GOVERNMENT OF UKRAINE

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN

Eastern Ukraine: Reconnect, Recover, Revitalize (3R) Project

Ministry for Reintegration of Temporarily Occupied Territories of Ukraine

State Agency of Automobile Roads of Ukraine - Ukravitodor

March 2020
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACRONYMS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Project description</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Objectives and Scope of Stakeholder Engagement Plan</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK AND INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. National Legislation and Regulations on Environmental and Social Protection</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. World Bank Environmental and Social Standards on Stakeholder Engagement</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Scope and Approach</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Selection of Stakeholder Groups</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3. Stakeholder Dialogue during Preparatory Phase</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4. Stakeholder Dialogue Outcomes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5. Stakeholder Engagement during Implementation</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6. Communication with Beneficiaries</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MONITORING AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1. Roles and Responsibilities</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. Estimated Budget for SEP</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. GRIEVANCE REDRESS MECHANISM</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1. Definition of the GRM</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2. GRM Purpose and Scope</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3. Procedures and Channels to Make Complaints</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4. Awareness Building</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5. Staff and Capacity</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6. Transparency, Monitoring and Reporting</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ANNEXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annex</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANNEX A – Grievance/ Inquiry Record</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNEX B – Stakeholder Dialogues Logs &amp; Photos</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNEX C – Stakeholder Discussion Guide</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFM</td>
<td>Beneficiary feedback mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS</td>
<td>Environment and Social Safeguards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMF</td>
<td>Environment and Social Management Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCV</td>
<td>Fragility, Conflict and Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCA</td>
<td>Government Controlled Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoU</td>
<td>Government of Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRM</td>
<td>Grievance Redress Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Implementing Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMP</td>
<td>Labor Management Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED</td>
<td>Local Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOSA</td>
<td>Luhansk Oblast State and Civil-Military Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDETA</td>
<td>Ministry for Development of Economy, Trade and Agriculture of Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRTOT</td>
<td>Ministry for Reintegration Temporarily Occupied Territories of Ukraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGCA</td>
<td>Non-Government Controlled Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIP</td>
<td>Other Interested Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP</td>
<td>Project Affected Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIU</td>
<td>Project Implementation Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEP</td>
<td>Stakeholder Engagement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFP</td>
<td>Total Factor Productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAD</td>
<td>State Agency of Automobile Roads of Ukraine -Ukravtodor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UXO</td>
<td>Unexploded ordnance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>The World Bank Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YL</td>
<td>Youth Liaisons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY

The nearly six-year old conflict in Eastern Ukraine has taken a toll on the local population with adverse impacts on local economic development, peoples’ livelihoods, mental health and overall social cohesion. Between 2013 and 2018 unemployment has doubled in the Government Controlled Areas (GCAs) of the Donetsk region and tripled in the Luhansk region. Reduced access to lucrative markets in the Luhansk and Donetsk urban centers that are now in the Non-Government Controlled Areas (NGCAs) and dependency on seasonal production is straining the local agriculture sector and smallholders whose livelihoods depend on the extra income they can make from sale of produce. Low capacity to attract outside investments further jeopardizes existing agricultural infrastructure in some cases with irreversible losses. Access to farmland, which was and continues to be an important source of income for many families living close to the contact line, has been severely curtailed due to landmines. Poor road conditions damaged by the conflict related traffic flows are disadvantaging transport for all but especially for local producers, rural households, women and the elderly in their access to healthcare, childcare and other public services.

This document presents a Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) for the Eastern Ukraine: Reconnect, Recover, Revitalize – the “3R Project”. The 3R project contributes to the Government of Ukraine (GoU)’s higher-level policy objective of national outreach and development support to Eastern Ukraine to promote recovery, connectivity and revitalization of conflict-affected regions. The investment aims to have a ‘demonstrative effect’ to underscore national commitment to the development of the GCAs and to highlight the benefits of socio-economic connectivity to NGCAs under a future integration scenario. With industrial losses due to conflict, multi-sectoral investments under the 3R Project will promote recovery and development of the agriculture sector and rehabilitation of roads as a future engine of growth and socio-economic opportunity in the Luhansk Oblast regional economy. Project activities also align with key aspects of Ukraine’s national reform agenda including decentralization and land reforms.

Stakeholder engagement and participatory approaches in project implementation are known to catalyze more efficient and effective achievement of projects’ results. The following SEP outlines planned participatory engagement activities to ensure that national and local project partners, affected communities and vulnerable groups, are adequately involved in all stages of the 3R project. Pro-active stakeholder engagement and participation will assist in the management of risks but also in the timely disclosure of relevant information and in gaining stakeholders’ cooperation and support for the project. Enabling individuals and communities to voice their ideas and concerns will further preserve their dignity, rights and overall social cohesion in the region. The SEP also ensures that vulnerable groups are amply engaged and that fragility, conflict and violence sensitivity is appropriately integrated in the proposed activities. The community outreach activities outlined in this SEP will also effectively communicate to the broader region information about the national government’s financial contribution to support economic recovery in Eastern Ukraine to promote the 3R Project’s broader goals around national outreach, confidence building and support to conflict-affected populations.

The SEP has been prepared and will be implemented by the Ministry for Reintegration of Temporarily Occupied Territories and Internally Displaced Persons (MRTOT) and the State Agency of Automobile Roads of Ukraine (Ukravtodor). Luhansk regional administration and local government bodies in project affected areas (including Severodonetsk City, Starobilsk Rayon, Svatove Rayon, Troitske Rayon, Bilokurakyne Rayon) actively participated in the SEP’s preparation.

Structurally, the SEP will outline: i) a stakeholder map and analysis; (ii) participatory instruments for engagement; (iii) issues raised during stakeholder consultations in the preparatory phase of the project; (iv) monitoring, reporting and disclosure of information processes as well as roles and responsibilities

---

on how the former will be implemented; and lastly, (v) grievance and redress mechanism modalities that will allow citizens to voice and promptly resolve their concerns throughout the project’s implementation. This SEP is a living document with possibilities to be adjusted as needed. It will be disclosed prior to project appraisal. It will be periodically updated, its progress will monitored and changes will be validated throughout project implementation. At the close of the project, SEP results and effectiveness will be evaluated.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Project description

The development objective of the Eastern Ukraine: Reconnect, Recover, Revitalize (3R) Project is to strengthen transport connectivity, support agriculture sector recovery, and promote community engagement in project areas in Eastern Ukraine.

The 3R Project reinforces national commitment to recovery and development of Eastern Ukraine and highlights the benefits of socio-economic connectivity in support of a future settlement. With industrial losses in the Donbas, multi-sectoral investments under the 3R Project aim to promote agricultural sector development in rural areas in Luhansk GCAs that could help stimulate future growth and opportunity in the region. Prioritized investments also reflect intensive stakeholder dialogues undertaken during 3R project preparation with national, regional and local officials, agri-industry, diverse agricultural producers, agricultural communities, women, IDPs, veterans, and youth in project areas. Recognizing the socio-economic and administrative characteristics of Luhansk GCAs, the project will include the following components:

Component 1: RECONNECT - Roads Investments to Link Rural Communities to Processing, Markets, and Services. Component 1 will support rehabilitation of roads in Luhansk Oblast in support of the agricultural sector; and to connect rural communities to urban service centers in Luhansk GCAs. Poor and deteriorating local roads have been a key bottleneck to agricultural logistics and supply chains and the broader development of the region. Component 1 prioritizes road investments that link farmers to processors, markets, and service centers in Luhansk GCAs. The target road network will be rehabilitated to a category 2-3 standard which is a two-lane road with safety specifications including side crash barriers where required. The project will finance all necessary road infrastructure such as bridges, interchanges, and railway crossing, safety measures, site supervision of civil works, and equipment. Additionally, for protection of the investments, the project will include installation of weigh-in-motion stations and speed cameras. The Component will also include activities to engage local administration and communities in project areas on road use, road safety measures, and will provide technical assistance to support development of ‘feeder roads’ to the network. This will promote local ownership and sustainability of transport investments.

Component 2: RECOVER - Agriculture Investments to Support Sector Recovery and Modernization. Component 2 will complement the connectivity investments of Component 1 through select agricultural sub-projects that address some of the conflict’s impacts on the agricultural sector in Luhansk GCAs, including loss of access to agricultural services, processing facilities, product testing and local urban markets, as well as limited technology and value chain to market support for the Oblast’s many small producers. Agricultural investments will include: (a) an Agriculture Logistics and Service Hub in Starobilsk City, as the agricultural center of the region and including a grain/oil seed elevator; a small grain/oil seed quality testing facility; an office building for administration and business development support; an innovative online trading platform to link producers and traders; and an agricultural services support area; (b) a Regional Agricultural Testing and Food Safety Laboratory to address a critical gap following the loss of access to the agricultural product testing and food safety management services due to the conflict; and (c) Agricultural cluster development for small household-level producers. Community-based Cluster support will facilitate the transition from current subsistence production towards more organized and market-oriented production practices, including value-chain to market support to an estimated 5 to 10 clusters of 100 to 150 small household-level producers.

Component 3 - REVITALIZE: Implementation Support Platform. Component 3 will support development of an implementation support platform for project investments recognizing the capacity constraints, deficits in state-citizen dialogue, and requirements for national-regional-local cooperation in effective delivery of 3R project activities. Component 3 will finance Project Management activities for the Ministry for Reintegration of Temporarily Occupied Territories. Component 3 will also include: Luhansk regional public-private investment forums to gather project beneficiaries, international and
Ukrainian private sector representatives, international and domestic financial institutions, GoU representatives, and development partners to raise awareness and promote investment opportunities in the region; user/beneficiary surveys and social audits to provide ongoing feedback on project design and implementation (project processes, budgets and outcomes) for infrastructure investments under Components 1 and 2; and support establishment of a 3R Project beneficiary feedback mechanism (BFM), including Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM). To educate communities and stakeholders in 3R project areas on the objectives, procedures, purpose, and opportunities associated with the Project and to emphasize the 3R Project as a national investment to support economic recovery in eastern Ukraine, Component 3 will also finance strategic communications activities. The implementation platform supported by Component 3 will promote sustainability and possible future scale-up and expansion of Project investments to additional sectors and geographic areas in Eastern Ukraine.

Results Chain for the 3R Project

At national level, MRTOT and the UAD constitute the Project’s lead partner institutions while the Luhansk Oblast State and Civil-Military Administration (LOSA) and corresponding local government bodies in five project sites will act as its complementary partners at local and community level. Other government partners supporting the project will include the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry for Development of Economy, Trade and Agriculture of Ukraine (MDETA).

Basic Characteristics of Project Affected Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Site</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Key Project Activity (preliminary to be confirmed during implementation)</th>
<th>Key Stakeholder Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severodonetsk City</td>
<td>113,616 (2018)</td>
<td>• Regional Agricultural Testing and Food Safety Laboratory</td>
<td>• Oblast Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2. Objectives and Scope of Stakeholder Engagement Plan

The stakeholder engagement process pertains to the meaningful involvement of, and communication with, project partners, project affected populations, including identified vulnerable and disadvantaged populations and other interested parties over the life cycle of the project. Utilizing a range of participatory instruments, a SEP enables: i) the sharing of information and establishment of rapport with project partners and local populations affected by the project’s activities, ii) identification of their needs and interests, iii) detection of any environmental and social risks pertaining to the project, as well as iv) to outline ongoing activities that seek to mitigate the identified risks in a systematic manner.

Active stakeholder engagement supports the development of strong, constructive and responsive relationships that are important for successful management of environmental and social risks identified in a project. Communicating early, often, and clearly with stakeholders helps to manage mutual expectations and avoid potential conflict, and project delays.

The SEP presented outlines the stakeholder engagement undertaken within the 3R Project. It is structured in five parts: (i) stakeholder identification and analysis; (ii) planning on ways to engage; (iii) consultation with stakeholders; (iv) monitoring, reporting and disclosure of information; and (v) grievance and redress mechanism modalities.

The SEP was prepared and it will be implemented by the MRTOT and the UAD. The LOSA and respective local government bodies in the project area actively participated and are expected to do so in the plan’s implementation.

The MRTOT and UAD will duly disseminate the SEP to all relevant project partners and interested parties at national and local level. Due to the dynamic context, the SEP is designed with the possibility of being amended as justifiably needed.

2. NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK AND INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS
2.1. National Legislation and Regulations on Environmental and Social Protection

Ukrainian citizens’ right to participate in the administration of state affairs and in all local referendums is granted by the Constitution of Ukraine, Articles 38. Article 40 of the Constitution also enables all citizens to file individual or collective petitions, or to personally appeal to bodies of state power, bodies of local self-government, and to the officials and officers of these bodies. People’s rights relating to access to information, consultation and engagement is further recognized in three Ukrainian legislative and regulatory acts.2

The first constitutes the Law of Ukraine on Access to Public Information (2011), the second, Law on Appeals № 47 (1996) and the third is vested in the Decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine (November 3, 2010) No. 996 “Order of the public consultations on the issues of development and implementation of the state policy”3. The Law on the Access to Public Information (2011), determines procedures for exercising and securing the right of every person’s access to information of public interest possessed by government agencies and other providers of public information as identified by this Law. In Article 3 the law also stipulates guarantees of observance where providers’ obligation to:

1) provide and disclose information;
2) to establish special information services and/or systems within information providing entities to secure access to public information in accordance with the established procedures;
3) to simplify procedures for submission of requests and receipt of information;
4) free access to open sessions of government agencies;
5) parliamentary, civil, and state control over observance of the right to access to public information and information access modes;
6) legal responsibility for violation of the legislation on access to public information.

The Law on Appeals № 47 (1996) further grants Ukrainian citizens the right “to apply to state bodies, local self-government, associations of citizens, enterprises, institutions, organizations regardless of ownership, mass media, officials according to their functional responsibilities with comments, complaints and proposals concerning their statutory activities, a statement or petition for the exercise of their socio-economic, political and personal rights and legitimate interests, and a complaint about their violation.” The Law of Appeals was reinforced in 2015 by the citizens’ right to file electronic petitions on corresponding portals instituted for this purpose by the President Administration, Parliament, the Government (“central authorities”), and hundreds of local bodies of self-government (“local authorities”). The last, third decree of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine ensures that the public is consulted on the issues of development and implementation of state policies.

All three regulatory acts and the Constitution of Ukraine will serve as the base reference for informing the stakeholder engagement plan and its activities throughout the project’s implementation.

2.2. World Bank Environmental and Social Standards on Stakeholder Engagement

The 3R Project is financed through the World Bank’s proceeds, and as such it will apply World Bank’s Environmental and Social Framework (ESF 2018) and its 10 Environmental and Social Standards (ESS) to ensure the execution of due diligence on the application of safeguards within the project. Specifically, this SEP is prepared following Environmental and Social Standard 10 on Stakeholder Engagement and Information Disclosure, which recognizes “the importance of open and transparent engagement between the Borrower and project stakeholders as an essential element of good international practice”. ESS10 emphasizes that effective stakeholder engagement can significantly improve the environmental and social sustainability of projects, enhance project acceptance, and make a significant contribution to successful project design and implementation.

---

2 https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/254%D0%BA/96-%D0%82%D1%80.
3 http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/996-2010-%D0%BF/print1390316109400037.
As defined by the 2018 ESF and ESS10, stakeholder engagement is an inclusive process conducted throughout the project life cycle. Where properly designed and implemented, it supports the development of strong, constructive and responsive relationships that are important for successful management of a project’s environmental and social risks. Key elements of ESS10 include:

• “Stakeholder engagement is most effective when initiated at an early stage of the project development process, and is an integral part of early project decisions and the assessment, management and monitoring of the project.”
• “Borrowers will engage with stakeholders throughout the project life cycle, commencing such engagement as early as possible in the project development process and in a timeframe that enables meaningful consultations with stakeholders on project design. The nature, scope and frequency of stakeholder engagement will be proportionate to the nature and scale of the project and its potential risks and impacts.
• Borrowers will engage in meaningful consultations with all stakeholders. Borrowers will provide stakeholders with timely, relevant, understandable and accessible information, and consult with them in a culturally appropriate manner, which is free of manipulation, interference, coercion, discrimination and intimidation.
• The process of stakeholder engagement will involve the following, as set out in further detail in this ESS: (i) stakeholder identification and analysis; (ii) planning how the engagement with stakeholders will take place; (iii) disclosure of information; (iv) consultation with stakeholders; (v) addressing and responding to grievances; and (vi) reporting to stakeholders.
• The Borrower will maintain and disclose as part of the environmental and social assessment, a documented record of stakeholder engagement, including a description of the stakeholders consulted, a summary of the feedback received and a brief explanation of how the feedback was taken into account, or the reasons why it was not.”

Disclosure:

The disclosure process associated with the release of project appraisal documentation, as well as the accompanying SEP will be implemented within the following timeframe:

- Placement of the ESMF, Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF), Labor Management Procedures (LMP) and SEP in public domain prior to appraisal
- Any follow up public consultation meetings in project affected communities and with other stakeholders to present and discuss the ESMF and RPF– by appraisal. However, given the evolving situation around COVID-19 in Ukraine and around the world, face-to-face consultations are not advisable. Alternative means of consultations should be explored by implementing entities, and they will follow the latest public health guidelines of Ukraine closely in order to adjust the format of consultations. These alternative types of consultations could be but not limited to e-mail, snail mail letters, social media, local and national gazettes, radio, and other means.
- Addressing stakeholder feedback received on the entire disclosure package

The outline presented in the table below summarizes the main stakeholders of the project, types of information to be shared with stakeholder groups, as well as specific means of communication and methods of notification. Table below provides a description of stakeholder engagement and disclosure methods recommended to be implemented during stakeholder engagement process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Project Information Shared</th>
<th>Means of communication/disclosure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local population in the Project Area of Influence</td>
<td>ESMF, RPF, LMP, Stakeholder Engagement Plan; GRM; Regular updates on Project development.</td>
<td>Public notices. Electronic publications and press releases on the Project web-site. Dissemination of hard copies at designated public locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Group</td>
<td>Communication Channels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental and community-based organizations</td>
<td>ESMF, RPF, LMP, Stakeholder Engagement Plan; GRM; Press releases in the local media. Consultation meetings (where necessary). Information leaflets and brochures. Separate focus group meetings with vulnerable groups, as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government authorities and agencies</td>
<td>ESMF, RPF, LMP, and Stakeholder Engagement Plan; GRM; Regular updates on Project development; Additional types of Project’s information if required for the purposes of regulation and permits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related businesses and enterprises</td>
<td>ESMF, RPF, LMP, Stakeholder Engagement Plan; GRM; Updates on Project development and tender/procurement announcements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Employees</td>
<td>ESMF, RPF, LMP, Stakeholder Engagement Plan; Project level and employee-level GRMs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN

3.1 Scope and Approach

The 3R project design focuses on robust stakeholder engagement mechanisms through community-informed selection of investments, multiple channels for feedback between implementing agencies and target communities, beneficiary-led accountability mechanisms, and participatory monitoring. A key objective of the 3R project is to build confidence and trust in conflict-affected communities alongside infrastructure investments. To this effect, a range of participatory instruments and communication channels will be used to ensure meaningful consultation, active involvement and means of receiving feedback from project affected parties (PAPs) and other interested parties (OIPs) throughout the project cycle. As the project will be implemented in a geographic area located close to the conflict line, FCV sensitivity will ensure that vulnerable populations - women, IDPs, veterans, young people and the elderly have an easy access to project documents and information, as well as opportunities to express their views, feedback and grievances. A built-in robust GRM within the project will also ensure that project affected populations can accessibly file their complaints and to receive timely resolution for them. The following sections elaborate further on these modalities.

3.2 Selection of Stakeholder Groups
Project stakeholders are ‘people who have a role in the Project, or could be affected by the Project, or who are interested in the Project’. 3R Project stakeholders are grouped into primary stakeholders who are individuals, groups or local communities that may be affected by the Project, positively or negatively, and directly or indirectly especially those who are directly affected, including those who are disadvantaged or vulnerable, and secondary stakeholders, who are broader stakeholders who may be able to influence the outcome of the Project because of their knowledge about the affected communities or political influence over them. Thus, stakeholder mapping and selection of stakeholders for consultations was guided by two broad categories of stakeholders – i) PAP, and ii) other interested parties.

PAPs include individuals or groups, who are likely to be affected by the project due to actual impacts (positive or negative) or potential risks to their physical environment, health, security, cultural practices, well-being, or livelihoods. In the context of the 3R Project, key PAP at national level include: the Presidential Administration, MRTOT, UAD and MDETA. At the regional and local level, the identified PAP include:

- LOSCMA
- Representatives of local government/ rayon/ hromada authorities in project areas – Severodonetsk City, Starobilsk rayon, Svatove Rayon, Troitske Rayon, Bilovodks, Bilokurakyne, and other rayons in Luhansk Oblast/ agricultural areas
- Representatives of larger agri and food producing concerns, Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SME), local producers, wholesalers, vendors, market organizers, landowners’ associations/unions
- Smallholder farmers, including female farmers, market vendors
- Representatives of Vocational / Technical Institutes-Schools, and students
- Women, IDPs, veterans.
- Vulnerable and disadvantaged groups who may be negatively or positively affected by 3R Project activities Local non-governmental organizations (NGO) that represent local residents and other local interest groups, and act on their behalf.

Community representatives may also provide helpful insight into the local settings and act as main conduits for dissemination of the Project-related information and as a primary communication/liaison link between the Project and targeted communities and their established networks. The legitimacy of such representatives may stem both from their official elected status and their informal and widely.

Other interested parties (OIPs) refer to individuals, groups, or organizations with an interest in the project, due to the project location, its characteristics, its impacts, or matters related to public interest. In the context of the 3R Project, the OIPs involve other donors working in the project area including USAID, UNDP, UN Women and KfW.

Defining Vulnerable and Disadvantaged Populations using a FCV lens

Vulnerability and vulnerability risks are adverse contextual or project-inflicted impacts that disproportionately affect the poor or vulnerable groups. While the livelihoods of the entire population living close to the contact line have been negatively affected by the conflict, households with children (one in three is below the poverty line), single mothers with young children, unemployed women, female pensioners, veterans and IDPs4 are among the most adversely affected. However, given the nature of the proposed 3R Project activities, these underlying issues will in fact be addressed by the Project, and will not further contribute to any of the preexisting social challenges.

---

4 For IDP women living in villages employment is 17% lower than it is among IDP women living in larger cities, they are more likely to represent single-headed households, and are more reliant on pensions (42%) and social assistance (32%).
The majority of vulnerable populations suffer from compounded vulnerabilities related to displacement, unemployment, unstable incomes, dependence on social assistance, residing in rural areas with poor access to public services, among others. Due to the prevalent involvement of males in combat, many women have become the sole providers for their families and assuming traditional roles as caretakers for children, the elderly, and the disabled. This restrict their freedom of movement and livelihood opportunities. In Eastern Ukraine many female-headed households have consequently become dependent on remittances from abroad. Veterans’ and IDPs’ vulnerability stems from their higher unemployment rates, absence of savings, debts, financial pressure, uncertain access to land and experience of psychological trauma which can negatively affect their capacity to integrate into everyday productive life. According to International Organization of Migration data, 271 367 IDPs are registered in the Luhansk region. (See figure above).

The conflict has also caused the disruption of service delivery connections, eroded state-citizen trust, and has led to the presence of a large number of vulnerable displaced persons and veterans, which has increased concern about the future development prospects of the region. Support for Ukraine’s reform agenda in Luhansk Oblast GCAs is weak and well below the national average. Citizen trust in central and local institutions is low and perceptions of poor accountability of government institutions are pronounced. Levels of “Soviet nostalgia” (preferring the paternalistic socio-economic ecosystem under the Soviet Union) and civic fatigue are also among the highest in the country. Unemployment in GCAs has reached 17.5 percent among working age individuals in 2018, the highest of any oblast. Out-migration from Luhansk averaged 4,000 to 6,000 individuals per annum during the 2008-2013 pre-conflict period but has since increased to more than 13,000 persons per year. The resulting mix of lack of trust in Government institutions, risk aversion, out-migration, and alienation makes engagement in the region challenging.

3.3 Stakeholder Dialogue and Outcomes During Project Preparation

As noted, a range of participatory instruments is proposed in order to provide the project affected communities with ample opportunities to participate, share their ideas and concerns when decisions pertaining to the project are made.

Stakeholder engagement during project preparation involved several rounds of consultations with identified stakeholders. These consultations were conducted on site in the Luhansk Oblast over three missions conducted by UAD, MRTOT and the World Bank between October 2019 and February 2020. The objective of these early consultations was solicit stakeholders’ views on the project design and potential risks that may be faced. Participatory instruments used for the consultations included: semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, smaller format public hearings and project site visits. Targeted questionnaires for different stakeholder groups and safeguards related questions were developed to guide the consultations and discussions (Template in Annex C). Particular attention was paid to

6 Spear et al. (2016), p. 60.
7 This section drawn from SEED (Centre for Sustainable Peace and Democratic Development (SEED), Ukraine survey work in 2018 and 2019 survey data at www.scoreforpeace.org.
8 ILO, Unemployment Data by Region, 2018.
ensuring that vulnerable populations were actively engaged in the consultation process. At the beginning of each consultation information about the project was disclosed and explained to all participants, related documents were also circulated. The discussions with vulnerable groups were guided by the following questions and their answers are taken into account in the design of the 3R Project components:

- What are the needs and challenges that the groups face in sustaining their livelihoods and overall wellbeing? What forms of support and deliverables do they expect to gain from the project?
- What might prevent them from gaining access to project information and from being engaged? (e.g. language, lack of transportation to events, disability, lack of understanding of process).
- What additional support or resources may they need to remove existing barriers for participation?
### 3.4.1 Stakeholder Dialogue with National and Local Government Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Participatory Instrument/ Date, location</th>
<th>Key Issues Raised</th>
<th>Needs and Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MRTOT             | Stakeholder dialogue Several Rounds of bilateral discussions held (multiple forums and consultations 10.2019; 11.2019; 1.2020 and 2.2020) | • Interest in developing an investment platform to support development of conflict-affected areas  
• Supportive of agricultural focus of project alongside transport investments to support rural communities/Luhank GCAs  
• Importance of building relationships with regional and local authorities and communities for implementation  
• It is important to ensure that each Component has a clearly defined local counterpart with whom MRTOT can work, especially referring to C2 activities  
• As a new Ministry, interest in capacity building support and technical assistance during project implementation.  
• Particular interest in ensuring IDPs and veterans are included as beneficiaries | Co-implementation of 3R project with UAD; utilizing 3R project to establish the Ministry as a facilitator of investments/Eastern Ukraine conflict-affected areas |
| UAD               | Stakeholder dialogue and Several Rounds of bilateral discussions held (multiple forums and consultations 10.2019; 11.2019; 1.2020 and 2.2020) | • Confirmed project alignment with key road sections in accordance to the State road rehabilitation plan in Luhansk Oblast in support of the agricultural sector; and to connect rural communities to urban service centers in Luhansk GCAs;  
• In need of additional financing to compliment state budget plan on roads rehabilitation in Luhansk GCAs  
• Interested in providing technical assistance to support local administration and communities in 3R project areas to better utilize, manage, and sustain roads investments | Co-implementation of 3R project with MRTOT |
<p>| MDETA             | Consultations and Semi-structured interview | • Interested and agreed to provide technical support and advice MRTOT to develop and implement investment activities directed on agriculture sector development in the Eastern Ukraine | Agriculture products value chain development; ensuring market access and trade development |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.2.2020</td>
<td>Confirmed the need of establishing Regional Laboratory on Food Safety and Consumer Protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.1.2020</td>
<td>Raised importance on the value chain development; strengthening market access, raise of productivity and support agriculture-related SME’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>State Service of Ukraine for Food Safety and Consumer Protection</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2.2020</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion and Semi-structured interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2.2020</td>
<td>As a result of the armed conflict in Eastern Ukraine, a modern regional laboratory accredited in accordance with ISO/IEC 17025 is located NGCA</td>
<td>Construction/ renovation and equipping Regional Laboratory on Food Safety and Consumer Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None of the accredited laboratories, situated in the GCA, is adequately equipped to conduct up-to-date laboratory studies (tests) vital for ensuring public health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting epidemiological and epizootiological well-being in the Eastern Ukraine by construction and technologically equipping a regional state laboratory of the State Service of Ukraine on Food Safety and Consumer Protection in Luhansk Oblast.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ministry of Finance of Ukraine</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.11.2019</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirmed need and importance of Government of Ukraine approach and agenda to support conflict-affected population</td>
<td>Ensuring compliance with the State Budget Plan and State Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreed with regards to the lack of investments for the Luhansk Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supported proposed project direction to support agriculture sector in parallel to roads rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affirm proposed project implementation structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location and Focus</td>
<td>Key Concerns and Priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Representatives of LOSA Donetsk Oblast State and Civil-Military (DOSA) representatives** | - Over-riding concern is the need for improvement of local road infrastructure and overall connectivity to markets in the rest of Ukraine and abroad.  
- Poor transport connectivity and disruptions in agricultural supply chains have resulted in low profits for outputs and high priced inputs.  
- Little incentive for agriculture investment or value chain development without improved connectivity  
- Lack of access to traditional storage and processing facilities, now in NGCAs poses an economic barrier to growth of the disrupted Luhansk Oblast agricultural sector  
- Other priorities included waste processing facilities (including for agri-industrial businesses); water treatment and sewage; tertiary medical facilities; district heating and IDP housing, and “softer side” investments in community infrastructure to stem out migration and improve the quality of life and services in rural communities  
- New EU food safety standards were introduced, but there are no means to ensure farmers’ and beekeepers’ compliance as there is no regional food safety lab. Former regional lab was located in the Luhansk city which is now inaccessible as it is in the NGCA.  
- Produce has to be sent away to be tested to other regions – Kharkiv (3 hours away) or to Dnipro (5 hours away).  
- MRTOT requested LOSA to explain the expected economic and social impact and financing of Food Safety Lab (FSL) requested.  
- FSL will service 12 000 SMEs, 472 local schools, 5000 households, create 100 jobs (per regulatory quota), salaries will be paid from state budget.  
- LOSA in turn requested more clarification about the financing instrument(s) available by the MRTOT. |
| **Starobilsk City Council and Rayon Administration** | - Key gaps facing local farmers: poor local roads and logistics, limited access to markets and volume of buyers for local goods;  
- Former wholesale market was located near the state road to Luhansk City—conflict has cut off local producers from key markets now in NGCA;  
- Local labour capacity and human resources are underutilized.  
- Current production sufficient to sustain local demand, but insufficient for LED, farmers need access to wider Ukrainian, EU markets.  
- To stimulate LED, the Starobilsk City would like to build a Multi-sectoral Agro-logistical Hub: |
| **Request for improvement of transport infrastructure, improved access to and investment in storage and processing; support for value chain development to capitalize on improvements; the development of a modern food safety lab (FSL) Luhank GCAs; community-level investments to improve service access and civic interaction** | - Key gaps facing local farmers: poor local roads and logistics, limited access to markets and volume of buyers for local goods;  
- Former wholesale market was located near the state road to Luhansk City—conflict has cut off local producers from key markets now in NGCA;  
- Local labour capacity and human resources are underutilized.  
- Current production sufficient to sustain local demand, but insufficient for LED, farmers need access to wider Ukrainian, EU markets.  
- To stimulate LED, the Starobilsk City would like to build a Multi-sectoral Agro-logistical Hub: |
i) connecting the existing surrounding rural areas through SME development, namely targeting the agriculture sector, 
ii) using a cluster-based approach for increasing the competitiveness of small farmers and connecting them to buyers and markets, 
iii) improving livelihoods for vulnerable groups: women, IDPs, disabled.

**Starobilsk City Council, Focal Point for Gender – Svetlana, Baradash**  
**Semi-structured interview**  
**City Council Offices, Starobilsk 19.02.2020**

- The City Council has a Gender Committee and gender action points in the Local development Strategy. 
- Due to loss of food processing factories, many women lost jobs. 
- Few female headed SMEs registered but the City tries to cultivate them via a new incentive project – in 2019, 4 women submitted first projects. 
- Gender roles in agri-production defined - women tend to be most active in food and grain processing activities (baking), subsistence farming, supplement household income. 
- Most needy populations are families receiving social assistance and pensioners – among the latter majority are unemployed females. 
- Youth lack future employment prospects to due to the region’s economic downturn, the City has established an internship program. 
- Veterans are a highly heterogeneous group – “some are easier and some are harder cases”- the city maintains a dialogue with them and facilitates different forms of state support.

**Bilotkurakyno Rayon Administration and representatives of agricultural enterprises**  
**Focus Group Discussion, 19.02.2020 25.09.2019**

- Close to Russian border (26km) – population 18 500, 50% IDPs, 40% urban, rest rural, have 3 grain elevators, large sunflower production. 
- Post-conflict the community got cut off from access to railway which limits their producers’ access to markets; poor roads are difficult for logistics especially for dairy farmers. 
- The need to attract investors to revitalize former and new food processing plants – provide high employment opportunities. 
- **On gender** - As regional production is becoming increasingly mechanized and as gender roles resort women to work in food processing, household production, finances and administration, women are crowded out of employment opportunities; with frequent market influxes even when employed they are first to be laid off, hence increasing their vulnerability.

**The City lacks gender-disaggregated data at general and sectoral level. Expressed an interest in TA to develop gender-disaggregated data collection strategy – could be part of the City’s recently created Monitoring and Evaluation Committee.**

**Improved women’s access to information and resources through better targeted, gender sensitive outreach and communication channels.**

**Greater support needed for household level women agri-producers (where women predominate in agri-sector)**

**Better and upgraded roads to connect local producers to markets.**

**Interest in agricultural cluster support to small/household producers**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Participatory Instrument/ Date, location</th>
<th>Key Issues Raised</th>
<th>Needs and Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Svatove Rayon Administration and City Council | Focus Group Discussion, 20.02.2020 21.11.2019 25.09.2019 | ● Key Luhansk Oblast GCA agriculture transfer hub to Central/Western Ukraine and export via Southern Ukraine ports hosting Oblast’s remaining railway hub serving as a gateway to markets  
● Highlighted importance on recreation of road infrastructure to connect neighboring rayons to access railway hub and markets  
● Due to absence of railway network in the Oblast transport cost for commodities have increased and roads continuing destroying under heavy tracks  
● High impact on profitability and incomes in agriculture sector due to roads/railway network system disruption | Roads and railway network rehabilitation to improve market access for agriculture directed SMEs. |
| Troitske Rayon Administration and City Council | Focus Group Discussion, 20.02.2020 21.11.2019 | ● 90% of road # R66 in poor condition and in need of immediate overhaul  
● 95% of the total mass of goods flow is carried by vehicles weighing more than 12 tons  
● 3rd place among the rayons of the region in grain and leguminous crops (126 tons)  
● 1st place among the rayons of the region in harvesting industrial crops (102 tons)  
● 1 agriculture cooperative and 2311 agriculture directed SMEs  
● Rayon facing reduction of agricultural purchase prices in the absence of a competitive market environment caused by transport system disruption  
● Reducing the level of traffic safety, medical, fire, emergency and social services  
● Road rehabilitation directed to Kharkiv region will add supplementary transport/market hub in addition to Svatove rayon hub  
● In need of technical assistance for the agriculture related new technologies  
● Lack of processing facilities and support on extending agriculture sector directions | Rehabilitation of the road # R66 and road to Kharkiv rayon.  
Network connection to Svatove and Kharkiv transport/market hub. |

### 3.4.2 Focus Group Discussions with Private Sector, NGOs, Community Representatives

| Representatives of food and local farm producers, cattle/meat farmers | Focus Group Discussions: Starobilsk, Svatove, Troitske, Bilokurakynye rayons, Krasnorechenske settlement, Polovinkyne village | • Uncertainty and fear of the future due to conflict – *anything can happen tomorrow*’ dissuades local farmers’ interest to plan, scale up.  
• Many food processing plants have closed down due to lack of investment, loss of jobs hence local products.  
• Due to poor road conditions and buyers, intermediaries distort and monopolize local markets, control prices, quality of produce.  
• Quality of produce is an issue due to poor certification mechanisms.  
• Local communities lack sufficient community infrastructure, resources and amenities to attract professionals and retain young men and women. | Railways and reconstruction of roads are number one priority for LED.  
Improved access to new or existing storage and processing facilities.  
Community improvements to attract professionals and retain youth in rural population centers |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Market vendors | Informal interviews with (4) vendors on-site, 19.02.2020 Starobilsk site visit, private market place | • Majority of city market vendors are women, supplementing household incomes with sale of produce.  
• Market sales and income from produce fluctuate, dependence on seasonality, winters are slow.  
• Markets are governed by informal rules (e.g. different prices for stall rentals based on bilateral agreements).  
• Concerns about upcoming land reform and rising land prices.  
• Concerns about inconsistent laboratory access and pricing | Improved storage facilities and consistent, predictably priced laboratory services. |
| Smallholder farmers, producers, including (8) female farmers/ vendors/ producers; (5) IDPs | Focus Group Discussions: Starobilsk, Svatove, Troitske, Bilokurakynye rayons, Krasnorechenske settlement, Polovinkyne village | • High suitability and potential of the region for agricultural growth.  
• Horticulture was important in the region in the past, big employer, but due to lack of investment and sellouts of food processing plants, this sub-sector has diminished.  
• Some farming clusters/cooperatives already exists where like-minded farmers share resources, logistics (e.g. 4 berry farmers).  
• Quality control systems are in very poor shape, e.g. no soil testing.  
• High interest in the adoption of new technologies and methods to remain competitive and for scaling (hydroponics, freezing, preserving)  
• Farmers resort to ‘self-help’ methods - online research to gain access to resources and markets | Improving roads is the highest priority.  
Interest in the cluster model to optimize joint resources, logistics.  
Modular storage park with individual storage spaces for farmers.  
Technical assistance for new types of production and infrastructure support to assist farmers to scale up beyond the seasonal production, ideally to moving to year-round production. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulnerable Groups/Stakeholders</th>
<th>Instrument Used/Date</th>
<th>Key Issues Raised</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Luhansk Agency for Regional Development; Starobilsk Business Association | Informal interviews 20.11.2019 | • General reluctance, fear, to seek financing options from banks.  
• Revitalization of food processing, packaging plants, freezer facilities.  
• Raised importance of SME’s development support/technical assistance and access to finance as key need for the regional development  
• Logistical challenges due to absence of railway/roads appropriate system interfere with agriculture productivity and market access  
• Plants/processing/storage facilities and market cut-off due to the conflict in the region that caused low productivity  
• Potential for the agriculture is high considering deindustrialization |  |
| Big enterprise - Agroton Group of Companies (the largest agricultural holding in the region) | Informal interview 21.11.2019 | • Diversified vertically integrated agricultural producer in Eastern Ukraine  
• Core business is crop production, comprising principally sunflower seeds and wheat, as well as the processing, storage and sale of such crops  
• #1 sunflower producer in Ukraine and #4 wheat producer in Ukraine  
• Engaged in livestock and food processing  
• Agroton is the leader in Luhansk region and ranks fourth in Ukraine by head of cattle, first in Luhansk region and seventh in Ukraine by beef production and first in Luhansk region and sixth in Ukraine in milk production  
• The Group produces beef at its 20 cattle facilities, all of which are located in Luhansk region  
• The military conflict in the region has disrupted the company’s agricultural operations and caused loses  
• Logistical issues are key for the Group operating | Roads/Railway rehabilitation |
| Veterans | Focus group of (18) veterans and civic advocates of veterans issues in Starobilsk 20.11.2019; and focus group discussion with (4) veterans in Polovinkine on 20.02.2020 | • ATO veterans claimed they received satisfactory support from local employment office;  
• Most veterans either work for agricultural producers or engage in household/small scale farming.  
• Several veterans point out they have capitalized on access to land provided free (equivalent 2 acres) to them by the state for their service.  
• Access to these land grants is inconsistent, however, and the quality of the land is typically low, prompting several to engage in alternative horticultural production.  
• Veterans do not note any discrimination or social stigma attached to service but do maintain that reintegration into family life has made retaining jobs and livelihoods overall more difficult | Technical support for new horticultural efforts or access to storage and small scale processing to increase marketability and production. Assistance with securing land grants from local administrations. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Women | Semi-structured interviews with (4) women small-hold farmers in Troitske and Svatove 24.11.2019 and 23.11.2019; Focus group discussion with (5) small hold farmers in Mostki on 21.2.2020 | • Poor access to expanded markets or support for improved yields for women engaged in household farming  
• Lack of access to technical support for value-chain opportunities for income generation  
• Low participation in larger-level agricultural enterprises and management  
• Poor transport infrastructure constrains timely and pragmatic access to services and lowers the quality of public transport as an alternative mode of conveyance | Improved road conditions  
Improved access to technical support for small hold farming endeavors  
Access to SME-level services and facilities as they become more available  
Community level improvements to provide additional opportunities for families and youth to interact; and to attract professional service providers to their communities |
| Youth | Focus Group Discussion with 20 male and female students at Luhansk Agricultural College, Vesele (and the Director of the facility) 20.02.2020 | • Majority of the students came from farming households.  
• Mixed optimism with realism – though majority expressed their intentions to remain in the region after graduation, they did acknowledge that due to lack of employment opportunities and amenities, many students will look for jobs in other parts of Ukraine or in the EU.  
• Wished for revitalization of cattle farming which has nearly disappeared from the region. | More access to technology and innovative farming methods  
Internships and short-term assignments that would enable students to share their instruction with local communities are of high interest for the students. |
Youth maintained that they would like to be part of improving the efficiency of agricultural production in the region through technological interventions.

Socio-economic situation in the Luhansk region is challenging, but assisting farmers can be catalytic. Many households, primarily in rural areas depend on agricultural production for income generation and food security.

- Rehabilitate the transport and logistics infrastructure and improve transportation
- Rehabilitation of critical infrastructure and service delivery
- Providing capacity building and technical support for the local communities and SMEs is a critical aspect for further growth
- Straightening cross-governmental collaboration strategy between national/regional/local authorities
- Strong outreach and communication campaign
- Regional value chain development To increase the productivity and efficiency of agriculture sector
- Environmental factors and living conditions, combined with the social and economic conditions of society are key for the future growth of the region

Improving agricultural infrastructure (roads, storage, markets) and professionalization of smallholder farmers is needed the most. Capacity building and outreach/communication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor organizations</th>
<th>Informal Interviews and consultations during 10.2019; 11.2019; 1.2020 and 2.2020</th>
<th>Improving agricultural infrastructure (roads, storage, markets) and professionalization of smallholder farmers is needed the most. Capacity building and outreach/communication.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USAID - DAI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada, Sweden, British Embassies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Resident Coordinator and Conflict adviser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Improved agricultural infrastructure (roads, storage, markets) and professionalization of smallholder farmers is needed the most. Capacity building and outreach/communication.
3.5 Stakeholder Engagement during Implementation

During the implementation stages of the project, stakeholder engagement will be conducted in an ongoing manner and will cater to the three complementary components and their respective activities. Tailored use of participatory instruments and modalities for engagement, feedback and communication will ensure that different beneficiaries’, users’ and stakeholder groups’ views, needs and preferences are taken into account in an easy and accessible manner. As the project will be implemented in a geographic area close to conflict-affected areas, FCV sensitivity in the engagement of vulnerable populations will be ensured. In recognition that a prevailing proportion of the population is Russian speaking, linguistic sensitivity will be also respected in all participatory, communication and outreach channels and materials.

Component 1. Under Component 1, target communities will be engaged in identifying safety measures associated with roads investments and in taking part in technical assistance around ‘feeder road’ development. Citizens will also be enabled to monitor the progress of works, and influence planning processes and decisions during road rehabilitation in affected project areas. Affected female and male beneficiaries’ perceptions of satisfaction with the project’s progress and results will be assessed through beneficiaries’ satisfaction surveys before, mid-project and after the completion of road works. Throughout the process, public hearings will be used to address progress updates and any other issues that may arise during implementation.

Component 2. Community engagement will feature in facilitated, participatory planning and prioritization with municipal leaders and target beneficiaries as part of the feasibility and design studies for the Agricultural Logistics and Service Facility (Subcomponent 2A) and with community-level beneficiaries for agricultural cluster-level investments (Subcomponent 2C). 3R Youth Leaders (3RY) will participate as 3RYs employed by MRTOT-hired Training and Facilitating Partner to provide ongoing implementation and social accountability support in 3R target communities. Participatory user surveys and social audits will explore citizen’s experience and feedback about the project and will be carried out to inform the project’s baseline, mid-line and end-line evaluations. In tandem, innovative use of digital technologies will be explored to enhance performance tracking (e.g. website or real-time mobile based project overviews, performance meters) and communication efforts.

Component 3 will support the periodic use of beneficiary scorecards and social audits to engage target users on infrastructure investments under Components 1 and 2. Community scorecards will provide quick and simple feedback on project implementation action plans (project processes and outcomes). The scorecard process will be facilitated independently by the TFP, with support from the YLs selected for monitoring and oversight roles. Scorecard results will be collated to promote feedback and identification of improvements/actions to be taken by Implementing Agencies (IA)s on agriculture and transport investments. Scorecards results will be presented and discussed at “community check” meetings in Project areas that will include IAs, regional and local administration, and representatives from the community and agricultural sector. The TFP contract will include the technical support needed to prepare, organize, and document these community check meetings. Results will also inform 3R Project monitoring and evaluation activities.

Citizens will also be engaged through beneficiary feedback mechanism (BFM) arrangements that build the capacity of local actors. 3RYs will be recruited from local Agriculture College, to play a role in exacting accountability and strengthen monitoring, complaint, and response mechanisms. Finally, broad public engagement with the project will be improved with communications-related activities under Subcomponent 3C that clarify the objectives, procedures, and opportunities associated with the project and to emphasize the 3R Project as a national investment to support economic recovery in Eastern Ukraine. Where feasible, in combination with conventional face-to-face modes of engagement innovative use of new technologies - e.g. interactive use of websites, palm readers, mobile- applications for information campaigns, beneficiary satisfaction and feedback mechanisms will be explored.
3.7 Communication with Beneficiaries

The objectives of project communications and visibility activities are to: (i) help manage expectations and mitigate against local political economy risks; (ii) facilitate outreach to and engagement of communities in project activities; and (iii) share results and disseminate project lessons with key audiences for broader impact. Communications and visibility activities are also intended to communicate to the broader region information about the national government’s financial contribution to support economic recovery in eastern Ukraine to promote the 3R Project’s broader goals around national outreach, confidence building and support to conflict-affected populations.

Communications and public outreach campaign to educate communities and stakeholders in project affected areas on the objectives, procedures, purpose, and opportunities associated with the project will be conducted within Component 3 (Subcomponent 3C). Providing a multi-channel, gender and linguistically sensitive access to the project’s information that tailors to different needs of local population will be central to all communications efforts. The objectives of project communications and visibility activities are to: (i) help manage expectations and mitigate against local political economy risks; (ii) facilitate outreach to and engagement of communities in project activities; and (iii) share results and disseminate project lessons with key audiences for broader impact. Communications and visibility activities are also intended to communicate to the broader region information about the national government’s financial contribution to support economic recovery in eastern Ukraine to promote the 3R Project’s broader goals around national outreach, confidence building and support to conflict-affected populations. Communications and outreach will utilize social and traditional media, and leverage the local knowledge and participation of the MRTOT Project Implementation Unit (PIU) team members in Luhansk Oblast, 3RYs, and Luhansk regional and local administration. Given the importance of 3R communications activities and the need for rapid launch, initial communications activities (surveys, development of the Communications Strategy and Action Plan, and design of materials) will begin prior to project effectiveness through Multi-Partner Trust Fund on Peacebuilding and Recovery Bank-executed financing.

**Project Brochure.** General information about the project, as well as information about grievance mechanism and liaison/feedback channels will be provided in the developed project brochures. The project brochures will be presented to the stakeholders in the beginning stages and will be accessible continually throughout implementation. To ensure multi-channel access to the project’s information, the project brochures will be available in hard copy at local *Information Desks* as well as electronically on MRTOT’s, UAD’s, regional and local authorities’ websites.
**Information Desks** in gromada\(^{10}\) community level offices will provide local residents with information on stakeholder engagement and capacity building activities where they can share information about the project with PAPs and other stakeholders. Project brochures and flyers on various project related social and environmental issues will be made available at these information desks.

**External Communication on Project Updates and Progress.** The responsibility for external communication on project updates and progress will rest in the hands of designated communications staff within the PIUs of implementing agencies. A multi-channel outreach and communication strategy using both conventional and electronic means of communication will ensure efficiency, effectiveness and social inclusion in reaching all PAPs and OIPs.

### 4. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

**4.1 Roles and Responsibilities**

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan will be periodically revised and updated as necessary in the course of project implementation in order to ensure that the information presented herein is consistent and is the most recent, and that the identified methods of engagement remain appropriate and effective in relation to the project context and specific phases of the development. Any major changes to the project related activities and to its schedule will be duly reflected in the SEP.

Implementation of the SEP, including the monitoring of output and outcome results will be the joint responsibility of MRTOT and UAD PIU staff working closely with field-based team members in Luhansk GCAs. The PIU will monitor the SEP in accordance with the requirements of the 3R Loan Agreement and the Environmental and ESMF including changes resulting from adjustments in the design of the project or project circumstances. The LOSA and corresponding local government bodies including the Severodonetsk City, Starobilsk, Svatove, Lysychansk and Troitske Rayons will act as the intermediary project partners at local and community level. Individual Memorandums of Understanding between IAs and local entities will be concluded to clarify both parties’ roles and responsibilities.

**Proposed Organizational Structure – Implementing Agencies**

---

\(^{10}\) The term hromada is more often applied in Ukraine, as a “territorial commune” (Ukrainian: Територіальна громада) naming the population of any region. The Constitution of Ukraine and some other laws, including the “Law on local self-governance”, delegate certain rights and obligations for “hromada”. But “hromada” does not have the rights of a legal entity.
As to the sequencing of monitoring activities:

First, MRTOT and UAD will ensure the collection of information for regular project reporting. This will include the component output measures defined in the POM, ESF risks and BFM/GRM reports. The BFM will be linked to MRTOT’s already established Data Portal on Peacebuilding and Recovery, which will include the potential for MRTOT to include satellite and other geocoded/visual data and for communities to post photographic evidence of progress of infrastructure investments. Semiannual progress reports will be made available by UAD (for Component 1 and MRTOT (for Components 2 and 3) 45 days after the end of each reporting period, and include updates on the results framework indicators. Where relevant, results framework indicators will be disaggregated by gender, youth, veteran, and IDP beneficiaries/users. This will be entered into an MIS system established by MRTOT. Periodic reviews of compliance with requirements outlined in the legal agreement, including the ESMF, will also be conducted.

Second, MRTOT, with support of the PIU team members in the Luhansk regional office and 3RYs, will facilitate the processes of community monitoring. During preparation, in cooperation with the MRTOT and UAD, the World Bank team started a series of beneficiary dialogues in a number of project areas to identify the diverse challenges and opportunities facing Luhansk Oblast agricultural communities (see Annex 4). This ongoing dialogue process will help inform project measurement. This will include a regular readout on citizen engagement indicators established under Component 3. Third, the project will include baseline, midline and endline evaluations, to be conducted by a firm hired by MRTOT. The POM will include an M&E section that defines the methodology for the measurement of each indicator, and templates for regular reporting.

Where other agencies or third parties will be responsible for managing specific risks and impacts and implementing mitigation measures, the implementing partners - MRTOT and UAdr - will collaborate with such agencies and third parties to establish and monitor such mitigation measures.
4.2 Estimated Budget for SEP

The following table provides preliminary information from the project budget on stakeholder engagement-related activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luhansk regional public-private investment forums</td>
<td>60,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Facilitation Partner (supports community engagement activities)</td>
<td>305,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3R Youth (2 cycles of 20 persons each part time)</td>
<td>285,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement Specialist</td>
<td>120,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User scorecards and social audits</td>
<td>30,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Community check” meetings</td>
<td>30,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project beneficiary feedback mechanism (BFM)</td>
<td>20,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and outreach campaign costs</td>
<td>120,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and outreach specialist</td>
<td>165,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses for communication campaign</td>
<td>15,000.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. GRIEVANCE REDRESS MECHANISM

5.1 Definition of the GRM

Transparency and accountability are core elements of the Project. For this purpose, the project will include a GRM. The goal of the GRM is to strengthen accountability to beneficiaries and to provide channels for project stakeholders to provide feedback and/or express grievances related to project supported activities. The GRM is a mechanism that allows for the identification and resolution of issues affecting the project. By increasing transparency and accountability, the GRM aims to reduce the risk of the project inadvertently affecting citizens/beneficiaries and serves as an important feedback and learning mechanism that can help improve project impact. The mechanism focuses not only on receiving and recording complaints but also on resolving them. While feedback should be handled at the level closest to the complaint, all complaints should be registered and follow the basic procedures set out in this chapter.

For the purposes of these Operational Guidelines, a GRM is a process for receiving, evaluating, and addressing project-related complaints from citizens and affected communities at the level of the project. The terms ‘grievance’ and ‘complaint’ are used interchangeably.

5.2 GRM Scope and Use

SCOPE: GRM will be available for project stakeholders and other interested parties to submit questions, comments, suggestions and/or complaints, or provide any form of feedback on all project-funded activities.

GRM’s users: Project beneficiaries, project affected people (i.e. those who will be and/or are likely to be directly or indirectly affected, positively or negatively, by the project), as well as the broader citizenry can use the GRM for the above purposes (see Scope).

GRM’s management: The GRM is managed by the MRTOT’s and UAD’s PIU, under the direct responsibility of RVTOT’s and UAD’s Executive Directors.
Submission of complaints: Complaints can be expressed at any time throughout project implementation.

5.3 Procedures and Channels to Make Complaints

As noted in an earlier section, citizens’ appeals, complaints and recommendations procedure is specified in the Law On Citizens’ Appeals and amendments to the latter through the 2015 amendment on Electronic Petitions. According to the mentioned law and Constitutional Article 40, the 3R Project proposes the following channels through which citizens, beneficiaries and PAPs can make complaints regarding project-funded activities:

a. **By Email**: Project’s email addresses: forec@ukravtodor.gov.ua; info@mtot.gov.ua
b. **Through the following web page**: www.mtot.gov.ua; ukravtodorgov.ua

c. **In writing to UKRAVTODOR and MVTOT**: Letter addressed to PIU, sent to the address of:
   - UKRAVTODOR - Fizkul'jury St, 9, Kyiv, Ukraine, 02000
   - MVTOT - Lesi Ukrainky Square, 1, Kyiv, Ukraine, 01196
d. **In person**: at the above addresses or at the addresses of delegated authority by the latter
e. **Other**: Written complaints to project staff (through project meetings)

The project shall ensure flexibility in the channels available for complaints, as well as ensure accessibility to the contact information for individuals who make complaints.

To this effect, in addition to the Grievance Log provided by the project (Annex A), citizens can also file their appeals in accordance with Article 5 of the Law of Ukraine On Citizens’ Appeals. In the latter case, the appeals filed by citizens should contain full name, place of residence, the issue of the question, comment, application, claim, statement, request or demand. A written appeal should be signed and dated by the appealer (appealers). An appeal sent via e-mail to the IAs noted above should contain an e-mail address or postal address or any other means of communication in order to answer the appeal. The use of electronic signature is not required for e-mail appeals.

5.3.1 Confidentiality and conflict of interest

Confidentiality will be ensured in all instances, including when the person making the complaint is known. For this reason, multiple channels to make a complaint have been established and conflicts of interest will be avoided.

5.3.2 Receipt and recording of complaints

The person receiving the complaint will complete a grievance form (see Annex A) and will record the complaint in the Register of Complaints, kept under GRM manager. Then, the complaint is to be submitted immediately to the tracking system for sorting and redirecting to the appropriate department responsible for investigating and addressing the complaint, or to staff if the complaint is related to a specific project activity. The Project Coordinator is responsible for determining who to direct the complaint to, whether a complaint requires an investigation (or not), and the timeframe to respond to it.

When determining who will be the investigating officer, the Project Coordinator should ensure that there is no conflict of interest, i.e. all persons involved in the investigation process should not have any material, personal, or professional interest in the outcome and no personal or professional connection with complainants or witnesses.

Once the investigation process has been established, the person responsible for managing the GRM records and enters this data into the Register of Complaints.
The number and type of suggestions and questions should also be recorded and reported so that they can be analyzed to improve project communications.

5.3.3 Investigation

Under Article 20 of the Law of Ukraine on Citizens’ Appeals, appeals are considered and resolved no later than one month from the date of its receipt, and immediately to those that do not require additional study, but not later than 15 days from the date of its receipt. If issues raised in the appeal can not be resolved within one month, the head of the body, enterprise, institution, organization, or his deputy define necessary time for its consideration, and report about it to the person who filed the appeal. At the same time the entire term for resolving issues raised in the appeal may not exceed forty-five days.

To process the grievance the person responsible for investigating the complaint will gather facts in order to generate a clear understanding of the circumstances surrounding the grievance. The investigation/follow-up can include site visits, review of documents and a meeting with those who could resolve the issue.

The results of investigation and the proposed response to the complainant will be presented for consideration to the Project Coordinator, who will decide on the course of action. Once a decision has been made and on the complainant informed, the investigating specialist describes the actions to be taken in the grievance form (see Annex A), along with the details of the investigation and the findings, and submits the response to the Executive Director for signing.

5.3.4 Response to complainant

The complainant will be informed about the results of verification via letter or email, as received. The response shall be based on the materials of the investigation and, if appropriate, shall contain references to the national legislation.

The deadline for investigating the complaint may be extended by 30 working days by the Project Coordinator, and the complainant is to be informed about this fact, whether:
   a) additional consultations are needed to provide response to the complaint;
   b) the complaint refers to a complex volume of information and it is necessary to study additional materials for the response.

5.4 Awareness Building

Information provided in an accessible format

Information about the GRM will be available at the www.bellesexport.by website will be included in communications with stakeholders.

5.5 Staffing and Capacity Building

Tasks and responsibilities of the PIU team on the GRM

The Project Coordinator will allocate responsibilities to the PIU staff. These will be documented in the Project Operations Manual, and kept updated.

- Overall management of the GRM system
- Developing and maintaining awareness-building
- Collection of complaints
- Recording complaints
- Notification to the complainant on the receipt and timeline to review a complaint
- Sorting/categorization of complaints
• Thorough examination of the issues, including the causal link between project activities and alleged damage/harm/nuisance
• Decision-making based on such examination
• Processing appeals or continuous communication with complainants with the purpose to resolve issues amicably
• Publishing responses to complaints, unless otherwise is requested by complainants due to privacy or other concerns (see above 4.2)
• Organization and implementation of information materials and awareness campaigns
• Reporting and feedback on GRM results.

5.6 Transparency, Monitoring and Reporting

5.6.1 Transparency

Policies, procedures and regular updates on the GRM system, the complaints made and resolved, will be available on the www.bellesexport.by web page. They will be updated quarterly.

5.6.2 Regular internal monitoring and reporting

The Executive Director will assess quarterly the functioning of the GRM in order to:

• Provide a monthly/quarterly snapshot of GRM results, including any suggestions and questions, to the project team and the management.
• Review the status of complaints to track which are not yet resolved and suggest any needed remedial action.

During quarterly PIU meetings, the project team shall discuss and review the effectiveness and use of the GRM and gather suggestions on how to improve it.

5.6.3 Reporting in half-yearly and annual progress reports submitted to the World Bank

In the semi-annual project implementation reports submitted to the Bank, MRTOT will provide information on the following:

• Status of establishment of the GRM (procedures, staffing, awareness building, etc.);
• Quantitative data on the number of complaints received, the number that were relevant, and the number resolved;
• Qualitative data on the type of complaints and answers provided, issues that are unresolved;
• Time taken to resolve complaints;
• Number of grievances resolved at the lowest level, raised to higher levels;
• Any particular issues faced with the procedures/staffing or use;
• Factors that may be affecting the use of the GRM/beneficiary feedback system;
• Any corrective measures adopted.
## ANNEX A – GRIEVANCE/INQUIRY RECORD

**GRIEVANCE/INQUIRY RECORD (Form A)**

*Instructions: This form is to be completed by staff receiving the inquiry or grievance and kept in the Project’s file. Attach any supporting documentation/letters as relevant.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Grievance Received:</th>
<th>Name of Staff Completing Form:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Grievance Received (check □):
- □ National
- □ Oblast
- □ Rayon
- □ Village

Mode of Filing Inquiry or Grievance (check □):
- □ In person
- □ Telephone
- □ E-mail
- □ Phone Text Message
- □ Website
- □ Grievance/Suggestion box
- □ Community meeting
- □ Public consultation
- □ Other ______________

Name of Person Raising Grievance: *(information is optional and always treated as confidential)*

**Gender:** □ Male □ Female

Address or contact information for Person Raising Grievance: *(information is optional and confidential)*

Location where grievance/problem occurred [write in]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National:</th>
<th>Oblast:</th>
<th>Rayon:</th>
<th>Village:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Brief Description of Grievance or Inquiry: *(Provide as much detail and facts as possible)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1</th>
<th>Social Safeguards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 2</td>
<td>Environmental Safeguards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3</td>
<td>Grievances regarding violations of policies, guidelines and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4</td>
<td>Grievances regarding contract violations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5</td>
<td>Grievances regarding the misuse of funds/lack of transparency, or other financial management concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 6</td>
<td>Grievances regarding abuse of power/intervention by project or government officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 7</td>
<td>Grievances regarding MERP staff performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 8</td>
<td>Reports of force majeure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 9</td>
<td>Grievance about project interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 10</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who should handle and follow up on the grievance:

Progress in resolving the grievance (e.g. answered, being resolved, settled):
## ANNEX B - PARTICIPANT LOGS & PHOTOS

### LOGS OF STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS AND INTERVIEWS

#### NATIONAL LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/ Organisation</th>
<th>Representatives Interviewed</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Economic Development, Trade and Agriculture of Ukraine</td>
<td>Deputy Minister of Agriculture and team</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Veterans Affairs, Temporarily Occupied Territories and Internally Displaced Persons</td>
<td>Technical Staff</td>
<td>25.02.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukravtodor</td>
<td>ESF Expert</td>
<td>20.02.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors (programs) working on similar projects/Luhansk: UNDP, USAID, Canada/CIDA, EIB, KfW</td>
<td>Ruslan Markov, Economic Development Manager</td>
<td>19.02.2020, 20.02.2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Administration, Focal points, Eastern Ukraine/reintegration</td>
<td>Speaker to the Head of President Office, Technical Staff</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### LOCAL LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/ Organisation</th>
<th>Persons, Representatives Interviewed</th>
<th>Date, Location of Consultation, Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Represenatives of LOSA | • Head and Deputy Head, LOSA  
• Head, Communal Services Dept.  
• Head, International Technical Assistance Dept.  
• Head, Transport and Industry Dept.  
• Head, Economic Dept.  
• Head, Food Safety and Security Dept.  
• MVTOT Advisor | 18.02.2020 – Severodonetsk, Conference Room of the LOSA |
| Represenatives of Starobilsk City Council and Rayon Administration | • Mayor & Deputy Mayor  
• Head, Agriculture Dept.  
• Deputy, Agriculture Dept.  
• Communal, Civil Protection Dept.  
• Rep.Geo-Cadastral Dept.  
• Rep. Territorial Development Dept.  
• DAI, USAID Representatives  
• Representative, City Council  
• MVTOT Advisor  
• Community Representatives | 19.02.2020 Starobilsk City Council premises |
| Starobilsk City Council, Gender Focal Point | Svitlana Baradash | 19.02.2020 Starobilsk City Council premises, Gender Focal Point’s Office |
| Biloukrainsky Rayon (4 female, 5 male participants) | Head and Deputy Head of Rayon Head of Agriculture Unit  
Head of Strategic Planning Unit  
Representatives of a Rabbit Farm (2)  
Representative of Grains (Elevator) | Biloukrainsky Rayon |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative of Local Cooperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local community based organisation representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHOTOS DOCUMENTATION OF STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS – LUHANSK REGION

Luhansk Oblast State Administration, Severodonetsk (19.02.2020)

Starobilsk Rayon Administration, Starobilsk, (19.02,2020)
Focus Group Discussion with Bilokurakyno Rayon Representatives and local farmers, (19.02.2020)

Visit of Potential Project Site, Agro-Logistics Hub, Starobilsk, Luhansk Oblast (20.02.2020)

Project Site Visit to local market, interviews with women market sellers, outskirts of Starobilsk Rayon (20.02.2020)

and

Focus Group Discussion with Students/ youth at Luhansk Agricultural College (20.02.2020)
ANNEX C

STAKEHOLDER DISCUSSION GUIDE

Principles
a. Provide a clear introduction
b. Ensure the names and positions of those participating are recorded
c. Establish a permissive environment with a few easy ground rules; for example:
   o Thank participants for their time and participation
   o There are no right or wrong answers, just different opinions
   o We are here to get your advice and everyone’s opinion is valuable
   o We would like to make sure everyone’s view here are heard
d. If multiple members of the World Bank team wish to engage in the stakeholder conversation, deference should be to the primary facilitator on question selection, introductions and ground rules, and time management
e. Control of the conversation should be unobtrusive and not overly formal
f. Leave pauses and spaces for participants to think and form responses
g. Probe with questions: “Would you explain further?” and “Do you have an example?” etc.
h. Use follow-up questions for particularly relevant points and cross-reference points of view among group members when useful.
i. Provide intermittent summations for the group to react to, as in: “What I hear you saying is…” or “That’s interesting. So what you are saying is…”
j. Listen for notable quotes
k. Observe body language, e.g. head nodding, etc.
l. Cover pre-determined questions – but not to a fault. Keep conversation flowing.
m. Be sure to ask “Have we missed anything”? as the discussion nears conclusion.
n. Maintain awareness of time
o. Assign an assistant moderator/facilitator to take comprehensive notes

Annex A: Stakeholder Question and Feedback Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opening Questions</th>
<th>Summary of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the key challenges in agricultural areas of Luhansk GCAs, from your perspective?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think investments in the 3R Project are appropriate to address these challenges?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of impact will investments like these have on your lives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who will benefit most? e.g. types of farmers, different demographic groups?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What key development needs are being overlooked, or are unaddressed by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these projects?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you distinguish local, regional and national impacts from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these projects?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up with more detailed questions on the most relevant investment(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the stakeholder group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the best way to manage a new improvement (project investment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>once it is finished?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the risks and the benefits to the needs and interests of IDPs;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then veterans?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there ways to design these investments to better engage women, IDPs,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veterans, and youth?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How might this project impact the lives of women? (what could be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved or changed?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there environmental issues that we should pay attention to with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these investments?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there negative social impacts or risks that may come with the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvements that are proposed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will these investments impact the lives of youth in this community?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the proposed investment create insecurity? Are you worried it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would worsen your safety?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think the best way to ensure the best and most open access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to this (facility) for users?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the easiest way to keep you informed about how these</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investments will proceed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the best way to announce the overall project to the public?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(esp. women, IDPs, veterans, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you saw a problem with the way the project was being implemented or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a new investment was being built or used, who would you talk to?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF PEOPLE MET

Ministry for Veterans, Temporary Occupied Territories and Internally Displaced Persons:
Ms. Oksana Kolyada, Minister
Mr. Oleksiy Illyashenko, Deputy Minister
Ms. Lydmila Daragan, Statate Secretary
Mr. Kostyantyn Tatarkin, Adviser to the Minister
Mr. Artem Salihov, Adviser to the Minister
Mr. Ruslan Kalinin, Adviser to the Minister
Ms. Olена Panamarchuk, Head of International Department
Ms. Yanina Breginetts, Chief Accountant
Mr. Serhiy Kopylov, Head of Luhansk Oblast Sector Office

LUHANSK OBLAST STATE ADMINISTRATION, OBLAST MILITARY-CIVIL ADMINISTRATION:
Mr. Sergiy Hayday, Head
Mr. Denis Denishchenko, Director of International Technical Assistance, Innovation and External Relations Department
Mr. Serhiy Medvedchuk, Director of the Department for Economic Development, Foreign Economic Activity and Tourism
Ms. Elena Polishchuk, Director of the Department of Social Welfare
Mr. Sergey Khlyakin, Director of the Department of Agroindustry Development
Ms. Valentina Kolesnyk, Deputy Director of the Department, Head of the Department for External Relations, Promotion and Innovative Development of the Department of International Technical Assistance, Innovative Development and External Relations
Ms. Marina Khozina, Deputy Head of Department, Head of Industry Department, Transport and Connections

STAROBILSK RAYON STATE ADMINISTRATION:
Mr. Volodymyr Rudakov, Head of Department
Mr. Sergey Boldar, Deputy Head of Agroindustry Department

STAROBILSK FARMINGS:
Mr. Yaroslav Prikhodko, Chairman of farming “Don”
Mr. Viktor Oliynyk, Chairman of village farming "Mriya"
Mr. Viktor Vasilyev, Chairman of farming "Krot"
Mr. Andriy Sirovatko, Deputy General Director of NIBULON JV LLC

TROITSKE RAYON STATE ADMINISTRATION:
Mr. Oleksandr Babushkin, Department of Agroindustry Development
Mr. Volodymyr Goydenko - Chairman of the Board of the Organization of Employers "Union of Employers of Agricultural Complex Troitske Rayon, Luhansk Oblast "
Mr. Valentin Shcherbyna, Executive Director of the Employers Union "Agricultural Company Union of Troitske Rayon, Luhansk Oblast "

TROITSKE FARMERS/SMES:
Ms. Nadia Golubtsova, Director of the Joint Stock Company "Zlagoda"
Mr. Dmytro Odenchuk, Director of Private Agriculture Enterprise "Agrofirma Privilnya"
Mr. Oleksandr Sinkovskiy, Deputy Director of LLC "Agro Capital Group Ltd"
SVATOVE RAYON STATE ADMINISTRATION:
Mr. Oleksii Lyba, First Deputy Chairman
MS. Vita Slipets, Chairman of the Rayon Council
Mr. Sergiy Gurgut, Head of the Department of Agroindustry Development
Mr. Valeriy Usov, Head of the Department of Urban Planning, Architecture and Housing and
Communal Services, Chief Architect of the Rayon

SVATOVE FARMERS/SMEs:
Ms. Lyubov Polyakova, CEO “Slobozhanskaya” LLC
Mr. Oleksandr Slipets, Chairman of the Village Farming “Progress-10”
Mr. Sergiy Kovalyov, Chairman of the Village Farming “Prolisok”
Mr. Viktor Proskurin, Chairman of the Village Farming “Batkivshyna”

BUSINESS REPRESENTATIVES:
Mr. Albert Zinchenko, Former Vice President of the Luhansk Chamber of Commerce and
current Director of the Luhansk Agency for Regional Development
Mr. Serhiy Khlibosolov, Head of Starobilsk Business Association

NGOs:
Mr. Volodymyr Pravenkiy, Head of NGO "Ukrainian Association of participants of Military
Actions and Volunteers in Luhansk Oblast"
Ms. Oksana Ochkurova, Head of NGO “Joint Community, Dieva Gromada”

INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS:
Ms. Maia Gogoladze, Regional Director/Governance Lead, USAID Democratic Governance
East Activity
Mr. Volodymyr Lyashchenko, Programme Coordinator, Economic Recovery and Restoration
of Critical Infrastructure Component of Recovery and Peacebuilding Programme, United
Nations Development Programme

USAID Economic Resilience Activity office:
Brian Milakovsky, Economic Resilience Strategy Lead
Oleksandr Sheludenko, Value Chain Coordinator
Ruslan Markov, Honey Growth Sector lead
Volodymyr Cherniakov, Investment Attraction lead
Alexandr Stetsenko, Biofuels and Public Infrastructure expert
Ron Hunter, Infrastructure lead

USAID Office of Economic Growth:
Jacob Morrin, Private Enterprise Officer
Larissa Piskunova, Project Management Specialist
Kaitlyn Denzler, Resilience Advisor

FAO:
Sasha Martinov, Project Advisor
Dnipropetrovsk Agricultural Advisory Service:
Maksym Maksymov, Director

EIB (by webex)
Henry Moykkynen
István Heinczinger
Violaine Silvestro
Jean-Erik Dezagon
Andrii Dubovyk

Ministry of Economic Development, Trade and Agriculture of Ukraine
Taras Vysotskyi, Deputy Minister

IFC
Leah Soroka, Project Manager

Kyiv School of Economics
Oleg Nivyevskiy, Agriculture specialist

Ministry of Finance
Ekateryna Elishyeva, Head of Division, International Relations and Communication Division
Valentyna Lakosnyk, Chief Specialist

UkrAvtoDor
Anna Yurchenko, Director of International Department
Alina Butenko, Head, Division for Long-term Planning and Investments Department for International Cooperation and Public Procurement

State Service of Ukraine for Food Safety and Consumer Protection
Olga Shevchenko, Acting Head
Rita Holodenko, Head of Department in Luhansk Oblast

Smt Bilokurakyne, Lugansk region
Kostyantyn Bondarenko – Head of Bilokurakynska regional council
Sergiy Siryk – head of Bilokurakynska regional amalgamated community
Mykola Zverhanovskyi – head of staff of regional state administration
Svitlana Khrystenko – head of economic development department
Oksana Veretsun – head of agro-industrial development department
Andriy Nazarov – director of PJSC SEZKU branch Solidarnenskiy Elevator Storage
Valentyna Kostiuchenko – commercial director of FE Viktoria K
Viktor Sydorenko – deputy director of ALLC Zorya
Yuriy Khomenko - deputy director of ALLC Zorya
Vasyl Mitin - head of the structural unit of grain storage LLC Dobrodiya Trade
Troitskyi rayon, Lugansk region

Valentyn Shcherbyna – executive director of Employers' organizations “Employers' union of agro-industrial complex of Troitskyi rayon”
Dmytro Odenchuk – director of Agrofirm Pryvillya
Sergiy Kryvoruchkin – head of farm enterprise Sapir
Nadia Golubtssova – head of LLC Zlagoda
Volodymyr Borovskiy – head of farm enterprise Urazovo
Viktor Chernikov – director of Troitskyi branch of Regional avtodor
Volodymyr Goidenko – director of LLC Voevodske
Volodymyr Yatsenko – head of farm enterprise Rodnichok
Valeriy Papusha – deputy head of rayon state administration
Oleksandr Babushkin - Head of Sector for Economic Development and TIC of the Department of Urban Development, Architecture, Economic Development and Infrastructure, rayon state administration

Starobilsk, Lugansk region

Yevhen Pogorelyi – Head of Starobilsk regional state administration
Vitaliy Chernenko - head of staff of Starobilsk regional state administration
Tetiana Kulachko – Head of department of economic development, infrastructure and trade, Starobilsk regional state administration
Olena Viriutina – deputy head of department of economic development, infrastructure and trade, Starobilsk regional state administration
Volodymyr Rudakov – head of Department of Agroindustrial Development, Starobilsk regional state administration
Sergiy Boldar – deputy head of Department of Agroindustrial Development, Starobilsk regional state administration
Mykhailo Labuzov – head of housing and communal services department, Starobilsk regional state administration
Iryna Khalyavkina – Head of the department in Starobilsk rayon of the Main Department of the State Geocadastre in Lugansk oblast
Yana Litvinova – city head
Anatoliy Kovaliov – deputy city head
Svitlana Babash – secretary of Starobilsk city council
Olga Kvitko – Head of the Territorial Development Department of the Executive Committee of Starobilsk city council
Brian Milakovsky - Economic Resilience Strategy Lead, USAID Economic Resilience Activity office
Ruslan Markov - Honey Growth Sector lead, USAID Economic Resilience Activity office
Oleksandr Sheludenkov - Value Chain Coordinator, USAID Economic Resilience Activity office
Sergiy Maslikov - Head of the Department of Agronomy of Luhansk National University named by Shevchenko
Viktor Oliynyk – Head of Farm Enterprise Mriya
Yuliya Zakutko – financial director, LLC Agrodar
Mykola Zolotopup – FE Zolote
Olga Alekseeva - individual entrepreneur Alekseeva O.M.
Yuriy Pryjmenko – Director of PRJSC Seleksiya Plem resursy
Viktor Popov – Director
Olena Popovych - individual entrepreneur
Gennadiy Kalashnyk – Head of FE Rankova zirka

Lugansk regional state administration
Kateryna Bezgynska – acting head
Denys Denyshchenko – director of department of international technical assistance, innovation development and international relations
Valentyina Kolesnyk – deputy director of department of international technical assistance, innovation development and international relations
Sergiy Oleinykov – director of Department of Communal Property, Land and Property Relations
Sergiy Klyakin - Director of the Department of Agricultural Development
Maryna Hozina – acting Head of the Department of Industry, Transport and Communications
Olga Sevostianova - Deputy Director of the Department - Head of Department for Economic Development, Foreign Economic Activity and Increasing the Competitiveness of the Region
Rita Holodenko - Head of the Department, Food Safety Agency

Krasnorechenske, Kreminskyi rayon, Lugansk Oblast
Vyacheslav Shevchuk – director of LLC Rynok Universalnyj
Iryna Safronova – NGO Women of Lugasnk oblast
Liubov Bezkorovayka - Agroindustrial Department
Sergiy Tykhonovskyi – head of Public Council, Lugansk Regional administration
Ganna Rudenko – first deputy head of Public Council, Lugansk Regional administration
Oleksandr Zakharov – UkrAvtodor
Yulia Mozgo - goat farm
Olga Zubar – greenhouse
Nataliya Reshetnyak – head of farm enterprise of family type Shchedra sadyba
Yaroslav Chepel - family beekeeping
Svitlana Kushnir – FE Polunychnyj ray
Viktor Lysenko – private entrepreneur
Vitalyi Golub – greenhouse
Viktor Reshetnyak – FE Shchedra sadyba
Yuriy Kushnir - FE Polunychnyj ray
Volodymyr Reshetnyak - FE Polunychnyj ray
Vasyl Khimich – FE Yablunevyy ray
Yevhen Pravyanskyj – honey Tsarskaya ptitsa
Oleksiy Kozachok - honey Tsarskaya ptitsa
Arkadiy Martynenko - growing vegetables (private entrepreneur)
Yuriy Chernysh – land owner
Oleksiy Tokar - beekeeping