



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

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 27-Feb-2020 | Report No: ISDSA25887

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

Country Congo, Democratic Republic of	Project ID P163835	Project Name CAFI AF Forest Dependent Community Support Project	Parent Project ID (if any) P149049
Parent Project Name Forest Dependent Communities Support Project	Region AFRICA	Estimated Appraisal Date 11-Feb-2020	Estimated Board Date 13-Mar-2020
Practice Area (Lead) Environment, Natural Resources & the Blue Economy	Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing	Borrower(s) Caritas Congo asbl	Implementing Agency National Steering Committee

**Proposed Development Objective(s) Parent**

The objective of the project is to strengthen the capacity of targeted Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLC) in selected territories and at the national level to participate in REDD+ oriented land and forest management activities.

**Components**

Component 1 - Reinforce the participation of the IPLC in forest and land management processes related to REDD+  
Component 2 - Support community-based sustainable forest and land management  
Component 3 - Increase the capacity to implement the IPLC development activities and consolidate feedback

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

<b>Total Project Cost</b>	1.80
<b>Total Financing</b>	1.80
<b>of which IBRD/IDA</b>	0.00
<b>Financing Gap</b>	0.00

**DETAILS****Non-World Bank Group Financing**

Trust Funds	1.80
-------------	------



3A Africa REDD+ Program

1.80

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

The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) spans 2.3 million km<sup>2</sup> with a widely dispersed population of nearly 70 million – 60 percent of which live in rural areas. It is estimated that between 600,000 to 700,000 Indigenous Peoples (IPs)—or approximately 1 percent of the country’s population—live in about half of country’s provinces. The IPs of the DRC are the Aka, Twa, Cwa, Baka, and Mbuti. While only a minority have a purely nomadic lifestyle (involving hunting or gathering), hunting traditions and semi-nomadism for hunting remain common. Despite a gradual move toward a more sedentary lifestyle, IPs have maintained their traditions and struggle to preserve their uniqueness, technical expertise, and ancestral knowledge. They rely heavily on forest resources and nature in general for cultural, religious, and economic reasons. Hence, they remain one of the most marginalized, poorest and vulnerable populations in the country.

According to the DRC’s Constitution which stipulates that all citizens are equal, the IPs have in theory the same rights as any other Congolese citizen. In reality, they face discrimination and have limited access to basic services such as education, healthcare, justice, and political and social representation. In general, the IPs remain dependent on neighboring communities, which often exploit them as cheap labor and treat them with disdain. This situation is exacerbated by the shift toward a sedentary lifestyle, which sometimes leads to the gradual loss of cultural identity and rights, as well as to violence and theft. For example, the IP being hunting-gathering societies, they sometimes honor hunting as a mystic activity and attach great importance to this livelihood which represents their specific cultural identity. In addition, as they usually trade a large part of the meat with farmers, hunting is a key element of their social role and balance their relation with the farmers (they provide the source of protein in exchange for farm’s product). Therefore, the rapid change toward sedentary life undermines the traditional social organization of both populations. A proposed law to protect Indigenous Pygmy people’s rights was presented to Parliament in May 2014, though it has not yet been put to a vote, and a roundtable discussion was held in June 2016 to raise awareness within the government.

### Sectoral and Institutional Context

The underrepresentation of IPs has been identified as a major issue at all levels. It prevents their participation in local, national, and international discussions on policies that directly affect them. Although potential benefits of inclusion have



been identified, difficulties remain in determining how their customary practices can be used to generate socioeconomic advantages and how their knowledge can be drawn on when establishing development policies within the sub-region.

The proposed Additional Financing (AF) package aims to foster experimentation with sustainable forest management models by Indigenous Peoples. It is intended to complement and expand the scope of the Forest-Dependent Community Support Project (FDCSP) financed by the Forest Investment Program's Dedicated Grant Mechanism (DGM). This USD 1.8 million grant will complement the FDCSP budget, expand the project's scope of action, which will make it possible to target priority areas, boost the impact and number of innovative experiments, and strengthen governance in 3 territories (identified by local representatives). Thus, 10 additional innovative micro-projects and two additional areas of community governance will be implemented in coordination with the other (integrated and sectoral) FONAREDD programs.

In addition, this initiative will complement the large Mai Ndombe program supported by the Forest Investment Program, the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility, the National Fund for REDD+, and the Global Environment Fund (GEF). The GEF project will actually focus on community-based forest management and is expected to establish a close partnership with this operation in the Mai Ndombe area.

### **C. Proposed Development Objective(s)**

#### Original PDO

The objective of the project is to strengthen the capacity of targeted Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLC) in selected territories and at the national level to participate in REDD+ oriented land and forest management activities.

#### Current PDO

The objective of the project is to strengthen the capacity of targeted Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLC) in selected territories and at the national level to participate in REDD+ oriented land and forest management activities.

#### Key Results

The PDO indicators will remain the same, however, the end target values will increase as a result of the proposed AF.

1. Aggregate score on community-based land and forest governance in four pilot sites (End Target: score of at least 100 out of a maximum of 150 on the scorecard)
2. Direct project beneficiaries (End Target: 25,000)
3. IPLC satisfaction rate regarding IPLC representativeness in the discussions on land use held by the CN-REDD and CONAREF (End Target: 70%)
4. Targeted beneficiaries satisfied with project interventions (End Target: 62%)
5. Share of Territories with sound representation of Indigenous in land and forest management discussions at the local level (End Target: 70%)

An additional indicator will measure the progress and impact in terms of capacity building.

### **D. Project Description**

The proposed Additional Financing of US\$ 1.8 million will provide additional resources to support the same objectives and activities as the parent project over expanded project territories (from 16 to 19 territories): *strengthen the participation of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLC) in forest and land management activities, support*



*sustainable community forest and land management, build their capacities to implement development activities and capture their feedback.* The proposed AF will aim to achieve this by: (i) increasing the budget for selected activities financed by the Forest Dependent Community Support Project through the Dedicated Grant Mechanism (DGM) in order to boost the development impact, as well as the resources made available for the various management models tested; (ii) expanding the scope of the FDCSP in terms of priority sectors (including for example their participation in the land use planning reform) in order to increase influence of Indigenous Peoples in the design of sectoral policies; (iii) adding three additional territories (Bikoro, Kalehe, and Walikale) to the FDCSP's governance mechanism, with local representation on the Steering Committee; (iv) financing ten additional micro-projects; and (v) contributing to the establishment of two additional areas with community governance and coordination with integrated programs so as to promote management by Indigenous communities. The proposed operation will support the following activities, consistent with the initial project's scope and description:

**Component 1. Reinforce the participation of IPLC in forest and land management processes related to REDD+ (US\$ 0.1 million).** This component will provide tailored support to organizations representing the IPLCs on technical matters, in areas such as land tenure and forest management, in addition to strengthening administrative and financial management. Following the same structure as the parent project, the AF will encompass two sub-components: one at the national level, and one for local support.

**Sub-component 1a. Building capacities at the national level for strengthening IPLC voices on land and forest policies (US\$ 0.04 million).** This activity will include: (i) strengthening the expertise of IPLCs on matters relating to forestry, and in particular the deployment of Local Community Forestry Concessions (CFCL); (ii) fostering the participation of legitimate IPLC representatives in the process to reform land tenure policies; and (iii) providing assistance for the formalization of the recognition of the customary rights of IPLCs over specific forested areas. The AF will aim to achieve this either by drawing on an existing legal framework or by supporting the development of innovative initiatives concerning community-based management of natural resources in the country, building on the experience in other countries where such initiatives have already been tested. Where possible, collaboration with the Civil Society Support Program and the various PIREDD will be sought.

**Sub-component 1b. Strengthening the capacities of the IPLCs to participate in forest and land management activities (US\$ 0.06 million).** Building on the project's progress to date, the AF will deploy activities designed to increase the representation of IPLCs at the local land level, strengthen the capacities of their organizations (e.g. in particular, their expertise in matters concerning forestry and tenure system management), and to strengthen their capacity to influence discussion at the provincial level. It will establish Local Monitoring Committees (LMC - "*comités Locaux de Suivi*") to ensure the implementation decision are effectively reflecting the guidance received from the communities.

**Component 2. Support community-based sustainable forest and land management (US\$ 0.7 million).** This component will promote the empowerment of IPLCs by supporting official recognition of their customary usage rights, and financing micro-projects aimed at sustainable natural resource management (including alternative activities designed to reduce pressure and change practices) to improve livelihoods in rural areas.

**Sub-component 2a. Promoting sustainable forest and land management through alternative livelihood activities and promotion of the IPLC culture (US\$ 0.4 million).** This sub-component will provide micro-grants for communities to engage in alternative activities that will: (i) generate additional incomes; (ii) improve community livelihoods; (iii) provide educational value through improved capacity for identification, facilitation, dialogue, dedicated monitoring and evaluation, and capitalization. While the micro-projects will be carried out mainly in the project areas and the 19 targeted territories, the overall component would benefit from a national approach. In areas outside of the 19 territories, priority



areas may be targeted depending on available funding. Co-funding would be sought to cover high-stake areas with substantial representation of Pygmy and indigenous communities.

**Sub-component 2b. Empowering the IPLC for the formal recognition of their user rights (US\$ 0.3 million).** This activity will support experiments in community-based forest management. The end-goal is to secure usage rights over specific plots through the recognition of an official status that will give the established communities the power to fully benefit from their local resources. Once the areas concerned will have been approved, the project will support work on their legal status as well as on the governance system for administering their usage rights. In these areas, micro-projects (financed under Component 2a) will enable the implementation of policies for preservation, protection, reasonable logging, and, in some cases, changes to practices in favor of extensive livestock farming or production instead of pure gathering.

**Component 3. Increase the capacity to implement development activities for IPLC and consolidate feedback (US\$ 1 million).** The objective of this component will be to ensure the smooth implementation of the Project in accordance with the Bank's procedures but with sufficient flexibility to be able to adapt to the communities' capacities.

**Sub-component 3a. Project coordination (US\$ 0.4 million).** This sub-component will finance the costs of the National Executing Agency (NEA), which is responsible for the implementation of the Project. The NEA will also be responsible for fiduciary management, notably procurement (e.g. screening, contractual terms, and management of contracts) and financial management (e.g. disbursements for micro-projects, cash management, accounting, and documentation). It will define the criteria for examining and evaluating risks, ensure the proper use of FDCSP funds, and keep project and micro-project documentation up-to-date, followed by periodic reporting to the Bank on the use of funds. It will also be responsible for the management and monitoring of safeguards. The NEA has been selected under a competitive process in accordance with DGM guidelines.

**Sub-component 3b. Strengthening feedback channels at the local and national levels (US\$ 0.6 million).** The objective of this sub-component is to consolidate the emerging national network of IPLC representatives that is able to maintain a direct and effective dialog both at national level and with leaders and organizations on the ground. By monitoring the implementation of micro-projects on the ground, measuring communities' satisfaction, reporting to the National Steering Committee (NSC) all cases of grievances and fostering local solution, the network will build its skills and acquire legitimacy – with an objective to become sustainable and grounded in the rural areas. In addition, the monitoring and measurement of the satisfaction rate by the network of IPLC representatives is expected to ensure that communities benefit from the project and that the IPLC leaders are able to deal adequately with any grievances from within their communities.

Given that the proposed activities represent a natural continuation and expansion to the parent project's activities, an additional financing is being proposed while maintaining the same Implementing Agency. This has been deemed the most suitable option to maximize development outcomes. This instrument will also enable a faster and more cost-effective response to the client's request to strengthen and scale-up the parent project.

## **E. Implementation**

### **Institutional and Implementation Arrangements**

The Implementing Agency was selected for the parent project through a competitive process based on its capacity to implement the activities in compliance with World Bank procedures related to procurement and FM. They have demonstrated strong commitment and proven to be a competent counterpart agency, as shown by the parent project's



satisfactory track record. After three years of implementation, it appears that the steering of the project has found the right balance between the need for efficiency and inclusion of multiple divergent parties. The respective roles of REPALEF, NSC, LMC and NEA are well understood. The accountability of the NSC toward the larger group of IPLC – through REPALEF – has also helped preventing major conflicts as it established REPALEF as the platform in charge of balancing powers and coordinating the actions of its member organizations.

Thus, as part of the additional financing, a strong emphasis will continue to be put on the accountability toward REPALEF. These arrangements would benefit from gaining recognition and being replicated in other projects. The National Executing Agency (NEA – CARITAS Congo asbl) will continue to be responsible for the implementation of the safeguards instruments, including the assurance that all subprojects are in compliance with the Environmental and Safeguards Management Framework (ESMF) provisions. The NEA will also work closely with the FIP Coordination Unit – which manages the DRC Improved Forested Landscape Management Project (P128887) and AfDB projects – to benefit from the compliance monitoring process proposed under the mentioned projects. The NEA and REPALEF will facilitate the FIP Coordination Unit reporting each year by providing all relevant information related to the project implementation areas and the satisfaction and observations of the local communities.

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

The project focus area (19 Territories) has been selected following the analysis from the FIP Investment Plan, which identified three basins of deforestation: (i) Kinshasa (area of the WB FIP project); (ii) Kananga/Mbuji-Mayi and (iii) Kisangani (both areas of the AfDB FIP projects), with a special note on the Kivu as being the next deforestation prone area. While the FIP activities will only focus on portions of each of 3 basins, the area selected for the investments in this project includes surrounding sectors and more remote territories in order to fit with the indigenous people (IP) and local communities (LC) living territories. At local level, locations of activities to be funded by the project will be decided by the communities through a participatory inclusive process and are therefore yet to be identified. Consequently, the precise locations or the potential physical impacts of project activities will first be known at the time of sub-project identification and preparation at local level. The Environmental and Social Management Framework has limited the scope of the potential activities, as only activities with a low or negligible negative impact will be selected. Most of the pre-identified micro-project includes agroforestry, honey production, improved cassava/agriculture products and small livestock management (less than 50 animals per villages). For each micro-project, an impact assessment screening will be conducted before any decision is taken on the micro-project proposed by the communities. Most of the likely investment zones are located in isolated areas with crucial ecosystems that can also have a sacred or cultural role for the IPLCs, particularly in the areas where the operation's objective is to guarantee their rights. As a result, the safeguard measures applicable in this project are: OP 4.01 Environmental Assessment; OP 4.36 Forests; OP 4.04 Natural Habitat; OP 4.11 Physical Cultural Resources.



## G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Grace Muhimpundu, 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 project under component 2 expects to support forest management activities in selected sites. These activities may have environmental impacts on a limited scale. An ESMF has been prepared based on the FIP ESMF and the national ESMF for REDD+ activities, consulted upon, and disclosed before appraisal.
Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03	No	Not applicable for this project
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	The ESMF provides guidance on the kind of Habitat in the project area and on the actions for avoiding or mitigating impacts on natural habitats.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	Forest policy and management are a primary focus of this project. The ESMF includes guidance on managing forestry issues
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	Not applicable for this project
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	This policy could be triggered if the project activities promote actions in areas containing sites deemed physical cultural resources by the local communities (e.g. holy/secret sites such as sacred groves, sacred forests, etc.). Though it is not anticipated that the project will have negative impacts on any such sites, the existence of any such sites and the corresponding need to trigger this policy will be determined once the targeted zones are confirmed. The ESMF includes guidance.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	The project main purpose is to support Indigenous People and their communities. As Indigenous Peoples will be the overwhelming majority of direct project beneficiaries, as project preparation will be carried out in a broadly participatory way including an intensive process of consultation with Indigenous Peoples, and as ruled by this Safeguard Policy (OP





		4.10, paragraph 12), no separate Indigenous People Policy Framework (IPPF) or Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) is required. A Social Assessment has been performed during preparation.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	No involuntary resettlement is anticipated; however, as for any REDD+ activity, securing land for indigenous people may induce land acquisition and limitation of access may happen at village level. Also, the project may require land use securing and enforcement of land use regulations - to the benefit of indigenous people. OP 4.12 has been triggered as a precautionary measure to manage impacts that may result from restrictions of access and securing land for indigenous people, A Process Framework has been prepared for the DGM
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	Not applicable for this project
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	Not applicable for this project
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	Not applicable for this project

## 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 impacts, though not fully identifiable until the sub-projects and activities are singled-out, will be localized in a limited number of sites (50 micro-projects in total). No potential large scale, significant or irreversible impacts are foreseen. The following activities have been identified as having potential adverse social and environmental impacts:

In Sub-Component 2a: Community based natural resource management activities, agroforestry and land planning activities may have an impact on Environment (even if the purpose is to improve the ecosystem quality). An Environmental and Social Management Framework provides guidance on the evaluation of the local environmental and social impacts once the projects are submitted to the National Steering Committee. Any micro-project that would have a significant negative impact would not be financed by the project. The national or local non-governmental organizations that will lead the implementation of the micro-projects will be assessed before being contracted to ensure they do not have a track record of social misconduct or abusive labor policies (including child labor). The risk of child labor is minimal, except for small scale family-based agriculture-related activities (animal keeper, etc..), which are tolerated in the local context.

In Sub-Component 2b: the intention to create community forestry concessions may limit the access to the natural resources. While any activity causing resettlement is excluded from the project, the risk of "restriction of access" led to the design of a Process Framework, which details the action plan whenever a restriction of access is identified.



For both the activities under Sub-component 2a and 2b, the Environmental and Social Management Framework provides guidance to ensure that the land used for the project activity has been voluntarily provided by the communities or its legal or traditional owner.

The project will elaborate guidance notes for the implementing agencies (local or national NGOs) regarding the safety while on mission or on site (who to call, what to do...), child labor and Gender Based Violence (lists of acceptable / non acceptable behaviors and principles) and respect of the IPLC cultural identity.

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

There are no anticipated or foreseen long-term negative impacts. Environmental impacts are expected to be mostly positive, as the overall aim of the Project is to enhance sustainable management of natural resources while improving the livelihoods of rural communities. The Project will also support the securing of community rights through the establishment of the local concessions and the promotion of the natural resources governance by the communities themselves..

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

The project is already minimizing the potential adverse impacts. Only areas without potential land use conflicts will be chosen to pilot the land use securing as it intends to have a demonstrating role. Only activities that have strong community support and that aim at having a positive impact on environment will be financed as micro-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.

The borrower is the National Executing Agency (NEA), which is a pure fiduciary agent. The NEA is responsible for arranging the safeguard management through the hiring of a safeguard specialist. In addition, as the DGM is a window under the FIP Program, a broader support from the FIP team (which includes a Social expert and an Environmental expert) has been set-up.

The challenges faced by the NEA so far have been related to the hiring processes for both the National Safeguard expert and the Provincial focal points, as the projects operates under demanding conditions, in remote areas and for a small amount of work (50 micro-projects over 3 years). As a result, a significant part of the Additional Financing has been oriented toward the component 3 (project management) in order to offer better conditions or anticipate more travel for the national expert if the project cannot secure any good local focal point.

As of December 2019, the Environmental and Social safeguard Specialist has been hired for the NEA and he started training the communities on the project safeguard instruments by visiting each territory and consulting the communities identified as beneficiaries. As part of this mission, he will identify local resources to be contracted as Focal Points for the Environmental and Social control of the micro-projects. In addition, with this new methodology, the community approval of the concept of micro-project, the identification of the precise encroachment, the settlement with the traditional authorities regarding the voluntary land donation and the micro-project screening happen at the same time. The project Safeguard Specialist can therefore directly check on site that there is no pressure on the traditional land owner and that the land donation is genuine, non-conflictual and for the good of the community. In all cases, the provision (or donation) of the land will be documented in the minutes of a community meeting, and by an act of provision by the rights holders (following the guidance of the project process framework).

In addition, the FIP project (P128887) Implementation unit is offering mentoring on the safeguard management.



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

The NEA is the main stakeholder as it is responsible for the safeguard management. The NEA is under the supervision of the National Steering Committee (NSC) that is constituted of the beneficiaries themselves. The NSC delegates have been selected by the communities after inclusive consultations and they have been trained on the Bank Safeguard Policies. The Steering Committee gathers twice a year and adopted the ESMF as well as its revised version.

Local Monitoring Committees (LMCs) has been established, one in each of the territories, to convey the various local leaders and ensure that local leaders are involved and consulted before any project activity. Those LMC members are currently being trained as the project Safeguard Specialist is touring the various provinces. The LMCs ensure that the stakeholders' engagement is maintained during the project lifetime.

A Grievance and Redress Mechanism is established and managed by REPALEF, which is the umbrella organization representing the Indigenous Peoples at local, provincial and national level. The Focal Point for the GRM visits the communities on a regular basis and discuss with the members of the LMCs and the locally-elected representatives of the communities to the Steering Committee. Unsatisfaction related to micro-projects (or more generally related to the government policies for natural resources management) can be reported either by the GRM focal point or by the elected delegate to the Steering Committee.

The initial safeguard documents were established after consultations at national and provincial level. Since the Additional Financing is simply scaling up the existing set of activities in three new territories, the safeguard instruments designed for the parent project (Environmental and Social Management Framework and Process Framework) were updated to reflect the changes in the geographic scope. Consultations were organized in December 2017 and January 2018 in Goma (for Walikale and Kahele territories) and Bikoro (for the Bikoro Territory) to present the Process Framework. In addition, consultations with the firm in charge of the creation of the Community Forest Concessions (CFCL) were hold in October 2019 to harmonize the procedure between the Process Framework and the mandatory public consultations to be held as part of the creation of the Community based forest concessions (CFCL). A procedure for the voluntary land donation was added in anticipation for the future micro-projects that may also have a physical presence on the ground (pigsty, hen-house, fish ponds...).

The final version of the revised Process Framework will be publicly disclosed and discussed during the next National Steering Committee (January 2020), which will include local representatives of the 19 territories as well as national level Indigenous leaders.

## **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
21-Jan-2020	28-Feb-2020	



**"In country" Disclosure**

Congo, Democratic Republic of  
24-Feb-2020

Comments

Revised version published on the project website

**Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process**

Date of receipt by the Bank  
21-Jan-2020

Date of submission for disclosure  
28-Feb-2020

**"In country" Disclosure**

Congo, Democratic Republic of  
28-Feb-2020

Comments

Revised version published on the project website

**Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework**

Date of receipt by the Bank  
24-Jul-2015

Date of submission for disclosure  
05-Aug-2015

**"In country" Disclosure**

Congo, Democratic Republic of  
05-Aug-2015

Comments

There is no need for a IPDP in this case

**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:

There is no need for a IPDP in this case

**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 4.04 - Natural Habitats**

Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?

No

If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?

No

#### **OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources**

Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?

Yes

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

Yes

#### **OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples**

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

No

#### **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

#### **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?

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**

Loic Jean Charles Braune  
Sr Natural Resources Mgmt. Spec.

##### **Borrower/Client/Recipient**

Caritas Congo asbl  
Andre Mathunabo  
Chargé de projets  
mathunaboandre@gmail.com

##### **Implementing Agencies**



National Steering Committee  
Kapupu Diwa  
President  
cpndgmrdc@gmail.com

#### 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):	Loic Jean Charles Braune
----------------------	--------------------------

#### Approved By

Safeguards Advisor:	Hanneke Van Tilburg	28-Feb-2020
Practice Manager/Manager:	Africa Eshogba Olojoba	28-Feb-2020
Country Director:		