance of refugee hosting communities; improving social cohesion between refugees and refugee hosting communities; increasing citizen voice and role in development decision making; and eliciting greater demand for social accountability. The operational approach will be Community Driven Development (CDD) and will involve: (i) building and capacitating grassroots institutions; (ii) ensuring the voice of all communities is heard in decision making; (iii) strengthening decentralized government administrative functions; and (iv) investing in public service delivery and social mobilization to enhance social cohesion among beneficiary communities.

Current PDO

19. The PDO remains unchanged. The original PDO refers to the refugee hosting communities – a reference to both refugees and host communities. The parent project seeks to address the social, economic, and environmental impacts of protracted refugee presence in the host communities through interlinked technical and investment components which remains relevant for the AF. Given that both the parent project and AF have host communities and refugees as project beneficiaries and that the interventions and investment responses to the protracted and new refugee presence remain consistent across the parent project and the AF, the PDO remains unchanged.

Key Results

20. The key PDO level indicators are the following:

- Direct Beneficiaries of the Project (number - disaggregated by refugees/host community and gender)
- Beneficiaries who engaged in economic activities (number - disaggregated by refugees/ host community; employed/self-employed, and gender)
- Households benefiting from displacement crisis response mechanism activities (number – disaggregated by refugees/host community)
- Beneficiaries of economic development activities that report an increase in income (number and percentage females – disaggregated by refugee/host community)
- Beneficiaries reporting increase in household assets (Percentage - disaggregated by refugee/host community)
- Land where sustainable land management practices have been adopted as a result of the project (hectares)
- Beneficiaries that feel project investment reflected their needs (Percentage - disaggregated by refugees/host community and gender)

D. Project Description

21. Like the parent project and AF have four major project components implemented in an integrated and sequential fashion, focusing on mobilization and capacity building for communities and local governments, and through an implementation process that is responsive to community priorities. The components are focused on: (i) Improving Social and Economic Services and Infrastructure; (ii) Ensuring Sustainable Environmental Management including through promoting use of alternative



and efficient energy sources; (iii) Livelihoods support program, to increase the income earning opportunities for community members; and (iv) Project Management, policy support, and Monitoring and Evaluation, designed to ensure effective delivery of the project and the development of sustainable systems and structures for the operation.

Component 1: Social and Economic Services and Infrastructure (approximately US \$74.5 million)

22. The component will provide investment funds to expand and improve service delivery, and build infrastructure for local development. It has three sub components: Subcomponent 1.1: Community Investment Fund that will support the rehabilitation and/or expansion of infrastructure for basic service delivery for education, health, water supply and some economic infrastructure at community level, not exceeding US\$ 250,000 for each subproject. Medium and larger strategic investments will range between US\$250,000-600,000. Overall, strategic investments will not exceed 10 percent of the CIF financed projects. Subcomponent 1.2: Support for Local Planning and Decentralized Service Delivery will focus on building capacity of Local Government Units and Implementing Agency staff in participatory planning processes; and mobilizing communities and establishing community institutions for planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and oversight of subprojects; and subcomponent 1.3 Displacement Crisis Response Mechanism (DCRM) that will support creating a mechanism to enable GOU to rapidly scale-up its assistance to poor and vulnerable communities in the refugee hosting settlements which experience a rapid refugee influx. The mechanism would be allocating resources which, under pre-agreed conditions, will be rapidly mobilized to districts which experience an increase in refugee numbers, to expand education, health and water supply services. Given the developmental objective of the scaled-up response, a list of eligible expenditures for which the DCRM resources may be used, will be defined. The DCRM is a global innovation to finance rapid response to refugee influx, and is informed by a similar and highly successful mechanism in Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF) 3.

Component 2: Sustainable Environmental Management (approximately US\$30 million)

23. The component supports a comprehensive package of the demand-driven soil and water conservation and management practices and interventions to rehabilitate degraded lands and support alternate energy sources. The subcomponent 2.1: Integrated Natural Resources Management, through a labor intensive public works mode, will support rehabilitation of degraded forests, using both natural and assisted regeneration. increasing biomass production for fuelwood, building poles, fruits and fodder through woodlots, and agroforestry systems. The sub-component 2.2: Access to Energy will support the enhancement of energy efficiency through improved household cooking, improve efficiency of woodfire dependent livelihoods like charcoal and brick production techniques; and access to alternate energy sources for including potential public-private-community partnerships.

Component 3: Livelihoods Support Program (approximately US\$30 million)

24. The component supports the development and expansion of traditional and non-traditional



livelihoods of the beneficiary households to build productive assets and incomes. There are 2 subcomponents, subcomponent 3.1: Support to Traditional and Non-Traditional Livelihoods and subcomponent 3.2: Capacity Building of Community Organizations for Livelihoods. The component will support (i) identification of beneficiaries and the traditional and non-traditional livelihoods to support; (ii) form community livelihoods groups and support group management activities; and (iii) provide individuals and groups necessary technical, business, market and financial advisory services.

Component 4: Project Management, Policy Support, and Monitoring and Evaluation (approximately US\$ 15.5 million)

25. This Component supports the three sub-components that include subcomponent 4.1 strengthened transparency and accountability mechanism (TAAC) to be implemented by the IG. The primary objective of the TAAC subcomponent is to contribute to the Government's commitment to increasing transparency and accountability in public service delivery, and enhance the effectiveness of transparency, accountability, and anti-corruption processes in project areas; subcomponent 4.2: project management and monitoring and evaluation that supports national and local level project coordination activities, including Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and Management Information System (MIS), fiduciary management, communication and citizen engagement, and environmental and social safeguards management and compliance; and subcomponent 4.3: policy support for furthering an integrated approach to the medium-term socioeconomic aspects of forced displacement to bridge fragmentation across Government entities and enhance Government coordination with humanitarian and development actors; and enhance an integrated approach to sectoral investments in refugee hosting districts.

26. The entrenched norms and practices that perpetuate uneven power dynamics between men and women, further exacerbate the conditions of women and girls in the project areas, which are underdeveloped and have been facing the challenge of hosting large number of refugees, with sometimes very different cultures and social practices. Such norms and practices get further accentuated by the limited access to basic social services, natural resources, and livelihoods in the target areas of the proposed project poses particular challenges for women and girls. The long distances traversed by women in search of water and fuel wood and for accessing education and health services increase the risk and exposure of women and girls, as well as boys, to GBV. The proposed interventions and subprojects under the three investment components related to basic social services and economic infrastructure, environmental and natural resources management, and traditional and non-traditional livelihoods, are gender-informed and contribute to GBV prevention and response among target beneficiaries of the project; and are supported by the SRM strategy of the project.

27. In addition, there will be a strong element of enhancing a systemic approach to the mitigation of social risks. The proposed AF will mitigate social risks comprehensively, including mitigation and prevention of GBV, Violence Against Children (VAC) and communal violence. The AF will intensify the efforts under DRDIP with respect to: 1) Mitigation of risks of conflict and violence through community-based activities that promote peace building and social cohesion among host and refugee communities; 2) Integration of activities aimed at reducing exposure to GBV and VAC as a



result of the project activities or within the community, including Sexual Exploitation and Abuse and sexual harassment in the workplace. This includes strengthening local structures both formal and informal that prevent violence against women and girls, support conflict mediation, youth inclusion and women’s participation, promotion of norms that foster long-term social and cultural change toward gender equality (e.g. ensuring leadership and active engagement of women and girls, along with men and boys, in community-based groups related to the project area/sector); and facilitation of assistance for survivors through referrals to safe and ethical care by existing service providers based on the mapping of existing services; and 3) Enhancing prevention and response to VAC through capacity building of DRDIP staff and local stakeholders on identification of risks of VAC as a result of project activities or within the community and strengthening referral mechanisms for VAC in both host and refugee communities with emphasis on the provision of child friendly services and safe spaces for survivors of VAC.

E. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

National level

28. Given the focus on the refugee settlements and the host communities in target districts, the implementation of the project will require multi-stakeholder engagement at various levels. These will include (i) OPM, sector Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs), and Local Government functioning in the host communities; and (ii) development partners, UNHCR and its implementing partners delivering humanitarian assistance and programs in the refugee settlements. This is in the context where the overall mandate for the coordination of the refugee response lies with OPM³. The Refugee Act (2006) notes that the *“Office of Refugees shall be responsible for all administrative matters concerning refugees in Uganda and shall, in that capacity, coordinate inter- ministerial and non-governmental activities and programs relating to refugees.”* The primary responsibility, therefore, for implementing the DRDIP and the proposed AF, lies with OPM, and specifically, the DRDIP Project Implementation Support Team (PIST).

29. The PIST is led by an Executive Director, working with a Project Manager, and a team of technical staff. Technical staff include Infrastructure specialist, Livelihoods specialist, Monitoring and Evaluation specialist, Procurement specialist, a qualified and experienced Accountant, Communications specialist, and a Safeguards specialist. This team will continue to provide key technical support during implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The Executive Director reports to the Permanent Secretary, OPM.

30. In implementing the project, OPM has convened other sectors through a National Technical Project Committee (at the national level) that serves as the forum for the technical coordination between OPM and sector Ministries. Policy guidance and strategic oversight for the project is to be

³ CRRF Secretariat, “Strengthening District Coordination”, Issue Paper, 13 June 2018



provided by the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) Steering Committee⁴. The Committee will dedicate a session to receiving updates from the DRDIP project once every six months. Oversight from the Steering Committee will ensure consistency in the dialogue and priorities identified across both committees. The CRRF Secretariat is leading a process of reviewing the most appropriate implementation arrangements at the district and sub-county levels for host-refugee activities. The proposed implementation arrangements for the AF are consistent with the current agreements. The review process and learnings will inform the implementation of DRDIP, and will be incorporated into project implementation processes on an ongoing basis.

31. The project implementation is aligned with Uganda's decentralized service delivery model. Since 1992, Uganda has been implementing a decentralization policy, with a view to improving the delivery of services at the district and sub county level. The Local Government Act (Cap 243) indicates that planning and delivery of basic services are implemented at district level, under the responsibility of Local Governments. To this end, The OPM is closely coordinating project implementation with Ministry of Local Government to ensure smooth implementation at the district and sub-county levels, using structures elaborated in the Project Implementation Manual (PIM), and based on experiences from NUSAF 3. These structures are the District Implementation Support Teams (DIST) and Sub-County Implementation Support Teams (SIST), at District and Sub county levels, respectively. The DIST and the SIST will ensure close coordination with other developmental and humanitarian agencies operating in and around refugee settlements in the target districts. The NDP II notes that, "the OPM will be responsible for coordinating implementation of NDP II across all MDAs". As such, the role of OPM in DRDIP is consistent with its overall coordinating mandate.

32. On areas beyond the coordinating or implementing mandate of the OPM, the PIST is working closely with relevant MDAs. The PIST is also working with the Inspectorate of Government to support transparency, accountability and anti-corruption functions including: (i) strengthening the capacities of community groups for general oversight and monitoring of activities at the parish levels; (ii) supporting communities' engagement through utilization of social accountability tools such as community score cards, participatory planning and budgeting and tracking surveys; (iii) strengthening the grievance redress mechanism; and (iv) strengthening monitoring and impact evaluation mechanisms.

District Coordination Mechanism

33. Refugee Management and protection is a centralized government function, with the Department of Refugees (DOR) and UNCHR coordinating activities and service provision to refugees. At District level, DOR has a Refugee Desk Officer (RDO), in charge of oversight of refugee programs on behalf of central government. RDOs coordinate with Settlement Commandants and Chief Administrative Officers (CAOs) on issues concerning host and refugee communities. Given that the DRDIP covers both host and refugee communities, the District will second a DRDIP Development Officer to work closely with the Settlement Commandant's Office. One dedicated Officer per settlement will be assigned in 8 districts, with 2 officers in Arua and Isingiro; and for Adjumani district which is

⁴ The CRRF Steering Group is co-chaired by the Office of the Prime Minister and the Ministry of Local Government



characterized by numerous settlements, three officers will cover three clusters of settlements. They will work closely with the Settlement Officers and other staff, and the Nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in establishing and/or supporting project-specific community groups (Community Project Committees, Community Procurement Management Committees and Community Monitoring Groups) identify and prioritize areas of intervention.

34. In areas in which there is need to establish committees comprised of both members from refugee and host community groups, the Development Officer and the Settlement Officer will facilitate this process.

35. The establishment of community implementation committees will recognize the need to consider whether identified interventions are (i) host community (ii) refugee community (iii) a combination of host and refugee committees. The specific process and guidelines for establishing and sustaining these communities will be elaborated further in the PIM. Working within the refugee settlements will also require the DRDIP team to work more closely with UNCHR and Implementing Partners. The engagement of these agencies in the DRDIP structures will also be defined comprehensively in the PIM.

36. The proposed AF seeks to better integrate the ongoing humanitarian response in refugee hosting settlements with the development approach under DRDIP. This would be supported by a District Officer seconded to the Settlement Commandant's office⁵, to lead on the development initiatives, and to provide a more direct link between the settlement structure and the district development structure in terms of planning and delivery of the project. Within the settlements, Community Facilitators identified from the refugee population will be recruited from each settlement zone. The profile, role, and qualifications of each of these personnel will included in the PIM.

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

For Uganda, the project will be implemented in 11 of districts of Arua, Adjumani, Yumbe, Koboko, Moyo, Lamwo, Hoima, Kamwenge, Isingiro, Kiryandongo and Kyegegwa. These 11 refugee hosting districts are poorer and more vulnerable than other communities in Uganda; with settlement areas suffering from lower agricultural productivity and greater environmental degradation due to poor climatic and soil conditions and/or overuse. In addition, the basic social services delivery system is weak, and economic opportunities are limited because of the remoteness of the settlements and the poor infrastructure. The project will benefit refugee and host communities in these districts. Specific project locations are not yet known.

⁵ One dedicated Officer per settlement in 8 districts, with 2 officers in Arua and Isingiro. For Adjumani with numerous settlements, three officers will cover three clusters.



G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Christine Kasedde, Environmental Safeguards Specialist
Constance Nekessa-Ouma, Social Safeguards Specialist

SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	<p>OP 4.01 is triggered for the original project for Ethiopia, Djibouti and Uganda; and the restructured project in Uganda because of the following activities of the project: (i) expansion and improvement of service delivery which will include small infrastructure, (ii) construction or rehabilitation of physical structures for water catchment management such as check-dams, water harvesting structures, and (iii) land-based livelihood activities which may have limited adverse environmental and social impacts. The specific sites for implementing these activities are not yet known, therefore ESMFs have been prepared in all the three project countries as the specific instrument for analyzing potential environmental and social risks.</p> <p>The ESMF for Uganda has been updated and would be used to develop a site specific Environmental Management Plan (EMP) prior to the commencement of activities mainly under Component 1, 2 and 3. The ESMF includes standard methods and procedures, along with appropriate institutional arrangements for screening and reviewing program activities and monitoring the implementation of mitigation measures to prevent adverse and cumulative impacts. The effective use of the ESMF would be regularly reviewed and audited.</p>
Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03	No	Not Applicable
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	Project activities in Ethiopia and Uganda are not likely to encompass natural habitats in the original project and this remains unchanged for the restructured project and the proposed Additional Financing in Uganda.



		<p>However in Djibouti, the Ali Sabieh Region is home to unique biodiversity, especially the “Aire naturelle terrestre protege d’Assamo” which is natural habitat to the Beira antelope. No project activities will be supported in this protected area. The project will also not support any activities which are likely to indirectly affect the ecosystem critical for the survival of this species. The ESMF will screen out any activities that could have indirect or cumulative impacts on this habitat.</p>
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	<p>Activities under Component 2 are likely to have a positive impact on forests with the implementation of physical and biological measures for soil and water conservation and afforestation. The ESMF provides detailed procedures to screen program activities/sub-projects for potential adverse environmental and social impacts, and to take measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts on forests. Project activities in Djibouti are not likely to take place in protected forest areas. This is applicable to Additional Financing for Uganda.</p>
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	<p>The Project will support activities under Component 3 which are likely to be agriculture based and may increase the application of agrochemicals (insecticides, herbicides, fertilizers, etc.). Therefore, the ESMF includes detailed guidelines for an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) to address related environmental and social impacts of the project. This is applicable to the Additional Financing for Uganda.</p>
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	<p>The Project sites and their potential cultural and historical significance are not known. The ESMF includes provisions and a set of procedures to screen project activities for such impacts and to deal with chance finds. This is applicable to the Additional Financing for Uganda.</p>
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	<p>The policy was triggered for Ethiopia in the original project. However for the Additional Financing for Uganda, the policy is not triggered since there are no IPs in the project areas.</p>
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	<p>The proposed project covering will not undertake any activities that will displace people. However, it would support small-scale infrastructure that might affect land holdings of individual farmers. While</p>



		these interventions are yet to be identified, as a precautionary measure, the project has prepared and consulted upon resettlement policy frameworks for all three countries and these will be disclosed prior to appraisal to address any issues which might arise from economic displacement and/or restriction of access to communal natural resources. This is applicable for the Additional Financing for Uganda and an updated RPF has been prepared, consulted and disclosed.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	Yes	Component 2 may support small dam construction (less than 4.5 meters) as part of small and micro scale irrigation schemes. The Project will use the FAO ‘Manual on Small Earth Dams, A Guide to Siting, Design and Construction’ or comparable text in French. This is applicable to the Additional Financing for Uganda.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	Yes	The project will finance small-scale irrigation investments but these are not likely to be located in international waterways basins in Djibouti. In Ethiopia, the project is located in international water basins such as Baro-Akobo, Genale Dawa, Awash, Terkeze and Abhay rivers. In Uganda, the project is located along rivers and streams that drain into international water basin of River Nile, the White Nile and the Lake Victoria. While the impact of small-scale irrigation on these rivers would be insignificant and the cumulative abstraction is expected to be minor, Riparian countries would be notified in accordance with the policy. This is applicable to the Additional Financing for Uganda.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	Not Applicable

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 is Category B for the IDA Credit supported activities. The following safeguard polices have been triggered for the this Additional Financing (AF) operation: Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01), Forests (OP/BP 4.36), Pest Management (OP/BP 4.09), Physical Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11), Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12), 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 and improvement of service delivery which will include construction of small infrastructure, (ii) construction or rehabilitation of physical structures for water catchment management such as check-dams, water harvesting structures, 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, 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 ESMF for the AF was updated and disclosed were disclosed in-country July 25th 2018 and on the Bank's external website July 26th 2018, to avoid or mitigate environmental and social risks from these activities and an ESMP will be prepared for each subproject during implementation, guidance is provided in the ESMF. The ESMF make reference to the WBG Environmental, Health and Safety guidelines for the management of community and occupational health and safety related risks. additionally, an integrated Pest Management Plan has been prepared by the client and appended to ESMF.

Social: There are no anticipated changes in safeguard impacts. Project screening showed no presence of recognized IPs (Ik in Kaabong and Batwas in Kanungu) in the 11 beneficiary Districts. The project's anticipated social impacts include the triggering OP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement and other broad social risks such as Gender issues and those associated with the anticipated influx of labor into project areas; notably Gender Based Violence (GBV), and particularly Sexual Exploitation and Abuse of women and children (SEA). Therefore an RPF and ESMF (to take into consideration of broad social risks) were prepared in a consultative manner at appraisal, to guide mitigation of these impacts. The instruments have been updated for AF to reflect the expanded beneficiary scope to include refugees in addition to the original host communities in 11 Districts. The AF updated RPF was disclosed in-country July 25th 2018 and on the Bank's external website July 26th 2018.

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 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 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.

3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts. The "no project" alternative would deprive the 11 districts which have host and refugee communities with adverse impacts regarding access to basic social services, social and environmental risks. To ensure safeguards due diligence including effective management of risks during implementation, timely assessment of potential risks involving more E&S technical expertise will be deployed at all levels; planning of sub-projects will involve full participation of beneficiary communities (refugee and host communities); and beneficiary districts being highly involved in the implementation of the project.



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.

Safeguards activities implementation will follow the existing structures at national to lower local government levels such as safeguards unit at the National, District level with District Environment Officers, Community Development officers (Gender & Probation officers), District Health Officer, etc. At sub county level, the Sub County Community Development Officers, Health Officers and Settlement Commandants will provide support. At the subproject level, community management structures including CF, CPMCs and CPCs will play the critical role in implementing social safeguards. The project shall also engage the Police and Judiciary departments for any upward reference of criminal cases and grievances that may go beyond the project.

The project plans to undertake a stakeholder analysis to develop an engagement plan involving key stakeholders from both refugees and host communities as well as other key stakeholders. Prioritized engagement based on critical issues will be guided by appropriate approaches informed by lessons from other projects such as NUSAF 3.

In addition to the hiring of Social Development Staff to manage of social risks, the project is charged with responsibility to establish a close coordination and collaboration with various implementing agencies and partners including district to create strong and coordinated teams. Specific attention will be given to bringing on board the District Gender, Community Development, Labor, Probation Officers and HIV/AIDS Focal Persons/Health Officers, in each of the 11 Districts and appropriately reaching out to Ministry of Gender, Labor and Social Development (MoGLSD) as may be necessary. The client will initiate dialogue and communication with the Local Government on the support required from these teams and scope of work will be communicated to the Chief Administrative Officers (CAOs) of the respective 11 districts to support management of social risk.

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

In Uganda, consultations were held with the Office of the Prime Minister – the implementing agency, UNHCR, Uganda Red Cross Society, Lutheran World Federation, Inter-Aid Uganda, Action Africa Help International, National Environment Management Authority, National Forestry Authority, Ministry of Gender Labour and Social Development; and the district and sub county administrative level as well as the communities. All applicable safeguards instruments will be made available at accessible places in the appropriate form, manner and language in Uganda as well.

Like the earlier process, preparation of the updated ESMF and RPF for the AF has involved a wide consultative process both at the OPM, in 11 districts as well as with other stakeholders regarding the beneficiary refugee and host communities. Likewise, all applicable safeguards instruments will be disclosed and made available at accessible places in the appropriate form, manner and language in Uganda as well.

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
-----------------------------	-----------------------------------	--



28-Jun-2018	26-Jul-2018	
<p>"In country" Disclosure Uganda 25-Jul-2018 Comments</p>		
<p>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</p>		
Date of receipt by the Bank 28-Jun-2018	Date of submission for disclosure 26-Jul-2018	
<p>"In country" Disclosure Uganda 25-Jul-2018 Comments</p>		
<p>Pest Management Plan</p>		
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal? NA	Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure
<p>"In country" Disclosure</p> <p>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:</p>		
<p>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)</p>		



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 4.09 - Pest Management

Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?

Yes

Is a separate PMP required?

No

If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?

Yes

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 4.12 - 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?

TBD

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

TBD

OP/BP 4.36 - Forests

Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?

NA

Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?



NA

Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?

NA

OP/BP 4.37 - Safety of Dams

Have dam safety plans been prepared?

NA

Have the TORs as well as composition for the independent Panel of Experts (POE) been reviewed and approved by the Bank?

NA

Has an Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) been prepared and arrangements been made for public awareness and training?

NA

OP 7.50 - Projects on International Waterways

Have the other riparians been notified of the project?

Yes

If the project falls under one of the exceptions to the notification requirement, has this been cleared with the Legal Department, and the memo to the RVP prepared and sent?

NA

Has the RVP approved such an exception?

NA

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

Varalakshmi Vemuru
Lead Social Development Specialist

Margarita Puerto Gomez
Senior Social Development Specialist

Michael Mutemi Munavu
Sr Social Protection Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Ministry of Finance and Economic Cooperation
Fisseha Aberra
Director
faberrak@gmail.com

Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development

Implementing Agencies



IGAD

Mahboub Mahboub Maalim
Executive Secretary
mahboub.maalim@igad.int

Agence Djiboutienne de Développement Social
Mahdi Mohamed Djama
Director General

Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources
Nigatu Bogale Bogale
Director, Emerging Regions Coordination Directorate
nigatu_bogale@yahoo.com

Office of the Prime Minister
Christine Guwatudde Kintu
Permanent Secretary
ps@opm.go.ug

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):	Varalakshmi Vemuru Margarita Puerto Gomez Michael Mutemi Munavu
----------------------	---

Approved By

Safeguards Advisor:	Nathalie S. Munzberg	01-Aug-2018
Practice Manager/Manager:	Robin Mearns	01-Aug-2018



Country Director:	Antony Thompson	13-Aug-2018
-------------------	-----------------	-------------