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INTRODUCTION

In accordance with paragraphs 52(c) (iii) and 59 of the Operating Rules and Procedures (June 2004) of the Independent Review Mechanism (IRM), the Boards of Directors of the Bank Group on 9 July, 2009, authorized the IRM to monitor the implementation of the findings of non-compliance issues raised by the IRM Review Panel’s Compliance Review Report and the related Management Action Plan on the Bujagali Hydropower Project and Bujagali Interconnection Project (hereinafter referred to as “Bujagali Projects”), approved by the Boards on 22 May, 2009.

The IRM Monitoring Team was authorized to monitor the actions taken with regard to bringing the Bujagali projects into compliance with the policies and procedures of the Bank Group, while the implementation of the recommendations of the IRM Review Panel in relation to institutional systemic issues and policies were left for the Bank Group for follow-up. The first and second IRM monitoring missions were conducted in 2009 and 2010 and the related 1st and 2nd IRM Monitoring Report submitted to the Boards of Directors for information and to Management for action on 22 July, 2009, and 28 July, 2010, respectively. The third IRM monitoring mission took place in 2011 and the related Monitoring Report submitted to the Boards of Directors for information and to Management for action on 5 August, 2011.

The fourth IRM monitoring mission was conducted on 6-10 August 2012 by a Team consisting of the Panel of Experts (Richard Bissell, Mafing Konde, and Arntraud Hartmann) and Grace Kimani, Principal Compliance Officer of CRMU. The Monitoring Team was assisted by Daniel Isooba, Infrastructure Specialist based in the AfDB Uganda field office (UGFO).

By this report, the IRM Monitoring Team intends to inform the Boards of Directors and the Bank’s Management of the progress made since the issuance of the IRM 3rd Monitoring report in 2011. The Team also notes measures that could be undertaken to ensure that the gains achieved in the course of these projects are sustained, whether by this Bank or other lenders. The proposed measures are based on the discussions that the IRM Team held with different stakeholders during its mission in Uganda and discussions with and documents obtained by the Team from Bank staff in Tunis. The Team’s principal recommendation is that, provided satisfactory completion reports on the compensation outcomes will be submitted, this should be the final monitoring report for the Bujagali Dam and Transmission Line projects.
KEY FINDINGS

In general terms, the IRM Monitoring Team (hereinafter referred to as “the Monitoring Team”) noted that progress has been made to resolve the pending issues reported by the Compliance Panel in 2008, and covered by the subsequent 1st, 2nd and 3rd IRM monitoring reports submitted during 2009-2011. However, there continue to be several specific but essential pending actions to be undertaken regarding social and environmental commitments from BEL, Government’s ministries and agencies. Moreover, there are some areas of concern that the Team considers could cause harm. These are:

- Kalagala Offset Area: The area established as an offset for the inundated area by Bujagali Falls yet lack sufficient support to protect it from intrusion such as illegal settlements, cultivation and illegal logging. Budgetary resources allocated by the government for the management of the Kalagala Offset area are inadequate. Moreover, institutional coordination mechanisms between different government agencies involved in the management of the Kalagala Offset need to be made operational.

- Blasting Compensation Process: People affected by rock blasting entered into a mediation process to agree on blasting damages and compensation. This process should be actively supported by the Bank so that it can come to satisfactory closure.

- Rural Electrification in Project Area: Access to power remains a key concern of villagers visited by the Team. While there is no formal commitment to connect individual households to the power lines in resettlement villages or villages affected by the transmission lines with power free of charge, the issue of lack of access to power by resettled households affected by the construction of transmission lines is a politically sensitive issue which deserves special attention. As a large number of mainly urban households will benefit from the additional power provided by the Bujagali plant, supporting access to power to people negatively impacted by the construction of the Bujagali dam and transmission lines, might wish to be considered.

- Spiritual Issues: Significant efforts have been made to resolve spiritual concerns. However, disagreements about the appropriate role of different spiritual leaders prevail. Bujagali Energy Limited (BEL) is encouraged to remain engaged in the consultation and reconciliation process to find a satisfactory solution to pending spiritual concerns.

The following is a detailed report of the specific pending issues as noted by the Monitoring Team during its fourth monitoring mission to Uganda:
1. Compensation and Resettlement Issues

IRM Compliance Review Report of 2008:

Failure to resolve legacy issues prior to commencement of the project, especially for people affected by the Bujagali Interconnection Project, constituted non-compliance with the Bank’s Policy on Involuntary Resettlement.

AfDB Action Plan of 2009:

A mechanism will be established to monitor compensation outcomes for displaced households and a completion report produced.

IRM Monitoring:

A total of 1400 households were affected by the projects, as defined by the first baseline survey conducted by AES Nile Power in 2001. BEL expanded the universe of the “affected” to include those whose income was indirectly affected by the project, such as those in fishing or tourism. Tracking of the impacts on those indirectly affected has been harder to establish. The process as a whole was adversely affected by the very long development process of the project with two separate developers (first AES and then later BEL). The carryover of commitments from one developer to the other, along with increasingly inadequate valuations of affected assets as a result of inflation, created an unusual number of complaints from project affected persons.

The latest survey conducted on the standard of living of PAPs was issued in December 2011.1 Unfortunately, the survey does not compare standard of living of PAPs to the 2001 survey conducted by AES, which BEL considers incomplete and thus not suitable as a baseline. Instead BEL conducted another baseline survey in 2009, long after project activities had started. Surveys conducted in 2010 and 2011 thus do not compare living standard of PAPs “before” and “after” the project. Therefore surveys cannot provide evidence whether the objective of restoration of livelihoods of PAPs to levels prior to the project is being achieved. Instead, the surveys provide trend information about livelihood changes between 2009 and 2011.

Trend indicators show a significant improvement in living standards between 2009 and 2010 and a more modest improvement between 2009 and 2011. Results need to be taken with significant caution. The surveys rely importantly on “proxy” indicators, which measure acquisition of luxury goods (for example bicycles) and improvements to household assets. As many PAPs received compensation payments in 2009 and 2010 it is not surprising that households purchased some luxury goods and made improvements in houses. But compensation payments are one-time transfers which do not reflect a sustainable improvement in standard of living. Results on income improvements are somewhat discouraging, as 34% of PAPs in 2011 reported a decline in income in

---

1 Bujagali Energy Limited, Social and Environment Department, Second Outcome and Standard of Living Evaluations of the Livelihood Restoration Program of the Bujagali Hydro Power Project, December 2011
comparison to 2009, while 64% reported an improvement. But income trends were strongly influenced by high inflation rates which eroded household purchasing power. Of particular concern is the poor nutritional status of children (measured by number of meals taken by children under 5 years old and nutritional value of meals). The child nutrition variable is independent from other variables, and no improvement in child feeding is observed even if PAPs report improved incomes and purchases of luxury goods. Inadequate feeding of children should thus not be linked to reduced household welfare, but appear primarily to be culturally and behaviourally motivated which would need to be addressed by education and nutrition extension services.

It is encouraging to see good trend indicators for the Naminya resettlement village, with improvements on most trend indicators between 2009 and 2011, including the child feeding variable. Households in Naminya are better off in 2011 than they were in 2009.

Lessons learnt for future comparable projects are: (i) appropriate baseline surveys of households expected to be affected by a large project need to be conducted before the project is implemented, so that an adequate baseline situation exists; (ii) living standard surveys should rely on the expertise available in Uganda from institutions engaged in the national household expenditure surveys which reflect international “good practice”. Proxy indicators employed in these surveys are more robust to measure household welfare changes.

The Monitoring Team found that BEL has just launched the compliance audit process, with the lead taken by the International Finance Corporation (IFC), and the completion report should be completed by December 2012 for the power project. The Team was unable to determine if the T-Line owners would conduct a similar project closure process for compliance issues.

The Team noted the following specific pending concerns on the part of project affected people as expressed in a series of community meetings held in Naminya and in the communities surrounding the project sites:

(a) Compensation of landowners along the T-lines

In terms of the original resettlement commitments, the compensation process is substantially complete. The Monitoring Team was informed by the Uganda Electricity Transmission Company Ltd (UETCL) that 2755 of the compensation cases have been finalized. Only a very small number of 43 cases are still pending. Funds have been put in an escrow account for the eventual resolution of those cases.

Separately, 557 previously-compensated landowners have filed court cases to revise their agreed compensation, but that process will be resolved outside the project structure when the courts are able to hear the cases. Adequate funds have also been set aside in an escrow account for compensation purposes in the event that the court rules in favour of the claimants.
(b) Resettlement villages

The 3rd monitoring report in 2011 highlighted the pending issues in Naminya resettlement village, which consisted primarily of fencing of the fish ponds for safety reasons, connection to piped water and electricity, and the empty houses. The fourth Monitoring Team also met with people resettled in Naminya village and visited various income replacement activities in the village, such as the fish ponds.

The people informed the Team that there had been little progress in the last year on their concerns about connecting the electricity and water utilities to their houses. In general, the villagers are unable to afford the connections to their houses required by the utility companies for either water or electricity. In the case of water, villagers can access a nearby spring, two boreholes for free, or three standpipes for USh 100 per jerry can.

In the case of electricity, the utility poles and lines have been installed through the village, and the current will be turned on when the utility company (Umeme Electricity Distribution Company) has determined how many households will pay for the basic wiring of the house that requires a minimum of USh 250,000 by the householder, a prerequisite for the connection to the utility. At the present time, only two households (out of 35 households) in Naminya resettlement village have committed to pay for the household connection and the monthly bills to follow. BEL has agreed to pay for the connection in the surrounding host community as well where eleven families have signed up. The Monitoring Team considers the rural electrification issue important to resolve owing to the politically-sensitive and visible presence of the dam and power lines.

The empty houses in the resettlement village are still a concern to the people living in Naminya. These are houses built by the project promoter but never occupied by the people intended to be resettled because they opted for voluntary resettlement elsewhere. BEL has carried out a consultative process with the current villagers to get their input on how to allocate the empty houses, and has taken a possible solution to BEL management for endorsement. The fish pond safety issue was not re-raised during the 2012 visit, when the Team monitored the harvesting of mature tilapia for sale at a price of USh 3000/fish.
With regard to the extension of electricity lines to nine other villages near the Bujagali Dam, BEL has pledged to contribute 30% of the total cost (the community component), while the Government of Uganda, through the Rural Electrification Authority (REA), will contribute the remaining 70%. BEL has transferred its share of the cost to the REA (USh 484 million). This scheme, while attractive in design terms by sharing the cost, has been undermined by the inadequacy of the REA budget. The Monitoring Team raised the issue with the government, but no definitive forecast could be made in light of ongoing debates over the next budget. The Team notes the importance of this budget issue in light of an enormous gap created by the transmission of the Bujagali output to the Kampala area at a time when such a high percentage of the houses in the project area remain unconnected and unable to benefit from the project. Lead is being taken by the Agence Francaise de Developpement (AFD) among the lenders on this issue.

The Team also visited a resettlement village along the T-Line, and found the settlement equipped with piped water and electricity connections and accessible un-tarmacked roads.

(c) Rock Blasting Damage

Another compensation issue that emerged among community concerns after the original complaint to the IRM was that of damage to houses from project rock blasting. Since 2007, 810 complaints were filed with BEL and the contractor on that issue. Additionally, complaints were collected by NGOs and by the Compliance Advisor/Ombudsman of the IFC. By 2010, the parties chose to identify an expedited process for addressing the complaints. BEL agreed, at the suggestion of the Complaints Mechanism of the EIB and the CAO, to bring all the various claims together into a mediation process, on the basis of independent commissioned studies to define the criteria for assessing damage that can be attributed to the blasting activities, and the appointment of a mediator to finalize appropriate repairs for individual homeowners. The dimensions of the zone within which repairs should be provided has been initially governed by the standards of the Ugandan government that identify 0.5 kilometers as the limits for compensation, which was also enumerated in the original BEL contract. The final zone, however, is not yet established and discussions continue about extending the 0.5 kilometers zone.
The Team notes that, among the lenders, the lead on this issue has been taken by the EIB Complaint Mechanism. The Team notes that, while not all of the claims will result in repairs, it is important to resolve this source of community dissatisfaction as quickly as possible. This is also an important opportunity to establish new approaches to establishing standards for infrastructure projects in Uganda, and to deal with consequent damage to the communities.

2. Consultations and Cultural/Spiritual Issues

IRM Compliance Review Report in 2008:

Failure to meaningfully consult with spiritual leaders and stakeholders due to the silence of the appraisal reports on the issue is non-compliance with the Bank’s policies on Involuntary Resettlement, Good Governance and Environment Review Procedures, Integrated Environment & Social Impact Assessment Guidelines.

AfDB Action Plan of 2009:

Government will update the Cultural Properties Management Plan (CPMP) with assistance from BEL.

IRM Monitoring:

The Government has completed its update of the Cultural Properties Management Plan. The Monitoring Team notes that the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD), BEL and the Busoga Kingdom agreed on an implementation path, whereby the Busoga Kingdom issued a Certificate of Completion to BEL upon accomplishment of the relocation of the spirits and appeasement ceremonies so as to mark these issues as closed, despite the absence of Nabamba Bujagali from the process.

The Team also notes that discussions with NAPE during this 2012 mission revealed continuing dissension over the path taken by MEMD and BEL to close this issue. In particular, the choice of spiritualist was controversial, with the abandonment of efforts to reach agreement with the Nabamba Bujagali raising concerns.
The Monitoring Team held discussions with Nabamba Bujagali, who confirmed that he and BEL currently have no contact and no plans to move forward on a collaborative approach. The Team received from him a copy of a proposal first submitted to BEL in 2010-2011 for appeasement ceremonies to involve delegates from the spiritualist community all over Uganda. While the formal commitment in the Management Action Plan has been completed, the Team notes the value of keeping open the possibility of a conciliatory arrangement with Nabamba Bujagali for appeasement ceremonies at some time in the future, should all the relevant parties find it appropriate. A satisfactory solution of the spiritual concerns could well be important as an element of cultural and social cohesion. Failure to find an agreeable solution on spiritual issues might well have a broader impact, possibly reaching beyond the Bujagali dam area.

3. Kalagala Offset and Forests Conservation

IRM Compliance Review Report in 2008:

There is a need for a long term action plan to ensure that the offset serves its purposes.

AfDB Action Plan of 2009:

A long term Sustainable Management Plan (SMP) for the Mabira and Nile River Forests, and Kalagala Offset is part of the World Bank Indemnity Agreement. The SMP is under preparation by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). The Bank will review the SMP produced by IUCN.

IRM Monitoring:

The SMP (2010-2019) has been completed, submitted to the lenders, and adopted by the Government in May 2011. The World Bank has committed to support the SMP implementation through a $4.8 million sub-component in the Water Management and Development Project, approved by the World Bank Board on June 26, 2012. According to the project appraisal document:

This sub-component will support priority investments related to the implementation of the environmental offset that complements the Bujagali Hydropower Project. These activities, spelled out in the Kalagala Offset
Sustainable Management Plan (KOSMP) launched by the Government on May 5, 2011, cover important ecosystems in the Kyoga catchment. They include afforestation and reforestation, restoration of native vegetation, conservation of sensitive habitats, restoration and protection of river banks, promotion of environmentally sustainable livelihood strategies, and enhancement of the capacities of the national and sub-national entities responsible for implementation of the management plan.²

Specifically, they will address gaps identified for effective implementation of the plan, beyond the UGX 400 million (approximately US$ 154,000) already committed by the GoU for FY12. The additional funds will support an integrated approach to the Nile catchment area and related ecosystems, promote environmental sustainable livelihood strategies, and develop the capacities of the various institutions involved in the implementation of the management plan. These include the NFA and local governments. The KOSMP was developed through a highly consultative process that involved stakeholders in the identified area. … As a complement to the ESMF, the KOSMP is also an environmental and social safeguard instrument.³

While the World Bank support is encouraging, it is not long-term support. Financing a conservation, multi-use set-aside will require a new mechanism that does not yet exist. It should be a priority of the World Bank’s project and a concern of the lenders to the Bujagali project who held out the promise of a sustainable offset for the Bujagali dam. The Monitoring Team also notes the importance of establishing the sustainability of the SMP given its long-term purposes in association with local communities. During the monitoring mission in 2012, the Team met with officials from several Ministries who were concerned about the implementation of the SMP. While the Plan has been finalized, the budget resources to carry it out have not been made available. The Team was informed that, within the Ministry of Water and Environment, the Directorate of Environmental Affairs is coordinating the implementation of the SMP, but it was also clear that full participation by a number of other Directorates and local governments (specifically in Jinja, Kayunga and Buikwe Districts) through a coordination process and budgetary commitment will be necessary for the SMP to have impact on the ground. For those interested in tracking progress, the World Bank project states that “each implementing institution will sign a MOU with MWE, which will guide implementation of the project. A focal Point Officer will be assigned to manage the implementation of the KOSMP in line with work plans developed and submitted to DEA on a quarterly basis.”⁴

---

The Kalagala Offset is intended to be applied to multi-purpose uses, but the management of the balance of activities requires intensive leadership. For instance, the Ministry of Tourism informed the Monitoring Team that it had commissioned and received a Rapid Assessment by DFID and the World Bank that will serve as a blueprint for the various Ugandan authorities as well as for designing partnerships with international financial sources. A major focus of the Rapid Assessment was on the tourism potential areas along the Nile River.

The 2012 Monitoring Team visited the Kalagala Offset and the river banks. Management has fulfilled its obligation of reviewing the Sustainable Management Plan produced by IUCN as provided in its Action Plan. The Team, however, noted that a range of needs remain to be met by the government, both in preserving the forests and managing the range of pressures on a highly scenic river/forest environment.

4. Witness NGO Monitoring of Projects

IRM Compliance Review Report of 2008:

The decision to have one witness NGO be both the independent monitor of the resettlement process and a participant in the decision making process that deals with grievances arising from the resettlement fails to comply with the applicable policy requirements calling for a separation of such functions.

AfDB Action Plan of 2009:

The Witness NGO, while not totally independent, is and has been providing satisfactory performance, and BEL/UETCL/GoU would not wish to change course at this stage. The NGO provides observations and recommendations but does not participate in the decision-making process. An additional NGO will be included in the Project Monitoring Committee under NEMA. The witness NGO will share its reports with the Project Monitoring Committee.

IRM Monitoring:

The Witness NGO, Inter-Aid, has carried out its observer functions with apparent effectiveness. Its contract was ended on 30 June 2012, but it has established a valuable presence for witnessing the complex social and environmental issues associated with infrastructure projects that impact local communities. In terms of lessons learned for
future projects, the observer NGO should not only report to the project implementer, but also share its reports regularly with the lenders, local authorities and the relevant government ministries to ensure maximum coordination in implementing remedies for problems.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As mentioned in the introductory remarks, the IRM Monitoring Team observed progress in resolving the pending social and environmental concerns posed by the Bujagali Projects. However, there are still some pending issues that the Bank Management should pay attention to during its supervision missions, in order to ensure compliance with Bank policies and the gains achieved in the course of this project are sustained. These are noted in the text above.

Lessons Learned:

- Action plans of the Bank in response to compliance reviews need to be both responsive to the findings of non-compliance as well as more operational to allow for effective implementation and monitoring.

- With the presence of many lenders in a project, proactive leadership by individual lenders for achieving compliance with specific policy elements is desirable but needs to be clarified and implemented early in the project. Multi-donor supervision missions have their value, but clearer accountability to individual lenders would assist both project implementation and the focus of independent compliance review units.

- Resettlement and compensation programs have been plagued by unrealistic expectations through miscommunication in the early stages of the project. The Bank should engage experts on consultation throughout the project cycle.

- Witness NGOs can be useful instruments, but need to be given independence through transparent reporting and external funding rather than from the project promoter.

- Adequate baseline Surveys on the livelihood conditions for populations to be resettled need to be undertaken before resettlement takes place, otherwise no meaningful and realistic assessments on the restitution of livelihoods can be conducted.

- Important lessons can be learned from the compliance review of the Bujagali projects for future infrastructure projects in Uganda for the setting of national standards and the development of appropriate governance practices in affected communities.
Recommendations:

- With regard to Compensation and Resettlement, the completion reports for the Bujagali dam and the T-lines pledged in the Management Action Plan need to be issued before the Bank completes its supervision of the project loan.

- Management shall work with BEL and UETCL to ensure that the Management project specific action plan commitments on compensation outcomes (in the section on social and cultural issues), which was approved in 2008, are finished prior to issuance of the completion reports.

- The Management shall submit to IRM/CRMU a copy of these completion reports for assessment. The IRM Panel of Experts and CRMU will then consider in 2013 concluding the IRM monitoring process with this report, provided that the submitted completion reports will be satisfactory.
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