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I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country:</th>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
<th>Project ID:</th>
<th>P163468</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Project ID (if any):</td>
<td>P160567</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name:</td>
<td>Citizens' Charter Afghanistan Project - Emergency Regional Displacement Response Additional Financing (P163468)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Project Name:</td>
<td>Citizens' Charter Afghanistan Project (P160567)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>SOUTH ASIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Appraisal Date:</td>
<td>15-May-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Board Date:</td>
<td>13-Jun-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Area (Lead):</td>
<td>Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience Global Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Instrument:</td>
<td>Investment Project Financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower(s):</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Agency:</td>
<td>IDLG, Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development (MRRD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?

Financing (in USD Million)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financing Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDA Grant</td>
<td>85.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund</td>
<td>44.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDA recommitted as a Grant</td>
<td>41.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Gap</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>172.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Category:

| Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note): | The review did authorize to proceed with Negotiations, in principle |
| Other Decision: | |
| Is this a Repeater project? | No |
B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

Despite the political and security upheavals over the past 15 years, Afghanistan has managed to achieve some notable economic and social progress on post-conflict reconstruction. From 2003 – 2012, economic growth averaged 9.4 percent annually driven primarily by aid and security spending. This positive economic growth helped raise GDP per capita from $186 in 2002 to $688 in 2012. Key human development indicators including school enrollment, life expectancy, and access to water also improved markedly. School enrollment increased from one million in 2001 to 9.2 million in 2011. Today, girls account for over one-third of school children compared to nearly none in 2001. In the health sector, primary health care coverage expanded significantly and infant and maternal mortality rates declined. Major infrastructure investments have led to gains in access to water, sanitation, electricity, and road connectivity. From 2007-08 to 2013-14, the share of population with access to safe drinking water increased from 27 to 65 percent; and the share of population with access to electricity increased on average from 41.7 to almost 90 percent nationally. Afghanistan has held five national elections since 2001, established a more open environment for the media and civil society, and drastically increased women’s participation in government, business, and public life.

But despite these accomplishments, Afghanistan remains one of the least developed countries in the world. Poverty rates stand at 39.1 percent as of 2013-14, with signs of growing inequality. Gaps in access to services between the poor and non-poor are sizeable. Economic growth fell sharply to 1.5-2 percent in 2014 and 2015 respectively. Donor plans to reduce foreign aid is another major challenge. Afghanistan is highly dependent upon foreign aid, which amounted to 45 percent of GDP in 2013. Security expenditures are remarkably high (with on-budget and off-budget security spending about 25 percent of GDP in 2014), thus limiting fiscal space for much needed civilian operating and development spending. Furthermore, the country’s demographic trends make poverty reduction challenging. Afghanistan faces high population growth and a youth bulge, with 400,000 entrants into the labor force each year. The proportion of the population aged 15 or below is 51.3 percent, making Afghanistan one of the youngest countries in Asia with extremely high dependency ratios. These demographic pressures are in the future likely to be exacerbated by significant numbers of returning refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs).

This last shock is the subject of the proposed Additional Financing (AF) to the Citizens’ Charter Afghanistan Project and was specifically requested by the Government to respond to the emergency situation created by the regional displacement crisis Afghanistan is facing as described below.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

Sectoral, Regional, and Institutional Context (applicable to the AF)

Afghanistan, and with it the South Asia region, is witnessing a massive displacement and potential humanitarian crisis. Over the course of 2016 and first quarter of 2017, an estimated 775,000 undocumented and registered refugees returned to Afghanistan from Pakistan and Iran. In addition, Afghanistan has 1.2 million individuals at different stages of displacement and additional 400,000 new internally displaced persons (IDPs) in 2016. According to UNCHR there are still 1.5 million registered Afghan refugees living in Pakistan, and authorities there have asked for all Afghan refugees in Pakistan to return to Afghanistan by December 2017. The UN is therefore projecting almost 500,000-700,000 Afghans will return from Pakistan in 2017.

This massive influx of returnees is putting tremendous pressure on Afghanistan’s already fragile social, economic, and service delivery infrastructure and is a threat to regional stability. Despite its
accomplishments in improving GDP per capita between 2002 ($186) and 2012 ($688) as well as several human development indicators (e.g. school enrollment, life expectancy, and access to water), Afghanistan remains one of the least developed countries in the world and nearly four decades of protracted conflict have left weakened government institutions and severe social and ethnic cleavages. Poverty rates stand at 39.1 percent as of 2013-14, with signs of growing inequality. Economic growth fell sharply to 1.5-2 percent in 2014 and 2015, influenced in part by the three binding constraints of deteriorating security, declining external financial aid and demographic and geographic factors identified in the Afghanistan Systematic Country Diagnostic (SCD). In this context, the sudden influx of returnees is likely to further escalate the fragile humanitarian situation in Afghanistan and potentially become a fourth binding constraint to economic development and social progress. The geographical concentration of returns is likely to put extra strain on local absorption capacity in hosting communities, particularly for basic services like education, health, energy, and water. Likewise, the pressure to create new jobs and employment for both host communities and IDPs and returnees (IDP/Rs) has escalated tremendously. In 2016, unemployment and underemployment stood at around 22 and 46 percent respectively (with 400,000 entrants into the labor force each year), and these have significantly increased over the past years (up from 8.1 and 22.6% in 2011) due to stagnating growth, the deteriorating security environment and withdrawal of international security forces, and now the influx of returnees.

The National Unity Government (NUG) of Afghanistan's goal is to grant returnees and IDPs decent and humane treatment. Planning for the successful return of refugees and migrants, and responding to the needs of IDPs, is first and foremost a humanitarian and constitutional concern, but absorbing over one million returnees and IDPs poses severe economic and political risks. Therefore, longer-term development interventions alongside humanitarian ones are needed to facilitate durable solutions for both returnees and displaced populations. Consequently, the “Solutions Strategy for Afghan Refugees” (SSAR) was jointly developed by the Governments of Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iran, and UNHCR in 2012 to provide an overall framework for moving towards a sustainable mechanism for voluntary repatriation and reintegration of Afghan refugees, while maintaining support for host communities. Since then, working in coordination with the GoP through the Tri-Partite Arrangement, the GoA has developed a Policy Framework for Returnees and IDPs that was officially endorsed by the Afghan Cabinet in March 2017. A high level ‘Displacement and Returnee Executive Committee’ (DiREC) has been established by the GoIRA to coordinate the inter-ministerial and regional work on the displacement response.

The GoIRA’s Policy Framework for IDPs and returnees (IDP/Rs) aims for a safe and successful re-integration of returnees and IDPs into the social and economic fabric of Afghanistan, in line with their constitutional rights as citizens of Afghanistan. The Government’s policy is to enable IDP/Rs to become productive and well-integrated members of their community, minimize the time they spend in transitional arrangements, and encourage their active participation in the identification of long-term sustainable solutions that promote their own self-reliance and development. The IDP/R Policy Framework is therefore articulated in three stages, with long-term actions needing to be planned in parallel to the humanitarian intervention so as to facilitate sustainable integration of returnees and IDPs. In the first humanitarian stage, consideration must be given to issues such as the proper identification of returnees and IDPs, assessments of their needs and intentions and the determination of their entitlements, initially as a provision of emergency support. In the second stage, when returnees and IDPs join existing or new communities or return to their places of origin, efforts must be made to receive them, and planning must encompass host areas and offset the burden on local services. The third stage shifts to a focus on livelihoods, employment and integration with the surrounding host communities, markets and government support. This three stage approach has been applied operationally through an Action Plan Matrix approved by Cabinet (February, 2017) that sets out 8
goals and corresponding actions to be implemented to support the overall Policy Framework.

The proposed AF is part of the initial package of support proposed to manage the returnee and displacement crisis. It was conceived in recognition of the need for implementing an emergency operation facilitating access to basic services, providing quick disbursing cash based transfers based on labor intensive public works, and aiding in the social reintegration of IDP/Rs. This builds on the GoIRA’s Policy framework and Action plan, while recognizing an appropriate division of labor between government, international partners, and the WBG. By focusing on service delivery provision and short-term income support, the AF fits in the second stage of the overall IDP/R Framework in terms of providing the bridge between the immediate humanitarian support being provided by UN agencies and the longer livelihoods and sectoral support that is planned through ongoing and future development programs, including a proposed IDA-18 regional operation. The AF will further link to and provide a platform for supporting other ongoing and future development programs that will be re-directed or restructured to respond to the needs of reintegration and rehabilitation of IDP/Rs as part of the overall Policy Framework.

The project is aligned with both the first (building strong and accountable institutions) and third (social inclusion) pillars of the Afghanistan Country Partnership Framework (CPF). In addition, it is part of the proposed Joint Displacement Response paper that the Afghanistan and Pakistan CMUs are putting together to address the regional displacement crisis under IDA-18.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Original Project Development Objective(s) - Parent

The Project Development Objective for the Citizens’ Charter Afghanistan Project is to improve the delivery of core infrastructure and social services to participating communities through strengthened Community Development Councils (CDCs). These services are part of a minimum service standards package that the Government is committed to delivering to the citizens of Afghanistan.

Proposed Project Development Objective(s) - Additional Financing

The Project Development Objective for the Citizens’ Charter Afghanistan Project is to improve the delivery of core infrastructure, emergency support, and social services to participating communities through strengthened Community Development Councils (CDCs).

Key Results

The key results indicators for the PDO after incorporation of the AF expansion and inclusion of the additional indicator are:

(a) Minimum of 10 million direct and indirect beneficiaries reached by CCAP;
(b) Minimum of 50 percent of direct and indirect beneficiaries will be women;
(c) Minimum of 9,600 communities in rural and urban areas receiving the stated minimum service standards. The minimum target is estimated at 9,600 communities (9,000 rural and 600 urban) due to high risks of insecurity and fluctuating conditions. However, the overall coverage target is planned for 13,850 total communities (13,000 rural and 850 urban communities); and
(d) Minimum of 11,750 rural and urban CDCs able to plan, implement, monitor and coordinate development activities as measured by an institutional maturity index
(e) Minimum of 2200 targeted high IDP/returnee communities provided with emergency support

The results framework for the project is further being revised to include additional indicators relating to the emergency cash for work assistance being provided under the AF. The specific indicators being
added are as follows (these will be confirmed during appraisal of the AF):

a. # of vulnerable households receiving MCCG support (disaggregated by displacement status)
b. # of persons benefiting from social inclusion grant (disaggregated by gender, displacement status and ability)
c. # of communities in rural areas receiving MCCG grants within 6 months after AF effectiveness

D. Project Description

ORIGINAL PROJECT COMPONENTS:

The CCAP has been set up as an inter-ministerial program for the delivery of a package of basic services. It is structured around 4 components which are as follows:

a) Component 1: Service Standards Grants. This component supports two types of grants to CDCs:
   i. Rural Areas Service Standards (RASS) Grants. This Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development (MRRD), which is the rural implementing agency of the CCAP will have overall responsibility for the implementation of these service standard grants. This rural sub-component supports delivery the minimum service standards related to rural infrastructure. Allocations per community under this component will be needs-based based upon an initial gap and needs assessment against the minimum service standards. The investments include water supply and a choice between basic road access, electricity, or small-scale irrigation. The average cost for all types of subprojects is expected to be US$28,000 and it will cover about 12,000 CDCs, who will implement most of these projects with technical assistance from MRRD’s provincial and district offices.
   ii. Urban Areas Block Grants (UABGs). The Independent Directorate of Local Governance (IDLG) – CCAP’s urban implementing agency - will have overall responsibility for the implementation of the urban areas block grants. This sub-component supports grants to 600 urban CDCs and 120 Gozars in four major cities (Herat, Mazar-i-Sharif, Kandahar, and Jalalabad) to fund small infrastructure works in urban settings. These four major cities are home to some 945,000 urban dwellers. The menu of options includes street upgrading, parks, lighting, provision of potable water, solid waste management arrangements, and women’s economic activities. Urban CDCs will receive US$70,000 and Gozars (clusters) will receive US$200,000 over the course of four years. This urban sub-component will support service delivery linkages between the CDC, cluster/Gozar, urban district, and municipal levels. All urban CDC and Gozar development plans will be validated and be consistent with overall municipality plans.

b) Component 2: Institution Building. This component supports: capacity building; technical assistance; and community facilitation services. In rural areas, MRRD will work with 14 facilitating partners (FPs) in undertaking capacity building and training of provincial and district staff to oversee, monitor and report upon project progress, Social Organizers (SOs), and engineering and technical support to communities across all 34 provinces. In urban areas, IDLG will work with UN Habitat, who will serve as an Oversight Consultant (OC) as well as four Facilitating Partners (FPs) on capacity building and training of municipality staff to supervise, monitor and report upon project progress are also included in this sub-component.

c) Component 3: Monitoring and Knowledge Learning. This component includes learning activities from village to national levels, exchange visits across communities, especially for women, and support
for thematic studies and evaluations. MRRD will be in charge of the activities described in this component for rural areas and IDLG will be in charge of activities in urban areas. It covers two sub-components: (a) citizens’ monitoring and scorecard – which covers a range of participatory monitoring and evaluation (M&E) tools, including the roll out of simple citizens’ scorecards to be completed by CDCs and Social Organizers to report upon the minimum service standards; and (b) studies and evaluations - there will also be several coordination and reporting arrangements, as well as a program of technical studies, thematic research, and evaluations that are supported through this component.

d) Component 4: Project Implementation and Management. The last CCAP component supports the management and oversight of the project at the national, provincial and district levels in rural areas and the municipal management units in the four regional hub cities. This includes areas such as policy and operational planning; capacity building; management information and reporting systems; grievance redress mechanisms; human resource management; communications; donor and field coordination, financial management and procurement functions; and safeguards oversight.

Implementation Status: The CCAP was declared effective on January 23rd, 2017 and is currently rated Satisfactory in terms of implementation progress and progress towards development objectives. The core project staff in both MRRD and IDLG have been hired. Recruitment of sub-national staff, facilitating partners, as well as field testing and refinement of the social mobilization strategy are all ongoing. All operations, technical, and social manuals have been completed. The core ‘training of trainers’ for FPs started in May and will be followed by the core Social Organizer (SO) training by FPs. The actual field roll out of the social mobilization process at the community level is expected to commence after Ramadan (in the last week of June). The first critical milestone in the mobilization would be completing the elections for the new CDCs, which would be done by end July allowing for the first set of grants to roll out in August. This implementation schedule allows for the additional activities in this AF to roll-out pretty much simultaneously with the parent CCAP.

ADDITIONAL COMPONENTS, ACTIVITIES AND PACKAGE OF SUPPORT:

The AF adds one additional component and one sub-component to the overall scope of the CCAP, while also expanding the scope of the remaining components on account of the geographic expansion. The details of these are provided below.

Geographic Expansion and Coverage. As part of the ‘Phase-1’ roll-out of the Citizens’ Charter National Priority Program, the original CCAP covers a total of 117 rural/peri-urban districts (1/3rd of the country) across all 34 provinces, as well as approximately half the catchment of 4 major cities – Herat, Mazar-e-Sharif, Kandahar, and Jalalabad. In terms of CDCs, this translates into 12,000 on the rural side and 600 CDCs (plus 120 Gozars or CDC clusters) on the urban side in the four cities. The funding under the AF will expand the overall coverage of the CCAP to cover additional high IDP/R concentration areas as well as provide extra support in the high IDP/R districts that were already in the original project’s catchment. Specifically, based on the available funding (including parallel financing from the Governments of Germany and Denmark) the geographic coverage of the AF is follows: (a) Rural/Peri-Urban Coverage: The AF will cover a total of 14 rural/peri-urban districts– half of which were already part of the original CCAP coverage. These districts have the highest estimated population of displaced persons (both IDPs and Returnees) among rural/peri-urban areas when taking the average of all existing data sources. (b) Urban Coverage: On the urban side, the AF will be used to expand and fully cover 2 cities – Jalalabad and Kandahar – that are also amongst the top 10 IDP/R hosting areas in the country based on existing data sources. With the expansion under the AF, an additional 250 CDCs and 50 Gozars will be added to the urban component of the CCAP.
New Subcomponent 3 (c): Enhanced Displacement Data Collection and Coordination Support – In addition to the new component described above, a new sub-component would be included in the overall Component 3 of the CCAP around M&E, Knowledge and Learning. This sub-component would adapt the social mobilization and community profiling that will be undertaken via the CCAP roll-out to include additional data around IDPs and Returnees. This includes getting a much clearer picture of where IDP/Rs are, what their vulnerability and livelihood profiles are, and what the core service delivery and infrastructure needs are for the communities hosting them. This enhanced data collection will fill several existing information gaps and help guide future IDP/R programs at both the national and regional level. The enhanced data collection will in the first instance be rolled out in the AF target districts, but subsequently will be applied nationwide through the main CCAP. This sub-component will also facilitate greater regional and cross-sectoral collaboration around the response to the displacement crisis through linkages with the DiREC high-level committee as well as various UN Agencies (UNOCHA, UNHCR, and IOM).

New Component-5: Social Inclusion and Maintenance and Construction Cash Grants (MCCG) The AF adds a new component (#5) to the CCAP, which will provide emergency short-term employment opportunities through labor intensive public works, as well as support for collective action activities beyond public works that are aimed to foster greater social inclusion and protect the ultra-poor/vulnerable in communities. The two sub-components in this new component are as follows:

a. Maintenance and Construction Cash Grants (MCCG) - the MCCG is a modified version of the Maintenance Cash Grant (MCG) program that was implemented by the MRRD under NSP-3 as part of the Jobs for Peace Initiative. Like MCG, the MCCG is meant to serve as a quick-disbursing emergency cash for work/labor-intensive public works scheme that is targeted to vulnerable households within the AF communities and managed through a community driven approach. The MCCG essentially expands the menu of public works covered by MCG to include ‘light construction’ – defined to be anything that can be built within a 6-month time frame and which involve a minimum labor to materials ratio of 60-40. The maintenance and construction could include things like road paving, maintenance of community infrastructure, building of boundary walls and toilets in clinics, and construction of additional classrooms in schools, etc. The roll out of the MCCG would be done through a household level targeting model in which eligible households will be selected using specific vulnerability criteria outlined in the well-being analysis that is part of the social mobilization process. This would be in line with the GoA’s proposed whole of community approach to reintegration of displaced people and returnees. A total of 115,000 vulnerable households are expected to benefit from the MCCG under the IDA and ARTF financed portion of the AF. This corresponds to an estimated 805,000 individuals (assuming an average family size of 7).

b. Social Inclusion Grants: Recognizing that there may actually be a number of households in the target communities where there is no able bodied man to undertake the MCCG work (e.g. women headed households or disabled households), a ‘social inclusion grant’ (SIG) will be provided alongside the MCCG roll out. The objective is to promote collective action and community philanthropy in an effort to provide sustainable welfare support for these ‘ultra-vulnerable’ households. Given that this would be quite a new and relatively untested approach, this is being treated as an “experimental/learning” subcomponent from which lessons would be drawn to inform future work on social protection and welfare targeting to these ultra-vulnerable groups. Mechanism: The SIG will take the form of a ‘matching grant’ up to a total value of $2000 per community that will be used to provide incentives for community philanthropy (particularly around festivals such as Eid). The combination of the matching grant and community donations will be used in the first instance to initiate a ‘food/grain bank’ for the ultra-poor in each of the targeted AF communities. It is expected that this will be replenished periodically with additional community donations. Targeting and identification of the
ultra-vulnerable (female-headed, disabled, etc.) households will be done the same way as in MCCG grants through the community “well-being analysis”. The social inclusion campaign will also promote the idea of other ‘in-kind’ forms of community philanthropy such as providing household repairs for ultra-poor HHs by youth volunteers.

Distribution of package of support: With regards to the overall package of support, in the 14 rural and peri-urban districts covered by the AF (and implemented by MRRD), both the regular CCAP rural area service standard (RASS) grant as well as the MCCG and social inclusion grants would be provided. This combination would provide both host communities and IDP/Rs access to basic services as well as short-term employment support as part of a longer vision of reintegration of displaced households. In the two target cities on the urban side, however, the AF would only provide urban area block grants as the parallel CGC program under UN Habitat was already providing labor-intensive public works in those areas. The sub-component on enhanced data collection would apply in all the AF communities. The AF will also link with other ongoing efforts on reintegration of IDP/Rs that the GoIRA is undertaking - for instance registration support being done with UNHCR, housing support led by the Housing Authority ARAZI, as well as different sectoral efforts (e.g. health, education, women's empowerment, etc.).

Component Name:
1. Service Standards Grants
   Comments (optional)
   Component budget increased from $290.3mn to $383.13mn on account of expansion under AF.

Component Name:
2. Institution Building
   Comments (optional)
   Component budget increased from $130.7mn to $139.6mn on account of expansion under AF and to incorporate institution building elements required for new Component 5 on MCCG and SIG.

Component Name:
3. M&E, Knowledge Learning
   Comments (optional)
   Component budget increased from $5 mn to $5.4mn on account of expansion under AF.

Component Name:
4. Project Implementation and Management
   Comments (optional)
   Component budget increased from $74mn to $91.41mn on account of expansion under AF.

Component Name:
5. MCCG and Social Inclusion Grants
   Comments (optional)
   New Component added as part of AF.

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

The project will be implemented throughout Afghanistan including rural and urban areas covering wide range of micro and small sub-projects. As noted previously, as part of the ‘Phase-1’ roll-out of the Citizens’ Charter National Priority Program, the original CCAP covers a total of 117 rural/peri-urban districts (1/3rd of the country) across all 34 provinces, as well as approximately half the catchment of 4 major cities – Herat, Mazar-e-Sharif, Kandahar, and Jalalabad. In terms of CDCs, this translates into 12,000 on the rural side and 600 CDCs (plus 120 Gozars or CDC clusters) on the urban side in the four cities. The AF will in turn cover 14 high IDP/R concentration districts on the rural/per-
urban side, and will saturate the two cities of Jalalabad and Kandahar.

A wide range of stakeholders and relevant ministries will be engaged to provide basic infrastructure services comprising micro-hydropower, basic road access, health and education services deliveries, water and sanitation facilities and agricultural supports. The Environmental and Social safeguards impacts will be minor and reversible in nature, while these issues will be managed through proposed safeguards framework approach. The framework will further spell out extra safeguards tools which will be used throughout the project life.

**F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists**

Obaidullah Hidayat(GEN06)
Qais Agah(GSU06)

**II. IMPLEMENTATION**

The overall institutional arrangements for the AF will remain the same as the parent CCAP. MRRD will be the main implementing agency (IA) for Citizens ‘Charter/CCAP in rural areas whereas the Independent Directorate of Local Governance (IDLG) through the Deputy Minister of Municipalities (DMM) will be the main IA in urban areas.

In early 2017, MRRD established a General Directorate for the Citizens’ Charter with sub-directorates for each of the four core services, which is responsible for the Citizens’ Charter’s minimum services, and one sub-directorate for coordination. In addition, MRRD has a single Provincial Management Unit (PMU), one for each of the 34 provinces located in existing MRRD provincial offices. The PMU is the primary unit responsible for direct monitoring of all Facilitating Partner activities on the ground, sample monitoring of all community and cluster level activities under the Citizens’ Charter related to the MRRD, review of all subproject proposals and disbursement requests under the investment windows to the communities/clusters, coordination with other line ministries and sectoral plans for the province, and database management and reporting. As of April 2017, 208 of 225 HQ positions for MRRD had been filled; and 938/2083 of the sub-national positions had been filled.

On the urban side, IDLG has established a Citizens’ Charter Central Project Implementation Unit (PIU) will be responsible for policy development and implementation as well as coordination with other national development programs. It will be the structure that is responsible for all management and administrative issues of the Citizens’ Charter as well as communications. The PIU will be supported by an Oversight Consultant (OC), for which UN Habitat was selected on a sole source basis. The PIU will be staffed with over 30 professional staff. Five additional advisors will be brought into the PIU as the OC role is phased out. At the sub-national level, four Provincial Management Units (PMUs) will oversee program implementation in each municipality (Mazar-i-Sharif, Herat, Jalalabad, Nangarhar.) The OC will oversee implementation for the first two years and then build the PIUs to takeover key responsibilities over that time. As of end April 2017, IDLG filled 109 of 141 positions at the central PIU (with another 22 in progress) and the PMUs in all four cities were fully staffed.

With the expansion in the coverage and the overall package of support (e.g. addition of new districts and of a new component - see later), additional staffing will be needed. Both agencies MRRD and IDLG will need to hire additional staff to deliver and manage the activities rural
and urban areas. The new MCCG and social inclusion component will be managed by MRRD social organizers (SOs) and engineers. As the current number of these is not sufficient additional SOs will need to be hired at the community level. Moreover, given the expansion in coverage of the CC as a whole, additional staffing will be required for both IDLG and MRRD at both national and sub-national levels.

In addition to the Government implementation structure, NGO facilitating partners (FPs) act as implementation arms and partners in delivering services particularly in remote areas. MRRD is to contract up to 14 firms to serve as the Citizens’ Charter FPs while IDLG will contract 4 FPs—one for each city under CCAP. The FP’s role includes: community and cluster of communities’ mobilization; CDC and Cluster CDC (CCDC) elections and office bearer elections; Community Participatory Monitoring (CPM) team selection; capacity building of CDC, CCDC, CPM members and communities in a variety of areas; participatory community empowerment; social audits; grievance handling; linkages; participatory community and cluster development planning, etc.

With the AF and expansion of activities in terms of scope and geographical coverage, the FP scope is also being expanded. The FPs assisting both MRRD and IDLG with social mobilization in the provinces in which the AF will be implemented, will require contract extensions. As the main CC package is being rolled out in all target areas, therefore only extensions to the scope of their work under the main CCAP is required for those provinces and two cities where the AF will be implemented. In addition, extra facilitation visits to implement the social inclusion grants will be required and added into the FP contract extensions. Also the number of social mobilizers and engineers will have to be ‘doubled up’ for the communities covered under the the new Maintenance and Construction Cash Grant (MCCG) component (see description later). It is understood though that the management of the MCCG will be done by MRRD social organizers and engineers who will take over the social mobilization in this regard once the FPs have completed the CDC election and the “Well-Being Analysis” for the community. The FPs would continue on with the mobilization work for the main Community Development Plan (CDP) and Rural Areas Service Standard (RASS) Grants.

Finally, at the community level the Community Development Councils (CDCs), Cluster CDCs, and Gozar Assemblies (urban areas) remain the vehicles for program implementation. The CDC will be established through democratic election processes to be outlined in the Citizens’ Charter Operations Manual and will be similar to the hamlet-based election process used in the NSP. Elected CDCs will have a term of four years in office. Elected members of the CDC will then elect the CDC’s office bearers, such as the Chairperson, the Vice Chairperson, the Secretary and the Treasurer. The positions of the Vice Chairperson and the Secretary will be reserved for women members only. The CDC will have two kinds of sub-committees, those that extend to all line ministries, such as operations and maintenance, project management, etc., and those specific to the mandates of the line ministries under the CC, such as the educational sub-committee, health sub-committee etc. Sub-committee membership will include both CDC and non-CDC members and the details of this have been outlined in the CCAP Operations Manual. The Operations Manual which in turn describes in detail the Project implementation and institutional arrangements will be revised to include an overall annex on the MCCG and social inclusion grants.
## III. SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safeguard Policies</th>
<th>Triggered?</th>
<th>Explanation (Optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01     | Yes        | Environmental Assessment OP/BP is triggered as the service delivery grants under component 1 of the parent project as well as Maintenance and Construction Cash Grant (MCCG) under AF may cause some level of adverse environmental impacts, including occupational health and safety issues. The ESMF of the parent project will address issues regarding the environmental impacts as well as spelling out the policy, guidelines and procedures to minimize and mitigate the likelihood of any negative impacts. It is anticipated that the proposed upgrading of small infrastructure works under Component 1 and activities under MCG will have minimal adverse impact on the environment. Such impacts are expected to be small, localized and reversible and thus, can effectively be managed with easily applied mitigation measures addressed in the Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs).

An assessment of the negative impacts can be classified into pre-construction, construction and post construction phases. Typical potential minor environmental impacts during rehabilitation, maintenance services and construction include, but are not limited to, soil and land degradation, increased dust/air pollution, noise level increase, water pollution and construction debris.

In compliance with World Bank’s safeguards policies, Afghanistan Environmental Law and evaluating Environmental Impact Regulation, sub-project with significant adverse impact should go for Environmental Clearance (EC) to National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA). CCAP sub-project are small-scaled and community demand driven therefore, it is expected to have very limited adverse impacts. However, the safeguards instruments will thoroughly investigate to ensure avoiding of Category A type of interventions.

Based on the scale and scope of the sub-projects, it is anticipated that EC will be taken
for a number of identical sample sub-projects from NEPA per province.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>This policy is not triggered, since the service delivery component and new MCCG component will not intrude on the identified natural habitat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forests OP/BP 4.36</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>This policy is not triggered, and under CCAP no as such activities will be financed which impose direct or indirect impact on the forests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest Management OP 4.09</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No herbicides will be used/finance to control weeds, and no such activities will be supported which may lead the exacerbate use of pesticides under the sub-projects of the CCAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Physical Cultural Resources WB OP 4.11 is triggered because it is possible that proposed investments might be located in areas and locations that may negatively impact local cultural properties and/or historical sites. Such possibilities are considered remote because of the small size of any sub-project investments, none of which involve excavation. The activities under Additional financing are not expected to impact known physical cultural resources; however, procedures for dealing with chance finds of historical or cultural artifacts are set out in Annex 4 of the ESMF. Cultural and Historical Management Plans will be prepared as required. Consultations on an advanced draft of the ESMF were held with a range of stakeholders in Kabul on June 29 2016. The minutes from those consultations are attached as an annex to the final project ESMF. The final version of the ESMF has been disclosed on MRRD and IDLG websites in Pashto and Dari. Gender will be mainstreamed in all components of the CCAP. Building on the NSP’s achievements in this regard and lessons learned, the CCAP will take proactive measures to ensure women’s active participation throughout the project cycle, including quotas for female participation in CDCs; female staffing; provision of gender-related trainings; involving women in community planning, decision-making, and monitoring processes; and sensitizing the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Triggered</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>This policy is not triggered as there are no Indigenous Peoples that meet the criteria of OP/BP 4.10 within the project area that could potentially benefit or be adversely affected by the Project's activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12 is triggered due to potential land acquisition for sub-project investments. Although no resettlement, major land acquisition and/or asset loss is expected, very small areas of land may be bought outright (willing buyer - willing seller) or acquired against community compensation to facilitate new or rehabilitation of small-scale infrastructure work under Component 1. In regard to the Government land transferred by the authorities to the project, documentation must be free of encroachments, squatters, competing claims or other encumbrances. In exceptional cases, minor voluntary land donation may occur in certain areas but only if there are no structures or assets on the land and the impact of the donation on the livelihood of the landowner is not significant (less than 10 percent). The voluntary nature of the donation will be fully documented and independently verified. A separate Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) has been developed to guide the preparation of Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) and Abbreviated RAP as needed. The RPF provide the guidance on the process of resettlement and land acquisition issues. The ESMF and RPF for the parent project which will be adopted for the additional financing to provide guidelines on land acquisition issues if any.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No dams will be affected by the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No project activities will take place on international waterways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There is no known disputed area in the project area of influence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. 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:

It is not anticipated that the proposed activities under component one, new subcomponent 3 C on data collection and coordination and new component 5 on MCCG and social inclusion grants under AF will have large scale adverse environmental or social impacts. The MCCG grant involve small maintenance of the existing infrastructure and construction of very small-scale infrastructure in rural Afghanistan. Likewise, the main CCAP sub-projects are small-scale and community demand driven therefore, are expected to have very limited adverse impacts. However, the safeguards instruments will thoroughly investigate issues to ensure avoiding interventions posing negative impact on the environment and the surroundings. Issues related to human health including labor and community health and hygiene would have some temporary impact which can be dealt with application of the existing safeguards management tools, guidelines and instruments as described in the ESMF of the parent project. Although no resettlement is involved in the project, nor is there major land acquisition and/or asset loss expected, there may be very small areas of land, which may be bought outright (willing buyer - willing seller) or acquired against community compensation to facilitate new or rehabilitation of small-scale infrastructure work under Component 1 and the MCCG grant under AF. The RPF for the parent project will be adopted for the additional financing to provide guidelines on land acquisition issues if any.

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

The proposed activities under MCCG grant of the CCAP project activities are not expected to cause any potential indirect or long term negative impacts because appropriate institutional arrangements for environmental and social management would be put in place throughout project implementation. The provision of MCCG element under Additional Financing is expected to have significant positive livelihood impacts on Afghan returnees.

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

The parent CCAP builds off of the 14 years of successful implementation of the National Solidarity Program (NSP) in Afghanistan using a community-driven development (CDD) approach. Experience from NSP has shown that no major violations of safeguards policies occurred. Since, the same CDD model will be applied and enhanced under CCAP and will be applied throughout the country, therefore, no specific project alternative is sought at this stage. Each subproject will undergo through social and environmental screening, thus the alternatives at community level will be set out during subproject design.

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.

Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development (MRRD) has over the years gained considerable experience and improved its capacity in ensuring proper implementation supervision and monitoring of safeguard issues in projects. MRRD has been implementing several World Bank funded project such as NSP, Afghanistan Rural Access Project (ARAP), as well as the parent AREDP project, and has long history of working with donors. The Safeguard Unit under CCAP consists of social and environment safeguard specialists and has...
trained staff to manage the environmental and social concerns from both the managerial and technical perspectives. The Implementing agencies have established Grievance Redress Committees (GRCs), where to supervise implementation and monitoring, of ESMF as well as report the level of safeguards compliances. The safeguards staff have specific terms of reference (ToRs) to ensure their effectiveness. The ongoing CCAP Project includes training for staff on all aspects of the ESMF and RPF, including preparation of site-specific ESMPs and RAP monitoring and reporting on progress of Environmental and Social 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 major stakeholders are NEPA, provincial & districts authorities, relevant NGOs, relevant department of key ministries and particularly the relevant local communities of provinces and districts.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other

| Date of receipt by the Bank | 18-Jul-2016 |
| Date of submission to InfoShop | 10-Aug-2016 |
| For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors | |
| "In country" Disclosure | |
| Afghanistan | 10-Aug-2016 |

Comments: All dates provided are for parent CCAP project since these instruments remain the same under the AF.

Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process

| Date of receipt by the Bank | 18-Jul-2016 |
| Date of submission to InfoShop | 10-Aug-2016 |
| "In country" Disclosure | |
| Afghanistan | 10-Aug-2016 |

Comments: All dates provided are for parent CCAP project since these instruments remain the same under the AF.

If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.

If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment
### Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?
- **Yes**
- **NA**
- **No**

### If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?
- **Yes**
- **NA**
- **No**

### Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?
- **Yes**
- **NA**
- **No**

---

### OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is physical displacement/relocation expected?</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### All Safeguard Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
impacts and measures related to safeguard policies? | Yes | [X] | No | [] | NA | []

V. Contact point

World Bank

Contact: Janmejay Singh
Title: Lead Social Development Specia

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name: Ministry of Finance
Contact: Elkil Ahmad Hakimi
Title: Minister of Finance
Email: eklil.hakimi@gmail.com

Implementing Agencies

Name: IDLG
Contact: Abdul Baqi Popal
Title: Deputy Minister
Email: abpopal@yahoo.co.uk

Name: Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development (MRRD)
Contact: Shaheer Shahriar
Title: Deputy Minister
Email: shaheer.shahriar@mrrd.gov.af

VI. For more information contact:

The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 473-1000
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