



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

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 17-Mar-2020 | Report No: PIDISDSA28188



BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country Congo, Democratic Republic of	Project ID P171821	Project Name STEP Second Additional Financing	Parent Project ID (if any) P145196
Parent Project Name DRC Eastern Recovery Project	Region AFRICA	Estimated Appraisal Date 13-Mar-2020	Estimated Board Date 29-Apr-2020
Practice Area (Lead) Social Protection & Jobs	Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing	Borrower(s) Democratic Republic of Congo	Implementing Agency DRC Social Fund (FSRDC), 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.

Proposed Development Objective(s) Additional Financing

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

Components

1. Support to Community Resilience
2. Livelihoods and Employment Generation
3. Capacity Building
4. Project Management
5. CERC

PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US\$, Millions)

SUMMARY

Total Project Cost	445.00
Total Financing	445.00
of which IBRD/IDA	445.00
Financing Gap	0.00

DETAILS



World Bank Group Financing

International Development Association (IDA)	445.00
IDA Credit	285.00
IDA Grant	160.00

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

1. **This US\$ 445 million equivalent Additional Financing to the Eastern Recovery Project in the Democratic Republic of Congo responds to the Government’s renewed request for emergency support on December 10, 2019.** The parent Project is known locally as *Projet pour la Stabilisation de l’Est de la RDC pour la Paix (STEP)*. The country context is one of overlapping crises including forced displacement, the Ebola outbreak, and persistent fragility, conflict, and violence (FCV) in several provinces. This Additional Financing, known as STEP 2, will hence draw on the rapid response mechanisms created under IDA18, namely: (i) a US\$100 million allocation from the Crisis Response Window (CRW); and (ii) a US\$220 million allocation from the Regional Sub-Window for Refugees and Host Communities (RSW). These amounts will be added to a national IDA performance-based allocation (PBA) of US\$125 million.

Country Context

2. **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. DRC ranks third to last in the world in terms of GDP (PPP) per capita at US\$747 (IMF, 2020). Two-thirds of the population lives below the poverty line. DRC has the second highest number of poor people in Africa and is set to become the biggest reservoir of poor in the world with current trends (WB 2019). About 15.6 million people needs humanitarian assistance (OCHA 2019) and about 900,000 are refugees in neighboring countries (UNHCR 2019). The country ranks 146/157 on the Human Capital Index (WB 2018) and 176/189 on the Human Development Index (UNDP 2018). It is also third for both population size and fertility rate in Sub-Saharan Africa (WB 2017).

3. **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 MONUSCO, the largest peacekeeping mission in the world, 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 destroyed or damaged schools. Sexual and gender-based violence is prevalent (UNFPA 2017) and represents a significant barrier to women's full engagement in social and economic life. Addressing these dynamics are prime objectives for the International Security and Stabilization Support Strategy (ISSS), which is implemented by MONUSCO and the Government to operationalize DRC's National Stabilization and Reconstruction Program (STAREC).

4. **DRC hosts almost 530,000 refugees, one of the largest numbers in Africa** (UNHCR 2019). Almost all refugees live in rural areas and 75 percent live outside camps; 60 percent are children and another 20 percent are women. Refugees currently account for 0.6 percent of the host population, but they are concentrated in remote and insecure border areas, where they account for a much larger share of the local population. More specifically, DRC's refugees include (a) 215,518 people from Rwanda primarily located in the East; (b) 171,581 from the Central African Republic in the North West; (c) 88,203 from South Sudan living in the North East; and (d) 47,259 from Burundi in the East. About 3 million people are also internally displaced (IDMC 2019); a number that hides the many people who are displaced for shorter periods of time and the many who manage to return.

5. **Since 2018, DRC has been confronting the worst Ebola outbreak in its history and the second most deadly in the world** (WHO 2020). More than 3,430 Ebola cases had been reported with a fatality rate of 66 percent, as of February 15, 2020. National and international efforts to contain the epidemic are hampered by insecurity: over 300 incidents against health workers have been recorded in 2019 (OCHA 2019). In particular, community resistance to the public health response is fueled by (i) disregard for existing local public authorities and community structures; (ii) absence of redistributive impacts despite unprecedented financing; (iii) distrust of external actors following decades of violence and neglect; and (iv) collective fear of the disease and of response practices sometimes considered invasive.

6. **The impacts of climate change are noticeable throughout the country through adverse effects that pose risks to sustainable development.** DRC is witnessing extreme rain and flood events leading to soil erosion and degradation, a prolongation of the dry season, and an increase in drought periods during the rainy seasons. Subsistence farmers, the urban poor, and women are especially vulnerable (WB 2018). The number of food-insecure people doubled from 7.7 million in 2017 to 15.6 million in 2019, making access to food a daily struggle for a significant part of the population. An estimated 5 million children are acutely malnourished (UNICEF 2019).

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.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

8. **Some progress on policy and institutional development has been made over the recent years.** In 2017, the Government adopted a comprehensive Social Protection National Policy. An ensuing strategy and action plan were elaborated based on findings from analytical work, including (i) a social safety nets assessment; (ii) an institutional diagnostic of MINAS; (iii) a review of targeting mechanisms; (iv) a feasibility study for delivery systems; and (v) a public expenditure review. Promoting inclusive growth, investing in human capital, and boosting good governance are all pillars of DRC's new Strategic National Development Plan (2019-2024). In October 2019, President Tshisekedi also launched a



new program to fight poverty and inequality focused on improving access to socio-economic infrastructure and services in rural areas, supporting local economic development, and building capacity of the provincial and local institutions.

9. **These encouraging policy developments have been possible due to the sustained financial and technical support from the international community**, including bilateral donors, UN agencies, and international NGOs involved in the recovery and resilience agenda. A Social Protection Donor Group, co-led by the WB and UNICEF, is part of the international aid architecture in DRC. A network of Cash Working Groups (CWG), co-led by OCHA and Mercy Corps at the national level, is also active and a key partner for social safety net programming. In-country consultations with all key international actors have informed the preparation of this new operation.

10. **However, DRC has no national social protection system to identify and register vulnerable people.** In the absence of a national registry, 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 nets 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 which are funded by international organizations through emergency programs (WB 2019).

11. **In order to determine eligibility for the IDA18 RSW, the WB in consultation with UNCHR have concluded that that the refugee protection framework is 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. The Government in its 2018 Letter of Development Policy commits to promote the socioeconomic inclusion of refugees at the provincial and local levels, allows refugees to access all services, and gives them the right to move and work. There have been no changes to or progress on the implementation of the legal framework nor Government strategy since the submission of the eligibility note (UNHCR Protection Assessment as of February 2020). The National Refugees Commission (*Commission Nationale pour les Réfugiés*, CNR) is the key Government institution responsible for legal and administrative protection of refugees and coordination of related government programs.

12. **The Government's Integrated Response Strategy to the Ebola crisis includes a dedicated pillar to assist communities affected by the outbreak.** Along with emergency support to health systems, this multi-sector document calls for (i) community works, (ii) access to social services, and (iii) increase coordination with humanitarian interventions, thereby improving the recovery resilience of the population while increasing acceptance and support to the medical teams. FSRDC is leading the first sub-pillar since August 2019, while UNICEF and OCHA are respectively in charge of the other two. This effort has been confirmed in the updated Ebola Strategic Response Plan (January 2020) and in the initial planning discussion of the post-Ebola strategy

C. Proposed Development Objective

Original PDO

The project development objective is to improve access to livelihoods and socio-economic infrastructure in vulnerable communities in the eastern provinces in the 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. **This new operation will target an additional 1,000 communities** that are (i) responding to the Ebola crisis, (ii) hosting large number of refugees, and/or (iii) rebuilding destroyed infrastructures and reintegrating ex-combatants. These communities will be selected in the provinces the most affected by a combination of poverty, FCV and forced displacement: Ituri, Kasai Central, North Kivu, North Ubungui, and South Kivu.

14. **While the project will help the overall population of these 1,000 communities, the project will specifically support 500,000 direct beneficiaries and an estimated 2.5 million indirect beneficiaries.** The direct users of the improved social infrastructure (pupils, patients, etc.) are projected at 200,000 individuals, while the safety net program will cover 300,000 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 be measured against the following Key Performance Indicators for the additional financing:**

- a. Number of vulnerable communities benefiting from the project (+1,000)
- b. Number of improved socio-economic infrastructures in benefiting communities (+2,000)
- c. Amount of social transfers received by direct beneficiaries (+US\$100 million)
- d. Number of indirect beneficiaries listed in the social registry (+1,800,000)

16. **All indicators are disaggregated by gender, status (e.g. refugees), and location (e.g. Ebola areas) as needed.** A special attention is paid in the updated results framework to facilitate accountability for the use of the RSW and CWR financing. Whenever possible, Corporate Results Indicators (CRI) are also added for aggregation as the IDA portfolio level.

D. Project Description

17. **Compared to the parent Project, the architecture of the STEP 2 Additional Financing will be upgraded to streamline implementation and management.** *Component 1 – Support to Community Resilience* will maintain its focus on community engagement and basic infrastructures. *Component 2 – Livelihoods and Employment Generation* will finance a social safety net program including both (i) labor-intensive public works (LIPW), (ii) unconditional cash transfers (UCT), and (iii) accompanying measures (AM). *Component 3 – Capacity Building* will promote country systems and policies with targeted institutional reforms. *Component 4 – Project Management* has been created to strengthen project administration and monitoring. Last, *Component 5 – Emergency Support* will be added to provide for a Contingent Emergency Response Component (CERC)

18. **Revised Component 1: Community Support (US\$152.0 million equivalent).** This component will continue to finance the maintenance, rehabilitation and/or construction of priority socio-economic infrastructures in targeted communities. The infrastructures will still be selected through a bottom-up approach, but now using a positive list focusing on three sectors: education, health, and water & sanitation. These sectors are systematically listed in communities' priority investment under the parent project. Component 1 will also sustain its support to local governance



through the Local Development Committees (CLDs). A charter of services between FSRDC and the CLDs will be signed, defining the community services that the CLDs are expected to provide in return of the project technical and financial support, e.g. maintenance plan for infrastructure, delivery of accompanying measures, outreach for the social registry, and grievances redress mechanism.

19. **Revised Component 2: Livelihoods and Employment Generation (US\$214.0 million equivalent).** This component will finance the delivery of a comprehensive social safety net to 300,000 new, direct beneficiaries, including refugees. This safety net will include social transfers delivered through public works (LIPW) and cash transfers (UCT), complemented by accompanying measures (AM) for all beneficiaries. Building on the parent project's experience, the LIPW program will be deployed in *urban* areas providing temporary jobs to unemployed and improving social infrastructure. In contrast, the UCT will benefit poor and vulnerable in *rural* areas to smooth consumption and increase resilience to shocks. AM will maximize the impact of the social transfers by providing beneficiaries with knowledge and skills focusing on both productive inclusion and human capital. The CLD will be mobilized to expand the reach of the AM program to the entire community whenever possible.

20. **Revised Component 3: Capacity Building (US\$30.0 million equivalent).** This component will finance the structuring of the social protection sector through an original partnership between MINAS (policy and systems), FSRDC (operations and delivery), and CNR (refugee inclusion and preparedness) to set up an inclusive national social safety net. MINAS will be tasked to develop national guidelines for the key building blocks of a country system, namely: targeting, registry, payment, and case management. It will also pilot the establishment of a social registry by expanding the project's beneficiary registry to indirect beneficiaries and integrating refugees from CNR/UNHCR's databases. Support will be provided to CNR to manage databases, promote socio-economic inclusion of refugees, and prepare contingency plans. Last, the project will include a structured technical assistance program accompanying FSRDC's ongoing reform with operational and fiduciary expertise. Appropriate policies and regulation will be put in place to match the best industry standards with regards to data privacy and protection.

21. **New Component 4: Project management (US\$44.9 equivalent).** This component will finance all costs related to the management, audits, communication, and M&E of the project (these costs were included in Component 3 in the parent project leading to challenging reporting by mixing project benefits and operational costs). In particular, this component will support the modernization of the project's M&E system to supervise implementation in real time and remotely, track key project indicators and document results. This system piloted by FSRDC during the response to the Ebola crisis also offers great options for information sharing and coordinated planning with partners.

22. **New Component 5: Contingency Emergency Response Component (US\$0.0 million equivalent).** This zero-fund component will allow the Government to quickly reallocate and mobilize funds in the event of an emergency that would require immediate recovery and reconstruction needs, and are not already covered by the project, e.g. an epidemic outbreak, a new displacement crisis or a climate-related shock. The CERC can be used to response to emergencies across the national territories, i.e. including in areas not initially covered by the project. In the case of reallocation of funds across components, attention will be paid to respect the principles of rules of the CRW and RSW, in particular RSW funds that are moved to the CERC may only be used for activities that benefit refugee and host communities.

E. Implementation



23. **The project's institutional and fiduciary arrangements will be kept with the DRC Social Fund (*Fonds Social de la République, FSRDC*) as Project Implementing Unit (PIU).** However, accountability to the Government and the public will be increased with a performance-based mechanism. Stronger partnerships will also be forged, especially with the Ministry of Social Affairs (*Ministère des Affaires Sociales, MINAS*) and the National Refugees Commission (*Commission Nationale pour les Réfugiés, CNR*).

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

24. **The FSRDC team is in place and it can deploy rapidly in provinces where it does not have a sub-office yet. Dedicated staff will be recruited for the project.** As in STEP, in each benefiting province, a Provincial Consultative Committee will serve as a steering committee to validating the choice of infrastructure to be improved. The project will also continue to support CLD in communities where it intervenes (see Component 1).

25. **STEP 2 will however introduce element of a performance-based model for FSRDC.** The subsidiary agreement between the Ministry of Finance and FSRDC, which governs the parent project, will be modified as follows. In addition to the reimbursement of direct operating costs, i.e. PIU costs, a negotiated management fee will be paid to FSRDC for the additional services it provides to support project implementation (time of FSRDC permanent staff, use of FSRDC's assets, etc.). This management fee is received by FSRDC in tranches, whose payments are triggered by the attainment of specific targets linked to the key performance indicators of the project. If the project implemented by FSRDC fails to achieve its objective, FSRDC's management fee is not paid in full. This set-up will increase transparency, accountability, and sustainability in social protection operations.

26. **FSRDC will also sign partnership agreements with MINAS and CNR.** To support the implementation of the third component on structuring the social protection sector, these partnership agreements will involve MINAS and CNR in the execution of the project. These agreements will be negotiated with terms of reference, a clear list of deliverables, and related timetable and budget. These entities will not be involved in cash flow management.

27. **Drawing from lessons learned under the parent project, STEP 2 will coordinate more closely with humanitarian and peace actors.** STEP 2 constitute a natural platform to operationalize the triple nexus in DRC. Collaboration and alignment will be sought whenever possible with MONUSCO and the humanitarian community. Aside from operational effectiveness, the goal of this effort is to avoid the creation a dual social protection system, where one is operated by international actors and another by the Government. It is especially true for emergencies like the Ebola outbreak, and support for refugees.

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

STEP 2 will be implemented in five provinces of DRC: North Ubangui, Kasai Central, North Kivu, South Kivu, and Ituri. The five selected provinces have the highest number of poor, important infrastructure needs, and all are affected by FCV and 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, incidence of Ebola outbreak, access to infrastructures, prevalence of violence or conflict-related destruction of infrastructures. Security, access, as well as colocation with other WB-funded or donor-funded projects, will constitute weights in the PTI. The 1,000 additional communities benefiting from the project will be selected in these priority zones. The project’s climate change and disaster risk screening revealed that the key relevant vulnerability for the project is seasonal flooding in the east. In addition, the terrain in some of the provinces (e.g. the Kivus) is mountainous, making construction/rehabilitation of infrastructure more challenging. However, FSRDC has learned a lot from the parent project and adapted its construction techniques accordingly. Furthermore, the presence of an active volcano in North Kivu must and will be taken into consideration. In Kasai Central, flooding has made the terrain particularly vulnerable to landslides, another aspect that will be taken into consideration by the project under component 1.

G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Richard Everett, Social Specialist

Joelle Nkombela Mukungu, Environmental Specialist

SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The proposed operation is classified a category B project. This policy is triggered because of potential environmental and social risks and impacts related to activities under: Component 1 (Community Support), which will finance the rehabilitation and/or construction of priority socio-economic infrastructures in beneficiary communities using the community-Driven Development (CDD) approach; Component 2 (Livelihoods and Employment Generation), which will finance a safety net delivered through two types of social transfers -- Labor-Intensive Public Works (LIPW) and Unconditional Cash Transfers (UCT). The potential adverse social impacts in STEP 2 remain the same as in the parent Project and include: (i) exclusion and inclusion errors in beneficiary selection; (ii) risks pertaining to the protection of beneficiaries, including GBV/SEA/SH and refugees; (iii) disturbance



of social cohesion and livelihood of indigenous people; (iv) involuntary resettlement and temporary restriction of access during civil works. Meanwhile, the improvement of small-scale community infrastructure through appropriate construction, rehabilitation and maintenance, will have minimal impact on the environment. Potential environmental risks and impacts include health and safety for workers and beneficiaries, air pollution, in addition to weak management capacity in new provinces. In order to minimize, reduce or mitigate these impacts, the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) that was approved for the parent Project was updated in December 2019 to reflect the extended geographic coverage and updates in components. The updated version of the ESMF will be disclosed in-country on March 16, 2020 and on the WB’s external website on March 17, 2020. The updated ESMF provides guidance for the preparation and implementation of the environmental and social screening process and the preparation, if needed, of site-specific instruments such as Environmental and social management plans (ESMPs), Resettlement Action Plans (RAP), etc.

Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03	No	No activity involves the private sector.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The proposed project will not affect natural habitats.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	The proposed project will not affect forests, nor will it involve reforestation.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	The distribution of assets to rural households will be discontinued. Therefore, the safeguards policy on pest management (OP/BP 4.09) will 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 five provinces targeted by STEP 2. An Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) that was prepared for the parent project has been updated with information on IPs in all five 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	The Project will not finance any dam construction or rehabilitation.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The Project will not finance activities with impacts on International Waterways.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	None of the intervention sites are in disputed areas.

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:

STEP 2 is a category B project as defined in OP 4.01 (Environmental Assessment). The improvement of small-scale community infrastructure through appropriate construction, rehabilitation and maintenance, will have minimal impact on the environment. The potential adverse social impacts in STEP 2 remain the same as in the parent Project and include: (i) exclusion and inclusion errors in beneficiary selection; (ii) risks pertaining to the protection of beneficiaries, including GBV/SEA/SH and refugees; (iii) disturbance of social cohesion and livelihood of indigenous people; (iv) involuntary resettlement and temporary restriction of access during civil works. Two social safeguards policies will continue to be triggered: OP/BP 4.12 Involuntary Resettlement and OP/BP 4.10, Indigenous People. In general, the project is expected to have a positive impact for the whole population in the targeted areas thanks to the inclusive and redistributive impact of the activities. An Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) and Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) prepared for the parent project have been updated to cover the existing and new activities and provinces. A Social Assessment on Refugees and Host Communities (2020) carried out in Ituri and North Kivu identified specific social risks in those provinces associated with forced displacement and conflict. This study will be expanded to Kasai Central and Nord Ubangi before activities start in these two new provinces.

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. As negative environmental and social impacts are expected to be minimal to moderate and no adverse, indirect or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities are expected in the project areas, there was no need to consider project alternatives.



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.

STEP2 will continue to be implemented by the Fonds Social de la République Démocratique du Congo (FSRDC). FSRDC has gained capacity in working with Bank requirements regarding environmental and social safeguards policies through the implementation of the following projects: STEP (P145196), DRC - Gender Based Violence Prevention and Response Project (P166763), as well as the Great Lakes Emergency Women's Health (P147489). The parent project was already implementing GBV mitigation activities and a GBV/SEA/H Action Plan is under development for the expanded activities and provinces covered by the Additional Financing. STEP 2 has a substantial GBV/SEA/H risk rating, in part as a result of the cash transfer activities that will now be introduced. FSRDC has a safeguards specialist within the national coordination and will recruit 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. FSRDC will further hire project-dedicated safeguards specialists at the provincial level to ensure proper implementation, monitoring, documentation, and reporting on the mitigation measures identified in the ESMF, in addition to relying on its existing engineers, who are trained in managing environmental and social risks and impacts, including grievances.

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 provinces, subject to modifications as needed based on consultations with local stakeholders.

The Social Assessment on Refugees and Host Communities identified the heightened vulnerability of people within communities in Eastern DRC in situations of conflict and displacement, and the importance of inclusive approaches and conflict-transformative programming that adopts gender-sensitive and geographically-specific actions. In addition, the Social Assessment calls for the reinforcement of cross-cutting conflict resolution and management services offered by the CLDs to ensure understanding and acceptance of rights of refugees (and other minority groups) for peaceful cohabitation. It also recommends supporting youth engagement through the promotion of livelihoods and economic opportunities that can counter tendencies towards joining armed groups or their engagement in risky behaviors such as transactional sex for survival. These aspects will be taken into consideration in project design and planning, and in development of social risk mitigation measures for the eastern provinces covered by the project. The study will be expanded to Kasai Central and Nord Ubangi to provide similar analysis, project planning and risk mitigation strategies before activities start in those new provinces. Risk analyses and mitigation strategies derived from the results of the Social Assessment will be incorporated as appropriate into ESMPs, RAPS or IPPs developed for project activities, and may vary by province depending on local contexts and conditions.

The addition of (i) a social registry, (ii) a systematic monitoring system, and (iii) near real-time perception surveys in the project design will contribute to measuring – and course-correcting as needed – the impacts of the project. CLDs,



which are key partners to the project at the local level, will also contribute to identifying, preventing, mitigating and responding to adverse social impacts. Last, the robust GRM system of the project will be continued for maintaining public accountability, responding to complaints and preventing conflicts.

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 will recruit environmental specialists in all its sub-offices to ensure proper implementation, monitoring, documentation, and reporting on the mitigation measures identified in the ESMF.

The Congolese Agency for the Environment (Agence Congolaise de l'Environnement - ACE), which operates under the the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD), is responsible for the monitoring and management of environmental and social impacts of all Bank-financed projects, in compliance with national regulations. However, the ACE has limited capacity; it is understaffed and under-funded, and mostly relies on donors and project funds to carry out its field supervision duties, e.g. approve and monitor the implementation of Environmental and Social Impacts Assessments (ESIA). Furthermore, both the MEDD and the ACE have no clear mandate regarding their roles in the management of social risks management within the ESIA process, such as community risk management, gender-based violence, child abuse and exploitation, and Indigenous Peoples issues. At the provincial level, government agencies (including those attached to the MEDD) often do not have the equipment necessary to monitor social and environmental impacts, staff lack training, and management capacity is limited. 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 will be consulted. The project will also ensure that adequate consultations with women in targeted communities will be 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 and understand their risks and vulnerabilities to GBV in a particular context, especially in view of the cash transfer programming to be implemented. Where displaced population and host communities are concerned, appropriate sensitization and communication mechanisms will be implemented to involve them in decision-making. Local stakeholders (authorities, civil society organizations, beneficiaries and affected groups, etc.) will participate in any consultation throughout the project's life cycle. The safeguards specialists recruited by FSRDC will ensure proper implementation, documentation, follow up and reporting of the mitigation measures (e.g. screening, execution of specific ESMPs, RAPs, IPPs), as per the recommendations included in the safeguards instruments (ESMF, RPF, IPPF). Sub-projects 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	Date of submission for disclosure	For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors
06-Mar-2020	12-Mar-2020	

"In country" Disclosure

Congo, Democratic Republic of
16-Mar-2020

Comments

Published on FSRDC's website and Media Congo

Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure
06-Mar-2020	12-Mar-2020

"In country" Disclosure

Congo, Democratic Republic of
17-Mar-2020

Comments

Published on FSRDC's website and Media Congo

Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure
06-Mar-2020	12-Mar-2020

"In country" Disclosure

Congo, Democratic Republic of
16-Mar-2020

Comments

Published on FSRDC's website and Media Congo

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?

No

OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources

Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?

NA

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

NA

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

FSRDC
Ruphin Bo-Elongo
General Coordinator

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:	Hanneke Van Tilburg	18-Mar-2020
Practice Manager/Manager:	Jehan Arulpragasam	18-Mar-2020
Country Director:	Issa Diaw	19-Mar-2020