STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (SESA)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

COUNTRY: Zambia
PROJECT NAME: Zambia Staple Crops Processing Zone (SCPZ) Luswishi Farm Block, Lufwanyama District, Copperbelt Province, Zambia.

Environment and Social Categorization: 1
Project Code: P-ZM-AA0-017

1. PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Luswishi Farm Block Development is an initiative of the Government of Zambia to commercialize agricultural land towards economic diversification and growth, enhance food security and open up undeveloped rural areas while reducing poverty and rural-urban migration. The Government produced the Farm Blocks Development Plan, which has 11 Farm Blocks earmarked for development with total gross area of 895,000 (ha). A Farm Block is a large agricultural area where backbone infrastructure such as feeder roads, electricity, water for irrigation and domestic uses, and communication facilities are provided by Government to stimulate sustainable partnerships with private sector investors in conducting agricultural, agri-business and economic activities. The Farm Block concept comprises a core venture (private sector), large (private sector), medium, and small-scale farms operating under an outgrower arrangement.
1.1 PROPOSED SCPZ AT LUSWISHI FARM BLOCK

The proposed Staple Crops Processing Zone at Luswishi Farm Block will comprise a gross area of 100,000 ha of idle land. The project will also cover adjacent smallholder farmers in Chief Shibuchinga and 20,000 ha under Kambilombilo Resettlement Scheme on the north-eastern end of Luswishi. The block is located over 150km from Ndola on the Copperbelt province and 50km from Lufwanyama District centre. The development goal is to contribute to poverty reduction and economic growth through enhanced agricultural production and productivity. The overall objective of the project is to improve productivity and competitiveness, household food and nutrition security, income and livelihoods through sustainable agricultural value chain development. The Project will promote infrastructure development for agricultural commodity value chain; gender mainstreaming, youth and women empowerment, capacity building and job creation.

The Luswishi Farm Block is located in the Lufwanyama District in the Copperbelt Province of Zambia and is about 130 km West of Kalulushi along the M18 Kalengwa road. It also lies between Luswishi River on the East and Mushingashi River on the West. The Northern end of the Farm Block runs along Mushingashi-Kambilombilo Youth Resettlement Scheme and on the south along Mirumbi River.

[Approximate Map of Zambia showing Lufwanyama District]
1.2 PROJECT STRUCTURE AND ENVISAGED INVESTMENTS

The following is the current structure of the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Component Name</th>
<th>Total Cost (USD million)</th>
<th>Sub-Component and Associated Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A  | Infrastructure development for production, processing and marketing of agricultural products | 45.0                     | (i) **Farm level infrastructure to support agricultural production:**  
- 1000ha Irrigation scheme  
- 5 small dams and water intake systems  
- Upgraded power supply and main feeder lines  
- Well maintained M18 60km road  
- 250km new feeder road network, bridges and drainage systems  
- Two telecommunication towers for improved connectivity.  
(ii) **Production and post-production infrastructure, including the Establishment of Agriculture Transformation Centres (ATCs):**  
- 5 Demonstration farms  
- 5 Agriculture Transformation Centres (ATCs) for support services and facilities such as mechanization, aggregation facilities, pre-processing and storage and warehouse facilities, retail shops, quality certification centre, market information centre, training facility, transport infrastructure, etc.  
- Network of 20-30 demand driven commodity and input Aggregation Centres close to areas of production within the SCPZ (within and outside the farm block)  
(iii) **Infrastructure for the Agro-Processing Hub:**  
- Offsite infrastructure linkages – water, power, road and drainage.  
- Onsite infrastructure of one Industrial Hub demarcated into a minimum of 10 x 5 acre plots (serviced with - power linkages, internal road, potable and non-potable water distribution system, sewerage and effluent networking, water treatment plant, drainage system, solid and liquid waste management facility, streetlighting, quality control, testing, certification lab, ICT services, environmental infrastructure including, rain water harvesting, environmental monitoring system and, value addition and common user facilities)  
(iv) **Social and other support infrastructure and facilities:**  
- In close proximity to the Industrial Hub and ATCs, strategic placement and development of:  
  - 5 primary schools  
  - 1 high school  
  - 1 mini hospital  
  - 5 RHCs  
  - 1 Police Station  
  - Community recreation facilities for farmers and workers’ families, etc. |
| B  | Policy, Legal and Institutional support                                           | 7.5                      | (i) **Support to policy and improvement of the SCPZ operational framework:**  
- Support for the development of a legal, policy and administrative framework, including, the monitoring of the investment climate to ensure proactive measures or prompt reactions are made on investment related matters.  
- Support the central bank in establishing a risk-sharing, guarantee and interest reduction mechanism for financing investments in the SCPZ.  
- Provide technical assistance and capacity building for critical investment promotion skills and structuring of public-private partnership agreements and models for SCPZ infrastructure;  
(ii) **Support to the governance system of the Luswishi SCPZ:** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Component Name</th>
<th>Total Cost (USD million)</th>
<th>Sub-Component and Associated Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Technical support to the National Agencies with responsibilities for SCPZ start up, operation, SCPZ Management Entity (SPV) and promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Facilitate the establishment of an independent, commercial-oriented, private sector modelled Special Purpose Vehicle for management of the SCPZ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Build capacity of key government agencies and SPV staff on business planning capacity, investor relations engagement, governance and reporting mechanism, development of a measurement and evaluation system to monitor progress of investments, and mediation/ exit support for failing investments in the SCPZ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide capacity building to agencies and SPV to enhance investment climate, regulatory and legislative frameworks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>Support to strengthen relevant Institutions:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support to research, extension &amp; training institutes, Quality control &amp; Standards, consolidation of financing facilities, the development of workbooks/ guides on good practice, and support on ensuring responsible agricultural practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Strengthening selected agricultural value chains:</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>(i) Capacity building of actors in selected agricultural value chains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Capacity building of agricultural producers to improve productivity and quality, capacity building for MSME’s along the value chains, vocational training / entrepreneurship development in the local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access to finance for actors:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Capacity building on developing bankable projects, the development of models for cooperatives and other models for assisting in micro financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitate value chain linkages amongst value chain actors:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Strengthen outgrower models for the development of desirable linkages between various actors along the value chains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Project coordination and M&amp;E:</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>(i) Project management,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Financial management,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Knowledge Management,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Communication and outreach, including sensitization from the design stage through implementation to ensure all stakeholders are well informed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(v) Monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.3 INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT OF THE SCPZ**

An SCPZ Management Unit based on a Public Private Partnership (PPP) model will be established as a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) to provide sustainable management and coordination mechanism. The SPV will manage the public infrastructure in the scheme and determine rules of engagement among investors. It is estimated that public sector investments will amount to about USD64.78m while private sector investment by various core ventures and other commercial operators is also estimated at about USD350m. The African Development Bank is expected to provide the loan for part of the public sector financing and is seeking co-financing partnerships from other cooperating partners like the GCF. There is, already, considerable interest from the private sector to invest in the Farm Block area. Six large investors have so far been allocated about
40,000 ha. The balance of 60,000 ha has been allocated to smallholders, medium sized producers and retired miners. There is an adjoining Resettlement Scheme of 1700 Ha, for the youth. The six private sector investors have already provided an indicative investment portfolio in production, value addition, marketing and social services of about USD350m.

1.4 PROJECT EXPECTED OUTCOMES AND BENEFICIARIES:

The project expected results are as follows: (i) improved enabling environment for private sector investment; (ii) Production, processing and market infrastructure established for key value chains; and (iii) Capacities of actors in the value chains strengthened. The direct beneficiaries will include the (i) existing 1300 inhabitants/households within the farm block, who will be integrated into the SCPZ (ii) about 1700 ex-miners (iii) 1700 new farm owners in the cadastral area and also (iv) 5,449 Chief Shibuchinga households from surrounding villages and (v) About 1700 farm settlers at Kambilombilo Scheme that lie within reach of the SCPZ Agriculture Service Centres. In addition the private sector investors are expected to employ more than 5,000 people. The Project will indirectly benefit about 100,000 people through other value chain supply linkages such as agribusiness, input suppliers, buyers, processors and transporters in the value chain activities at the Industrial Hub and ATCs.

2. POLICY, LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE FRAMEWORK

In executing the SESA, the implication of the existing Policies, Strategies, Acts, Regulations, Plans and Programmes on the SCPZ Development has been examined to ensure that the necessary legislative and institutional frameworks are in place to manage any potential adverse impacts from the project. In this context, the project financier (AfDB) and Zambian environmental and other sectors legislations and requirements relevant to SCPZ were examined.

According to Zambian Environmental Management Act, 2011, the development of SCPZ have been categorized as high risks projects (category B) and a SESA is required to be undertaken for the development to ensure environmental and social considerations are incorporated in the design and implementation. The Acts also provides for acquisition of different permits and licenses for different activities within the SCPZ under its Environmental Management (Licensing) Regulations, 2013.
According to the AfDB’s Integrated Safeguards System (ISS), the SCPZ project has been categorized as category 1 in view of potential environmental and social impacts, which could be significant and irreversible. Furthermore, some of the project works (provision of access roads and temporary water pipelines) could potentially result in the displacement of more than 200 people. However, at this stage of the project, not all the sites to be developed have been specifically identified and not all the technical characteristics of the investments have been determined. It is against this backdrop that, in accordance with Zambian environmental Management Act, 2011 and the procedures of the African Development Bank (AfDB), it was deemed necessary to prepare a Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA). This is to ensure that the environmental and social issues of future project activities are factored in from planning up to implementation, monitoring/evaluation for the entire production and processing zone.

Based on the analysis of the provisions of the Zambian policies and legislations as well as the Bank’s safeguards system it was determined that the existing framework was adequate for implementation of the project but capacity building and strengthening is needed for successful implementation of the project.

3. PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Luswishi Farm Block is in the west of Lufwanyama District in Copperbelt Province. The farm block of almost 88,000 ha lies in a gently rolling terrain, with a few hills and elevations ranging roughly between 1,100 and 1,300 m above mean sea level. The area lies between Luswishi River to the east and Mushingashi River to the west. In the north it borders the Mikelo River and in the south the Mirumbi River and Bwingimilonga River with many smaller streams. The project area is mostly covered by Miombo woodlands. Settlements and cultivated land is sparse. There are three main habitats that can be considered in the project area: miombo woodland, dambos and freshwater rivers. The Luswishi Farm Block has a humid subtropical climate typical for the most of Zambia. The block falls in Agro-Ecological Zone III, with rainfall above 1,000 mm.
Figure 1: Prevalence of different land cover types in the Luswishi Farm Block

Figure 2: Typical land cover (source: LFB feasibility study report, 2018)
The level of anthropogenic agricultural activities in the area has led to the alterations of wildlife habitats. Fauna in the project area include small mammals such as rodents, lagomorphs, small antelopes and smaller carnivores. The local fauna in the area include a variety of snakes, insects, hares and bush rats. Others include lizards, chameleons and moles. Interviews and interactions the local people reveal that they have observed the presence of Black Rat (*Rattus rattus*), Cane Rat (*Thryonomys swinderianus*), rabbits and bush Squirrel (*Paraxereus cepapi*). Insect life includes a
variety of species of dragonfly, wasp, bees, crickets, grasshoppers, termites, mosquitoes, ants, red ants, lady bugs, Caterpillars, butterflies and moths.

The region is known to have low endemism but relatively high diversity in terms of fish. Within the Zambezi basin, there are 165 fish species recorded, with approximately 42% found in the Upper Zambezi system (Timberlake 2000).

**Water resources**

About 238.5 km of rivers and streams run through the Luswishi Farm Block. All main water courses generally flow from north to south. Luswishi, the most important perennial river with an average flow of about 30m$^3$/s and its watershed covers 80% of the Farm Block. Mushingashi is the second largest perennial river which watershed covers 20% of the Farm Block while its flow is much smaller than Luswishi River with an average annual flow of about 3.3m$^3$/s.

**Land tenure**

In 2008, Chief Shibuchinga, in whose area the block is located, released the land for development to the Ministry of Agriculture. Land ownership in the project area will be based on statutory leasehold titles of 99 years issued by the Commissioner of Lands within the Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources.

Currently, much of the land tenure in the farm block is still in a transitional phase, from customary land to state land. The indigenous residents are holding traditional entitlement to the land or have received a permit from the Chief. Others may have settled without prior approval from the authorities. Some occupants have obtained title deeds. These occupants include the private investors who established large-scale commercial farms in the block. Title deeds have been prepared for about 1,691 retrenched miners in the area but the title deeds have not yet been issued. Other plots still need to be demarcated, beaconed, and surveyed. It is worth noting that all land of Zambia is still vested in the President (Lands Act, 1995 Part II section 3.1) and land in a customary area, held under customary tenure before the commencement of the Lands Act 1995, continues to be so held and recognized (Lands Act, 1995, Part II section 7). Although all land is vested in the President, the actual power of control is delegated to the Commissioner of Lands. The Zambian land tenure system consist of two systems: customary rights applying to the old Reserve and Trust land, now referred to as customary land, and statutory tenure applying to state land.
4. **SESA OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY**

The SESA study aimed at providing a baseline overview of prevailing environmental and social conditions. Using this baseline, the SESA examined alternative scenarios to assess the potential environmental and social implications of the proposed initiative and the institutional options for the monitoring and management of resulting environmental and social changes over time. The SESA also aimed at providing possible approaches to address in advance the cumulative environmental and social effects of numerous individual projects.

**SESA Approach**

The methodology employed in the SESA was derived from the SESA Terms of Reference (ToR), consultation with the SESA project team, interaction with the AfDB staff in Zambia and the GRZ staff from different Institutions and Agencies, and Zambia requirements on Strategic Environmental Assessment as stipulated in Zambia Environmental Management Act, 2011. Briefly, the general methodology used during the SESA study consisted of:

- Situational assessment and stakeholder analysis to form the baseline understanding of the SCPZ concept, the key environmental and socio-economic issues, and main actors
- Review of relevant national and international policies and legislations, published and unpublished reports including relevant Initiatives for sustainability of SCPZ and related developments.
- Collection and processing of secondary data held by GRZ ministries, departments, divisions, and agencies;
- Consultations with stakeholders;
- Appraisal of field conditions; and
- Data analysis and reporting.
5. **SESA STRATEGIC ALTERNATIVES**

**Assessment of a “No Project” and “With Project” Alternatives**

The purpose of the analysis of the alternatives is to determine which alternative best meets the threshold criteria of sustainable development. The following alternative actions were considered in relation to the proposed project. Analysis of alternatives is done to establish the preferred or most environmentally sound, financially feasible and benign option for achieving project objectives. This requires a systematic comparison of proposed investment design in terms of site, technology, processes etc. in terms of their impacts and feasibility of their mitigation, capital, recurrent costs, suitability under local conditions and institutional, training and monitoring requirements.

The “No Action” alternative assumes that there will be no alteration to the existing areas. This would imply that the Agro Processing; Productivity Enhancement and Livelihood Improvement Support Project investment proposed area/location would be left in their present states with a real potential for worsening. Specifically, if the area is left unimproved, environmental degradation as a result of the ongoing agricultural practices by the locals would continue and in turn will continue to lead to an ever-increasing destruction of the habitat without proper or sustainable management leading to soil erosion, deforestation, etc. The damage and loss rates may increase even in the remaining forest reserve as there will not be proper and systematic management, monitoring and guidance from the appropriate authorities, which has been the case in the area over the years. Furthermore, poverty levels amongst the local population will remain high and the objective of the economic diversification of the GRZ for the country will suffer a setback. A no-action or no project alternative is therefore not recommended.

On the other hand, the “with project” alternative; though more expensive in terms of cost in every respect at the start, is seen to be the most feasible and profitable than the do nothing alternative. It is expected to reduce operational costs for crops in the value chain processors by up to 30%, create new jobs, and contribute significantly to Zambia’s economy and poverty reduction. The development of SCPZ Project will strengthen national food security, improve regional economic growth and generally improve livelihoods in the rural farming communities in the project area through increased household incomes arising from opportunities for secured markets, improved productivity, reduced post-harvest losses and increased employment of the locals. In addition, the negative impacts on the environmental resources due to the unsustainable manner in which the local farmers are exploiting the forest resources will be reduced if not eliminated. This will follow from the enhanced knowledge on how these environmental resources could better be utilized as
part of the project’s capacity building activities. This in turn will reduce the overall level of poverty noticed in the country.

The two scenarios considered herewith are summarized in Table 1. The inference from this consideration is that even though the go-ahead option will require investments, it is a preferred and is more environmentally sound, financially feasible. It also has the added benefit of achieving project objectives and ensuring economic growth and sustainable development both at the micro and macro scale.

**Table 1: Analysis of the Alternatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria(s)</th>
<th>No Project Alternative</th>
<th>Go Ahead Project Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Protection of the environment and improvement of social well being</td>
<td>The field visits revealed the level of poverty in the communities, the unsustainable manner in which environmental resources are being devastated to the extent that taking a &quot;no action&quot; alternative will not benefit members of the study areas or their environment and even the national economy.</td>
<td>The intervention would lead to strengthening agriculture in a more professionalized and highly organized manner, which provides room for best practice soil conservation and sustainable management of natural resources. It will further improve productivity, food security, generate income, which in turn increases the living standard of the locals and overall improvement of the individual household and the national economy as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Effectiveness and Permanence (Sustainable management of natural resources, sustainable use of non-renewable resources)</td>
<td>No action alternative does not meet the long-term effectiveness and permanence criteria of the national and local economy including the agenda to improve the overall management of environmental resources for sustainable development</td>
<td>Go ahead option will further improve the local and national economy with sustainable development agenda in mind through careful planning based on informed decision making by all parties including the locals of the project environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with Applicable or Relevant Appropriate policy, legal and administrative Requirements (Maintaining environmental and social Management systems)</td>
<td>Does not require compliance with applicable or relevant appropriate requirements even at local levels</td>
<td>All undertakings will go through an established system of screening to ensure the necessary standard and permit requirements even at the national levels are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term Effectiveness</td>
<td>No action alternative will not add any input under these criteria</td>
<td>The go-ahead alternative will be completed in a long-term period based on the projections. However, the benefits when completed outweighs a “no action” alternative because of the systematic manner of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining and improving options and capacities to adapt to climate change</td>
<td>The SESA study has revealed un-coordinated activities, which can exacerbate climate change within the block. A “No go alternative” means allowing these activities to continue and delaying the country plans towards climate change adaptations.</td>
<td>Go ahead option will further improve the setting and implementation of all activities and processes within the LFB with sustainable development agenda in mind through careful planning based on the framework stipulated in the National climate change policy and other climate change plans in the country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **STAKEHOLDERS’ CONSULTATION**

Stakeholders’ consultations were held from April 9 to April 19, 2018. Consultations with stakeholders were conducted for the purpose of:

- Obtaining stakeholders’ views, issues, and concerns on the potential environmental – physical, biological, and social - impacts that the development of the SCPZ project;
- Obtaining stakeholder views on measures to avoid or mitigate, the identified potential environmental impacts; and
- Ensuring stakeholder agreement that their issues and concerns have been addressed in the SESA Report.
The format of these consultations, whether individual or group, consisted of:

- A brief presentation of the SCPZ model and proposal.
- Open discussions and enquiries on the development
- A check list of questions that could be discussed informally or formally
- A standard procedure for taking notes on stakeholder issues and concern.

**Summary of issues raised by consulted stakeholders**

Different stakeholders raised various issues. In this section, opinions are presented in summarized form and relevant responses are provided. The ideas, contributions or opinions expressed by the public and other stakeholders have to be incorporated into the design of the project as part of ensuring project sustainability. Therefore all significant comments from the stakeholders were presented and incorporated in the project as presented in table below.

**Project response to stakeholders’ comments/opinions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders’ Concerns</th>
<th>Project Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government commitment on ensuring enabling environment for private sector participation in the project</td>
<td>The GRZ will have a dialogue with the private sector community towards their engagement in the SCPZ development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion to declare the LFB an export processing zone as one of the initiative in creating an enabling environment for private sector participation</td>
<td>The government has agreed to take into consideration the issue of declaring the LFB an export processing zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility of land acquisition from the local communities especially communities residing along M18 road and areas where major components of the SCPZ will be located</td>
<td>The whole farm block will subjected to evaluation and all existing land rights will be identified. A RAP will be done in accordance to the national resettlement policy and ZEMA requirements and the AfDB Safeguards requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It has been recommended that systematic land registration and titling scheme to be introduced to safeguard the rights of local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of local communities so as to adequately benefit from the project</td>
<td>Social inclusion and gender mainstreaming programmes shall be included in the project design and implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Climate change implications to the project and also implications of project activities e.g. massive forest clearance for opening land for agriculture

Implementation of the climate change adaptation principles and strategies as per the framework stipulated in the National policy on climate change e.g. support to conservation agriculture, fully aligned to environmentally-friendly and climate resilient practices

Uncertainties on Project Sustainability

The AfDB will support the GRZ in terms of SCPZ development, promotion, technical assistance

A special purpose vehicle (SPV) will be established which will be complemented by special development strategy, implementation structure and legal aspects undertaken following a holistic approach

Value chain commodities analysis, economic and financial analysis, Market demand assessment and competitive positioning assessment and other studies are being done and will continue to be done in order to come up with a strong value proposition for investment promotion and development.

7. POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION PRINCIPLES

The project is envisaged to have a range of positive environmental and social impacts. Some of these are a function of the objectives of the project, while others are a function of the way in which the project is designed to meet its objectives. The project beneficiaries are the population of poor rural communities living aside from the roads. Specifically, the following are some of the benefits that could be due to the project:

i. improved soil conservation,
ii. increased farm incomes from crop output and ensuring dignity in farming practices,
iii. food security, poverty alleviation,
iv. elevation of rural income and the national economy,
v. improved nutrition,
vi. employment creation for community members,
vii. empowerment of farmers and enhanced gender opportunities,
viii. improved infrastructure, improved health care,
ix. attainment of the agricultural promotion policy of the federal government, etc.

It is also expected that the sub-project would exert some negative impacts on the social and physical environment within which they are implemented. These impacts have been identified, and are typical of agricultural activities and agro processing facilities and infrastructures.

These impacts in a nutshell include impacts to the terrestrial, aquatic and social systems as well as climate change implications resulting from development of the project e.g. air emissions from agro-processing activities, loss of forest cover due to massive forest clearance, discharges to the river and streams, social systems disruption, overconsumption of community resources, pressure to available resources etc. In the full SESA report, the corresponding mitigation principles have been identified as well and this would be made more robust by the ESIA/ESMP that shall be prepared for each subproject when the sufficient details are known.

The mitigation principles include implementation of best environmental practices in agro-processing and agricultural development such as the use of best environmental practices in agro-processing industries operations, smart agricultural practices, use of effluent treatment technologies, compliance to available standards and procedures, social inclusion mitigation measures etc.

**Mitigation Implementation and Management**

The successful implementation of the SESA recommendations and mitigation plans depends on the commitment of the sector and related institutions, and the capacity within the institutions to apply or use the framework effectively, and the appropriate and functional institutional arrangements, among others.

Hence, these key ESMP areas relevant to its successful implementation were included in the SESA report, namely: institutional arrangements, capacity building, environmental and social monitoring.
### Table 2: Summary of impact significant and mitigation potential against key issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>Confidence of occurrence</th>
<th>Mitigation Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achieving national food security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversification of agriculture activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercialisation of agricultural practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution to national food demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meeting local food security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution to household food demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversification of crops grown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased post harvest processing and value addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in irrigation practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contributions to national &amp; local economies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased macroeconomic (GD) growth due to booming agricultural sector and increased government revenues and spending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial growth (including agricultural related industries)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased employment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of new infrastructure (including roads, bridges, large scale irrigation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction of poverty and increase in livelihoods-base for rural poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contraction of natural resource sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement in communication in Lufwanyama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement in transport systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes in Land use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forest Cover</strong></td>
<td>Loss of forest through land clearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Habitat loss and degradation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in key biodiversity areas associated with the proposed area for the farm block</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss in forest productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of tree species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in population of endangered and rare species (e.g Mukwa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of wildlife associated with forests within the proposed farm block area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of forest land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes in River bank gardens</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in micro ecosystems within the river banks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of river bank gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes in soil characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of soil nutrients due to inorganic fertilisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soil pollution (due to agricultural chemicals and oils)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQUATIC SYSTEMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in productivity of aquatic habitats</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of habitat diversity due to sedimentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of fish productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in primary productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption of rivers/streams due to siltation/sedimentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes in water quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of nutrients on fine sediments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution of surface and underground water due to pesticides/insecticides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes in the populations of rare and endagered aquatic species</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of fish species that cannot survive contamination of rivers/streams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase of species that can survive in disturbed areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes in health and nutrition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved health due to availability of variety of food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple disruption of already existing subsistence activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD/HIV transmission from external labour force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved medical facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved access to health care due to the presence of clinics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social effects of resettlement, land acquisition and loss of access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of homes for those who will be relocated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of access to common forest lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of access to common water sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased income sources due to the presence of various investors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social conflicts between investors and local people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes and reduced relevance of forest based festival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of ways of life leading to erosion of cultural identities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption of local culture due to the inflow of people from other areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes in literacy levels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased access to formal education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved educational infrastructure (e.g. schools)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green House Gas emissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Carbon dioxide emissions from both landuse and machines and industries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct impacts of climate change on farm block projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in extreme events such as floods and droughts due to clearing of vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in mean local temperature of the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic category</td>
<td>Key issues and impacts</td>
<td>Impacts</td>
<td>Mitigation/Enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Systems</td>
<td>Achieving national food security</td>
<td>Diversification of agricultural activities</td>
<td>Ensure the results of value chain commodities/crops analysis are adequately incorporated in the SCPZ design and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting local food security</td>
<td>Contribution to household food demand</td>
<td></td>
<td>A holistic and integrative approach is instituted in coordination of relevant Government Institutions and all key actors along the value chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercialization of agricultural activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution to national food demand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversification of crops grown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased post harvest processing and value addition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased irrigation practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Systems</td>
<td>Contribution to national and local economies</td>
<td>Increased macroeconomic (GD) growth due to booming agricultural sector, increased government revenues, and spending. Development of infrastructure (including roads, bridges, schools, large scale irrigation etc)</td>
<td>Government commitment in creating enabling environment for private sector development and increase their engagement in agricultural sector e.g. Regularization of trade policies,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reduction of poverty and increase in livelihoods-base for rural poor

Creation of short and long term employment for local people

Development of new back-borne infrastructure

Induced industrial growth (including agro-processing and agro-allied ones)

Reduced poverty & increase in livelihood-base for rural poor

Improvement of transport & communication systems

Declaring the Luswishi farm block an export processing zone, timely establishment of back-borne infrastructure to the SCPZ area

Support and capacity building on PPP, development of SPV and in SCPZ Promotion.

The Project coordination and supervision must subjected to knowledgeable, credible high-level champion, of the Government

| Terrestrial Systems | Change in land use pattern (Forest cover) | Loss of Forest cover due to land clearing | Maintain adequate buffer zones around the forest reserves
Establish afforestation programmes
Smart agricultural practice
Ensure better soil/crop management
Apply integrated crop/soil management | SPV of the SCPZ, MACO and Regulatory Authorities | Throughout the project cycle

Habitat loss and degradation

Changes in key biodiversity areas associated with the proposed areas within the farm block

Loss in forest productivity

Loss of tree species
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aquatic Systems</th>
<th>Changes in productivity of aquatic habitats</th>
<th>Loss of habitat diversity due to fragmentation and sedimentation</th>
<th>Ensure compliance to Environmental procedures and standards</th>
<th>SPV of the SCPZ and regulatory Authorities (ZEMA, WARMA)</th>
<th>Throughout the project cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of fish productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid environmentally sensitive sites and unnecessary exposure or access to sensitive habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in primary productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disruption of rivers, streams due to siltation/sedimentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in water quality</td>
<td>Loss of nutrients in fine sediments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pollution of surface and underground water due to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Loss of wildlife associated with forest within the proposed farm block areas that increase yields and reduce erosion.

Changes in micro-ecosystem within the river banks.

Soil pollution and degradation due to agricultural activities.

Avoid cultivation on slopes and maintain vegetation of such areas.

Avoid broadcasting of fertilizers.

Changes in river bank gardens.

Maintain adequate buffer zones around the river banks.

Loss of river banks gardens.

Ensure compliance to Environmental procedures and standards.

Avoid environmentally sensitive sites and unnecessary exposure or access to sensitive habitat.

Promote buffer zones of at least 500m along the local streams to serve as natural filters for surface runoff from the cultivated areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Systems</th>
<th>Changes in health and nutrition</th>
<th>Improved health due to availability of variety of foods</th>
<th>Capacity building to Health centres in terms of resources and training</th>
<th>SPV of the SCPZ and relevant Ministries and Agencies</th>
<th>Throughout the project cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple disruption of already existing subsistence activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPV of the SCPZ and relevant Ministries and Agencies</td>
<td>Throughout the project cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STD/HIV transmission from external labour force</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPV of the SCPZ and relevant Ministries and Agencies</td>
<td>Throughout the project cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved medical facilities and services</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPV of the SCPZ and relevant Ministries and Agencies</td>
<td>Throughout the project cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved access to health care to due presence of new clinics/health centres</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPV of the SCPZ and relevant Ministries and Agencies</td>
<td>Throughout the project cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social effects of resettlements,</td>
<td>Loss of homes for those who will be relocated</td>
<td>In case of involuntary resettlement, Resettlement Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition and loss of access</td>
<td>Loss of access to common forest land</td>
<td>Plan should be undertaken and implemented according to Government’s Resettlement Policy and Bank Operational Safeguards requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of access to common water sources</td>
<td>Government undertake dialogue to establish affordable land regularization and certification scheme. (Land Registration and Titling)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased income sources due to inflow of people from other areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural assets</th>
<th>Social conflicts between investors and local people</th>
<th>Avoid cultural sites and unnecessary exposure or access to cultural assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes and reduced relevance of forest based festivals</td>
<td>Instituting chance find procedures for identification and management of cultural assets in collaboration with community based committees and traditional leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of ways of life leading to erosion of cultural identities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disruption of local culture due to inflow of people from other areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Changes in literacy levels | Increased access to formal education | Throughout the project cycle |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Climate Change</strong></th>
<th><strong>Green house gas emissions</strong></th>
<th><strong>Increased CO₂ emissions from both land use &amp; machines and industries</strong></th>
<th><strong>Implementation of the climate change adaptation principles and strategies as per the framework stipulated in the National policy on climate change e.g. support to conservation agriculture, fully aligned to environmentally-friendly and climate resilient practices</strong></th>
<th><strong>SPV of the SCPZ in collaboration with sector Ministries, Agencies</strong></th>
<th><strong>Throughout the project cycle</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct impacts of climate change on farm blocks projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increase in extreme events such as floods and droughts due to clearing of vegetation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increase in mean local temperature of the area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. MONITORING PROGRAMME

Zambian Environmental Management Act, 2011 and AfDB, ESAP, 2015 explicitly require monitoring of the environmental effects emanating from implementation of the activities or plans. A monitoring system has been proposed which will help fulfil the following requirements:

- to monitor the significant effects of the economic activities;
- to identify any unforeseen adverse effects at an early stage; and,
- to ensure that remedial measures can be taken to offset the effects.

The monitoring is anticipated to be undertaken under categorized themes including grievances, community engagement activities, biodiversity and natural resource use, land use and resettlement monitoring and climate change implications monitoring. Other forms of monitoring will be done by individual projects as established in the respective ESIAs and EMPs.

9. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES AND STRENGTHENING PLAN

The development of SCPZ will involve institutional structural arrangement to enable successful execution of the project. The proposal on SCPZ recommends that a special coordinating body i.e. Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) to be established for overseeing and coordinating all activities and processes related to the SCPZ development.

The institutional arrangement shall have to be supported with arrangements for strengthening the available institutions relevant for execution of the SCPZ activities. In line with establishment of the SPV, it is recommended that the Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) that will be established for coordinating and overseeing the SCPZ implementation should constitute an environmental and social compliance unit. The unit shall encompass an environmental specialist, community liaison and social development officer. These will be responsible for ensuring environmental and social management and monitoring plans suggested in SESA study are deployed. The project will explore the organization of local community groups that can be empowered as “change agents” to promote participatory monitoring, protection and management of natural resources within the SCPZ and Luswishi Farm Block in general.

The SESA study has revealed limited capacity at the Provincial and District levels for making informed environmental decisions particularly, in screening for individual projects for subsequent environmental assessments, monitoring and enforcing compliance to environmental regulations. It has been observed that the investors’ environment and social management activities are not being adequately monitored because of the limited resources at the Zambian Environmental Management Agency (ZEMA) offices. The study also noted that the capacity of the District and Provincial institutions (including Ministry of Agriculture (PACO & DACO offices, the Lufwanyama District Council (Environment, Forestry, Water and Sanitation departments) and ZEMA) needs
strengthening for effective oversight and management of the environmental concerns within the Project area.

Initiatives that shall be considered, among others, include training for existing staff, hiring new employees, reorganizing units or agencies and redefining roles and responsibilities for strengthening environmental and social management.

Therefore, the institutional strengthening will also be extended to capacity building arrangements to proponents who will invest in the project and other Institutions relevant for overseeing environmental and social management within the SCPZ development scope.

To facilitate dialogue with the individual operators within the SCPZ project on environmental management, each industrial enterprise established, and in particular the institutions subject to impact assessment, will be required to designate from among their senior staff an Health Safety and Environmental manager. Sensitization/training sessions will be held periodically to enhance the capacity of the Environmental Managers of newly established enterprises.

10. INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND MONITORING ROLES

Under the project, the "environmental and social" function will be necessary both for implementation and for monitoring. Institutional arrangements are proposed for the project with respect to implementation and monitoring roles and responsibilities at the following levels:

- Coordination and external supervision
- Preparation and "internal" monitoring of implementation
- Conduct of activities
- "External" environmental and social monitoring

The major coordinating role for monitoring of the mitigation plans suggested in the SESA study lies on the SPV that will be established for the SCPZ development. The environmental and social compliance section of the SPV will work closely with Government Institutions and regulatory Authorities and non-government actors to ensure monitoring activities in all individual developments within the SCPZ are implemented accordingly.
11. **ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR IMPLEMENTING THE SESA**

The implementation of the environmental and social management mitigation measures as part of the SESA implementation requires budgetary provisions, which covers environmental and social mitigation cost, management costs, cost of environmental monitoring and capacity building. All administrative costs for implementing the ESMP and monitoring activities shall be budgeted for as part of the overall project costing. The total cost for implementing the SESA is estimated at **1,446,500 USD**.

12. **CONCLUSION**

This SESA work concludes that implementing the SCPZ project at LFB will have both potential positive and potential negative impacts. In Zambia, there have been many programmes and plans in different sectors. Agriculture has been identified in the NDP 2017-2021 and vision 2030 as one of the major sectors for ensuring economic diversification in Zambia. The SCPZ project is one of the GRZ initiatives in the agriculture and other allied sectors directed towards attaining objectivity in economic diversification.

Implementation of the SCPZ will encourage and foster private sector development in agriculture sector; preferably, in partnership with smallholder farmers who will stimulate further private investors. The anticipated increased agricultural productivity will improve food security, government income, increased growth of the service sector that will benefit the local people and local economy. Also envisaged environmental benefits such as improvement of biodiversity and reduction of greenhouse gases may also be achieved.

The SCPZ development may also trigger potential negative impacts such as, land tenure, negative impacts to biodiversity, soil, water, and air (greenhouse gases emission).

Other potential negative impacts may be the introduction of new cultures and behaviours, increased competition for resources, increased social tension and conflict over access to resources and to their unsustainable use. Other possible impacts include increasing exposure to HIV/AIDS, either from emigrants or behaviours resulting from increased incomes. With increased populations and incomes, there will increased stresses on social services.

Sustainability of SCPZ project can be enhanced if the proposed mitigation measures and monitoring plans are put in place and implemented effectively. In the long term, such changes could influence positive livelihood outcomes. In light of the insufficient institutional and human resource capacity to provide the necessary coordination and guidance for development, the socio-economic and ecological sustainability of the SCPZ development is highly questionable without heavy investment by the GRZ in supporting key planning initiatives and activities. The GRZ
therefore must set as a priority for institutional strengthening, and provision of technical and financial support to the proposed recommendations.
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