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1.0 Introduction

This document provides the Public Consultation and Disclosure Plan (PCDP) for the Bujagali Hydropower Project (HPP) as proposed by Bujagali Energy Ltd., henceforth referred to as the “Project Sponsor” or “BEL”. This PCDP outlines community engagement activities that were undertaken during the preparation of the Social and Environmental Assessment (SEA) for the HPP. This PCDP also provides an outline of planned community engagement activities that are to be undertaken leading up to and during the construction of the HPP which are to be done in association with the Community Development Action Plan (CDAP) activities. Given that the Bujagali HPP has been identified by the World Bank (WB)/International Finance Corporation (IFC) as a “Category A” project, the Project Sponsor is required to develop and implement a PCDP. A separate PCDP has also been prepared for the associated transmission line project, which is to be implemented by the Uganda Electricity Transmission Company Limited (UETCL).

The International Finance Corporation’s (IFC) newly adopted Sustainability Policy, Performance Standards and Disclosure Policy have guided the public consultation and disclosure procedures (these policies/standards have replaced the 1998 Environmental and Social Safeguard Policies and 1998 Disclosure Policy).

To be consistent with the new IFC policies as noted above, the PCDP is intended to be a means to and fully integrated with the project planning, design and implementation process so as to enhance community benefits. Similar to the SEA, the PCDP is not intended to be a “static” document that only describes what has been undertaken, but perhaps more importantly, plays a role in the overall long-term social and environmental management system for the project that sets into motion a proactive plan to enhance community benefits and minimise negative effects.

The PCDP has built on public consultation and disclosure procedures carried out in 1999/2001 by the previous project sponsor, AES Nile Power (AESNP), as well as extensive public consultation carried out by the UETCL Bujagali Implementation Unit (BIU) Team since then, particularly in 2004-2005. Similar to the previous public consultations, BEL has sought to obtain alternative views on the design and construction of the hydropower facility and transmission system, including concerns of potential impacts and ways to mitigate such impacts. Based on this input, BEL has assessed alternatives and considered raised concerns in its decision-making process.

Public consultation and disclosure procedures have been and will continue to be carried out in an ongoing, transparent, consistent, up-to-date and equitable manner. Relevant project information has been and will be made accessible in a timely manner and in a language understandable to the groups being consulted. Information included as part of this process has been considered in the preparation of the SEA Report and associated action plans (e.g. the CDAP).
1.1 Project Description

The project includes a proposed 250 MW hydropower facility located at Dumbbell Island, located 8 km downstream (north) of the Town of Jinja, Uganda on the Victoria Nile. The project consists of a power station housing five 50 MW turbines and a 28 m high dam and associated spillway works (Scott Wilson Piesold, 2004). The project reservoir will occupy an area of 388 ha, approximately 80 ha of which will be newly inundated land and 308 ha of which is area currently occupied by the Victoria Nile. The SEA ToR includes a brief description of the main project components.

Figure 1 illustrates the project location.

In addition to the hydropower generation component of the Bujagali HPP, new and/or upgraded electrical transmission facilities will be necessary to evacuate the power from the Bujagali HPP to the Uganda system grid and load centres. The transmission facilities will be developed by UECTL with assistance from BEL.

1.2 Applicable Laws, Regulations and Policies to Public Engagement

The following provides an outline of applicable laws and regulations as they relate to public consultation and engagement for the Republic of Uganda and potential project lenders.

1.2.1 The Republic of Uganda

National Environmental Management Policy, NEMA, 1995

Section 3.7 of the Policy specifies that the project sponsor is to involve land and resource users in all phases of environmental planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation at all levels. Participation will be an empowering process and seek to involve women and the youth in environmental planning and decision-making.

Environmental Impact Assessment Regulation, NEMA, 1998

As required in Part III Section 12 of the Regulation, the following is required:

- Prior to the commencement of the EIA, NEMA may decide to consult and seek public input. This is to be undertaken within four weeks of the submission of the project brief to NEMA. A public notice shall be placed inviting comments. Comments from the public shall be submitted with 21 days of the public notice requesting comments. (Note: NEMA has not requested the need for this step. BEL voluntarily published an initial start-up notice and made available the SEA ToR and PCDP for public review and comment).
During the EIA study the project sponsor shall consult with the public and seek their opinion.

That the report documenting the results of the EIA (referred to as the Environmental Impact Statement or EIS) be made available to the public and appropriate public notice of the report’s availability be provided. The report is to be made available for a period of time not less than 14 days. Comments on the EIA report are due within 21 days of the public notice [this process is ongoing as of December 2006].

NEMA has the right to hold a discretionary public hearing if it felt that the level of consultation was not adequate and/or that it would be beneficial to the project [it is expected that a decision on the need for this by NEMA would be made in early 2007].

1.2.2 Project Lenders

The project lenders that may be involved with the project’s financing have their own environmental and social due diligence requirements. BEL has reviewed, and built into its SEA process and reporting, the relevant international lender legislation, regulation and policy requirements that apply to the Bujagali HPP.

The following describes the known consultation requirements of project lenders known to be involved with the HPP as of November 2006:

World Bank Group Requirements

As of April 30, 2006, the new IFC Sustainability Policy, Performance Standards and Disclosure policy came into force. Of particular relevance to the PCDP is:

- Policy on Social and Environmental Sustainability;
- Performance Standards on Social and Environmental Sustainability; and,
- Guidance Notes on Performance Standards.

The Policy on Social and Environmental Sustainability introduces new requirements in relation to Community Engagement. Of particular interest is specification that the engagement process involves free, prior and informed consultation with the affected communities to enable informed participation, leading to lenders’ confirmation of broad community support (BCS) for the project within the affected communities. The concepts of free, prior and informed consultation are explained below:

- Free – the client or its representatives have not coerced intimidated or unduly incentivised the affected population to be supportive of the project;
- Prior – Consultation with project-affected communities must be sufficiently early in the project planning process; and,
- Informed – Consultation with all project-affected communities on project operations and potential adverse impacts and risks, using methods of
communication that are inclusive, culturally appropriate and adapted to the community’s language needs and decision making.

The IFC defines “Broad Community Support” as a collection of expressions by the affected communities, through individuals or their recognised representatives, in support of the project. There may be BCS even if some individuals or groups object to the project. It is the IFC’s responsibility to determine whether there is BCS for the project, not the project sponsor.

Also to be considered is the World Bank (IDA) Operational Policy (OP) 4.01 Environmental Assessment which includes consultation policies. This OP specifies that for Category A and B projects, the borrower is to consult with project-affected people and NGOs about the project’s environmental aspects and take their views into account. Consultations are to be initiated as early as possible and for Category A projects, at least twice: shortly after the environmental screening and before the terms of reference are finalised; and (b) once a draft EA report is prepared. The borrower is also to consult with such groups throughout project implementation as necessary to address EA-related issues that affect them. Also specified in the OP are the disclosure requirements, which include:

- The borrower is to provide relevant material in a timely manner prior to consultation and in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to the groups being consulted;
- The borrower is to provide a summary of the assessment for consultation after the draft SEA Documentation is prepared and makes the draft SEA Documentation available at a public place accessible to project affected groups and local NGOs;
- The final SEA Documentation is to be available through the WB’s Infoshop; and,
- IFC requires a 120-day international disclosure period, while IDA and MIGA require a 60-day review period.

**IBRD and IDA**

The operations of these World Bank members are guided by a comprehensive set of environmental and social policies and procedures dealing with the Bank's development objectives and goals, the instruments for pursuing them, and the project sponsor requirements for Bank-financed operations. These policies and guidelines, known as Operational Policies (OPs), are set out in the Bank's Operational Manual. The OPs are focused statements that follow from the Bank's Articles of Agreement, general conditions, and Bank policies specifically approved by the Board. The Manual also addresses procedures, good practice and advice on implementation of policies.

Within the overall set of OPs, the Bank has identified ten key policies critical to ensuring that potentially adverse environmental and social impacts are identified, minimised, and mitigated. These ten are known as the "Safeguard Policies" and include policies on Environmental Assessment (EA).
MIGA

MIGA addresses concerns about investment environments and perceptions of political risk in developing countries by providing three key services:

- Political risk insurance for foreign investments;
- Technical assistance to improve investment climates and promote investment opportunities; and,
- Dispute mediation services, to remove possible obstacles to future investment.

MIGA’s environmental and disclosure policies are derived from WB policies. They are a tool for identifying risks, reducing development costs, and improving project sustainability. Their application benefits affected communities and helps preserve the environment. MIGA’s Issue-Specific Safeguard Policies include:

- Natural Habitats;
- Forestry;
- Pest Management;
- Projects on International Waterways;
- Involuntary Resettlement;
- Indigenous Peoples; and,
- Physical Cultural Resources.

During the underwriting of a project, MIGA identifies the policies and guidelines that are applicable to a project. Projects are expected to comply with the applicable policies and guidelines, as well as applicable local, national, and international laws. Considerations include:

- Environmental Assessment Policy;
- Disclosure Policy;
- Environmental and Social Review Procedures;
- Stakeholder Comments - 1999;
- Environmental Guidelines;
- Interim Issue-specific Safeguard Policies;
- Available Category A Environmental Impact Assessments;
- World Bank Note on Alcoholic Beverages; and,
- IFC/MIGA Office of Compliance and Ombudsman.

Further information is available on MIGA’s website: [www.miga.org](http://www.miga.org)

African Development Bank
As the AfDB is a potential lender to the project, the Bank’s requirements need to be satisfied. The community engagement programme and the SEA to be prepared will need to be consistent with the AfDB’s *Integrated Environmental and Social Assessment Guidelines (2003)* as well as various cross cutting themes as they relate to the environment, community development, gender issues, broad community support, etc. Other AfDB policies/guidelines that will need to be recognised in undertaking the community engagement programme includes:

- *Environmental Review Procedures for Private Sector Operations of the African Development Bank; and,*
- *Policy on Resettlement and Involuntary Displacement.*

For Category A projects alike the Bujagali HPP, AfDB will disclose an ESRS on its InfoShop. This document will not be disclosed locally. AfDB requires a 120-day international disclosure period.

**European Investment Bank**

The EIB has several policy documents that will be adhered to in the completion of this PCDP including:

- *EIB Public Disclosure Policy, Principles, Rules and Procedures, March 2006;* and,

It is EIB practice to publish the SEA for a project alike the Bujagali HPP on the EIB website at least 60 days before Board presentation.

**Deutsche Investitions und Entwicklungsgesellschaft mbH (DEG)**

Deutsche Investitions und Entwicklungsgesellschaft mbH (DEG). DEG promotes private enterprise in developing and transition countries providing long-term capital for private enterprises investing in those countries. DEG requires project enterprises to achieve the relevant national and international standards, using the Environmental and Social Policies and Guidelines of the World Bank Group as a benchmark. From time to time the Conventions of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and the Guideline on the Social Compatibility of DEG Business Operations will be adopted. More information on DEG’s environmental and social requirements can be viewed at [www.deginvest.de](http://www.deginvest.de).

**Equator Principles**

The Equator Principles are a set of voluntary set of guidelines developed by leading financial institutions for managing environmental and social issues and based on IFC requirements in 2003. Revised Equator Principles were released in July 2006.
The Project Sponsor will apply the Equator Principles in the Bujagali HPP and provide non-technical summaries of environmental and social issues to the public in the local language. The Project Sponsor will establish procedures in order to receive and address concerns about the project's environmental and social impacts raised by individuals or groups from among project-affected villages.
2.0 Stakeholder Analysis

2.1 Areas of Influence/Stakeholders

The consultation programme was developed and implemented taking into account the various areas of influence (AOIs) that were identified as part of the SEA (see Section 3.2). Based on these recognised areas of influence, Table 2.1 below outlines the stakeholder groups that were consulted with and a summary of how those consultations were undertaken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Consultation Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Public</td>
<td>Project notices in national newspapers, web site and making documentation available to all interested parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Agencies</td>
<td>Meetings were held with various government agencies and SEA documentation is being circulated through NEMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs (national and local)</td>
<td>Numerous NGOs were identified and contacted to arrange meetings with to discuss their concerns and interests. Project documentation was circulated to the NGOs and offers made for additional meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>Contact was made with District and Sub-County level governments to inform them of the project. Sub-County Consultation committees were established to assist in consultation activities with local villages. Public meetings were held in the affected communities to advise people of the project and to receive their comments and concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Affected Persons</td>
<td>PAPs were resettled under the previous SEA process undertaken by the former project sponsor. Socio-economic audit surveys were undertaken with the PAPs as part of this process and an action plan has been prepared to deal with remaining issues. Additional surveys were also undertaken with the “fishers” community in the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable groups</td>
<td>Vulnerable group representatives were included on the Sub-county Consultation Committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Operators</td>
<td>As part of a separate tourism impact study that was undertaken, key affected businesses were consulted through individual interviews. Subsequent discussions between the tourist operators and BEL regarding mitigation/compensation due to the flooding of Bujagali Falls have been ongoing. Discussions with the employees of the tourism industry have also occurred and actions to deal with potential loss of income (either temporary or permanent) have been proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist/visitors</td>
<td>The interests of tourists were identified in the above mentioned tourism impact study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Groups</td>
<td>The Kingdoms of Buganda and Busoga were directly consulted with through meetings and the submission of project documentation. These consultations are ongoing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noted that no indigenous peoples were identified to be resident within the project area of influence.
2.1.1 Description of Stakeholders

The following provides a summary description of the stakeholders most affected by the project, which includes: Local Villages & PAPs; Tourist Operators/Tourists; and Cultural Groups. It is noted that Section 3.7 of the SEA Report and Section 2.0) of the CDAP provides a detailed description of socio-economic conditions in the study area.

Local Villages & PAPs

The group of stakeholders most affected by the project include the eight villages located on either banks of the river including:

- Kikubamutwe, Buloba, Naminya, and Malindi (on west bank); and
- Ivunamba, Bujagali, Kyabirwas, and Namizi (on the east bank).

The location of the communities that were consulted with are shown in Figure 1.

It is again noted that the previous project sponsor had previously undertaken resettlement activities. The resettled villagers were identified stakeholders in this consultation process as well.

The following presents a summary of the socio-economic conditions of the PAPs as presented in the APRAP:

- Along the sides of the river there exists numerous small settlements that are connected by tracks/roads;
- Most of the inhabitants along the riverbank could be described as small plot peasant farmers that may supplement their income through cash crops and other income generating activities (e.g. fishing, trade, bicycle taxi driving, etc.);
- Housing is constructed mainly in family compounds. Buildings are either ‘temporary’ (built with traditional materials), ‘semi-permanent’ (with traditional walls and corrugated iron roofs) or ‘permanent’ (with brick or concrete walls). The majority of housing is owner-occupied;
- Water is obtained from the river and from boreholes, wells and springs. Sanitation is normally via traditionally built pit latrines;
- According to 2001 agricultural statistics from the Jinja District Agricultural Office, the average sustainable land holding in the District is 0.8 ha per compound/household;
- The average annual household income from fishing, according to the AESNP baseline survey is UGX 527,400 (USD 350);
- Average annual income per household from business activities or formal sector employment, according to the baseline survey, is UGX 3,481 m (USD 2,700);
Agriculture is practiced as a labour intensive, intercropping system with both cash crops and subsistence crops. Women are responsible for food supply and other household duties whereas men are responsible for cash income including cash crops. In addition, women generally do not own family land but merely have access to it. All of this has inhibited women's economic advancement by blocking avenues to credit schemes; and,

Fishing in the Nile River is an income generating activity for some farmers.

Tourist Operators and Tourists

Tourism activity in the area is based on white water rafting on the Nile River. The Bujagali project will flood some of the rapids that are commercially rafted. There are four major rafting companies that operate on the affected section of the river. These companies and the tourists that they provide services to are profiled as part of the Tourism Impact study and which is documented in Appendix C.4 of the SEA. Commercial rafting will be able to continue on downstream rapids after the dam has built. BEL is working with the four major existing rafting companies to adapt their activities to the changed conditions.

Cultural Groups

The two main cultural groups potentially affected by the project are the Kingdom of Busoga and the Kingdom of Buganda. The Nile River has served as the historic divider of these two Kingdoms. The dam itself is reported to be located within Busoga Kingdom as the west bank of the Nile River serves as the boundary between the two Kingdoms. Kingdoms within Uganda are officially recognised cultural institutions by the Government of Uganda and each kingdom is represented by a head cultural leader or “King” (Kyabazinga). The Kingdoms are organised into several “Chiefdoms” as well as smaller clans that are based on the family. An administrative government body composed of various representatives and a council governs the Kingdoms. It is noted that the Kingdom of Buganda owns a considerable amount of land of which is leased to others for various periods of time.
3.0 Stakeholder Engagement

The consultation and disclosure programme was designed and implemented so as to foster community awareness of the proposed project and SEA study and to provide opportunities for community input and involvement. Careful attention was made to the various national and international principles/policies/guidelines (as previously noted) as they relate to consultation. The approach was also designed recognising that an extensive amount of consultation was undertaken by the previous project sponsor, and the more recent consultation activities undertaken by the BIU. By all indications, the starting point was a relatively high awareness level of the project, and which was confirmed through the initial community consultations undertaken in August 2006.

3.1 Previous Public and Agency Consultations

From 1997 to 2001, AESNP undertook an extensive public consultation programme using methods best suited to the diverse interests of the various stakeholders and their level of literacy. Consultation was undertaken with local, regional, national and international interests and stakeholders. Methods of public consultation that were applied during the course of the project included:

- Targeted briefings;
- Displays and exhibitions;
- Project progress reports and newsletters;
- Advertising;
- Interviews with key people;
- Site visits;
- Informal at-home meetings;
- Surveys; and,
- Focus group discussions.

The AESNP ESIA reports provide summaries of all consultations that were undertaken and the major issues/concerns that were raised. Some of the key issues from the past consultation process as well as those raised since the project was put on hold include:
Table 3.1: Summary of Previous Key Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for and project benefits</th>
<th>Jobs for local people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism impacts</td>
<td>Drinking water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic impacts</td>
<td>Access to river during construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental effects</td>
<td>Moving of spirits from the river/cultural concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative effects of other dam projects</td>
<td>Disruption to culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resettlement and compensation</td>
<td>Crop damage compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health (disease)</td>
<td>Importation of labour from the outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarrying impacts</td>
<td>EMF effects from the transmission lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency of the process</td>
<td>Public health implications (HIV/AIDS increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need for electricity to local communities and the affordability of power</td>
<td>Lake Victoria water levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in local community infrastructure</td>
<td>The condition/safety of the Nalubaale (Owens Falls) dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking procedures for stakeholders</td>
<td>The need to address unresolved issues of the resettled persons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of women, orphans, elderly and physically challenged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information collected in the previous consultation process was used as a starting point for the preparation of this PCDP. This information was used with some caution though recognising the changes to the project (although few), the potential for new stakeholders and the potential for new issues and concerns.

More recently, the Bujagali Implementation Unit (BIU), which has been an agent of the Uganda Electrical Transmission Co. Ltd. (UETCL), has been engaging the potentially affected communities. Consultations related to the HPP that have occurred include:

- Since 2004, the BIU have met regularly with each of the hydro dam affected villages (about every 2 months);
- Have provided advice on issues such as agri-forestry to the resettled community\(^1\); and,
- Have continued to work with a number of community associations based in the hydro dam villages including: Water Users Committees, Fisheries Associations, and Health Development Committees.

The results of these previous consultations have been documented and are presented in Appendix A.

\(^1\) It is noted that all households located in the area to be flooded were resettled and landowners compensated. This was done by AES prior to them dropping the project. Some outstanding commitments remain and BEL is in the process of fulfilling these commitments. Resettlement has also been completed for the Kawanda sub-station site. No other resettlement has been undertaken for the transmission system.
3.2 BEL Community Engagement Activities

Consultation activities undertaken and to be undertaken by BEL have been organised into the following phases:

- **Phase 1:** Initial consultation activities that fed into the development of the SEA Terms of Reference
- **Phase 2:** Release of the *SEA Terms of Reference and Draft PCDP*
- **Phase 3:** Release of SEA Summary Report
- **Phase 4:** Release of the Final Draft SEA Report and Action Plans
- **Phase 5:** CDAP Planning Consultation
- **Phase 6:** Ongoing Project Consultation

Figure 2 presents a schematic diagram of the key consultation activities and their timing.

Table 3.2 provides as outline of the IFC’s broad community support indicators and a description of the extent to which the PCDP satisfies each of the indicators.

The project sponsor retained the services of a witness NGO (InterAid) in August 2006 to assess whether or not BEL/UETCL and their affiliates abide by Ugandan law and international requirements when undertaking the PCDP activities. InterAid was required to attend a sample of the consultation activities and to establish a grievance mechanism. (See Section 5.1 for further details on this)

The following sections describe the consultation phases and the activities undertaken in each Phase.
Table 3.2: IFC Consultation Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>APPROACH TAKEN TO ADDRESS ISSUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Stream 1 – Has the client conducted free, prior and informed consultation and enabled participation of affected communities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Company Strategy/Policy/Principles on Engagement</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>BEL’s policy regarding community engagement are presented in Section 5.0 of this PCDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stakeholder Identification and Analysis</td>
<td>New IFC policies makes reference to a project’s area of influence (and the need to tie the PCDP to the area of influence). Area of influence includes: primary project site; associated facilities; area potentially affected by cumulative impacts and areas potentially affected by impacts from unplanned but predictable developments caused by the project. Potential interests to be consulted include: those to be relocated/have been relocated (and sub groups associated with these interests); those whose livelihoods are affected; local communities and their representatives; cultural/religious groups; visitors/tourists; future migrant workers; business operators and associations; local/regional/national NGOs; national government; larger civil society.</td>
<td>AOI for the project was defined and stakeholders identified and profiled (See Section 2.1) Stakeholder profiling was based on socio-economic surveys that were previously undertaken by the previous project sponsor and from more recent surveys undertaken of select groups to audit past resettlement activities and other affected villages. Key stakeholder issues were identified and responses/resolutions provided as documented in Section 3.4.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INDICATORS | ISSUES | APPROACH TAKEN TO ADDRESS ISSUE
--- | --- | ---
3. Community Engagement | IFC guidelines require communities to be engaged to provide input on identifying potential impacts; assessing the consequences of those impacts; on mitigation & developing benefits. | Project affected communities have been engaged at various stages of the study including the release of the ToR, draft SEA Consultation Summary Report and draft final SEA reports that were initiated in December 2006 (Infoshop version). In each phase stakeholders have been provided the opportunity to provide comments and to express their issues of concern.

4. Information Disclosure | New IFC procedures stress the need of information disclosure to ensure that stakeholders are making informed decisions. | Numerous information releases have been made available to the affected communities. This has included the release of: the SEA ToR and Draft PCDP; a SEA Consultation Summary Report, project newsletters and the draft final SEA documentation. The Summary Report and newsletters were produced in the local language. The communities were also informed through public meetings held in the two adjacent Sub-Counties to the HPP that were held in conjunction with the release of the SEA Summary.

5. Consultations a) Free | IFC indicators suggest that “free” consultation can be demonstrated through records of communication with community representatives, key informants and sub-group representatives. | All consultations that were undertaken were free and under the observation of a witness NGO (InterAid). This PCDP documents the results of consultations that were undertaken with various stakeholders.

b) Prior | IFC indicators stress the importance of early consultation and timely so that the released information can be interpreted and comments formulated; so that material input can be provided on broad project design options; and on the choice and design of mitigation measures and project development benefits. | Awareness of project is high due to previous sponsor’s efforts over an extended timeframe

Prior to consulting with the various stakeholders, information was typically provided in advance including the SEA ToR, SEA Summary and SEA Report. Stakeholders always had the opportunity to provide comments after reviewing the provided materials.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>APPROACH TAKEN TO ADDRESS ISSUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Informed</td>
<td>Consultation needs to be inclusive (accommodating different levels of vulnerability), culturally appropriate and adapted to language needs and decision-making processes.</td>
<td>Various types of consultations were undertaken throughout the study period with all identified stakeholder groups. Meetings were undertaken and information materials provided in the local language (Luganda &amp; Lusoga). Vulnerable groups representatives were included as part of consultation committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Informed Participation</td>
<td>The process needs to be iterative to show how decisions were made and that the views of the affected communities were taken into account include impact minimisation, mitigation and benefits sharing.</td>
<td>The consultation process was iterative in that it was undertaken through a number of phases that corresponded to the release of the draft ToR, draft SEA findings and the SEA Report. The results of the consultation activities were fed into the overall SEA process. Key issues that were identified were responded to as described in Section 3.4.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Vulnerable Groups – consultation and mitigation</td>
<td>Groups such as the poor, HIV/AIDs, orphans, women need to be explicitly consulted with. Documentation needs to be clear as to how these groups were consulted, the potential for impacts on them and how their concerns were addressed.</td>
<td>Vulnerable group representatives were included as part of the Sub-County Consultation Committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Grievance Mechanisms</td>
<td>Need to address potential grievances both with this project configuration and of those who have been relocated to date and have expressed concerns regarding unfulfilled AES commitments.</td>
<td>All relocations were completed by the previous project sponsor. A grievance mechanism is being implemented by the witness NGO (InterAid) in conjunction with the SEA release. BEL is in the process of responding to gaps identified in previous sponsor's activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INDICATORS | ISSUES | APPROACH TAKEN TO ADDRESS ISSUE
--- | --- | ---
9. Feedback to Affected Communities | IFC procedures specify that the results of the consultation need to be fed back to the community to demonstrate how comments/recommendations have been accommodated and where not accommodated, provide a rationale for this. | Input received through the consultation and disclosure process was fed back into the SEA process through responses to identified issues and concerns. A long-term grievance mechanism process is being implemented to address issues during project implementation. |

### Review Stream 2 — What is the level of support and dissent among the communities for the project affected?

1. Formal Expressions of Support of Objection | IFC guidance materials indicate that formal support can be expressed through minutes of meetings with government bodies/community bodies and referendums. | PCDP and its implementation are designed in such a manner to move to a level of broad community support for the project. To date, key stakeholders such as the local governments, communities and Kingdoms have provided verbal support for the project. Formal expressions of support from the local governments and Kingdoms are to be obtained following the release of the draft Final SEA Report. |

2. Informal Expressions of Support or Objection | Can be expressed through media releases, agreements, consultation event participation levels and responses to these events. | As noted above, key stakeholders such as the local governments, communities and Kingdoms have provided verbal support for the project. Informal reviews of national newspaper articles have clearly identified the need for new power supplies in Uganda. |

3. Evidence of good faith negotiations | Providing evidence that previous problems have been/will be rectified. Documenting the results of the negotiations and agreements reached and outline how the project proponent intends to honour these agreements. | BEL has committed to resolving past resettlement issues of the previous project sponsor and has initiated these actions. Discussions/negotiations are ongoing with the tourism business owners. The results of these discussions to date are confidential. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>APPROACH TAKEN TO ADDRESS ISSUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Contents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Net Benefits</td>
<td>As per IFC policies, need to provide evidence that the project affected communities will receive net benefits from the project. (including all sub groups of those affected).</td>
<td>Benefits of the project to the project affected communities are described in Sections 7.3 and 7.4 of the SEA and in the CDAP. It is noted that the final agreed community development initiatives to be implemented will depend on needs assessment work that is to be undertaken in consultation with the communities in early 2007 prior to project construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Legal Framework/Public Policy Considerations</td>
<td>Need to provide evidence that local land use planning approvals have been obtained and other regulations met/address consistency of project with national/regional/local policies.</td>
<td>There are no specific land use planning approvals that are required for the project. Approval of the SEA by the National Environmental Management Agency (NEMA) is required. The NEMA review and approval process was initiated in early December 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Local and National Political Considerations</td>
<td>Need to examine whether community opinions have been influenced by the political system/cycle.</td>
<td>BEL is not aware that community opinions were influenced by the political system. There has been no evidence of this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 BEL Community Engagement Activities

The following describes the results of the community engagement activities that have been undertaken to date.

3.3.1 Phase 1 – Initial Stakeholder Consultation

The project sponsor has conducted two initial sets of consultations prior to the release of the SEA ToR and this draft PCDP. These consultations took place in January and March 2006 and largely involved meetings with various government agencies. Some additional meetings were also conducted in late May 2006. The purpose of these meetings was to reintroduce the project and to identify initial comments and expectations that the agencies may have with respect to the project and SEA process.

The agencies that were met with are outlined in Table 3.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.3: Initial Government Agency Consultations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 2006 Consultations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BIU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ugandan Electricity Generation Co. Ltd. (UEGCL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ugandan Electricity Transmission Co. Ltd. (UETCL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jinja District (reps. of Jinja, Budondo, Bujagali, Kyabirwa, and Namizi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mukono District (reps of Mukono, Wakisi, Kikubamutwe, Naminya, Buloba)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Fisheries Resources Research Institute (NAFIRRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uganda Wildlife Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Directorate of Water Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Forest Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rural Electrification Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ugandan Investment Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Electricity Regulatory Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nile Basin Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 2006 Consultations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BIU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Makerere University Institute of Environment and Natural Resources (MUIENR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Forest Authority (NFA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Road Agency Formation Unit (RAFU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mukono District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NAFIRRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jinja District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NEMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry (MTTI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tourism Operators (Nile River Explorers, Equator Rafting, Adrift)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The key issues/comments raised during these initial consultation meetings include:

- The recognition of the urgent need for new reliable electrical generation sources given current rolling power blackouts;
- The concern that the lack of power is damaging the economy;
- The need to update information in regards to the river rafting companies;
- The need to resolve issues for the affected villages in the vicinity of the hydro dam (e.g. replacing the water pumps);
- The need to audit the results of the previous RAP (this has been undertaken and corrective action is being initiated);
- That the east bank of the river site is still to be fenced;
- The fisheries study previously undertaken in 2000 requires updating;
- The need for land to compensate the removal of land in the Mabira forest;
- Concerns remain regarding the displacement of the rafting companies and the need to improve the area as a tourist destination – what are the tourism economic effects of the project?
- Suggestions from NGOs that previous process was not transparent – it did not involve NGOs;
- The need for an EA process that promotes open dialogue;
- The need to assess the effects of the project on Lake Victoria (particularly considering the low water levels);
- The need to consider and assess other electricity generation options in the EA;
- The cumulative effects of the three dams (Nalubaale (Owen Falls), Kiira (Owen Falls extension) and Bujagali) need to be considered;
- Safety issues associated with the structural integrity of the Nalubaale Dam needs to be considered;
- The need for a more integrated EA process and examination of the issues;
- The need for an NGO forum to discuss the issues;
- The need for input from the people and not just community representatives who may be biased in their opinions;
The need to involve both east and west bank villages in the construction employment;

The need to provide training and employment recruitment;

The need to provide opportunity for local women to participate during construction (e.g. breakfast/lunch/dinner kiosks); and

The need to consider public access to the river for subsistence, commerce and recreation.

Business/Tourism Operator Meetings

Consultations were undertaken with a variety of businesses/tourist operators potentially affected by the hydroelectric project, many of which were associated with the white water rafting community. Initial meetings were conducted in late March 2006 as part of a tourism impact study that was undertaken. The purpose of these meetings was to reintroduce the project, to develop an understanding of their operations, to understand how their operations would be affected by the project, and to explore how BEL can help the companies adapt their operations to the changed environment. Subsequent follow-up meetings between the tourist operators and BEL have been ongoing since June 2006 to work towards agreements on the way forward. The results of these ongoing discussions are documented in Chapter 8 of the SEA.

Assessment of Past Resettlement

As part of the SEA, surveys and discussions were undertaken with a sample of those people who had been previously relocated by the previous project sponsor from the hydroelectric dam site to the Naminya settlement. The purpose of these consultations was to assess the effectiveness of the previous resettlement programme and to identify concerns and issues of the resettled people that have yet to be resolved. These meetings/interviews were conducted in April 2006.

In summary, issues identified included:

- Those who were resettled are generally satisfied with the resettlement site;
- The new houses are generally much better than their previous houses, although some criticisms were made of the houses regarding their condition;
- That the refurbishment of the existing Naminya school (as promised by the previous project sponsor) never took place – as no action was taken people took it upon themselves to create their own school in one of the vacant houses on the resettlement site;
- Lack of health facility staff accommodation on-site jeopardises the operation of the community health centre;
- Mixed reactions regarding livelihood restoration as some suggested that they are now better off where as others have suggested that they now have less land/land is less fertile than before; and,
Those who suggested to be less well off indicated that reduced fishing opportunities (due to being located further from the river) has contributed to this.

BEL has responded to these issues as documented in the Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan (APRAP) report, which forms part of the SEA documentation.

Fishers Consultations

Consultation meetings were conducted with a number of villages along the Nile in April, 2006 for the purposes of updating baseline information relating to the livelihood of the fishers and to better understand the impacts of the project on this group. These meetings were undertaken by the National Fisheries Resources Research Institute (NAFIRRI). Discussions/focus group sessions were conducted with the Kikuba-Mutwe (Waskisi sub-county), Kirindi (Nazigo sub-county), and Namasagali (Namasagali sub-county).

Issues identified included:

- Reduced access or increased distance to former fishing sites;
- Potential effects of noise, blasting and air pollution from project construction on agricultural activities or practices;
- Reduced incomes of resettled people (due to lack of access to the river and removed from Market areas to sell products);
- Decreased agricultural productivity on replacement lands;
- Risks associated with increased traffic during project development; and
- Lack of access to potable water due to pump malfunctions.

BEL has responded to these concerns through its APRAP process, which was undertaken as part of the SEA process.

3.3.2 Phase 2 - Release of the SEA Terms of Reference and Draft PCDP

The Phase 2 consultations occurred from July to August 2006 were focused on gaining input on the SEA ToR and the draft PCDP. Contact was made with various interests in order to inform them of the process, to identify issues/concerns, and to obtain input on the planned consultation programme.

Public Notice

An initial public notice that announced the initiation of the SEA study and release of the SEA ToR and draft PCDP was placed in the following three newspapers:
In addition to appearing in the newspapers, the notice also was placed on the New Vision web site for a period of two weeks in early August 2006.

The public notice also identified contact information for additional information and advised that the SEA ToR and PCDP are available from the project website. A copy of the public notice is contained in Appendix C.

NGO Meetings

Offers were made to meet with a targeted group of NGOs in July/August 2006. The purpose of these meetings was to introduce the project and to obtain their initial feedback and concerns in regards to the project and SEA study. Initial contact was made with about 20 NGOs. Both local and national NGOs were consulted with. A summary of key issues raised during the NGO meetings is provided in Table 3.4 below.

The only written comments submitted by an NGO (at the time of this report writing) on the SEA ToR were from NAPE (see Appendix C). Issues raised by NAPE included:

- Request for information on studies being carried out on Lake Victoria levels;
- How cumulative effects are being dealt with;
- How safety issues regarding the aging Nalubale facilities will be addressed;
- The need for a comprehensive assessment of all Nile River projects;
- The need for an overall assessment of energy options;
- The lack of plans and strategies to evaluate and monitor the impacts of resettlement and compensation of dam affected people; and,
- Impacts of the project on tourism.
### Table 3.4: Summary of Phase 1 NGO Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 27\(^{th}\) July 2006 | Uganda National NGO Forum  
Plot 25 Kabalagala  
Box 4636 Kla. 031 260373/ 041 510272/ 041 501674 e-mail;  
ngoforum@infocom.co.ug | - Their interests can be represented by ACODE and NAPE. |
| 27\(^{th}\) July 2006 | Anti-Corruption Coalition Uganda (ACCU)  
Mr. Godfrey Rwakabale (Coordinator)  
Plot 243 Tuffnel Drive  
041 535659/ 535660/ 0772611482  
E-mail: rwakabale@anticorruption.or.ug | - Their role is mainly promotion of corporate social responsibility.  
- Knew the project history since the times of AES Nile Power.  
- Pledged their contribution to the SEA process. |
| 1\(^{st}\) July 2006 | International Union for the Conservation of nature and Natural resources (IUCN)  
Mr. Alex Muhwezi (Country Rep.)  
Plot 39, Acacia Avenue  
041 344508/ 0772221499  
e-mail; alex.muhwezi@iucn.co.ug | - Country Rep. was out of country but still promised to forward their input to the document. At the time of writing this report no input has been received. |
| 26\(^{th}\) July 2006 | Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA)  
Director, tourism business development and planning  
Mr. Damian B. Akankwasa  
Box 3530 kla. 041 355000/ 0772 790729  
damian.akankwasa@uwa.or.ug | - Needed to look at the SEA TOR’s as a guide to UWA’s input and old EIA documents.  
- UWA is supportive of the project. Their role will be more of guidance throughout the process. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1st Aug 2006 | Green Watch Uganda | • Willing to participate.  
• Had concerns on whether the affected communities were consulted or the NGO feedback would be basis for consultation. (Explained to them that community consultation is ongoing). |
| 2nd Aug. 2006 | Uganda Debt Network | • They are willing to participate in this development.  
• Requested copies of the TORs to act as a basis of their input. |
| 27th July 2006 | DENIVA | • Liked the concept of involving NGOs unlike the way it was conducted previously.  
• Promised to have a look at the TORs as a group and give feedback. At the time of writing this report no input has been received. |
<p>| 1st Aug 2006 | Environmental Alert | • Appreciated the approach the SEA team took making sure the Civil society is involved in this SEA process. Advised that all the groups under the National NGO forum umbrella should be contacted. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Confirmation of and response from initial contact pending | Wildlife Clubs of Uganda  
Tibakenya, Dr. Elly Africa  
Box 4596  
Kampala  
Phone: +256.41.256534  
Fax: +256.41.258351 | • NAPE noted that they are not against dams but would like their issues addressed.  
• Requested a better explanation of the overall SEA process (this was provided at the meeting).  
• Asked relationship of project to Nile Basin Initiative and World Commission on Dams.  
• Recommended interaction with the Uganda Dams and Development Dialogue.  
• How is the SEA process addressing falling Lake Victoria water levels and climate change?  
• Nalubaale Dam safety issues are a concern.  
• Need to address cumulative effects of other Nile Basin Initiatives.  
• Need to address problems associated with previous resettlement activities from the hydro dam.  
• Need to examine other power generation alternatives in the SEA.  
• Need to consider tourism impacts from the project.  
• Have the findings and recommendations of World Bank Inspection Panel and IFCs Compliance Advisor/Ombudsman been considered?  
• Asked about the status/disclosure of the PPA. |
| 27th July 2006 | National Association of Professional Environmentalist (NAPE)  
Frank Muramuzi  
041-534453/ 0772 492362  
e-mail: nape@utlonline.co.ug | • NAPE noted that they are not against dams but would like their issues addressed.  
• Requested a better explanation of the overall SEA process (this was provided at the meeting).  
• Asked relationship of project to Nile Basin Initiative and World Commission on Dams.  
• Recommended interaction with the Uganda Dams and Development Dialogue.  
• How is the SEA process addressing falling Lake Victoria water levels and climate change?  
• Nalubaale Dam safety issues are a concern.  
• Need to address cumulative effects of other Nile Basin Initiatives.  
• Need to address problems associated with previous resettlement activities from the hydro dam.  
• Need to examine other power generation alternatives in the SEA.  
• Need to consider tourism impacts from the project.  
• Have the findings and recommendations of World Bank Inspection Panel and IFCs Compliance Advisor/Ombudsman been considered?  
• Asked about the status/disclosure of the PPA. |
| Confirmation of and response from initial contact pending | Action for Development (ACFODE).  
Type: Non-indigenous.  
Physical Address:- Plot 623/624 ACFORD House Bukoto, Kampala.  
Postal Address:- Telephone & Fax:- 532311 & 530460  
E-mail:- | • NAPE noted that they are not against dams but would like their issues addressed.  
• Requested a better explanation of the overall SEA process (this was provided at the meeting).  
• Asked relationship of project to Nile Basin Initiative and World Commission on Dams.  
• Recommended interaction with the Uganda Dams and Development Dialogue.  
• How is the SEA process addressing falling Lake Victoria water levels and climate change?  
• Nalubaale Dam safety issues are a concern.  
• Need to address cumulative effects of other Nile Basin Initiatives.  
• Need to address problems associated with previous resettlement activities from the hydro dam.  
• Need to examine other power generation alternatives in the SEA.  
• Need to consider tourism impacts from the project.  
• Have the findings and recommendations of World Bank Inspection Panel and IFCs Compliance Advisor/Ombudsman been considered?  
• Asked about the status/disclosure of the PPA. |
Bujagali Energy Limited
Bujagali Hydropower Project, Uganda
Public Consultation and Disclosure Plan (PCDP)
November 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ngoforum@starcom.co.ug">ngoforum@starcom.co.ug</a>. Contact Person:- Mrs. Annette Muwonge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of and response from initial contact pending</td>
<td>Uganda Fisheries and Fish Conservation Type:- Indigenous Telephone &amp; Fax:- E-mail:- <a href="mailto:ngoforum@starcom.co.ug">ngoforum@starcom.co.ug</a>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of and response from initial contact pending</td>
<td>Lake Victoria Catchment Environment Education Programme Eastern Africa Regional programme Mary Shuma (Executant) 5th floor of ACS Plaza Lenana Road Nairobi Kenya +254 203877355</td>
<td>As an umbrella of manufacturers, they fully support the project especially in light of the current power crisis that greatly affects the manufacturing sector.  Manufacturers only get electricity an average of 17 days per month. There is more than 50% decrease in production because of this. Promised to convene a UMA Environment sub-committee meeting and provide input into the project document (SEA ToR). At the time of writing this report no input has been received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th July 2006</td>
<td>Uganda Manufacturers Association (UMA) 041 220831/ 041 221034/ 0772 861147 Mr. Mawanda Robert.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 28<sup>th</sup> July 2006 | Save Bujagali Crusade (SBC)  
Afunaadula  
0782555222 | • SEA should address potential for dam (Owen Falls) failure and project cost.  
• The flooding of Lake Kyoga should be considered.  
• Need to look into options of small dams that are easily manageable and nearer to people.  
• Concerns of political influence in developmental projects and the need for political support for the alternatives and removal of all barriers to such developments.  
• Noise being generated from the project generators is a concern.  
• Need to consider effects on the Busoga Kingdom.  
• There should be a grievance handling mechanism for the PAPs.  
• There is need for confidence building with the PAPs. NAPE noted that they are not against dams but would like their issues addressed.  
• Culture and tourism need to be boosted in the area. |
| 1<sup>st</sup> August 2006 | ECOVIC  
Kefa Kaweesa (Director)  
0772 2455270  
kefasan@yahoo.com | • Due to the short notice for the meeting, they could not provide comments at the meeting, though they knew about the project.  
• Have to share the project’s TORs with the rest of the team and then come up with a proper input. At the time of writing this report no input has been received. |
| 1<sup>st</sup> August 2006 | Nile Basin Discourse  
Sarah Naigaga  
0782 436700 | • Was very interested to get involved in the exercise and on receiving project’s documents, would then prepare a response. At the time of writing this report no input has been received. |
| 1<sup>st</sup> August 2006 | Uganda Dams Dialogue  
Mr. Bazira (Chairman)  
0772 504173  
bazirae@yahoo.com | • The organisation represents both the government and several civil society organisations. One of the aims is to address concerns surrounding dams developments in the Country.  
• They are to convene a meeting, review the TORs and provide feedback. At the time of writing this report no input has been received. |
| 31<sup>st</sup> July 2006 | Student Partnership Worldwide Jinja (SPW)  
Jimmy Innes (Country Director)  
jimmy.innes@spw.org  
0782 974434 | • Most of their work is channelled to community based environmental programmes. Would therefore be happy to participate in this SEA process especially where community related issues are involved. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 31<sup>st</sup> July 2006 | JIDDECO (Jinja)  
Paul Bakeze (Coordinator)  
0772 408378  
jiddeco@jiddeco.or.ug | • Despite being located in Jinja (project area) they did not participate in the previous EIA process and hence have limited awareness about the project.  
• Documentation was provided to them (SEA ToR and PCDP) for their review and input. At the time of writing this report no input has been received. |
| 31<sup>st</sup> July 2006 | Busoga Trust (Jinja)  
Frank Kumbuga & Johnson Waibi (programme manager)  
0772 452693 / 043121572 | • Just like JIDDECO, it's also under the Busoga arch-dioceses.  
• Could not provide specific comments on the process.  
• Provided with the TORs for their review and comments. |
| 4<sup>th</sup> August 2006 | African Institute for Energy Governance (AFIEGO)  
Dickens Kamugisha  
041571597 - 0782407085  
afiego-ug@yahoo.com | • Would liaise with the ACODE director after getting the TORs and provide their input. At the time of writing this report no input has been received. |
| 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2006 | Energy Plus Ltd  
535 Kisaasi Road, Bukoto  
041-533073- 077-2441953  
eng@utlonline.co.ug | • Glad for to be considered participate in this process as they have so many concerns on the same.  
• There was need for them to consult other professional colleagues due to the professional nature of the concerns, in order to have an informed and professional input. At the time of writing this report no input has been received.  
• Their firm did not have budgetary provision for the activity this financial year.  
• Needed some funding from the project sponsor for them to carry on the activity. (Note that BEL is not providing funding to NGOs) |
| 4<sup>th</sup> August 2006 | A CODE  
Plot 96 Kanjokya Street  
Tumushabe Godba  
041 530798 – 0782 202816 | • Would liaise with the AFIEGO director after getting the TORs and give their input. At the time of writing this report no input has been received. |
Nile Basin Discourse (NBD) Forum

On September 21, 2006 a BIU representative was invited to attend and to make a presentation to a forum organised by the Ugandan Nile Discourse Forum. This forum was not focused on the Bujagali project, but none the less, there is interest in the project by the NBD. The workshop was attended by over 30 participants representing different NGOs and CBOs. One objective of the forum was to help better understand how ECOVIC (a umbrella organisation of environmental NGOs in Uganda) could work with the Bujagali project to promote environmental sustainability. The Nile Basin Initiative is an inter-governmental partnership focused on the fighting of poverty, socio-economic development and the management of the Nile water resources. Some key issues raised by the participants at the meeting included:

- The public availability of the power purchase agreement;
- The need for independent project monitoring to ensure that the proposed measures are actually implemented;
- Interest in establishing linkages with technical people working on the project;
- Interest in ensuring that environmental issues/restoration are included as a component of the CDAP;
- Interest in developing proposals for community development in the area for submission and consideration by BEL;
- Capacity building of the CSOs so that they can access funding;
- That micro enterprise development should be integrated into the CDAP; and,
- Creating linkages with InterAid (the witness NGO for the project).

Community Meetings

Local governments/communities potentially affected by the hydropower project included:

- Jinja and Mukono District (LC5);
- Budondo and Wakisi sub-counties (LC3); and,
- Communities of Kikubamutwe, Buloba, Naminya and Malindi (on west bank) and Ivunamba, Bujagali, Kyabirwas and Namizi (on the east bank) (LC1 level).

To consult with the potentially affected villages, Sub-County level (LC3) consultation committees were established that included representatives of the following:
Sub-county Committee Composition

| Political:          | L.C 3 Chairperson  
|                    | Sub-county Chief   
|                    | L.C Is of the affected villages. |
| Technical:         | Environment       
|                    | Health/Education  
|                    | Works/Production/Community development |
| Special Interest/  | Women             
| Vulnerable Groups  | People with Disability |
|                    | Youth             
|                    | Elderly           
|                    | Directly affected persons (in case none of the above is) |

The purpose of these committees was to sensitise the affected villages regarding the project and to obtain their concerns & suggestions. In Phase 2 of the PCDP process, these committees met with the villages in the form of village meetings and in some cases consulted with local leaders such as teachers and vulnerable groups.

The SEA ToR and the draft PCDP were provided to the Sub-County Committees in late July 2006 and provided with a list of issues/questions to explore with the villages including:

Questions to Guide the Sub-county Committee Meetings

1) What general concerns do people have regarding the proposed development of the HPP?
2) Is there any specific information regarding your village that the project team should be aware of?
3) What types of information are people interested in receiving?
4) Are there any specific issues/topics that people would like more information on?
5) How would people like to receive information about the project and the SEA study results in the future?
6) How should the results of the draft SEA and other project information be made available to the villages?
7) Is the use of sub-county committees to consult with the villages appropriate?
8) Are there other consultation approaches/methods that could be used?
9) What mitigation measures should be undertaken to reduce negative effects?
10) How do the villages/people want to be involved in the future?
11) Are there any specific local interest groups that we should be consulting with?
12) What expectations do the villagers have regarding community development opportunities as a result of the project?
13) Do people have any comments/concerns with respect to the proposed study schedule?
These initial meetings were undertaken in late July/August 2006. The subcommittees reported back the input from their meetings to the study team in early August 2006. A summary of key issues raised in these meetings is provided in Table 3.5.

**Kingdom Meetings**

Introductory meetings were held with representatives of the Kingdoms of Busoga (August 11 & 18, 2006) and Buganda (August 15, 2006). The purpose of these meetings was to reintroduce the project/study, to identify concerns and identify how the Kingdoms would like to be involved in subsequent steps of the process. Although the dam itself is within Busoga Kingdom, dam infrastructure will be within Buganda Kingdom. Both Kingdoms were provided with the SEA ToR and Draft PCDP and were requested to provide their comments. Key issues raised during these initial meetings are summarised in Table 3.6.

Buganda’s interest relates primary to the associated transmission line as land has already been acquired for the HPP. As such, more detailed comments from the Buganda Kingdom follow-up meetings are documented in the SEA and PCDP for the Transmission Line project for which UETCL is the project sponsor.

Several follow-up meetings were held with representatives of Busoga Kingdom to discuss impacts and impact management, including the need for further measures to appease Spirits and monetary compensation or royalties for the Kingdom. Ongoing consultations are taking place with the Kingdom on these issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-County/Division Consultation Committee</th>
<th>Communities Represented</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Discussion Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Budondo Sub-County                        | Ivunamba, Bujagali, Kyabirwa, Namizi | Aug 7/06      | BPIU, InterAid, Consultant Rep | • The Sub-County indicated support for the project and see it as a means to community improvement  
• The Sub-County suggested several community improvement initiatives as follows:  
  o Need for improved water supply to the villages as sections of the river are being cut-off;  
  o Need to improve roads among the communities in the sub-county and to tarmac the main road from Jinja;  
  o Need for upgrading of health facilities;  
  o Greater distribution of access to electrical power;  
  o An employment centre on the east bank of the river;  
  o Technical school/vocational centre to train people to take advantage of new jobs;  
  o Provide support for a cultural resource centre directed at youth; and,  
  o Improvement of the sub-county office.  
• The Committee also made suggestions for future consultation activities that included the use of radio programmes and newsletters. The Committee indicated a willingness to work with BEL and conduct future consultation with the villages on their behalf. They suggested that it would be useful to have a BPIU rep attend the village meetings as well.  
• The Committee requested a schedule for future consultations.                                                                                                           |
| Wakisi Sub-County                         | HPP Villages Kikubamutwe, Buloba Naminya, Maleindi  
IP Villages Wabyinga, Lukaga, Kiyunga, Scoul | Aug 7/06      | BPIU, InterAid, Consultant | • It was noted that the sub-county is affected by both the dam and the transmission line corridor. Some landowners expressed concern on the need to undertake revaluation of the affected properties. The concern being that after the AES valuation was completed, residents/landowners were told not to use the land and this these areas were not up kept in many cases. New property value rates should be applied though.  
• Several issues were also raised regarding the resettlement community:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-County/Division Consultation Committee</th>
<th>Communities Represented</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Discussion Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Poor road into the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o The need for improved schools/health facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o The need for improved water supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o The latrines get filled in during the rains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Some houses are cracking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Property boundary conflicts with the host community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Uncertainty with land titles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o The community is not close to markets – making it difficult to sell their products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Houses not conforming to the model home/no kitchens in the houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Other comments made include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o That residents be given priority for jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o The need for piped water to accommodate the large construction workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Rural electrification and road lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Alternative roads for school children to travel along as the existing road will become too busy with truck traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Improvements for the fishers and provision of fish ponds in the affected villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The committee asked whether funds could be released for community improvement prior to project initiation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Regarding consultation, it was suggested that dam and transmission related issues be separated among the respective affected communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The use of newsletters through a Q&amp;A format was also suggested as a means of communication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.6: Summary of Issues from Kingdom Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Summary of Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Busoga Kingdom Prime Minister and Permanent Secretary (Aug. 11/06)** | - Official Kingdom position is that they support the project.  
- Feel that previous project sponsor was dismissive of social and cultural issues – did not adequately engage the Kingdom.  
- Pleased that BEL has engaged them to hear their issues.  
- Felt that the previous EIA did not adequately capture the effects of the Bujagali Falls inundation and the effects on the spirits in the Falls & tourism impacts.  
- The spirits in the Falls, have not be adequately released – there needs to be a collective belief of this among their community  
- Suggested that a meeting be held with the Busoga cultural leaders to identify the way forward. Should also hold a meeting with Council to sensitise them of the Project.  
- Need to address the potential workforce impacts of the project on the community.  
- Feel that the project needs to result in tangible benefits for the Kingdom. There should be increase access to power/reduced tariffs for the community hosting it. (Also, what alternatives exist to provide power to our community?)  
- Communication materials need to be in the local language. |
| **Busoga Kingdom Cultural Leaders (Aug. 18/06)** | - Nine cultural leaders were met.  
- Confirmed that the cultural issues of the project were not adequately addressed process the past process. Spirits in the Falls and shrines need to be relocated.  
- Noted that the Falls are entire within Busoga Kingdom.  
- The cultural leaders indicated a willingness to work with BEL and are to meet among themselves to determine the appropriate path to address the spiritual issues associated with Bujagali Falls. All 11 cultural leaders of the Kingdom will need to be involved.  
- Commented that there needs to be benefits to the Kingdom. The project headquarters should be on the east side of the river & not the west; there should be a reduced tariff for power within the project site; should be priority given to people in this community for employment; main road on east bank should be tarmacked; public health issues of the project need to be addressed – public education required; training to bring people into the workforce. Perhaps provides assist in the form of Lusoga Language development.  
- The Kingdom wants to play a role in the process. |
| **Buganda Kingdom – Partial Technical Committee (Aug. 15/06)** | - The Kingdom has not yet familiarised themselves with the project and its potential issues. Are willing to do this but will require assistance.  
- A key concern is the impact on their land – they noted that they are undertaking a land tenant audit at this time.  
- Want to avoid misinterpretation of the project; the parish chiefs need to be made aware of it.  
- Public confidence in the project needs to be restored.  
- It was suggested that the Parish Chief might want to sit in on the Sub-County Consultation Committees. |
### Meeting Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Summary of Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Buganda Kingdom Technical Committee Meetings Aug. 31/06 and Sept. 5/06 | - Additional meetings with the technical committee will be required as well as with the Kingdom Parish Chiefs.  
- It was suggested to the TC that a Buganda representative might want to monitor the land valuation process (for the T-line). |
| Busoga Kingdom PM, PS and Royal Chiefs Meeting Oct. 26/06 | - The Kingdom has agreed to work closely with BEC to ensure the successful implementation of this project.  
- The Kingdom's key concern relates to the impact of the project on land that the King and Kingdom owns.  
- Advised that BEL should work with the Kabuka's officers and Buganda Land Board.  
- The Kingdom appears to have greater interest in the IP than the HPP.  
- Meeting attended by the Kingdom's Prime Minister, Permanent Secretary and Royal Chiefs;  
- The key issues discussed included the need for spiritual appeasement and the Kingdom's request for long term economic benefit from the project;  
- The Kingdom is to provide BEL with an updated outline of costs to facilitate the appeasement of spirits.  
- Future consultations will be required to address their expectations for economic benefits from the project. |
National Government Agency Meetings

During this phase of the study, some discussions were held with NEMA as part of their review and approval process of the EA ToR. As well related to the HPP, discussions were held with:

- Department of Fisheries Resources;
- DWD Water Resources Management Department;
- Mukono District Agriculture Officer;
- Mukono District District Entomologist (re: vector control);
- Jinja Vector Control Officer;
- Jinja District Agriculture Officer;
- Uganda Wildlife Authority; and,
- NAFIRRI.

Issues raised at these meetings are as follows:

- The need for a fish pass on the Bujagali dam (for potomadromous species);
- Project could support cage culture of fish (form of fish farming) as a community compensation measure;
- That DWD can provide assistance in project monitoring regarding water levels/groundwater;
- District agriculture offices can provide support in the CDAP as it relates to improving agricultural capacity through demonstration plots, implementation of NAADS projects, soil conservation, introduction of new crops, bee keeping, etc.;
- Suggestion to increase tsetse control on both banks particularly in advance of vegetation clearing in the reservoir;
- UWA confirmed that the Jinja wildlife sanctuary is in name only – no precedence that UWA being asked to give approval for developments in WS areas;
- Suggestion by NAFIRRI that the reservoir will increase opportunities for fisheries; and,
- NAFIRRI can assist in the fishers capacity building activities proposed as part of the CDAP.

Public Inquiries

A telephone number was provided in the public notices for the purposes of information requests and to address inquiries to the project team. As well, an email address was provided on the project website and in public advertisements for people to send in comments and ask questions. Only a few calls were received during Phase 2 despite the contact numbers being advertised through the newspaper ads. Most of the inquiries have related to employment opportunities.
3.3.3 Phase 3 – Release of SEA Consultation Summary Report

The Phase 3 consultation activities occurred from September to October 2006 and were focused on the release of the draft SEA findings in the form of a SEA Consultation Summary Report for the purpose of obtaining input from various interests. The SEA Consultation Summary Report was produced in English as well as Luganda and Lusoga. Activities that were undertaken and the input that was received are outlined below:

**SEA Consultation Summary Report Release Advertisements/Distribution**

A public notice regarding the release of the SEA Consultation Summary Report, and its availability for review, was placed in the New Vision and Monitor newspapers (English) on September 23/27 and 23/26 respectively. The same ad but in Luganda was placed in the Bukedde newspaper on September 23/27, 2006. Copies of these notices are contained in Appendix D. In addition to advertising the release of the SEA Summary, contact information was provided should people have comments or questions regarding the project.

The availability of the summary reports was also advertised on national radio (CBS and Radio One stations). The ads ran from October 2 to October 11, 2006.

The SEA Consultation Summary Report was distributed to the Sub-County Consultative Committees and provided to the LC3/LC1 level governments.

**Newsletter**

A 4-page newsletter was prepared which provided an overview of the project as well as a summary of key SEA findings to date (See Appendix D). The newsletter was distributed to people who attended the public meetings (see below), provided to the Sub-County Community Development Officers and copies were left with the LC3 and LC1 government levels. The Newsletter was produced in English and Luganda.

**Community Meetings**

Community meetings were held in Budondo Sub-County on October 5, 2006 and Wakisi Sub-County on October 6, 2006. The purpose of the meetings was to present:

- A project update;
- The initial findings of the SEA;
- The PCDP; and,
- The proposed community development initiatives.
There was also an opportunity for the participants to provide their input and ask questions. The meetings were held with the assistance of the Sub-County Consultation Committees. The meetings were advertised through letters sent to the Villages (through the Sub-County Committees), posters in public places and radio advertisements in the local area (on CBS and NBS (local language) stations from October 2 to October 6, 2006).

About 150 people attended each meeting. Also present were representatives of BEL, BIU, UETCL, Burnside Consulting team, LC3/LC1 governments, Buganda and Busoga Kingdoms as well as a representative from MIGA. A presentation on the SEA findings to date was made at the meeting. (See Appendix D). After the presentation, an opportunity was provided for people to ask questions/provide comments and project representatives provided responses to the questions. Minutes of the two meetings are contained in Appendix D.

By large, the sub-counties, as well as those who attended the meeting, indicated their support for the project. Nevertheless, many questions and issues were raised. Table 3.7 summarises the input/comments received at these meetings and responses to the comments.

**Table 3.7: Key Issues/Actions from October 5 & 6, 2006 Budondo and Wakisi Community Meetings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Responses/Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant interest in employment &amp; training opportunities. Priority should be given to local communities for jobs</td>
<td>Workforce training opportunities would be provided as part of the CDAP. A Resource Centre is to be developed on both sides of the river. As well, preference to local qualified individuals would be given by the EPC contractor for employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce accommodation – community has offered to house workers in Wakisi area. Feel that workers do not all need to live in Jinja Town area. Expressed concern that local people would need to live in Jinja to work on project (in response to comment that there would be no workers specific camp and that housing would be provided in Jinja area).</td>
<td>BEL’s proposal to house migrant workers in Jinja is to avoid the creation of a construction camp. However, if existing housing is insufficient it may be necessary to create a camp/or build new housing in the area. BEL is open to workers being housed in the local villages if the communities are in favour of this. Local people who are working on the project would not need to stay in Jinja Town.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 As Wakisi Subcounty will also have the transmission line passing through, some of the issues raised at the meeting related to the transmission project as report in the table. These issues were considered in the preparation of the SEA for the IP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Responses/Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request for guarantees regarding proposed community development initiatives, jobs and other sponsor commitments. Need to live up to the old (AES) CDAP.</td>
<td>The implementation of the CDAP activities would be monitored by BEL, NEMA and international lenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety concerns for pedestrians/children along access roads, particular the west bank road, which is heavily used by pedestrians.</td>
<td>BEL will examine options to address safety issues associated with construction traffic using the west bank road. Mitigation options are presented within the SEA and will be discussed with the LCs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion that resettlement people in Naminya were “dumped” there.</td>
<td>Resettlement activities were undertaken by the previous project sponsor. An Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan has been prepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns expressed regarding safety standards for construction workers.</td>
<td>All construction activities will adhere to Ugandan and IFC/World Bank worker health and safety requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns regarding community health issues from workforce during construction.</td>
<td>An AIDS/HIV/Malaria education, prevention and treatment programme will be implemented with the assistance of local institutions/NGOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Electrification – communities feel that they should benefit from increased electrical supply through the provision of electricity to the villages.</td>
<td>UMEME is responsible for the distribution of electricity in Uganda. BEL will lobby UMEME and work with them to facilitate rural electrification in the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on fishers – suggested that they have already been affected – Asked if compensation to be offered to the fishers?</td>
<td>Although there have been some river access restrictions, fishers are still able to access the river at other locations. As part of the CDAP, several fisher related activities will be undertaken including developing new beach landing facilities, the provision of training to improve fishing practices and the provision of fishing equipment to the Beach Management Committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on the Bujagali swimmers should be taken into account.</td>
<td>Discussions with the Bujagali swimmers along with other tourism related workers have been initiated. The potential for effects on these individuals is being addressed in the APRAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to expand CDI beyond the affected communities – entire sub-County should benefit.</td>
<td>CDAP activities such as skills training and improvements to health care facilities will be available to all in the Sub-County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than just new wells should be provided - we want piped water.</td>
<td>Beyond the immediate programme of improving water supply in the 8 affected villages prior to construction initiation, it is proposed that an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Responses/Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional well be provided in each community to further improve water supplies. Piped water is not being proposed at this time due to maintenance requirements, the high cost and the need for electrical power.</td>
<td>A portion of the CDAP fund has been allocated to social infrastructure such as water, health facilities and schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased population in area is increasing the demand for public services – funding needed to increase level of services to accommodate increased population (people are already coming to the area because of the project).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for improved roads in the area (request for tarmac main road on east side?)</td>
<td>The current CDAP does not propose road improvements although BEL is open to reallocating funds from other programmes if this is a priority for a community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We support the project - our communities are willing to work with BEL in the development of the project.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment impacts on WWR guides – feel that some will loose their jobs – this impact needs to be considered.</td>
<td>Discussions with the WWR guides along with other tourism related workers have been initiated. The potential for effects on these individuals is being addressed in the APRAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of river access – how to compensate this loss.</td>
<td>Although river access will be reduced, particularly during the construction period, river access points will still be available to the local communities. Formal beach landing points will be developed for the fishers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety issues along river (to children) from changing water levels.</td>
<td>Depending on hydrology and operations, water levels will fluctuate about 1 to 2 meters per day. BEL will consult with downstream stakeholders about safety issues and how to manage them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to consult with villages in the CDAP implementation.</td>
<td>Prior to the finalisation of the CDAP and its implementation, consultation will be undertaken with the communities to help them prioritise their needs and to confirm their participation in programme development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to consider building a new public road over the dam.</td>
<td>At this time, BEL is not proposing to develop a new access road across the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Responses/Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns over land valuation process/fairness.</td>
<td>A grievance mechanism will be set up so that landowners and tenants have a process available to them to dispute valuation/compensation amounts once they are released.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People (along the T-line) should be compensated within a few months of the valuation process.</td>
<td>Compensation by UETCL to PAPs along the T-line is to be provided once the project sponsors have received the necessary project approvals and financing has been confirmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked why the project construction was not to start until late 2007.</td>
<td>The construction date is influenced by the SEA approval timelines. If SEA approvals by all lenders is obtained by 2nd quarter 2007 then construction could commence by mid 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As part of the CDAP, get women involved with tree planting and help to build fish ponds due to Nile River access restrictions. Poverty alleviation should be part of the CDAP.</td>
<td>BEL is willing to explore this suggestion in future consultations to develop the CDAP implementation plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A community needs assessment should be done prior to CDAP implementation.</td>
<td>BEL will hold additional consultation with the communities to further develop the CDAP prior to its implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training initiatives should be long-term that go beyond the construction period.</td>
<td>The primary purpose of training will be to develop skills needed for the project. However, it is expected that these skills will be of lasting benefit and applicable to other projects and needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money needs to be put into education – we need computers for our schools.</td>
<td>A portion of the CDAP funds is to be allocated to education. Future consultations with the communities and schools boards are proposed to establish needs and priorities for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns that the east side of the river will receive less benefit than the west side – yet, Busoga lands will be affected more from the dam.</td>
<td>BEL is committed to providing community development funds equitably among both the east and west side communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A resident claimed to be very close to new east side access road but have not been offered resettlement – concerned about truck traffic impacts along this new road.</td>
<td>This is to be investigated by the BIU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative from Busoga Kingdom indicated that the correct Kingdom representative should be dealt with.</td>
<td>Communication has been established with the PM and PS of Busoga Kingdom and meetings also held with the cultural leaders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**People asked about whether downstream communities would be compensated for water quality impacts (assumed during construction).**

- Minimal downstream effects from the project are anticipated. Appropriate sedimentation control measures will be put in place to prevent water quality impacts. In the event of any fuel or other hazardous materials spills, spill clean-up procedures will be implemented. Should effects be detected, through its EPC Contractor, BEL will have the problem addressed.

- NEMA policies should be followed and NEMA involved.

- Applicable NEMA policies will be followed. Project approval will be required by NEMA prior to construction initiation.

- Question asked how WWR activity could continue during dam construction.

- Water flow will be maintained through the right channel while the powerhouse is being constructed. It may be possible to float this section depending on water levels. Otherwise, raft trips will need to start below the dam as will be necessary during the dam operations period.

- A spiritual leader indicated that there is a location within the river (an island?) that is of spiritual significance.

  - BEL will raise this with the Busoga Kingdom.

**Other Public Meetings**

**WWR Tourism Employees**

In follow-up to the community meetings, a meeting was held with representatives of the white water rafting/tourism industry employees. The meeting was held at the Jija BIU office on October 13, 2006. BIU and Burnside representative were present at the meeting. About 30 people attended. A brief introduction to the project was made to clarify people’s understanding of the project. Questions were then posed and responses provided. Key issues/comments raised by the representatives included:

- It was reported by the WWR tourism employees that about 300 to 400 people are employed by the tourism industry in the area which is focused around white water rafting; this include the guides, kayakers, restaurateurs, taxi motorcycle (boda boda)drivers, Bujagali swimmers and dancers, rafting photographers, ATV guides, etc..
- The employees of the various companies are concerned about their jobs as the owners have indicated that some will be laid off when the dam is built – the owners have informed the employees on the nature of their discussions with BEL regarding compensation;
- The group indicated support for the project but are worried about their jobs;
Concerns that there will be less opportunity for jobs for those that live on the east side of the river;
- That their employment “contracts” are verbal – nothing written so they have little long term security;
- Concerned that their skills are not directly applicable to other types of employment – although interest was expressed in working on the dam construction project;
- That these tourism workers have provided much to the local community. The farmers and fishers have been identified as a vulnerable and affected group but there seems to be no initiatives targeted at the employees of the tourism industry; and,
- Concerned that if the rafting operations are moved downstream that access to employment will be reduced – owners will employ people more local to the new base of operations.

BEL recognizes the concerns of the formal and informal workers of the tourist industry in the project vicinity. The Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan (APRAP) Report has considered the potential for loss of income to these stakeholders and suggests mitigation to address potential effects/loss of income.

The AIDS Support Organization

The AIDS Support Organisation (TASO) is the largest indigenous NGO providing HIV/AIDS services in Uganda and the region. To-date a total of 83,000 people with HIV/AIDS have been registered and 22,000 directly receive care and support.

TASO had developed an AIDS/HIV management programme for the Bujagali project for the previous project sponsor. The programme was however never implemented.

A meeting with TASO representatives was held with representatives of BEL, BIU and Burnside attending on October 13, 2006.

The purpose of the meeting was to confirm TASO’s interest in assisting in the AIDS/HIV programme for the project – TASO confirmed their interest to participate.

It was indicated that has much has changed when the first programme was developed about 5 years ago. TASO agreed to review the previous programme and to propose an updated conceptual plan for BEL.

NGO Consultation

SEA Consultation Summary Report and Newsletter #1 was sent to NGOs and a request for comments made. An initial email was sent on October 1, 2006 to 36 NGOs with an attached electronic copy of the SEA summary and a request for comments made by October 19, 2006. A follow-up letter and hard copy of the SEA
Summary was subsequently sent to the NGOs in October and a request for comments made. The comment period was extended to October 26, 2006, as well as an offer to receive comments after that date, should the organisation be unable to respond by the specified date. Appendix D contains the cover letter and list of NGOs that the SEA Summary was sent to.

No NGO comments had been received at the time of writing this report.

A follow-up meeting was held on October 13, 2006 with representatives of the Nile Basin Discourse Forum, ECOVIC and the Ugandan Wildlife Society. Representatives of the BIU and the Burnside consultant team attended. The purpose of the meeting was to identify concerns that these agencies may have and gauge their interest level in participating in social development and environmental restoration activities associated with the project. Some comments made at this meeting included:

- Important to engage in dialogue with the affected communities to ensure that their needs are being met;
- The people need to be properly informed of the process and potential opportunities;
- Need to assess the skills/ability for stakeholders to participate in the process;
- That NBD/ECOVIC are interested in being involved with the implementation of the CDAP initiatives;
- There is a need to start mitigation/restoration/CDAP activities early in the process as they take time to develop and to be effective;
- NGOs are very interested in reviewing the PPA for the project; and,
- That UWS would be interested in participating in the monitoring of environmental restoration activities.

National Government Agency Meetings

Copies of the SEA Consultation Summary Report were sent to various GoU organisations including: [NTD: preliminary list – to be confirmed]

- National Environment Management Authority (NEMA);
- National Environment Management Authority (NEMA);
- Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD)
- Ministry of Water and Environment;
- Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry
- Ministry of Lands and Urban Development;
- Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development;
- Ministry of Agriculture;
- Directorate of Water Development;
- National Fisheries Resources Research Institute (NAFIRRI);
- Uganda Wildlife Authority;
- Directorate of Water Development;
- National Forest Authority;
- Rural Electrification Agency;
- Ugandan Investment Authority;
- Ugandan Electricity Generation Co. Ltd. (UEGCL);
- Ugandan Electricity Transmission Co. Ltd. (UETCL);
- UMEME Ltd.; and,
- Commissioner for Disaster Management.

**Associated Activities Consultation**

The main associated project to the Bujagali HPP is the Bujagali Interconnection Project (IP), which involves the development of new transmission lines and associated facilities to evacuate the power from the HPP site. A separate, yet complementary SEA and PCDP consultation programme was undertaken for the IP. The PCDP programme was run concurrently with the consultation programme for the HPP. The IP programme did involve a larger study area and a separate set of communities that would be affected. The results of this consultation programme have been documented in the IP SEA Report (Chapter 6) and a separate IP PCDP report. Feedback received from the IP consultation activities related to the HPP (as some of the IP project area overlaps with the HPP project area) was considered as part of the HPP process.

**Public Inquiries**

A telephone number was provided in the public notices for the purposes of information requests and to address inquiries to the project team. As well, an email address was provided on the project website (www.bujagali-energy.com) for people to send in comments and ask questions. The few calls that were received during Phase 3 were primarily from job seekers. At the time of this report writing, only a few inquiries regarding the HPP were sent to BEL through the project email address.
4.0 Summary of Key Issues

As a result of Phase 1-3 engagement and consultation activities, an number of issues were identified and which were taken into account in the preparation of the of the SEA. The key issues and how these issues were addressed are presented in Table 4.1 below:

Table 4.1: Summary of Key Issues and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue 1: Past resettlement activities</td>
<td>The 8 affected communities and people resettled by the previous project sponsor indicated that some of the commitments of the previous project sponsor were unfulfilled. An audit of the past resettlement activities was undertaken and an <em>Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan</em> (APRAP) report prepared that outlined the concerns/issues and proposed activities to be undertaken. BEL has committed to resolve certain of these past resettlement issues in the immediate future and prior to construction initiation. Some actions have already been taken such as the installation of new pumps at the boreholes in each village. Consultation on resolving these past problems has been occurring by the BIU and is expected to continue into 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 2: Community development opportunities</td>
<td>The local residents and local governments have indicated an interest to take advantage of development opportunities as a result of dam construction. As an example residents have expressed interest in offering housing to the construction workers. As part of the CDAP, it is proposed that a market area be developed near the construction site where local products could be sold to the workers. As well, a resource/job skills centre is to be developed on both banks and a micro credit scheme to allow people to develop their own business enterprises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 3: Cultural impacts</td>
<td>Consultation with the local communities as well as the Busoga Kingdom, have indicated that spirits associated with the Bujagali Falls, and perhaps other sites in the area, have not been adequately appeased. BEL has initiated consultations with the Kingdom’s Prime Minister and cultural leaders to develop a programme to address their concerns. BEL is willing to work with the Kingdom and will be supportive of the activities required to address cultural concerns. Ceremonies associated with graves on land to be newly inundated and not completed by the previous sponsor will also be undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue 4: Construction workforce impacts</strong></td>
<td>The project is expected to attract large numbers of migrants looking for employment opportunities through the project. Local residents have expressed concerns in regards to the social and health consequences of migrant workers coming into their community. There are no camps or residential complexes suitable for housing a large workforce currently available in Jinja. It is expected that a variety of housing would be used, including use of the existing housing stock including hotels, as well as new purpose built housing. The specific size, design, and location for such housing will be determined by the EPC Contractor, under advisement from BEL and in consultation with local authorities. The housing plan will be developed keeping in mind the objective to maximise local benefits and minimise avoid and community health problems. The detailed accommodations plan for the workforce will be provided as an addendum to the SEA following the selection of the EPC Contractor by BEL. As well, a comprehensive Aids/HIV programme is to be implemented (with the assistance of the Ugandan Aids/HIV NGO TASO or similar organisation) which is to involve education programmes for both the local community and the workers. Further details regarding how this issue will be managed is outlined in Sections 7.5.10 and 7.5.13 of the SEA Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue 5: Local community access to electricity</strong></td>
<td>Access to electricity in the local area is very limited. Recognising that this is a power project, the local communities have expressed interest in getting improved access to electricity as a community development initiative. It has been explained to the communities that electrical distribution in under the authority of UMEME, which is a private company. BEL or the GoU cannot simply direct UMEME to improve electrical connection in the area. Nevertheless, BEL has committed to discuss with UMEME (who have access to an international funded programme) to improve electrical access in the area. This might include first providing electrical connections to community facilities in each of the 8 villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue 6: Employment opportunities/training</strong></td>
<td>There is considerable interest among the community members to be employed by the project. There is also an expectation that local community members would receive priority in employment opportunities. As part of the CDAP, BEL has committed to implementing training programmes (with the assistance of local institutions) to assist local people in gaining access to employment. BEL will also direct the EPC Contractor and its sub-contractors to give preferential treatment to the local community in their hiring practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue 7: The need to consult with Communities in implementing the CDAP</strong></td>
<td>The communities and NGOs have indicated the need to engage the communities in the finalisation of the CDAP and the formation of the implementation plan for it. BEL is committed to undertake ongoing consultation activities with the local community to help prioritise community needs and to finalise the CDAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue 8: Potential for job loss by the tourism industry employees and by self-employed and informal workers in the tourism industry</strong></td>
<td>A key finding of the PCDP process is a large concern among the tourism industry workers that they will lose their jobs once the dam project begins. BEL has begun consultations with these two groups of stakeholders. The APRAP Report makes recommendations to address this impact should it occur. Consultation with the tourism company owners have indicated that they do not expect to experience significant decreases in tourist numbers - in fact, many are anticipating growth. Furthermore, BEL is undertaking to support additional tourism initiatives, particularly those which will ensure continuity of employment of existing employees. (Note that discussion with the tourism company owners have not indicated that they expect to experience significant decreases in tourist numbers – in fact, many are anticipating growth).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue 9: Safety issues from construction traffic along the west bank road</strong></td>
<td>The communities on the west bank are very concerned about the safety risks associated with construction traffic along the main west bank roadway. The road is heavily used by pedestrians including school children. BEL is aware of this issue and will consult with local community leaders in the development of the Construction Traffic Management Plan. Discussions will continue with the local communities to develop appropriate measures to manage and monitor the issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 10: That the local community needs to benefit from the project</td>
<td>BEL agrees that the local communities should benefit socially and economically from the project. As such, a comprehensive CDAP is to be implemented based on future needs assessment work. Overall, the employment benefits (direct and indirect) and induced economic benefits from the project are expected to be significant for these communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 11: Concerns from the east bank communities that they will not benefit as much as the west bank communities</td>
<td>As most of the project facilities and the construction activities will be focused on the west bank, east bank communities are concerned that they will receive much less benefit from the project. This appears to be a concern of the Busoga Kingdom in light of the dam being reported to be within their Kingdom (the west bank is reported to be the boundary between the Busoga and Buganda Kingdoms). BEL is committed to providing programmes and opportunities to both east and west bank communities. As an example, resource centres will be developed on both banks of the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues 12: Local institution interest in participating in the project</td>
<td>NGOs, CBOs and GoU agencies have indicated an interest in participating in the project such as through assisting in the delivery of the CDAP and environmental monitoring of mitigation/restoration activities. BEL is willing to work with the existing institutions and will engage them in dialogue beginning in early 2007 as part of the process to develop the project implementation plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 13: Loss of access to the river</td>
<td>Some (particularly the Fishers) have indicated that river access has been limited (due to fencing) and are concerned about further access restrictions once the construction period begins. Although some fencing along the west bank has been installed, access to the river has not been cut off and use of the river in the vicinity of the project has continued as has been observed on several occasions by the consulting team. Once construction is initiated more formal “beach land facilities” will be developed so as to allow a location to access the river for fishing. As such, the project has not nor will it substantially reduce access to the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 14: That the Bujagali project will exacerbate the low water levels in Lake Victoria</td>
<td>There is concern that once operational, the Bujagali Dam would create additional pressure for increased releases from Lake Victoria. The Bujagali project will reuse of the same water that the existing hydro facility at Jinja uses. By reusing the same water, twice the amount of power will be generated from the same amount of water. Water levels in Lake Victoria will continue to be determined by rainfall, evaporation and rate of discharge at the Nalubaale/Kiira dams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Responses/Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue 15: How have safety issues associated with the aging Nalubaale facilities been addressed?</strong></td>
<td>To address safety issues, BEL will form the Bujagali Dam Safety Panel (BDSP). The BDSP, consisting of up to three technical experts, will provide advice through final design, construction, initial filling, and start-up phases of the dam. Safety risks will be addressed as part of the Panel’s terms of reference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 Future Consultation Events

BEL is committed to the continuation of the community consultation programme as part of the SEA Review process (Phase 4), the planning of CDAP activities (Phase 5) and long-term consultation through the project construction phase (Phase 6). BEL’s future stakeholder consultation and engagement activities will be guided by a set of consultation principles as outlined below:

- That stakeholders be adequately informed of issues prior to their engagement in the process;
- That consultation be undertaken in a timely manner prior to key decisions being made;
- That the consultation and engagement programme be inclusive to all affected persons and be undertaken in a culturally appropriate manner;
- That consultations and information releases be in a form and language that is understandable by stakeholders;
- That there be communication to the participants as to how their input influenced the process;
- That the consultative process be iterative;
- That the process will lead to the building of a constructive relationship between BEL and the local community; and,
- That a transparent grievance programme be put in place to allow for the identification and resolution of raised concerns.

5.1 Phase 4 - Release of the SEA Report and Action Plans

In Phase 4, the focus of the consultation is on the release of the SEA Report and associated Action Plans. This consultation period is undertaken in conjunction with the review and approval process of the SEA Reports by both NEMA and the international lenders. This phase of the consultation process is expected to last from the SEA submission date to financial closing. Phase 4 consultation activities are to include:

- Notices in early December 2007 advising the public of the availability of the SEA Report for review and comment. These notices are appearing in national newspapers including the New Vision, Monitor and Bukekke (in local language);
- The SEA Report is being made available at public locations such as libraries, government offices and BEL Offices;
- The SEA Consultation Summary Report (in English) will also be distributed to key stakeholders including the local governments;
- The SEA documentation will be accessible through the project website: www.bujagali-energy.com;
The preparation and distribution of a non-technical SEA Summary in the form of a Newsletter, which will be translated into both Lusoga and Luganda. Copies of the Newsletter will be distributed to various interests including the affected communities and NGOs;

• A letter and copy of Newsletter #2 will be sent to the identified NGOs advising them of the release of the SEA Reports and a request made for their comments. Offers to provide them with a CD copy of the report and to meet with them will be made;

• Meetings will be set up with the Wakisi and Budondo Sub-County Consultation Committees (that have already been formed) to run through the SEA results. An issues based presentation will be made, followed by a discussion period. The purpose of the meeting is to ensure that local government representatives are aware of the key project findings and understand how the project will affect their communities;

• BEL will continue to consult with the key affected tourism business operations regarding the mitigation and compensation plan. Employees of these businesses, as well as informal tourism based workers will be met with as required to address their concerns and to receive their feedback;

• BEL will consider comments received regarding the SEA Report and action plans;

• If necessary update/addendum documentation will be prepared and released to address issues that emerge through the Phase 4 consultation process;

• BEL will also offer the opportunity to meet with an interest groups/government agencies to discuss their concerns; and,

• The need for additional community meetings will be assessed during this period and if need necessary, meetings will be held.

To meet the requirements of the international lenders, the SEA Report and associated actions plans will be placed on the World Bank “Infoshop”, which is accessible through the Internet.

It is noted that NEMA’s review and approval process requires:

• Advertising the availability of the SEA Report through national newspaper(s). The report is to be made available for a period of time not less than 14 days. Comments on the EIA report are due within 21 days of the public notice;

• The release and distribution of SEA Consultation Summary Reports to public accessible locations;
  o The project sponsor (BEL) may have to respond to some of the comments received as requested by NEMA; and,
  o An optional public hearing may be held at the discretion of NEMA.

Table 5.1 summarises how each stakeholder group will be consulted with in Phase 4.
### Table 5.1: Summary of Future (Phase 4) Consultation Activities per Stakeholder Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Consultation Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Public</td>
<td>Advertisements of the release of the SEA reports will be placed in national newspapers. Documents will be available for review at public places such as libraries. The public will be encouraged to provide comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Agencies</td>
<td>NEMA will distribute the reporting to GoU agencies for review and comment. NEMA to consider their comments in making an approval decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs (national and local)</td>
<td>Letters/emails being sent to about 50 NGOs advising them of SEA Report release and offers to meet with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>Meetings with the Sub-County Consultation committees to explain key SEA findings and to receive their feedback. Purpose is to ensure that they understand the implications of the project on their communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Affected Persons (PAPs)</td>
<td>The BIU continues to deal with past resettlement issues. These issued are to be resolved prior to construction initiation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable groups</td>
<td>Vulnerable group interests are represented through the Sub-County Consultation Committees. Input on how their interests have been taken into account will be considered at the above noted meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Operators</td>
<td>Consultations are continuing with the owners of key tourism based business to confirm the mitigation and compensation plan. Employees of these operations as well as the informal tourism workers will be met with to address their concerns and to receive their feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist/visitors</td>
<td>The interests of tourists are being addressed through consultation with tourism business associations as well as agencies such as the Uganda Tourism Association who will be kept informed of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Groups</td>
<td>Meetings with Busoga and Buganda Kingdom will continue to address their concerns particularly as they relate to spiritual appeasement as a result of river flooding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grievance Management Mechanisms

According to IFC's Performance Standard 1, if ongoing risks to or adverse impacts on project-affected communities are anticipated, the Project Sponsor is required to “establish a grievance mechanism to receive and facilitate resolution of the affected communities’ concerns and grievances about the client’s environmental and social performance” (IFC, 2006, p. 5). To respond to this requirement, BEL has appointed a Witness NGO (InterAid) to receive grievances and to oversee the process to address these concerns.

The availability of a Grievance Mechanism will be advertised with the other project notifications regarding the release of the SEA Reports. The advertisements will include InterAid contact information should an individual have a grievance with the SEA process. A grievance form has been prepared (See Appendix E) and will be
available through the chairpersons of the local villages. The Sub County Committees will also be used to channel the forms and vet the grievance issues. They will identify which ones can be solved locally or one that has to go to higher level beyond the village and Sub-county. The community leaders know the PAPs very well and have the political and social responsibility for the community members. InterAid will advise BEL on how to respond to received grievances. Responses and actions (if necessary) to resolve the grievance will be communicated to the individual who submitted the grievance. A written record of all grievances received, and how they were dealt with, will be kept by InterAid and BEL.

5.2 Phase 5 - CDAP Planning Consultation

Phase 5 of the consultation programme is anticipated to commence once SEA approval has been obtained.

Included as part of the SEA Reports is the Community Development Action Plan (CDAP), which describes the proposed community development initiatives to be implemented as part of the project. The initiatives in the CDAP are to be considered as draft and are in need of confirmation/further definition prior to their implementation. A clear message that was received from the communities is the need to work with us to finalise the community development initiatives. In meeting with the communities, lists of community development requests were provided to BEL. There is a need to refine these lists and prioritise their expectations. The communities also need to be aware that the CDAP fund, while generous, is of a finite amount and thus there is a need to focus on the most urgent needs for the communities. The following is a proposed list of activities to be undertaken:

- The identification and retention of the BEL Community Liaison Manager who would oversee the community consultation/engagement activities;
- Meet with and confirm membership on the Wakisi and Budondo Sub-County Consultation Committees. Develop the role of the Consultative Committees;
- Meet with vulnerable group representatives of the consultative committees and explore the needs of vulnerable peoples in the area;
- Meet with and explain the proposed CDAP to each of the 8 villages with the assistance of the Consultation Committees. Obtain initial feedback;
- Undertake a community development initiatives prioritisation exercise in each of the 8 villages. With this input, roll-up their input to the Sub-County level and with the assistance of the Consultation Committees. Finalise the CDAP;
- Present the final CDAP to each of the villages;
- Establish Community Sub-Committees to assist in the development of the implementation plan and an implementation schedule for each of the key community development initiatives;
Identify and meet with existing NGOs/CSOs to present the CDAP and to identify potential roles in CDAP implementation;

Prepare draft implementation plans for each of the initiatives through the Community Sub-Committees and with NGO/CBO input;

Present the implementation plans to the 8 communities as well as the wider Sub-County. Receive feedback and finalise the implementation plans; and,

Oversee the start-up of the CDAP initiatives that should be implemented prior to construction start-up (e.g. job training activities).

As well, during this period, the Community Development Officer will work with InterAid in responding to and resolving any received grievances.

It will also be important to keep the communities informed on the project progression. In particular it will be important to communicate job training opportunities so that community members can take advantage of these opportunities.

5.3 Phase 6: Ongoing Project Communication

Once the project has begun the construction phase it will be important to regularly communicate to the public on the progress of the project including the CDAP and other action plan activities. During this period, the Community Liaison Officer will:

- Coordinate the release of regular project information/updates with the EPC contractor during the construction period;
- Providing updates to the project website: www.bujagali-energy.com;
- Work with the Sub-County Consultation Committees on the release of project information and obtaining community feedback;
- Work with InterAid in the ongoing Grievance response process;
- Receive and respond to questions from the local community;
- Communicate the results of CDAP activities;
- Coordinate the release of Annual Reports which will among other things, report on CDAP activities, environmental management activities and environmental/social monitoring activities; and,
- Work with TASO (and possible other CSOs) in regards to the development and release of Aids/HIV education materials.
6.0 Disclosure Plan

In promoting transparency and accountability, BEL has and will continue to “provide relevant material in a timely manner prior to consultation and in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to the groups being consulted”. To date, BEL has disclosed the following:

- SEA ToR and the draft PCDP;
- Summary of draft findings of SEA for consultation and feedback;
- The final draft HPP SEA Report, SEA Summary (that integrates the findings of the HPP and IP SEAs);
- This PCDP Report; and,
- Action Plan documentation including: Community Development Action Plan (CDAP), Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (EMMP) and Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan (APRAP).

The SEA ToRs and draft PCDP were distributed in July 2006 to the National government (NEMA) and local government stakeholders (sub-county level).

The draft SEA Consultation Summary Report was released in late September 2006.

The final draft SEA Report was released in early December 2006.

BEL has submitted the final draft SEA Report, Summary Report and Action Plans to the IFC, who we understand will in turn distribute the summaries to the members of IFC’s Board of Directors. The IFC will make the summaries available through the WB InfoShop.

The SEA Report and Actions Plans are being made available to the other identified stakeholders and the public at large at publicly accessible locations and on the proponent’s web site: www.Bujagali-energy.com.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PERSON/ GROUP MET</th>
<th>TITLE/ADDRESS</th>
<th>CATEGORY OF STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF CONSULTATION</th>
<th>ISSUES RAISED</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/11/03</td>
<td>Wakisi Residents</td>
<td>L.C 1 C/Ms of buloba, Naminya, Malindi and Kikubamutwe, Some residents</td>
<td>Affected Communities</td>
<td>Security meeting introduction of new guards and measures for site access</td>
<td>Special access for fishermen, allowance for collection of firewood and grass; regular bush clearance to keep off hazardous animals; need for good relations with the guards</td>
<td>Formation of security committee with residents involved; provision of Ids to fishermen; no access for firewood; constant monitoring and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/07/04</td>
<td>Wakisi Council</td>
<td>L.C 3 C/Mof Wakisi, Some councilors and residents</td>
<td>Affected Communities</td>
<td>General Project Update</td>
<td>Timing for the project; the new project developer; remnant issues relating to community development; land titles for the people in Naminya</td>
<td>Titles to be worked upon; issues related to community development to be documented and forwarded to MEMD or new developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/07/04</td>
<td>Residents of East Bank (Kyabirwa, Bujagali, Namizi and Ivunamba)</td>
<td>L.C chairpersons of the affected villages and local residents</td>
<td>Affected Communities</td>
<td>Briefing on Site clearance and fencing preparations</td>
<td>Access to the river needed; allowance of time to harvest crops planted within project site; water issue</td>
<td>Access points to be provided when fence is up; time will be given to allow harvesting but that should be the last notice; water program to be carried out before fence is erected; residents to advise on best access points to be retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/05/04</td>
<td>Naminya Resettled persons</td>
<td>Alex Wanyama, Hakim Mujuzi and beneficiaries</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Distribution of Titles</td>
<td>Pending titles to be availed too; are the resettled allowed to sell mortgage?</td>
<td>Team to work hard to process remnant titles; persons not advised to sell anything or mortgage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE (MM/DD/YY)</td>
<td>PERSON/GROUP MET</td>
<td>TITLE/ADDRESS</td>
<td>CATEGORY OF STAKEHOLDER</td>
<td>PURPOSE OF CONSULTATION</td>
<td>ISSUES RAISED</td>
<td>ACTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/08/04</td>
<td>West Bank residents</td>
<td>Wanje Peter, Wagota Michael, (Kikubamutwe L.C officials); Some residents, L.C Cm of Naminya, and Buloba</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Briefing on monitoring activities to be done shortly</td>
<td>Rationale for monitoring; actual date of commencing needed; NAPE's activities; T-Line residents not catered for</td>
<td>Rationale for monitoring was explained and target sample identified; date to be communicated soon; residents to be careful with NAPEs activities but should not be hostile; T-Line issues to be dealt with once developer is identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/04</td>
<td>Wanyama Cornelius</td>
<td>Cornelius Wanyama and Buyer.</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Land dispute</td>
<td>Clarification of Project boundary</td>
<td>Map to be availed and mark stones to be identified; L.Cs and PLCs to be encouraged to take up such issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/01/05</td>
<td>Naminya Residents</td>
<td>Residents of Naminya and host community</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Regular monitoring and documentation of arising issues</td>
<td>Outstanding issues (titles, School, Clinic, and Electricity); new access route to main highway; governments involvement in solving their problem</td>
<td>Issues documented and to be forwarded to MEMD for action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/01/05</td>
<td>NAPE</td>
<td>Frank Muramuzi, Geoffrey Kamese</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Regular monitoring and documentation of arising issues</td>
<td>Abandonment of the resettled persons; failure to fulfill the RAP as was laid out</td>
<td>Issues documented and to be forwarded to MEMD/UETCL for action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/01/05</td>
<td>West Bank Residents (few)</td>
<td>Few residents utilizing the boreholes</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Regular checks on Boreholes</td>
<td>Most boreholes breaking down</td>
<td>Consult water officers at the Sub county and Mukono district; inform MEMD/UETCL on problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE (MM/DD/YY)</td>
<td>PERSON/ GROUP MET</td>
<td>TITLE/ADDRESS</td>
<td>CATEGORY OF STAKEHOLDER</td>
<td>PURPOSE OF CONSULTATION</td>
<td>ISSUES RAISED</td>
<td>ACTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/03/05</td>
<td>Namizi residents</td>
<td>Residents of Namizi and other neighboring villages; aspiring candidates for local elections; L.C officials</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Regular monitoring and documentation of issues</td>
<td>Access points to the river; water problem;</td>
<td>Residents to advise on appropriate access points; CDAP issues to be resolved once developer is identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04/05</td>
<td>Kyabirwa Residents</td>
<td>Residents of Namizi and other neighboring villages, aspiring candidates for local elections; L.C officials</td>
<td>Affected Communities</td>
<td>Regular monitoring and documentation of issues</td>
<td>Access points to the river; water problem; remnant CDAP issues; fishermen were forgotten</td>
<td>Residents to advise on appropriate access points; CDAP issues to be resolved once developer is identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 Project Introduction

The Bujagali Hydropower Project (HPP) is a 250 MW hydroelectric power project (HPP) located on the Victoria Nile, near Jinja, in Uganda. The Project sponsor is Bujagali Energy Limited (BEL), a project-specific partnership of SG Bujagali Holdings Ltd. (a wholly owned affiliate of Sithe Global Power, LLC) and IPS Limited (Kenya). The Bujagali Interconnection Project (IP) is an associated transmission system project that is to be developed by the Uganda Electricity Transmission Company Limited (UETCL) with the assistance of BEL to interconnect the HPP with the National Grid.

The overall project was originally initiated by AES Nile Power Ltd., ("AESNP") in the late 1990's. AESNP prepared Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) documentation for the Project that was approved by the Government of Uganda's National Environmental Management Authority ("NEMA") in 1999/2001, and by the World Bank, IFC and African Development Bank Boards in December 2001.

In 2003 AESNP withdrew from the Project, leading the Government of Uganda ("GoU") to initiate an international bidding process for the HPP aspects of the project. BEL was selected as the preferred bidder and entered into a power purchase agreement and an implementation agreement with the GoU.

The draft Social and Environmental Assessment (SEA) Report for is being prepared to identify the impacts of the HPP and to formulate mitigation measures to minimise these impacts. This document will be reviewed by NEMA, and by potential lenders before being finalized. Comments received from other interested parties will also be incorporated in the final SEA Report. The SEA Report is being drafted to fulfill the requirements of NEMA and the multilateral and bilateral lenders.

This report is intended to provide interested stakeholders with an overview of the HPP SEA completed to-date, and a parallel summary has been prepared for the IP. Public consultations have been undertaken throughout 2006, and will continue throughout the month of October 2006 to inform the affected communities and to receive input on the information provided herein.
2.0 Project Setting

The HPP is located on the Victoria Nile in southeastern Uganda (See Figure 1). The Victoria Nile drains Lake Victoria, which is the Africa's largest water body. The Lake is considered the source of the Nile, since the Victoria Nile is the start of the longest branch of the Nile, which is known as the White Nile.

The Lake lies within an elevated plateau in the western part of Africa's Great Rift Valley, and straddles the equator. The location of the HPP itself is about 1100 m above sea level and a few degrees north of the equator.

The discharge of Lake Victoria was dammed in 1954 by construction of the Owen Falls Hydro Project, and which was recently renamed as the Nalubaale Hydro Dam. In early 2000's, a second power plant, originally known as the Owen Falls Extension and later renamed Kiira, was installed next to the Nalubaale Dam in a canal excavated for that purpose. The Bujagali HPP would be located about 8 km downstream of the Nalubaale/Kiira facilities.

The Nile in this area is located within a deeply incised, steeply sloped valley, and drops in a series of rapids. In recent years the rapids in the area affected by the HPP as well rapids further downstream have been used for commercial whitewater rafting. The river is also used for small-scale artisanal fisheries by local villagers, and its many islands and rapids hold cultural/religious values for some local persons and communities.

Jinja town, located on the east side of the river near Nalubaale is the closest large community. The city developed starting in the 50's when power for industry became available form the Owen Falls project. Kampala, Uganda's largest city is located about 70 km to the west.

The majority of the study area for the Bujagali hydropower facility is rural, with estate and small-scale or subsistence agriculture being the predominant land uses. Agricultural activity is primarily a labour-intensive, intercropping system with both cash and subsistence crops following the seasonal changes. The main cash crops are coffee and sugar cane, coupled with more recent cropping of vanilla. Subsistence food crops include bananas, cassava, sweet potatoes, maize, beans, millet, and yams.

Within the project area, there are several ethnic groups, including persons mostly of Bantu origins, among others. Tribal groups, the Basoga and the Buganda, live on both banks of the river. Amongst these people, many still practice traditional religions, although they are often practiced in tandem with Christianity and Islam.
Bujagali Falls is of spiritual significance to the Kingdom of Basoga as it is a place inhabited by spirits. Cultural ceremonies were conducted by the previous project sponsor to relocate the spirits, although recent meetings with Kingdom representatives indicate that additional activities may be required to address the spiritual significance of the area prior to flooding. The Kingdom has expressed support for the project and BEL is committed to continuing and undergoing consultations with them to determine what needs to be done prior to the flooding of the Falls.
3.0 Project Need and Alternatives

Uganda has been suffering from an acute shortage of electricity. Regular blackouts have become the norm, and are expected to continue or get worse in the short term as the energy production of the Nalubaale and Kiira hydropower facilities, which are the main sources of electricity in the country, is limited due to low water levels in Lake Victoria. The GoU has commissioned new, emergency thermal generation projects to offset the reduced capacity of the hydro facilities. However, there remains a clear and immediate need for new, large scale, economical power generation capacity in Uganda.

Various consultants have prepared power sector studies over various planning horizons for Uganda. The general conclusions from these studies are that large-scale hydropower development is the lowest cost source for large-scale power generation in Uganda. The Victoria Nile is considered to be the main hydropower resource to meet the electricity demand of Uganda.

Geothermal resources have in the past been reported to be extensive, but recent analysis suggests the true capacity for geothermal at the present time is about 45 MW. While there is a role for other sources such as wind, solar and biomass, for Uganda these are not considered feasible or economical for large-scale generation of electricity at this time.

Thermal generation can provide large-scale base load power. However, because Uganda has insufficient delivery infrastructure and no indigenous hydrocarbon fuels the cost for thermal power is much greater than the cost for large-scale hydro. Nevertheless, Uganda has recently embarked on selected thermal options to be located in the vicinity of Kampala to bridge the increasing supply gap in the near term.

Six potential hydropower sites have been evaluated along the Victoria Nile. With its comparatively low social and environmental impacts, and its ability to generate a peak of 250 MW of power, Bujagali emerged as the preferred location for the next hydropower development on the Victoria Nile. The Murchison Falls and Ayago projects were not preferred as the next hydro project for the Victoria Nile as each was in Murchison Falls National Park, a World Heritage Site, and would thus entail unacceptably high environmental impacts compared to Bujagali. The Masindi Project was also not preferred as it would have been prohibitively expensive compared to Bujagali, and because it precluded future downstream hydropower development projects such as Karuma. The Karuma and Kalagala Projects were considered feasible, but each were considered to have greater potential environmental and social impacts than Bujagali. The following section provides a description of the proposed Bujagali HPP.

To offset cultural, social and environmental effects of the Bujagali project the GoU has made a commitment protect the Kalagala stretch of the Victoria Nile for exclusive use and protection of environmental, cultural and tourism activities. As a result, the Kalagala Falls site is not considered to be available for hydroelectric project development.
4.0 Project Description

The HPP involves using the power of falling water to spin a turbine and generate electricity. A 30 m (max) high earth-filled dam will be built at the Bujagali site to create a corresponding large water drop, or head. The water will flow by gravity through the turbines, causing them to spin, which in turn causes the generators to spin, and thereby generate electricity. There will be five 50 MW turbine-generator sets installed giving a totally installed capacity of 50 MW (See Figure 2).

The dam will include a spill way such that if flows exceed the capacity of the power station than the excess water can safely spill over the spillway to the river below.

The project will involve a permanent land take of about 125 ha land: 45 ha for the permanent project facilities and 80 ha of newly inundated land. A temporary land take of about 113 ha of land will also be needed to facilitate construction. The temporary land take will become available for local people to use again, once construction is completed.

The dam will create a reservoir extending 8 km upstream to Nalubaale (formally Owen Falls) and Kiira (formally Owen Falls Extension) facilities. The existing rapids within this section, including the rapids at Bujagali Falls, will be flooded. The reservoir will have “live storage”, that is the water within it will be fully replaced every 12-16 hours by upstream flows. The reservoir waters will be contained within the steep banks of the Victoria Nile between Dumbbell Island and Owen Falls, which effectively limit the reservoir surface area to 388 ha – this is only 88 ha greater that the 300 ha surface area of the river as it exists without the dam.

AESNP, the previous project sponsor, completed the land acquisition and resettlement and relocation of all residents formerly located in the reservoir area and compensated all landowners or other project affected persons. As there are some unresolved resettlement issues, BEL has initiated an “Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan” to resolve these issues.

In addition to the dam, spillways and Power house various other buildings and structures will be developed on the west bank to support the power station, including an access roads, telecommunications, stand-by diesel generator, workshop and stores.

The permanent site will be accessed from the public highway that runs along the west bank of the river. While the dam will be designed to support a roadway, there are no plans at present to create a new public crossing of the Nile via the dam and spillways.
1. **Inundated Land**
2. **Existing River Area**
3. **New high water level when reservoir is filled**
4. **Permanent Fence Line**
5. **Transmission Lines**
6. **Permanent Roads**
The facilities will be constructed by an Engineering, Procurement and Construction (EPC) Contractor, who will develop the detailed construction plan. However, in general the following is expected. Construction will take place over a 44 month period, and is expected to involve a peak labour force of more than 1000 persons. Workers will be housed in Jinja and environs – there will be no on-site workers camp.

A quarry will be developed on site to produce the necessary aggregates and rock fill material needed to construction the dam and other facilities. A batching plant will be installed for on-site production of concrete. Coffer dams shall be used to divert the river into, first to the east channel around Dumbbell Island while the west portion of dam, spillways and powerhouse are built, than the west channel whilst the east portion of the dam is built. The coffer dam will be removed and the reservoir filled.

Most heavy machinery, equipment and manufactured products needed for the facility will need to be imported into Uganda. Most goods are expected to arrive in Africa at the seaport of Mombassa in Kenya and be transported overland by truck to the site.

The reservoir offers very little storage of water – essentially all water released at Nalubaale/Kiira will subsequently be released at Bujagali. The water levels in the reservoir will fluctuate daily by about 2 vertical metres, up to the Full Supply Level of 1,111.5 metres above sea level.

A permanent work force of about 30 to 50 people will be needed to operate the facility. Workers will reside in Jinja or environs.
5.0 Outline of SEA and PCDP Process

SEA Process

The SEA is being undertaken to meet requirements of the Government of Uganda's as well as the policies and guidelines of the various International Financial Institutions (IFIs) that are expected to finance the project. The purpose of the SEA is to ensure that the project is designed and developed in a manner that results in the least amount of social and environmental effects while maximizing project benefits. An SEA Report is being prepared which will describe the results of the SEA process. The SEA Report will be made available to stakeholders for their review.

The key components of the SEA Report will include a description of:

- The regulatory requirements to be met;
- The social and environmental conditions in the study area;
- Alternatives studied;
- The project to be built including construction activities;
- The public consultation and disclosure process;
- Social and Environment effects;
- Social and Environmental Action Plans;
- Community Development Activities; and
- Project monitoring activities.

A key aspect of the approach undertaken by BEL for the Bujagali HPP has been to conduct the SEA according to SEA Terms of Reference (ToRs) that were approved by GoU (NEMA) and were made available to IFI representatives, project affected people, NGOs and the general public for their review.

The main SEA work for the hydropower facility commenced in early 2006 including ecological fieldwork, social surveys and consultations with relevant review agencies and potentially affected people and NGOs.

Public Consultation and Disclosure Program (PCDP)

The PCDP has been designed and is being implemented so as to maximise community awareness of the proposed project and SEA study and report and to maximise opportunities for community input and involvement. The approach was designed recognizing that extensive consultations and community engagements were completed by AES Nile Power, and following their withdrawal, ongoing consultations have been carried out by UETCL's Bujagali Implementation Unit. By all indications, the starting point was a relatively high awareness level of the project; this was confirmed through the initial community consultations undertaken as part of this SEA in August 2006.
The consultation program has been organized into the following phases:

- **Phase 1:** SEA Terms of Reference preparation (completed);
- **Phase 2:** Release of the *SEA Terms of Reference and Draft PCDP* and SEA Preparation (completed);
- **Phase 3:** Release of the draft SEA findings (ongoing); and,
- **Phase 4:** Following the release of the Final draft SEA Report (to be undertaken).

BEL retained the services of a witness NGO (InterAid) in August 2006 to provide independent monitoring of the consultation and resettlement activities, and to provide a mechanism for stakeholders to file a grievance with the SEA or RAP processes.

A wide variety of stakeholders are being consulted with through a variety of consultation activities as outlined in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Consultation Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Public</td>
<td>Project notices in national newspapers, web site and making documentation available to all interested parties. The SEA will be available electronically through the web sites of the lenders involved in the project, as well as a project specific website. Information has been made available in the local language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Agencies</td>
<td>Meetings are being held with various government agencies and SEA documentation is being/will be circulated through NEMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs (national and local)</td>
<td>Numerous NGOs were identified and contacted to arrange meetings with to discuss their concerns and interests. Meetings were held with, and project documentation (including the terms of reference for the SEA) was provided to those NGOs that expressed an interest. A standing offer was made for additional meetings as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>Contact was made with District and Sub-County level governments to inform them of the project. Sub-County Consultation committees were established to assist in consultation activities with local villages. Public meetings are being held in the affected communities to advise people of the project and to receive their comments and concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Affected Persons</td>
<td>PAPs were resettled under the previous SEA process undertaken by the former project sponsor. Socio-economic assessment surveys were undertaken with the PAPs as part of this process. Additional surveys were also undertaken with the fishers community in the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable groups</td>
<td>Vulnerable group representatives were included on the Sub-county Consultation Committees. Specific meetings are also to be held with vulnerable groups in the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Operators</td>
<td>As part of a separate tourism impact study that was undertaken, affected businesses were consulted through individual interviews. Subsequent discussions between the tourist operators and BEL regarding mitigation/compensation due to the flooding of Bujagali Falls are ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist/visitors</td>
<td>The interests of tourists were identified in the above mentioned tourism impact study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Groups</td>
<td>The Kingdoms of Buganda and Busoga are being consulted directly with through meetings and the submission of project documentation. Meetings are continuing with the Kingdoms regarding the project and to determine actions that need to be taken to address their concerns. Through the Busoga Kingdom, the custodian of the cultural site (Budhagali) will also be consulted with.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Project Benefits

Through the generation of electricity, Bujagali hydropower facility will result in benefits to the national community. The project will give rise to a number of economic and development benefits at both the macro-economic level and the local level. The key macro-economic benefits that are expected include:

- Reduced electricity rationing and associated costs;
- Increase in investment and national income;
- Increase in export revenues; and,
- Lower energy costs to the consumer.

Overall, it has been estimated in some reports that every month that the Bujagali project is delayed costs the economy approximately 10 to 15 million dollars. The project is also expected to help reduce noise and air emissions generated by the countless small generators that are used to provide electricity during blackout periods.

There will also be local economic benefits resulting from the project through employment and from impacts on the local economy. Current estimates for the number of personnel to be employed during the four-year construction period are between 600 and 1,500 at peak times. The majority of employees will be in the unskilled and semi-skilled sectors and the need for imported expatriate management staff is relatively low. A large proportion of the workforce will be drawn from the immediate local area, with preference given to displaced landholders and labourers from affected communities.

During the construction phase, the generation of local employment opportunities will act as a catalyst to stimulate the local economy. Increased incomes in the area will encourage the formation and growth of local businesses, which will in turn create new indirect employment opportunities. Both processes will alleviate pressure on land resources from subsistence farming.

The implementation of a Community Development Action Plan (CDAP), will enhance local benefits as described in Section 8.0 of this Summary Report.
7.0 Management of Project Effects

The following table presents a preliminary summary of the key issues/effects of the project and a brief description of mitigation that is to be put in place to address these issues. The full SEA report will provide a more detailed description of the project effects and the measures to be put in place to deal with them. The SEA report will have a separate volume on the Social and Environmental Action Plan for the project. It will include details on monitoring programs, as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Issue/Effect</th>
<th>Description of Effect &amp; Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resettlement and Land Compensation</td>
<td>Land required for the construction and operation of the hydropower facility totals 238 ha. Landowners were either compensated for loss of land or resettled by the previous project sponsor. Eighty-five households were displaced. An assessment survey of the resettled villagers was undertaken by BEL as part of this SEA process to confirm whether any unresolved issues remained. BEL has initiated an Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan (APRAP) to resolve these remaining issues. Pre-construction activities to be undertaken include: the provision of new water supply hand pumps at 17 existing bore hole locations in the surrounding communities; improvements to education facilities in the 8 affected communities; and improvements to the health facilities at the Naminya resettlement site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Effects on Land                      | There will be permanent and temporary loss of agricultural land. Temporary land take areas will be reinstated to a condition that will make it possible for the land to be used for agriculture, forestry or industry. To minimise impacts to terrestrial habitat, BEL will:  
  • Do enrichment planting to regenerate forest vegetation on island land not inundated but previously logged or cleared for agriculture, as well as land along the mainland shore.  
  • Plant native and medicinal tree species in areas of the riparian strip that are currently bare or planted with cash and/or subsistence crops, in order to control erosion and to provide (in the long term) roosting sites for birds and bats.  
  The portion of the quarry that will remain above water level, i.e. form the new riverbank, will be profiled and planted such that it has a similar landscape to equivalent areas above the water line prior to construction, and blends in with the profile of undisturbed areas. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Issue/Effect</th>
<th>Description of Effect &amp; Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Water</td>
<td>• The project is not expected to significantly change downstream water flows – during filling a maximum of 2.5% of the combined Nalubaale/Kiira dam discharge will be retained in the Bujagali impoundment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Water levels will rise in wells and pit latrines located adjacent to the river. Although no adverse effects are anticipated, any latrines or wells negatively affected will be replaced or compensated for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There will be an increase in suspended solids resulting from coffer dam and other construction activities. These effects will be minimised by avoiding disturbance of soils during the clearing activities. Site drainage systems will include sedimentation basins to trap sediments in runoff prior to release to the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Indigenous aquatic grasses will be planted to control erosion that might occur as a result of the fluctuating water levels during the initial operation period. In the long term the banks are expected to stabilise and no significant erosion is expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trees and shrubs will be harvested prior to the reservoir being filled, to minimise water quality effects associated with rotting vegetation, and to prevent fouling of fishing gears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is expected that fish stocks will naturally increase in the reservoir compared to the existing condition. For Nile tilapia, <em>Rastineobola argentea</em> habitat enhancement will be carried out as part of the quarry and river bank restoration. Stocking is not expected to be needed. Haplochromines are expected to also increase as a result of the conversion of faster-flowing habitats to the slower-flowing habitats that are preferred by these species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Entrapment and entrainment of aquatic organisms is not expected to have a significant effect on fish or other populations. Fish screens will be installed on the water intakes reduce the rate of entrainment by fish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access points will be provide to the river to ensure there is access to the river by local persons for washing, fishing or other purposes during the construction period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Air Quality</td>
<td>• Dust generated during construction is not expected to result in any significant offsite impacts. Industry good practice will be used to limit dust, including grassing stockpiles to prevent wind raised dust, using wetting agents on roads, and using covering loads of friable materials on trucks using public roads. Vehicles and motors will be regularly maintained to minimise exhaust emissions and black smoke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Issue/Effect</td>
<td>Description of Effect &amp; Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Noise</td>
<td>• Noise generated during construction is not expected to have any significant off-site nuisance effects. The main offsite noise will be short term noise related to blasting during quarrying. Communities will be informed the procedures and timing of blasting, including posters warning residents of blasting noise, and door-to-door visits to advise and consult with residents in person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Roads and Traffic</td>
<td>• An existing two-lane, paved, public highway provides access to the site. The existing roads are of sufficient capacity to accommodate project related traffic. A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will address all aspects of project related traffic including speeding, maximum loads on trucks, abnormal loads; and, management of connection points between access roads and main public highways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Managed and Protected Areas</td>
<td>• The project will result in disturbance and loss of land that falls within the Jinja Wildlife Sanctuary. Consultations with the management authority for the Sanctuary indicate that planned enhancement planting will offset the losses. The sponsor will assist in the further development of the Kalagala Falls and Nile Bank CFRs to help offset impacts on Bujagali Falls and Jinja Wildlife Sanctuary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism, White Water Rafting and Aesthetics</td>
<td>• The project will result in flooding of Bujagali Falls and associated rapids that form a portion of the whitewater rafting (WWR) routes. Consultations with WWR operators indicate that the operators are generally well-advanced in their preparations to move their operations downstream. BEL will provide new raft launching facilities downstream of the dam, the specific locations to be agreed upon with the operators. BEL is involved in ongoing consultations with the WWR operators as to how it can further offset the impacts on their activities, and support the relocation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BEL will construct a visitor’s centre at the HPP and a cultural centre near Bujagali Falls, and work with Jinja Tourism Development Association (JITDA) on sustainable tourism activities for the new reservoir recreationally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Cultural Property</td>
<td>• The project will result in flooding of household graves and amasabo. Where possible these have been relocated as part of the resettlement programme or through compensation payments. Remembrance services to commemorate those buried in the area will be completed. A structure or monument may be erected, either at site of remembrance or elsewhere, in accordance with wishes expressed by local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dwelling sites of spirits important to the local community are being addressed through transfer and resettlement ceremonies. Ceremonies for the Bujagali Rapids have been carried out, although additional activities are being discussed with the Busoga Kingdom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Issue/Effect</td>
<td>Description of Effect &amp; Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Community, Health, Safety and Security | - The project is not expected to result in a significant change in the prevalence of diseases such as malaria and HIV/AIDS. Workers will be housed in Jinja to avoid creating a camp with large numbers of single males living outside their normal social surroundings. BEL and its EPC Contractor will work with local NGOs to deliver awareness and prevention programs for AIDS/HIV, Malaria, and other diseases. Actions to control malaria infection by workers will include anti-malarial prophylactics for expatriate workers, bed-nets, window screens, and insecticidal sprays.  
- The reservoir is not expected to significantly change the prevalence of vector born parasitic disease. The narrow, steep-sided valley of the impoundment will create significantly fewer vector breeding sites when compared with impoundments with extensive, shallow shorelines. Daily fluctuations of water levels will strand vectors, including mosquito larvae and snails, and to expose both the vectors (adults and egg masses) and potential breeding sites to the drying effects of the sun. Trees and shrubs will be cleared from the reservoir area before inundation to remove potential anchorages for weed mats that are favourable habitat for snail vectors. |
| Labour and Working Conditions | Adherence to labour standards and well-being of construction workers  
- EPC Contractor will be required to adopt policies and procedures that comply with national legislation and address all aspects of labour standards relevant to the project as specified by IFC policies. Sub-contractors will be contractually required to comply with labour and health and safety legislation.  
Public safety issues regarding: accidental contact with power lines, collision with construction equipment, quarry excavations, material storage  
- Secure equipment and demarcate any excavations in such a way as to prevent accidents when construction not in progress; Keep non-authorised persons away from any construction activities/sites/yards/ equipment; Fence critical areas and post warning signs with appropriate text and graphics; Begin educational programs in schools and communities to educate people of hazards and safe practices.  
Work related injury or health effects  
- The EPC Contractor will comply with relevant WB/IFC health and safety requirements, including specific provisions for: Introduction and use of poisonous or other chemicals injurious to health; Handling dangerous goods and special waste; Training; Working environment committee; Use of helmets; Personal injuries and accidents; Damage to material, equipment and buildings; Poison treatment, chemical and fire injuries; Safety audit; Work done by hired personnel or firms; Operating cranes; Working with heat in confined places; Corrective action; and Protective action. |
8.0 Community Development Action Plan

The Bujagali hydropower facility will result in many community benefits at the national, regional and community levels. In addition to the resettlement and compensation package that each directly affected person will receive, BEL is committed to providing community benefits in a sustainable manner by means of the Community Development Action Plan, one of the component of the Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan.

The area that will benefit from the CDAP consists mainly of the eight directly affected villages: four on the West Bank (Mukono District): Naminya, Buloba, Malindi, Kikubamutwe; and, on four the East Bank (Jinja District): Bujagali, Ivunamba, Kyabirwa and Namizi.

BEL proposes to support long-term sustainable development initiatives, rather than to generate them. The CDAP was developed, based on the following strategy:

1. Improve local social infrastructure as part of quick-impact activities to enhance community support and confidence and fix projects left incomplete by AESNP:
   - Improve water supply;
   - Improve education and health facilities;
   - Establish a social unit to monitor implementation, particularly with respect to vulnerable peoples

2. Support sustainable economic development:
   - Enhance direct and indirect employment opportunities:
     - The construction of the dam will provide direct sources of employment; the job opportunities will be directed to the affected communities to the extent possible and employability must be improved;
     - Measures will be taken to enhance indirect employment;
   - Enhance agricultural productivity and farm produce marketing;
   - Develop non agricultural sources of livelihood.

BEL is proposing to invest approximately $USD 2.4 million into a community development action plan. Although the specifics of the plan will need to be established through future consultation with appropriate authorities and the affected communities, Table 3 summarizes the regional and community benefits that are expected to occur as a result of the hydropower facility project. These programs are to be implemented during the pre-construction and construction phases of the project.
Table 3 - Community Development Initiatives Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Development Areas</th>
<th>Description of Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Facilities</td>
<td>It is understood that improvements are required to health facilities in the communities of Budondo, Iyunamba, Wakisi and Kalagala. BEL will consider participating in the upgrading of these facilities after an assessment of needs is conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Opportunities/Training</td>
<td>It is expected that a minimum of 10 percent of the unskilled workforce will originate from the affected villages for the construction phase of the project. This phase will employ 600-1,500 people at the peak period. The Ministry of Education &amp; Sports and the Vocational Training Institute in Jinja, in conjunction with BEL, is developing skills refresher courses in motor vehicle repair, electrical installation and fitting, welding and fabrication, plumbing and pipe fitting, metal fabrication and brick/block laying. Courses will be designed to meet the needs of interested PAPs. BEL and the EPC Contractor will pursue an apprenticeship programme that can provide additional job opportunities during the operational phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>BEL will work with the affected communities to improve their water supply. It is tentatively proposed to add one well in each of the affected communities (8 new wells).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>BEL will be consulting with the Rural Electrification Authority (REA) to explore the possibility of providing investments that improve community access to electricity in the area. Consultation with REA is essential both for implementation, design and materials authorisation and for the appropriate methodology for sensitisation and community management within the framework of the existing Rural Electrification Policy in Uganda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Small Business Support      | A commercial area will be created in the vicinity of the contractor’s base in the dam area. This market would aim primarily at selling food and basic goods to construction workers. The area would be provided with drinking water, latrines, proper run-off water, sanitation and made accessible to Matatu mini-buses. This commercial area would provide indirect job opportunities (i.e., it is estimated that 50 jobs could be created, mainly for women) in addition to those created directly by the project. BEL will implement a small business support and micro-credit program that will include:  
  - A basic business support centre on each bank of the river to provide training in business planning and management with a focus of fisheries, trade and agriculture.  
  - A revolving credit line funded by BEL will be established and managed by an existing micro credit institution  
  - Support to local businesses to create linkages with BEL and the EPC contractor outsourcing departments |
### Community Development Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fisheries</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed improvements to the fisheries sector include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide improvements to landing facilities (4 new locations are proposed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The provision of fishing equipment to each ‘Beach management Committee”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implement a training program to the fishers to prepare the fishers for the change in the river’s characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering the scarcity of land, support to agriculture should focus on the intensification and high-value added crops. Proposed initiatives include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organization of producers in groups to support extension services and to better structure marketing of local produce in Jinja and Kampala;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Agricultural extension services:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provision of technical advice and assistance for new crops, new varieties, fertilization, soil preparation, agro-forestry and erosion control, intensification and market gardening;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Subsidized provision of improved seeds and fertilizers to groups;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promotion of intensive modes of cultivation (mushrooms, tree nurseries);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Integration agriculture / livestock (use of organic matter);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Animal husbandry extension services:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promotion of new animal species (grass-cutters) and breeds (higher productivity pigs and poultry for instance);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Integration agriculture / livestock (use of agricultural by-products);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Better methods for animal nutrition;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Improved slaughtering and hygiene management;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Management support (“farming as a business”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The previous project sponsor established a detailed program for improvements in the educational sector of the 8 affected communities. To date, only improvements at two schools have been implemented. BEL is proposing to invest in school improvements. The program is to be confirmed after consulting with education authorities, the local councils and the communities themselves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.0 Project Schedule

The draft SEA Reports are to be completed and publicly released by mid-October 2006. It is anticipated that project lenders and the GOU will take until early 2007 to review and make a decision on whether the draft SEA meets their requirements. Construction on the HPP is anticipated to be initiated in 2007 and is expected to take about 4 years to complete.
10.0 Contact Information

For additional information and/or to submit comments in regards to the project, please contact:

Bujagali Energy Limited
IPS Uganda
Plot 109-112, Fifth Street,
Industrial Area, Kampala.
Tel.: +256 41 258194
Email: info@bujagali-energy.com

Comments are requested by October 19, 2006.
PCDP Appendix A
Summary of Previous Consultation Activities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE (MM/DD/YY)</th>
<th>PERSON/GROUP MET</th>
<th>TITLE/ADDRESS</th>
<th>CATEGORY OF STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF CONSULTATION</th>
<th>ISSUES RAISED</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/11/03</td>
<td>Wakisi Residents</td>
<td>L.C 1 C/Ms of buloba, Naminya, Malindi and Kikubamutwe, Some residents</td>
<td>Affected Communities</td>
<td>Security meeting; introduction of new guards and measures for site access</td>
<td>Special access for fishermen; allowance for collection of firewood and grass; regular bush clearance to keep off hazardous animals; need for good relations with the guards</td>
<td>Formation of security committee with residents involved; provision of Ids to fishermen; no access for firewood; constant monitoring and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/07/04</td>
<td>Wakisi Council</td>
<td>L.C 3 C/Ms of Wakisi, Some councilors and residents</td>
<td>Affected Communities</td>
<td>General Project Update</td>
<td>Timing for the project; the new project developer; remnant issues relating to community development; land titles for the people in Naminya</td>
<td>Titles to be worked upon; issues related to community development to be documented and forwarded to MEMD or new developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/07/04</td>
<td>Residents of East Bank (Kyabiirwa, Bujagali, Namizi and Ivunamba)</td>
<td>L.C chairpersons of the affected villages and local residents</td>
<td>Affected Communities</td>
<td>Briefing on Site clearance and fencing preparations</td>
<td>Access to the river needed; allowance of time to harvest crops planted within project site; water issue</td>
<td>Access points to be provided when fence is up; time will be given to allow harvesting but that should be the last notice; water program to be carried out before fence is erected; residents to advise on best access points to be retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/05/04</td>
<td>Naminya Resettled persons</td>
<td>Alex Wanyama, Hakim Mujuzi and beneficiaries</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Distribution of Titles</td>
<td>Pending titles to be availed too; are the resettled allowed to sell mortgage?</td>
<td>Team to work hard to process remnant titles; persons not advised to sell anything or mortgage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE (MM/DD/YY)</td>
<td>PERSON/GROUP MET</td>
<td>TITLE/ADDRESS</td>
<td>CATEGORY OF STAKEHOLDER</td>
<td>PURPOSE OF CONSULTATION</td>
<td>ISSUES RAISED</td>
<td>ACTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/08/04</td>
<td>West Bank residents</td>
<td>Wanje Peter, Wagola Michael, (Kikubamutwe L.C officials); Some residents, L.C Cm of Naminya, and Buloba</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Briefing on monitoring activities to be done shortly</td>
<td>Rationale for monitoring; actual date of commencing needed; NAPE's activities; T-Line residents not catered for</td>
<td>Rationale for monitoring was explained and target sample identified; date to be communicated soon; residents to be careful with NAPEs activities but should not be hostile; T-Line issues to be dealt with once developer is identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/04</td>
<td>Wanyama Cornelius</td>
<td>Cornelius Wanyama and Buyer.</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Land dispute</td>
<td>Clarification of Project boundary</td>
<td>Map to be availed and mark stones to be identified; L.Cs and PLCs to be encouraged to take up such issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/01/05</td>
<td>Naminya Residents</td>
<td>Residents of Naminya and host community</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Regular monitoring and documentation of arising issues</td>
<td>Outstanding issues (titles, School, Clinic, and Electricity); new access route to main highway; governments involvement in solving their problem</td>
<td>Issues documented and to be forwarded to MEMD for action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/01/05</td>
<td>NAPE</td>
<td>Frank Muramuzi, Geoffrey Kamese</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Regular monitoring and documentation of arising issues</td>
<td>Abandonment of the resettled persons; failure to fulfill the RAP as was laid out</td>
<td>Issues documented and to be forwarded to MEMD/ UETCL for action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/01/05</td>
<td>West Bank Residents (few)</td>
<td>Few residents utilizing the boreholes</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Regular checks on Boreholes</td>
<td>Most boreholes breaking down</td>
<td>Consult water officers at the Sub county and Mukono district; inform MEMD/UETCL on problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE (MM/DD/YY)</td>
<td>PERSON/ GROUP MET</td>
<td>TITLE/ADDRESS</td>
<td>CATEGORY OF STAKEHOLDER</td>
<td>PURPOSE OF CONSULTATION</td>
<td>ISSUES RAISED</td>
<td>ACTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/03/05</td>
<td>Namizi residents</td>
<td>Residents of Namizi and other neighboring villages; aspiring candidates for local elections; L.C officials</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Regular monitoring and documentation of issues</td>
<td>Access points to the river; water problem;</td>
<td>Residents to advise on appropriate access points; CDAP issues to be resolved once developer is identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04/05</td>
<td>Kyabirwa Residents</td>
<td>Residents of Namizi and other neighboring villages, aspiring candidates for local elections, L.C officials</td>
<td>Affected Communities</td>
<td>Regular monitoring and documentation of issues</td>
<td>Access points to the river; water problem; remnant CDAP issues; fishermen were forgotten</td>
<td>Residents to advise on appropriate access points; CDAP issues to be resolved once developer is identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PCDP Appendix B
Phase 1 Consultation Materials
# Meeting Notes: Bujagali ESIA Scoping Mission, January and March 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Project site/ESIA status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| UEGCL, UETCL, MEMD 9 Jan 06 | Commissioner Mubiru, Henry Bidassala, Eddie Mutesa, George Kahunguru, Eriasi Kyemba, Several others | - No major differences from AESNP design and operation, water releases, management etc.  
- Rock fill will be won from completely within land take footprint.  
- Resettlement of dam site is complete. PAPs generally happy but some AESNP undertakings are yet to be completed, e.g. collector roads, electrification, dispensary (one small one constructed), west bank school  
- Traffic assessment may need updating  
- Fisheries may be less significant due to setting up of business with compensation money  
- Tourism needs updating – more rafting companies present  
- Water supply – pumps broken down in dam area, not Naminya resettlement village  
- West bank is fenced off, East bank not fenced off yet. Contract for fencing east bank is under negotiation  
- Effects of blasting on Nalubaale & Kiira dams?  
- AESNP IPR has reverted to GoU.  
- BIU say no new RAP needed for hydro site, but needs of PAPs may have changed, therefore need monitoring and independent audit of AESNP RAP. Scope to include tenure, gender balance, further property acquired, level of education. May be done by Witness NGO? | Power demand and supply  
- National power demand currently 350 MW.  
- Current generating capacity = 180-190 MW, therefore emergency measures are in place. 50MW thermal power plant supplied by Aggreko, runs at full capacity from 6 am to midnight.  
- Deficit of 100-110 MW remains – managed through load shedding.  
- Lake Vic level dropped 9 cm in December alone. DWD directive to only release 830 m³/s (down from 1000) will mean cutting back generation by 1 x 40 MW unit, i.e. reduce Nalubaale/Kiira generation to 150 MW.  
- Capacity of Bujagali is more important when L. Vic level is low, due to live storage in Bujagali headpond being > Nalubaale.  
- Geothermal option examined by Acres – said 400 MW potential, but hard to realise this.  
- Mini-hydro – several initiatives underway – help with electrification in rural areas but not significant on a national basis.  
- Transmission losses were 15-20 MW in 2000 – talk to ERA/UMEME to update. (see UETCL 12 Jan |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transmission Line</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>UETCL expect AESNP t-line route and substation location to be used. Only difference should be development cost will have increased due to inflation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No compensation has been paid for t-line, other than Kawanda substation. Kawanda not fenced off, and some crops are present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structures constructed in wayleave since 2003 – little scope for local adjustment in t-line route to avoid these as surrounding areas are now more developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T-line re-valuation is a legal requirement of GoU/UETCL. Site/IPS team are to advise, take info back and report to international lenders/community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Riparian notification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft notifications were sent to Ministry of Foreign Affairs, along with technical package. MEMD to check with MFA as to whether these were sent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nile Basin Initiative is not an appropriate vehicle for notification as is still transitional, but we should consult with NBI anyway out of courtesy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WWR/Kalagala offset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner to check with PS on Kalagala offset position, and advise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will also check on Sector Revenue Waterfall project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WWR – be aware that LCs may seek replacement revenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMD</td>
<td>PS Kaliisa</td>
<td>WWR: GoU position (Cabinet and Ministries) is that Bujagali is primarily a hydropower site, and all other industries are subservient to this. GoU position is that no compensation is due to WWR companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Jan 06</td>
<td></td>
<td>Riparian notification: NBI is not a govt authority, therefore cannot make and objection. MoU signed between Egypt and Uganda in Dec 2005 re: no objection to Bujagali. PS Kaliisa to follow up and give info.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kalagala offset: still exists, but will need to re-constitute multi-sector committee that was looking after this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEMA</td>
<td>Henry Aryamanya-Mughisha, ED Waiswa Ayazika, EIA Coordinator</td>
<td>New Code of Conduct for Environmental Practitioners – need to be registered with NEMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Jan 06</td>
<td></td>
<td>Addendum to old EIA sufficient, or start from scratch? OK to submit ‘Revised EIA’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Project Brief required as this project has already been subject to EIA and approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lake water levels should be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fish passage – follow up with FIRRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation should focus on updating. Include new developments e.g. hotels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Jinja leadership**<br>11 Jan 06 | RDC & Deputy RDC  <br>Deputy Mayor of Jinja <br>(apologies from Mayor)  <br>Budondo LC3  <br>Bujagali LC1 Chair  <br>Kyabirwa LC1 Chair  <br>Namizi West LC1 Chair  <br>Namizi Central LC1 Chair  <br>DEO Jinja (Dick Lufafa)  <br>BIU – Eddie, Zac, George K, Thomas | - Leadership was advised re: new Applicant/Sponsor, changed compensation rates, t-line route not finalised, changed lake levels.  
- LC3 Budondo – all still support project, when will it happen?  
- LC1 Namizi Central – what about Health Centre, roads, technical school, boreholes (number & location), electrification?  
- Zac – borehole complaint is about well development and maintenance, not the number. Several wells were drilled, but most were for investigation and never intended to be developed for water supply.  
- DEO – need to follow Ugandan guidelines for well construction (no. of people per well etc.). Need to involve District Water Officer.  
- Thomas – east bank not yet fenced, therefore water is not a critical problem. But need to install wells before fencing.  
- Deputy RDC – fencing should be permanent, but not until water supplies secured. Need more than 2 wells/village. Need a bridge across river.  
- RDC – all social amenities are on west bank, east bank does not benefit.  
- George – reality is that most of works and PAPs are on west bank, therefore most of compensation/community development is on east bank.  
- LC3 – fisheries development/income replacement?  
- LC1 Namizi Central – museum/cultural centre.  
- Eddie – will be in CDAP                                                                                                                                 |
| **Jinja DEO**<br>11 Jan 06 | Dickson Lufafa                                                           | - District Water Officer must be involved with selection and implementation of boreholes, including siting issues (proximity to houses, latrines, on slopes, workmanship etc.). Policy limits to around 80 households per borehole. Also need to identify and rectify wells which contravene guidelines. Water Resources Regs and Water Supply Regs are relevant.  
- Fence – planting is in Feb/March and Sept/Oct rainy seasons. Need to fence after harvest but before |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>planting, and give sufficient time to find alternative locations.</td>
<td>100 m buffer zone required.</td>
<td>Monitoring - DEO is required to carry out monitoring (all DEOs are Gazetted Environmental Inspectors). DL looking to set up Environmental Committees at parish level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation – too many people per latrine? Bush has been removed. Needs education.</td>
<td>Address WWR issue.</td>
<td>FIRRI John Balirwa, Director Jonna Kamanyi Bismus Babazi – catch assessment S Wandera G Namulemo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRRI 11 Jan 06</td>
<td>FIRRI previously have AESNP (PON/Thomas) a proposal for how to proceed with training for changes in fish stocks/fishing types.</td>
<td>AESNP had permits to construct new landing sites/ floating jetties. These were not constructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in fishery sector – managed by Beach Management Units (BMUs) that co-own and manage the fishery. BMUs have minimum of 30 boats. New policy overseen by Dept of Fisheries Resources, Entebbe. Need to review locations/economics vis-à-vis BMUs. Include assessment of community perception.</td>
<td>Fish ladder – FIRRI happy to re-state earlier recommendation to NEMA, that this is not needed</td>
<td>2000 fisheries surveys need updating, to take into account both random change, and the effects of changes in Lake Victoria levels. Water hyacinth in L Vic has probably not changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent haplochromine work on Vic Nile found the same as 2001 surveys.</td>
<td>Mukono RDC Mukono LC3 Wakisi LCI Kikubamutwe General Sec Kikubamutwe LCI Naminya LCI Buloba BIU</td>
<td>RDC: power is the priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC3 Wakisi - use local labour. Advise LC3 of workforce size in advance so they can mobilise.</td>
<td>Gen Sec Kikubamutwe – LCI should approve employment offers – may be thieves or not locals.</td>
<td>Gen Sec Kikubamutwe - LC3 Wakisi - what about schools, health centre, electricity, water tanks as promised?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCI Naminya – borehole spare parts, schools, electrification, establish market/committee.</td>
<td>Gen Sec Kikubamutwe – t-line surveyed but no compensation. Structures have collapsed, plants left to revert to bush. Should be compensated at 2000 rate.</td>
<td>RDC – access roads should be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Sec Kikubamutwe – concerned re: water sources – 2 pumps broke down due to lack of spare parts and high use/population. Requested replacement and to be given a type which can be easily repaired.</td>
<td>RDC – bore water is primitive. Can we provide piped water?</td>
<td>RDC - access roads should be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Wildlife Damian Akankwasa (Acting)</td>
<td>Mabira conservation area needs to create similar habitat. Shouldn’t be existing forest – better to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority (UWA) 12 Jan 06</td>
<td>ED) Charles Mwesigye (Community Consultation/Planning/EIA) Richard Eunice Dule Sam</td>
<td>enhance a degraded area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Need to assess effects of gazetting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can animals be translocated to Kalagala Islands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Little animal translocation experience at UWA (re: animals on islands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Jinja Animal Sanctuary is now Jinja Wildlife Sanctuary. Defined as an area where human activity is allowed so long as it is compatible with wildlife in the area. Jinja AS was mainly for birds. Sam – 100 m buffer area should allow compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ED – possible to extend length of JWS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Poaching – UWA would need to work with NFA et al. re: what actions are needed for controlling poaching, illegal logging in Mabira. Use existing access/control points wherever possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• DWD mobilises villages to form Water and Sanitation Committees (9 members including Chair, Secretary).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Capital cost of water/sewerage schemes comes partly from community (c. 1.25%). Typical borehole costs Ush 15 million. Operation and Maintenance is community responsibility, but District Water Officer will get involved if beyond community capability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ss 6 &amp; 18 permits only last 1 year. Need to re-apply at Entebbe. Ditto dredging licence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No new permits required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Dam Safety Management Unit/Commission must be struck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Forestry Authority (NFA) 12 Jan 06</td>
<td>Olav Bjella, ED Edward Mupada Paul Buyerah Samuel Vivian Matagi</td>
<td>NFA has been an 'Authority' since 26 April 2004, mandated under the National Forestry &amp; Tree Planting Act 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There is a new National Forestry Policy (2001) and National Forest Plan (2002). Forestry Nature Conservation Master Plan was reviewed in 2002/3. NFA to provide these in digital form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Act vested former Forest Department responsibilities into three:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Policy &amp; Regulatory role lies with Ministry of Land, Water &amp; Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Central Forest Reserve responsibilities lie with NFA (506 in total, 1.2 million hectares)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o District Forestry Services (local government) – meant to recruit officers to manage Local FRs (c. 200 in total) plus supervise private sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mabira forest:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Loss of land must be compensated (e.g. like-for-like)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Trees must be compensated with cash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder | Attendees | Notes
--- | --- | ---
 | | o Licence has been issued to Mabira Forest Lodge – middle/high class lodge  
o Natural re-vegetation is occurring – will be in better condition than 2000  
o NFA can provide consultancy arm to do surveys.  
- Kifu/Namyoya FRs are now licensed to provide individuals for plantation forest. Will need to be compensated.  
- Kalagala Offset:  
- Adrift has a permit/licence for tourism lodge on islands (semi-permanent structures)  
- Query on ownership/legal status of Kalagala Islands – unsure if they are part of Kalagala Falls or Nile Bank FRs.  
- Will project flood the Kimaka FR? (no – c. 100 m from riverbank)  
- Gazettement of Bujagali Islands is possible. But both Jinja and Mukono districts claim the islands, and Local FR must be owned by one or the other. May be better to be a CFR (land owned by ULC). There is no minimum size for CFRs. If Jinja Animal/Wildlife Sanctuary does not include islands then these could be added as replacement JAS area.  
- ED – why not gazette buffer area along river bank as well?  
- Edward Ssenyonjo is NFA GIS officer – will provide GIS data (at a price).
| Gerald Muganga – Manager, Engineering  
George K  
Steven ? (Engineer) | GM – doesn’t see any new issues with hydro site.  
- Acres study (E African Power Master Plan) contains most recent load forecasts, for Ug, Ken, Tz individually and combined. (digital copy provided). Recommendations adopted by all 3 countries with some amendments.  
- System alignment is 220 kV double circuit, northern alignment as per 2001. Part of reason for wanting this is a regional circuit around L Victoria, consistent with Tz and Kenyan circuits. (under EAPMP).  
- Regional circuit is not just for export – also gives security of supply (e.g. thermal from Kenya, Songo Songo) and compatible voltage. Poverty reduction is still relevant.  
- Transmission/distribution losses are 34% in terms of GWh.  
- Local amendments to t-line route will be difficult due to intensive settlement. Angle towers are also more expensive.  
-  | 
| T-line field visits, 13 Jan 06 and 14 Jan 06 | Chris & Eddie, BIU | Mutundwe substation – Masaka line is starting construction (upgrade from 33 to 132 kV), not a new line. Bujagali will run parallel to this. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MEMD                             | PS Kaliisa, George K, Eng Muganga, UETCL       | • New houses constructed under proposed Buj line, e.g. 2 story structure at AP2  
• AP9 area – considerable encroachment into Lubigi swamp - cattle grazing, draining, papyrus cutting etc.  
• API4 area – land owned by Buganda Kingdom. Previously there was one tenant who was compensated (?). Sold tenancies to sub-tenants, who have since built houses in the wayleave.  
• Might be better to use Northern bypass corridor on opposite side of Lubigi swamp as people have been resettled off this.  
• Mabira FR – UETCL is keeping 30 m wayleave clear of vegetation and has improved access road and culverts/bridges. |
| Rural Electrification Authority   | Godfrey Turyahikayo – ED                       | • Northern bypass route – Burnside to draft letter to Min. Works Transport & Communications and request this option be considered.  
• Scope of work for UETCL valuation exercise – 3 months in field, 1 month reporting. 3 packages – survey, valuation, Witness NGO.  
• ToRs sent to Fred Giovannetti.  
• Crops should be valued as they are in 2006. Ok for 2 systems to operate e.g. 2006 valuation, plus uplift for those who abandoned structures after 2001 (the latter by sponsor).  
• Residents have encroached illegally. Ugandan law does not allow for UETCL to compensate people who are in wayleave illegally. But WBG guidelines will apply as this is an associated facility of Bujagali. Kaliisa – this has been discussed with WBG but no resolution found. Defaulted to GoU enforcing its laws. |
|                                 |                                                | **Rural** - any area not currently connected to power. Also infilling of existing areas (70% contribution from REA in these situations).  
**Target** - 10% connection by 2010 – c. 400,000 new connections between 2001 and 2010 i.e 40k/year. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Uganda Investment Authority**<br>16 Jan 06 | Dr Maggie Kigozi Issa Mukasa | - Equates to around 130 MW in total.  
- GIS based system to match sources/transmission with demands.  
- IRN criticism that Bujagali won’t increase rural connections - response is that REA programme needs increased generation capacity. Extension priority is to productive and potentially-productive areas. Also need to re-assure private sector (existing and potential investors) re: security of supply.  
- Prioritisation of productive areas as follows: economic potential first, viability to operator (UMEME) second, ease of connection third.  
- IPS expects REA to be involved in electrification of PAP villages.  
- Karuma timing - development will follow Bujagali financial close.  
- $878 m investment licensed in 2005 – all need power. Manufacturing is in second place at $197 m.  
- No new info available on unrealised projects.  
- Tourism - UIA markets Uganda as a destination. Source of Nile and WWR are very important. UIA promotes investment at hotel/WWR operator level, but have warned these parties that hydropower is coming. UIA is licensing authority. Bujagali needs to apply for an investment licence!  
- Issa provided investment information and info on perceived obstacles to investment, past and present (power supply back at top of list).  
- UTA is still against the project.  
- UIA also works on Carbon Fund. MLWE is the Designated National Authority under the CDM. Local experts at MUK Dept of Mechanical Engineering calculate baseline and future carbon. MLWE signs off then can get $ from WB Carbon Fund or sell credits. |
- Need to update Kalagala offset report  
- Encroachment of FRs is an issue at Kalagala  
- MTTI would support investment in ‘Source of Nile’ infrastructure e.g. hospitality, sanitation, access, presentation (e.g. improve existing Speke & Gandhi monuments, underwater viewing structure?)  
- Destination Uganda programme run by private sector – this could be an annual event at Source of Nile.  
- Need community development to discourage begging e.g. at Bujagali currently (encourage community participation)  
- Bill currently going through Parliament, specifically for licensing of tourist facilities.  
- MTTI does not have info on revenue of individual tourism operators. Data held by local authorities – |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attendees</strong></td>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>probably sensitive and under-reported. Best to approach companies directly when ToR approved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PS: Kalagala offset/access/development is best way to mitigate/compensate Bujagali. GoU needs to commit to improving access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Future communications should be direct with MTTI – no local representation other than local authorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity Regulatory Authority</td>
<td>Eng. Sebbowa – CEO Benon Mutambi – Mgr Economic Regulation Patrick Mwesigye – Finance Mgr Mgr Technical Regulation</td>
<td>ERA is 5.5 years old. Purpose is to licence, and set tariffs, explore tariff methodology and structure. If not happy, can call for public hearing. Also have an arbitration role if necessary. Don’t generally have a legal mandate to make a ruling. Need approved EIA to issue licence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Jan 06</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Land Act and Electricity Act define roles and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ERA do load and supply forecasting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supply forecast is difficult due to projects which are not announced early, plus shocks such as drought/lake level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tariff = 6-7 c/kWh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nile Basin Initiative</td>
<td>Patrick Kahangire – ED Phillip de Felix &amp; Henri Garros, Coyne &amp; Bellier</td>
<td>NBI is a transitional institution – intention is to replace it with a supranational commission which may have regulatory powers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Jan 06</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Riparian notification should come from MLWE, not MEMD as this is a water issue not an energy issue. MEMD is just a user. Notification is only a WB requirement, therefore should not make it a political treat (via Foreign Affairs). Don’t want to create a precedent. Tz and Kenya should be notified via Lake Victoria Basin Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Looking to make NBI the forum for international notification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Bujagali should be viewed as a water management project as well as an energy management project – i.e. correcting OF/OFE losses. Needs integrated planning, i.e. water and energy set their objectives and plan accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lake levels – NBI has no current information on lake levels. Soon launching a project in Addis for sharing such information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), 20 March 06</td>
<td>Waiswa Ayazika, EIA Coordinator</td>
<td>Results of Draft ToR review and ToR finalization. ToRs have been sent to DWD, MUEINR, and Commissioner of Energy. No preliminary comments on the ToRs until response by stakeholders. There would be wider distribution to other agencies at draft ESIA stage. Document will be placed in public places. Exec. Summary in local newspapers. Public review period is 28 working days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide briefing on plans for March mission. Consultant explained that ToRs only covered hydropower component and that transmission consultant work would be complete in mid April.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry (MTTI), Tourism Department, 20 March, 06 | Justus Tindigarukayo-Kashagire (Commissioner, Tourism & Wildlife) Baguma Cuthbert Balinda, Tourism Officer | - Status of EIA Consultant Registration. EIA registration was good for the life of the project.  
- Invitation extended to NEMA for field visit.  
- Set up meeting for March 29 to discuss ToRs finalization.  
- From 1992 to 2002 MTTI has been developing a 10 year integrated Tourism Master Plan. This has not been updated but there is a new policy that came out in 2003 and a Tourism Marketing Strategy in 2004.  
- MTTI advises on the Wildlife Act as well as National Environment Management Policy, the National Environment Management Act and the Wetlands Management Policy within the context of developing a Policy Framework. Overall policy is to develop high quality low impact tourism.  
- Specific to Bujagali WWR is relatively new and draws largely on thrill seekers. MTTI has been unable to canvass specific proprietors.  
- In the event of displacement by the dam Kalagala is considered an appropriate alternate option/tourist destination.  
- MTTI would like to see improvements to tourist sites at the mouth of the Nile including better amenities for elderly and handicapped, better service facilities and better linkages with Jinja town. Difficulty is that due to decentralization responsibility lies with local govt. MTTI would like sponsor to work with local govt. To assist in tourist opportunities at the source of the Nile.  
- Kalagala seen as Bujagali tradeoff but development is hampered by poor access and poor infrastructure as well as encroachment of locals along the shores.  
- MTTI wants to see reasonable continuance of WWR with assistance by sponsor as part of an overall mitigation plan. Would like to see Bujagali project sponsors work within the context of MTTI goal to develop the Lake Victoria shores and Nile for "high quality - low impact" tourist development as well as a conferencing destination. |
| National Forestry Authority (NFA), 20 March, 06 | Olav Bjella, Paul Musamuli, C.D. Lagoya and Jones Ruhombe. | - Discussed issue of gazettement of Kalagala Islands. Currently not gazetted but consultations with NEMA as well as Dept. of Lands and Surveys indicates that they can likely be gazetted as forest reserve.  
- NFA has a draft plan for the Kalagala/Nile Bank Area in which tourism development is a significant component. For example one of the WWR companies has conducted an EIA for a low impact development in the area. Relevance of the Kalagala offset within this needs to be reconciled within the overall NFA strategy. Long term goal is to move encroachers away from the river bank to enhance naturalisation.  
- Would be looking to sponsor to assist NFA in carrying out NFA Plan for Kalagala as part of the |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nalubaale Rafting, 20 March, 06</td>
<td>Ian Baille - Owner</td>
<td>• Fairly new operator (newest of the existing WWR operations. \n• Runs 1 day, 2 day and multiday trips. 2 day trips would become 1 day trips and there would be no more multiday trips. \n• June to the end of August is busy time. Slow time from end of August to beginning of June. Charges $95 for 1-day trip. Operation has 5 rafts with 8 pax per raft. Operation is based out of Kampala. Caters largely to local expats and backpackers. Has around 8 staff in Jinja. Local training kayakers get 3000/= per day plus food, local qualified kayakers get 20 to 30,000/= per day plus food. Overseas guides get $50 per day. \n• Wants to be provided with timing of construction operations so as to be able to work their operation around the project for as long as is safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugandan Wildlife Authority (UWA), 20 March, 06</td>
<td>Eunice Nyiramahoro Duli, Deputy Director, Planning, Monitoring and Research</td>
<td>• UWA does not have a mandate at Kalagala or Bujagali but is interested in the protection and/or relocation of significant plant and animal species. Would want to have input into mitigation measures if required. Would like to see species lost at Bujagali replicated at Kalagala. \n• With respect to ecotourism UWA would only have an interest in significant species and would provide advice on implementation and mitigation. Local districts and agencies such as NFA and MTTI would be largely responsible for project implementation. \n• UWA is a sub ministry of MTTI. \n• UWA has a 5 year Strategic Plan as well as a Tourism Investment Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nile River Explorers</td>
<td>John Dahl, Owner</td>
<td>• Started out about 9 years ago. \n• Runs mainly 1-day trips. Main clientele is backpackers and over Landers. Have a camping facility in Jinja and charge $95 for 1-day trip, 1 night accommodation and breakfast and barbecue. Have around 800 people per month during busy season (June to September). Have 8 people per raft including guide. Kayakers get $20 per day. Overseas guides get $40-50 per day. Have about 100 to 150 employees. Have a new high-end tented camp on east bank of the Nile north of Jinja that caters to local expats. \n• Sees the need for power but also wants to remain a viable business. Intends to diversify through offering camping and fishing trips, trips on the lake, canoeing and mountain biking. Also wants information with respect to timing of construction operations so as to be able to work their operation around the project for as long as is safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equator Rafting</td>
<td>Hitesh Vora, Manager</td>
<td>• Have been around for 4 years. Business owned by same operation who owes the Speke Hotel Group. \n• Site is located at Bujagali picnic site. Have campsites near entrance. Intends to build hotel at campsite in the near future that will have 200 rooms and conferencing facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Stakeholder site meeting to Bujagali, East and West Bank of Kalagala, 23 March 06 | Ugandan Wildlife Authority – Richard Kapere, MTTI – Cuthbert Balinda, NEMA – Waiswa Ayazika, NTA – Rueben Arinitwe. | - NEMA has authority over all land within 100m of the riverbanks.  
- UWA requested more detailed information on the terrestrial ecology and plant and animal species on the Bujagali islands that will be inundated.  
- MTTI wants to confirm that heritage issues are reviewed to the satisfaction of the Ministry.  
- NFA wants review of the Kalagala tourism development plan.  

| LC1 and LC3 representatives for Wakisi sub-county (West bank of Nile), 27 March 06 | Consultant team, Sponsor representative and BIU representative. | - Locals saw little benefit coming from the rafters and envision more benefits coming from the provision of power generated by the dam. See rafters as detriment and possible reason why project was derailed last time. Resent the fact that the rafters do not buy local produce. They feel that the rafters can relocate if need be.  
- In terms of project spin-offs they are local small scale and not big picture. See main benefit in employment on the project. Would also like to get assistance in building a market, fishponds and training?  
- With respect to cultural matters. They feel that the spirits on the riverbank have not been appeased and that the only appeasement ceremonies completed were for the ones at Bujagali itself. See possible opportunity for a shrine/cultural visitor centre that could be a single site and have dual purpose of spirit appeasement and tourist draw.  
- Very important that hiring for the project construction be local. LCs stressed that they are in support of the project.  
- Women representatives want to see benefits to women through opportunities to sell food to workers working at the site. Also wanted to know what the situation was with respect to the repairs/upgrades to the boreholes. Some question as to who is responsible for compensation along the t-line. BIU responded that this was an issue for the GoU.  

<p>| Eskom Engineer | Engineer Elimu Esimu | - Volume of flow through the powerhouse is governed by the regulations imposed by DWD. Currently |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>at Nalubaale Dam site (Owen Falls), 27 March 06</td>
<td>the facilities (Nalubaale and Kiira) are not running at full capacity due to limitations from tail water cavitation and the need to maintain live storage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Elect Kezaala Basuale Muhammed, 27 March 06</td>
<td>Mayor Elect Kezaala Basuale Muhammed</td>
<td>Understands need for project. Was born near Bujagali and was involved in the earlier debate about the Bujagali Project. Was concerned about the potential for flooding the surrounding land. Was concerned about the potential impact on the tourist industry and wanted to know how involved the sponsor would be in mitigating the potential impact to the area. Mayor wants to see recruitment centre located in Jinja (Busoga) as he believes that the River is effectively located in Busoga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCI and LC3 representatives for Budondo sub-county (East bank of Nile), 28 March 06</td>
<td>Consultant team, Sponsor representative and BIU representative.</td>
<td>As opposed to the west side of the river rafting has been a positive benefit to the inhabitants of Budondo. Rafters purchase goods and services locally and much of the workforce is drawn from the east side of the bank. Therefore would like to know what was proposed to mitigate the impact of the construction on the tourist industry. Generally consultant believes impact will be minimal due to a maturation of the tourist market in the area. Locals also saw advantages of project in terms of improved infrastructure (roads) and increased development downstream. Similar concerns as west bank inhabitants about markets and cultural centre. Some dissention as to whether or not road improvements are a government or sponsor responsibility. Concerned about how equitable the hiring process for jobs on the project would be in terms of hiring locals from the west and east banks of the river. Currently it is anticipated that the recruitment centre is located on the west bank. There was a suggestion that a meeting between the leaders from the west and east bank be facilitated to ensure equitable treatment of both communities. Generally in support of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD), 29 March 06</td>
<td>Engineer Paul Mubiru, Commissioner</td>
<td>In terms of alternative power supply geothermal is still a long way down the road. There is potential for possibly 450MWe but this is still 5 to 10 years away minimum. With respect to solar power main issue is transmission, small scale and high development costs. Not deemed as a real alternative in the short term. Small hydro is being actively pursued but seen as an option for local use within small communities. Biomass. Kabira sugar works input 6MW to main grid with this to potentially increase to 10MW next year. Wind not considered viable due to lack of reliable wind patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| NEMA, 30 March 06 | Gerald Sawula, Deputy Executive Director; Waiswa Ayazika, EIA Coordinator | • Thermal plants currently being brought online to alleviate immediate power need. These include a 50MW diesel fired unit that is now online, a 50MW HFO unit to come online in January and another 50MW unit that is in the planning stages.  
• With respect to Kiira original design was for a 3-unit facility. Was redesigned as a 5 unit facility and combined with the subsequent drought has resulted in increased flows from L. Victoria. |
| UWA, 30 March 06  | Aggrey Rwetsiba, Monitoring and Research Coordinator; Kapere Richard, Planning and EIA Officer | • Mission wrap up meeting and met to discuss ToRs. Could not approve ToRs until such time as t-line was approved. Received official notification of such via letter. |
| MTI, 30 March 06  | Justus Tindigarakayo-Kashagire, Commissioner, Tourism & Wildlife; Baguma Cuthbert Balinda, Tourism Officer. Courtesy visit with MTI Minister Daudi Migereko | • Mission wrap up meeting. MTI concurred that a cultural information centres would be a good idea.  
• MTI reiterated that they continue to work with the districts to develop area specific plans i.e. Kalagala, Bujagali/source of Nile. Want to keep these areas separate from the urbanized Jinja area to maintain natural character of those settings.  
• Other approaches include a luxury boat cruise.  
• Mitigation to offset impact on local populace includes development of tourist destination at Kalagala-Itanda. Want project to make efforts to engage local communities in poverty alleviation.  
• Want to develop MICE concept, cultural/spiritual interpretation centre at Kalagala. Would also like to see a study to assist Jinja in developing a Tourist Development Strategy. Identify benchmarks in the ESIA with respect to mitigation and monitoring. Connect development plan with tourist attractions in other tourist focus areas e.g. Lake Kyoga, Tororo, Mt. Elgon. |
| NFA, 31 March 06  | Addison Anbrua, Coordinator for Land Management | • Mission wrap up meeting. NFA is proceeding with its development strategies for the Kalagala area regardless of the dam construction. NFA looking for recommendations as to how impacts of possible developers may be mitigated. Also looking for approaches and methodologies for enhancement plans at Kalagala location.  
• Institutional issue in that the NFA has a more limited scope than its predecessor which in turn affects its ability to implement its plan.  
• Kalagala offset plan developed during FD era therefore plan needs to be updated to reflect current NFA policies and mandate. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Directorate of Water Development (DWD), 1 April 06 | Jackson Twinomujuni, Hydrologist | - All lands in the Kalagala/Itanda area are in the process of being gazetted.  
- No plans to gazette the Bujagali Islands.  
- Main issues for DWD include sediment management with respect to the potential impact on the water head upstream of the dam.  
- L. Victoria area currently experiencing historic low water levels. Three consecutive years of very little rainfall (2003, 2004 and 2005).  
- Water input basin wide is derived 82% from rainfall and 18% from surface groundwater. Water loss is 76% from evaporation and 24% by outflow from the Nile.  
- Net Basin Supply has decreased in the last 3 years. NBS is the amount of water into the lake minus the amount of water that evaporates. In 2005 this was 8Billion cumeecs, which is the second lowest level since records taken (1890).  
- Design of Bujagali and Kiraa dams based on NBS numbers from 1961 to 1996.  
- Been moving water though dams above the Agreed Curve since 2001. Have lost 0.5m in lake levels since Nov. 2005.  
- Significant basin wide issue since Ugandas excessive use of water from the lake is impacting upstream users in Kenya and Tanzania.  
- Need to move water through dams to provide power puts DWD in conflict with MEMD as MEMD mandate is to manage water resources. |
THE BUJAGALI HYDROPOWER PROJECT & THE BUJAGALI INTERCONNECTION
PROJECT SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STUDY INITIATION

EKIRANGO

ENNYANJULA

Bujagali Hydro Power Project (BHPP) esuubirwa okukola amasanyalaze agaweza 250 MW ng’esangibwa ku kizinga ekiyitibwa Dumbell, 8km mubuki-

Bujagali HPP yasooka kutandikibwa ekitorongole kya AES Nile Power Ltd. ng’e-

Oluvannyuma lw’abaali ba’okuddukanya puljojekiti eno, AES Nile Power Ltd okujjama ena, Wagye m’irimu gyonna ba’okuddukanya Banka y’ensi yonna (World Bank) yatandikibwa okukwata kungeri gyenekosaamu embeera yonna. Enkola ey’okunoonya abanasasulira pulo-
jejiti eno yatambula bulungi era neggwa mu April 2005 nga balonze Bujagali Energy Limited (BEL) okuba kampuni esasulira Bujagali Hydropower Project.

Era bwogatta ku BHPP waliwo ne Bujagali Interconnection Project. Munkola eriwo kati, BEL, kulwa Uganda Electricity Transmission Company Limited (UETCL), eja kukuulakula yonna okukwata kungeri gyonna ey’e-
taagisa okukola amasanyalaze mu bbbiibiro ly’amasanyalaze esusubirwa okuz-
imbwa e Bujagali.

Okekekeneeyana engeri pulojekiti gyekosaamu obutonde bw’ensi n’embeera z’abantu (Social and Environmental Assessment) BEL eteekateeka okuwaayo n’okukakasibwa NEMA, World Bank Group

n’ebitongole ebiralaba ebivola ensimbi omuli African Development Bank ne European Investment Bank, nebiwandiiko ebipyanya ebya SEA.

Mungeri y’emu, BEL ewaddeyo eri NEMA ebigobererwa SEA (ToRs) ebya BHPP ne Interconnection Project okuyekeneenya wagye m’irimu gyonna ToRs zino.

Enkola ya SEA wagye m’ebiwandiiko ebipyanya ebya SEA ku pulojekiti zombi. Lipoota ez’en-
jawulo eza. SEA zija kutegekebwa okukwata kungeri gyonna okukakasibwa mu BHPP ne Interconnection Project. Enkola ya SEA wagye m’ebiwandiiko ebinagenderako biija kula bituuukagana bulungi n’amateeka ga GOU wagye m’ebitongole eby’ensi yonna ebivola, amateeka eg’obutonde bw’ensi, ebiragiro n’enkola eginjirwa. SEA za pulojekiti zakakibwa omwaka gwo.

Eby’okolo ku kwebuzaako

Abasasulira pulojekiti eno bewaawo okwebuza kubantu bonna abakwatib-wako mukisereya kyonna eky’okunoonyereza kwa SEA. Okubuukiriza eri aban-
tu bonna wagye m’irimu gyonna okukala palana ‘Social and Environmental Assessment’ (SEA) for the Hydro Power Project wagye m’irimu gyonna okukakasibwa. Pulojekiti yonna okutwalira awamu (hydro and transmission facilities) yakakasibwa Government ya Uganda (GoU) ng’eyita mu National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA) mu mwaka gwa 1999/2001 era nkakasibwa ne Banka y’ensi yonna wagye m’irimu gyonna yonna.

Okwebuzaako ku kwebuzaako kubantu bonna, ebivola, ebibiina by’anakyewa wagye m’ebitongole bya gavumenti era tugenda mumaaso.

Okumanya ebisingawo, tuukirira:

Bujagali energy Limited
IPS Uganda
Plot 109-112, Fifth Street,
Industrial Area, Kampala.
Tel.: +256 41 258194
info@bujagali-energy.com
THE BUJAGALI HYDROPOWER PROJECT &
THE BUJAGALI INTERCONNECTION PROJECT
SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STUDY INITIATION

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT

Background
The Bujagali Hydro Power Project (BHPP) is a proposed 250 MW hydropower facility located at Dumbell Island, 8km downstream (north) of Jinja town, Uganda on the Victoria Nile. The project consists of a power station housing 50 MW turbines, a 28m high dam and associated spillway works. The hydro site is expected to cover a total land take of 308 acres on both banks of the river.

The Bujagali HPP was first initiated by AES Nile Power Ltd. in the late 1990’s, a Social and Environmental Assessment (SEA) for the Hydro Power Project and for the associated transmission system facilities was undertaken. The overall project (hydro and transmission facilities) was approved by the Government of Uganda (GoU) through the National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA) in 1999/2001 and by the World Bank and African Development Bank boards in December 2001.

Following withdrawal of the previous Sponsor, AES Nile Power Ltd. in August 2003, the GoU with the support of the World Bank embarked on an international competitive bidding process for the procurement of a new project Sponsor. The procurement process was successfully completed in April 2005 with the appointment of Bujagali Energy Limited (BEL) as Sponsor of the Bujagali Hydropower Project.

Related to the BHPP is the separate Bujagali Interconnection Project. Under current project arrangements, BEL, on behalf of the Uganda Electricity Transmission Company Limited (UETCL), shall develop and manage the construction of the necessary transmission capacity to interconnect the proposed hydropower facility at Bujagali to the Ugandan grid.

Social and Environmental Assessment
BEL is preparing for submission and approval by NEMA, the World Bank Group and other lenders including the African Development Bank and the European Investment Bank, new SEA documentation.

In this regard BEL has submitted to NEMA the SEA terms of references (ToRs) for both the BHPP and the Interconnection Project for review and approval. These ToRs provide the basis for conducting the new SEA studies and producing the SEA documentation for both projects. Separate SEA reports will be prepared for the BHPP and the Interconnection Project. The SEA process and the resulting documentation shall comply with the relevant GOU and the international lender social and environmental legislation, regulations, guidelines and policies. The project's SEAs are to be completed later this year.

Consultation Activities
The project sponsors are committed to consulting with relevant stakeholders throughout the SEA study process. A Public Consultation and Disclosure Plan (PCDP) has been prepared which outlines the proposed consultation program. The PCDP and the SEA ToRs are available through the contact below and on the projects website [Note: website address to be provided]. Comments on the SEA ToRs and PCDP should be forwarded to the contact person below.

Consultation activities with the public, communities, civil society and government agencies are ongoing.

For more information, please contact:
Mr. Fabian Ahaisibwe
IPS Uganda
Plot 109-112, Fifth Street,
Industrial Area, Kampala.
Tel: +256 41 258194
fabian@ipsuganda.com
18th August 2006

The Bujagali Energy Limited
P.O. Box 30500-00100
IPU Uganda
Plot 107, 112, Fifth Street
Industrial Area, Kampala

RE: SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF BUJAGALI HYDROPOWER PROJECT AND INTERCONNECTION PROJECT.

This is in response to the advertisement which appeared in the New Vision of 8th August 2006 and the Daily Monitor of 9th August 2006 inviting comments on the social and environmental assessment (SEA) Terms of Reference (ToR) and the Public Consultation and Disclosure Plan (PCDP) of the above captioned projects.

The following are our concerns

1. Procedural concerns

The procedure of the above project is erroneous

(i) While there are invitations in the press/media for public comments on the ToR and PCDP of the projects, there is evidence that the ToR is already being implemented, before official approval by National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), which is misleading.

The following questions arise:

(a) Has NEMA approved the ToR?
(b) Has NEMA approved the PCDP?
(c) If NEMA has approved ToR and PCDP, what is the essence of inviting public comments?
(d) If NEMA has not approved ToR and PCDP, why are the ToR being implemented?

(ii) The Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) for the Bujagali project has already been signed without approval by Parliament and without incorporating the costs of the project related to EIA studies, construction, compensation and resettlement issues. Even after the PPA was signed, it still remains a secret instrument between government, World Bank and the Developer. Isn’t keeping the PPA secret a contravention of the law, especially now when there is a judicial precedent on this
matter. (Refer to a case: HCT-00-CV-MC-0139 of 2001 Greenwatch vs Attorney General and Uganda electricity Transmission Co. Ltd at the High Court of Uganda). What if the resultant costs of the Dam Development are way-above or below the Power Purchase price, will the signed PPA be abandoned?

2. Technical concerns.

(a) The project plans should indicate clearly how the current water decline levels in Lake Victoria and River Nile will be addressed in the SEA and what impact the crisis is likely to have on the proposed Bujagali projects. The Burnside Consultants in a meeting with NAPE, July 28, 2000 revealed that many independent studies are being carried out. Which studies are these? When did these studies start? When are they ending? and how are they going to be reconciled with the fast-tracking of the Bujagali project?

(b) How is the project dealing with the assessment to establish the cumulative impacts of having the proposed Bujagali, Kiira and Nalubaale hydropower facilities close to each other, especially when there was no re-construction and post construction EIA done for Nalubaale and Kiira facilities?

(c) There are no clear strategies of how the safety issues concerning the Bujagali and the ageing Nalubaale facilities will be addressed?

(d) A comprehensive assessment of all the projects on the River Nile needs to be done, in order to establish the cumulative impacts of all the proposed hydropower facilities, especially now when there is reduced water volume.

(e) There are no plans and strategies of conducting a comprehensive assessment of energy options, so as to establish the viability, sustainability and affordability of Bujagali hydropower facility. If this is not done, there is no basis of continuing to say that Bujagali is the least cost option. (refer to the Review of the Norwegian Support to Energy Sector in Uganda 1997-2005 final report 13th June 2006, www.nceg.no)

(f) There are no plans and strategies to evaluate and monitor the impacts of resettlement and compensation of dam-affected people both on the western and eastern banks. What is mentioned in the ToR is a plan to resettle and compensate those that will be affected by the establishment of Transmission Line Project.

(g) There are no plans and strategies to assess the impact of the hydropower facility on tourism (local and international) in Uganda
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BUJAGALI HYDROPOWER & INTERCONNECTION PROJECTS

RELEASE OF SEA SUMMARY REPORTS

Background

The Bujagali Hydropower Project (HPP) is a 250 MW hydropower project proposed for the Victoria Nile, near Jinja, in Uganda. The sponsor of the HPP is Bujagali Energy Limited (BEL), a project-specific company owned by SG Bujagali Holdings Ltd. (a wholly owned affiliate of Sithe Global Power of USA) and IPS (Kenya) Limited. The Bujagali Interconnection Project (IP) is a system of high voltage electrical transmission lines and related facilities proposed to interconnect the Bujagali HPP with the national grid. The sponsor of the IP is the Uganda Electricity Transmission Company Limited (UETCL). The two projects are closely interlinked, and the two sponsors are working in close cooperation on their design and planning, including the consultation program being completed as part of the social and environmental assessments (SEAs) for the project.

Social and Environmental Assessment’s (SEAs) for both projects are in preparation for submission to Uganda’s National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), and for review by potential lenders to the projects, such as the World Bank Group. The SEAs are being undertaken to meet requirements of the Government of Uganda, as well as the policies, performance standards and guidelines of the potential project lenders. The purpose of the SEAs is to ensure that the projects are designed and developed in a manner that results in the least amount of social and environmental effects while maximizing project benefits. Social and Environmental Action Plans are being prepared based on the findings of the SEAs to guide project implementation.

The draft SEA reports will be released for public review and comments later in 2006 (November).

Social and Environmental Assessment Summary Reports
BEL is preparing for submission and approval by NEMA, the World Bank Group and other lenders including the African Development Bank and the European Investment Bank, new SEAs documentation.

SEA Summary Reports have now been prepared for both the Hydro Power Project and the Interconnection Project. These reports summarize the draft findings and recommendations of the SEA process. These summary reports are being distributed to various stakeholders including: government agencies; Sub-County (LC3) and local communities (LC1), the Buganda and Busoga Kingdoms, and Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs). Copies of the summary reports are available through the contact below and from the project website: www.bujagali-energy.com. The summaries are available in English, Luganda and Lusoga (HPP Summary only).

Consultation Activities
The project sponsors are committed to consulting with relevant stakeholders throughout the SEA study process.

In the coming weeks, BEL will be conducting consultations on the SEA summary reports with various stakeholders. This will include village-level meetings to present the SEA summary results and to receive community feedback. These meetings shall be advertised locally through various means including radio and posters in public places.

All stakeholders are encouraged to provide comments on the project & SEA. Comments are requested by October 19, 2006.

For more information, and to provide comments, please contact:

Bujagali Energy Limited
c/o IPS Uganda
Plot 109-112, Fifth Street,
Industrial Area, Kampala.
Tel.: +256 41 258194
info@bujagali-energy.com
www.bujagali-energy.com
THE BUJAGALI HYDROPOWER PROJECT &
THE BUJAGALI INTERCONNECTION PROJECT

EKIRANGO

OKUFULUMYA LIPOTOA MUBUFUNZE (SEA SUMMARY REPORTS)

Ennyanjula

Bujagali Hydro Power Project (BHPP) lye bbibiro ly'a-
masanyalaze erisuuibirwa okukola amasonalyalaze
agaweeza obungi bwa 250 MW lisangibwa ku kizing-
gga Dumbell, kilomita 8 okuva ku bbibiro lya Kiira ne
Nalubale, mumugga Kiira (Victoria Nile) mu bukikia
kkono bwe kibuga ky'e Jinja, Uganda. Omulimu
guno guja kusasulirwa Bujagali Energy Limited (BEL),
kampuni ekola ku pulojekiti nga bannanyini
yo beba SG Bujagali Holdings Ltd. (kampuni erina
oluganda ne Sitohe Global Power eya USA) wam ne
IPS (Kenya) Limited. Bujagali Interconnection
Project (IP) y'enkola eya layini z'amasonalyalaze
ag'ekikika ek'awaggulu wam ne'ebitongole
bpani ku pulogulaamu ebisubirwa okuyungga Bujagali HPP
kusamasonalyalaze ag'eggwanga lyonna. Uganda
Electricity Transmission Company Limited (UETCL)
y'esasuila IP. Pulojekiti zombi zikolera wamu
era abazisa susulura bakolera wamu mukuteekatecka,
nga mwothalele ne pulogulaamu ey'okwebuza okuba
ng'ekomekerezedda ng'ekitundu eky'okunonye-
ereza ku ngeri pulojekiti gy'ekosaamu embeera z'a-
bantu n'obutonde bw'ensi (SEAs).

Okunonyereza ku ngeri pulojekiti gy'ekosaamu
embeera z'abantu n'obutonde bw'ensi (SEAs) ku
pulojekiti zombi kutegekebwa okuweebwayo eri eki-
tongole kya Uganda eky'a National Environment
Management Authority (NEMA), era zekaanyizibwe
ebitongole ebyawagalu okuwala pulojekiti ensimbi
okugwanga Banka Yens Yonna (World Bank Group).
SEAs zikolera okuweebwayo ey'ensimbi embeera
Gavumenti ya Uganda, wamu n'enkola ebogeberera,
olutindo n'ebinagoberera abanaawola pulojekiti
ensimbi. Ekidagimerwa kya SEAs kwekulaaba nti
pulojekiti ziteekebateekewba era zikuulakakulaky-
ziwba mungeri eraga nti ekosa kitono embeera z'a-
bantu n'obutonde bw'ensi wabula nga zitwala mu
maaso okuganyulwa kwa pulojekiti. Pulani ku
embeera z'abantu n'obutonde bw'ensi zikoleba
okuva mubuyava mu lipoota za SEAs okuyamba
mukusa munkola pulojekiti.

Lipoota ya SEA eri mububage eja kwanjulwa eri
abantu okugyekenee y'okuwa ebirowoozo mu
November 2006.

Lipoota mubufunze ezikwata ku ngeri pulojekiti
gezikosaamu embeera z'abantu n'obutonde
bw'ensi

BEL etekateekaa okuwaayo ekidagiendo kya SEA
ekipiba kikakasibwe NEMA, World Bank Group
n'ebitongole ebyawagalu ebyensi bi'ensimbi omulu
African Development Bank ne European Investment
Bank.

Lipoota za SEA mubufunze kati zitegekeddu wa
Pulojekiti y'ebyawagalu (Hydro Power
Project) ne Interconnetion Project. Lipoota zino
zifunza ebbago ly'ebiyazisumilwa n'amagezi agaweeb-
wa kunkola ya SEA. Lipoota zino mubufunze kati
zisasanyizidwa mubonna abakwabikwa bwensil;
ebibongole bya gavumenti; Amagombolola (LC3)
n'enikiko z'ebiyalo (LC1), Obwakabaka bwa Buganda
n'Obwakyabazinga bwa Busoga, wamu n'ebibina
bya Nakyewa. Kkopi za lipoota zino mubufunze
zifunika okuva ku ndagiriro wammanda nekumukus-
tu gwa yintanteeti eya pulojekiti: www.bujagali-ener-
gy.com. Lipoota mubufunze zifunika mu Lungereza,
Oluganda n'Oltusoga (eva SEA zokka).

Emirimu gy'okwebuzaako

Abasasulira pulojekiti eno beyama okwebuza
kubantu bonna abakwabikwa mukiseera kyonna
eky'okunonyereza kwa SEA.

Mu wiliki ezijja, BEL eja kuba yebuaa kubantu
bonna bekkikwato kyu Lipoota mubufunze eya SEA.
Muno muli kuzingiramu enkungana eze'okum-
tendera og'ebiyalo okubanjulira ebyaba mu
lipoota mubumpi eby'engeri pulojekiti gyenekosamu
embeera z'abantu n'obutonde bw'ensi wam ne'ebi-
funu endowooza z'abantu. Enkungana zino zija
kugirrwa mubuyalo wamu n'empewo za radio, n'e-
bipande mu bino ebya lukuile.

Abo bonna abakwabikwa bwawooza amagezi
okuwaayo ebibifuso byawhe ku pulojekiti SEA.
Musabibwa okuwaayo ebibifuso nga October 19,
2006 terunayita.

Okumanya ebisinga, n'okuwa amagezi tuukirira:
Bujagali Energy Limited
e/ o IPS Uganda
Plot 109-112, Fifth Street,
Industrial Area, Kampala.
Tel.: +256 41 258194
info@bujagali-energy.com
www.bujagali-energy.com
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Background

The Bujagali Hydropower Project (HPP) is a 250 MW hydropower project proposed for the Victoria Nile, near Jinja, in Uganda. The sponsor of the HPP is Bujagali Energy Limited (BEL), a project-specific company owned by SG Bujagali Holdings Ltd. (a wholly owned affiliate of Sithe Global Power of USA) and IPS (Kenya) Limited. The Bujagali Interconnection Project (IP) is a system of high voltage electrical transmission lines and related facilities proposed to interconnect the Bujagali HPP with the national grid. The sponsor of the IP is the Uganda Electricity Transmission Company Limited (UETCL). The two projects are closely interlinked, and the two sponsors are working in close cooperation on their design and planning, including the consultation program being completed as part of the social and environmental assessments (SEAs) for the project.

Social and Environmental Assessment’s (SEAs) for both projects are in preparation for submission to Uganda’s National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), and for review by potential lenders to the projects, such as the World Bank Group. The SEAs are being undertaken to meet requirements of the Government of Uganda, as well as the policies, performance standards and guidelines of the potential project lenders. The purpose of the SEAs is to ensure that the projects are designed and developed in a manner that results in the least amount of social and environmental effects while maximizing project benefits. Social and Environmental Action Plans are being prepared based on the findings of the SEAs to guide project implementation.

The draft SEA reports will be released for public review and comments later in 2006 (November).

Social and Environmental Assessment Summary Reports

BEL is preparing for submission and approval by NEMA, the World Bank Group and other lenders including the African Development Bank and the European Investment Bank, new SEAs documentation.

SEA Summary Reports have now been prepared for both the Hydro Power Project and the Interconnection Project. These reports summarize the draft findings and recommendations of the SEA process. These summary reports are being distributed to various stakeholders including: government agencies; Sub-County (LC3) and local communities (LC1), the Buganda and Busoga Kingdoms, and Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs). Copies of the summary reports are available through the contact below and from the project website: www.bujagali-energy.com. The summaries are available in English, Luganda and Lusoga (HPP Summary only).

Consultation Activities

The project sponsors are committed to consulting with relevant stakeholders throughout the SEA study process.

In the coming weeks, BEL will be conducting consultations on the SEA summary reports with various stakeholders. This will include village-level meetings to present the SEA summary results and to receive community feedback. These meetings shall be advertised locally through various means including radio and posters in public places.

All stakeholders are encouraged to provide comments on the project & SEA. Comments are requested by October 19, 2006.

For more information, and to provide comments, please contact:

Bujagali Energy Limited
C/o IPS Uganda
Plot 109-112, Fifth Street,
Industrial Area, Kampala.
Tel.: +256 41 258194
Info@bujagali-energy.com
www.bujagali-energy.com
THE BUJAGALI HYDROPOWER PROJECT &
THE BUJAGALI INTERCONNECTION PROJECT

Ennyanjula

Bujagali Hydro Power Project (BHPP) lyebibiro ly’amasanyalaze erisubirwa okukola amasanyalaze agaweza obungi bwa 250 MW lisangibwa ku kizinga Dumbell, kilomita 8 okuva ku bbiroo ly’Kiira ne Na’lubale, kumugga Kiira (Victoria Nile) mu bukika kkonkono bwe kibuga kye Jinja, Uganda. Omulimu guro gijja kusasulirwa Bujagali Energy Limited (BEL), kampuni ekula ku pulolekiti nga bannanyi yin’ebi k Jessie S. A. Nyabubare w’enyarira gy’okwebuzaako (BEL), kampuni erina Lipoota ya SEA erinza kyeziwa z’ebyaloo y’ebirowoozo mu Uganda.

Lipoota mubufunze zikuva mu Lungereza, masanyalaze erisuubirwa okukola amasanyalaze izibwa mungeri eraga n’oluganda n’olusoga w’ensimbi (Oluganda n’Olusoga (eza HPP zokka).

Agaweza obungi bwa 250 MW lisangibwa ku kizinbantu n’obutonde bw’ensi wabula nga zitiwa maasao okuganyulwa kwa pulolekiti. Pulani ku mbeera z’abantu n’obutonde bw’ensi zikolebwa okuva mubuya mu lipoota za SEAs okuyamba mukussa munkola pulolekiti.

Lipoota ya SEA eri mububage ejja kwingiwa eri abantu okuyekkencenya n’okuwa ebirowoozo mu November 2006.

BEL etekateeka okuwayo ekikondwa kyo SEA kikopindwiko kyo SEAs ekipya kikakasibwe NEMA, World Bank Group ye’ebibiina ebibiro ly’ebirowoozo y’ensimbi omuli African Development Bank ne European Investment Bank.

Lipoota za SEA mubufunze kati zitegedebya ku Pulolekiti y’ebibiro ly’amasanyalaze (Hydro Power Project) ne Interconnection Project. Lipoota zino zifuza ebbago ly’ebiyuzuluibwa n’amasgezi agaweeba Buddha, okuwaayo ebirowoozo nga October 19, 2006 terunayita.

Enkungana y’wasusulirwa, kibabyba: Bujagali Energy Limited
E/c IPS Uganda
Plot 109-112, Fifth Street, Industrial Area, Kampala.
Tel: +256 41 258194
info@bujagali-energy.com
www.bujagali-energy.com
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The material in this report reflects best judgement in light of the information available at the time of preparation. Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance on or decisions made based on it, are the responsibilities of such third parties. R.J. Burnside International Limited accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this report.
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1.0 Project Introduction

The Bujagali Hydropower Project (HPP) is a 250 MW hydroelectric power project (HPP) located on the Victoria Nile, near Jinja, in Uganda. The Project sponsor is Bujagali Energy Limited (BEL), a project-specific partnership of SG Bujagali Holdings Ltd. (a wholly owned affiliate of Sithe Global Power, LLC) and IPS Limited (Kenya). The Bujagali Interconnection Project (IP) is an associated transmission system project that is to be developed by the Uganda Electricity Transmission Company Limited (UETCL) with the assistance of BEL to interconnect the HPP with the National Grid.

The overall project was originally initiated by AES Nile Power Ltd., (“AESNP”) in the late 1990’s. AESNP prepared Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) documentation for the Project that was approved by the Government of Uganda’s National Environmental Management Authority (“NEMA”) in 1999/2001, and by the World Bank, IFC and African Development Bank Boards in December 2001.

In 2003 AESNP withdrew from the Project, leading the Government of Uganda (“GoU”) to initiate an international bidding process for the HPP aspects of the project. BEL was selected as the preferred bidder and entered into a power purchase agreement and an implementation agreement with the GoU.

The draft Social and Environmental Assessment (SEA) Report for is being prepared to identify the impacts of the HPP and to formulate mitigation measures to minimise these impacts. This document will be reviewed by NEMA, and by potential lenders before being finalized. Comments received from other interested parties will also be incorporated in the final SEA Report. The SEA Report is being drafted to fulfill the requirements of NEMA and the multilateral and bilateral lenders.

This report is intended to provide interested stakeholders with an overview of the HPP SEA completed to-date, and a parallel summary has been prepared for the IP. Public consultations have been undertaken throughout 2006, and will continue throughout the month of October 2006 to inform the affected communities and to receive input on the information provided herein.
2.0 Project Setting

The HPP is located on the Victoria Nile in southeastern Uganda (See Figure 1). The Victoria Nile drains Lake Victoria, which is the Africa’s largest water body. The Lake is considered the source of the Nile, since the Victoria Nile is the start of the longest branch of the Nile, which is known as the White Nile.

The Lake lies within an elevated plateau in the western part of Africa's Great Rift Valley, and straddles the equator. The location of the HPP itself is about 1100 m above sea level and a few degrees north of the equator.

The discharge of Lake Victoria was dammed in 1954 by construction of the Owen Falls Hydro Project, and which was recently renamed as the Nalubaale Hydro Dam. In early 2000's, a second power plant, originally known as the Owen Falls Extension and later renamed Kiira, was installed next to the Nalubaale Dam in a canal excavated for that purpose. The Bujagali HPP would be located about 8 km downstream of the Nalubaali/Kiira facilities.

The Nile in this area is located within a deeply incised, steeply sloped valley, and drops in a series of rapids. In recent years the rapids in the area affected by the HPP as well rapids further downstream have been used for commercial whitewater rafting. The river is also used for small-scale artisanal fisheries by local villagers, and its many islands and rapids hold cultural/religious values for some local persons and communities.

Jinja town, located on the east side of the river near Nalubaale is the closest large community. The city developed starting in the 50’s when power for industry became available from the Owen Falls project. Kampala, Uganda’s largest city is located about 70 km to the west.

The majority of the study area for the Bujagali hydropower facility is rural, with estate and small-scale or subsistence agriculture being the predominant land uses. Agricultural activity is primarily a labour-intensive, intercropping system with both cash and subsistence crops following the seasonal changes. The main cash crops are coffee and sugar cane, coupled with more recent cropping of vanilla. Subsistence food crops include bananas, cassava, sweet potatoes, maize, beans, millet, and yams.

Within the project area, there are several ethnic groups, including persons mostly of Bantu origins, among others. Tribal groups, the Basoga and the Buganda, live on both banks of the river. Amongst these people, many still practice traditional religions, although they are often practiced in tandem with Christianity and Islam.
Figure 1

LOCATION OF THE BUJAGALI PROJECT

Project Name: BUJAGALI HYDROPOWER PROJECT SEA

Prepared for: BUJAGALI ENERGY LIMITED

Date: August, 2006

Prepared by: BURNSIDE
Bujagali Falls is of spiritual significance to the Kingdom of Basoga as it is a place inhabited by spirits. Cultural ceremonies were conducted by the previous project sponsor to relocate the spirits, although recent meetings with Kingdom representatives indicates that additional activities may be required to address the spiritual significance of the area prior to flooding. The Kingdom has expressed support for the project and BEL is committed to continuing and undergoing consultations with them to determine what needs to be done prior to the flooding of the Falls.
3.0 Project Need and Alternatives

Uganda has been suffering from an acute shortage of electricity. Regular blackouts have become the norm, and are expected to continue or get worse in the short term as the energy production of the Nalubaale and Kiira hydropower facilities, which are the main sources of electricity in the country, is limited due to low water levels in Lake Victoria. The GoU has commissioned new, emergency thermal generation projects to offset the reduced capacity of the hydro facilities. However, there remains a clear and immediate need for new, large scale, economical power generation capacity in Uganda.

Various consultants have prepared power sector studies over various planning horizons for Uganda. The general conclusions from these studies are that large-scale hydropower development is the lowest cost source for large-scale power generation in Uganda. The Victoria Nile is considered to be the main hydropower resource to meet the electricity demand of Uganda.

Geothermal resources have in the past been reported to be extensive, but recent analysis suggests the true capacity for geothermal at the present time is about 45 MW. While there is a role for other sources such as wind, solar and biomass, for Uganda these are not considered feasible or economical for large-scale generation of electricity at this time.

Thermal generation can provide large-scale base load power. However, because Uganda has insufficient delivery infrastructure and no indigenous hydrocarbon fuels the cost for thermal power is much greater than the cost for large-scale hydro. Nevertheless, Uganda has recently embarked on selected thermal options to be located in the vicinity of Kampala to bridge the increasing supply gap in the near term.

Six potential hydropower sites have been evaluated along the Victoria Nile. With its comparatively low social and environmental impacts, and its ability to generate a peak of 250 MW of power, Bujagali emerged as the preferred location for the next hydropower development on the Victoria Nile. The Murchison Falls and Ayago projects were not preferred as the next hydro project for the Victoria Nile as each was in Murchison Falls National Park, a World Heritage Site, and would thus entail unacceptably high environmental impacts compared to Bujagali. The Masindi Project was also not preferred as it would have been prohibitively expensive compared to Bujagali, and because it precluded future downstream hydropower development projects such as Karuma. The Karuma and Kalagala Projects were considered feasible, but each were considered to have greater potential environmental and social impacts than Bujagali. The following section provides a description of the proposed Bujagali HPP.

To offset cultural, social and environmental effects of the Bujagali project the GoU has made a commitment protect the Kalagala stretch of the Victoria Nile for exclusive use and protection of environmental, cultural and tourism activities. As a result, the Kalagala Falls site is not considered to be available for hydroelectric project development.
4.0 Project Description

The HPP involves using the power of falling water to spin a turbine and generate electricity. A 30 m (max) high earth-filled dam will be built at the Bujagali site to create a corresponding large water drop, or head. The water will flow by gravity through the turbines, causing them to spin, which in turn causes the generators to spin, and thereby generate electricity. There will be five 50 MW turbine-generator sets installed giving a totally installed capacity of 50 MW (See Figure 2).

The dam will include a spillway such that if flows exceed the capacity of the power station than the excess water can safely spill over the spillway to the river below.

The project will involve a permanent land take of about 125 ha land: 45 ha for the permanent project facilities and 80 ha of newly inundated land. A temporary land take of about 113 ha of land will also be needed to facilitate construction. The temporary land take will become available for local people to use again, once construction is completed.

The dam will create a reservoir extending 8 km upstream to Nalubaale (formally Owen Falls) and Kiira (formally Owen Falls Extension) facilities. The existing rapids within this section, including the rapids at Bujagali Falls, will be flooded. The reservoir will have “live storage”, that is the water within it will be fully replaced every 12-16 hours by upstream flows. The reservoir waters will be contained within the steep banks of the Victoria Nile between Dumbbell Island and Owen Falls, which effectively limit the reservoir surface area to 388 ha – this is only 88 ha greater that the 300 ha surface area of the river as it exists without the dam.

AESNP, the previous project sponsor, completed the land acquisition and resettlement and relocation of all residents formerly located in the reservoir area and compensated all landowners or other project affected persons. As there are some unresolved resettlement issues, BEL has initiated an “Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan” to resolve these issues.

In addition to the dam, spillways and Power house various other buildings and structures will be developed on the west bank to support the power station, including an access roads, telecommunications, stand-by diesel generator, workshop and stores.

The permanent site will be accessed from the public highway that runs along the west bank of the river. While the dam will be designed to support a roadway, there are no plans at present to create a new public crossing of the Nile via the dam and spillways.
The facilities will be constructed by an Engineering, Procurement and Construction (EPC) Contractor, who will develop the detailed construction plan. However, in general the following is expected. Construction will take place over a 44 month period, and is expected to involve a peak labour force of more than 1000 persons. Workers will be housed in Jinja and environs – there will be no on-site workers camp.

A quarry will be developed on site to produce the necessary aggregates and rock fill material needed to construction the dam and other facilities. A batching plant will be installed for on-site production of concrete. Coffer dams shall be used to divert the river into, first to the east channel around Dumbbell Island while the west portion of dam, spillways and powerhouse are built, than the west channel whilst the east portion of the dam is built. The coffer dam will be removed and the reservoir filled.

Most heavy machinery, equipment and manufactured products needed for the facility will need to be imported into Uganda. Most goods are expected to arrive in Africa at the seaport of Mombassa in Kenya and be transported overland by truck to the site.

The reservoir offers very little storage of water – essentially all water released at Nalubaale/Kiira will subsequently be released at Bujagali. The water levels in the reservoir will fluctuate daily by about 2 vertical metres, up to the Full Supply Level of 1,111.5 metres above sea level.

A permanent work force of about 30 to 50 people will be needed to operate the facility. Workers will reside in Jinja or environs.
5.0 Outline of SEA and PCDP Process

SEA Process

The SEA is being undertaken to meet requirements of the Government of Uganda's as well as the policies and guidelines of the various International Financial Institutions (IFIs) that are expected to finance the project. The purpose of the SEA is to ensure that the project is designed and developed in a manner that results in the least amount of social and environmental effects while maximizing project benefits. An SEA Report is being prepared which will describe the results of the SEA process. The SEA Report will be made available to stakeholders for their review.

The key components of the SEA Report will include a description of:

- The regulatory requirements to be met;
- The social and environmental conditions in the study area;
- Alternatives studied;
- The project to be built including construction activities;
- The public consultation and disclosure process;
- Social and Environment effects;
- Social and Environmental Action Plans;
- Community Development Activities; and
- Project monitoring activities.

A key aspect of the approach undertaken by BEL for the Bujagali HPP has been to conduct the SEA according to SEA Terms of Reference (ToRs) that were approved by GoU (NEMA) and were made available to IFI representatives, project affected people, NGOs and the general public for their review.

The main SEA work for the hydropower facility commenced in early 2006 including ecological fieldwork, social surveys and consultations with relevant review agencies and potentially affected people and NGOs.

Public Consultation and Disclosure Program (PCDP)

The PCDP has been designed and is being implemented so as to maximise community awareness of the proposed project and SEA study and report and to maximise opportunities for community input and involvement. The approach was designed recognizing that extensive consultations and community engagements were completed by AES Nile Power, and following their withdrawal, ongoing consultations have been carried out by UETCL's Bujagali Implementation Unit. By all indications, the starting point was a relatively high awareness level of the project; this was confirmed through the initial community consultations undertaken as part of this SEA in August 2006.
The consultation program has been organized into the following phases:

- **Phase 1**: SEA Terms of Reference preparation (completed);
- **Phase 2**: Release of the *SEA Terms of Reference and Draft PCDP* and SEA Preparation (completed);
- **Phase 3**: Release of the draft SEA findings (ongoing); and,
- **Phase 4**: Following the release of the Final draft SEA Report (to be undertaken).

BEL retained the services of a witness NGO (InterAid) in August 2006 to provide independent monitoring of the consultation and resettlement activities, and to provide a mechanism for stakeholders to file a grievance with the SEA or RAP processes.

A wide variety of stakeholders are being consulted with through a variety of consultation activities as outlined in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Consultation Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Public</td>
<td>Project notices in national newspapers, web site and making documentation available to all interested parties. The SEA will be available electronically through the web sites of the lenders involved in the project, as well as a project specific website. Information has been made available in the local language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Agencies</td>
<td>Meetings are being held with various government agencies and SEA documentation is being/will be circulated through NEMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs (national and local)</td>
<td>Numerous NGOs were identified and contacted to arrange meetings with to discuss their concerns and interests. Meetings were held with, and project documentation (including the terms of reference for the SEA) was provided to those NGOs that expressed an interest. A standing offer was made for additional meetings as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>Contact was made with District and Sub-County level governments to inform them of the project. Sub-County Consultation committees were established to assist in consultation activities with local villages. Public meetings are being held in the affected communities to advise people of the project and to receive their comments and concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Affected Persons</td>
<td>PAPs were resettled under the previous SEA process undertaken by the former project sponsor. Socio-economic assessment surveys were undertaken with the PAPs as part of this process. Additional surveys were also undertaken with the fishers community in the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable groups</td>
<td>Vulnerable group representatives were included on the Sub-county Consultation Committees. Specific meetings are also to be held with vulnerable groups in the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Operators</td>
<td>As part of a separate tourism impact study that was undertaken, affected businesses were consulted through individual interviews. Subsequent discussions between the tourist operators and BEL regarding mitigation/compensation due to the flooding of Bujagali Falls are ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist/visitors</td>
<td>The interests of tourists were identified in the above mentioned tourism impact study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Groups</td>
<td>The Kingdoms of Buganda and Busoga are being consulted directly with through meetings and the submission of project documentation. Meetings are continuing with the Kingdoms regarding the project and to determine actions that need to be taken to address their concerns. Through the Busoga Kingdom, the custodian of the cultural site (Budhagali) will also be consulted with.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Project Benefits

Through the generation of electricity, Bujagali hydropower facility will result in benefits to the national community. The project will give rise to a number of economic and development benefits at both the macro-economic level and the local level. The key macro-economic benefits that are expected include:

- Reduced electricity rationing and associated costs;
- Increase in investment and national income;
- Increase in export revenues; and,
- Lower energy costs to the consumer.

Overall, it has been estimated in some reports that every month that the Bujagali project is delayed costs the economy approximately 10 to 15 million dollars. The project is also expected to help reduce noise and air emissions generated by the countless small generators that are used to provide electricity during blackout periods.

There will also be local economic benefits resulting from the project through employment and from impacts on the local economy. Current estimates for the number of personnel to be employed during the four-year construction period are between 600 and 1,500 at peak times. The majority of employees will be in the unskilled and semi-skilled sectors and the need for imported expatriate management staff is relatively low. A large proportion of the workforce will be drawn from the immediate local area, with preference given to displaced landholders and labourers from affected communities.

During the construction phase, the generation of local employment opportunities will act as a catalyst to stimulate the local economy. Increased incomes in the area will encourage the formation and growth of local businesses, which will in turn create new indirect employment opportunities. Both processes will alleviate pressure on land resources from subsistence farming.

The implementation of a Community Development Action Plan (CDAP), will enhance local benefits as described in Section 8.0 of this Summary Report.
7.0 Management of Project Effects

The following table presents a preliminary summary of the key issues/effects of the project and a brief description of mitigation that is to be put in place to address these issues. The full SEA report will provide a more detailed description of the project effects and the measures to be put in place to deal with them. The SEA report will have a separate volume on the Social and Environmental Action Plan for the project. It will include details on monitoring programs, as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Issue/Effect</th>
<th>Description of Effect &amp; Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resettlement and Land Compensation</td>
<td>Land required for the construction and operation of the hydropower facility totals 238 ha. Landowners were either compensated for loss of land or resettled by the previous project sponsor. Eighty-five households were displaced. An assessment survey of the resettled villagers was undertaken by BEL as part of this SEA process to confirm whether any unresolved issues remained. BEL has initiated an Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan (APRAP) to resolve these remaining issues. Pre-construction activities to be undertaken include: the provision of new water supply hand pumps at 17 existing bore hole locations in the surrounding communities; improvements to education facilities in the 8 affected communities; and improvements to the health facilities at the Naminya resettlement site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Land</td>
<td>There will be permanent and temporary loss of agricultural land. Temporary land take areas will be reinstated to a condition that will make it possible for the land to be used for agriculture, forestry or industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To minimise impacts to terrestrial habitat, BEL will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do enrichment planting to regenerate forest vegetation on island land not inundated but previously logged or cleared for agriculture, as well as land along the mainland shore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plant native and medicinal tree species in areas of the riparian strip that are currently bare or planted with cash and/or subsistence crops, in order to control erosion and to provide (in the long term) roosting sites for birds and bats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The portion of the quarry that will remain above water level, i.e. form the new riverbank, will be profiled and planted such that it has a similar landscape to equivalent areas above the water line prior to construction, and blends in with the profile of undisturbed areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Issue/Effect</th>
<th>Description of Effect &amp; Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Water</td>
<td>• The project is not expected to significantly change downstream water flows – during filling a maximum of 2.5% of the combined Nalubaale/Kiira dam discharge will be retained in the Bujagali impoundment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Water levels will rise in wells and pit latrines located adjacent to the river. Although no adverse effects are anticipated, any latrines or wells negatively affected will be replaced or compensated for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There will in an increase in suspended solids resulting from coffer dam and other construction activities. These effects will be minimised by avoiding disturbance of soils during the clearing activities. Site drainage systems will include sedimentation basins to trap sediments in runoff prior to release to the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Indigenous aquatic grasses will be planted to control erosion that might occur as a result of the fluctuating water levels during the initial operation period. In the long term the banks are expected to stabilize and no significant erosion is expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trees and shrubs will be harvested prior to the reservoir being filled, to minimise water quality effects associated with rotting vegetation, and to prevent fouling of fishing gears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is expected that fish stocks will naturally increase in the reservoir compared to the existing condition. For Nile tilapia, <em>Rastineobola argentea</em> habitat enhancement will be carried out as part of the quarry and river bank restoration. Stocking is not expected to be needed. Haplochromines are expected to also increase as a result of the conversion of faster-flowing habitats to the slower-flowing habitats that are preferred by these species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Entrapment and entrainment of aquatic organisms is not expected to have a significant effect on fish or other populations. Fish screens will be installed on the water intakes reduce the rate of entrapment by fish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access points will be provide to the river to ensure there is access to the river by local persons for washing, fishing or other purposes during the construction period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Air Quality</td>
<td>• Dust generated during construction is not expected to result in any significant offsite impacts. Industry good practice will be used to limit dust, including grassing stockpiles to prevent wind raised dust, using wetting agents on roads, and using covering loads of friable materials on trucks using public roads. Vehicles and motors will be regularly maintained to minimise exhaust emissions and black smoke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Issue/Effect</td>
<td>Description of Effect &amp; Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Noise</td>
<td>Noise generated during construction is not expected to have any significant off-site nuisance effects. The main offsite noise will be short term noise related to blasting during quarrying. Communities will be informed the procedures and timing of blasting, including posters warning residents of blasting noise, and door-to-door visits to advise and consult with residents in person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Roads and Traffic</td>
<td>An existing two-lane, paved, public highway provides access to the site. The existing roads are of sufficient capacity to accommodate project related traffic. A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will address all aspects of project related traffic including speeding, maximum loads on trucks, abnormal loads; and, management of connection points between access roads and main public highways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Managed and Protected Areas</td>
<td>The project will result in disturbance and loss of land that falls within the Jinja Wildlife Sanctuary. Consultations with the management authority for the Sanctuary indicate that planned enhancement planting will offset the losses. The sponsor will assist in the further development of the Kalagala Falls and Nile Bank CFRs to help offset impacts on Bujagali Falls and Jinja Wildlife Sanctuary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism, White Water Rafting and Aesthetics</td>
<td>The project will result in flooding of Bujagali Falls and associated rapids that form a portion of the whitewater rafting (WWR) routes. Consultations with WWR operators indicate that the operators are generally well-advanced in their preparations to move their operations downstream. BEL will provide new raft launching facilities downstream of the dam, the specific locations to be agreed upon with the operators. BEL is involved in ongoing consultations with the WWR operators as to how it can further offset the impacts on their activities, and support the relocation process. BEL will construct a visitor's centre at the HPP and a cultural centre near Bujagali Falls, and work with Jinja Tourism Development Association (JITDA) on sustainable tourism activities for the new reservoir recreationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects on Cultural Property</td>
<td>The project will result in flooding of household graves and amasabo. Where possible these have been relocated as part of the resettlement programme or through compensation payments. Remembrance services to commemorate those buried in the area will be completed. A structure or monument may be erected, either at site of remembrance or elsewhere, in accordance with wishes expressed by local communities. Dwelling sites of spirits important to the local community are being addressed through transfer and resettlement ceremonies. Ceremonies for the Bujagali Rapids have been carried out, although additional activities are being discussed with the Busoga Kingdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Issue/Effect</td>
<td>Description of Effect &amp; Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Community, Health, Safety and Security | • The project is not expected to result in a significant change in the prevalence of diseases such as malaria and HIV/AIDS. Workers will be housed in Jinja to avoid creating a camp with large numbers of single males living outside their normal social surroundings. BEL and its EPC Contractor will work with local NGOs to deliver awareness and prevention programs for AIDS/HIV, Malaria, and other diseases. Actions to control malaria infection by workers will include anti-malarial prophylactics for expatriate workers, bed-nets, window screens, and insecticidal sprays.  
• The reservoir is not expected to significantly change the prevalence of vector born parasitic disease. The narrow, steep-sided valley of the impoundment will create significantly fewer vector breeding sites when compared with impoundments with extensive, shallow shorelines. Daily fluctuations of water levels will strand vectors, including mosquito larvae and snails, and to expose both the vectors (adults and egg masses) and potential breeding sites to the drying effects of the sun. Trees and shrubs will be cleared from the reservoir area before inundation to remove potential anchorages for weed mats that are favourable habitat for snail vectors. |
| Labour and Working Conditions        | Adherence to labour standards and well-being of construction workers  
• EPC Contractor will be required to adopt policies and procedures that comply with national legislation and address all aspects of labour standards relevant to the project as specified by IFC policies. Sub-contractors will be contractually required to comply with labour and health and safety legislation.  
Public safety issues regarding: accidental contact with power lines, collision with construction equipment, quarry excavations, material storage  
• Secure equipment and demarcate any excavations in such a way as to prevent accidents when construction not in progress; Keep non-authorised persons away from any construction activities/sites/yards/ equipment; Fence critical areas and post warning signs with appropriate text and graphics; Begin educational programs in schools and communities to educate people of hazards and safe practices.  
Work related injury or health effects  
• The EPC Contractor will comply with relevant WB/IFC health and safety requirements, including specific provisions for: Introduction and use of poisonous or other chemicals injurious to health; Handling dangerous goods and special waste; Training; Working environment committee; Use of helmets; Personal injuries and accidents; Damage to material, equipment and buildings; Poison treatment, chemical and fire injuries; Safety audit; Work done by hired personnel or firms; Operating cranes; Working with heat in confined places; Corrective action; and Protective action. |
8.0 Community Development Action Plan

The Bujagali hydropower facility will result in many community benefits at the national, regional and community levels. In addition to the resettlement and compensation package that each directly affected person will receive, BEL is committed to providing community benefits in a sustainable manner by means of the Community Development Action Plan, one of the component of the Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan.

The area that will benefit from the CDAP consists mainly of the eight directly affected villages: four on the West Bank (Mukono District): Naminya, Buloba, Malindi, Kikubamutwe; and, on four the East Bank (Jinja District): Bujagali, Ivunamba, Kyabirwa and Namizi.

BEL proposes to support long-term sustainable development initiatives, rather than to generate them. The CDAP was developed, based on the following strategy:

1. Improve local social infrastructure as part of quick-impact activities to enhance community support and confidence and fix projects left incomplete by AESNP:
   - Improve water supply;
   - Improve education and health facilities;
   - Establish a social unit to monitor implementation, particularly with respect to vulnerable peoples

2. Support sustainable economic development:
   - Enhance direct and indirect employment opportunities:
     ● The construction of the dam will provide direct sources of employment; the job opportunities will be directed to the affected communities to the extent possible and employability must be improved;
     ● Measures will be taken to enhance indirect employment;
   - Enhance agricultural productivity and farm produce marketing;
   - Develop non agricultural sources of livelihood.

BEL is proposing to invest approximately SUS 2.4 million into a community development action plan. Although the specifics of the plan will need to be established through future consultation with appropriate authorities and the affected communities, Table 3 summarizes the regional and community benefits that are expected to occur as a result of the hydropower facility project. These programs are to be implemented during the pre-construction and construction phases of the project.
Table 3 – Community Development Initiatives Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Development Areas</th>
<th>Description of Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Facilities</td>
<td>It is understood that improvements are required to health facilities in the communities of Budondo, Ivunamba, Wakisi and Kalagala. BEL will consider participating in the upgrading of these facilities after an assessment of needs is conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Opportunities/Training</td>
<td>It is expected that a minimum of 10 percent of the unskilled workforce will originate from the affected villages for the construction phase of the project. This phase will employ 600-1,500 people at the peak period. The Ministry of Education &amp; Sports and the Vocational Training Institute in Jinja, in conjunction with BEL, is developing skills refresher courses in motor vehicle repair, electrical installation and fitting, welding and fabrication, plumbing and pipe fitting, metal fabrication and brick/block laying. Courses will be designed to meet the needs of interested PAPs. BEL and the EPC Contractor will pursue an apprenticeship programme that can provide additional job opportunities during the operational phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>BEL will work with the affected communities to improve their water supply. It is tentatively proposed to add one well in each of the affected communities (8 new wells).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>BEL will be consulting with the Rural Electrification Authority (REA) to explore the possibility of providing investments that improve community access to electricity in the area. Consultation with REA is essential both for implementation, design and materials authorisation and for the appropriate methodology for sensitisation and community management within the framework of the existing Rural Electrification Policy in Uganda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Support</td>
<td>A commercial area will be created in the vicinity of the contractor’s base in the dam area. This market would aim primarily at selling food and basic goods to construction workers. The area would be provided with drinking water, latrines, proper run-off water, sanitation and made accessible to Matatu mini-buses. This commercial area would provide indirect job opportunities (i.e., it is estimated that 50 jobs could be created, mainly for women) in addition to those created directly by the project. BEL will implement a small business support and micro-credit program that will include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A basic business support centre on each bank of the river to provide training in business planning and management with a focus of fisheries, trade and agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A revolving credit line funded by BEL will be established and managed by an existing micro credit institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support to local businesses to create linkages with BEL and the EPC contractor outsourcing departments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Community Development Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Development Areas</th>
<th>Description of Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fisheries</strong></td>
<td>Proposed improvements to the fisheries sector include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide improvements to landing facilities (4 new locations are proposed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The provision of fishing equipment to each ‘Beach management Committee’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implement a training program to the fishers to prepare the fishers for the change in the river’s characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture</strong></td>
<td>Considering the scarcity of land, support to agriculture should focus on the intensification and high-value added crops. Proposed initiatives include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organization of producers in groups to support extension services and to better structure marketing of local produce in Jinja and Kampala;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Agricultural extension services:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provision of technical advice and assistance for new crops, new varieties, fertilization, soil preparation, agro-forestry and erosion control, intensification and market gardening;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Subsidized provision of improved seeds and fertilizers to groups;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Promotion of intensive modes of cultivation (mushrooms, tree nurseries);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Integration agriculture / livestock (use of organic matter);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Animal husbandry extension services:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Promotion of new animal species (grass-cutters) and breeds (higher productivity pigs and poultry for instance);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Integration agriculture / livestock (use of agricultural by-products);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Better methods for animal nutrition;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improved slaughtering and hygiene management;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Management support (“farming as a business”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>The previous project sponsor established a detailed program for improvements in the educational sector of the 8 affected communities. To date, only improvements at two schools have been implemented. BEL is proposing to invest in school improvements. The program is to be confirmed after consulting with education authorities, the local councils and the communities themselves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.0 Project Schedule

The draft SEA Reports are to be completed and publicly released by mid-October 2006. It is anticipated that project lenders and the GOU will take until early 2007 to review and make a decision on whether the draft SEA meets their requirements. Construction on the HPP is anticipated to be initiated in 2007 and is expected to take about 4 years to complete.
10.0 Contact Information

For additional information and/or to submit comments in regards to the project, please contact:

Bujagali Energy Limited
IPS Uganda
Plot 109-112, Fifth Street,
Industrial Area, Kampala.
Tel.: +256 41 258194
Email: info@bujagali-energy.com

Comments are requested by October 19, 2006.
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Project Background

It is widely known that there is a large shortage of electricity in Uganda. Regular blackouts have become the norm, and are expected to get worse in the short term. Energy production from the Nakasalel and Kirka hydroelectric facilities, which are the main sources of electricity in the country, is limited due to low water levels in Lake Victoria. There is a clear and immediate need for new, large scale, economical power generation capacity in Uganda.

The Bujagali 250 MW Hydropower Project (BHP) is proposed to meet this need for additional electricity production in Uganda. The sponsor of the hydropower plant is Bujagali Energy Limited, a company owned by SG Bujagali Holdings Ltd., a wholly owned affiliate of Sithe Global Power, LLC and IPS (Kenya) Limited. The Bujagali Interconnection Project (IP) is a system of high voltage electrical transmission lines and related facilities proposed to connect the hydropower plant with the national electricity grid. The sponsor of the Interconnection Project is the Uganda Electric Transmission Company Limited. The two projects are closely interlinked, and the two sponsors are working in close cooperation on their design and planning, including the public consultation program being completed as part of the social and environmental assessments for the project.

It is expected that the draft Social and Environmental Assessment reports will be released for public review and comment in November 2006.

Consultation Summary Reports Released

Consultation Summary Reports for each of the projects are now available for public review. They present the initial findings of the assessment work completed to date for both projects.

The Consultation Summary Reports are available:

- Through the following local authorities: Entebbe Town Council, Mityana Sub-County, Nalumbe Sub-County, Naggal Sub-County, Nama Sub-County, Nansana TC, Nandika Sub-County, Kamwokosaic Division, Nakwero Sub-County, Namasuba TC, Nakasongola Sub-County, Nakasongola Division, Nsangi Sub-County, Rubaga Division, Kajjansi Sub-County.

- From BEL's web-site: www.bujagali-energy.com

- By mail or telephone request (see contact information on the top of each page).

We are interested in your comments and concerns on the information presented in the Consultation Summary Reports. Please make your submissions to us by October 19, 2006.

Hydropower Project Description

A hydropower project involves using the power of falling water to spin a turbine and generate electricity. For the proposed project, a 30 m high earth-filled dam will be built at the Bujagali site to create a large water drop. The Bujagali site is located about 8 km downstream of the existing Nalubaale and Kirka Hydropower Stations (formally known as the Owen Falls and Owen Falls Extension Stations) at Jinja. There will be five 50 MW turbines generating a total of 250 MW. The dam will create a reservoir extending 8 km upstream to Nalubaale and Kirka facilities. The project will require 45 ha for the permanent project facilities and 80 ha of land will be covered by the water behind the dam. About 1123 ha of land will also be needed during construction. Construction will take about 4 years. The accompanying map shows the project's general layout.
Interconnection Project Description

To transmit the electricity from the hydropower plant, about 97 km of new high voltage electrical transmission lines and a new substation at Kawanda will need to be built. The proposed lines and substation are shown on the accompanying map. Much of the new transmission line between Bujagali and Kawanda will be located adjacent to the existing line that connects the Nabulobe (Owen Falls) and Kampala North substations. It passes through the districts of Mukono, Wakiso, and Kampala. The line from Bujagali to the Kawanda substation will be built as a 220 kV line and the rest will be built as 132 kV lines.

The 132 kV lines will use steel lattice towers of the type and size already in use for several lines in Uganda. The 220 kV towers will be slightly larger and spaced slightly further apart than the 132 kV towers. The property width requirements needed for the lines will be 30 m for 132 kV lines and 40 m for 220 kV line. No structures, such as houses, or tall vegetation such as trees or crops over about 2 m high, will be permitted within this area. A resettlement and compensation program is being developed to ensure those directly affected are fairly compensated.

Public Consultation and Disclosure Process

As part of the assessment work, a comprehensive public consultation and disclosure process is being carried out. Consultation activities completed to date include disclosure of the assessment Terms of Reference documents, and discussions with numerous stakeholders including the affected communities, government agencies and NGO’s.

Consultation activities happening in September and October of 2006 are focusing on the recently released Consultation Summary Reports. Public meetings are planned with the villages around the hydropower plant, and along the proposed transmission lines.

Social & Environmental Action Plans

Social and Environmental Action Plans are being prepared for both projects. They provide details of how potential effects will be managed. Negative impacts will be mitigated and potential benefits will be enhanced to the extent possible.

The following summarizes effects and actions identified to date.

Hydropower Project Predicted Effects and Proposed Management Actions

**Reliability of Electricity**

The electricity to be generated by the project will greatly reduce the rolling blackouts that are now disrupting the country.

**Economic Benefits**

The Bujagali HPP will provide direct and indirect employment during construction. A peak of about 1000 people will be employed during construction. Operational staff will number about 45 people for at least the 30-year life of the facility.

**Kalahala Offset**

The Government of Uganda has committed to protect lands in the vicinity of Kalahala Falls for environmental, cultural and tourism purposes. This protection will offset the effects the Bujagali project will have on environmental, cultural and tourism resources in the project affected area.
Social & Environmental Action Plans cont...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resettlement and Community Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People directly affected by the hydropower project have already been compensated and resettled as appropriate. As there are some unresolved resettlement issues in the community of Naminya, the project sponsor has initiated an “Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan” to resolve these issues. Significant community development programs will also be funded in the project area, including programs to address education and health.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Several companies operate whitewater rafting tours on the Victoria Nile both upstream and downstream of the proposed location for the dam. The dam will flood the upstream rapids that are used by the rafting companies. The sponsor is in discussions with the companies about opportunities to re-orient their business to downstream stretches, including the Kalagala area. The Government has committed to protecting for environmental, cultural, and tourism purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125 ha of land are needed for the reservoir and for the permanent fenced property of the hydropower project. An additional 113 ha of land are needed temporarily during construction. The temporarily used lands will be rehabilitated as appropriate for their proposed future uses. To minimize impacts to natural habitats, the project sponsor will reforest cleared land along the streambanks and on the portions of islands that are not to be flooded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction activities may cause erosion to areas besides the reservoir, but the impacts are not expected to be significant. Filling the reservoir will take place over several days and will not result in a significant change to the flow of water downstream. During operation, water levels will fluctuate about 2 m on a daily basis, which is similar to the fluctuations that already occur as a result of operation of the upstream Nakabale/Kiira facilities. The health and amount of fish in the reservoir will be closely watched and replenished if necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project sponsor is consulting with the Kingdom of Busoga regarding the cultural and spiritual impacts of the hydropower project and the approach to address any concerns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workforce and Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The peak labour force will be more than 1000. These workers will be housed in Jinja and bused to the site for shift changes. Programs will be offered to ensure the health and safety of the workers as well as programs to address social and health issues associated with work force on the local community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction related noise and dust are not expected to be a significant nuisance for local residents. To manage the effects related to construction, traffic management and environmental monitoring and managements plans will be in place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National and Local Economic Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of the transmission lines will enhance the Ugandan electricity transmission system and make a significant contribution to its future development. Jobs and other economic benefits will be associated with the construction and operation of the facilities. Local people will benefit from these opportunities, including the training provided for skill development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resettlement and Community Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All property and people to be directly affected are being identified, and a resettlement program is under way. Landowners and others will be compensated for loss of property and assets. The sponsor will also fund small scale community development programs in the affected villages, including supporting existing education and health initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Resettlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 2001, land was acquired for the Kawanda Substation. People affected by the project were compensated and resettled. An assessment of the past resettlement activities has been completed, including corrective actions to address identified deficiencies. Some additional lands will be required for the substation as it was re-configured to minimize impacts on a neighbouring school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest Reserves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About 60 ha of land affected along the Bujagali-Kawanda line is forest reserve land, primarily within the Mabira Forest Reserve. The sponsor is working closely with the National Forestry Authority on a compensation and mitigation program to address the loss of standing trees and forestry land. Compensation may include support of enhancement planting in other portions of the reserve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lubigi Swamp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To minimize the need for resettlement, the Kawanda-Mutundwe line was routed across the Lubigi Swamp in several locations. Tall towers will be used to increase spans (the distances between towers) to minimize the number of towers being located within the wetland. Wherever possible, the towers will be located adjacent to existing roads or access ways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visiblility and Aesthetics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposed lines will create unavoidable new visual elements in the landscape. The impacts of the new lines have been minimized by routing lines next to existing lines and other linear features. Where possible, towers will be placed adjacent to existing towers or parallel lines to minimize visual impacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction will create a temporary disturbance along the corridors for the transmission lines. The construction of the transmission project will result in increased noise, dust and some traffic congestion. Measures will be put in place to reduce these effects to the extent possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project sponsor is consulting with the Kingdom of Buganda regarding the cultural and spiritual impacts of the transmission project and the approach to address any concerns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Development Action Plans

Community Development Action Plan programs are proposed for the hydropower and transmission line projects. The sponsors will establish a Social Unit to assist in the implementation of the plans, including monitoring of the projects' effects on vulnerable peoples.

Hydropower Project

The project sponsor is working with the eight directly affected villages of Naminya, Buloba, Malindi and Kikubamutwe on the west bank and the villages of Bujagali, Hunambwa, Kyabirwa and Namizi on the east bank to develop a community development program. Although the specifics of the plan are still being developed through consultation with the communities and other stakeholders, the key commitments will include:

- Improvements to local health care facilities
- Employment training activities for the local communities
- Improved water supply in the eight communities
- The creation of a market area in the vicinity of the contractor’s base in the dam area
- Improvements to river landing facilities for the fishers and training through the Beach Management Committees
- Capacity building with the local community in the agricultural sector
- Investment in local school facilities

Interconnection Project

The project sponsors will dedicate funds to affected communities along the transmission lines. The community development activities are viewed as a means to enhance community self-reliance. The distribution of funds will be based on the size of the project’s impact to the community and the size of the population. Examples of typical projects that may be eligible for support include:

- Upgrades to community schools, including upgrades to buildings, furniture, and school equipment (blackboards etc.),
- Upgrades to health centres, including structures and/or equipment,
- Community water points or upgrades thereto, including hand-dug wells and drilled wells, with or without hand pumps,
- Upgrades to access roads,
- Connection to public electricity networks.

Project Schedule

The assessment reports are expected to be completed and publicly released in November 2006. It is anticipated that project lenders and the Government of Uganda will be ready by early 2007 to make a decision on whether the assessment reports meet their requirements. Construction on the project is anticipated to start in 2007. It is expected to take about four years to complete the hydropower plant and dam and three years to complete the transmission line.
ENTANDIKWA YA PULOJEKITI

Kimanyidiwa bulungi nti walwiwo ebbula ly'amasanyalaze mu Uganda.Ciise havaaikale buli-kasera ezi n'ebembeera eno esusubwa okweyogerwa ovu'entonga nti amabibi a nga Nabale ne Kirira mwejama matono oke'ekukundera kw'amazizi mu nnyanja.N'olweekyo walasa okweyaeza obwa mangu okukula ebibiro eddaalai okukula ku mbeera eno.

PULOJEKITI: ya Bujagali Hydropower Project (HPP) ezirigami okuzimba ebibiro 'ly'amasanyalaze eziyeye Bujagali nga Holi amasanyalaze ng'obungi bwa megavansi 250. Ebibiro loo liganda kuumbiwa ku muganga ki Kyi a akumungwa.

Lipostha ebyo ongwezi konakaize ku kuwemba eziyeye Bujagali eneefaanana etya?
Pulojekiti ya Bujagali yetoololera mu kukozesa ama anyi g'amazzi agakulugguka okuva ku neazi okusobola okutambuza ebyuma ne ziyi yingini okukola amasanyalaze. Ebibiro ly'ebiji loo liganda kusse mu kovuma 8 nga kumukungi 5 buli ame ng'ozigasse. Ebibiro bino ligenda kutandawo akaliko obuwanvu bwa Kiromita 8 nga katuuka mu Nabale ne Kira. Okuzimba hujla kutwala ebanga lya myaka ena.

Tuwagala myo okumanya ebireewo byo n'obweraaliribw akeke 250 amby by'omaze okumanya era twagala ebinta ebyo okubufanya ng'omuluko asemwe 10' og'we sekkumisezi asezi.
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Pulojekiti y’okutambuza amasanyalaze eneeba etya?

Okusobola okutambuza amasanyalaze gano, okintekera ly’UETCL kiteddeka okutambuza layini agatanambuza ng’ekika hiririkiza 97 nga aganda kubera ne sitensi e Kawanda. Ebifo omi ne layini amasanyalaze eku ibiggenika okuyita, burgagidwa wamuna nga maapu. Layini ombu obiranya aganda kubera waakali eva Bujagali ne Kawanda nga azaami enekadde ezirwo engatya ku bbibo lya Nalubaale ne sitensi ez’enjawala mu Kampala. Ziyita mu dusabiki omi Mukono, Wakiso ne Kampala.

---

Okwebusza ku bantu ku Puloojekiti eno.

Ng’okugattiriza kw’ebyo olumaze okuzuulibwo mu kubuuliriza, abantu abaliaanye ebibundu omuganda okukolerwa emirimu gino bwa kubwazawo ana okwebusza kubya-genda mu mawo n’okwebusza kali.

---

Entegeka ekoleddwa okuyamba eybalyo n’embeera y’obutonde

Alpota ez’emawilo zaakalebwa ku nsonga eno. Alpota ziro n’isa siga ela ku y’obutonde kugizimba ate ereete n’enjawulo enebuga.

---

Ekifo kye l(alagala Gavumenti esawe akulaba shy e’Kalaga okusigalwo okuyamba ku butonde kw’ensi, okutambuza ne’ebiramu ebizibwvako era okugattibwa okusomesa n’okutendeka abakozi.
Ebikwata kubantu n'ebysosutonde byeeyerewero...

**Abantu abasengulwa bagenda lukikibwako.**

**Eby'obulambuzi**

Kampuni en'entwando n'okukolugguka ku mugga Kiira era kino kikyagenda mu maaso naddala abo ababadde banyuairwa okukolerako. Kampuni ya BEL eri mu nteeseganya ne gavumenti okulaba nga buli kimu kigenda bulungi. Abantu baba kulabulwa obutaliraana nnyo waaya zino kabanga amasannyalaza agabeeramu gavaako obulaba.

**Ettaka**

Etta traanisgawo legendu kwakugenda ku mugga Kiira n'okukolugguka ku mugga Kiira era Kinina abantu abasengulwa bagenda.

**Amazi**

Okukolugguka kw'ettaka okukolwa mu Kinina ku masezi n'okukolugguka nu amazi. Okukolugguka ku mugga Kiira n'tsonga zino.

**Emengo zehy'ebusugwanga**

Entegeka n'ebutundu byabwaho mu muludi ogwo baasasulwa. Ku mulundu guno, waila ettaka eddala erijia okugulibwa okuyisa layini z'amasannyalaza mu kitoogo kya Lubigi.

**Abakozi n'etibo mme bakOLEMA**

Abakozi abasuubirwa basukka mu 1000. Balia kuba basuzibwa Jinja naye akye'ebulambuzi akye'ebulambuzi abantu abaataataganyizibwa wamu n'ebintu byabwe baakunoanyezebwa olwo baliyirirwe buli kimu. Wajja kubaawo n'okukulugguka ku mugga Kiira era Kiwango akye'ebulambuzi abantu abasuubirwa basukka.

**Emmu gy'okuli**

Okuleekaana okusuwe Mu Puloojekiti kugenda mu Mulunda ogwo baasasulwa mu kitoogo kya Lubigi.

**Okutamboza amasanmyalaze, biki ebyalo okuva mu Gatamba.**

**Eby'obuwangwa**

Okutangira ettaka ebintu byabwe baakunoanyezebwa olwo baliyirirwe buli kimu. Wajja kubaawo n'okukulugguka ku mugga Kiira era Kiwango akye'ebulambuzi abantu abasuubirwa basukka.

**Ettaka**

Ettaka okugale ekitambuza amasanmyalaza ma Kiira kikolagana butereevu n'eky'ebibira ekya National Forestry Authority okulaba nga basimba n'okuzzaawo emiti gyonna egyonooneddwa nga bayisaawo emiti ne layini z'amasannyalaza.

**Ekitaogo kya Lubigi**

Ekitaogo kya Lubigi okukendeeza ku kusengula abantu mu bitundu bya Kawanda. Abantu abasuubirwa basukka mu muludi ogwo baasasulwa. Ku mulundu guno, waila ettaka eddala erijia okugulibwa okuyisa layini z'amasannyalaza mu kitoogo kya Lubigi. Okwewala okwonoona ekitoogo, emitilebyuma egiwanirira waaya ziija kusimbibwa ku mabbali g'ebitoogo wamu naokulinda ebiseera by'ekyeya okugenda mwa maaso n'okuleekaana.

**Okutaataaganva ettaka n'ebifo emebeera**

Empag cino n'ebulo ekukikikanda ekukolugguka okukola ne一层edda esa n'ebulo ekukikikanda okukolugguka.

**Ebisibu obnawo mu kuzemba**

Ebisibu obnawo mu kuzemba okutangira ettaka n'ebutundu bya Kayunga, waila ettaka eddala erijia okugolibwa okuyisa layini z'amasannyalaza.

**Embeera y'ebutundu**

Ng'amulimi gugenda mu maaso, waja kubaawo enzegala y'obutundu byabwe. Abantu abasuubirwa basukka mu muludi ogwo baasasulwa baliyirirwe buli kimu. Wajja kubaawo n'okukolugguka ku mugga Kiira era Kiwango akye'ebulambuzi abantu abasuubirwa basukka.
Ebyalo bigenda kukolebwa bitya?

Watereddownavosa enkala ya Community Development Action Plan (CDAP) nga muna mwe bagenda okuyita okuyamba abanta abateesobola mu byalo ebinaaala bhatapataanyiziddwa.

Ebyalo ebikosenyiza ebibiro lyi Bujagali

Abashira osumu gwa bakyiti gwa bisho mu byalo muna muka Naminya, Buloba, Malindi, Kikubamutwe, Kyabirwa ne Namiza kya businga kwa by'byalo. Ebyalo bo by'byalo kubakwellaniibwasa nga bwaboo kwa bantu abakwatahika mu ngeri zino; Bismu ku beebuza

- Okutumula ebyo
- Okutendeka abanta b'tuma byalo ebyo
- Okutumula omukindo g'amazi mu bittundu ebyo omunaana
- Okutukwame ekatala eni abanabwazi abamaabera mu bittundu ebyo
- Okulongoosa emyalo ku Kiyira okuyamba abasunzi mu bittundu ebyo
- Okulongoosa osumu orwamunyi mu b'tuma
- Okutumula osumu n'ebikosenyiza

Okutumula amucyana

Ebyalo ebikosenyiza gwa bakyiti gwa bisho mu by'byalo muna muka abakwatahika nga byyirya basobole okuyambwa. Bisa wamawana

- Okutumula osumu osya g'byalo g'ebikosenyiza
- Okutumula osumu orwamunyi osya g'ebikosenyiza
- Okutumula osumu orwamunyi osya g'ebikosenyiza
- Okutumula osumu orwamunyi osya g'ebikosenyiza
- Okutumula osumu osya g'ebikosenyiza
- Okutumula osumu osya g'ebikosenyiza
- Okutumula osumu osya g'ebikosenyiza
- Okutumula osumu osya g'ebikosenyiza

Pulojekiti enaamala bbanga ki?

Okunoozera ny'ekuuteeka mu muka osuka osy'ebiita mu by'okulabiko osuka okutukira bana wamanga;
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It is widely known that there is a large shortage of electricity in Uganda. Regular blackouts have become the norm, and are expected to get worse in the short term. Energy production from the Nalubaale and Kiira hydropower facilities, which are the main sources of electricity in the country, is limited due to low water levels in Lake Victoria. There is a clear and immediate need for new, large-scale, economical power generation capacity in Uganda.

The Bujagali 250 MW Hydropower Project (HPP) is proposed to meet this need for additional electricity production in Uganda. The sponsor of the hydropower plant is Bujagali Energy Limited, a company owned by SG Holdings Ltd. (a wholly owned affiliate of Sithe Global Power, LLC) and IPS (Kenya) Limited. The Bujagali Interconnection Project (IP) is a system of high voltage electrical transmission lines and related facilities proposed to connect the hydropower plant with the national electricity grid. The sponsor of the Interconnection Project is the Uganda Electric Transmission Company Limited. The two projects are closely inter-linked, and the two sponsors are working in close cooperation on their design and planning, including the public consultation program being completed as part of the social and environmental assessments for the project.

It is expected that the draft Social and Environmental Assessment reports will be released for public review and comment in November 2006.

Consultation Summary Reports Released

Consultation Summary Reports for each of the projects are now available for public review. They present the initial findings of the assessment work completed to date for both projects.

The Consultation Summary Reports are available:
- Through the following local government offices: Budondo Sub-County; Wakiso Sub-County; Najjembe Sub-County; Ngaiga Sub-County; Nama Sub-County; Gombe Sub-County; Kira TC; Nansana Division; Nakwero Sub-County; Nansana Town Council; Nansana Sub-County. 
- From BEI's website: www.bujagali-energy.com
- By mail or telephone request (see contact information on the top of each page).

We are interested in your comments and concerns on the information presented in the Consultation Summary Reports. Please make your submissions to us by October 19, 2006.

Hydropower Project Description

A hydropower project involves using the power of falling water to spin a turbine and generate electricity. For the proposed project, a 30 m high earth-filled dam will be built at the Bujagali site to create a large water drop. The Bujagali site is located about 8 km downstream of the existing Nalubaale and Kiira Hydropower Stations (formally known as the Owen Falls and Owen Falls Extension Stations) at Jinja. There will be five 50 MW turbine-generator sets installed giving a total installed capacity of 250 MW. The dam will create a reservoir extending 8 km upstream to Nalubaale and Kiira facilities. The project will require 45 ha for the permanent project facilities and 80 ha of land will be covered by the water behind the dam. About 113 ha of land will also be needed during construction. Construction will take about 4 years. The accompanying map shows the project's general layout.
Interconnection Project Description

To transmit the electricity from the hydropower plant, about 87 km of new high voltage electrical transmission lines and a new substation at Kawanda will need to be built. The proposed lines and substation are shown on the accompanying map. Much of the new transmission line between Bujagali and Kawanda will be located adjacent to the existing line that connects the Nalubaale (Owen Falls) and Kampala North substations. It passes through the districts of Mukono, Wakiso, Mpigi, and Kampala. The line from Bujagali to the Kawanda sub station will be built as a 220 kV line and the rest will be built as 132 kV lines.

The 132 kV lines will use steel lattice towers of the type and size already in use for several lines in Uganda. The 220 kV towers will be slightly larger and spaced slightly further apart than the 132 kV towers. The property width requirements needed for the lines will be 30 m for 132 kV lines and 40 m for 220 kV lines. No structures, such as houses, or tall vegetation such as trees or crops over about 2 m high, will be permitted within this area. A resettlement and compensation program is being developed to ensure those directly affected are fairly compensated.

Public Consultation and Disclosure Process

As part of the assessment work, a comprehensive public consultation and disclosure process is being carried out. Consultation activities completed to date include disclosure of the assessment Terms of Reference documents, and discussions with numerous stakeholders including the affected communities, government agencies and NGO's.

Consultation activities happening in September and October of 2006 are focusing on the recently released Consultation Summary Reports. Public meetings are planned with the villages around the hydropower plant, and along the proposed transmission lines.

Social & Environmental Action Plans

Social and Environmental Action Plans are being prepared for both projects. They provide details of how potential effects will be managed. Negative impacts will be mitigated and potential benefits will be enhanced to the extent possible.

The following summarizes effects and actions identified to date.

Hydropower Project Predicted Effects and Proposed Management Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect Description</th>
<th>Proposed Management Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of Electricity</td>
<td>The electricity to be generated by the project will greatly reduce the rolling blackouts that are now disrupting the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Benefits</td>
<td>The Bujagali HPP will provide direct and indirect employment during construction. A peak of about 1000 people will be employed during construction. Operational staff will number about 45 people for at least the 30 year life of the facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalagala Offset</td>
<td>The Government of Uganda has committed to protect lands in the vicinity of Kalagala Falls for environmental, cultural and tourism purposes. This protection will offset the effects the Bujagali project will have on environmental, cultural and tourism resources in the project affected area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Environmental Action Plans cont...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resettlement and Community Development</strong></td>
<td>People directly affected by the hydropower project have already been compensated and resettled as appropriate. As there are some unresolved resettlement issues in the community of Naminya, the project sponsor has initiated an &quot;Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan&quot; to resolve these issues. Significant community development programs will also be funded in the project area, including programs to address education and health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism</strong></td>
<td>Several companies operate whitewater rafting tours on the Victoria Nile both upstream and downstream of the proposed location for the dam. The dam will flood the upstream rapids that are used by the rafting companies. The sponsor is in discussions with the companies about opportunities to re-orient their business to downstream stretches, including the Kalagala area that the Government has committed to protecting for environmental, cultural, and tourism purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land</strong></td>
<td>125 ha of land are needed for the reservoir and for the permanent fenced property of the hydropower project. An additional 113 ha of land are needed temporarily during construction. The temporarily used lands will be rehabilitated as appropriate for their proposed future uses. To minimize impacts to natural habitats, the project sponsor will restrict cleared land along the riverbanks and on the portions of islands that are not to be flooded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td>Construction activities may cause erosion to areas besides the reservoir, but the impacts are not expected to be significant. Filling the reservoir will take place over several days and will not result in a significant change to the flow of water downstream. During operation, water levels will fluctuate about 2 m on a daily basis, which is similar to the fluctuations that already occur as a result of operation of the upstream Nakwala-Kira facilities. The health and amount of fish in the reservoir will be closely watched and replenished if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Issues</strong></td>
<td>The project sponsor is consulting with the Kingdom of Buganda regarding the cultural and spiritual impacts of the hydropower project and the approach to address any concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workforce and Community</strong></td>
<td>The peak labour force will be more than 1000. These workers will be housed in Jinja and bused to the site for shift changes. Programs will be offered to ensure the health and safety of the workers as well as programs to address social/health issues associated with workforce effects on the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Activities</strong></td>
<td>Construction-related noise and dust are not expected to be a significant nuisance for local residents. To manage the effects related to construction, traffic management and environmental monitoring and managements plans will be in place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interconnection Project Predicted Effects and Proposed Management Actions**

**National and Local Economic Benefits**

Completion of the transmission lines will enhance the Ugandan electricity transmission system and make a significant contribution to its future development. Jobs and other economic benefits will be associated with the construction and operation of the facilities. Local people will benefit from these opportunities, including the training provided for skill development.

**Resettlement and Community Development**

All property and people to be directly affected are being identified, and a resettlement program is under way. Landowners and others will be compensated for loss of property and assets. The sponsor will also fund small-scale community development programs in the affected villages, including supporting existing education and health initiatives.

**Past Resettlement**

In 2001, land was acquired for the Kawanda Substation. People affected by the project were compensated and resettled. An assessment of the past resettlement activities has been completed, including corrective actions to address identified deficiencies. Some additional lands will be required for the substation as it was re-configured to minimize impacts on a neighboring school.

**Forest Reserves**

About 0.5 ha of land affected along the Bujagali-Kawanda line is forest reserve land; primarily within the Mabira Forest Reserve. The sponsor is working closely with the National Forestry Authority on a compensation and mitigation program to address the loss of standing trees and forestry land, compensation may include support of enhancement planting in other portions of the reserve.

**Lubigi Swamp**

To minimize the need for resettlement, the Kawanda-Mutundwe line was routed across the Lubigi Swamp in several locations. Tall towers will be used to increase spans (the distances between towers) to minimize the number of towers being located within the wetland. Wherever possible the towers will be located adjacent to existing roads or access ways.

**Visibility and Aesthetics**

The proposed lines will create unavoidable new visual elements in the landscape. The impacts of the new lines have been minimized by routing lines next to existing lines and other linear features. Where possible, towers will be placed adjacent to existing towers of parallel lines to minimize visual impacts.

**Construction Effects**

Construction will create a temporary disturbance along the corridors for the transmission lines. The construction of the transmission project will result in increased noise, dust and some traffic congestion. Measures will be put in place to reduce these effects to the extent possible.

**Cultural Issues**

The project sponsor is consulting with the Kingdom of Buganda regarding the cultural and spiritual impacts of the transmission project and the approach to address any concerns.
Community Development Action Plans

Community Development Action Plan programs are proposed for the hydropower and transmission line projects. The sponsors will establish a Social Unit to assist in the implementation of the plans, including monitoring of the projects’ effects on vulnerable peoples.

Hydropower Project

The project sponsor is working with the eight directly affected villages of Namunya, Buloba, Malindi and Kikubamutwe on the west bank and the villages of Bujagali, Ivunamba, Kyabirwa and Namizi on the east bank to develop a community development program. Although the specifics of the plan are still being developed through consultation with the communities and other stakeholders, the key commitments will include:

- Improvements to local health care facilities
- Employment training activities for the local communities
- Improved water supply in the eight communities
- The creation of a market area in the vicinity of the contractor’s base in the dam area
- Improvements to river landing facilities for the fishers and training through the Beach Management Committees
- Capacity building with the local community in the agricultural sector
- Investment in local school facilities

Interconnection Project

The project sponsors will dedicate funds to affected communities along the transmission lines. The community development activities are viewed as a means to enhance community self-reliance. The distribution of funds will be based on the size of the project’s impact to the community and the size of the population. Examples of typical projects that may be eligible for support include:

- Upgrades to community schools, including upgrade to buildings, furniture, and school equipment (blackboards etc.),
- Upgrades to health centres, including structures and/or equipment,
- Community water points or upgrades thereto, including hand-dug wells and drilled wells, with or without hand pumps,
- Upgrades to access roads,
- Connection to public electricity networks.

Project Schedule

The assessment reports are expected to be completed and publicly released in November 2006. It is anticipated that project lenders and the Government of Uganda will be ready by early 2007 to make a decision on whether the assessment reports meet their requirements. Construction on the project is anticipated to start in 2007. It is expected to take about four years to complete the hydropower plant and dam and three years to complete the transmission line.
ENTANDIKWA YA PULOJEKITI


PULOJEKITI ya Bujagali Hydropower Project (HPP) ezon-gramu ukuzima eddala okuva okyivugira anve’ekigaalinya eg’obungi bwa bimagwa 250. Ebbibiro lya luganda kusobola ku m’embeera kwa magu ka 250.

Liponta ezi’imyanye nga aseppobola okuva kwa kampuni Bujagali Energy Limited.


Liponta ezi’imyanye nga aseppobola okuva kwa kampuni Bujagali Energy Limited.

Liponta ezi’imyanye nga aseppobola okuva kwa kampuni Bujagali Energy Limited.

Pulojeeti ya Bujagali eneefaanana etya?

Pulojeeti ya Bujagali yezogolera mu kuzopita wakabi na m’amaanyi. Pulojeeti ya Bujagali yezogolera mu kuzopita wakabi na m’amaanyi. Pulojeeti ya Bujagali yezogolera mu kuzopita wakabi na m’amaanyi.
Pulojekiti y’okutambuza amasanyalaze eneeba etya?

Okusobola okutambuza amasanyalaze gano, okutongole kya UTCL, kighted kozimba layi aqtambuza ng’teko kimotia 97 nga ogenda kubera ne stitseni e Kawanda. Ebiba embe ne layi z’amasanyalaze mwe bigenda okyida, biragiddwa wamanga ku maapu. Layi embe ne layi z’amasanyalaze mwe bigenda okyida, biragiddwa wamanga ku maapu. Layi embe ne layi z’amasanyalaze mwe bigenda okyida, biragiddwa wamanga ku maapu. Layi embe ne layi z’amasanyalaze mwe bigenda okyida, biragiddwa wamanga ku maapu. Layi embe ne layi z’amasanyalaze mwe bigenda okyida, biragiddwa wamanga ku maapu. Layi embe ne layi z’amasanyalaze mwe bigenda okyida, biragiddwa wamanga ku maapu. Layi embe ne layi z’amasanyalaze mwe bigenda okyida, biragiddwa wamanga ku maapu. Layi embe ne layi z’amasanyalaze mwe bigenda okyida, biragiddwa wamanga ku maapu. Layi embe ne layi z’amasanyalaze mwe bigenda okyida, biragiddwa wamanga ku maapu. Layi embe ne layi z’amasanyalaze mwe bigenda okyida, biragiddwa wamanga ku maapu. Layi embe ne layi z’amasanyalaze mwe bigenda okyida, biragiddwa wamanga ku maapu. Layi embe ne layi z’amasanyalaze mwe bigenda okyida, biragiddwa wamanga ku maapu. Layi embe ne layi z’amasanyalaze mwe bigenda okyida, biragiddwa wamanga ku maapu. Layi embe ne layi z’amasanyalaze mwe bigenda okyida, biragiddwa wamanga ku maapu.

Okwebuza ku bantu ku Pulojekiti eno.

Ng’okugattirza kw’ebyo obimaze okuzaibwa mu kubuuliza, abantu abakhwany ebtundu amsgenda okukulirwa eminimu gano biaja kwewubuzwaaka ena okwebuza kubya- genta mu msao n’okwebuza kati.

Entegeka ekoleddwa okuyamba ebalyo n’embeera y’obutonde

Aliposta e’t’okwe buzaakoleedwa ku msao eno. Aliposta zino zaraa ebusiba n’emgeni gye bnaaporiwerwamu nga bwe biragiddwa wamanga:

Entegeka kye Karagala Gavumenti esazeewo okukuuma ebiyiriro by’e Kalaga okusigalawo okuyamba ku butonde by’ensi, obulambuzi n’ebiramu etibera mu n’okukulama.
Ebikwata kubantu n’ebyoobutonde byyeonyango...

Okusengula abantu n’oukutatshikirya ebintu

Abantu abasuubirwa basukka mu 1000. Bajia kuba basuzibwa Jinja naye eby’obullamu nabyo bya kukolebwako nnyo okutangira obutwadde bwa siriimu n’endwadde endala.

Emirimu gy’okukola

Okuleekaana okuza mu Pulolobana eno kujia kusalirwa amagezu wamu n’okukola ebizibu obuzibu.

DOkuserguia abantu Abantu bonna abaataataganyizibwa wamu n’ebintu byabwe baakunoonyezebwa olwo baliyirirwe buli kimu. Wajja kubaawo

Eby’obulamu Ng’omulimu gugenda mu maaso, wakula kubeawo entegeka y’okutangira embeera y’obulamu obutataateaganyrzibwa. Kino kihja

Ebdujra Ekitambuza amasanyalze mu ggwanga kikolagana butereevu n’eky’ebibira ekya National Forestry Authority okulaba nga basimba n’okuzzaawo emiti gyonna egyonooneddwa nga bayisaawo emiti ne layimi z’amasanyalze.

Fkitoogo kya Lubigi

Okutaataaganyza attaka n’ebifo ebrinwo

Empagi zino ne waya zija kustaataaganya ekunla y’etta atokwa iriko naye basudira okugoberera eziwo kati na zi binziranya awe. Kino kya kumpara okukola ku nsonga eno.

Embeera y’ebi’obulamu

Ng’umiramia p refunda mu maaso, wajja kubaawo ontogga s’okutangira embeera y’obuwali okutaataaganya biberwa. Kino kija

Embirira

Ekitongole ekitambuza amasanyalze mu ggwanga ky’okukola ku msina y’aaya zino kusimbibwa ku mabbali g’ebitoogo wamu n’ukulinda ebiseera by’ekyeya okugenda mu maaso n’okukola.
Ebyalo bigenda kukolebwa bitya?

Watereddisho enki y'ka Community Development Action Plan (CDAP) m'umuto mu bigenda okuyita okuyinda abantu abateesobola mu byale abinaaba bituzazaanyo yitende.

Ebyalo ebiteenshiddeka eebibiro bya Bujagali

Abasulira omulimu gye bakolagana biterowe n’ebitya maraana ebikoseeddeka nga mu mulimu Naminya, Bukoba, Mbaleni, Kikubamutwe e bugwanjuba na Kyiira ne Bujagali, Kikubamutwe, Kyabirwa ne Namizi ku buvanjuba bwa Kyiira. Ebyalo bino biija kugadakulanyizibwa nga wwe beebuzza ku bantu abakwabwako mu ngeri zino, Ebemtu kufunaabwako mulim;

- Okutumbula eby’ubulamu
- Okutendeka abantu b’omu byale elyo
- Okutumbula omulimu g'omuzi mu bittundu elyo omunana
- Okuteekawa akatale en abasubuzi abanaabona mu bittundu elyo
- Okulongoosa emyalo ku Kyiira okuyinda abavubu ku bittundu elyo
- Okutumbula emyalo abasaamnyi g’otumfi nga omulimu
- Okutumbula eby’ubulamu

Okutumbula amasanyalaza:

Ebyango ebitisa eninamulimu gye bensobre okuteekawa szente okuyinda ku bantu abanaakoseebwa nga bayisaamu emiti ne waya bastele okuyindwa. Bino wammanga by’ebi okutara eby’ubulamu okutikireeba;

- Okuyinda eby’ubulamu g’ebityo g’ebityo n’ebimbi mu masomero ago
- Okutumbula eby’ubulamu n’ebito omugambarwana
- Ebifo omulimwe amazri n’okusima enzi abantu b’ebityo mwe bakima amazri
- Ebyalo eby’omu binkubamba
- Okutamula amasamnyi g’ebityo
- Okutafaa ku mili ne waya l’amasanyalaza endela mu byale

Pulojekiti enaamala bbanga k’?

Okutumweze ebyakata mu nkala n’ebusubira kiyenda bensobre okutikireeba ara bfuulisiibwe mu muzi gw’ekluma m’oguma 2006. Kisuburwa mti abagenda okuteekawa szente mu pulokjekiti ene baja kuba beentegese nga 2007 atandika owabo balaba oba okutamula kutandikhe. Okunamula ebibiro kwa kutikira emyaka ona ste okutambula amasanyalaza, emiti ne waya binaa emyaka esatu.
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Dear NGO/Agency:

The Bujagali Hydropower Project (HPP) is a 250 MW hydropower project proposed for the Victoria Nile, near Jinja, in Uganda. The sponsor of the HPP is Bujagali Energy Limited, a project-specific company owned by SG Bujagali Holdings Ltd. (a wholly owned affiliate of Sithe Global Power, LLC) and IPS (Kenya) Limited. The Bujagali Interconnection Project (IP) is a system of high voltage electrical transmission lines and related facilities proposed to interconnect the Bujagali HPP with the national grid. The sponsor of the IP is the Uganda Electric Transmission Company Limited (UETCL). The two projects are closely interlinked, and the two sponsors are working in close cooperation on their design and planning processes.

Social and Environmental Assessment's (SEAs) for both projects are being prepared for submission to Uganda’s National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), and for review by potential lenders to the projects, such as the World Bank Group. The SEAs are being undertaken to meet requirements of the GoU, as well as the policies, performance standards and guidelines of the potential project lenders. The purpose of the SEAs are to ensure that the projects are designed and developed in a manner that results in the least amount of social and environmental effects while maximizing project benefits.

SEA Summary Reports that describe the results of the SEA work completed to date for both the Hydro Power Project and the Interconnection Project have been prepared for public and agency review and comment. Public notices and radio ads have been published inviting all to comment on these reports.

We have enclosed a copy of each Summary Report for your agency’s review and comments. Note that in some cases we already sent an electronic copy of the reports to your organization. The Summary Reports have also been translated into Luganda and Lusoga and copies of these translated summaries can be made available.

Originally, we had requested that comments are be forwarded to the outlined address below by 19 October 2006. We have extended the comment period to 26 October 2007. If you would like to submit comments but cannot do so by this date, then please advise us.

BEL would also be interested in meeting with you to receive your comments and answer your questions. Comments received will be taken into account in the preparation of the Draft SEA Reports that are scheduled to be released in November.

We look forward to receiving your comments.

Yours truly;

Kenneth Kaheru
BEL

Bujagali Energy Limited
IPS Uganda
Piot 109-112, Fifth Street,
Industrial Area, Kampala.
Tel: +256 41 2568194
info@bujagali-energy.com
NGO/CSOs SEA Summary Report Distribution list

1. BANDERA COMMUNITY PROJECT
P.O.BOX 720 JINJA ENKABI
CENTRE PLOT 6, NIZAM ROAD - JINJA
BALWANA GODFHEY
0772 913045
balwanagodfrey@yahoo.com

2. KAYUNGA DISTRICT
NAMATOVU JULLIET
ASS. D. E. O, KAYUNGA
077 2392684

3. KIRIINDI KEWERIMIDDE FARMERS ASSOCIATION
NAZIGO SUB COUNTY,
KAYUNGA DISTRICT.
MILTON ONYANGO KADDO
0772 64005

4. FABIO
PLOT 9/11 MAIN STREET
P.O.BOX 1537, JINJA.
NANDUDDU SUZAN
043 121255
fabio-bikes@utlonline.co.ug
kapaga2006@yahoo.com

5. MUKAIRE RASHID
ECOVIC UGANDA CHAPTER
PLOT 1 NILE AVENUE
P.O.BOX 983 JINJA
0752 998396
mukrashid@spirifinder.com

6. JINJA JOINT DEVELOPMENT ASS.
PLOT 23 Lubas Road
MWAVU ALEX MUGOYA
0712 733569
mugoyaalex@yahoo.co.uk
jointjjoda@hotmail.com
7. ANPPCAN - JINJA
PLOT 23A LUBAS ROAD
P.O.BOX 1962 JINJA
JIMMY OBBO IVANS
0772 640013
jimmyobbo@yahoo.com

8. JOINT MODERN DEV'T ASS.
PLOT 39 MAIN STREET WEST JINJA
JAMES MUSAAZI
0772 405339
jmda Ngo@yahoo.com

9. KASIIBA BUSOGA YOUTH ENV'T PROTECTION
KIVE JINJA ROAD, BUWENGE TOWN COUNCIL
P.O.BOX 702 JINJA
TENYWA DAVID
0772 909831
bepauganda_2004@yahoo.co.uk
byepa_2000@yahoo.co.uk

10. ECOCIC UGANDA CHAPTER
P.O.BOX 983 JINJA PLOT 1 NILE AVENUE
KEEFA WAWEESA
077 2 455270
eovicug@yahoo.com
kefasen@yahoo.com

11. JINJA URBAN WOMEN'S WETLAND ORGANISATION
TOWN HALL JINJA
KAKUZE TABITHA
077 2664438
kakuzet@yahoo.com

12. LIVELIHOOD DEVELOPMENT INTERNATIONAL
PLOT 14, AMBERCOURT, AMBERLEY ROAD
P.O.BOX 2101 JINJA
ERNEST NABIHAMBA
0772 522335
enabi65@yahoo.co.uk
13. UGANDA FISHERIES DEV’T ASS.
P.O.BOX 1309 JINNA
NAPIAR MARKET PLOT 1A JINJA C DIVISION
KALANZI RAMATHAN
075 2 596522
ufda2002@yahoo.com

14. AUXILIARY FOUNDATION (AUXFOUND)
MUHUMBA HEALTH CENTRE
WALUKUBA MASESE DIV.
OGWAL PERMENAS WILLY
0772 309863
ogwalwilly@yahoo.co.uk

15. CENTRE FOR INTERGRATED DEV’T
P.O.BOX 71327 KALUNGU, BUNGA (CIDEV) KAMPALA
SSETENDA PETER
071 2 878085, 041 267256,
fax: 256 41 267256
.cid@vol.co.ug
pssetenda@yahoo.com

16. INTERGRATED ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENCE (INED)
P.O.BOX 18048 Kayunga - Galiraya
ROBERT WANGOOLO
0772 658465
ined2003@yahoo.com

17. H.A.P.I/H.I.V AIDS PREVENTION INITIATIVE JINNA
P.O.BOX 9151, FAX 1213322
ABOTH BRENDA
0712 716087
abothbrenda@yahoo.com

18. ERIISO LYOMUKULU BEE FARMERS DEV’T GROUP
19. KAYUNGA S/COUNTY BUYOBE VILLAGE
LUKWAGO ERISA
077 2820427

20. BUYOBE YOUTH DEV’T ASSOCIATION
KAYUNGA KANJUKI TOWN COUNCIL
P.O.BOX 18081, KAYUNGA.
BBALE ROAD
WASSWA PATRICT
0772 528741
21. RURAL AND URBAN DEV'T FOUNDATION
IGANGA TOWN COUNCIL
P.O. BOX 191, IGANGA
NAKIGO ROAD
KIRUNDA YASIN
0772 616905
fax 043 242345
yasinkirunda@yahoo.com

22. NWASEA
IGANGA TOWN COUNCIL
PLOT 17 WAGOMA ROAD
NANTALE ANNE
0772 50069
FAX 043 2 42345
n_wasea@yahoo.com

23. UGANDA ENVIRONMENT EDUCATION FOUNDATION
P.O. BOX 5658 KLA.
MUKONO NEAR LANDS
SSENYONJO NICHOLAS
041 290740
ugandaenvironmetal@yahoo.com
ueef@operamail.com

24. MUUKONO MULTI PURPOSE YOUTH ORGANISATION
BOX 7838 K'LA MUKONO
KAYUNGA ROAD
BYANSI LAWRENCE
0772 401990
FAX 041 290211
mumyorg@yahoo.com

25. CAPE OF GOOD HOPE ORPHAN CARE & FAMILY SUPPORT PROJECT
P.O. BOX. 5329 K'LA
MAWOTTO PROJECT
KABEERA NTALE
0772 563447
gkabeera@yahoo.com
26. KISIMBA MOSLIM MISSION
P.O.BOX 4646 BUIKWE
NAJJA S/COUNTY
GITTA MOHAMMED
0712 281835
kmmnajja@yahoo.com

27. NWASEA - BUGIRI TOWN COUNCIL
MAIN HIGH WAY BUGIRI
NAMUWOLYA HADIJJA
0772 451507
namuwolya@yahoo.com

28. RUCODEF
P.O.BOX. 5191 JINJA
ALULE CHRISTOPHER
0752 965877
rucodef@yahoo.com

29. KATOSI WOMEN DEV'T TRUST
P.O.BOX 33292 K'LA
NABALEMA CAROLYNE
041 348774
fax 041 348774
katosi@utlonline.co.ug
carkitester@yahoo.com

30. UEEF
P. O. BOX 5658, MUKONO
MULINDWA JOSEPH
041 290740
mulindwajos@yahoo.com

31. ENVIRONMENTAL ALERT KAMPALA
DOROTHY KAGGWA
0772 680686
dkaggwa@envalert.org

32. UGANDA NILE DISCOURSE FORUM
P. O. BOX 34404 KAMPALA
SARAH NAIGAGA
078 2 436700
snaigaga@yahoo.co.uk
undf@uws.org
33. Uganda National NGO Forum  
Plot 25 Kabalagala  
Box 4636 Kla. 031 260373/ 041 510272/ 041 501674  
gouforum@infocom.co.ug

34. Anti-Corruption Coalition Uganda (ACCU)  
Plot 243 Tuffnel Drive  
Mr. Godfrey Rwakabale (Coordinator)  
041 535659/ 535660/ 0772611482  
E: mail: rwakabale@anticorruption.or.ug

35. International Union for the Conservation of nature and Natural resources (IUCN)  
Mr. Alex Muhwezi (Country Rep.)  
Plot 39, Acacia Avenue  
041 344508/ 0772221499  
e-mail; alex.muhwezi@iucn.co.ug

36. Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA)  
Director, tourism business development and planning  
Mr. Damian B. Akankwasa  
Box 3530 kla.  
041 355000/ 0772 790729  
damian.akankwasa@uwa.or.ug

37. Green Watch Uganda  
Kaneth Kakulu/ Irene Ssekyana  
P.O. Box 10120,  
Kampala- Uganda  
Tel: 256-41-344 613  
Fax: 256-41 343 787  
E: mail- irene@greenwatch.or.ug  
environment@greenwatch.or.ug

38. Uganda Debt Network  
Kapepwe Julius  
041 543974/ 041 533840/ 041 223152  
jkapepwe@udn.or.ug

39. DENIVA  
Wandera Peter  
041 530575/ 041531150  
info@deniva.or.ug
40. Environmental Alert
Christine Nantongo (Program manager)
P.O.Box 11259, Kla.
Tel: 256 41 510215; 0772440926
e-mail envalert@envalert.org

41. National Association of Professional Environmentalist (NAPE)
Frank Muramuzi
041-534453/ 0772 492362
e-mail: nape@utlonline.co.ug

42. Busoga Kingdom
043 122848/ 077 2401665
(P.Min. Musumba Martin)

43. Buganda Kingdom
Hon: Ben Lubega Lwebanjo
041 272730/ 0772 410665
Uganda Manufacturers Association (UMA)
041 220831/ 041 221034/ 0772 861147
Mr. Mawanda Robert.

44. Save Bjagali Crusade (SBC)
Afunaadula
0782555222

45. Uganda Dams Dialogue
Mr. Bazira (Chairman)
0772 504173
bazirae@yahoo.com

46. Student Partnership Worldwide (Jinja)
Jimmy Innes (Country Director)
jimmy.innes@spw.org
0782 974434

47. JIDDECO (Jinja)
Paul Bateeze (Coordinator)
0772 408378
jiddeco@jiddeco.or.ug

48. Busoga Trust (Jinja)
Frank Kumbuga & Johnson Waibi (program manager)
0772 452693 / 043121572
49. ACODE
Plot 96 Kanjokya Street
Tumushabe Godba
041 530798 – 0782 202816

50. Energy Plus Ltd
041-533073- 077-2441953
eng@utlonline.co.ug

51. African Institute for Energy Governance (AFIEGO)
Dickens Kamugisha
041571597 - 0782407085
afiego-ug@yahoo.com
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The Bujagali Hydropower Project (HPP) is a 250 MW hydropower project proposed for the Victoria Nile, near Jinja, in Uganda. The sponsor of the HPP is Bujagali Energy Limited, a project-specific company owned by SG Bujagali Holdings Ltd (a wholly owned affiliate of Sithe Global Power, LLC) and IPS (Kenya) Limited. The Bujagali Interconnection Project (IP) is a system of high voltage electrical transmission lines and related facilities proposed to interconnect the Bujagali HPP with the national grid. The sponsor of the IP is the Uganda Electric Transmission Company Limited (UETCL). The two projects are closely interlinked, and the two sponsors are working in close cooperation on their design and planning processes.

Social and Environmental Assessment’s (SEAs) for both projects are being prepared for submission to Uganda’s National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), and for review by potential lenders to the projects, such as the World Bank Group. The SEAs are being undertaken to meet requirements of the GoU, as well as the policies, performance standards and guidelines of the potential project lenders. The purpose of the SEAs are to ensure that the projects are designed and developed in a manner that results in the least amount of social and environmental effects while maximizing project benefits.

SEA Summary Reports that describe the results of the SEA work completed to date for both the Hydro Power Project and the Interconnection Project have been prepared for public and agency review and comment. Public notices and radio ads have been published inviting all to comment on these reports. We have enclosed a copy of each Summary Report for your agency’s review and comments. Note that in some cases we already sent an electronic copy of the reports to your organization. The Summary Reports have also been translated into Luganda and Lusoga and copies of these translated summaries can be made available.

Originally, we had requested that comments are be forwarded to the outlined address below by 19 October 2006. We have extended the comment period to 26 October 2007. If you would like to submit comments but cannot do so by this date, then please advise us.

BEL would also be interested in meeting with you to receive your comments and answer your questions. Comments received will be taken into account in the preparation of the Draft SEA Reports that are scheduled to be released in November.

We look forward to receiving your comments.

Yours truly;

Kenneth Kaheru
BEL

Bujagali Energy Limited
IPS Uganda
Plot 109-112 Fifth Street,
Industrial Area Kampala.
Tel: +256 41 256194
info@bujagali.energy.com
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0752 998396
mukrashid@spirifinder.com

6. JINJA JOINT DEVELOPMENT ASS.
PLOT 23 Lubas Road
MWAVU ALEX MUGOYA
0712 733569
mugoyaalex@yahoo.co.uk
jointjjoda@hotmail.com
7. ANPPCAN - JINJA
PLOT 23A LUBAS ROAD
P.O.BOX 1962 JINJA
JIMMY OBBO IVANS
0772 640013
jimmyobbo@yahoo.com

8. JOINT MODERN DEV'T ASS.
PLOT 39 MAIN STREET WEST JINJA
JAMES MUSA AZI
0772 405339
jmda_ngo@yahoo.com

9. KASIIBA BUSOGA YOUTH ENV'T PROTECTION
KIVE JINJA ROAD, BUWENGE TOWN COUNCIL
P.O.BOX 702 JINJA
TENYWA DAVID
0772 909831
bepauganda_2004@yahoo.co.uk
byepa_2000@yahoo.co.uk

10. ECOVIC UGANDA CHAPTER
P.O.BOX 983 JINJA PLOT 1 NILE AVENUE
KEEFA KAWEE SA
077 2 455270
ecovicug@yahoo.com
kefasen@yahoo.com

11. JINJA URBAN WOMEN'S WETLAND ORGANISATION
TOWN HALL JINJA
KAKUZE TABITHA
077 2664438
kakuzet@yahoo.com

12. LIVELIHOOD DEVELOPMENT INTERNATIONAL
PLOT 14, AMBERCOURT, AMBERLEY ROAD
P.O.BOX 2101 JINJA
ERNEST NABIHAMBA
0772 522335
enabi65@yahoo.co.uk
13. UGANDA FISHERIES DEV’T ASS.
P.O.Box 1309 Jinja
NAPIAR MARKET PLOT 1A JINJA C DIVISION
KALANZI RAMATHAN
075 2 596522
ufda2002@yahoo.com

14. AUXILIARY FOUNDATION (AUXFOUND)
MUHUMBA HEALTH CENTRE
WALUKUBA MASESE DIV.
OGWAL PERMENAS WILLY
0772 309863
ogwalwilly@yahoo.co.uk

15. CENTRE FOR INTERGRATED DEV’T
P.O.Box 71327 KALUNGU, BUNGA (CIDEV) KAMPALA
SSETENDA PETER
071 2 878085, 041 267256,
fax: 256 41 267256
cid@vol.co.ug
pssetenda@yahoo.com

16. INTERGRATED ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENCE (INED)
P.O.Box 18048 Kayunga - Galiraya
ROBERT WANGOOLO
0772 658465
ined2003@yahoo.com

17. H.A.P.I/H.I.V AIDS PREVENTION INITIATIVE JINJA
P.O.Box 9151, FAX 1213322
ABOTH BRENDA
0712 716087
abothbrenda@yahoo.com

18. ERIISO LYOMUKULU BEE FARMERS DEV’T GROUP
19. KAYUNGA S/COUNTY BUYOBE VILLAGE
LUKWAGO ERISA
077 2820427

20. BUYOBE YOUTH DEV’T ASSOCIATION
KAYUNGA KANJUKI TOWN COUNCIL
P.O.Box 18081, KAYUNGA.
BBALE ROAD
WASSWA PATRICT
0772 528741
21. RURAL AND URBAN DEV'T FOUNDATION
IGANGA TOWN COUNCIL
P.O.BOX 191, IGANGA
NAKIGO ROAD
KIRUNDA YASIN
0772 616905
fax 043 242345
yasinkirunda@yahoo.com

22. NWASEA
IGANGA TOWN COUNCIL
PLOT 17 WAGOMA ROAD
NANTALE ANNE
0772 50069
FAX 043 2 42345
n_wasea@yahoo.com

23. UGANDA ENVIRONMENT EDUCATION FOUNDATION
P.O.BOX 5658 KLA.
MUKONO NEAR LANDS
SSENYONJO NICHOLAS
041 290740
ugandaenvironmental@yahoo.com
ueef@operamail.com

24. MUKONO MULTI PURPOSE YOUTH ORGANISATION
BOX 7838 K'LA MUKONO
KAYUNGA ROAD
BYANSI LAWRENCE
0772 401990
FAX 041 290211
mumyorg@yahoo.com

25. CAPE OF GOOD HOPE ORPHAN CARE & FAMILY SUPPORT PROJECT
P.O.BOX. 5329 K'LA
MAWOTTO PROJECT
KABEERA NTALE
0772 563447
gkabeera@yahoo.com
26. KISIMBA MOSLIM MISSION
P.O.BOX 4646 BUIKWE
NAJJA S/COUNTY
GITTA MOHAMMED
0712 281835
kmmnajja@yahoo.com

27. NWASEA - BUGIRI TOWN COUNCIL
MAIN HIGH WAY BUGIRI
NAMUWOLYA HADIJJA
0772 451507
namuwolya@yahoo.com

28. RUCODEF
P.O.BOX. 5191 JINJA
ALULE CHRISTOPHER
0752 965877
rucodef@yahoo.com

29. KATOSI WOMEN DEV'T TRUST
P.O.BOX 33292 K'LA
NABALEMA CAROLYNE
041 348774
fax 041 348774
katosi@utlonline.co.ug
carkitester@yahoo.com

30. UEEF
P. O. BOX 5658, MUKONO
MULINDWA JOSEPH
041 290740
mulindwajos@yahoo.com

31. ENVIRONMENTAL ALERT KAMPALA
DOROTHY KAGGWA
0772 680686
dkaggwa@envalert.org

32. UGANDA NILE DISCOURSE FORUM
P. O. BOX 34404 KAMPALA
SARAH NAIGAGA
078 2 436700
snaigaga@yahoo.co.uk
undf@uws.org
33. Uganda National NGO Forum
Plot 25 Kabalagala
Box 4636 Kla. 031 260373/ 041 510272/ 041 501674
ngoforum@infocom.co.ug

34. Anti-Corruption Coalition Uganda (ACCU)
Plot 243 Tuffnel Drive
Mr. Godfrey Rwakabale (Coordinator)
041 535659/ 535660/ 0772611482
E-mail: rwakabale@anticorruption.or.ug

35. International Union for the Conservation of nature and Natural resources (IUCN)
Mr. Alex Muhwezi (Country Rep.)
Plot 39, Acacia Avenue
041 344508/ 0772221499
e-mail: alex.muhwezi@iucn.co.ug

36. Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA)
Director, tourism business development and planning
Mr. Damian B. Akankwasa
Box 3530 Kla.
041 355000/ 0772 790729
damian.akankwasa@uwa.or.ug

37. Green Watch Uganda
Kanneth Kakulu/ Irene Ssekyana
P.O. Box 10120,
Kampala- Uganda
Tel: 256-41-344 613
Fax: 256-41 343 787
E-mail: irene@greenwatch.or.ug
environment@greenwatch.or.ug

38. Uganda Debt Network
Kapepwe Julius
041 543974/ 041 533840/ 041 223152
jkapepwe@udn.or.ug

39. DENIVA
Wandera Peter
041 530575/ 041531150
info@deniva.or.ug
40. Environmental Alert
Christine Nantongo (Program manager)
P.O.Box 11259, Kla.
Tel: 256 41 510215; 0772440926
e-mail envalert@envalert.org

41. National Association of Professional Environmentalist (NAPE)
Frank Muramuzi
041-534453/ 0772 492362
e-mail: nape@utlonline.co.ug

42. Busoga Kingdom
043 122848/ 077 2401665
(P.Min. Musumba Martin)

43. Buganda Kingdom
Hon: Ben Lubega Lwebanjo
041 272730/ 0772 410665
Uganda Manufacturers Association (UMA)
041 220831/ 041 221034/ 0772 861147
Mr. Mawanda Robert.

44. Save Bujagali Crusade (SBC)
Afunaadula
0782555222

45. Uganda Dams Dialogue
Mr. Bazira (Chairman)
0772 504173
bazirae@yahoo.com

46. Student Partnership Worldwide (Jinja)
Jimmy Innes (Country Director)
jimmy.innes@spw.org
0782 974434

47. JIDDECO (Jinja)
Paul Bateeze (Coordinator)
0772 408378
jiddeco@jiddeco.or.ug

48. Busoga Trust (Jinja)
Frank Kumbuga & Johnson Waibi (program manager)
0772 452693 / 043121572
49. ACODE
Plot 96 Kanjokya Street
Tumushabe Godba
041 530798 – 0782 202816

50. Energy Plus Ltd
041-533073- 077-2441953
eng@utlonline.co.ug

51. African Institute for Energy Governance (AFIEGO)
Dickens Kamugisha
041571597 - 0782407085
afiego-ug@yahoo.com
Appendix D.5
HPP Community Meeting Presentations
and Minutes
Bujagali HPP Meeting Agenda

- Introductions
- Meeting Purpose
- Project Sponsor
- Project Need
- Project Description
- Project Schedule
- SEA & Consultation Process
- SEA Draft Results
- Community Development Initiatives
- Summary Points & Group Discussion
Purpose of Meeting

1. To inform you about the project;
2. To present the draft findings of the SEA and proposed community development initiatives; and
3. To receive your comments.

Your comments are important to us – we want to make this the best project possible!
Project Sponsor

- The sponsor of the HPP is *Bujagali Energy Limited*
- BEL is committed to the development of this project – we are here for the long term
- The sponsor of the IP is the Uganda Electricity Transmission Company Limited (UETCL)
HPP Project Description

- A 30 m high earth-filled dam will be built
- 250 MW of electricity will be generated
- A permanent land take of 45 ha for the project facilities
- A reservoir extending 8 km upstream – About 80 ha of flooded land
HPP Project Description (cont’d)

- No plans at present to create a new public crossing of the Nile over the dam
- Dam construction will take about 4 years
- Construction workforce of 1000 persons
- Workers will be housed in Jinja
- 30 to 50 people will be needed to operate the dam
IP Project Description

- 97 km of new electrical transmission lines needed
- The line from Bujagali to north of Kampala will be built as a 220 kV line
- In Wakisi, new 132 kV lines include:
  - south from Bujagali switchyard to the existing 132kV line from Owen falls to Tororo;
  - north from severed Owen Falls-Tororo line to interconnect with the Bujagali switchyard.
IP Project Description (cont’d)

- Land for the 5 m RoW corridor will be acquired. No buildings or farming will be allowed.
- A wayleave of 35 m (220kV line) and 25 m (132 kV line) is required.
- Lands in the wayleave area will remain under the original ownership. Landowners & tenants will be compensated.
- No buildings or tall vegetation permitted in wayleave.
Project Need

- Uganda has been suffering from a shortage of electricity. Blackouts are common.
- Large-scale hydropower development is the lowest cost source.
- 6 potential hydropower sites have been evaluated along the Victoria Nile.
- Bujagali is the preferred location for the next hydropower development (low social and environmental impacts).
SEA & Consultation Process

- To meet the requirements of NEMA and potential project lenders, SEAs are being prepared

**What does the SEA do?**
- Describes the natural and social environmental conditions
- Examines project alternatives
- Identifies the different project components and activities that might cause effects
- Identifies and assesses the effects
- Identifies measures to reduce the negative impacts and maximize positive effects.
SEA & Consultation Process Cont’d

- SEA Summary Reports have been prepared - available at the LC3 office

- Consultation is involving:
  - Public Advertisements
  - Summary Report/Newsletter release
  - Meetings with NGOs, the Kingdoms & agencies
  - Community Meetings
HPP Resettlement

- An "Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan" is being prepared for the Naminya resettlement community.

- Pre-construction activities to include:
  - the provision of new water supply hand pumps at 17 locations;
  - improvements to education facilities; and
  - improvements to the health facilities in Naminya.
IP Land Valuation and Compensation

- Land and assets along the transmission corridor are being valued & compensation amounts set
- Affected residents can receive cash compensation or be resettled
- Landowners and tenants will receive advance notification of when the affected land will need to be vacated
Project Effects/Issues

- Workforce and Community Effects
- Construction Disturbances
- Traffic Management
- Employment Opportunities
- Fisheries
- Tourism
- Visual Effects
- Cultural Issues
HPP Community Development

- Improvements to local health care facilities
- Employment training activities for the local communities
- Improved water supply in the eight communities
- The creation of a market area in the vicinity of the contractor's base in the dam area
- Improvements to river landing facilities for the fishers and training through the Beach Management Committees
- Capacity building with the local community in the agricultural sector
- Investment in local school facilities
IP Community Development

- UETCL/BEL proposing to dedicate funds to be available to affected communities along the transmission line.

- Funding could be directed at:
  - Upgrades to community schools
  - Upgrades to health centers
  - New Community water points or upgrades
  - Upgrades to access roads
  - Connection to public electricity networks
Next Steps

- Submission of the draft SEA Reports to NEMA and the lenders – Nov 06
- Requests for public comments on the Draft SEA Reports
- Community Development Consultation – early 2007
- SEA Approval – early 2007
- Construction Start – mid/late 2007
Key Messages

- Project being implemented to increase the supply of electricity in Uganda
- Landowners & tenants will be fairly compensated for loss of land & assets
- Issues remaining from the hydropower resettlement activities are being dealt with
- A SEA is being undertaken which will require approval
- Effects from the project will be minimal and largely limited to the construction period
- Community development initiatives will be implemented for villages in the vicinity of the hydro dam & along the transmission route

We want your support for this project!
Questions for You...

- What information regarding your village should we be aware of?
- Are there any specific project effects that you are concerned about?
- What comments can you provide us on the proposed community development initiatives?
- How would you like to be involved in the implementation of the community development initiatives?
- What future information/consultation activities would you like?
MINUTES OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION MEETING HELD ON 5TH OCTOBER 2006 AT THE BUDONDO SUBCOUNTY HEADQUARTERS.

1. OPENING
The meeting was called to order by the LC I Chairperson, Namizi, Mr. Tenywa Suleiman at 2.26 p.m. The National Anthem of Uganda and Busoga Kingdom anthem were played and prayer was conducted by Mr. S. Mugote from Busoga Kingdom.

2. ATTENDANCE
Attendance of the meeting was as per attached Attendance List.

3. COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN
Mr. Tenywa called upon the LC III Chairman, Mr. Tibenkana Ivan Godrey, to open the meeting on behalf of the LC Chairperson for the area. Mr. Tibenkana welcomed all the guests and thanked them for coming. He said the area was grateful for every arrangement being made to inform them about the progress of the Bujagali Hydropower and Transmissions Projects. He introduced members of the following committees in the area:

- The Budondo Subcounty Consultative Committee on the Bujagali Hydropower Project
- Budondo Subcounty Councillors
- The Chairpersons of the East Bank villages with their executives
- Religious Leaders
- Cultural Leaders
- Busoga Kingdom Representative
- Leaders of different political parties
- Heads of institutions, schools and health units

After these introductions Mr. Tibenkana declared the meeting officially opened.

Mr. Tenywa pointed out that during AESNP time the public consultations were done at Jinja SSS but today they are grateful that the meetings were being held in the affected areas and assured those present that they would be informed when the project will start.

3. COMMUNICATION FROM BEL
Mr. Kenneth Kaheru of BEL thanked the LCIIIs and LCIs and their councils and the members of the Budondo Subcounty for warm welcome. He introduced the team on the Bujagali and Transmission Projects:

- Mr. Kenneth Kaheru – BEL
- Mr. Philip Mooney-BEL
- Ms. Deniz Baharoglu-WB-MIGA
- Mr. Don McKinnon – Dilbu Consulting
- Dr. Patrick Mwesigye – Burnside
- Mr. David Bizimana – Witness NGO
- Mr. George Kihuguru – BPIU
• Mrs. Florence Namata - BPIU
• Mr. Eddie Mutesa - BPIU
• Mr. Titus Bitebekezi - BPIU
• Mr. James Engaro - BPIU
• Mr. Thomas Kasule - BPIU
• Mr. Charles Dramu - BPIU
• Ms. Rosemary Matovu - BPIU
• Mr. John Othieno - UETCL
• Mr. Mawanda Rashid - UETCL

Other representatives:
• Mr. Dick Lufafa – District Environmental Officer, Jinja
• Mr. Charles Ngeye
• Mr. Geoffrey Muzusa – representing the Jinja Town Clerk

Mr. Kaheru invited Mr. Don McKinnon to explain to the public why this meeting was called and its purpose.

4. PRESENTATION
Mr. McKinnon thanked all those present and set out the Agenda for Bujagali HPP Meeting as follows:
• Introductions
• Meeting Purpose
• Project Sponsor
• Project Need
• Project Description
• Project Schedule
• Social Environmental Assessment (SEA) & Consultation Process
• SEA Draft Results
• Community Development Initiatives
• Summary Points & Group Discussion

PURPOSE OF MEETING
Mr. McKinnon informed the public that introductions had been made and that the purpose of the meeting was as follows:
1. To inform the public about the project.
2. To present the draft findings of the SEA and proposed community development initiatives.
3. To receive comments from the public

He emphasized to the public that their comments are important to the Sponsor – as the Sponsor want to make this the best project possible.
PROJECT SPONSOR
Mr. McKinnon informed the public that:
- The Sponsor of the Bujagali Hydropower Project is BUJAGALI ENERGY LIMITED (BEL) composed of IPS Kenya and Sithe Global
- BEL is committed to the development of this project and that they were here for the long term.
- The Sponsor of the Interconnection (Transmission) is the Uganda Electricity Transmission Co. Ltd. (UETCL).

He informed the meeting that BEL and UETCL are working closely together to build the dam and the interconnections.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The project description is as follows:
- A 30m high earth-filled dam will be built
- 250MW of electricity will be generated
- A permanent land take of 45 ha for the project facilities
- A reservoir extending 8 Km. upstream – about 80 ha of flooded land.
- No plans at present to create a new public crossing of the Nile over the dam
- Dam construction will take about 4 years
- Construction workforce of 1000 persons
- Workers will be house in Jinja
- 30 to 50 people will be needed to operate the dam after construction

Mr. McKinnon informed the public that all this work will be done on the West Bank and that maps showing how the dam will be built are available for viewing.

PROJECT NEED
Mr. McKinnon explained to the public the project need:
- Uganda has been suffering from a shortage of electricity Blackouts are common.
- Larg-scale hydropower development is the lowest cost source
- 6 potential hydropower sites have been evaluated along the Victoria Nile
- Bujagali is the preferred location for the next hydropower development (low social and environmental impacts)

SEA AND CONSULTATION PROCESS
Mr. McKinnon informed the public that:
- To meet the requirements of NEMA and potential project lenders, social environmental assessments (SEA) are being prepared
- What does the social environmental assessment do?
  - Describes the natural and social environmental conditions
  - Examines project alternatives
  - Identifies the different project components and activities that might cause effects
  - Identifies and assesses the effects
- Identified measures to reduce the negative impacts and maximize positive effects

- SEA Summary Reports have been prepared and are available at the LC3's office
- Consultation is involving:
  - Public advertisements
  - Summary Report/Newsletter release
  - Meetings with NGOs, the Kingdoms and agencies
  - Community meetings

HYDRO POWER RESETTLEMENT
Mr. McKinnon informed the public resettlement activities are well known and that:

- An assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Plans is being prepared for the Naminya resettlement community
- Pre-construction activities to include:
  - The provision of new water supply hand pumps at 17 locations
  - Improvements to education facilities
  - Improvements to the health facilities at Naminya.

PROJECT EFFECTS/ISSUES
Mr. McKinnon explained to the public that the following were being considered:

- Workforce and community effects
- Construction disturbances
- Traffic management
- Employment opportunities
- Fisheries
- Tourism
- Visual effect
- Cultural issues

PROJECT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Mr. McKinnon informed the public of community improvements and implementation plans as:

- Improvements to local health care facilities
- Employment training activities for the local communities
- Improved water supply in the eight communities
- The creation of a market area in the vicinity of the contractor's base in the dam area
- Improvements to river landing facilities for the fishers and training through the Beach Management Committees
- Capacity building with the local community in the agricultural sector
- Investment in local school facilities
NEXT STEPS (PROJECT SCHEDULE)
Mr. McKinnon informed the public of the project schedule:

- Submission of the draft SEA Reports to NEMA and the lenders by November 2006
- Requests for public comments on the draft SEA Reports
- Community Development Consultation by early 2007
- SEA approval by early 2007
- Construction to start in mid/late 2007

KEY MESSAGES
Mr. McKinnon explained to the public the key messages concerning the projects as:

- Project being implemented to increase the supply of electricity in Uganda
- Landowners and tenants will be fairly compensated for loss of land and assets
- Issues remaining from the hydropower resettlement activities are being dealt with
- A SEA is being undertaken which will require approval
- Effects from the project will be minimal and largely limited to the construction period.
- Community development initiatives will be implemented for villages in the vicinity of the hydro dam and along the transmission route.

He emphasized to the public the need for their support for this project.

GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR THE COMMUNITY
Mr. McKinnon informed the public that they were free to ask any questions concerning the presentation and the project but some guiding questions included the following:

- What information regarding your village should we be aware of?
- Are there any specific project effects that you are concerned about?
- What comments can you provide us on the proposed community development initiatives?
- How would you like to be involved in the implementation of the community development initiatives?
- What future information/consultation activities would you like?

5. SESSION FOR QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
The following questions were raised from the public:

Question 1 by Mr. Kinara Felix Chairperson 1 Kyabirwa
What water improvements are being done and provision of more boreholes? Do you have plans to improve the surface water? Do you plan to improve the road network?

Question 2: You are talking about 8 villages, what will happen to the rest of the villages of this subcounty?

Question 3 by Nkambwe Isa of Kibibi- Will you decrease the power tariffs for this area?
Question 4 by Kaweireku Bosco of Kyabirwa – I am a fisher. What will happen to us fishers our concerns have not been addressed?

Question 5 by Ntuyo Haruna of Namizi Central on jobs (workers) What will be the benefits of the workers? Will the job allocation opportunities be done proportionately? Will the budget for social amenities be increased from $1 million to $2 million? Will the road be built? What about a debt that left by AESNP for renting the subcounty premises, will it be paid? What assurance do we have that all these things will be done before construction?

Question 6 by Tenywa Suleiman of Namizi – Will you set up a recruitment office in Budondo?

ANSWERS
Mr. Philip Mooney of BEL said he would try and answer the questions.

- He said that labour, jobs and electricity are important. We have formulated a plan for a recruitment programme for both the east and west banks. Training will be carried out on workers who will work in the dam on safety and we would like to work with existing training institutions in the area. The EPC contractor will manage the construction and priority will be given to local labour. On electricity, our plan is to generate high voltage power not low voltage but we are interested in extending the power to the area using a line through UMEME. We will support the initiative.

- On water supply, roads and community development – AESNP had a plan that was not finished. We want to honour and add to it. BEL is carrying out the work. The boreholes have been repaired. Concerning the 2 blocked ones, a report is awaited from the contractor. We are at the moment handling current issues. On schools, provision of desks, water tanks, sanitation (toilets), renovating buildings (quick-fix) mainly with government aided schools (6 in number).

- On health – 2 health centres had been earmarked for upgrading. However, the District Health Officers advised to upgrade Ivunamba since Budondo had already been upgraded by the government. BEL is also upgrading Wakisi and Naminya health units on the west bank

- The Bujagali Swimmers’ concerns were noted and would be taken seriously and will be handled but not in monetary terms. The Fishers Association will be used for training especially through programs put in place by the Fisheries Department.

Question 7: The Budondo Subcounty Consultative Committee - Eastern Bank presented a summary report of the requirements of the area: Presented here as reported;

- “We recommend that the dam should be constructed and according to the way we moved in several meetings, all people agreed to build up the dam.
- Thus we ask the government to assist in this process due to lack of electricity in the country.
- **Water Supply:** The water is not enough in the area so piped water and boreholes should be increased to the growing population.
- **Education:** We need a technical School to accommodate the school dropouts from Primary Seven (P.7) to A-Level (S.6). To facilitate them with more classrooms, equipments, staff quarters, fencing, solar energy, water harvesting tanks, and kitchens.
- **Health:** To provide a theatre at Budondo Health Centre Four, staff quarters, fencing, water harvesting tanks, medical equipments, drugs, mortuary, laboratory, drug store, ambulance, public phone, computers, photcopying machine.
- **Public Roads:** To tarmac the road from Kaitabawala to Namagera (15 Km). Access roads in Budondo should be graded and murramed (first class) and to provide culverts where necessary.
- **Electricity:** We need to complete our lines as it is in the agreement and to provide solar panels.
- **Fishing:** To implement the memorandum of understanding that was made.
- **Budondo sub-county:** Completion of Subcounty projects as it was agreed on in the agreement.
- **Office:** Recruitment office and equipment where job seekers will be recruited. The community needs jobs.
- **AIDS/HIV affected people:** there should be a body to cater for AIDS/HIV affected areas and condom supply.
- **Additional land:** Any additional loss of land should be compensated.
- **Access road on the Eastern Bank:** It is being used by the school children when going to Kyabirwa Primary School, therefore, their lives are in danger. So the community requests for public road leading to the school when the construction of the dam start.

Signed: Tenywa Suileman Chairperson Kapampa Haruna Secretary

(Refer to original document)

**Question 8:** The Busoga Kingdom Representative who is also Director of Culture in the office of the Prime Minister (Katikiro), Mr. S Mugote, said that:
- The Kingdom was in support of the project.
- They have needs and hope that what was agreed upon will be implemented
- They had an intention of building a a modern town resulting from the project benefits
- Culture – the cultural affairs within the project area should be handled according to the culture book of Busoga (Ritual Gestures in Busoga) in consultation with the Kingdom
- The representative ended by singing a song for those present to thank them.

**Question 9** by a rafter regarding tourism – we need to get jobs. How will we survive in these 4 years? Will workers be protected by the workers’ laws?

**Questions 10** by Mr. Jamada from Buyala – what will happen to the water for those living downstream since there are no boreholes in Buyala West and yet construction will affect the flow and quality of water. How will the people of Buyala be compensated?
What happened to the promised St. Paul Primary School modern structure? What happened to the feeder road linking Buyala and Namizi

**Question 11** by Rogers Kayabya from Kyabirwa – he is a fisher what will happen when there is a change in the water? The yellow fish fear noise, what is being done about this?

**Question 12** by Kinagoidhi Isabirye, the President of New Uganda Traditional Healers – he is concerned about the culture, what will happen to their site where they worship? Will you build a museum (cultural site) to keep our cultural things? He feels the people on the eastern have been treated unfairly.

**Question 13** by Kabiina Ronald, Rafter with Nile Explorers – they have been informed by their employer that they will be laid off. Has the project sponsors taken into account the plight of these workers who will lose their jobs?

**Question 14** by Kimbugwe Sebagala Ben from Namizi West - what happened to the access road after evaluation and the safety measures? What kind of people are you going to recruit?

**ANSWERS**

Mr. Philip Mooney answered as follows:

- Most of the workers will be sourced locally. Skilled and technical workers will be recruited. BEL will have 1000 workers on site and those off site may be more than that.

- On white water rafters, he explained that a lot of time was spent with the owners of rafting companies and consultations are still ongoing. Their point was noted and Kabiina Ronald (078 2 396558) was given as the contact person for further consultations. Dr. Mwesigye asked them to get organized into one group and will have a discussion with them during the course of the week.

- On culture issues by traditional healers, he said these were being handled seriously with the Busoga kingdom officials.

- On water quality downstream and upstream, Mr. Mooney explained that the water will be protected during construction by coffer dams and filters. A detailed plan on water quality management is will be laid out in the SEA report.

- On workers being protected by labour laws, Mr. Mooney said that:
  1) The company had its own rules
  2) The World Bank has rules on projects
  3) They follow Uganda labour law

These three will be their guidelines.

**Question 15** by Mr. Kale and Balyjusa Edinani - that since the access road had taken part of his verandah and Edinani’s house, what will happen to them since they were not treated as affected persons.
Question 16 by Ntuyo Haruna – he wanted to be assured that will the things that have been agreed be fulfilled.

Question 17 by Monday John who is working at Sudhir’s place – will he be considered for compensation.

Dr. Patrick Mwesigye explained to all that this meeting had been called to inform the public how things are moving and get inputs from them. All these are in a draft form. When you give your comments and input we will do a final report.

The LC3 Chairperson informed the public that the effects constructing a dam will affect the area permanently. We need to get jobs and how our community needs will be meet and a technical school in the area.

Mr. Philip Mooney said the ideas expressed in this meeting are good. We will continue to consult with the community authorities. Every one will see our memorandum of undertaking. The commitments will be met. Memorandum of Understanding with AESNP fell short because AESNP left the project.

6. CLOSING REMARKS
Mr. Tenywa thanked the BEL team and all the people for coming to the meeting. The meeting was closed at 5.30 p.m.

PREPARED BY: ROSEMARY MATOVU
MINUTES OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION MEETING HELD ON 6TH OCTOBER 2006 AT THE WAKISI SUBCOUNTY HEADQUARTERS

1. OPENING
The meeting was called to order by the LC 1 Chairperson, Buloba, Mr. Maasa Yafesi at 2.31 p.m. The National Anthem of Uganda and Buganda Kingdom anthem were played and prayer was conducted by Sheikh Ntuyo Rashid.

2. ATTENDANCE
Attendance of the meeting was as per attached Attendance List.

3. COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN
Mr. Maasa thanked the Government of Uganda for its commitment to the building of the project; he thanked the BPIU team for good working relationship with the residents and thanked the residents for coming to attend the meeting. He said that six years ago, they gave up their land under AES Nile Power and advised those who are against the project to change their hearts. He urged the leaders of Wakisi to come out and work for the development the area and requested the LCIII Chairman to ensure that our people are working.

He acknowledged the presence of the following committees in the area:
- The Wakisi Subcounty Consultative Committee on the Bujagali Hydropower Project
- Wakisi Subcounty Councillors
- The Chairpersons of the West Bank villages with their executives
- Religious Leaders
- Buganda Kingdom Representative through the Sekibobo of Kyaggwe
- Heads of institutions, schools and health units in the area.
- Apologies sent from Mr. Kakoba Onyango, MP.

He said the transmission line has been going well. However he warned some residents who want to cause problem to the work through speculation. He thanked Valuer, Mr. Mungati, and his team for the work they are doing.

Mr. Maasa finally declared the meeting officially opened.

4. COMMUNICATION FROM BEL
Mr. Kenneth Kaheru of BEL welcomed all present and he introduce the team that had come with him on the Bujagali Hyro Power and Transmission Line Projects:
- Mr. Kenneth Kaheru – BEL
- Mr. Philip Mooney-BEL
- Ms. Deniz Baharoglu-WB-MIGA
- Mr. Don McKinnon – Dillon Consulting Limited
- Dr. Patrick Mwesigye – Burnside
- Mr. David Bizimana – Witness NGO
- Mr. Eddie Mutesa – BPIU
Mr. Titus Bitebekezi – BPIU
Mr. James Engaro – BPIU
Mr. Thomas Kasule – BPIU
Mr. Charles Dramu – BPIU
Ms. Monica Atugonza - BPIU
Mr. Christopher Ssekitto – BPIU
Ms. Rosemary Matovu - BPIU

He also acknowledged the presence of Wakisi Subcounty officials, the Chairman LC III and LCIs, Njeru Town Council officials and the Valuation team led by Mr. Mungati.

Mr. Kaheru invited Mr. Don McKinnon to explain to the public why this meeting was called and its purpose.

5. PRESENTATION
Mr. McKinnon thanked all those present and set out the Agenda for Bujagali HPP and IP Meeting as follows:

- Introductions
- Meeting Purpose
- Project Sponsor
- Project Need
- HPP Project Description
- IP Project Description
- Project Schedule
- Social Environmental Assessment (SEA) & Consultation Process
- SEA Draft Results
- Community Development Initiatives
- IP Community Development
- Summary Points & Group Discussion

PURPOSE OF MEETING
Mr. McKinnon informed the public the introductions have been made and that the purpose of the meeting was:

1. To inform the public about the project.
2. To present the draft findings of the SEA and proposed community development initiatives.
3. To receive comments from the public

He emphasized to the public that their comments are important to the Sponsor – as the Sponsor want to make this the best project possible.

PROJECT SPONSOR
Mr. McKinnon informed the public that:

- The Sponsor of the Bujagali Hydropower Project is BUJAGALI ENERGY LIMITED (BEL) composed of IPS Kenya and Sithe Global
BEL is committed to the development of this project and that they were here for the long term.

The Sponsor of the Interconnection (Transmission) is the Uganda Electricity Transmission Co. Ltd. (UETCL).

He informed the meeting that BEL and UETCL are working closely together to build the dam and the interconnections.

**HPP PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Mr. McKinnon informed the meeting of the Hydro Power Project description as follows:

- A 30m high earth-filled dam will be built
- 250MW of electricity will be generated
- A permanent land take of 45 ha for the project facilities
- A reservoir extending 8 Km. upstream – about 80 ha of flooded land.
- No plans at present to create a new public crossing of the Nile over the dam
- Dam construction will take about 4 years
- Construction workforce of 1000 persons
- Workers will be housed in Jinja; no construction camps at the site.
- 30 to 50 people will be needed to operate the dam after construction.

Mr. McKinnon informed the public that all this work will be done on the West Bank and that maps showing how the dam will be built are available for viewing.

**IP PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Mr. McKinnon outlined to the public the description of the Interconnection Project as follows:

- 97 Km of new electrical transmission lines needed
- The line from Bujagali to north of Kampala will be built as a 220KV line
- In Wakisi, new 132kV lines include:
  - South from Bujagali switchyard to the existing 132kV line from Owen Falls to Tororo
  - North from severed Owen Falls-Tororo line to interconnect with the Bujagali switchyard.
- Land for the 5m RoW (Right of Way) corridor will be acquired. No buildings or farming will be allowed.
- A wayleave of 35m (220kV line) and 25m (132kV line) is required
- Lands in the wayleave area will remain under the original ownership. Landowners and tenants will be compensated
- No buildings or tall vegetation permitted in wayleave

He informed the public that Summary Reports for HPP and IP will be available in Luganda next week in order to enable you to read and provide comments.

**PROJECT NEEDS**

Mr. McKinnon explained to the public the project need:
Uganda has been suffering from a shortage of electricity. Blackouts are common.
Large-scale hydropower development is the lowest cost source.
6 potential hydropower sites have been evaluated along the Victoria Nile.
Bujagali is the preferred location for the next hydropower development (low social and environmental impacts).

SEA AND CONSULTATION PROCESS
Mr. McKinnon informed the public that:
- To meet the requirements of NEMA and potential project lenders, social environmental assessments (SEA) are being prepared.
- What does the social environmental assessment do?
  - Describes the natural and social environmental conditions
  - Examines project alternatives
  - Identifies the different project components and activities that might cause effects
  - Identifies and assesses the effects
  - Identified measures to reduce the negative impacts and maximize positive effects
- SEA Summary Reports have been prepared and are available at the LC3’s office.
- Consultations involve:
  1. Public advertisements
  2. Summary Report/Newsletter release
  3. Meetings with NGOs, the Kingdoms and agencies
  4. Community meetings

HYDRO POWER RESETTLEMENT
Mr. McKinnon informed the public resettlement activities are well known and that:
- An assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Plans is being prepared for the Naminya resettlement community.
- Pre-construction activities to include:
  - The provision of new water supply hand pumps at 17 locations
  - Improvements to education facilities
  - Improvements to the health facilities at Naminya.

IP LAND VALUATION AND COMPENSATION
Mr. McKinnon informed the public that the following steps are being taken:
- Land and assets along the transmission corridor are being valued and compensation amounts set.
- Affected residents may receive cash compensation or be resettled.
- Landowners and tenants will receive advance notification of when the affected land will need to be vacated.

PROJECT EFFECTS/ISSUES
Mr. McKinnon explained to the public that the following were being considered:
- Workforce and community effects
- Construction disturbances
- Traffic management
- Employment opportunities
- Fisheries
- Tourism
- Visual effect
- Cultural issues

**HYDRO PROJECT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**
Mr. McKinnon informed the public of community improvements and implementation plans for the hydro power project:
- Improvements to local health care facilities
- Employment training activities for the local communities
- Improved water supply in the eight communities
- The creation of a market area in the vicinity of the contractor's base in the dam area
- Improvements to river landing facilities for the fishers and training through the Beach Management Committees
- Capacity building with the local community in the agricultural sector
- Investment in local school facilities

**IP COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**
Mr. McKinnon informed the meeting of the Interconnection Project community development plans as follows:
- UETCL/BEL proposing to dedicate funds to be available to affected communities along the transmission line.
- Funding could be directed at:
  - Upgrades to community schools
  - Upgrades to health centres
  - New community water points or upgrades
  - Upgrades to access roads
  - Connection to public electricity networks

**NEXT STEPS (PROJECT SCHEDULE)**
Mr. McKinnon informed the public of the project schedule:
- Submission of the draft SEA Reports to NEMA and the lenders by November 2006
- Requests for public comments on the draft SEA Reports
- Community Development Consultation by early 2007
- SEA approval by early 2007
- Construction to start in mid/late 2007

**KEY MESSAGES**
Mr. McKinnon explained to the public the key messages concerning the projects as:
- Project being implemented to increase the supply of electricity in Uganda
- Landowners and tenants will be fairly compensated for loss of land and assets
• Issues remaining from the hydropower resettlement activities are being dealt with
• A SEA is being undertaken which will require approval
• Effects from the project will be minimal and largely limited to the construction period.
• Community development initiatives will be implemented for villages in the vicinity of the hydro dam and along the transmission route.

Mr. McKinnon said that resettlement will be done, and that BEL is committed to the project and re-emphasized to the public the need for their support for this project.

GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR THE COMMUNITY:

Mr. McKinnon presented the following questions to the public to raise awareness on concerning the projects:
• What information regarding your village should we be aware of?
• Are there any specific project effects that you are concerned about?
• What comments can you provide us on the proposed community development initiatives?
• How would you like to be involved in the implementation of the community development initiatives?
• What future information/consultation activities would you like?

After the presentation, Mr. McKinnon thanked the public for listening and invited questions from them.

6. SESSION FOR QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

QUESTION 1 by Deputy Town Clerk, Njeru Town Council: Will the workers sleep in specials houses? What plan does the Sponsor have to localize electricity? Is it possible to include Njeru in these activities because up to now it has not been the case? Is it possible to resettle the people in Njeru since there is enough land?

QUESTION 2 by Mr. Lubanga Lawrence: Where will the flooding water come from since Lake Victoria is decreasing? Will this flooding be permanent? Is it possible to build humps on the main road since the tippers are driving at a terrific speed? What will happen to the people between Naminya resettlement and T-Line, are you not creating a gap by not developing them?

QUESTION 3 by Waswa Richard: How many plots can one own according to the constitution?

QUESTION 4 by Sentogo Yusuf: If the lake is flooded, where will we get water for our area? Since the project is in Wakisi, shouldn’t the workers come from and stay in the area:
QUESTION 5 by Stella Okwir: Will the jobs be on a permanent basis and will workers be given medical treatment in case of sickness or accident?

ANSWERS
Mr. Philip Mooney of BEL said that he was glad for the support being given to the project by the people. “We will try and answer some questions now but we will also continue to research on them”.

- On questions concerning labour and employment, he informed the meeting that the project will have strict working standards based on:
  1) The BEL standards
  2) The World Bank and Lenders standards
  3) The Uganda standards

Mr. Mooney said that labour will be sourced locally and that locals will be given priority. The contractor will also be advised to source the workers locally but, he inquired on the level skilled labour within the locals.
- Housing the workers – Mr. Mooney said that there will be no camp for workers but will find accommodation in Jinja. He said that if there enough houses in the area, then this will be to the advantage of the workers.
- On traffic and safety, Mr. Mooney this of a high priority and that the contractor will ensure safety. As for speed bumps, he requested that he meets with the person who had raised the question to further explore the issue.
- On the flooding of the river upstream of the dam, he said that the water will fluctuate by 1 metre during operation of the dam.
- On comments about community development plans: “We want to develop more plans as stated in the newsletter and this is up to the community to say what they want”.
- On localizing the power, he said BEL is putting up a 220kV line and this cannot distribute power to the local lines. This requires UMEME and that BEL will discuss with UMEME to look at possibilities. He advised the community to see Thomas Kasule for further explanation on the electrification programme.

QUESTION 6 by Mr. Ntale Edirisa: He said there are many people and many schools but the infrastructure is poor. What happened to the schools uplift programme initiated by BEL, Is there anything going on? Work will start in 2007, will you able able to meet the target? He referred to the process as “Hurrying slowly”

QUESTION 7 by Ms Joyce Muzale. She was expressing her plans for the community such as helping the women with tree nurseries to plant, fish ponds, to conduct capacity building seminars for income generating activities, upgrade road from Malindi to Naminya

QUESTION 8: There is 2006 valuation exercise going on. How are you going to consider the first valuation of 2000?
QUESTION 9: How are you helping with AIDS?

QUESTION 10 by Sylvester Bitokote Mayinja representative of Sekibobo. He said concerns are well explained and dealt with but requested for more explanation on the other subcounties where the T-Line covers; will the opportunities be shared with these other subcounties, will the trainings be continuous, why will the road project be limited to workers, offering another road would have helped the people of Uganda and will the NEMA needs be managed?

QUESTION 11 by Yasat: He has concern as farmer because it is rumoured that during such projects, the rain is stopped. Will the rain be stopped?

ANSWERS
- On the 15 subcounties; “yes they are covered from Mutundwe to Wakisi through consultative committees that have been set up to help deal with issues”.
- On valuation – there will be a comparison between the old and the new Training will be continuous. Every worker will get training on safety and on occupational hazards before and after construction Will use the local technical training institutions.
- On access road, this damsite will be fenced of and it will be up to the government of Uganda through the ministry of works and transport take up the issue.
- On schedule for contract, “we have to go through SEA process by November 006. It takes time to review this. Then the project may get funding between March and May 2007. Building of the dam depends on the outcome of the SEA especially the comments from the community”.

QUESTION 12: Mr. George Emojong requested that the Njeru subcounty be informed of these activities.

QUESTION 13 by Mr. Walube Ivan: What will happen to where I have been cultivating?

QUESTION 14 BY Mr. Peter Wanje: concerning the piped water from Njeru, will it extended to Wakisi?

QUESTION 15 by Kabuye Remigio: how will you value the jack fruit trees that you have cut?

QUESTION 16 by Chairman Wakisi: Will there by any contributions to the community development fund. Will you build a technical training school since we hand land in Wakisi. Is it possible to open up another road during construction?
ANSWERS
Mr. Mutesa informed the people that the issues raised are important and form the basis for the SEA. He explained that the purpose of the meeting was to get those views from the community and requested the people who never got a chance to ask to put all queries on paper through the LCs. “The purpose of this meeting was to get comments from you and we expect your comments before the end of October 2006”.

QUESTION 17 by Florence Nanyonjo – what criteria did you use to get to how you are going to help the community, where did you get the ideas from?

QUESTION 18 by Walusimbi Joseph for Youth Bujowali: On investment in schools we need computers, books for libraries, piped water to Bujowali and boreholes.

ANSWERS
In response to criteria used on how to help the community, the person who asked the question was referred to the Wakisi Consultative Committee for briefing on how the needs assessment was done.

For Bujowali the water issue was noted.

7. CLOSING REMARKS
Mr. Maasa Yafesi thanked the BEL team for the presentation and also thanked the people for attending the meeting. The was closed the meeting at 5.35 p.m.
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Grievance Form
WITNESS N.G.O GRIEVANCE FORM FOR PROJECT AFFECTED PERSONS

BUJAGALI ENERGY PROJECT
FORM NUMBER..............................................

BIO DATA AND DETAILS OF GRIEVANCE

1. Names of the Affected Person..............................................................

2. LCI........................................Parish Name...........................................

3. Sub County........................................District........................................

4. Sex of PAP................Age .................

5. Reference No........................

6. Ever been surveyed and valued by AES ? 1- YES 2-NO

7. If yes, what properties were surveyed and valued?

8. Do you have valuation documents for the properties that were valued?
   1- YES 2-NO

9. Do you reside in the LCI village mentioned above?
   1- YES 2-NO

10. Have you been surveyed and valued recently (this year, 2006)?
    1- YES 2-NO

11. Do you have a copy of the valuation report?
    1- YES 2-NO
13. Who do you want to solve this problem?

1. LCI Chairperson
2. Parish Land Committee/
3. Sub County Project Committee
4. Government/ Bujagali Implementation Unit
5. Bujagali Energy Project
6. Court/Land Tribunals

Reported by (Project Affected Person)
............................................................................................................
............................................................................................................
............................................................................................................

We hereby confirm that the said named person above is known to be affected by the Bujagali Energy Project and a resident of the village and the case needs attention and possible solution. Case is hereby forwarded to the higher authorities for action.

LCI Chairman..................................................................

Chairperson Sub County Project Committee................................................

Witness NGO................................................................................
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT GENERAL BACKGROUND

The Bujagali Hydropower Project (hereinafter "Project" or "HPP") is a proposed 250 MW hydropower facility on the Victoria Nile in the Republic of Uganda. It is located at Dumbbell Island, approximately 8 km downstream (i.e. north) of the Town of Jinja (see Figure 1). Bujagali Energy Limited ("BEL") is the proponent of this project.

Development of the HPP was first initiated by AES Nile Power Ltd., ("AESNP") in the late 1990's. Among other things, AESNP prepared Environmental Impact Statement documentation for the Project that was approved by the Government of Uganda's National Environmental Management Authority ("NEMA") in 1999/2001, and by the World Bank, IFC and African Development Bank Boards in December 2001.

In 2003 AESNP withdrew from the Project. Subsequent to AESNP pullout, the Government of Uganda ("GoU") initiated an international bidding process for the development of the project. BEL, a project-specific partnership of Sithe Global Power (USA) and IPS Limited (Kenya), won that bid.

The lenders' Board approvals and the permits issued by NEMA for AESNP are no longer valid. Thus, BEL was required to prepare and submit for approvals new Social and Environmental Assessment (SEA) documentation. This report (Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities - Bujagali HPP) is part of the required SEA Documentation. For this assignment, BEL has appointed a consulting team led by R.J. Bumside International Limited of Canada to conduct and oversee the SEA tasks, manage the SEA process on behalf of BEL, and author the SEA documentation to comply with GoU and international lender requirements. Within the general SEA exercise, this specific report has been prepared by Frederic Giovannetti, a sub-consultant to R.J. Burnside International Ltd, based on field information that was gathered and compiled by Dr. Florence Nangendo, a lecturer at Makerere University (Department of social work and social administration), and her team of three Ugandan social scientists in March and April 2006.

The Terms of Reference for the new SEA of the Project, approved by NEMA and submitted to the lenders, include the Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities, wherever such activities took place. This assessment is expected to include:

- An assessment of compliance of the activities undertaken with the RAP and applicable safeguard policies,
- An assessment of the current status of resettlers and compensatees, particularly from the perspective of livelihood restoration,
- Where gaps are identified, the formulation of recommendations and recovery plans intended to meet these gaps.

1.2 SCOPE OF THIS DOCUMENT

1.2.1 Social Documentation submitted within the SEA

The contents of the general SEA report are designed to meet requirements of the GoU as well as the policies and guidelines of the various International Financial Institutions (IFIs) that are expected to finance the project.

As far as documents presenting social mitigations and action plans are concerned, the following documents are prepared:

- Bujagali Hydropower Project:
  - Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan (this document),
  - Community Development Action Plan,
  - Environmental and Social Action Plan (Section 8 of the general SEA report),

- Bujagali Interconnection Project:
  - Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan (applies to the Kawanda sub-station),
  - Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan.
Murchison Falls National Park

Project Name:
BUJAGALI HYDROPOWER PROJECT APRAP

Prepared for:
BUJAGALI ENERGY LIMITED

Date: December, 2006

10045-H-APRAP-1

LOCATION OF THE BUJAGALI PROJECT

Prepared by: BURNSIDE
1.2.2 Scope of this Document

AESNP developed a Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan (RCDAP) in 2000 and 2001, and this document was approved in 2001 as part of the Environmental Impact Statement that was cleared successively by NEMA and by the International Finance Corporation prior to the Project approval by IFC’s Board.

AESNP then started implementing resettlement and compensation between the first half of 2001 and mid-2003. All compensation for identified land use in the inundated area was effected. Amongst others, compensation included:

- Resettlement of physically displaced people,
- Cash compensation of assets such as land and land use rights, perennial crops and trees, structures,
- Compensation for spiritual and cultural sites, including compensation of physical structures and ceremonies required for the relocation and appeasement of the spirits.

The purpose of this document is to assess whether AESNP’s commitments to comply with the publicly-released RCDAP were met. Where gaps are observed, recovery activities are recommended.

1.3 THE DISPLACEMENT IMPACTS OF THE BUJAGALI HPP

A Project-Affected Person (PAP) is any person who, as a result of the implementation of the Project, loses the right to own, use, or otherwise benefit from a built structure, land (residential, agricultural, or pasture), annual or perennial crops and trees, or any other fixed or moveable asset, either in full or in part, permanently or temporarily. PAPs include Displaced People and people otherwise affected. Displaced People include Physically Displaced People, and Economically Displaced People1.

The total number of PAPs who were affected in one way or other by the Bujagali Hydropower Facility is 1,288 households, or 8,700 individuals. This number includes all “dependents” declared as such by the household head during the socio-economic survey, some of whom may be children over 18 years, or other dependents who are not household members in sociologic or economic terms. When these latter are deducted, the number of project-affected persons is 5,158.

Displaced persons are those Project-Affected Persons who have had to relocate as a result of the project. They may have been either physically-displaced or economically-displaced. The total number of Displaced Persons that have moved their domicile was 634 individuals from 85 households.

Amongst the 85 households who were displaced:

- 34 households elected to resettle to a site specifically developed for resettlement by AESNP, located within Naminya LC1 near the affected area to the south-west;
- 51 households elected to relocate by their own means without resettlement assistance, using the cash compensation paid by AESNP to relocate and in-kind compensation to build their new residences.

Section 2.2.3 presents the main reasons that led a majority of PAPs to choose cash compensation rather than resettlement.

---

1 Definitions of these terms can be found in the 2001 RCDAP, as well as in the IFC’s «Handbook for Preparing a Resettlement Action Plan». 
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2 AESNP’S RESETTLEMENT AND COMPENSATION ACTIVITIES

2.1 THE 2001 RCDAP

The executive summary of the 2001 RCDAP is presented in Appendix 1.

2.1.1 Eligibility and Entitlements

Eligibility to resettlement and compensation is based upon the census: any household who has been identified in the field at the census stage as having interests affected by the project is eligible to resettlement and compensation packages proportionate to the level of impact. All land rights give eligibility to compensation and/or resettlement whichever the land tenure regime (formal or customary, ownership or tenancy).

In summary, AESNP committed to the following entitlements:

- Resettlement package offered as an option to all physically or economically displaced households, including:
  - the provision of a plot on a resettlement site, with slightly greater surface area than the present affected person’s plot, and similar or better agricultural potential;
  - the provision of a replacement house, improved vis-à-vis usual houses, featuring amongst other improvements a corrugated iron roof, a concrete floor, and a ventilated pit latrine;
  - agricultural inputs such as seeds, seedlings, fertilizers;
  - cash compensation against the value of lost perennial crops plus disturbance allowance;
  - cash compensation against the cost of moving.

- Cash compensation for those households who do not opt for resettlement or who are not displaced, for their land, perennial crops and buildings. All compensations were calculated according to the Ugandan legislation with an “uplift” from AESNP to meet WB/IFC requirements.

2.1.2 Resettlement Site

A resettlement area had been identified in Naminya village, one of the 8 affected communities, on the West Bank. This site was chosen for the following reasons:

- It was at a short distance (a few kilometers) from the affected peoples’ present location, thus causing minimal social and psychological disruption,
- Because sufficient land was available there,
- It was conveniently located near the main road and Jinja town. A primary school and a clinic are available in the vicinity.

2.1.3 Implementation

The implementation of the RAP was entirely under the responsibility of AESNP. AESNP put in place a team based in Jinja that was in charge of resettlement and compensation for both the hydropower facility and the transmission system.

In addition to AESNP’s implementation team, the following independent institutions were also involved in the monitoring of the implementation of the RAP:

- An independent legal counsel firm was available to advise PAPs on legal issues relevant to compensation and resettlement;
- A Ugandan NGO (Interaid) independently witnessed the whole RAP implementation;
- Local Government representatives were involved in signing off on compensation payments to individuals, and participated in various consultation bodies.

2.2 RESETTLEMENT AND COMPENSATION ACTIVITIES

2.2.1 Census

Affected People and their affected assets have been identified starting in 1999. A first identification and valuation exercise took place with a first contractor, but AESNP decided to cancel it as it had appeared that the
whole exercise was flawed by corruption attempts. AESNP then took full responsibility for the implementation of the census and valuation, starting in late 1999. This exercise, which is described in details in the 2001 RCDAP, included:

- the identification of all affected “stakeholders” in the Project-Affected Area,
- the valuation of their assets,
- a detailed socio-economic survey.

The census was undertaken in each of the eight affected communities by a field team including AESNP personnel and Local Government representatives (LC1 representatives and Parish Land Committees at LC2 level).

Appendix 2 presents a brief summary of the socio-economic information derived from the census and used for the 2001 EIA/EIS and RCDAP.

2.2.2 Implementation of the RCDAP

AESNP started implementing the RCDAP shortly after its release in the first quarter of 2001. Physically- and Economically-Displaced People were offered a choice between resettlement and cash compensation, with 34 households opting for resettlement on land that AESNP had secured in late 2000 within the village of Naminya. Figure 2 shows the location of this resettlement site. The resettlement site was developed in 2001 and the actual move of the resettlers took place in late 2001. The village of Kikubamutwe had by far the largest number of physically displaced people together with Namizi on the East Bank. As a result, most resettlers at Naminya resettlement site come from Kikubamutwe as people from the East Bank were more reluctant to resettle on the West Bank.

Meanwhile, the majority of affected people were receiving cash compensation for their affected assets. The payment of compensation for land, crops and structures started in April 2001 and the first half of 2001. It included a so-called “disclosure” step, first in group, then individually, and the signing of agreements and actual payment.

Participants in the field implementation of the RCDAP were:

- AESNP,
- the Counsel of Affected Residents,
- the Witness NGO,
- Local Government representatives (usually Parish Land Committee members at LC2 level, and LC1 representatives),
- Representatives of the Uganda Lands Commission, acting as the formal “purchaser” of the land.

After interests in the affected land were compensated by AESNP, titles were transferred to the Uganda Lands Commission (ULC). AESNP was supposed to be granted a 30-year occupation lease on this land by the ULC.

After AESNP withdrew from the country, affected land has remained in the custody of the ULC, which holds a formal freehold title on it. The area has been fenced (West Bank) or watched (East Bank) to avoid encroachment. No new settlement is indeed observed in the fenced area.

2.2.3 Resettlement vs. Cash Compensation

As shown by the numbers in section 1.3, only 40% of the eligible displaced households chose the full resettlement package. The following factors explain this rather low number:

- In many displaced communities such as the one interested by this project, people tend to think that they will get a better deal taking cash and choosing their relocation housing themselves rather than relying on the Project sponsor to provide resettlement houses, which they usually think would be incompletely built or poor quality;
- Ugandan law does not provide for resettlement as a compensation option; per Ugandan law, compensation is normally offered in cash; AESNP was therefore compelled to offer cash compensation as an option; offering resettlement only would have been illegal, and there was anyway a large community demand for cash compensation;
Ugandan law requires all household members to give their consent to the compensation option; this is a factor that may have favored cash compensation as it is easier to obtain consent on a compensation option (of which everyone in the household can easily claim a share) than on a resettlement option.
Bujagali Hydropower Project – Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities

METHODOLOGY OF THE ASSESSMENT

2.3 STUDY TEAM

The assessment was carried out in the field in March 2006 by a team of six, including:
- the author of this report, also the author of the AESNP 2001 RCDAP, who was not involved in its implementation;
- a Ugandan senior social scientist from Makerere University, Dr. Florence Nangendo, coordinator of the field assessment;
- three experienced social scientists from Makerere University (two males, one female), who took part in the implementation of both qualitative and quantitative methods of investigation (administration of questionnaires and moderation of interviewees with individuals and focus groups);
- one data processing officer.

Significant support was obtained from the Bujagali Implementation Unit, particularly in terms of qualitative information, access to the database of affected people and compensation, and to other documents. The assessment also included an interview with one representative of the witness NGO Interaid, who had been involved in witnessing activities at the time AESNP implemented the RCDAP. Extensive use has also been made of the Interaid final report, an excellent document with many pertinent observations.

2.4 SAMPLING

The sampling of Affected People to be interviewed was based on the use of the database established in 2000 and 2001 by AESNP, which has since then been maintained by the Bujagali Implementation Unit. The generation of lists of people in the three categories below was carried out by the BIU database officer based on the study team’s indications. Further to this generation of overall lists, the samples themselves were drawn randomly by use of a computer program.

Project-Affected People were split into three groups:
- Resettlers at the Naminya resettlement site: the initial intention was to interview all of them (34 in total); it appeared however when starting the exercise in the Naminya resettlement site that 10 resettlers had in fact moved from the resettlement site, and that their house was now occupied by tenants; these tenants were interviewed by the study team but it appeared that they had no relation whatsoever with the affected people apart from occupying their houses at the resettlement site, and they were eventually taken out of the sample; the sample of resettlers includes 24 households (actual sampling rate: 71%); according to their tenants, the remaining 10 have moved to Jinja or Kampala;
- Non resettled physically displaced people: these are people who did not choose resettlement but were nevertheless compelled to move by the acquisition of most of their agricultural land or of the plot of land where their residence was located; the initial intention was to interview 50% of people in this category; 51 households in total were identified, out of which a sample of 26 was extracted (50%); these households were, however, particularly difficult to find, and a lot of time was spent trying to identify their whereabouts, with the assistance of the BIU and of local councils representatives; a secondary sample was drawn to allow for the replacement of people who could not be found, but in spite of this effort, only 18 households could eventually be located and interviewed, out of a total of 51 (actual sampling rate: 35%);
- Non physically displaced people: the initial intention was to interview 3 to 5% of households in this category; based on the experience with the previous category, a sample of 120 households was generated to allow for replacement of those people who could not be located; eventually 60 households could be found and interviewed (actual sampling rate: 5%).
2.5 METHODS AND INSTRUMENTS

Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used. A questionnaire was administered to all households in the three groups mentioned in the previous section. The questionnaire was based on the socio-economic questionnaires administered in 2000 and 2001 by AESNP, in a slightly modified and simplified version (unsuccessful or irrelevant questions were removed). Three variations of the questionnaire were prepared, to match the three categories of interviewees. The questionnaire was administered to the head of household, whether a male or female, or to the spouse (usually a female) in the event of the household head’s absence.

In addition to the administration of the questionnaire to a total of 102 household heads (not including the 10 non-affected tenants mentioned in section 3.2), qualitative instruments were also used as follows:
- 8 Focus Group Discussions were held as shown in Table 1 below; males and females were separated in different focus groups, which has proved extremely useful; the two women of the study team dealt with the female interviewees, while the two men were moderating the groups of men;
- Key-Informant Interviews also took place with the following individuals:
  o Chairman LC3, Wakisi sub-county,
  o Clerk LC3, Budondo sub-county,
  o Chairman LC1, Kikubamutwe,
  o Chairman LC1, Budhagali,
  o Health officers, Budondo health center,
  o Health officers, Wakisi health center,
  o Headmaster, Kyabirwa primary school,
  o Headmaster, Naminya primary school.

Table 1: Focus Group Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Groups and number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naminya Resettlement Site</td>
<td>Males (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naminya Host Community</td>
<td>Males (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikubamutwe (West Bank)</td>
<td>Males (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namizi West (East Bank)</td>
<td>Males (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 3 presents the full transcripts of the Focus Group Discussions. Appendix 4 presents those of the Key-Informant Interviews.

2.6 ASSESSMENT LIMITATIONS

2.6.1 People whose Whereabouts are Unknown

Since AESNP’s withdrawal, the BIU has tried to do as much monitoring of affected people as its limited resources allowed. The BIU has tended to focus on the Naminya resettlement site, where significant issues have appeared, some of which have drawn media and other attention. This is certainly legitimate as the resettlers are rightly assessed as the people who have been the most affected. However, for lack of resources, the BIU has been at pains monitoring non resettled affected people, particularly those who have moved out of the area, or those who were not permanent residents of the area, such as the numerous “licensees” (sharecroppers). It now appears that the whereabouts of many people, who received compensation in 2001, are unknown. A specific concern arises for people who were significantly affected and were considered as Displaced People but did not opt for AESNP’s resettlement assistance, and chose rather to relocate themselves. A significant number of these households could not be located (see 3.2 above), in spite of numerous attempts and help from the BIU and Local Government officials.
2.6.2 Database

As often in compensation and resettlement programs, AESNP’s database was established as a compensation management tool. A record in the database is usually an affected plot, or part of an affected plot with one or several identified “stakeholders”. As per Ugandan law, the compensation recipient (or “stakeholder”, to use AESNP’s terminology) is not necessarily the household head, it is the actual interest holder. As a result, the “stakeholder” as recorded in the database is not a household or a household head. It can be the spouse, the child or the dependent of a household head recorded elsewhere in the database. As a result, each household is recorded through its individual members as many times as there are household members who received compensation. In this particular compensation and resettlement exercise, it has occurred in addition that household heads deliberately split their land holdings amongst their spouses and children in an attempt to maximize compensation.

The database as it was designed made perfect sense in the perspective of compensation management. It makes, however, socio-economic monitoring of households extremely difficult, because information is not recorded by household, but by individual, whereas the unit in which socio-economic monitoring is interested is the household in its entirety. Establishing the link between every individual recorded in the database and the household to which he/she belongs is probably possible, but would be extremely time-consuming.

Another issue related with the database was its safety. There was only one copy in Uganda of the original AESNP’s database, which was physically located on an old computer in the BIU Jinja office. The database has now been saved on another UETCL computer.

2.6.3 The Resettler Syndrome

Most of the observations, complaints and requests are certainly genuine and well founded. In some instances, complaints and/or requests were expressed that were either not founded or unrealistic. This is a common observation in communities that are disrupted by land acquisition and resulting compensation and resettlement programs. People tend to expect everything from the authority that displaced them: “you have put us here, you must take care of us for the rest of our lives”. Creating a sense of ownership of resettlement houses for instance requires a lot of time and attention.

In the Bujagali case, disruption has in fact been particularly high due to a combination of factors, such as:
- interruption of the project, after the area was for 3 years the object of extremely high attention by all sorts of people,
- high media attention in Uganda and elsewhere, and political controversies attached to the project,
- introduction, through the compensation, of a vast amount of cash in a society that was not used to it, and resulting social troubles,
- low social cohesion, related with relatively recent settlement in the area, and resulting attempts by PAPs to maximize their own compensation at others’ detriment,
- fraudulent valuation and hesitations on some aspects of the valuation and compensation policy (the “1-4” issue – see § 6.1.1).

It is indeed interesting to observe (Appendix 4) that people who were not affected themselves and have observed the exercise from a distance are often more critical than PAPs. Hearsay and rumor play a tremendously important role in an oral communication society such as the affected communities. Most PAPs have in fact kept a fairly balanced view, and do for instance acknowledge that their situation has improved on certain aspects, deteriorated on others. Some affected people have, however, obviously taken the opportunity of interviews with an independent study team to express as many complaints as they could. Although not all comments made by PAPs and recorded in Appendices 3 and 4 must be taken at face value, each must be responded to in further stages of the Project development.
3 FINDINGS – RESETTLERS

3.1 RESETTLEMENT SITE LOCATION AND DEVELOPMENT

The site was chosen at the stage of RAP preparation in 2000, its location and characteristics were widely known of the resettler community at the time the displacement took place. In this sense, implementation is consistent with commitments made by AESNP in the RAP.

Resettlers at the Naminya resettlement site are generally satisfied with its location. The situation is assessed as convenient by most, for the following reasons:
- Close to Jinja, which is good in terms of accessing to markets for agricultural produce,
- Close to Njeeri and Mbiko towns,
- Close to the Mehta sugar estate, where some males indicate they could get employment,
- Close to the Jinja - Kayunga tarmac road,
- No relationship problems with the host community.

Qualifications are expressed by some, as follows:
- The site is farther from the river than the previous location, which makes fishing in the river very difficult (a livelihood issue for some resettlers, as will be discussed further in this report),
- The site location is good, but it is too small for each to have sufficient agricultural land (this too is discussed further in this report).

The layout and general development of the site are generally appreciated and do not appear to raise any specific issues.

3.2 HOUSING

3.2.1 Houses

The house design was developed at the stage of RAP preparation in 2000, and was disclosed in the RAP. Houses actually built correspond to the design disclosed in the RAP. Implementation is therefore generally compliant with commitments made in respect of house design.

Resettlers generally recognize that their current houses are much better than the previous ones, particularly in terms of durability (iron roofs) and of size (usually larger). However, the following criticisms are made:
- No good plastering of the inside walls (see Photographs – plate 2),
- No ceilings (see Photographs – plate 2),
- Some walls are cracked, and there is a general belief amongst resettlers that cement was stolen by contractors’ workers during construction and they are concerned as a result that the houses might not be durable,
- Some roofs are leaking,
- No kitchens were built by AESNP (they were compensated in cash where they existed),
- Some problems are observed with doors and windows.

When asked whether they regard these houses as really theirs, it appears that since resettlers obtained their title, they do regard the house and plot as theirs. However, some also note that the company should assist them in maintaining their house. Women further note that their husbands are usually not very interested in maintaining or improving the house.

3.2.2 Latrines

People are usually happy with ventilated improved pit latrines (VIP). A particular issue has occurred with six houses in the lower part of the site. It was initially observed that these six latrines did not function properly, and the reason was identified as groundwater in-flow into the pit. These six houses were then equipped with an “ECOSAN” latrine, based on a model developed in Asia and that the Department of Water Development (DWD) was trying to promote at that time. This latrine is designed for excreta recycling and does not have an underground pit, which was expected to mitigate the groundwater issue. However, beneficiary households
were observed not to use these structures as latrines, and use the lower compartment as a pigsty or granary instead. They still use the VIP latrines, which were not dismantled, in spite of the groundwater in the pit. Others, who did not receive these ECOSAN latrines now complain that they did not receive such a structure, whereas their six neighbors now have a small ancillary building that they can use for other purposes.

3.2.3 Rain Water Harvesting System

Each house has a rain water harvesting system, including a network of gutters catching the rainwater falling on the corrugated iron roof of their house, and a storage tank. This provides a storage that lasts well into the dry season, and alleviates the water chore to a great extent.

Although not mentioned by the resettlers as a major issue, it was observed that the great majority of tanks have leaking taps.

3.2.4 Land Titles

Most people interviewed have stated they had received land titles from AESNP. This is viewed as a major improvement and has a lot of significance to affected people. It seems, however, that a few of the resettlers may not have received their land titles, although this cannot be stated with certainty as in some cases, the person who has received the title was not around during the interview. It will therefore need to be checked whether all households were indeed issued a valid land title.

3.3 ACCESS TO PUBLIC SERVICES

3.3.1 Access to Public Transport

Vehicular access to the resettlement site is possible at all times, and some resettlers have specifically recognized this as an improvement in comparison with their previous location. It is worth noting that the majority of affected people used to live in the area to be inundated at some distance from the main road, and that their residences and agricultural fields were accessible only by bicycle or on foot. Several people in the resettlement site have however mentioned that seldom did taxis and other public transport vehicles reach the site.

3.3.2 Water

The site has one drilled well built by AESNP. This well is equipped with an Orbit handpump like all other wells constructed by AESNP. It is located near the health center at the entrance of the resettlement site (northern end). In addition, AESNP built an improved spring catchment in the middle of the resettlement site. Both water points are shown on Photograph Plate 1. Another pre-existing drilled well is available to resettlers at the other end of the resettlement site to the south-west. It is equipped with an India Mark 2 handpump. In addition, resettlers have rain water harvesting systems with a storage tank. Qualitative indications are that the storage capacity allows to draw water from these tanks for 1 to 3 months into the dry season, depending on the household size, and of course during the whole rainy season itself.

Few Ugandan rural communities have such a level of water service. For planning purposes, it is usually assumed that in rural Uganda a handpump can serve between 30 and 50 households. In the Naminya resettlement site, 34 households are served by two handpumps, a spring catchment and rainwater harvesting systems.

In spite of a few resettlers complaining about the water situation, it is therefore not deemed necessary to upgrade the water systems at the resettlement site. BEL however plans to replace the Orbit handpump (which is of an obsolete type) by a more common and easier to maintain India Mark 2 handpump. These activities, which are starting in August 2006, are described in more detail in the CDAP document.
3.3.3 Power

There is no electricity supply in the resettlement site. Some residents have mentioned promises to have electricity in the site, which AESNP would not have kept. However, it does not seem that it was ever planned to supply the resettlement site with electricity and this is not mentioned in the 2001 RCDAP as a commitment by AESNP. What AESNP had indeed planned under the 2001 RCDAP was to equip the trading centers of the four Western Bank affected villages with transformers and low tension lines that would allow nearby residents of these four villages to connect to the grid. This was not expected to benefit the resettlement area, which is too far away from the existing mid tension line, which runs along the Jinja – Wakisi road.

It has also been noted by outside parties that the resettlement site was crossed by a high voltage line (the Kiira dam – Kampala line) while residents did not have electricity. However, such high voltage lines are not intended for power supply of local communities that they intersect, but for long distance transport of electricity. Nonetheless, BEL will discuss with interested authorities, including the utility, the feasibility and priority for a possible expansion of the rural electrification network to the resettlement site, and keep consulting with the resettled and host community about this issue.

3.3.4 Education

This is an area of legitimate discontent on the resettlers’ side. The situation is the following:
- The 2001 RCDAP included a commitment by AESNP to refurbish the existing Naminya public primary school, which is located at about 1,500 meters from the resettlement site; although it was budgeted as one of the first activities under the CDAP, this project never took place before AESNP pulled out of the Project, for reasons that are not totally clear;
- This has caused a lot of frustration both in the host community, to which this commitment was also made, and in the resettlers’ community; the additional pressure put by resettlers’ children on Naminya R/C school has not been mitigated;
- The resettlers took the option of claiming a specific school for themselves, rather than insisting on the existing school’s upgrade;
- After multiple requests to obtain a specific school never achieved any result, the resettlers, together with some nearby residents, took action in early 2006 and created their own school in one of the vacant houses of the resettlement site; this raises a number of issues:
  o This school is not recognized by the Primary Education authorities of the Mukono district, and as such could be deemed illegal;
  o It is established in a building that is not suitable for normal schooling of children;
  o It does not have recognized teachers.

Subject to consultation with the District of Mukono primary education inspectorate, the resettlers’ community and the host community, the recommended solution is the following:
- Fulfill the old AESNP commitment to refurbish and expand the Naminya R/C primary school (the budget earmarked by AESNP for these works was in the order of USD 100,000 and included the construction of a new 10 classroom block),
- School all resettlers’ children there, except for those under 7 years of age,
- Support the creation of a private kindergarten for children under 7 in one of the vacant houses of the resettlement site, with BEL providing funding for the refurbishment of this house into a proper kindergarten and for furniture.

3.3.5 Health

The site has a level 2 health center, which is intended for both the resettlers’ and the host communities. This health center is staffed with a qualified nurse, a qualified midwife, and three support staff. It is established in the model house built in 2001 by AESNP at the entrance to the resettlement site, near the drilled well. It has been established two years ago, and is supervised by the Sub-County level 3 health center located in Wakisi. The center in itself is operational and appears to meet or exceed usual Ugandan standards for health centers of this level. It is in fact the only one available to communities along the road between Njeru and Wakisi, as none of the three other affected communities (Kikubamutwe, Malindi, Buloba) has a health center.
However, resettlers and the health staff have repeatedly mentioned to the study team that the lack of staff accommodation on-site jeopardized the normal operation of the Naminya health center. Staff have to commute from Jinja everyday, and cannot come early, if at all, not to mention the cost associated with transport which is no incentive for them to show up.

Another issue is the fact that residents of Kikubamutwe (most of the resettlers originate from this village) had easy access to the Level 3 health center located in Wakisi, which was in fact only a few hundred meters away from Kikubamutwe. Obviously the Wakisi health center was able to provide a more complete range of health services than the smaller Naminya health center.

The issue of staff accommodation has been discussed between BEL and the Mukono District public health Directorate. Although BEL, not being the formal owner of the vacant houses in the resettlement site, cannot make a firm commitment to avail these houses to the District for staff accommodation, BEL will facilitate negotiations between the Uganda Lands Commission and the Mukono District and it is expected that two houses could be made available to the District for its health staff. Further details on this activity can be found in the CDAP report.

3.4 AGRICULTURE AND LIVELIHOOD RESTORATION

3.4.1 AESNP's Plot Allocation Policy
AESPNP's entitlement policy for land allocation in the resettlement site was the following:

Residential plots (the plot where the homestead was located in the original location, usually a combination of residential and agricultural use):

i. A residential plot of less than 1 acre would be replaced by a plot of 1 acre;

ii. A residential plot of more than 1 acre would be replaced by land rounded up to 1/8 acre. Additional pieces of land would be compensated in cash.

Non-residential plots (usually agricultural plots without a residential homestead on them):

i. An agricultural plot of less than 1/8 acre would be replaced by a plot of the same surface;

ii. An agricultural plot of more than 1/8 acre would be replaced by a plot of 1/8 acre with cash compensation to offset the difference in surface above 1/8 acre.

In other words, every resettler household was allocated as a minimum a one acre residential plot, where the house is located, with additional surface compensated in kind if it was part of the same residential plot in the original location. Any other agricultural surface was compensated in cash.

This policy was designed to accommodate the following factors:

- Provide a minimum "safety net" of one acre to the poorest landowners (those with less than one acre);
- Leave it to the better-off people to deal themselves with acquisition of additional land using the cash compensation they were allocated in this purpose;
- Manage as best as possible the limited agricultural surface available on the resettlement site.

The result of this policy is that some resettlers are net winners (those who had less than one acre), while others have lost in agricultural surface, particularly where, as some women repeatedly pointed out to the study team, the man in the household has spent the cash on other purposes than purchasing replacement land.

In addition to the individually allocated plots, a communal agro-forestry plot was intended for all the resettlers' community to be able to gather firewood. Its surface is 8 acres, it is located near the Faithful Servants Orphanage at the western end of the resettlement site.
3.4.2 Comparison of Previous and Current Land Situations

The comparison of actual surface areas of land available to affected people before and after land acquisition is made difficult by the fact that the information on previous land holdings is not available from AESNP's database. Only the surface of affected plots is available, and that was only a part of the overall household land holdings. In addition, as mentioned above in section 3.4.2, information on land holdings is not consolidated at household level, and is therefore impossible to process adequately.

Faced with the impossibility to produce a quantitative comparison of the current and past situation with respect to agricultural land available, the study team therefore had to rely on qualitative indications given by the affected people themselves, and this produces a mixed impression. Some acknowledge that they now have more land to cultivate (these are the households with the smallest plots in the original situation – see above 4.4.1), while others say they now have less.

The difference between women’s and men’s reactions in this respect is also interesting. Men complain that they could not buy land (“With what would I buy land? With my teeth?”). Women indicate that men indeed received cash compensation to buy land, but did not do so and used the money for other purposes, including marrying other women and “touching the bar even those who had never touched the bar before”.

On land fertility, it is again a mixed picture that respondents depict. Some indicate that the land fertility is better than before, others that it is dryer, more stony, and overall less fertile. Observation of crops in March 2006 in the resettlement site (see photograph plate 3) seems to indicate however that maize, cassava and plantain bananas are in adequate, if certainly not the best, soil conditions. It is true, however, that not all plots are adequate for plantain bananas for instance, with some obviously too dry and with a too thin layer of arable soil for this particular crop.

3.4.3 Livelihood Restoration

It is again a mixed picture that is described by respondents in Naminya resettlement site. Some indicate that they are clearly better off, but seem to include all aspects of life quality, specifically their house, in the concept. In this respect, resettlers seem to be very sensitive to the fact that they received land titles and are formal owners not only of a piece of land but also of a permanent residence. Several resettlers include this asset, although not productive as such, in their assessment of being “well-off”.

Several people have also explicitly mentioned that they had more land, and/or more fertile land, than in the previous situation, and were better off as a result. Others have described better access to market and better employment opportunities, in relation with the SCOUL sugar plantation and factory and the proximity of employment centers at Njeru, Mbikko and Jinja.

Where people complain that they are worse-off than before, it is usually related with the following three aspects:
- Loss of fishing opportunities, the most frequently mentioned cause for being worse-off than before: this is specifically mentioned by some men2 in the resettlement site as the most significant loss they have experienced since resettling in the new site; their inability to fish is in relation with:
  - The increased distance to the Nile River, which makes it difficult for them to go fishing;
  - Obstructed access due to fencing of the area;
  - The fact that AESNP has not built new landing sites as it has committed to do;
- Loss of fruit trees (jackfruit and mango trees are specifically mentioned), which provided an income and also a source of self-consumed food that was particularly appreciated by mothers of young children;
- Less agricultural surface than before.

The RCDAP stated that about 10% of households fished, and that these were mainly living in the East Bank communities, but it is quite likely that the significance of fishing has in fact been underestimated when planning resettlement and compensation. Particularly, physically displaced people, such as those now resettled

2 Fishing is (was) a male-only occupation.
in were living closer to the river than others, and were therefore more likely to derive a significant part of their income and livelihood from fishing.

All resettler households acknowledge that AESNP has put substantial effort in training, particularly in agriculture and in money management. The actual impact of this training is, however, not very visible. Agricultural practices, including types of crops farmed and cultivation methods, seem to be very much the same as they were before. There is no modern equipment in the resettlement site, such as post-harvest transformation or animal traction equipment. The fact that people were not supported in purchasing agricultural equipment after they received training may have dramatically reduced the impact of training.

While not all households have lost in the resettlement process, some certainly have. In fact what seems to have happened is that the resettlement process has leveled the social and economic differences that existed before, through the provision of the same house to all and of a minimum agricultural surface to all, while the better-off (those who had more land) have received cash in compensation of their additional land, which some misused.

Alternative sources of livelihood need to be aggressively promoted in the near future to balance losses. In the context of the resettlement site, there is little to expect from traditional agriculture because land is not available in sufficient quantity. Subsistence agriculture must be viewed as a safety net for most households, as it indeed was before. Additional sources of income should be promoted, such as the following:

- Employment, either directly at the dam construction site, or indirectly in opportunities that will arise from the presence of workers, such as food supply,
- Animal husbandry, with a focus on applications that require little land (pigs, poultry),
- Intensive garden agriculture, possibly using the opportunity of free water provided by the spring catchment in the resettlement site.

3.5 RELATIONSHIP WITH HOST COMMUNITY

Interviews with members of the host community (see Appendix 3) as well as with resettlers do not indicate that there is any major issue in this respect. It was observed, however, that:

- The resettlers have consistently sought to establish their own LC1 for the resettlement site, to no result to-date, as they do not appear to be eligible due to insufficient population size;
- They have also consistently sought to establish their own school (see section 4.3.4).

The resettlers do not mention, however, that the host community displays any hostility.

Seen from the host community’s perspective, the resettlers do not appear to pose any serious problem. Initial concerns that there might be a deterioration of the security situation in relation (increase of petty theft) have not been confirmed. Some members of the host community have indicated that the land that was purchased by AESNP from an individual landowner for the establishment of the resettlement site was used before by some squatters, who received no compensation when they were evicted, but this has not been confirmed.

The most serious issue for the host community is the fact that AESNP’s promises to upgrade the existing Naminya primary school were not met (see above 4.3.4).

3.6 CONSULTATION AND TRAINING

Resettlers met unanimously indicated that they were well informed and that they had a say in decisions related with their compensation package, including the option of resettlement versus cash compensation. Training provided by AESNP was also appreciated, but as mentioned above, people tend not use it due to lack of equipment and absence of credit facilities.

It is also interesting to see the different reactions from men’s and women’s groups with respect to training. Women seem to have been very interested in matters pertaining to their rights over property and compensation, and some of them have indeed taken advantage of it, avoiding deprivation by their husbands, thanks to their
being better aware of their rights. Women also indicate that in spite of AESNP's numerous warnings in relation with misuse of cash, many men spent their compensation unwisely on second-hand cars that broke down quickly, or on women and drinking.

Overall, the resettlement package seems to have played well one of the roles for which it was intended, the protection of more vulnerable women against potential misuse of cash compensation by men.
4 FINDINGS - NON-RESETTLERS

4.1 GENERAL

As already mentioned in this report, resettlers at the Naminya resettlement site have attracted a lot of attention from the different parties involved. They are easy to locate and identify, hence they are easy to monitor, and they have come up as a somewhat cohesive community to express grievances and negotiate with the BIU or other parties.

It can be assumed that resettlers were amongst the most affected of the PAPs. But they were not the only ones to be significantly affected, as other people were also physically or economically displaced, but simply did not opt for the AESNP resettlement package. However, these people, who were not resettled by AESNP are much less in focus than the resettlers. Their current whereabouts are frequently unknown, and they proved very difficult to locate when the study team endeavored to interview them. Neither the BIU, nor the Local Councils are able to identify the current location of many of these affected people. This is understandable for people who were only marginally affected (such as sharecroppers who were not permanent resident in the area). It needs to be corrected for people who were significantly affected, particularly those who were displaced by the Project. This aspect is further addressed in Section 7 (Action Plan).

4.2 USE OF COMPENSATION

The first priority of affected people once they were paid compensation was usually to improve their existing house and/or build a new one. Purchasing agricultural land usually came only second in the affected peoples' concerns. Housing is obviously important to affected people, as an indicator of social status. When asked whether their overall livelihood has improved or deteriorated against the pre-compensation situation, PAPs often respond that it is indeed improved because they now have a permanent house, regardless of their access to agricultural land or lack thereof.

When questioned separately from men on the use of compensation, women indicate that men have not used compensation wisely. The purchase of second-hand vehicles has been common, they were intended as taxis, but they usually did not last. All (including the men) however acknowledge AESNP's efforts to create awareness on the use of compensation.

4.3 AGRICULTURE AND LIVELIHOOD RESTORATION

4.3.1 Replacement Land

The option given to AESNP to provide replacement agricultural land to landowners in-lieu of cash compensation is generally well appreciated, and a significant number of PAPs benefited from this option without relocating their houses, particularly on the East Bank. However, plots of land provided as replacement land are generally assessed as too far away from the PAPs' residence ("our crops are stolen") and less fertile.

Another issue that was raised by people on both banks is that the price that landowners would charge for replacement land was higher than the price paid in compensation for the lost land. While one acre of land would be compensated between UGX 0.8 M and UGX 1.2 M, it was not uncommon, according to PAPs, to be charged UGX 2.2 M for a similar piece of land. PAPs state that they were viewed as rich persons and were overcharged for everything, including most prominently agricultural land. This cannot be substantiated as there was no monitoring of land transactions in the area.

The situation of tenants and sharecroppers (who were compensated only for crops as they did not own land) appears to be worse in this respect than that of landowners. The discontent about the "1-4" crop compensation comes mainly from tenants and sharecroppers, and they usually state that they have lost more than landowners as a result of land acquisition. However, there are also examples of tenants and sharecroppers who have been able to secure new land.
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4.3.2 Agriculture Restoration

People usually do not appear to have changed their agricultural methods as a result of scarcer land. The loss of fruit trees (which were compensated taking account of a re-establishment period – see the 2001 RCDAP) is mentioned more as a lost opportunity to introduce variety in children’s diet than as a loss of income.

4.3.3 Fishing

In contrast with resettlers, there is no mention in the non resettled community of the loss of fishing opportunities as a major issue. People have usually stayed where they were, and are therefore still able to practice fishing as they used to. However, the commitment of building better landing sites for fishermen, which was not met by AESNP as this was intended to be available in the post-dam impoundment period, is repeatedly mentioned as detrimental to fishermen.

4.3.4 Livelihood Restoration

Like with the resettlers’ community, it is a mixed picture that is depicted by non-resettled PAPs. Some proudly state that they are now much better-off because they have been able to use their compensation money as initial capital for various profitable ventures, such as the following:

- Building houses for rental (although some also say that they have built houses for rental to Project workers, which of course never happened);
- Buying motorcycles for use as a “boda-boda”;
- Engaging into small-scale poultry farms or production of various live animals.

Where PAPs say that they are worse off, the main reason for it is usually the loss of agricultural land, the smaller size of the replacement land they have been able to secure, or its deficient fertility. When questioned separately from men, women also indicate, as already mentioned in several occasions this report, that many men have misused their compensation money. However, some women also state that they have lost out in the process, either because they tried to engage into a business that eventually collapsed, or because they now have too little land to make a living.

4.3.5 Firewood

The firewood issue is often mentioned by non-resettled PAPs. On the West Bank, people state that they cannot obtain access to the fenced area and that they now have to purchase firewood, which adds to their difficulties in re-establishing their livelihood.

4.4 Consultation and Training

As with the resettler community, people are generally happy with consultation and training and recognize AESNP’s efforts in this regard. There is, however, a sense of having been cheated in the deal. People interviewed repeatedly say that they have fulfilled their side of the deal ("we voluntarily surrendered our lands to the dam") while “the dam” (which associates AESNP, the Government, the World Bank) did not keep its promises. Some add that they gave their land voluntarily to AESNP because of these promises, to build boreholes, to improve schools and to build “hospitals”, to build landing sites for fishermen, which in the end were never fulfilled.

Another promise that was not kept is of course employment. PAPs again mention repeatedly that the perspective of employment at the dam was for them a strong motive for not opposing land acquisition.

4.5 Land Titles

Several affected people met by the study team claimed that land titles for replacement land provided by AESNP to non-resettlers were not all issued, particularly on the East Bank. This will need to be checked, and follow up actions will need to be taken to fix any deficiencies.
5 OTHER GENERAL ISSUES

5.1 CASH COMPENSATION

5.1.1 Crop Compensation

Two issues appear to have been particularly contentious, and PAPs keep complaining now about the treatment they received from both AESNP and the Government of Uganda, which they think was unfair in respect of these crop compensation issues:

- the “1-4” issue, as it is commonly known in the area, refers to crops of less than 4 months of age, which after some hesitation and numerous discussions, were excluded of the compensation formulas; AESNP observed fraudulent attempts to maximize compensation through the planting of young seedlings (specifically vanilla seedlings, because the rate for vanilla was particularly high at that time); AESNP requested the Government of Uganda to rule on this issue, and this ruling eventually excluded all plants younger than four months; however, the ruling in question came relatively late in the process, and was given a particularly bad reception by PAPs;
- the “max cap” issue: as a result of fraudulent attempts to maximize the number of plants in a given surface of land, AESNP requested agricultural experts to calculate what the maximum value of crops could be for an acre of land, and also received backing from the Government of Uganda.

PAPs on the other hand usually state that their crops were indeed genuine, and that where one of these two rules were applied, they unfairly missed out on due compensation. It is interesting to observe that men are bitterer about the “1-4” issue than women.

Some PAPs have mentioned that they will expect this issue to be reconsidered by the new sponsor. It is the opinion of the author of this report that this would be highly risky, for the following reasons:

- Records of 1-4 crops (which were indeed counted and valued before the Government ruled that they should be excluded) may or may not have been kept after AESNP has left;
- As there is no visible evidence of what was in the field at the time of the census, a reconsideration of this question would generate countless disputes;
- If some PAPs may have unfairly missed out, the vast majority of young crops was indeed speculative; for those which were not speculative, the 3-month notice to vacate provided time to harvest most annual crops without suffering any loss.

As mentioned in section 6.1.2, several court cases are pending in relation with 1-4 crops. The above opinion that this issue must not be revisited may need to be reconsidered would the Jinja District Tribunal rule that claimants be paid compensation for 1-4 crops.

5.1.2 Outstanding Claims and Court Cases

According to information provided by the BIU, there are about 25 cases pending at Court (March 2006). These belong to three categories:

- 8 stakeholders have taken Court action because they reject the absence of compensation for young crops (“1-4” – see above 6.1.1);
- There is a dispute between two landowners over land ownership, who have brought the case to Court;
- The rest (about 15 cases) have not taken their compensation because it is deemed to be too small (these are usually licensees with small interests). The BIU has been following up as closely as possible on these cases and has tried to convince these stakeholders to come up and take their compensation.

These Court actions seem to proceed very slowly, all the more since in several occasions interested stakeholders did not show up at Court hearings.
5.2 COMPENSATION FOR CULTURAL PROPERTIES

The 2001 RCDAP made a distinction between two types of cultural properties that required compensation:

- Individual cultural sites, usually in the form of amasabo, small shrines used by a household or a local medium for offerings to ancestors’ spirits or other rites;
- Community cultural sites, most prominently the Bujagali Rapids, which bore cultural significance to the whole community at regional and even national level.

Compensation for individual cultural sites usually involved a comprehensive consultation exercise with dedicated groups in each of the interested communities, who were tasked with identifying the sites and devising adequate compensation measures, which included compensation for the structures and compensation for a ceremony allowing for relocation of the amasabo. This was organized by specialized consultants (the Synergy group of Kampala) on behalf of AESNP, and was duly witnessed by Interaid in its capacity as witness NGO. It appears that there is no pending issue related with compensation in respect of the relocation of these sites.

The compensation for the spiritual value of the Bujagali Rapids was also preceded by a thorough consultation exercise, under the responsibility of Synergy Consultants, with amongst others the participation of Government of Uganda authorities and the Kingdoms of Buganda and Busoga. Three interested “stakeholders” were identified as holding interest in the Bujagali Rapids. An appeasement ceremony was organized on the 28th of September, 2001, and was attended by the three stakeholders and their followers, and was entirely financed by AESNP, with considerable media coverage and general public interest. The compensation also included relocation and reconstruction of several large amasabo that were located in the then Bujagali Picnic Site (now “Speke Camp”). All three interested parties then acknowledged in writing that compensation had been adequate and that construction of the dam at Dumbbell Island could proceed, with the partial inundation of Bujagali Rapids as a result. This whole process has been witnessed by the Witness NGO.

While the two other stakeholders appear to have been genuinely satisfied with measures taken by AESNP, the Budhagali medium seems to have remaining claims over the site. This particular individual has been able in the past to draw a lot of attention, including international attention, which later did not appear to be justified by his actual spiritual performance, in contrast with the other two. It cannot be excluded that he will seek to obtain more compensation through media coverage for instance.

One of the cultural commitments made by AESNP in the RCDAP was not met. It appeared during consultation in 1999 and 2000 that an unknown number of people had been buried in the Nile River islands. After consultation with local communities and religious authorities, it was decided to hold an inter-denominational remembrance service to honor the memories of those buried in the islands, as it was impossible to locate these graves with certainty and therefore also impossible to exhume and relocate their bodies. This service never took place. BEL will honor this commitment prior to island inundation.

5.3 SPEKE CAMP POTENTIAL DISPUTE

The site next to Bujagali Rapids has been operated as a tourist attraction for a long time (see also section 6.5). When AESNP paid compensation for land acquisition, the site, which was then known as the “Bujagali Picnic Site”, was formally the registered property of the Jinja District, who had let it to a private operator. The Jinja District was compensated and land was acquired by the Uganda Lands Commission and re-registered in the ULC’s name according to the usual transaction process.

---

Ntembe Waguma, Nfuudu Lubaale, and Nabamba Budhagali. Ntembe Waguma was identified as the head of the clan that traditionally owns the area where the Bujagali falls are. The divine custodianship of the spirit in the Ntembe clan rests with Mr. Nfuudu, who is a diviner, and Mr. Ntembe Waguma, who is the clan head. Mr. Nabamba Budhagali is the medium the spirit uses to communicate. There has been fierce rivalry between Nabamba Budhagali on the one hand and Ntembe and Nfuudu on the other during the whole consultation and negotiation process. Nabamba has been quite successful in attracting media attention and obtaining significant compensation, whereas the other two seemed to be more genuinely interested in cultural and spiritual aspects.
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The site is now operated by a new operator, which is a member company of the Speke Hotel Group (Kampala). It has been renamed the Speke Camp, and is promoted as a rafting excursion departure site (Equator Rafting), while the previous operation (bar, restaurant, accommodation) has been maintained under the new umbrella. According to a representative of the operating company met in July 2006, a new lease was issued by the Jinja District, further to the transaction with the ULC, in the benefit of the Speke Hotel Company. If this was indeed the case, the Jinja District would have had no right to issue such a lease as it did not own the land any more.

This somewhat unclear situation is assessed as a potential dispute that could cause delays and legal difficulties. Legal advice should be sought by BEL to obtain a better understanding of the situation, and possibly dismiss any further compensation claims for a piece of land that has already been compensated by AESNP and acquired by ULC. The BIU has documentation clearly establishing that compensation was indeed paid.

5.4 VULNERABLE PEOPLE

This is an area of serious concern and of potential non-compliance with WBG operational policies. The available database fails to identify vulnerable people properly. Vulnerability criteria were indeed stated in the 2001 RCDAP, in compliance with applicable policies. Vulnerable people in the affected area include, amongst others, a sizable number of orphans, widows and people with disabilities. However, the 2001 RCDAP failed to identify a clear way forward, and as a result little has been done in terms of implementation of identification and assistance measures in favor of vulnerable people. While both AESNP and the BIU have been sensitive to the issue when implementing resettlement and compensation activities and the monitoring thereof, vulnerable people do not seem to have been properly recorded by AESNP, and it is now virtually impossible to identify, locate and monitor vulnerable people.

In addition, good practice has changed since 2001 in this respect: there are now good practice examples of what should be done to mitigate hardship on vulnerable people when implementing a compensation and resettlement program in Africa. This will need to be corrected as a matter of utmost importance: vulnerable people need to be identified (or re-identified) and monitored, and assistance measures need to be devised where needed. This applies specifically to orphan heads of households and other affected orphans.

5.5 TOURISM ACTIVITIES

5.5.1 Context

In its 2002 report, the World Bank Inspection Panel pointed out that:

"In failing to ensure that compensation was paid, and/or rehabilitation was provided to people who will lose their primary sources of income as a result of the Project's impacts on the tourist industry, the Panel finds that Management is not in compliance with OD 4.30."

BEL is committed to reach compliance with World Bank Group policies on this particular issue. BEL has updated in 2006 the baseline information related with tourism operators (see SEA section 3.6.5), and has engaged in pro-active consultation with tourism operators. While this specific consultation exercise is not complete at the time of submitting this draft SEA, it is expected that agreements will be reached with the tourism operators on mitigations acceptable to the parties.

5.5.2 Summary Baseline Information

5.5.2.1 Overview

The site of the Bujagali hydropower facility is approximately 8 km downstream of the “source of the Nile” (i.e. where Lake Victoria empties into the Victoria Nile). Due to the history and scenic topography of the area, it is attractive to tourists, especially to white water rafters who come to take advantage of the sequence of rapids on the upper reaches of the Victoria Nile. Many white water rafters are primarily adventure and overland tourists.
In such cases, Jinja represents a convenient stopping point for tours, where WWR is available as an optional activity.

Four companies currently operate WWR excursions in the Bujagali area: Adrift, Nile River Explorers (NRE), Equator Rafting and Nalubaale Rafting. These companies market one- or two- day rafting trips, which start above Bujagali Falls. Rapids are classified based on the degree of danger and “thrill”, on a scale of 1 to 6, with Grade 6 being a vertical drop and unsafe for commercial rafting operations. Three of the 'Big Four' Grade 5 rapids (considered the most thrilling) are downstream of the Dumbbell Island dam site.

Details below are summarized from the main SEA report (section 3.6).

5.5.2.2 Adrift (Uganda) Ltd

Adrift was the first company to operate white water rafting in Uganda, commencing operations in 1996. Adrift was and still is based in Kampala, and brings the majority of its clients to Bujagali on a one-day excursion from Kampala. In mid 2003, Adrift opened the ‘Nile High Club’ which is a campsite with dormitory (and more recently a few thatched bandas) a bar/restaurant and 44m bungee jump located on a 32 m cliff-top site overlooking the Nile, adjacent to the Jinja Nile Resort Hotel.

Adrift originally launched their rafts from the riverside recreation site beside Bujagali Falls and paid a commission to an entrepreneur who held a lease for the site from the Jinja District Council. This arrangement continued until they entered a business partnership with the Kenyan Mada Hotels group, who own the Jinja Nile Resort and extensive cliff top landholdings adjacent to their hotel, upon which the ‘Nile High Club’ is now located and below which their rafts are now launched.

Adrift generates their market from amongst Kampala based ex-pats and other Ugandan based NGO employees as well as some travellers staying in Kampala as opposed to the overland truck based market. Some 90 percent of their rafters originate from Kampala sources.

Adrift offers several rafting options, one day, two day, family rafting etc., but 90 percent of their clients take the one day trip which currently costs USD 95 per person. It is estimated that Adrift took around 4,000 clients rafting during 2005, putting it in second place behind the current market leaders NRE.

Adrift as a company has developed from being simply a white water rafting provider to a more broadly based travel company offering gorilla trekking, mountain climbing, wildlife safaris and outdoor management development programmes for companies, NGO’s, school groups etc. They have recently been awarded a concession from the National Forestry Authority to operate a high quality eco-tourism Lodge on Kalagala Island, within the Kalagala – Itanda Offset area, which would involve an investment of USD 1 M in association with international partners.

5.5.2.3 Nile River Explorers Ltd (NRE)

Nile River Explorers (NRE) was the second rafting company to operate on the Victoria Nile, commencing operations early in 1997, with initially a rafting base and backpacker lodge in Jinja, and later a camp site near Bujagali Falls.

NRE’s market focus is different from that of Adrift. The base at Jinja made it the natural stop for the overland truck based traveller market and this sector has dominated NRE’s business. NRE indicates that around 60 per cent of their clients are sourced through the overland truck sector and that some 40 per cent therefore come through various Kampala or other Ugandan based organisations, travel agencies, ex-pats or NGO’s.

The Explorers Campsite at Bujagali is located on the cliff top overlooking the Bujagali Falls, and has been significantly upgraded in the recent years, enabling higher-value markets to be attracted from Kampala and overseas. The overland truck market stays three nights at the campsite which gives the travellers time to engage in a variety of activities, including a day devoted to working with local NGO’s assisting with community based projects such as renovating school buildings or similar, in liaison with the NGO “Soft Power”.
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NRE have always launched their rafts from a river bank site close to the Nalubaale (Owen Falls) Dam, in order to give their clients more practice and familiarity on the raft and in the water before they decide to proceed to the rapids. Like Adrift, they also offer a range of rafting options, 1 day, 2 days, family trips etc. but once again it is the 1 day option which accounts for the large majority of rafting trips. One-day rafting trips cost USD 95 per person, the same as Adrift. Estimates of the number of rafters handled during 2005 suggest a figure of around 5,000, which would make NRE the leading rafting company with Adrift in second place.

5.5.2.4 Equator Rafting

Equator rafting was originally established as a joint venture between a former employee of Adrift Rafting, and the Speke Hotels Group in early 2001. The partnership and performance of Equator was very successful for a while but the partnership broke up, which appears to have resulted in a decline in operational performance.

The Speke Camp, however, appears to be more successful. It has a location immediately beside the Bujagali Falls and the site doubles as a visitor recreation and picnic site as well as a campsite and rafting base. All visitors to the site are charged for entry, UGX 2,000 for a Ugandan, UGX 3,000 for a non-Ugandan and UGX 500 for a child, while vehicles are charged at an additional UGX 1,000. Revenues from the operation of the site as a visitor picnic/recreation site alone are understood to be around UGX 130 million (some USD 72,000) and this suggests annual visitor numbers of between 50,000 to 60,000.

Equator, who launch their rafts from their own campsite upstream of the Bujagali Falls, offer the same rafting options as Adrift and NRE and again find that the one day trip is the most popular choice. Their market is dominated by Kampala sourced/based ex-pats, NGO's and visitors and this is assisted by the Speke Hotels Group owning several prominent hotels in both Kampala and Entebbe. Formerly, rafting rates were the same as Adrift and NRE but as of early 2006 Equator had dropped its price to USD 75 per person. The rafting business is understood to have carried only 600 to 700 clients during 2005 and continues to operate weakly.

5.5.2.5 Nalubale Rafting

Nalubale Rafting was started in mid-2005. The rafting operation operates out of rented premises in Jinja town but has no campsite or related facilities. Kampala is the main source of clientele.

At present, Nalubale only operates at weekends and while it offers a range of rafting trips like the other rafting companies, the majority of trips are one day in length and costs USD 95. The company employs eight people in Jinja, including three ex-pats and is the smallest of the four rafting businesses. It is estimated that they carried around 200 – 300 clients during the six months in which the business operated in 2005.

5.5.2.6 Summary

Research carried out in 2006 as part of the SEA indicates that total rafter numbers are approximately 10,000 per year, with Adrift and NRE each carrying 4,000-5,000 per year, and 800 to 1,000 per year being carried by Equator and Nalubaale combined. Table 2 below provides summary data on the four WWR companies that currently have operations on the Upper Victoria Nile.

### Table 2: Summary Operational Characteristics of the Rafting Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Market Mix</th>
<th>Most Popular Rafting Trip</th>
<th>Rafting Trip Fee (USD)</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Rafter Nos. in 2005 (estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrift</td>
<td>Mid 1996</td>
<td>90% NGO / Kampala 10% Truckers</td>
<td>1 Day Trip (90% of clients)</td>
<td>40 F/T (10 ex-pat, 30 local)</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.R.E.</td>
<td>Early 1997</td>
<td>40% NGO / Kampala 60% Truckers</td>
<td>1 Day Trip (95% of clients)</td>
<td>50 F/T (10 ex-pat, 40 local)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5.3 Impacts on the WWR Operations

5.5.3.1 Overview

It is overall important to observe:
- that the two older rafting companies (Adrift and NRE) have significantly changed since 2001 when the first EIS for the AESNP-sponsored project was submitted: both now offer a broader range of services, including predominantly rafting but with other non-rafting related services;
- that the other two were established well after the Bujagali HPP was initiated.

The following description of impacts is a summary of the main SEA report.

5.5.3.2 Adrift

Adrift have confirmed that they will continue to operate their white water rafting business after the Bujagali HPP is constructed and that they have no intention to move their rafting base from the ‘Nile High Club’ location. Once the dam is built, rafting trips will have to move downstream of the dam and while this will represent a different mix of rapids in the traditional one day trip from the existing experience they do not expect this to diminish the experience of rafting on the Nile for probably 99.9 per cent of the market. Most rafters will be trying the trip for the first time and the fact that the experience will have one or two fewer grade 5 rapids than at present will not be regarded as a poorer trip since they will have no basis for comparison and in reality, the same thrill of having had the opportunity to white water raft on the Nile will still be available.

Adrift accepts the reality of the proposed Bujagali HPP and recognises that they will need to manage the change in their rafting product once the timetable for the dam becomes clear. Maintenance of the integrity, quality and thrill of the rafting experience is considered to be fundamental and a core value of the company’s operating philosophy and thus the commitment of the company to its current and future product, in marketing and promotional terms, is regarded with a similar passion which understands the need to embrace change positively.

Although Adrift will not need to relocate their rafting base, the one impact which they will suffer is the need to find a new launching point into the river somewhere below the new dam. A facility shared with other rafting companies is not regarded as ideal. Each operator has historically used different access points and exit points to/from the river and has a different approach to delivering their operationally distinct rafting product and will prefer to maintain their own separate site for entry to and possibly exit from the river.

5.5.3.3 NRE

NRE have also confirmed that they will not be closing down their white water rafting business if the Bujagali HPP project proceeds, nor will they move from either their base in Jinja or their campsite close to Bujagali Falls. For the overland truck market, Jinja and the option to raft the Nile is simply one stop and one experience among many on a tour around Uganda or an even longer trip around East Africa and thus the change to the rafting trip caused by the Bujagali HPP has no bearing on whether they will choose the holiday or not, or take the rafting trip or not. Contact with leading U.K. based adventure/overland trucking tour operators has confirmed this position and their commitment to including Jinja/white water rafting in their future itineraries.
The principal impact upon NRE’s business operation once the Bujagali HPP is built is exactly the same as for Adrift, that is, the need to find new sites to enter and exit the river below the dam. The primary concern is to have a launch site which is solely for their own use, as is the current situation, so that they can provide their clients with the distinct NRE rafting experience without distraction from other rafting companies. NRE feels that the provision of toilets and changing facilities would be a desirable improvement on current practice.

5.5.3.4 Equator Rafting

Equator Rafting confirmed that it was their intention to continue rafting following the completion of the Bujagali HPP but that since their existing base at Speke Camp would be submerged by the new reservoir they would need to find a new location for these activities. The Speke Hotels Group owns an extensive cliff top site above the Bujagali Falls where it plans to build a 200 room hotel and conference centre and it may be possible to find a discrete part of this site to relocate their rafting operation to but Equator indicates that no examination of alternative sites has been undertaken so far.

The principal impacts upon Equator Rafting from the development of the Bujagali HPP are therefore related to the loss of their existing business base and associated structures, the costs of relocating these business assets to a new site and in common with other rafting companies, the need to find new entry and possibly exit points to/from the river. As mentioned in section 6.3, this site has been acquired by ULC based on compensation paid by AESNP in 2001.

5.5.3.5 Nalubale

Nalubale is quite prepared to operate rafting trips below the new dam after it is built and although it indicates that it has an operating relationship with NRE, sharing a new launching site with them is unlikely to be acceptable to NRE and they will need to find an alternative location. It may be possible for Nalubale to share a facility with Equator Rafting who expressed preparedness to share such a facility with other rafting companies.

5.5.4 The Consultation Process About Proposed Mitigations

BEL has launched consultation with WWR operators in March 2006 (description of the baseline situation) through a specialized consultant, and has then (July 2006) started consulting directly with the four companies involved in WWR operations. BEL has requested that the WWR operators should formulate mitigation concepts themselves.

To-date (August 2006), preliminary contributions have been made by the rafting companies (details and budgets are not provided as BEL has committed to the rafting operators that their contributions would be kept confidential for obvious reasons), as follows:

- Adrift has submitted a comprehensive proposal, which includes:
  - The development of several different tourist attractions in the area of Kalagala island,
  - Establishment of a new starting point and of a new camp downstream to the dam;

- NRE has submitted preliminary ideas:
  - Transport of the rafters from the current NRE base at Bujagali to the dam wall where the rafting trip would start,
  - Re-establishment of a new base downstream to the dam, as the current NRE accommodation site near Bujagali falls would lose part of its interest.

BEL intends to enter into more detail discussions with Adrift and NRE towards establishing the financial and operational viability of these investment proposals. BEL will then consider these investment opportunities within the context of the principles established for the overall SEA and CDAP for the hydropower project before arriving at a set of investment priorities, subject to satisfactory negotiations with the tourism operators, to be implemented during the construction phase of the project.

To-date, discussions with Nalubale and Equator Rafting have not resulted in formal proposals from either company. At this time, BEL’s discussions with Nalubale and Equator Rafting only indicate possible involvement of BEL in establishing separate launch facilities downstream of the Bujagali dam. For BEL to be involved in specific tourism-oriented investments with these two entities, they will need to take initiative in the
coming months. In this purpose BEL will continue to keep open lines of communication with Nalubale and Equator Rafting throughout the 120-day SEA commenting period.

5.5.5 Tourism Industry Employees

During the SEA consultation exercise in August and September 2006, employees of the tourism industry have publicly expressed concerns that they may lose jobs as a result of the HPP construction and operation, specifically in relation with impacts to the rafting industry. As shown above, BEL is taking steps to maintain the current levels of activities in the tourism industry unaffected, and has engaged with tourism operators in this perspective. It is possible, however, that changes in activities, for example with the reduction in rafting-related activities, may result in certain skills not being needed in the long term. For instance, smaller numbers of rafting guides or rafting safety personnel may be required when tourism companies change their offer from rafting-related to non-rafting products, and not all staff will be able to acquire new skills to adapt to the change in activities. This might result in some staff being made redundant by the tourism companies. It is impossible at this stage to provide a quantitative assessment of this impact, although it is fair to say that numbers should be small.

If there are clearly documented examples of tourism industry employees being laid off as a result of a change in their employers' activities in response to Project impacts, these employees qualify as Project-Affected People.

BEL will address such situations on a case-by-case basis, in cooperation with both employers and workers. Cash compensation will not be proposed as a mitigation. The following mitigations can be proposed to affected workers:

- Training course to acquire new skills that may be required in the changed local tourism industry;
- Employment on a temporary or semi-permanent basis on the construction site, and related training to enhance employability;
- Enrollment in livelihood restoration programmes detailed hereunder (section 7.3), namely agriculture, fisheries and small business enhancement components.

5.5.6 Informal Tourism-Related Activities

During SEA consultation in October 2006, representatives of informal sector tourism businesses have similarly expressed concerns that their businesses would be affected by the Project construction and operation. Representatives that came out during meetings and wrote a letter to express their concerns and ask whether they would be assisted indicated they represent the following professions:

- The Bujagali jerrican swimmers (local people based at the Speke Camp who swim across the Bujagali Rapids with the help of a jerrican);
- Photographers;
- Craft sellers;
- Acrobats and other artists who perform at Bujagali Speke Camp during week-ends and functions.

These self-employed people could also potentially be affected by the planned inundation of the Bujagali Rapids. A census of people who actually rely on this kind of activities for a living is not available. By some accounts, they may be around 30 people who occasionally and informally earn some income from different activities in or immediately outside the Speke Camp. These include a few (about 10) rather well-established businesses (craft sellers), some of which run a small kiosk near the Speke Camp main gate (an area that is not itself affected), while the others are hawkers with no fixed assets affected.

Even assuming impacts are ascertained, Ugandan law makes no obligation to BEL to compensate these activities. While some of these businesses may indeed be affected, compensation to hawkers raise difficult eligibility and legal issues (as the actual loss is very difficult to ascertain and to value). This is why most resettlement and compensation projects faced with similar situations usually do not provide compensation to hawkers. At this point in time and subject to further consultation with representatives of these professions, it is proposed to consider them in the same manner the fishermen were considered by AESNP: they would not be entitled to any form of compensation, particularly not to any cash compensation, but might benefit from livelihood restoration activities. The Bujagali swimmers might be enrolled in the fisheries enhancement
programme described in Section 7.3.2. Other professions such as photographers and craft sellers could be enrolled in the small business enhancement programme described in Section 7.3.3.

Further consultation is required to gain a better understanding of this issue. It is particularly important that informal business operators themselves understand that identification of people who are genuinely affected is critical to the success of the exercise as people with false claims might undermine the credibility of the others.
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6 ACTION PLAN

6.1 OVERVIEW

This assessment indicates that while AESNP has overall complied with commitments contained in the 2001 RCDAP, its early withdrawal in mid-2003 resulted in incomplete activities, particularly with respect to the following three topics:

- Deficient tools and resources for monitoring of affected people, in spite of all the efforts put by the BIU in this task, with a specific concern for the monitoring of vulnerable people,
- Incomplete or insufficient livelihood restoration activities, leading to potential hardship on certain categories of affected people,
- Unmet commitments in respect of public services at the resettlement site and in the Naminya host community, as well as some issues of more limited impact with regard to housing at the resettlement site.

The other issues requiring attention are the following:

- Impacts on tourism activities,
- Outstanding claims and court cases, and the potential dispute related with the Speke Camp,
- Inter-denominational remembrance service for people buried in the islands.

The action plan below provides details on each of the activities required to fix these observed deficiencies or address outstanding issues. Where linkages are envisioned with activities planned under BEL’s Community Development Action Plan (CDAP), these linkages are mentioned.

6.2 IMPROVING MONITORING OF AFFECTED PEOPLE

6.2.1 Establishment of a Monitoring Tool

Two tasks are critical for the establishment of a proper monitoring tool, based on the current database:

- Reconsolidating information by household, rather than by individual; compensation and socio-economic information recorded for the different individuals belonging to one household needs to be consolidated into one household file within the reorganized database; no monitoring can be done if this lengthy and cumbersome task is not done;
- Identifying the current whereabouts of as many affected people as possible, as follows:
  o Inputting the address of all those for whom it is known,
  o Seeking LC1 officials’ cooperation in identifying other PAPs’ whereabouts.

6.2.2 Establishment of a Social Unit

The BIU has been tasked with the monitoring of affected people since AESNP withdrew, and has received limited funding from the Government of Uganda in this purpose. One entity needs now to be clearly responsible for monitoring of affected people in the current pre-construction period and further during the construction and operation phases.

BEL will establish a Social Unit, which will be responsible for the following:

- Implementation of the CDAP (see CDAP report),
- Implementation of commitments made under this APRAP.

The Social Unit will include the following personnel:

- One head of unit, specifically responsible for the implementation of the CDAP, and preferably one of the BIU staff who has long experience in dealing with affected people and knows the history of the Project prior to AESNP’s withdrawal,
- One social worker, tasked with monitoring of vulnerable people and responsible for the activities listed in the following section (7.2.3),
- One database manager, with temporary assistance as appropriate for the database upgrades mentioned under 7.2.1.
6.2.3 Specific Activities for Vulnerable People

6.2.3.1 General

There is no proper identification of vulnerable people at the moment, and it needs therefore to be done (or redone). Although this is not "best practice", the Bujagali HPP is certainly not going to be the first project where vulnerable people are identified \textit{a posteriori}, after compensation was paid and resettlement took place. The 2001 RCDAP was deficient in this respect, although it was cleared at the time by all parties involved, as it does not propose clear criteria for vulnerability and does not identify adequate assistance actions. Identification and assistance activities need therefore to be revisited in light of current best practice.

6.2.3.2 Identification of Vulnerable People

\textit{Vulnerable people} are people who by virtue of gender, ethnicity, age, physical or mental disability, economic disadvantage, or social status may be more adversely affected by resettlement than others and who may be limited in their ability to claim or take advantage of resettlement assistance and related development benefits.

Vulnerable people include, but are not limited to:
- disabled persons, whether mentally or physically;
- refugees and internally displaced people;
- seriously ill people, particularly people living with HIV/AIDS and other illnesses;
- the elderly, particularly when they live alone;
- households whose heads are children;
- households whose heads are female and who live with limited resources;
- households whose heads have no or very limited resources; and
- widows and orphans.

Current best practice is to involve the community in the identification of vulnerable people, which is the only way to mitigate jealousy (everybody wants to be vulnerable) or stigmatization (nobody wants to be vulnerable). In the case of the Bujagali area, it is recommended to establish one "Vulnerable Committee" for each of the two districts, which should include some LCI elected officials, elders or religious authorities, CBO representatives of both genders, and representatives of the Ugandan Government department in charge of social welfare. A broadly publicized application process would allow vulnerable people to apply to this committee for consideration of their eligibility. A specialized working group within each of the committees would also prepare a list of assistance activities.

6.2.3.3 Potential Assistance Activities to Vulnerable People

It is not BEL's mission to assist vulnerable people in general. BEL will assist vulnerable people insofar as they were affected by the displacement and resettlement process.

Assistance may take the following forms, depending upon vulnerable persons' requests and needs:
- Counseling in matters such as family, health, money management, livelihood restoration,
- Food support,
- Health monitoring, or medical attention if required.

A specific focus will be put on orphan affected heads of households, who had been identified by AESNP as a specific group of concern, and have been monitored by the BIU since AESNP left. A full round of orphan re-identification will be carried out, to make sure that most if not all orphans are identified and tracked. Specific activities will be implemented by the BEL Social Unit to assist orphan affected heads of households in the following areas:
- Custody issues, and monitoring of compensation management by designated custodians,
- Use of compensation once it becomes available to the orphans after legal majority.

\textsuperscript{4} \textit{IFC's Handbook for Preparing a Resettlement Action Plan
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6.3 **ENHANCING LIVELIHOOD RESTORATION**

### 6.3.1 Agriculture

As mentioned above, in the economic strategies of the affected people, traditional subsistence agriculture must be viewed as a safety net, of critical importance for providing self-consumed food. However, improvement in income cannot come from traditional agriculture, due to scarcity of land. This applies to the resettlement site and to the rest of the affected communities.

However, a livelihood enhancement strategy in this area can be based on several positive economic factors:

- The proximity of Jinja, Njeru and Mbikko provides a large urban market for agricultural produce;
- The construction phase will enlarge this market significantly with a large workforce brought in the area;
- The local agriculture remains a labor-intensive, input-extensive form of production, with a lot of space for intensification and improvement in a new context where land is scarcer.

Support to agriculture will therefore focus on intensification and high-value added crops. Linkage with construction catering needs will be sought, but as this is clearly not sustainable in the long term, better marketing in general should be supported, through better producer organization and linkage with markets in Jinja and other centers of the area. Agricultural extension services are critical to reach these objectives, as farmers remain unfamiliar with high value added crops and marketing.

Areas of intervention will include the following:

- Organization of producers in groups to support extension services and to better structure marketing of local produce in Jinja and Kampala;
- Agricultural extension services:
  - Provision of technical advise and assistance for new crops, new varieties, fertilization, soil preparation, agro-forestry and erosion control, intensification and market gardening;
  - Subsidized provision of improved seeds and fertilizers to groups;
  - Promotion of intensive modes of cultivation (mushrooms, tree nurseries);
  - Integration agriculture / livestock (use of organic matter);
- Animal husbandry extension services:
  - Promotion of new animal species (grasscutters) and breeds (higher productivity pigs and poultry for instance);
  - Integration agriculture / livestock (use of agricultural by-products);
  - Better methods for animal nutrition;
  - Improved slaughtering and hygiene management;
- Management support (“farming as a business”).

This agricultural enhancement program is proposed in the CDAP, and its funding is included in the CDAP – Construction phase. It will target the 8 affected communities in their entirety, with a specific focus on Project-Affected People, particularly – but not only – physically displaced people. The cost of dealing with Project-Affected People is individualized in the budget of the APRAP. This cost is included in the budget provided under the CDAP.

These activities will start in July 2007 and will last for 5 years.

### 6.3.2 Fisheries

The loss of fishing opportunities has been consistently mentioned by male resettlers as their most important loss since they resettled at the new site in Naminya. It is therefore of critical importance that resettlers, as well as other affected people, be prioritized for the fishery development program. This program will be developed in consultation with communities and in collaboration with NAFIRRI, the Uganda national fisheries research institute based in Jinja. It should include the following components:

- Construction of landing sites and related facilities,
- Construction of local fish market near the landing sites,
Support to the formation of fishermen associations and management committees,
- Provision of fishing equipment to the fishermen associations, including boats, paddles, lifejackets, nets, etc.,
- Training to prepare fishermen for the change in the river characteristics following the impoundment of the reservoir.

The fisheries program is proposed in the CDAP, and its funding is included in the CDAP – Construction phase. It will target the 8 affected communities in their entirety, with a specific focus on Project-Affected People, particularly but not only physically displaced people. The cost of dealing with Project-Affected People is individualized in the budget of the APRAP. This cost is included in the budget provided under the CDAP.

These activities will start after financial close and will last for the whole construction phase, i.e. from July 2007 to the 1st quarter of 2011.

**6.3.3 Small Business Support and Micro-Credit**

BEL will also implement a small business support and micro-credit program in the CDAP. This program will include the following three components:

- Establishment of a basic business support center on each of the banks, with the following services:
  - Training in business planning and business management, with focus on fisheries, petty trade and agricultural businesses;
  - Support services (assistance in setting up businesses, telecommunication and secretarial services);
- Micro-credit;
- Linkage with BEL and EPC contractor supply chain departments, and support to local businesses being outsourced construction or operation services by BEL or its contractors.

This program is proposed in the CDAP, and its funding is included in the CDAP – Construction phase. It will target the 8 affected communities in their entirety, with a specific focus on Project-Affected People, particularly but not only physically displaced people. The cost of dealing with Project-Affected People is individualized in the budget of the APRAP. This cost is included in the budget provided under the CDAP.

These activities will start after financial close and will last for the whole construction phase, i.e. from July 2007 to the 1st quarter of 2011.

**6.4 Improving Public Services in Naminya for Resettlers and the Host Community**

**6.4.1 School**

Establishing a dedicated primary school for the resettlement site is not recommended. Subject to consultation with the Mukono District Education Inspectorate, it seems more appropriate:

- to meet the commitment made by AESNP to significantly upgrade the Naminya R/C primary school, which would benefit a broader population and much more positively influence the integration of the resettlers with the host community than the separate schooling of their children;
- to create a community-run kindergarten at the resettlement site for younger children, who would be unable to walk to the Naminya primary school.

Activities will include the following:

- Naminya R/C primary school:
  - Construction of one 10-classroom block,
  - Provision of furniture in respect of the above and upgrade of existing furniture,
  - Construction of a headmaster office,
  - Construction of a 12-stance pit latrine
- Naminya Resettlement Site kindergarten:
  - Establishment of a management entity associating the resettlers’ and the host communities, with election of a representative committee,
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- Allocation on a temporary basis of one vacant house,
- Upgrade to a suitably located vacant house,
- Provision of furniture.

The cost of works at the Naminya R/C primary school had been estimated at USD 100,000 in 2001, and needs to be re-evaluated at USD 120,000. This cost is included in the Construction phase of the CDAP, which is due for commencement in July 2007.

The cost of the kindergarten at Naminya resettlement site is estimated at USD 10,000.

### 6.4.2 Health Center

As revealed by this assessment and by BEL’s consultation with health authorities in Mukono Districts, the personnel posted by the Mukono Health District in the Naminya level 2 health center does not have accommodation at the site, and has to commute everyday from Jinja. BEL will focus on this issue for the 1st phase of the health component of the CDAP, with the following activities:

- Allocation of three vacant houses in the Naminya resettlement site to the Mukono Health District
  - one – the former model house, already used as a health center – for the clinic itself,
  - two for staff accommodation;
- Transfer of the title for the clinic itself to the Mukono District Administration (currently the title is in the name of ULC – Uganda Lands Commission), whereas the ownership for the houses intended for staff accommodation would remain with ULC;
- Limited upgrades to the existing clinic as per agreement with the Mukono District Directorate of Health.

This will be beneficial to the resettlers’ community and to the host community of Naminya.

The cost of these activities is borne in totality by the budget of the Pre-Construction phase of the CDAP. Implementation will start shortly.

### 6.4.3 Water

Water supply in the affected area in general is addressed in the CDAP. In the Pre-Construction phase of the CDAP, BEL will finance the replacement of all Orbit pumps by more common India Mark 2 pumps on all AESNP-installed wells, including the one at the resettlement site in Naminya. In the Construction phase of the CDAP, BEL plans to enhance water supply further in the 8 affected communities of both banks. As mentioned above in the assessment (see section 4.3.2), the resettlement site should not be given priority to be further equipped in the Construction phase of the CDAP, as its water situation is already more favorable than that of the neighboring communities.

The individual rain water harvesting systems should have been properly maintained by the resettlers. This has not been the case. However, as a good will gesture, it is proposed that BEL should fund the replacement of the leaking taps, and train a member of the community to repair them in the future.

### 6.4.4 Housing at the Resettlement Site

No physical action is planned with regard to houses at the resettlement site (apart from fixing the taps – see previous section). An awareness and education campaign needs to be organized to make resettlers fully aware that these houses are theirs, and that it is their responsibility to maintain them properly.

### 6.5 TOURISM

BEL will continue consultation with affected tourism operators, with a view to reaching agreement by Financial Close on concrete projects that BEL would be willing to support. These projects could include (see section 6.5.4):
- relocating the landing sites for rafting trips downstream to the dam, including the facilitation of land acquisition,
- participation in the construction of access to the relocated landing sites,
- other mitigations that the WWR operators would propose and that would be agreeable to BEL.

Commitments in this regard will be made public in due time and to the extent that their public release does not breach BEL’s confidentiality obligations to the WWR operators.

6.6 CLAIMS

BEL will facilitate the monitoring by the BIU and the Ministry of pending claims, and the settlement thereof, including:
- those pending at Court (see section 6.1.2),
- the Speke Camp potential dispute (see section 6.3).

6.7 OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

6.7.1 Firewood

Residents of the affected communities should be given priority in salvaging firewood when the fenced area is cleared for construction needs. Subject to construction requirements, they should also be given access to this area.

6.7.2 Access to Fishermen Landing Sites

Particularly on the West Bank, where the compensated area is fenced, it seems that residents experience difficulties in accessing the sites that were earmarked as landing sites for fishermen. Security personnel should be instructed to let fishermen access these sites on the River banks. A fisherman pass could be issued for fishermen to be warranted access.

6.7.3 Land Titles

There seems to be some confusion in relation with the actual issuance of land titles, both for resettlement plots in the Naminya resettlement site (where most, but possibly not all, beneficiary households were given a land title), and for replacement land that was purchased by AESNP as in-kind compensation of lost land. The situation must be checked (when the monitoring unit mentioned above is operational), and potential gaps must be fixed.

6.8 IMPLEMENTATION, BUDGET AND SCHEDULE

6.8.1 General Implementation Arrangements

BEL will take responsibility for this action plan and will implement it. Table 3 below shows the general implementation arrangements, the implementation partnerships required, and the linkages with the CDAP where relevant.
## Table 3: Implementation Arrangements for Each Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility</th>
<th>Partnerships for Implementation</th>
<th>Linkage with CDAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in Monitoring of Affected People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of a Social Unit</td>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>BIU or BEL</td>
<td>The Social Unit will also implement the CDAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of a monitoring tool (database enhancement)</td>
<td>Social Unit BEL</td>
<td>BIU</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of vulnerable people</td>
<td>Social Unit BEL</td>
<td>BIU – Local Councils – Department of Social Welfare</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to vulnerable people, including orphan affected heads of households</td>
<td>Social Unit BEL</td>
<td>BIU – Local Councils – Department of Social Welfare</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood Restoration Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture enhancement</td>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>Specialized NGO</td>
<td>Activity planned under CDAP Construction Phase, with specific budget earmarked for PAPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>NAFIRRI</td>
<td>Activity planned under CDAP Construction Phase, with specific budget earmarked for PAPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business support and micro-credit</td>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>Specialized NGO – EPC Contractor</td>
<td>Activity planned under CDAP Construction Phase, with specific budget earmarked for PAPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>District of Mukono – Education Inspectorate</td>
<td>Budget included in CDAP Construction phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center</td>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>District of Mukono – Directorate of Health</td>
<td>Activity planned under CDAP Pre-Construction Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water (individual rain water harvesting systems)</td>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses (awareness campaign)</td>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>BIU</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Implementation Arrangements for Each Activity (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Implementation Responsibility</th>
<th>Partnerships for Implementation</th>
<th>Linkage with CDAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation of Impacts on Tourism Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with tourism operators</td>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>Tourism Operators – Ministry of Trade and Tourism</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement with tourism operators on mitigation projects</td>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>Tourism Operators – Ministry of Trade and Tourism</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation by tourism operators of mitigation projects</td>
<td>Tourism Operators</td>
<td>BEL will contribute to funding under arrangements to be determined</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and monitor employees of the tourism industry who might be affected by loss of jobs, if any</td>
<td>BEL with Tourism Operators and employee representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and monitor informal tourism-related businesses that might be affected if any</td>
<td>BEL</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Claims</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring of outstanding claims and facilitation of their settlement</td>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>BIU – Ministry of Energy</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.8.2 Action Plan Budget

Table 4 below presents the budget of the activities resulting from this assessment, with the linkages with the CDAP where relevant. BEL’s participation to projects formulated by tourism operators to mitigate impacts on their activities is not included in Table 4.
Table 4: Budget and Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Linkage with CDAP</th>
<th>Cost (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements in Monitoring of Affected People</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of a monitoring tool (database enhancement) - 2 qualified database officers for 6 months</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of the BEL Social Unit - Cost for 5 years - Head of unit + social worker + database manager + vehicle (1) and logistics for 5 years</td>
<td>Budget covered by the CDAP – Total budget: USD 361,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of vulnerable people – Operation of 2 committees for 5 years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to vulnerable people for five years</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific activities intended for orphan affected heads of households</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Livelihood Restoration Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture enhancement</td>
<td>Activity planned under CDAP Construction Phase – Total budget: USD 955,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>Activity planned under CDAP Construction Phase – Total budget: USD 182,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business support and micro-credit</td>
<td>Activity planned under CDAP Construction Phase – Total budget: USD 286,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (Naminya R/C primary school)</td>
<td>Activity planned under CDAP Construction Phase – Total budget: USD 120,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center</td>
<td>Activity planned under CDAP Pre-Construction Phase – Total budget: USD 5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water (individual rain water harvesting systems)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses (awareness campaign)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>497,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.8.3 Schedule
The implementation schedule is shown in Table 5 below.
## Table 5: Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Commencement Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements in Monitoring of Affected People</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of a Social Unit</td>
<td>July 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of a monitoring tool (database enhancement)</td>
<td>July 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of vulnerable people - Operation of 2 committees for 5 years</td>
<td>July 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to vulnerable people for five years</td>
<td>July 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Livelihood Restoration Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture enhancement</td>
<td>Start with PAPs in July 2007 – Five years of activities (till June 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>Start with PAPs in July 2007 – Activities till Q1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business support and micro-credit</td>
<td>Start with PAPs in July 2007 – Activities till Q1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (Namina R/C primary school)</td>
<td>July 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center</td>
<td>August 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water (individual rain water harvesting systems)</td>
<td>July 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses (awareness campaign)</td>
<td>July 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General view of the resettlement site seen from its western end looking eastwards
Visible houses are all resettlement houses – January 2006

Spring catchment at the Naminya resettlement site
January 2006

Site water well with operational Orbit hand pump – January 2006

Private VIP latrine – March 2006
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General view of a resettlement house from the front yard
March 2006

Roofing – The absence of ceilings is a motive of complaint by resettlers – Houses usually did not have ceilings before – March 2006

A few resettlers have built additional structures – March 2006

Cracks in the plastering inside are another motive of complaint by resettlers – March 2006

Rain water harvesting system – March 2006

Most taps on individual storage tanks leak – March 2006
Agricultural plot in the resettlement site (cassava intercropped with maize) - March 2006

Maize just harvested - January 2006

Mango tree - March 2006

Another plot with cassava - maize association - March 2006

Pilot improved stove installed by AESNP to rationalize firewood use - January 2006
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APPENDIX 1 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE 2001 AESNP RCDAP

The project

The Bujagali project is a proposed hydropower facility on the Victoria Nile in the Republic of Uganda. The installed capacity of the power plant will be 250 MW. It will be located approximately 8km downstream (i.e. north) of the Town of Jinja. AES Nile Power (AESNP) is to Build, Operate, and Transfer this facility. After a construction period of approximately 4 years, AESNP will operate the power generation plant for 30 years under a Power Purchase Agreement (PPA). New transmission lines will also be constructed. After they are commissioned, they will be transferred to Uganda Electricity Board.

This facility is the subject of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), this Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan (RCDAP) being part of the EIA. The Transmission System has been addressed in a separate Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), including a specific Resettlement Action Plan.

The sponsor of the Bujagali Project, AES Nile Power, is willing to go beyond their obligations under laws and regulations. AES Nile Power will fully respect the social and cultural environment of the Project, and is willing to share the benefits of the Project with the Ugandan community at large as well as with the neighbouring communities.

This RCDAP is comprised of three parts:
1. a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) prepared in compliance with the relevant Ugandan laws and regulations and the World Bank Group OD4.30;
2. a Cultural Property Management Plan, prepared to address the issues related to Culture and to mitigate the potential impacts of the Project in this regard;
3. a Community Development Action Plan, aiming at sharing the benefits of the Project with the Community in which it is set.

Details on the project can be found in the RAP report (Part I), chapter 2.

The legal and policy background

Both the EIA and this RAP have been prepared to comply with the requirements of the National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA). As the World Bank and IFC (WB/IFC) are potential lenders for the project, this document has also been prepared in accordance with WB/IFC RAP requirements, as they stand in OD 4.30 “Involuntary Resettlement”.

The Constitution (1995), the Land Act (1998), and the Electricity Act (1999) are the main Ugandan laws applicable to the Project as far as acquisition of land for public interest, compensation, and resettlement are concerned. In law, compulsory acquisition (eminent domain) is technically feasible in the context of this Project, however it is not anticipated to utilize this possibility, and all endeavours will be sought to achieve amicable transactions.

The Constitution provides that compensation should be “fair, adequate and prompt”. Both the Constitution and the Land Act make specific provisions to protect the rights of spouses and children. Specifically, the prior consent of spouses is required in writing before land transactions can occur. Land management and the control of land transactions are decentralised at District and Parish levels, according to the general framework of decentralised powers in Uganda.
Some aspects of the WB/IFC requirements are more favourable to Project Affected Persons than the Ugandan regulations, in terms of compensation amounts (full replacement cost as per WB/IFC instead of depreciated cost as per Ugandan laws) and in terms of resettlement (OD 4.30 strongly recommends “land-for-land compensation” while there is no provision to this effect in Ugandan law). For this Project, specific uplifts are intended to fully meet WB/IFC requirements on top of Ugandan requisites.

Details on the legal context can be found in the RCDAP report, chapter 3.

**Identification and categorisation of PAPs**

WS Atkins International carried out a first comprehensive socio-economic survey in 1998 in the first stages of the EIA process. It was found necessary to complement and update this study, and therefore, AESNP carried out an exhaustive census in 2000. All affected assets were inventoried and valued, which includes land, structures (residential buildings and other structures), and crops. Affected people were taken into account whatever the tenure regime under which they hold or use land (customary or formal rights, ownership or tenancy). The census followed the consultation process described hereunder, and included a comprehensive socio-economic survey addressing all potentially affected households.

All plots falling within the land-take area have been surveyed and valued, together with crops and buildings. Impacts on land are known for all affected households and have been inputted into a database, which also includes detailed such socio-economic data as the detailed household composition and size, their activities, their incomes according to their own statements, the disabled persons if any.

Lists of affected people are presented in Appendix 4 to this RCDAP, while the methodology of the census/survey/valuation exercise is detailed in Chapter 4 and Appendix 2 of this RCDAP.

**Consultation with stakeholders and PAPs**

Consultation has been undertaken at different levels:
- At National Government level during the EIA process with relevant institutions including NEMA, the Ministry of Lands, Water and Environment, the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, Uganda Electricity Board;
- At Local Government (LCV to LCI) level during the EIA and census process;
- At the household level for purposes of census and socio-economic survey, which allowed for information on the project to be disseminated to all potentially affected persons.

Affected persons and their representatives have been informed of the Project and on the process leading from census to construction. Many consultation meetings at various levels have addressed the issues of compensation and resettlement. Among other staff, AES Nile Power has put in place Community Information Officers in all affected villages permanently residing there. AESNP offices in Jinja are easily accessible to affected persons who can get detailed and updated information.

Details on consultation are provided in the RCDAP report, Appendix 2, and in the relevant appendices to the EIA which list all meetings held to date.

**The affected area**

The affected area is a relatively narrow strip of land on both the western and eastern banks of the Victoria Nile river. It is located a few kilometres to the north of Jinja, the second largest city in Uganda. Eight (8) villages are affected, 4 on each bank, with most of the impact in the villages of Kikubamutwe on the West Bank and Namizi on the East Bank.

The area is characterised almost entirely by smallholder farming, with intercropping and manual cultivation on small plots the predominant system. Subsistence crops are mainly plantain (“matoke”) banana as in all central Uganda, together with sweet potatoes, yam and maize. The predominant cash crop is coffee. Fruit trees like pawpaw, mango and jackfruit are also to be found, together with some timber trees.
The following sketch shows a simplified cross-section across the valley in the affected area.

This sketch shows that no village centre will be flooded as a result of Bujagali hydropower facility. The impact project on land, agriculture and residence concerns mainly:

- the islands which have been recently turned to cultivation in anticipation of compensation but are not inhabited;
- the steepest part of the river banks, which have also been recently cultivated;
- the agricultural areas located between the village centres and the River, where houses can be found.

The total surface of affected land is 238 hectares, with the following distribution:

- 80 hectares of land will be permanently inundated as a result of the reservoir creation;
- 45 hectares of land are required permanently (dam, switchyard, access roads, among others);
- 113 hectares are required for the construction period only.

Details on the affected area are given in Chapter 4 and in the EIA. Affected surfaces of land are detailed in Chapter 6 of the RAP.

**The affected people**

Project-Affected Persons are all persons who lose assets as a result of the project, whatever the extent of the loss; lost assets may be land rights, structures, crops, or a combination of those three. Most PAPs will not have to relocate as a result of the project as the great majority of PAPs do not reside on affected plots. Also, many of them lose only one of several plots which they own or farm.

The total number of people that will have to move as a result of the Project is 101 households or 714 individuals. This number is based on a count of the people actually residing in the affected part of plots. Amongst these 101 physically displaced households, it is estimated that 19 will only have to relocate to the unaffected part of their plot which will be sufficient for them to continue to run a sustainable farming system. In these latter cases, there will be little disruption to the household.

The surface of land required to resettle the 82 other households is estimated between 30 and 38 hectares. The total number of affected residential structures is 108.

The total number of Project – Affected People is 1,288 households, or 8,700 individuals, including the above-mentioned displaced people. Among the 1,187 not physically displaced households, it is estimated that about 12% will loose such a proportion of their land holding that they will need land compensation.

Definitions of affected persons are given in Chapter 1, while details on the numbers and their breakdown are in Chapter 6.
Socio-economic features of the affected people are detailed in Chapter 4 of the RAP.

**Resettlement and compensation packages**

Eligibility to resettlement and compensation is based upon the census mentioned above; any household who has been identified on the field at the census stage as having interests affected by the project is eligible to resettlement and compensation packages proportionate to the level of impact. All land rights give eligibility to compensation and/or resettlement whichever the land tenure regime (formal or customary, ownership or tenancy).

A resettlement area has been identified in Naminya village. Naminya is one of the 8 affected villages: the resettlement area is a short distance (a few kilometres) from the affected peoples' present location, thus causing minimal social and psychological disruption. This area is conveniently located near the main road and Jinja town. A primary school and a clinic are available in the vicinity.

A full resettlement package will be offered to affected landowners who are either physically or economically displaced and have to move. It includes:

- the provision of a plot on the resettlement area; this plot will have slightly greater surface area than the present affected person’s plot, and similar or better agricultural potential;
- the provision of a replacement house, improved vis-à-vis usual houses, featuring among other improvements a corrugated iron roof, a concrete floor, and a ventilated pit latrine. It is based on a model developed in Uganda by the NGO “Habitat for Humanity”, which has been widely consulted on the house design;
- agricultural inputs such as seeds, seedlings, fertilizers;
- cash compensation against the value of lost perennial crops plus disturbance allowance;
- cash compensation against the cost of moving.

Households who do not opt for resettlement or who are not eligible for it, will get cash compensation for their land, for their perennial crops, for their buildings. All compensations are calculated according to the Uganda legislation, with an uplift from AESNP where this is required to meet WB/IFC requirements.

Consultation with the affected persons at the household level will ensure that the final compensation / resettlement package is optimised to the affected household’s needs and expectations. Ugandan law requirements regarding prior consent of spouses and children will be complied with. They allow for proper protection of spouses and both minor and adult children in the event of a land transaction carried out by the household head.

Details on the resettlement and compensation packages are given in Chapter 7 of the RAP.

**Implementation**

The implementation of this Resettlement Action Plan is under the responsibility of AESNP, the sponsor of this Project. AESNP has developed a specialised team based in Jinja, which is in charge of resettlement and compensation for both the hydropower facility and the transmission system. This same team has already carried out the census exercise and therefore has extensive background knowledge of the affected people and area.

Also involved in the implementation of the RAP are the following institutions:

- An independent legal counsel firm is available to advise PAPs on legal issues relevant to compensation and resettlement;
- A NGO independently witnesses the whole RAP implementation and will report their conclusions for public release on a quarterly basis; this NGO is Interaid, a Uganda-based international NGO which has already been appointed so as to become familiar with the area and the affected people;
Financial training of compensated PAPs has been organised with the bank which will process the payments;
The Government of Uganda is represented in a Steering Committee that will be set up and facilitated by the
sponsor to provide guidance and review the results of the process on a regular basis.

The institutional arrangements associated with the RAP implementation are detailed in Chapter 8 of this RAP.

**Grievance**

AESNP will put in place an amicable dispute settlement mechanism, which will involve the aggrieved affected
person, AESNP, and an independent 3rd party.

Aggrieved persons have a right of access to court, which is guaranteed by the Constitution and the Land Act.
Where land disputes are concerned, District Land Tribunals as set up under the Land Act are the relevant
jurisdictions in first instance cases. However, these Tribunals are not in place yet, and appeals will therefore be
directed to the common jurisdictions.

The grievance mechanisms are presented in Chapter 9 of this RCDAP.

**Assistance to vulnerable people**

Vulnerable people include:
- Disabled people or people suffering from serious illnesses,
- Women and children at risk of being dispossessed of their productive assets -land- as a result of
  the land compensation process that may benefit the sole male household head,
- Widows, orphans and elderly persons.

Assistance shall take the following forms, depending upon vulnerable peoples’ requests and needs:
- Assistance in the compensation payment procedure (going to the bank with the person to cash the cheque);
- Assistance in the post payment period to secure the compensation money;
- Assistance in moving: providing vehicle, driver and facilitation at the moving stage, providing
  ambulance services for disabled persons during moving;
- Assistance in building: providing materials, workforce, or building houses;
- Health care if required at critical periods: moving and transition period.

The assistance to vulnerable people is detailed in Chapter 10 of this RAP.

**Internal and external monitoring and evaluation**

AESNP will monitor the results of the Resettlement Action Plan at implementation phase and afterwards. As a
corporation, AESNP will remain present in Uganda for 30 years, which is the contractual period of operation of
the Bujagali hydropower facility. When the implementation of this RAP is completed, the resettlement means
and team will be downsized, but a resettlement team will be maintained for 5 years after completion. The
objectives of the monitoring are the following:
- To identify affected persons who might get into specific difficulties as a result of the
  Compensation/Resettlement process;
- To provide a safety mechanism and appropriate responses addressing these situations (see
  “Vulnerable People”).

Evaluation procedures have been prepared. External evaluation will take place to ensure that the objectives of
this RAP and the applicable requirements have been fulfilled. Independent auditors will evaluate the
implementation of the RAP during the implementation phase, and the results will again be evaluated after a
sufficient period of time (2 years) in terms of both physical and socio-economic indicators, with the initial
socio-economic information gathered as part of the census exercise used as baseline.

The monitoring and evaluation mechanism is detailed in Chapter 11 of this RAP.
Cost of the RAP – Time schedule for implementation

The cost of the RAP is estimated at 17.8 billion Ugandan Shillings or 11.1 million US Dollars. This amount has been calculated to incorporate the cost of compensation and resettlement for all affected people of different categories, together with costs of the implementation organization, monitoring, evaluation and assistance to vulnerable people. Contingencies amounting to 10% of the total take care of potential unforeseen expenses. It is planned that the implementation of the Resettlement Action Plan will be conducted over a period of 15 months. Construction works will not take place on any property where the compensation and/or resettlement process is not completed. Consultation and preparation time requirements are taken into account in this time schedule in a conservative manner.

Details on both cost and time schedule are given in Chapter 12 of this RAP.

Management of cultural property

In accordance with relevant WB/IFC policies and guidelines, AES Nile Power has prepared a Cultural Property Management Plan, which is part 2 of this Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan. This Plan follows extensive consultation with all relevant parties in the field of Culture.

Intangible spirits play an important role in the life of people in the project area, although these beliefs tend nowadays not to be as predominant as they used to be. This mainly concerns the household level, where people keep in contact with ancestors’ spirits by offerings in dedicated shrines or “amasabos”. Some spirits are of greater influence, and are usually attended by a medium. These latter spirits may be specific to one particular topographical feature like a rapid, a big tree, a rock outcrop.

AESNP is committed to the implementation of mitigation measures at the household and community levels in accordance with the best Ugandan norms and best practices globally as they have been developed in other parts of the world, the recommendations of specialists and in agreement with the affected spiritual entities. It is generally agreed that it is possible to move the dwelling places of spirits as long as the necessary rituals are carried out. This results from the various surveys and studies and the extensive consultations that have been undertaken.

AESNP is also committed to the conservation of cultural property wherever possible in accordance with the best Ugandan norms and best practices globally as they have been developed in other parts of the world. The EPC contractor will undertake detailed transect walks to complete the information which is already available. This will be done through the site with cultural representatives and specialists to map and tag all cultural property prior to the commencement of any works on site. Cultural property will be either preserved within the affected area of the project or relocated to acceptable sites.

At the level of the wider community AESNP acknowledges that the rapids at Bujagali Falls will be largely inundated and that this is an unavoidable impact with this project configuration. However, it is considered by the parties involved with the spiritual value of the site – namely Nabamba Bujagali, Lubaale Nfuudu and the Leader of the Ntembe Clan, that the issue is a local one and the impact is acceptable as long as appropriate measures are taken. Toward this end, these parties have given their consistent support to the project, as long as the necessary ceremonies to ensure appeasement of the spirits are carried out.

Furthermore the preliminary baseline socio-economic survey revealed that the spiritual value of the Falls is not an over-riding issue to the vast majority (83%) of the local community. The Ministry of Culture at the national level and the Kyabazinga (cultural minister of Basoga Government) have also supported the project. A Code of Good Practice will be developed to ensure that all staff is aware of the places, objects and behaviours of cultural significance and that taboos are not transgressed. Training by local specialists will help build cultural awareness in AESNP and EPC contractor staff.
Community Development

The aim of this programme is to share the project benefits with the neighbouring community. The Action Plan has been designed in a demand-responsive manner, with attention paid to communities’ priorities, as they were determined from extensive consultations, in terms of infrastructure, equipment, services, and training. All components of the Community Development Action Plan are intended to be sustainable in the long-run. The Community Development Action Plan comprises of two successive phases:

- Phase I has a total budget of 1.8 million USD, and to the extent possible will be implemented prior to the completion of construction;
- Phase II has a budget of 250,000 USD per annum over the 30 years of operation of the facility.

The total amount that AESNP plans to spend on Community Development is USD 9 millions, plus 1.9 million of “uplifts” on compensation.

One of the major positive impacts of the Project is employment at the construction phase. Specific measures are proposed to make the construction of the facility a real employment opportunity for the people in the area:

- a preferential employment policy will be put in place to the benefit of people from the affected area;
- apprenticeships will be sponsored by the EPC contractor during the construction phase (EPC consortium) and by the operator during the operation phase (AESNP);
- a commercial area will be constructed to allow for small local food vendors to market their products in relation with the workers’ daily catering; this action is planned to benefit women primarily.

The main components of the Community Development Action Plan are the following:

- the Water component will include the construction of boreholes fitted with handpumps, within the general framework of the Rural Water Supply policy implemented by DWD with World Bank support. The siting of the water well, together with the organization put in place by the community, will result from extensive consultation, sensitisation and training;
- the Electricity component aims to expand the benefits of rural electrification to the affected villages. 33kV transmission lines were recently constructed in the area along the main roads on both banks. These lines do not effectively serve the affected area and more low voltage lines are needed to penetrate inside the villages; AESNP is proposing to build these LV lines, to set up users’ committees and to help build a sustainable electricity service in the affected villages;
- the Fishery component comprises of monitoring and training on the one hand, provision of equipment and infrastructure on the other; both these sub-components are designed and implemented in close consultation with existing fishers’ associations of both banks and the Ugandan relevant institutions of training and research in the field of fisheries; monitoring and training will aim at help fishers deal with modified river conditions when the reservoir is impounded, while the provision of infrastructure and equipment will include nets and boats, together with the construction of landing sites (jetty + accessible marketing area);
- the Training and Financial Services component will include a revolving credit line managed by a local Micro-Finance Institution or other suitable institution and targeting people who did not receive cash compensations, and various training actions aimed at helping people taking advantage of the compensation cash they received to build new business opportunities in agricultural or non-agricultural fields;
- an Education component was also identified as meeting one of the affected peoples’ major needs: 5 schools will be refurbished and/or expanded in order to improve the quality of education;
- The development of Tourism will be supported through the construction of a cultural centre at Bujagali picnic site or in another location; this centre will later aim at presenting to visitors the culture of the area through exhibitions, with documentation and guides available; a visitors’ centre will later operate at the hydropower facility;
- following a detailed review of existing health facilities and consultation with Ministry of Health officials, one Grade IV health centre will be built on the West Bank while on the East Bank, the existing Health centre in Budondo will be upgraded and refurbished.
Sponsor’s commitment

This Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan has been prepared by an independent consultant in close consultation with AESNP, who has helped to develop the Plan and provided all relevant baseline information. The Plans as they stand in this Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan are fully endorsed by AESNP. AESNP is committed to their implementation and agrees to carry out all obligations under these Plans.
APPENDIX 2 - OVERVIEW OF THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE CDAP AREA

ADMINISTRATIVE AND POLITICAL ORGANIZATION

Uganda is a decentralized form of Government, with a large level of devolution to Districts. Districts are further divided into counties, sub-counties, parishes and villages. At each level the area is run by elected local councils (LC5 at District level to LC1 at village level). Districts (LC5), sub-counties (LC3) and villages (LC1) generally play the most important role in local government.

In the project area, the River Nile forms the boundary between Jinja District on the east bank and Mukono District on the west bank. Within Jinja District, the area directly affected by the project lies within Budondo Sub-county (LC3) within which lie the villages (LC1) of Kyabirwa, Ivunamba, Bujagali and Namizi. Within Mukono District the area directly affected lies in Wakisi sub-county within which lie the villages of Naminya, Buloba, Malindi and Kikubamutwe.

The Nile River also forms the limit between the traditional kingdoms of Buganda to the West and Busoga to the East.

HISTORY

In the pre-colonial period both river banks were settled but the east bank was particularly densely populated being the heart of Busoga land. In the second half of the 19th century, however, the population decreased due to a sleeping sickness epidemic. The west bank was less severely affected.

During the colonial period, the east bank was repopulated and there was extensive settlement and clearing of forest. On the west bank, extensive areas of forest were cleared following the eradication of the mbwa fly (the sleeping sickness vector) in 1952. Settlers came from all parts of Uganda, particularly the south-eastern part of the country, as well as from other East African countries. As a result both banks have a very heterogeneous population. The best land was cleared first and cash crops were planted, particularly cotton. Bush vegetation was left in swampy areas and on the dry hills. Later, coffee was planted and cassava, sweet potatoes and groundnuts introduced as subsistence food crops. Jinja town grew rapidly in the 1950s in the wake of the construction of the Owen Falls dam (now renamed Nalubaale).

After Independence, coffee was developed as the main cash crop. Jinja continued to expand and became a marketing centre and industrial base. The area was relatively prosperous.

However, with the onset of political instability there was economic collapse. Jinja town was adversely affected. People were afraid of accumulating wealth and reverted to subsistence agriculture.

Since the return of political stability in 1985, population pressure in the area has increased, and the subdivision of land has intensified. Plots were divided into long strips stretching from the roads to the hills or swamps to include both fertile and poorer quality land. Virtually the entire area is now cultivated and very little forest remains.

DEMOGRAPHIC CONDITIONS

Demographic data at the district level was obtained from the 2002 census (GoU, 2002). The total populations of Jinja and Mukono Districts in 2002 were 387,573 and 785,393, respectively, with population in Mukono District presumably having dropped from 824,606 in the 1991 census as a result of the creation of Wakiso District. The growth rates of the population in the two districts were 2.5 percent and 2.6 percent per annum respectively between 1991 and 2002, which was below the national average of 3.3 percent per annum.

The population of both districts was 49 percent male and 51 percent female for Jinja District; 50 percent male and 50 percent female for Mukono District. In Mukono District 49 percent of the population was under the age of 15 while in Jinja District the proportion was 46 percent. In Mukono District 82.8 percent of the population...
lived in rural areas whilst in Jinja District the proportion is only 77.9 percent due to the presence of the Jinja urban area, Uganda’s second largest urban centre.

Sixty-seven percent (73.4%) of the population over 10 years of age is literate in Jinja District whilst in Mukono it is 79 percent. In both districts it is higher than the national average (68 percent). The proportion of the population over the age of six who have never attended school is 13.2 percent in Jinja District and 13 percent in Mukono compared to a national average of 32 percent. Overall literacy rate was 68 percent for persons aged 10 years and above, with 76 percent male and 61 percent female. In conclusion, standards of education in the study area are generally higher than at the national level, particularly in Jinja District.

The proportion of economically active population (defined as between 10 and 64 years) is higher in Jinja District (53 percent) than in Mukono (29 percent), and both are lower than the national average (60.5 percent). These trends relate closely to the trends in educational enrolment described above. The proportion of economically active population engaged in agriculture is 43 percent in Jinja District compared to 53 percent in Mukono and 71 percent nationally. In Jinja, the proportion of the population in the sales and service sector is 0.9 percent, whereas in Mukono, it is 18.7 percent. Within the project-affected area, 46 percent of affected people are primarily involved in agriculture, while 16 percent are involved in business, 15 percent are students, 4 percent are fishermen and 4 percent are bicycle or taxi drivers (AESNP RCDAP, 2001).

**SETTLEMENT PATTERNS**

The town of Jinja is the second largest town in Uganda and the administrative centre for Jinja District. Located on the East Bank, it forms an urban agglomeration with the smaller town of Njeru on the West Bank. Together, these two towns are an industrial center with paper, textile, beer, plastics, flour milling, food processing, leather and other industries. Jinja has a substantial commercial center providing hotel, business and social services. It also functions as a tourist base for visitors to the source of the Nile and the Bujagali Falls and as a marketing centre for agricultural produce from the surrounding area. The town has a strategic location on the main route from Kampala to Mombasa in Kenya, which also gives it a significant trading function.

Outside of Jinja on the east bank, settlement is concentrated along the main road from Jinja to Kamuli, and along tracks between this road and the Nile River. It is more dispersed and evenly distributed than on the west bank. The villages of Kyabirwa, Namizi and Buyala are clearly defined by pronounced valleys. Ivunamba is a sizeable trading centre with grocery shops, butchers, tailors, workshops, restaurants and market stalls.

On the west bank, settlement is concentrated along the main Jinja-Kayunga road. There is almost continual linear development along this road through the project area. Between the main road and the river a number of minor roads and tracks give access to clusters of homesteads within the villages of Nkokonjeru, Naminya, Buloba, Malindi and Kikubamutwe. Settlement is generally on higher land.

**HOUSING AND PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Housing in the rural areas is constructed mainly in family compounds. Buildings are either ‘temporary’ (built with traditional materials), ‘semi-permanent’ (with traditional walls and corrugated iron roofs) or ‘permanent’ (with brick or concrete walls). The majority of housing is owner-occupied. Water is obtained from the river and from boreholes, wells and springs. Sanitation is normally via traditionally-built pit latrines.

Charcoal is generally used for cooking and kerosene for lighting. Electricity is in theory available from a low voltage line running along the roads on both banks, but in fact it is cut off at least 50% of the time as a result load-shedding.

There are six primary schools in the project area. Several organizations, including AESNP, have participated in refurbishing primary schools in the recent past. Secondary schooling is provided in Jinja town. There are no significant recreation facilities for local people in the area, other than the Bujagali picnic site. There are no fixed line telecommunication in the rural areas but cellular phone services are available everywhere.
PUBLIC HEALTH

Health centers in Uganda are categorized according to the level of services they are able to provide, from 1 (village level health posts) to 5 (district and regional hospitals). Two local health centers serve the population of the project area, as follows:

- On the west bank of the Nile (Mukono District), approximately 20 km from Jinja, is the Wakisi health center level 3; this center supports lower level health facilities, such as the Kalagala (north to Wakisi) and Namilya (in the Project-Affected Area) health centers (both level 2);
- On the east bank of the project area, approximately 15 km north of Jinja, is Budondo Health Centre level 4, which amongst others supports the Ivunamba level 2 health centre.

These rural health units refer difficult cases and emergencies to Jinja Hospital, which is a general hospital with complete medical, surgical, laboratory, radiological and other diagnostic and treatment services.

Further details on the baseline health situation in the Project-Affected Area can be found in Section 3.6.3. of the SEA report.

ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES

Overview

46% of households are primarily peasant farmers. While the vast majority of people in the area undertake some farming, a significant number of people are involved in other occupations. These include business / trade, fishing, and bicycle taxi driving.

According to 2001 agricultural statistics from the Jinja District Agricultural Office, the average sustainable land holding in the District is 0.8 ha per compound/household, with a net annual income of UGX 3.7 million or USD 2,300 per compound/household. Based on an average of 8.4 persons per household in the project area (WSAtkins, 1998), the average annual agricultural income per individual is USD 270.

The average annual household income from fishing, according to the AESNP baseline survey is UGX 527,400 (USD 350). As with agricultural income derived from AESNP surveys, the reported income from fishing may have been exaggerated in anticipation of possible compensation for loss of income.

Average income per household from business activities or formal sector employment, according to the baseline survey, is UGX 3,481 m (USD 2,700). Other sources of income include rents and social benefits. The total average annual income per household in the project area is estimated at approximately UGX 8 m or USD 5,360. However, income is not distributed evenly among households in the project area.

The important categories of expenditure are education, food/household essentials, health care, farming, taxes, transport, credit and home building. The costs that are considered to impose hardships on a family are, in general order of importance:

- education,
- acquiring land and health services;
- marriage, death and transport requirements;
- starting a household and having a first born child; and,
- paying taxes and hosting visitors.

People are able to save during the productive seasons of May to July and September to December. However savings are inadequate to address needs during the lean months of January to March when incomes are low and expenditures high.

Any savings are normally used to cover anticipated costs. If more unexpected financial burdens, e.g., a death, occur during a period when income is high, the expense may be manageable but if it occurs during a low
income period these costs may have a very negative impact on the household. In such cases, routine needs such as school fees or even money for food may be sacrificed.

Affordable and reliable opportunities for saving and obtaining credit are limited. About 10% of households have a bank account. Micro-Finance institutions are currently not playing an important role in the area. About a third of all households are in debt with the average debt being Ush 850,000 (US$565). Borrowing mainly takes place from friends and relatives rather than financial institutions.

**Agriculture**

Agriculture is practised as a labour intensive, intercropping system with both cash crops and subsistence crops. The main cash crops grown today are coffee and some sugar cane whilst there has recently been extensive planting of vanilla. The main subsistence food crops grown are bananas, cassava, sweet potatoes, maize, beans, groundnuts, cocoyam, millet, sorghum, peas, sesame, and yams. A range of horticultural crops is grown throughout the year including tomatoes, onions, cabbages, pepper, eggplants and carrots.

Trees are planted for a wide range of reasons including: to demarcate plots; provide shade and windbreaks; to provide a source of fuel and building materials; to produce fruit for sale and household consumption; to provide fodder; and, to improve soil moisture and fertility. The main fruit trees are jackfruit, avocado, mango, oranges and pawpaw.

Few livestock are kept due primarily to a shortage of grazing land although wealthier families on larger plots tend to keep livestock. A few cattle are kept for milk although yields are low. Goats, turkeys and poultry are the main livestock kept, along with some pigs.

There is a clear subdivision of responsibilities between men and women with regard to farming. Women are responsible for food supply including planting, weeding, harvesting, collection of firewood and the preparation of meals as well as childcare, fetching water and household tasks. They generally do more work than men who are responsible for cash income including cash crops, trading and providing income from other activities. They clear the land and are responsible for building houses and looking after trees and animals. Despite the hard work, women generally do not own family land but merely have access to it. This has inhibited women's economic advancement by blocking avenues to credit schemes.

Land is being subdivided and production is being intensified. The number of plots into which a holding was traditionally subdivided was usually proportional to the size of the holding because the largest families tended to have the largest holdings.

In his study of Budondo sub-county, Anderson (1994) considers the smaller holdings to be not only poorer but also less environmentally sustainable. He considers a holding of less than 0.5 ha to be below the threshold to support an average family.

Other problems and constraints to production include:
- Steep slopes and erosion;
- Low capital base and high costs of inputs;
- Pests and plant diseases, especially in coffee and bananas;
- Mechanization not possible due to topography;
- Lack of business planning and management skills;
- Low prices for crops;
- High transport costs and poor roads that become impassable during the rainy season; and,
- Lack of a co-operative approach, which could assist in bulk purchase of inputs, value added to crops and/or access to more lucrative markets.
Fisheries

Four quarterly surveys carried out by FIRRI during 2000 indicate that the most important commercial fish species in the Upper Victoria Nile are the introduced Nile perch and Nile tilapia.

Fishing effort in terms of active fishing canoes showed no major change in 2006 from the April 2000 counts (50 fishing canoes in 2000 vs 51 fishing canoes in 2006) for all the four transects sampled. However, in terms of type of canoes used, there was a 57 percent increase in the more robust Ssese type of craft and a 39 percent decrease in the active dugout type of fishing canoe. The April 2006 survey also revealed an increase in the number of fishers from 89 during 2000 to 128 during 2006. Similarly, there was an increase in the number of fish traders from 12 to 47 (a 74 percent increase) by the April 2006 survey. Further details can be found in the SEA report, Section 3.6.4.4.

The total monthly yield from the four transects was much higher in April 2006 (16,816 kg valued at UGX 12M) compared to April 2000 (7,969 kg valued at UGX 4M) in 2000. However the 2006 figure is heavily influenced by the report from one owner, who may have overstated his catches. If this latter is omitted from the analysis, the overall fish catch in 2006 is similar to that in 2000.

The commercial fishing gears were the same as in 2000, i.e. multifilament gill nets, hooks, cast nets and mosquito nets.

It should be noted that the Uganda Fisheries Master Plan Study (Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries) states that average income for full-time fishermen in Uganda is circa USD 280 or USh 350,000 per annum, which accrds well with the estimate for the Bujagali area of USD 350 per annum.

Tourism

The site of the Bujagali hydropower facility is approximately 8 km downstream of the “source of the Nile” (i.e. where Lake Victoria empties into the Victoria Nile). Due to the history and scenic topography of the area, it is attractive to tourists, especially to white water rafters who come to take advantage of the sequence of rapids on the upper reaches of the Victoria Nile.

Four companies currently operate one- or two-day WWR excursions near Bujagali: Adrift, Nile River Explorers (NRE), Equator Rafting and Nalubaale Rafting.

Many white water rafters are primarily adventure and overland tourists. In such cases, Jinja represents a convenient stopping point for tours, where WWR is available as an optional activity.

Research carried out in 2006 as part of this SEA indicates that total rafter numbers are approximately 10,000 per year, with Adrift and NRE each carrying 4,000-5,000 per year, and 800 to 1,000 per year being carried by Equator and Nalubaale combined.

Further details on tourism can be found in the SEA main report, Section 3.6.
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WOMEN – RESETTLEMENT SITE – NAMINYA

VENUE: CHAIRMAN’S RESIDENCE – NAMINYA RESETTLEMENT SITE

START TIME: 02.21 P.M.; END TIME: 03.48 P.M.; 9/3/06

MODERATOR: DR. NANGENDO ; NOTE TAKER: KENYONGA GRACE

PARTICIPANTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Identification No.</th>
<th>Previous Location</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Present livelihood activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Malindi</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Peasant farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukiya</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Malindi</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Peasant farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinah</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Malindi</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Animal Husbandry/Crop farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliet</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Kikubamutwe</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Primary teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Kikubamutwe</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>Animal/Crop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>F6</td>
<td>Kikubamutwe</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Peasant farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice</td>
<td>F7</td>
<td>Kikubamutwe</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Peasant farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>F8</td>
<td>Kikubamutwe</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Peasant farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>F9</td>
<td>Kikubamutwe</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Peasant farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliet</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Naminya</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Peasant farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magret</td>
<td>F11</td>
<td>Kikubamutwe</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>Peasant farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>F12</td>
<td>Mbiko</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Primary teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernadete</td>
<td>F13</td>
<td>Kikubamutwe</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Peasant farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadija</td>
<td>F14</td>
<td>Kikubamutwe</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Peasant farmer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qn: How were you informed about the resettlement and compensation process?

F8 – AES called meetings in our previous village and we were informed about the dam and how we would be compensated and we accepted to shift willingly.

F5 – The AES informed us that all the property on the land would be paid to enable owner plant the same on new land that was to be given.

Probe: How many meetings were called?

F3: The meetings were very many (all agree)

F3: many meetings were called. In these meetings we were told about the goodness of having a dam and that the dam would benefit us, our children and the whole nation.

F4: A lot of sensitisation was done and we agreed to give the dam our land because the development the dam would bring would be both for us and our children.

Qn: Did you sufficiently express your opinions about the resettlement and compensation during these meetings?

F6: Every thing was explained properly on how crops would be paid, houses and the land.

F3: We also gave our views and they accepted that every thing on the land would be compensated.

F9: In the meetings they explained properly how every thing would be compensated but when it came to the real paying, they did not pay as they had promised.
F5: For example, the price they paid for vanilla was a different one from that they valued. They said they would pay the price worth value of vanilla and the time of paying and not the value of vanilla at the time of value.

**Probe: How long was the time from valuation to payment?**

F7: I took about a year

F6: Myself I am still demanding for payments for the time line

F5: All the hydro people were paid only t-line has not been paid.

F9: Some of the issues we raised in meetings were done but they did not provide a market as they had promised.

F4: During these meetings we were promised that a primary school would be built in Naminya. We even prepared the school budget but up to now nothing has been done.

F5: Water in this resettlement is a serious problem. We only have one borehole for the whole resettlement and this one bore hole is at the extreme end near the health centre.

F8: The other borehole that is in the neighbouring village has dirty water.

F5: Another serious grievance we have is that of the health staff in the health centre they gave us. The staff in this health centre come at 10.00 a.m. and leave at 1.00 p.m.. It seems that we are only supposed to get sick between the times they are present. We are also not supposed to get sick on Saturday and Sunday because they are not around (all laugh).

**Probe: Have you had any case when one needed the health workers but could not get them?**

F4: Yes especially children, if a child develops an illness at night you can get any health worker. You have to get a boda boda to the main road or walk the whole distance since boda bodas are scarce but if we had the health workers residing here you would knock on the doors any time at night. Pregnant women also suffer if they develop labour pains in the night.

F8: There are no drugs in the health centre.

F3: Sometimes you do not even get panadol they tell you go and buy it outside.

**Probe: Why did you call this place Muyenga.**

F1: Because it had nice houses and people knew that we had come with a lot of money.

F4: This was seen as a place for the rich because of the compensation money we had received.

F2: We were promised electricity but up to now nothing is seen.

F4: No, they promised to give us electricity from Bujagali dam and since they have not began on the dam we cannot say they refused to give us electricity.

**Qn: Was the compensation given fair to everybody?**

F9: The compensation depended on what you had on your land. On my own I say that they compensation was fair. I benefited more. I was given equal land as I had before and on top of that I was given a permanent house. My only problem is that I share this house with my co-wife, yet they other side each of us had her own house.
F7: The compensation was very good, we were in grass thatched houses but now we are in permanent houses.

F8: On the side of land, I benefited because I got more land but when it comes to the house I was given I feel I was cheated, the windows are very big with no iron bars. If you forget to close them, a thief can easily enter.

F11: The tanks have also began leaking.

F3: Personally I was in a grass thatched house, now I am in iron sheets, I have a water tank and land. I also bought a commercial plot with 15 rooms and three shops. The only complaint I have is on the toilets, I was promised that they would add pipes to take water outside which has never been done.

F7: Mine filled up and even the second toilet they built is soon filling up.

F9: Mine also broke up, the part where the solid waste should be going fills up with water from the ventilation pipe during rainy seasons.

F5: I am very happy with the compensation because I have ¼ acre of land and I had no land for cultivation. When I was brought to the resettlement site, I was given 1 acre of land. During rainy season my grass thatched house would leak now I am in a permanent house.

F2: I benefited because I got house with a tank.

F3: I had a grass thatched house I have permanent house and 2½ acres of land as those the dam took.

Probe: Were you compensated land equal to what the dam had taken?

F3: It depended on the size of land you had before if you had 1 acre they would give you 1 acre.

F5: Those who had ¼ acre were also given a full 1 acre on the resettlement site.

F10: I joined this resettlement site recently, I used to stay in Mbiko and that where I used to work. I had my own school I decided to leave the school to come and teach in the resettlement site. I and my husband have bought land within the resettlement site and plan to build house in it and become permanent residents.

F11: I was cheated I was given 1½ acre and a neighbour is now digging in my land claiming it is hers.

Probe: You complained that they promised to give a market which was done, why do not you begin your own market?

F7: We were promised land for the market place but it was not given.

F11: Because our land neighbour Metha Sugar plantation, we get thieves who steal out bananas.

Qn: How was the money received as compensation used. How did you spend it?

F1: Men did not, us wives how much they had received. He would only buy you fish and some clothes and you all keep quiet.

F9: After getting the money men were no longer doing any creative work at home, all they could do was to dress smartly and go to town.

F3: Some men would come at home to change clothes and then go back to the town.

F9: During the days when we had just received the money men would bring cooking oil frying sauce was on daily basis and you know that for us women was is in the spoon.
F4: We benefited from the money. We bought household items that we did not have before like sauce pans, chairs and we now sleep on mattresses (sponge). My husband also bought a boda boda but it didn’t benefit him a lot because it got spoilt.

F3: I got good clothes and household items the rest of the money I do not know the man used it.

F1: For us we bought a cupboard, a commercial building and a car.

F14: We also bought household items and the rest ate.

F8: My husband bought a car, but it got problems and he sold it, we are now back to zero.

F13: Used the money to buy food.

F7: We bought land, a plot and many more things.

F14: I bought cows but they later died.

F10: For me I was not resettled as I had said earlier that I am from Mbiko, I would request the project to avail us more space for our school. Many pupils came but we refused them because of lacking space. We only took pupils for nursery, P1, P2 and P3, the rest of the classes pupils we not taken in due to the space problem.

Qn: Do you take these houses as your own or as project houses?

F2: Men complain that they were promised durable houses and yet these houses now have damages when they already spent all the money they were given.

F4: Not all men are like that. My husband recently bought a lock for our door.

Probe: What do you have to say about the design and durability of the houses?

F1: The houses are durable. We used to be in grass thatched houses.

F13: The size of the houses is enough for my family.

F10: The houses are big and durable.

F4: At first we were worried that the project would take back the houses and land but afterwards when we were given the land titles, we became firm and knew that these are our own houses and land.

Probe: Do you as women have right on this land and house?

F5: I have rights on this land because I have worked with my husband on the previous land. If he feels it is not comfortable here, let him go but I am not leaving this house and my children.

F1: Even if he wants to marry, let him marry as many wives as he wants provided he does not bring them to this house.

F10: The bible says that a man leaves his mother and father and is joined to his wife to become one body since the bible emphasizes it, it means I belong to him and have rights on the property.

Probe: Do even those who are not legally married have rights on compensation house and land?

F10: For me I assist because I am married in church.
Bujagali Hydropower Project – Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities

F4: Even if I am married in church, I still have rights on this house. The bond we have is our sexual relationship not the ring which only put on the finger to show off.

**Qn: Were you able to replace land taken by the project with land of similar potential?**

F9: Yes, the land I now have is more than what I used to have.

F13: The land is enough.

F5: The only problem we have with this land is that they surveying stones for demarcations were removed and many people now have grievances on boundaries. If possible the land should be resurveyed so that people know the proper boundaries.

F13: My land is not enough as I had before. I have four children but only two were given land the rest did not get yet they had land before the dam project came.

**Probe: How do the neighbours of this community that found around treat you?**

F5: At the beginning they used to steal our property but after wards they stopped when they realised that we have come permanently.

F9: Our side it was okey but on the extreme end of the site even pangas were used because of land grievances people removed the demarcation and separating village from resettlement site.

F3: The houses that remained vacant, neighbours are encroaching on that land.

**Qn: What is your opinion on the location and layout of the resettlement site?**

F11: The place is good.

F5: We mainly have a problem of transport no public means in this place, in case some one falls sick you have to hire vehicle or boda boda to take the person to hospital.

F9: We are requesting that health workers should reside here because we can knock on their doors in case some one gets sick at night.

F7: On the outside houses are okey but inside the blocks are seen, no plastering the plaster is only sand and no cement.

F9: The windows leak when it rains.

F12: The locks in the windows do not lock of you push the window it opens.

F2: When tell the man he says I was given a complete house and I do not need to mind.

**Qn: Did you get any training by AESNP and where they able to provide knowledge to replace the lost agricultural income.**

F1: AESNP provided a lot of training.

F3: Very many of them.

F9: They taught us about modern farming methods.

F4: They also told us on how to use money on activities that would generate money but the anxious and did not mind but I was they have seen their mistake and they money is no more.
F3: They warned people not to buy motor cars and bikes of second hand but still men could not listen.

F9: The project people told us that buying cars in our money was bad because would consume all the money.

Probe: Did you as women put in practice what you were taught?

F5: Yes, that is how we are surviving we were told to grow crops for home consumption and the balance be sold for income purposes (all agree).

Qn: How do you compare your current livelihood with what is was before compensation and resettlement?

F4: I am better off, previously I had very little land but now I can sell cassava and beans unlike before when I used to depend on the man’s money.

F6: We are near the road, it you grow greens you can easily get the market and if you have a lot you can take to Mbiko.

F5: Buying seedlings is expensive and at times the harvest is poor when there are little rains.

F7: Because of being near the river we used to get a lot of rain but this place is on a hill and doesn’t get enough rain.

F2: I personally think that we are badly off in terms of income, when we were still in Malindi and Kikubamutwe, we have a lot of crops and fruits. We could sell some of the fruits to get income. Here in the resettlement site the place is dry no fruits and the land is not enough to produce crops for selling.

F14: We are very badly off because you could give children Jack fruit or passion fruit but now we are surviving the hard way yet the men do not mind.

F9: For me I am as used to be I still depend on the little crops I grow.
Qn: How were you informed about the resettlement and compensation process?

K4: We were taken through several courses and we held several meetings including some meetings attended by minister Kisamba Mugerwa, telling us that we had the right to decide and make choice on how we would want to be resettled. If you wanted money, you would get money, if you want a house, you get a house. For example, we had crops on the land, and we made our own choice on how to be compensated.

K3: I agree with the previous speaker. For use to be resettled, it was not our won choice but because there was a coming project, and in one way or the other water would affect.

We were not given enough compensation especially in terms of crops, we were brought here unwilling. We were not compensated for young seedlings like coffee, vanilla and cocoa.

Probe: What was the criteria of compensation?

K3: The way they told us to “Kulembeka” and grow plants, is not what they did when it came to compensation. Now they considered the young crops as immature, and were not compensated.

Qn: Do you think you were sufficiently informed about the resettlement and compensation process?

K3: We were sufficiently sensitised and educated for example standard chartered bank sensitised us on how to use well our money that would be paid to us and advised us not to keep liquid cash, lessons on how to bank your money, withdraw, and these lessons enlightened us on what to do, for example how to run a business, savings, etc.

K9: We were sensitised on farming by AES especially on how farming can be a very good business so that we don’t waste our money. They emphasised farming and agriculture as good business.

K5: They educated us it’s true, they even opened for us bank accounts however that money was later deducted from our money. They promised us power but has never honoured their promise.

K1: During resettlement, we happen to come from different places/areas, some Buroba, but everyone was charged 200,000 for transport which was a lot.

Probe: How would you rate the efficiency of the information given to you on resettlement and compensation?
K3: I would say very efficient – we were well informed and we also knew that the project would bring development to this place.

K4: We were sensitised that the project had to cause relocation, what hurts us is to bring us from Kikubamutwe which is a trading centre to this far village place where we don’t have easy access to the town as before. They should have allowed us to make choice of where we wanted to go, we were forced here.

Qn: Were you allowed to suggest or bring in your opinion/ideas on where you wanted to go?

They told us that we would benefit in terms of jobs especially jobs for our children. They used to ask us where we come from, you tell them, so instead of allowing us follow our relatives instead they changed their mind and decided that we all come here.

K9: We got the chance to be educated they told us that they were not forcing us and so if you wanted money, they give you money, you want land, they give you land, you want a house, they give you a house.

They asked us more than three times whether we had chosen to join the resettlement site, they would show you your house and then make a decision. Those who didn’t want that, refused and had other options for example Masiga Francis the first person to resettle here.

Sincerely we had the right and power to decide on what you want. After resettling here, they provided us with security for a very long period of time until our money got finished. From day one we were not forced for example Elia who went to Bunya and Nile power provided transport. In the true sense of it all, we were allowed to make choice (majority concur in support).

K4: May be me I am different, madam Annah convinced and forced us to come here. There was a condition that though you would feel your plot was worth 800,000/=, she would say it’s worth 400,000/= which forced us to prefer physical compensation, land to land, house to house, I fell that the company in one way or the other forced us to come here (others disagree).

K9: Another thing is that the company promised us a school, a health centre, power, for the health centre now there is Naminya health centre II but we don’t have power. The school is just in its infant (nursery) and so we want the new company to promote it.

Qn: Do you think that the compensation and resettlement packages were fair to everybody?

K3: I am satisfied for the reason that I am not complaining. My request now is that they should honour their promises for example the school, power (all other concur in support)

K5: They promised us a market but we don’t see one.

K4: We are satisfied but with minor complaints for example the houses are not plastered inside, the windows are weak, and can easily break, not each house was provided with a toilet, and even those with them, they can easily get full, which makes us make our own toilets.

The solar toilets were good but not given to everyone.

The other things we are complaining about is a house without a kitchen which makes look like we were before resettlement.

K6: I am contributing, if it rains for a week the toilets will get full and even overflow, but to most of us, we are satisfied, they brought us here and we are okay.
K8: We came here when we were satisfied, but I don’t have a land title which reserved the satisfaction. The checked my name on the list and found, it was missing. The following day Eddie come and explained that they will follow up the issue and get one a title. One of my plot is for agriculture and the other residential.

Qn: What about money?

K3: We were not satisfied because most of our agricultural crops were considered immature and seedlings which is complaint to all of us. All agree.

K6: When they valuers were evaluating they could categorise our crops as immature, etc which was bad.

Probe: Were you satisfied about that?

Yes all agree.

K4: On the same issue, we are not satisfied because there are people called licences but when it came to compensation, they were not compensated therefore not considered for example Kisamba Mugerwa licence was not taken seriously. Some were compensated but not fairly. I think this should not be repeated to those in the transmission line. This has even resulted into conflict with parents of their people because money paid to them was not enough for the son/daughter to another land elsewhere.

Qn: Apart from water, power and a few land title cases, are there grievances you think that have not been settled?

K4: We asked for a school and they have combined us with Naminya RC which is not good, we want our own school here in the settlement site. The other time they gave out materials, but were taken to Naminya RC. This is why we have started our own nursery school here.

K10: One time they convinced the white man with that neighbouring school but he refused.

K6: We suggested that they give us one house and one acre of land so that we start on that and have a school but unfortunately what we discussed with them is now shifted to Naminya RC.

K9: The health centre here has no tablets for patients, the staff don’t have accommodation and even they don’t work on weekends. There is need to restock the health centre.

K4: The other thing I would request is that the road is repaired by brining in more marrum and filling the pit holes (all agree).

Qn: According to your opinion, what is your comment on the site as in the location, layouts and public services?

K9: To me the location is good because we are surrounded by MEETA company which is involved in sugar can business so we can get jobs there.

Mbiko town is very near, we have a short cut
We are near Jinja town so we can sell our produce
We have a tarmac road nearby, Kayunga road.

K3: The location is good but also has its one problem e.g. we can’t cultivate crops because the land is too small. May be we need a factory so that we create jobs especially for our grand children.

K2: We need a borehole and good health centre.
K10: The place is good because the soil is fertile only that the land is small.

K6: I agree with him.

K11: The place is good because we can easily access the road. The only problem is the small agricultural plot which you have to cultivate now and then.

Qn: What is your opinion on the social services available?

K4: We used to be near the lake and used to fishing and eating fish so if they can bring to us a fishing pond (All concur in support)

K6: Buying fish is very expensive and fishing was our way of life.

K11: Here AES promised us that in case it’s to continue, the young and energetic would get jobs, the fact that AES was unable to continue, the new company should honour AES promise.

K4: They promised us a landing site which should be honoured too.

Qn: What is your opinion on the design, size and durability of the house?

K1: They are not durable enough because they windows are already breaking down. The houses are not even plastered.

K9: In the middle of the house, there was need for a door which they didn’t put.

K11: According to the model house, there is no shade on the houses they gave us. In terms of size, it’s okay, in terms of distance from one another, it’s also okay as each of us is on his/her own land.

Probe: How durable do you think they are?

K11: We can’t tell sincerely because we hear that cement meant for these house was stolen, to me they are not long lasting.

K1: My house has cracks already.

K2: Others say there are already cracks so it’s true cement was stolen.

K5: In Ntanda’s house, there is already a crack so they can’t be durable.

K11: The iron sheets, especially Spensor houses didn’t use the ‘caps’ while roofing, so the houses are leaking already. Even timber is going to be lost as rottens due to rain.

Qn: The land that was taken from you by the project, could you replace this land by other land of similar potential?

K6: No the value they gave our land was cheap, one acre was considered at 800,000/= which is too small transport inclusive.

K4: No, the income we had the other side is not the same here. What even small money we get, we just buy food for example I had 1½ acres of land and they were offering me 300,000/=.

Probe: Could you replace or buy land similar to what you lost?

K1: How would you buy it, he asked? Could you offer your teeth to get it?
K3: They asked us what we preferred, so we preferred relocation to this settlement, if you were convinced, they you relocate.

**Qn:** Did the project educate you on how to replace your lost agriculture land?

K1: They educated us however the issue of immature seedlings insulted us.

K6: They gave us rates which were later changed. The first circular indicated something else and the second also a different new. It is that new circular that caused problems.

**Qn:** Compared to the situation before settlement and after resettlement, would you say you are well off, worse off, or fair or similar?

K6: To me the conditions today is better off because I have my own house, the other time it was an extended family property.

K7: Me I am also well off. I lived in a grass thatched house, now I have a permanent house. They gave me money to buy a plot and build, so today I have monthly income life a salaried person.

K3: Me I am badly off/worse off. I bought two boats but now have nothing. I sued to eat bananas but now can’t.

K4: I am better on the issue of accommodation but when it comes to daily income I am worse off. We need a factory to create jobs.

K1: I am worse off. I sued to fish and could get daily income, but no longer fish.

K2: Me, I am far well off, because I can dig, get food, make money and live a good life.

K5: We well off, I used to rent but now have may own house.

K11: On accommodation, I am well off, because I had a poor house but used to get daily income which no longer exist.

K7: I am not badly off, though I had a poor house but was getting daily income through fishing, selling agricultural produce, but here, you have to just cultivate the small piece of land, and that is all.

K10: Me I am well off, life is better now, though it is difficult to make money, life is generally good.

**Qn:** Any suggestion, comment or question as we wind up?

K4: I thought you would ask us if we needed a micro finance project or IGA which you have not.

K1: Tell the project managers that the money they gave us is finished, so as this project starts, we should get priority in terms of employment/jobs.

K9: We request for IGAs or a bakery factory at the site.

K3: We suggest that you tell the company to bring power there and everything will be okay.
Bujagali Hydropower Project – Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities

WOMEN – HOST COMMUNITY – NAMINYA

PARTICIPANTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Identification No</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Florence</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Peasant farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rehema</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Peasant farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Susan</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Peasant farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Jennipher</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jennipher</td>
<td>F5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gladys</td>
<td>F6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Scovia</td>
<td>F7</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qn: Were you informed about the people going to be resettled with this community?

F2: We were not informed, we first saw tractors digging the roads, they began pouring building materials.

F3: We were only informed that we should stop digging on this land because the owners wanted to use but we were not sure of what use.

F5: We heard it was as rumours from the people they were going to bring to this place whom we knew before.

F9: The dam people did not call any meeting to inform us that they are bringing people here. They did not need to tell us, since the land was theirs they had liberty to use it the way they wanted.

F1: I have quite not sure but let's not say that project not I. Inform us, they might have called the local council official and informed them which we do not know.

F6: Annah came around and asked people to leave the land because people from Kikubamutwe were coming to occupy it.

F4: When the new people came we freely interacted with them and we not friends.

Qn: Do you have any grievances with the new migrants or has their stay brought any harm to your community?

F6: We do not have any problem with them we look at them as our relatives. We work together in case of problems like burials and are at peace with them.

F2: We even elected the owner on his home at Secretary on our village council.

Probe: How are health and school facilities in this place since the coming of new people in place?

F3: I would say the situation is still the same as it used to be before they came. Nothing has changed.

F7: We do not have nearby government primary school. The resettlement site people have created a private school with three classes but still it’s not enough for all the children.

F9: The place has not water, there only one operational borehole in the resettlement side yet it’s not places in the middle but in the extreme end near the health centre.

F4: The health workers at the health facility are terrible they only work from 10.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m.. We are not supposed to get sick during the afternoon, night and in week ends.
F2: The gentleman is some how good but the nurse is rude if you go to the health centre many times she say I am tired of your sickness. She is rude.

Qn: What have you benefited from having a resettlement site with your community?

F1: We got new people, friends and are one community now.

F6: Because of the resettlement site our road was graded which had not happened before.

F5: I hear that this health centre was put in this village because of the resettled people other wise they would have taken it to another village.

F7: The resettled people especially those not around assist with their land and use it for cultivating crops.

Qn: How would you comment on the livelihood of the resettled people since you know some of them before they came to this village, did it become better or worse?

F4: They are now poorer, men all the money they were given are gone, women are now starving on the bare land with no crops.

F3: The land that was given to the resettled people is very little, you cannot cultivate both food for home consumption and selling on this small piece of land.

F6: Where these people came from, they had banana, maize and fruits at least a woman sell a banana for soap. The settlement land is dry and they only feed on cassava and posho.

F1: Majority of these people were fisher men, the lake was their source of income for paraffin and sauce, now they cannot get the same income they sued to get from fish and they even have to buy sauce to eat cassava since fish is no more.

Qn: What would recommend to be done to help integrate the new settlers as full members of this society.

F4: We have already accepted as our members because we even knew some of them before.

F1: Government should provide us money to begin income generating activities.
MEN – HOST COMMUNITY – NAMINYA

Moderator: Jjuko E
Note taker: Kasozi Ibrahim L

Names of Group Participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Francis</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Naminya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Robert</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>Naminya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Daudi</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
<td>Namilyango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lawrence</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
<td>Namilyango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ambrose</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
<td>Namilyango</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qn: How were you informed about the new settlers in your area?

K3: There is need to tell the truth, this land belonged to a Muganda man who decided to sell it to a white man. Before we had requested the sub-county for permission to cultivate the land – because it was becoming a forest and thieves were hiding here. Otherwise I was not told about the new settlers, I just heard in rumours.

K4: Many people come educating us about the new settlers and we used to meet in Kamwokya for those meeting.

They told us that new people would be our neighbours and we also welcomed them. What we told them was that we needed genuine neighbours not thieves.

We narrated to them the problems of the place which included poor health facilities, unavailability of a grinding mill, and that there were no schools in the area.

They told us that the settles would be were inhabitants of the villages near the river that was then to be turned into a hydro power station. They were to be compensated and resettled here.

K3: They promised us the residents that they would build us good houses and would re-pay them in instalments, by paying 15,000/= per month.

Qn: Did you express your opinion on the idea and if so, were your opinions sufficiently taken into consideration?

K4: After telling us about the new settles, we all accepted as long as they were good people.

We made requests for services like: Schools, Health centre, Roads and Water.

Qn: Were these fulfilled?
K4: Some were fulfilled and others not. The road we requested was constructed, the health centre is now available though with no drugs.

The health centre staff/workers come late and leave early. They work even on weekends, so if some one gets sick then, we, have nothing to do.

K1: Most of the things they promised were never honoured, especially the health centre which has just started operating.

Qn: Do you face pressure as a result of new immigrants?
K1 – Yes, we no longer produce enough food because the land we used to cultivate was taken away as already told, so both of us face this problem.

They too came with families and children. Here there is a white man’s school and it started experiencing pupil pressure as a result, so the education services are not enough for the inhabitants.

Water is also a problem. They only constructed one borehole which is not enough according to our population in the area.

Employment is another challenge. These settlers were not educated on how to become job makers and most of them are unemployed which increased on the problem.

Probe: Any other challenge that come as a result of the settlers.

K1: Nothing more, it’s all that.

Qn: What are some of the positive issues that arise as a result of the settlers?

K1: We had no clinic here, and today we have one, may be it’s because of them.

However, trees were cut because it’s the only existing energy source, so the land is plant free. This even forces people today to go to Mabira forest for firewood which is dangerous as one can be killed.

K4: Our new friends are good, we greet each other, we join one another in case of a problem let’s say burial, so it’s okay.

Qn: Are they causing any security threat or theft?

K4: No, no, they are not like that.

Qn: How can you better live together with the settlers?

K4: If services promised by the project to these people like water, electricity, health centres, schools and others are brought here, we would be happy because we would also use them.

If a fish pond they promised is provided, we would also enjoy fish.

Qn: Any question, comment or suggestion?

K1: I wanted to say that these people’s social economic life is deteriorating since they have no income. In case the project begins now, give them first priority in terms of employment, or any other IGA.

The project too needed to take care of the settlers above the mere five years promised so that they don’t become a burden to the host community.
Qn: How were you informed about the resettlement and compensation process?

F1: People from Bujagali project came and gave us a lot of meetings concerning the purpose of the dam and their request for our land.

F3: During these meetings we were informed that all our land would be paid for and all the crops on the land. We knew that the project would benefit us and our children in future and we gave in our land willingly. We thought that they project would provide jobs but since we left our land we are suffering a lot, our children were used to fruits which no more, children now move from place to place looking for fruits.

F1: My business collapsed because I used all the money I got to feed my family in hope that when dam comes I would begin a new business of feeding dam workers in a restaurant.

F4: The population has increased yet there is no land. The rich added on the money they got and bought big plots some where else but the majority bought within the same village small plots and are not suffering. Those who tried to begin some business also failed.

F6: The lake used to assist us so much. We would fetch water freely. Presently the water we drink is very dirty and even the only clean borehole we had was gazetted in the project land. The projects borehole that replaced our old one have collapsed.

F9: The project took my land and they even came and asked for land to build borehole on the remaining piece of land. When I asked for compensation for this piece of land they said I should assist the community and I was not paid for the borehole space.

The project informed us in advance and we actually very anxious waiting for them to take the land so that we could get the money. We knew that the money given would help us begin business around the dam especially restaurant. We were tired of digging and we gave in our land expecting the project to begin soon but up to now nothing has happened.

F6: Even those who built houses for rent expecting to get money by renting dam workers are frustrated their houses are empty.

Qn: Did you express your views about the resettlement and compensation process during these meetings?
F4: Yes, everyone was free to give his or her comments. But we were more interested in money and our views were always to request them to bring the money fast.

F6: We knew that once the project begins, this place would develop as a trading centre just like how Njeru was during the construction of the new dam. We did not object much about giving out land.

Qn: Do you think that the compensation and resettlement packages were fair to everybody?

F8: The land and money given depended on how big you land was and the crops that were on that land.

F2: One had an option of either getting land in another place like Naminya or to get money to buy land somewhere else.

F5: People benefited a lot those who were in grass thatched houses are not in cemented houses.

F4: I was in a grass thatched house but now I also mop my floor. I am very happy that I now have a permanent house although I did not enjoy much on the remaining part of the money that was handed to my husband.

F3: The compensation especially money was a lot, but our men just used it extravagantly and now they are badly off than they used to be. When men had just received money.

F5: I heard that those who went to Naminya their houses are now cracking.

F4: We as women we gained from having permanent houses at least after our husbands had consumed all the money they had some where to come back to.

Qn: Were you able to replace land taken by the project with land of similar potential?

F1: If the men were serious the money they got would have helped them buy even more land than they have but most of them spent it on buying cars and marrying more wives and now that the money is over we are in small plots suffering.

F8: Men ate all the money expecting the project to begin very soon. They knew that once the project begins they would get jobs on the site or begin serious business near the dam. Even if you tried to persuade a man to buy land somewhere else where land is cheap he would insist that we stay near by so as to benefit when the project begins.

F1: Personally I was left with a small piece of land on the road, the money they gave could no buy land because I had to feed my children who where used to a lot of food that I could get from my land.

F2: Men are now job less, they sold coffee which is not more. They have now resorted to going to look for jobs in Islands where they stay for long without coming home. You struggle alone as a woman to run the home.

F3: This land was hilly and we were tired of digging. We thought that once we get money we would begin business but are now regretting.

F9: Most of the men did not buy land to replace the one taken by the project. The man would only buy plot to build new house in case your house was taken by the project and the rest you would not know where the money went. For those where the project took only land and left the house men could buy any extra land. In the end it’s us women suffering because we have to feed our families yet the land we now have is not enough.

F1: My children were used to eating fruits but all this is no more. Men do not leave sugar. Previously you would substitute this with sugar can but now you have to buy sugar of 100 which cannot feed the whole family.
F4: The compensation soil we were given in Muyenga is very far from our homesteads. You walk a long distance there. I personally grew cassava in Muyenga but it was all stolen because I do not reside there and I got discouraged in using that land.

F5: Another area of Dekabusa where the project gave us compensation land has a lot of stones and spear grass.

F8: Men are not worried about buying more land yet they demand for food.

F4: I wanted to shift and stay near my land in Muyenga but the place no health workers residing there and feared my child getting sick at night where I can get any health worker.

F6: Another problem we have is the lack of water in the places where they gave us land. In Dekabusa there is no borehole, people have to go up to Kangulumira road to fetch water.

F4: We only benefited in getting good houses but when it comes to land we made losses we as women.

F2: They promised that to give us a school, health centre and boreholes but all these are not done.

F7: The government built some boreholes but they are very far. The people in Nakwanga do not have any borehole.

F6: Another problem we have is the lack of water in the places where they gave us land. In Dekabusa there is no borehole, people have to go up to Kangulumira road to fetch water.

F4: We only benefited in getting good houses but when it comes to land we made losses we as women.

F2: They promised that to give us a school, health centre and boreholes but all these are not done.

F7: The government built some boreholes but they are very far. The people in Nakwanga do not have any borehole.

F9: During dry season a jerrican of water costs 200/=.

**Probe: How much money and how did you use it?**

F1: Money was confidential men would not tell wives how much they got.

F3: In cases where both the man and wife got money differently, the man would demand the money from the wife saying that he would plan for the whole family and that was to be the end of touching the money.

F7: Men bought cars first and then married wife. It actually this family of the Chairman where we are sitting that did not marry another wife. The rest of the men, they added more wives.

F3: We also built houses because we thought we would rent them to dam workers in the end the houses are vacant and we are back to our old condition.

F8: Men would buy meat, sugar and few household items, the rest of the money would be his business.

F5: The dam money was bewitched. Those who added to their business the businesses collapsed. Those who did not have business and got this money became poorer after getting the dam money.

F9: Even the men who did not practically marry got prostitutes in town.

F6: You would hear from friends that your husband bought a car and sleeps in Sheraton.

F5: In case you went to the bank to collect with your husband if you had opened a joint account, he would immediately give you meat and transport money back home and you would not see him for the following days.

F8: People who had never tested bar were now drinking as they wanted.

Qn: Did the courses organised by AESNP provide sufficient opportunities to replace your lost agricultural income by other activities?

F1: Many meeting were organised in this village by the dam people.
F8: They educated us that once money comes many men will marry wives, fornication will increase and that disagreement would happen in marriages all this happened but we were already aware.

F4: During training men were separated from women and each group was told separate. It’s only when they were teaching on land ownership that men and women were taught together.

F2: A lot of organisation were brought by AESNP to sensitise on how we would use this money. There is an organisation which taught us that if a woman stayed in a man’s home for 14 days, he would have equal rights on his property. This annoyed men so much.

F6: The training were important because they insisted that people should concentrate on replacing their lost property and land but men did not follow this advice and now they are back to nothing after selling off the vehicles they had bought.

Qn: How do you compare your current livelihood with what it was before compensation and resettlement?

F2: As women we are badly off. We used to have a lot of land where we would grow crops for both home consumption and sale surplus but present the land was taken and men did not buy place to replace what we had the little land we have can only produce food for home consumption.

F4: We used to sale some bananas and jack fruit but this no more because most of the land we now have has not fruits. We used to get our won income as women from crops.

F6: Feeding of our children now poor children now eat cassava the whole week with this cassava children not study well at school.

F9: We now lack fire wood. We are not allowed to go back to the land to get firewood. We now buy fire wood yet men do not give us money for it.

F4: We gave in our land willingly because we wanted to get money but our husbands who got the money misused it and when they go to islands to get alternative jobs they do not come back.

F1: Most of the men here were fishermen who used to earn income on daily basis and could provide family with sauce. Present men have no stable income because fishing site was closed off. Children born these days do not even know the test of fish.

F2: We only benefited in houses but on the side of money it’s the men who benefited.

Comments:
Before the dam construction begins they should first construct boreholes for us
There is no government school around for secondary students government should look into this.
Some people want to sell off land given to them as compensation but the project people do not allow them to sell. We have developed a feeling that may be after some years the project will take back their land.
MEN – NON-RESETTLERS – KIKUBAMUTWE

Introduction:
The moderator Mr. Kasozi Ibrahim introduced himself and the note taker, Mr. Jjuko Edward as researchers from Makerere University who are working on behalf of IPS and the Government of Uganda to obtain quantitative information from people who were affected by the Bujagali Hydro power project.

He told them that the main objective of the study is to assess their overall appreciation of the compensation and resettlement process, including issues. With regard to information and public consultation, and how their livelihood were being restored after the compensation and resettlement exercise was completed. At this point he requested them to participate in the discussion as much as they can but before that was done, he asked them to introduce themselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Identification No.</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yiga</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Musa</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jowari</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Steven</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Paulo</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Godfrey</td>
<td>R7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Porter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Abdusalam</td>
<td>R8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Peter</td>
<td>R9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qn: How sufficiently were you informed about the resettlement and compensation process?

R9: A team of people from VOCA was brought here and trained us about investment. In this training, a number of issues were discussed including, farming as an investment, entrepreneurship skills, personal capacity evaluation and how one can identify profits from his/her working capital.

R4: A number of consensus building meetings were held between us and the project officials on the resettlement process and compensation. During such meetings, people were given the opportunity to raise all pertinent issues and ideas on how best they wished to be resettled and compensated. Issues were discussed and resolved in a participatory approach.

R1: We also received a course on the different land tenure systems that existed in the affected area. The officials also told us that they would base on the existing land ownership type at a particular household in determining it’s compensation value. They also told us all the resettlement and compensation activities that were going to be undertaken such as taking a cash audit value of all the property on the land including both structures and crops found on it. Issues of permanent and non-permanent structures as well the different categories of crops classification that were later used in determining value for the crops were also extensively discussed.

The resettlement options that were available to choose from were also brought to our attention. Quite a big number of us took the option of having the freedom to choose a land we like and them the project gives us the building materials and money so that we could build the houses which we liked. Others decided to be relocated physically by the project to the resettlement camp which had been bought and had its houses built by the project. The affected household head was at liberty to take up an option which he/she thought was more convenient to him/her at that material time.

R5: They also warned us against informing any one the amount of money each of us got from the project as this would attract thieves. This limited people from making consultations from their friends on how best they could invest their money. Secondly payments were not effected as they were calculated by the first team of consultants. Two property value exercises were undertaken by two different consultants who came up with different and contradicting property cash value results for instance for me the total amount of money I received...
was almost \( \frac{3}{4} \) of what was indicated by the original consultants. I also expected a cash value to all the crops found in the gardens regardless of their nature or type. I was also bitter about the idea of paying tenants for the crops they had on my land. It should have been better if they had paid me the owner and be given the opportunity to pay my tenants as their land lord, all these irregularities brought a lot of mistrust and discontent among the people who were affected by the project.

Observation:
It was evidently clear from what was being said by the respondents that apart from a few things which were done and probably did not please them e.g. cutting down the crop cash value rate and failure to pay for crops of 1-4 months old, that there was general consensus among them all that they received sufficient information about the resettlement and compensation process of the project.

Qn: Were you given the opportunities to express yourselves about resettlement and compensation, and that your opinions were sufficiently taken into consideration?

R4: We actually agreed on a number of issues as we have already explained and to this effect, some of the most critical issues were highly places as priority items to the project officials. For instance, since the lake was our main source of water, we requested them to construct alternative sources of water in the area such as boreholes which were identified as missing at that particular time. We also agreed on a number of other issues such as having a school, and health facility constructed and to distribute electricity lines all over the area which they accepted to do. Just only a few things have been implemented for instance, they put up two boreholes in each village but unfortunately they were weak and most of them broke down shortly after they were constructed. It was a new technology borehole type in Uganda which was supplied as a pilot technology model, so efforts to have them repaired were futile. Things that are still pending and waiting to be settled are: the school, a health centre and electricity because no efforts have been seen to be in the process to have them implemented.

R9: We also agreed with them that as soon as the construction work begins, first priority was to be given to the people who were affected by the project for both casual and professional labour supply if all it existed. We are still waiting to see how sincere they will be when time comes and see them start the construction work.

Qn3: Do you think that the compensation and resettlement packages were fair to everybody?

R7: I don't think it was fair at all, because what was indicated as the worth value of the structure, land and crops is not what they paid us. So many people are still complaining especially about the unclear way in which the project refused to pay for the young plants under the disguise of them falling in the 1-4 categorisation or seedlings.

R5: The project has a standard fee of 1.2 million shillings per acre which was too little and not even enough to use to buy just \( \frac{3}{4} \) of an acre of land of a similar potential. Today majority of the people that were affected by this project ended up buying just small plots of land simply because the money they received as their land compensation was not enabling them to replace their land by other land of the same size and potential. For instance, I owned 11½ acres of land but my compensation and resettlement package I received was only enough to buy about half the size of land I owned before. I discovered that I needed about 45 million if I were to replace my land with the same size and capacity of land I owned before.

Observation: It was generally observed that all respondents were not contented with the compensation and resettlement packaged which they received and that they could not use it to replace their land with other land of the same size and if similar capacity and potential.

Qn4: Are there grievances that you think have not been settled?

R9: Yes, there are quite several grievances that have not yet been settled. For instance, the school and a Health Centre have not yet been built. Water sources are still few in the area, the two bore holes that were constructed by the project have both broken down and our efforts to repair them hit a snag since there are not spare parts on market for that particular model which were constructed.
R4: The project promised us to build a market in our area to promote small scale business and ultimately increase the incomes of the resettled people. This has not been done and I am not sure if they are about to do it or whether they are even willing to build it at all. Even the electricity has not yet been distributed into the villages to enable people to utilise it as they had promised. It seems the project promised to do a lot of things which might have been beyond their financial capacity to fulfil because they have only implemented just one activity out of very many others which they promised us to.

R6: Among the many things, they project has completely failed to fulfil are: its failure to provide life saving jackets to the fisher men, motor board engines and hooks. The project had promised to provide these items to the fisher men immediately after the compensation and resettlement exercise was completed but it is surprising that 5 years have already elapsed and nothing to this effect has been implemented.

R9: The project also promised to lobby the World Bank authorities to introduce a loan scheme in the affected area to enable the affected people to access soft loans from the scheme and improve on their livelihood. It had also promised to start building the dam immediately and have it finished before the end of 2005. This has not yet been done. The abandoned land is now bushy and it is acting as a breeding ground for dangerous snakes and mosquitoes.

Qn: Did the courses organised by AESNP provide sufficient opportunities to replace your lost agricultural income by other activities?

R9: The training we went through for engaging ourselves in alternative income generating activities to agriculture were really helpful. People have tried their best in putting those skills into practice to improve on their performance and hence their incomes. The challenge however was that many of us were very excited when we received large amounts of money which we did not think we could even get in our life time. What therefore happened is that we became overwhelmed with the situation and did not concentrate well on the businesses that could have been useful to our lives and rather focused more on non feasible ones e.g. buying vehicles which were really new and strange engagements to majority of us.

Qn: How then do you compare your current livelihood with what it was before compensation and resettlement. Do you think it is better, equal or worse?

R9: Many things have changed as a result of this resettlement exercise. For instance this exercise left us scattered because they all took different directions and we are living totally different lives from the ones we were used to. Most of our friends were taken away to Naminya resettlement site and we can no longer do business with them as we used to. It has taken some of us a lot of time to get used to new living environments and different life styles that we were not used to. Some people's livelihood have improved in this new arrangement while for others, it has instead worsened. Like for instance, in the short run just immediately after receiving my resettlement package, my life was better than what it was before I relocated but when I used up all the money I had and losing most of it when I tried to do the business (retail shop) which I was not used to, my life has now completely worsened because I don't have any steady income to cater for my family and other dependants.

R1: Before resettlement, I would never be worried about my family even if I spent more than 4 days away from home because I was always sure that my neighbours would take good care of them in all ways including meeting their domestic and subsistence requirements. I had a big piece of land where I would grow a number of different crops which was just enough to feed my family. I had access to fire wood and water. These days I have to buy basically all household requirements because I do not have enough land to grow crops to feed my family and to generate some income. My expenditure is actually higher than what I earn which puts me in a worse off situation than I was into before the resettlement.

R3: My agricultural cultivation land was a lot bigger than the one I bought out of my compensation package. The food crops I grow on this land are only enough to feed my family, but I cannot generate any income from agricultural produce as I used to before I relocated to my new settlement.
Observation:
Most of the respondents complained about lack of enough agricultural plots on which to grow crops from which they can generate some income. This is the main reason as to why all of them think that they are worse off in terms of cash incomes currently compared to how they were before compensation and resettlement.
WOMEN – NON-RESETTLERS – NAMIZI

NAMES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>I. No.</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Justine</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Licensee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Zarika</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sarah</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Joyce</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pukeria</td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Halima</td>
<td>F6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Jalia</td>
<td>F7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fatima</td>
<td>F8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bernadate</td>
<td>F9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ida</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qn: How were you informed about the Resettlement and compensation process?

F1: Around 1999, I do not remember properly, 1 group people from Nile power came and told us that a dam was going to be built in this village and that they were going to buy land from people in this village.

F3: We came to know about the compensation process through our Chairman. As Nile Power came and asked our Chairman to call a village meeting where we were informed about the on coming dam project.

F6: Many meetings were done in this village and we voluntarily gave in our land because we knew that the dam would benefit it.

F9: We were told that once the dam is built we would get jobs and our village would develop to a trading centre.

F2: What please us most in these meetings was the fact that even us who were using other people’s land, our crops would be compensated but to our surprise when the time for compensation came some crops were not paid.

F4: All most every week there would be a meeting with the Nile power staff.

F3: Madam we were informed about everything as since we were going to be paid back for the land and crops taken, we accepted the project to take our land.

F10: The project promised to build for us 10 boreholes as a reward for our cooperation.

F7: They also promised to build schools and a hospital.

F1: They also said that once the dam is completed, people in this village would be given free electricity.

F5: We actually appointed committees in this village to over see the construction of boreholes and electricity but up to now we have not seen any thing.

Qn: Were you able to express yourselves about the resettlement and compensation opinions during these meetings?

F3: Yes, we told them that if they were paying us good money we would freely give our land.
F5: During the first valuation out crops were valued at high prices and all were counted. We felt that our disappointment, when time for paying came, they deducted the money saying that were not paying crops of 1-4 yet in meeting we agreed crops be paid.

F2: During these meetings were requested that the EAS Nile power should construct boreholes, and repair our existing roads all these the promised but nothing has been done.

F3: We as people of Busoga and this village we are not happy with the way things changed over night. This dam is called Bujagali yet the site for the dam has been shifted to Buganda side it seems that baganda MPS bribed so that their people may benefit more than us.

F10: We thought that we would begin restaurant business and casual jobs of mixing sand as they promised us, but since the offices and dam were shifted to buganda side, our hopes for jobs have seized.

F2: If the offices and dam were to be put on this village, we would get market for our produce, rent our houses to workers in the dam and get jobs to sweep offices.

Qn: You said you gave in you views in meetings, what view were taken into consideration and which ones were not considered?

F6: They only built 2 boreholes the rest were never completed yet had asked for ten boreholes.

F5: People who had land were compensated with land but the land they were given is far away from their home steads.

F10: The crops of 1-4 still hurt us we had agreed that all crops be paid.

Qn: Was the compensation and resettlement packages fair to everybody?

F4: Myself, I was cheated and had big piece of land that taken by the dam and what was given as replacement is smaller.

F5: For me I was a tenant but the compensation I got for my crops was not fair. During the valuation I signed to receive money for even the young crops but when time for paying came, I received less money and I was told that majority of my crops were in the category of 1-4.

F8: The money that was meant for crops of 1-4 that was not paid affected very much. For example if according to the first valuation you were deducted 1-4 crops you could get about 1.8 m shillings which was not fair.

F7: I expected to get a lot of money from my maize and beans but when they counted what they gave was less yet the crops had been destroyed trying to demarcate the plots.

F1: I personally I think that the compensation was very good to land owners because they money they gave them could buy bigger land than that taken by the dam.

F9: Many of the land lords are now rich yet they were like ourselves before the dam money came.

F2: People with crops who majority were licensees are the ones who did not benefit from the compensation because deducting 1-4 crops. Apart from the crop compensation of 1-4, the rest of the payments were okey (all agreed).

Qn: Are there grievances that you were not settled?

F2: Yes, especially on the people who were given land, AES Nile power does not allow them to sell the land. We wonder whose land is it now.
F10: Buyers who want land can not buy land because the land was surveyed as has mar stones yet the owners do not have land titles, this makes buyers think that it's still government land.

F3: They promised to give land titles to people given land but it was never done although the land was surveyed.

F6: The taking of the dam site to Namizi was not fair yet the dam is called Bujagali.

Qn: If land was taken from you by the project could you replace this land by other land with similar potential?

F6: It all depended on ones planning and money received.

F2: Some people were given the same piece of land as they had before.

F5: I think I was personally not able to replace my land with land of similar potential the money I was given could buy more land and even build a house.

F10: What happened here was that most of us were licencees on other people’s land. After the dam had taken land from our land lords, majority of us used money from crops to build permanent houses which our immediate need and since the money from crops was not a lot nothing was left to buy land.

F2: Some of us are still renting similar portions of land from people’s whose land was not affected by the dam.

F8: It’s basically the land lord’s who were able to replace their land.

F6: I do not agree with that statement, some of the land lords I know complain that the land given to them by the project is dry and infertile.

F4: The land that was given to us is dry and very far away in Makeke. You walk a long distance to dig and because of land not being near home stead crops are stolen.

Qn: Did the course organised by AESNP provide sufficient opportunities to replace the lost income by other activities?

F1: That question is difficult to answer madam but I will try to explain what exactly happened in this village. When people got the compensation money especially men, they married wives, ate chicken and beer daily and did not mind about investing.

F3: Majority of men with land bought vehicles which are all non functional by now.

F5: Many training were organised in this village. We were taught about opening accounts how to invest in modern farming.

F2: Before the money was given people already had their plans in mind on how to spend their money. Although AES Nile power sensitised us, all this was ignored by the people.

F3: On our side as women, all we got was from our crops and what we did was to construct houses for our children.

F10: Those who followed the training are successful but those are few especially among men.

F1: People here built permanent houses using the dam money.

Qn: How did you use the compensation money got?
F2: As we said earlier most of us only got money on crops we had on rented land, money for land was for the land lords. Myself I bought a plot, built a permanent house which I do not think that even my husband would ever construct for me.

**Probe: Has your livelihood changed is better off or worse?**

F2: I would say that to some extent good and to another bad, I now live in a permanent house I have 1 piece of land that is personally mine not my husband’s because I earned money from labour. On the other side I am worse off because it’s hard for me to get land near by to rent because all the land I used to rent was taken other people with big land to rent are in neighbouring village. I have now reduced on amount of food I grow due to lack of space.

F1: I bought of land and the balance I paid school fees for my children. I am now better off because crops that I grew on rented land have enabled me buy land of my own. In terms of crop harvest, I am still the same because I still rent people’s land and generally I produce the same quantities as I used to before the dam came.

F4: I bought a plot and built a house.

F5: The money I from crops was used to buy plot and then my husband used his compensation to construct a house. I think we are now better off because we have a permanent house my husband expanded his business.

F6: Renovated my old house and bought household item. I am still the same. Apart from renovating house nothing changed in my life after dam taking the land was renting, I immediately looked for another piece of land to rent which I presently use.

F1: People whose lives have changed so much are the land owners who used their money properly. I know one who was in grass thatched house, he now is in a permanent house, has bought other pieces of land, bought commercial buildings in Jinja and has a car.

F8: For me I bought land where I now did. I think I have benefited.

F9: I also bought land for farming.

F10: The livelihood situation has changed differently toe very person. Those who got big money are very okey. While those with little money especially licencees used to build houses.

**Probe: What about food at home?**

F5: In terms of food still it depends on the way one used the money. Majority used to build houses myself food has remained the same although I used money to buy farm land, I still rent land and produce same food as used to before if there is no drought.
MEN – NON-RESETTLERS – NAMIZI

Moderator: Jjuko Edward  
Note taker: Kasozi Ibrahim L

Names of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaaba</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdu</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>41 years</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godfrey</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soosi</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asads</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulaiman</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introductory remarks by the moderator who introduced the purpose of our discussion and assured participants that their information would be treated with confidentiality and was very important, then we started.

Qn: How were you informed about the resettlement and compensation process?

K12: Those people first educated us about the importance of the project, then after they told us that they wanted our land if the project was to be successful. We were all satisfied and educated us for almost a year, then the period for compensation came. This itself involved a lot of sensitisation. During all this, we were three major partners, the community, the government and the company itself. However, when it came to compensation we were cheated, so compensation had so many complaints.

The ministry of lands gave us guidelines on compensation but which were not followed by the company and that is when World Bank came in and failed the project.

All the process had five stages:
1. Education and information  
2. Compensation  
3. Resettlement  
4. Monitoring  
5. Construction and provision of social services.

K6: They came up with a good project but never informed us about the immature crops. They never told us that crops as young as below four months were not going to be compensated for.

K7: There was land that was taken – but a portion of it remained, then interrupted by moderation – says let’s talk about only the process.

K5: They used to invite us to their meetings and sometimes invited specific individuals, and they would as questions like how we earn a living at home, what we eat and how, what we do, asked about our business, our agriculture produce, and what e do with our money. Asked how often we do with our money. Asked how often we go to town, some of the problems encountered in our daily life, and the later our general social economic status and life in the village.
The asked how many children we had, how many went to school, what responsibility we had over them. They
could us all this with the intention of finding out how the resettlement is going to affect us. At the end of it all
they promised to monitor us and our way of life for sometime so as to establish how we are doing.

K11: They informed us very well of what was happening and we accepted. They told us to be confident and
trust them because they would do the following:

- Compensate us
- Take care of us in our new resettled areas for two years for example providing us with enough
  food, good water and other social services
- They said they would compensate us – according to Uganda laws, using professional valuers
  and they promised to abide by that
- They promised to establish development projects and provide all the social services like
  power, water and schools. The poor schools were to be supported and rebuilt. Social services like a
  market were to be brought nearer, as villagers we also accepted.

K4: They said that the neighbouring communities would take first priority while giving out jobs especially the
causal jobs.

New and improved roads were suggested by the community members and accepted by the company for
accessibility purposes.

They told us that we were walking long distances for health services, so they promised so many things
including a technical institute, roads, rehabilitated with nee marrum and it was all good.

Qn: Do you think that you were sufficiently informed about the compensation and resettlement process?
Yes, all agree.

Qn: Then, were you given an opportunity to sufficiently express yourself on the compensation and
resettlement process and were your opinion taken into consideration?

K12: Yes, we were given the opportunity. We told them that when you start construction, many people will be
affected for the whole three years of construction but we are not sure that our opinion was taken into
consideration.

K9: That opportunity was there, and even they told us to form a committee, both the east bank of the river and
the west each committee comprised of ten members. Before some local council members were against the
project and were ignored. We used to meet at sunset hotel international, after discussion, the project staff would
communicate back of their decisions on what they could afford or accept or otherwise, at the send of it all, we
were satisfied and if some one said that he was against the project, the community members even would think
of killing you.

K2: They promised us a landing site especially the former fishermen, however they never fulfilled their
promise.

K7: They promised boreholes but only constructed two.

Qn: Do you think that compensation and resettlement were fair to everybody and if why?

K6: They payment was not fair. They never paid for our young crops, what they termed as seedlings through
they had promised to do so. It was because of this that after one year, we experienced famine.

Qn: Why?
K6: The project staff would say that we planted poorly, that we planted so many seedlings on a small plot of land, and so would not compensate for some crops.

K8: You question is good because it involves money and land, first one acre of land was supposed to buy another acre and everyone agreed. On payment however, the three partner as mentioned before, that is government, the community and the company agreed on the rates which the chief valuer followed, these rates catered for all crops but we were never informed of the so called 1-4 seedlings and why they could not compensate for it. They never paid for 1-4 despite the Chief Valuers advice that all crops would be compensated from. When it came to receiving payment, that is when they were cancelled out. (All nod in acceptance).

K12: The company never respected what they chief valuer sanctioned, they never paid for our fish ponds! I had a fish pond but they never compensated me.

Probe: What about rumours that you started planting when you heard of compensation?

K5: We bought those seedlings from Nursery beds so they were old enough and we so thought that they would pay for them.

K4: They promised to pay for every crop in the garden but later they changed.

Qn: Were you not told why 1-4 would not be paid for?

K11: No, no, I remember a whole minister came here, by then Baguma Isole of lands who gave us the rates on which we would be paid including the 1-4 crops they didn’t. There is a lot of anger and dissatisfaction because of their failure to pay for the 1-4 (all agree).

Qn: Do you have any unsettled claims?

K6: Yes, they promised us land titles especially if they took portion of your land, which they have never fulfilled.

K4: On water, they promised many boreholes in Namizi west but out of 10, they only constructed two. They even promised educative programmes on how to run business but they never did that.

K8: Some NGOs for example DANIDA wanted to construct for us boreholes but when they hear that these were AES boreholes but unfinished, they run away. They promised us schools but fulfilled half of their pledge by assisting Kyabirwa primary school but never built a school themselves.

Also promised power but never fulfilled their promise.

Probe: Do you think that people could afford electricity here?

K8: Yes, many people will afford (all concur)

Qn: If some one's land was taken away by the project could AES person replace this land by other land of similar potential?

K8: For us who were resettled by the company have a problem, because our neighbours encroach on our land, thinking this is project land and therefore free to every one.
Even our crops are being grazed into by the neighbours’ animals, because of politics, the local councils too fear to intervene because they don’t want to lose votes, so we suffer.

**Probe**: Would people whose plots were taken by the project be able to replace the same plots of similar potential?

K3: No, no, for me, the land they took was very productive, but the new plot, is not. I was cheated.

K2: They told us that one acre was worth 1.2 millions when you went out to buy similar land, they would ask for 2.2 million which we didn’t have.

K5: There was a belief that re-settled people were rich so they would charge us highly (All agree)

K9: People truly thought that we were very rich and over charged us. This would be well understood if it was the company buying the land, and then later a person. A company would be charged little money but for us, they would want to charge you highly.

**Qn**: Did the course organised by AESNP provide sufficient opportunity to replace your lost agricultural income by other activities/ty?

K8: To me, it was sufficient enough. I benefited when they sensitised us because they said we should invest in productive business.

They advised us that before receiving the money, first come for this information but many community members never turned up for that information because they were only interested in money.

K6: This sensitisation only took a short period of time.

K8: It was for a short time but enough for those who attended.

**Qn**: How do you compare your current livelihood (including cash and subsistence) with what it was before compensation and resettlement? Do you think it is equal, better or worse?

K12: Me I am worse off because I have the same house as I used to have, I used to produce a lot of food but now Buyala land is not productive.

K11: I am better off, though I lost most of my agricultural productive land. I used the money to buy and build houses and gets monthly rent, so life is good.

K10: Me I am badly off. I tried to do business with the money they gave me but things never worked out. I lost all the money in the business and had not replaced my taken land.

K4: I used to farm my land and produce enough food for my home and family so I was affected. The money they gave me I built a house, bought a motorcycle, so life is fair and good.

K9: I benefited, I bought cows, bought a plot of land, started some income generating activities, therefore I am not complaining.

K5: I am badly off, because my farm land was taken away and I have a big family. Today I hire land for farming but it’s very expensive.

K8: I am better off to some extent.

K7: I had never got a lot of money like the one they gave me, and when I got it, I started business and things are going on well. I even have a poultry farm.
K1: Me I am badly off. I used to get food and some little money from that land, so as a tenant, I was not compensated with a lot of money so, poorly off now.

K2: Me I am not badly off because they only took part of my land and retained the big portion. I used my money to build and am better off.

Qn: As we wind up, any comment, suggestion or question?

Yes, Is it possible for the new company to compensate for our crops especially the 1-4 left out by AES?

We shall take your idea as we don’t make decisions for the company.

We request for good working relationship as we had with the previous company.

We request that during construction, the noise is controlled to avoid sound pollution.

Thanks and good bye.
APPENDIX 4 – KEY-INFORMANT INTERVIEWS
CHAIRMAN KIKUBAMUTWE VILLAGE

Introduction:
The moderator Dr. Florence Nangendo introduced herself and the note taker, Mr. Jjuko Edward as researchers who had been contracted by IPS to take an audit of the resettlement activities and to obtain information from people who were affected by the Bujagali Hydro power Project. She indicated that the main objective of the audit is to establish the people’s appreciation of the compensation and resettlement process, including capturing information on how the affected people were consulted on this matter.

Qn.1: What is your contribution in the resettlement and compensation process?
Answer: First of all I double as both the Local Council Chairman for this area as well as the Chairperson of all people who were affected by the hydro power project and resettled in this area. In these two capacities, I coordinated most of the projects activities which were implemented in this area such as construction of the boreholes, exhuming dead bodies and relocating them to their new sites and to remove cultural shrines of displaced people to where they currently got resettled.

Qn.2: Do you think the information you got about the resettlement and compensation process was clear to every one?
Answer: Most of the things were very clear because the project commissioned a number of meetings, course and consensus building workshops that provided an opportunity for all affected persons to comprehend the resettlement process activities and to present their views about what they thought was good and what they did not want about the process. All ideas were captured and discussed and in a participatory approach were resolved after reaching a compromise position between the project officials and the affected people. The challenge was however realised towards the end of the entire process especially at the time of assessing people’s property on the affected land where by cunningly, some people started planting more crops in their gardens to benefit more from the process. This was not in any way acceptable to the project authorities which was a source of conflict for quite some time until the concerned minister intervened and helped to solve the problem although majority of the people remained discontented even after that resolution.

Qn.3: How do you compare people’s lives currently with what it used to be before resettlement?
Answer: People’s lives has greatly improved, those who claim to be in a worse off position than what they used to be before resettlement are not being sincere to themselves and they are mainly those who misused their money and they are trying to cover up their shame to this effect by blaming the project for not compensating them adequately which is not true. For instances, majority of these people were sleeping in grass thatched houses which were built by mud and wattle. Today all of them managed to buy land else where and built permanent houses with bricks, sand and cement. Something many would never have done in their life time.

Qn4: Are there grievances that you think have not been settled?
Answer: Yes, there are some issues which have not yet been settled by the project. For instance, the project had committed itself to build a school and a health facility in the area. It had also promised to provide electricity and to increase the number of water sources e.g. bore holes. A strategic framework was drawn for these public facilities to be accessible in this area but this has not been achieved unfortunately. The company signed agreements with the local authorities to provide these services in the area but it eventually wound up before it implemented this agreement. The good thing is that, the new investors have also committed themselves to implement these agreements, so our hope has some how been rejuvenated.

Qn: Any suggestions?
Answer: Water is a very critical problem in this area. The two boreholes which were dug in the area were not that very strong and they broke down a few months after they were constructed. People suffer a lot with water and I think the earlier this problem is settled the better for the community.

I would also request for the establishment of a community centre in the area as a recreation ground for the people and the community at large.
CHAIRMAN BUJAGALI VILLAGE

PARISH: IVUNAMBA
SUB-COUNTY: BUDONDO

Qn: Where were you by 2000?
Ans: I was here but not the Chairman, by then I was the Secretary.

Qn: Do you think that you and your people you were sufficiently informed about the resettlement and compensation process?
Ans: Yes, the project staff came here and invited people to the sub-county headquarters though it was for a short period of time.

There were meetings organised especially for the affected persons. They were told that there was a developmental project that was coming in the area, and when they hear that they were to be paid, as poor people they were excited.

Qn: Did you and your people given an opportunity to express your opinion?
Ans: People were given that opportunity to express themselves on the project, though some were taken and others not.

Qn: What are some of their concerns that were not taken into consideration?
Ans: They promised access road
- They were to pay for all crops but what happened, they paid and left out 1-4 crops.
- They promised lease offer and land titles but have never done so
- They promised good drinking water that is a borehole, but have never honoured their promise
- They promised transmission line and poles but we have never seen either.
- Said that they would take care of settles for five years but never did so.
- That they would build a technical school/institute but there is none.

Qn: How was the compensation and resettlement packages handled?
Ans: Those who were resettled in Naminye were a worse off category so now I think they are better off. Even those given materials are better off. People were well educated on how to use their money.

Qn: What are the things that the project promised and honoured?
Ans: They promised to support our schools and they did so by renovating the school and put up more structures.
- Compensation was fair and okay. The only problem was the 1-4 issues
- One of my residents Kajumba Richard refuse the money because of the 1-4 conflict.
- Those who lost their houses were built new houses and others were given materials.

Qn: For those whose land was taken by the project, could they replace this land with a similar one with the same potential?
Ans: Some benefited and bought land of similar potentials and others not so it all depended on the persons wish and ability to use it. Actually they constructed some bore holes here but they are incomplete.

Qn: Are there land wrangles or pressure in this area as a result of the project?
Ans: No, we don’t have that problem.

Qn: Did the project activities in one way or the other affect people’s health?
Ans: No, no, no, not even – those working at the site.

Qn: Are you in any way affected by the project for example social services like school?
Ans: No, for those that were attending school, they continued, those not they remained the same. Parents who were paying school fees continue to do so and vice versa. Most people remained the way they were.
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Qn: Any suggestions, comment or question?

Ans: - People that are neighbours need to be given first priority by the new company if it comes to employment.
  - There is need to notify framers who are farming in the project land to avoid conflict on crops grown.
HEALTH STAFF BUDONDO HEALTH CENTRE 4

Names: Mr. Robert Mawerere
Position: Senior Clinical Officer
Village: Namizi
Parish: Namizi
Subcounty: Budondo
District: Jinja.

Qn: Do you think that affected people as well as yourself, were sufficiently informed about the resettlement and compensation process?
I don’t know because I am new here just one year old, so was not available by the time people were compensated.

Qn: Any staff here who was available by then?
No, no, most of us are very new, actually I am the oldest staff at the moment.

Qn: According to you and probably what you hear, do you think the compensation and resettlement process was fair to every one?
-It seems it was fair because they are all happy. You hear them say, we got money and did this and this, so it must have been fair and I think they are happy.

Qn: Any information on whether they were given an opportunity to express their opinions and whether it was considered?
I don’t know.

Qn: Do you think most people who lost their agricultural plots due to the project were able to replace them with similar plots of the same potential?
I don’t know too.

Qn: Is there any specific impact on health related to the resettlement and compensation process?
I heard that the project promised to build a theatre here, fence the whole health centre and equip it with all the necessary medical facilities. However, this has never been honoured.

I also heard people say that all the staffs of the project would be treated here in case of any sickness. Otherwise, there is no specific impact on health as a result of the compensation and resettlement process.

Qn: Do you think there was any impact on education as a result of the project’s compensation and resettlement process?
Yes, there was an impact, most people who could not afford school fees, I hear had the opportunity to pay for their children’s because they received money. Some paid for their children’s up to University level.

Qn: Any comment, suggestion or questions on what we have been discussing as I wind up?
No, nothing much, unfortunately was not here by then, may be wishing the project success.

Thanks.
HEALTH STAFF WAKISI HEALTH CENTRE 3

Names: Nantege Alice
Position: Deputy In-charge, and In-charge OPD, Wakisi
Subcounty: Wakisi
District: Mukono

Qn: Do you think that affected people as well as yourself, were sufficiently informed about the resettlement and compensation process?
I was not party to that, but I heard that people were well informed about the compensation and resettlement, some with cash, and others with both cash and houses.

Qn: Were they sufficiently informed about the whole process?
Yes, but not here at the dispensary as we were not involved.

Qn: Do you think that these people were given the opportunity to express their opinion about the whole process and were their opinion taken into consideration?
Yes, they were given the opportunity but not sure whether their opinion was taken into consideration

Qn: Is there any specific impact related to health with regard to resettlement and compensation process?
Yes, the company brought us power here at the health centre which we didn’t have.

Probe: Any other impact?
No.

Qn: Did the company/project promise anything to the health centre?
I don’t know, may be at the sub-county because that is where meetings were held.

Qn: Any specific impact on education as a result of the compensation and resettlement process?
I don’t know.

Qn: Were you or any of the staff here at the health centre engage in any meetings with the project staff?
Those meetings were held at the sub-county headquarters not here because that is where they had an office. I am not sure of any direct engagement but the in-charge would attend some of these meetings but unfortunately she is not here.

Qn: Any question, comment or contribution?
No, that’s all.

Thanks and good bye.
KYABIRWA PRIMARY SCHOOL - HEADMASTER

Qn: Do you think that the affected people as well as yourself were sufficiently informed about the resettlement and compensation process?

The community at large was well informed because a lot of sensitisation was done by the project. But as school administration within the affected area, no communication was ever formally done to let us know about the resettlement program.

The school administration became aware of the AES Nile power by communication from the local council Chairman of the place and the parents of pupils of this school.

During community meeting of AES Nile power, the community requested that they project should construct some 7 classes for this school as a token of appreciation for the community cooperation.

The Chairman and parents informed that very soon AES would begin the construction and that is how we as a school got involved with this AES Nile power.

According to community request 7 classes were to be constructed.

The project promised 30m for the construction of class rooms in Kyabirwa primary school and Budondo primary school implying that each school would get 15m worth building but in the actual sense the work done is not worth 15 million shillings.

Qn: How did Kyabirwa P/S benefit from this project?

The project benefited through the renovation of 6 class rooms block. The project put new iron sheets on these class rooms and repainted the walls.

An office block as also constructed. However, according to the agreement made with the community the project was supposed to construct new class rooms which it never did and work done is not worth 15 million.

Qn: Were you given an opportunity to express your opinion on the resettlement and compensation?

No, as I had said earlier no formal communication was sent to the school administration, all communication were from local council and community that had requested for assistance.

When time for building the project brought their own constructor we were not given opportunity to get our own constructor and we could not supervise him, since he was not answerable to the school administration but the project.

I would say that community expressed their views but the school did not.

The community view were not met since project renovated classes instead of building new ones.

Qn: Did the resettlement and compensation process affect the school education system in terms of pupils attendance, performance?

Yes, very much some pupils completely changed school because their parents shifted other locations after receiving the compensation money.

Another great impact is on the distance moved by those pupils whose parents bought land in new locations where they are now stationed. Student walk long distances and this affects their concentration in class because they arrive already tired.
Qn: Do you think that the development/construction of the dam will have any impact on the educational system in this place?

- Yes, both positively and negative
- Positively, parents' incomes will increase once the dam is constructed, parents will be able to get jobs at the dam, get market of their produce by dam workers. Once parents incomes increase, parents will be able to buy scholastic materials, pay money for feeding children and standard of school will improve.
- On the negative side, school drop rate, may increase, old boys may be tempted to leave school and go for casual labour at the dam.
- Prostitution and abuse of young girls by dam workers is likely to happen since the population around the area will increase.

Comments:
- The project should facilitate school with the construction of teachers quarters. Most teachers reside far away and this hinders them from coming to school in time.
Bujagali Hydropower Project – Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities

NAMINYA RC PRIMARY SCHOOL - HEADMASTER

Qn: Were you informed about the resettlement and compensation process?

We were informed that AES project that was going to construct the new dam had promised to construct classes for this primary school.

The project sent men who came and made measurements but that was the end of the story nothing was done. We have hope that since another company is taking over the construction, the promised may be fulfilled.

Qn: Were you given opportunity to give your views on the resettlement process?

Views were given during community meetings with AES staff but as a school we were not consulted.

Qn: Did the compensation process in any way affect the educational system of this school.

Yes, Kikubamutwe, Naminya, Malindi and Buloba are the areas where the project took most of the land with people’s homesteads. Majority of the people preferred getting money instead of being given houses. Many of our pupils left this school because some parents went to Bugerere and Busoga.

For the parents who were shifted to Naminya resettlement site, the distance is very long especially for the infants in lower classes of primary one and two.

The government did not provide any school for that community yet there is not existing government school within that area.

Qn: What do you think would be the impacts of the development of dam in this area on the educational system?

First I have a feeling that the school drop out rate will increase especially among boys. Boys will be in danger of leaving school in search of employment at the dam. I was informed that the dam would employ more than 1000 casual labourers.

The only good in see on the dam is the development in the area. Once this place is developed, parents’ incomes will improve which means family feeding habits will also improve. Some days children come to school on empty stomachs such children can perform well.

Another issue I review in future is the rise of prostitution in the areas which in one way may be dangerous to young girls in school. Dam workers may persuade these young girls with money in exchange for sex.
CHAIRMAN LC3, WAKISI SUBCOUNTY

Qn: Do you think that affected people as well as yourself were sufficiently informed about the resettlement and compensation process?

Answer: It is true that people were given enough information about the resettlement and compensation process because they were sensitised about the need to have a dam constructed in that particular area and how they were going to be affected as a result of that process. They were given enough time to think about it and to raise their opinions with regard to this intervention. The people thought that the project was useful to them and to the country as a whole and therefore accepted to work with the project towards its’ implementation.

A number of meetings were subsequently held with the affected people in which all issues to do with the resettlement and compensation activities were discussed. People were asked to forward their appeals to the project officials just in case they were not satisfied with their compensation packages and all these meetings were held in the presence of their local leaders including the are member of parliament.

Qn2: Do you think that the affected people as well as yourself had sufficient opportunities to express yourself about the resettlement and compensation and that your opinions were sufficiently taken into consideration?

Answer: Yes, people were given a lot time to express themselves especially at the point where they discussed their compensation procedure and strategies until a time when the two parties come to an agreement on the best strategy. This is the main reason to explain why it took long for people to receive their compensation packages because there were a lot of discussions and processes that the two parties went through before they finally reached an agreement. The compensation rates were discussed extensively and reviewed from time to time up to when a common position was arrived at between the two parties.

A number of other issues were also discussed. For instances, people requested the project officials to increase the number of water sources in the resettlement areas to contain the demand for water which has been created as a result of the compensation and the resettlement process. The people also requested the project officials to allow them to continue fishing in the rive until the project starts constructing the dam. They also asked the project officials not to cut down some cultural trees which existed in the affected area and the project officials accepted.

Qn: Do you think that the compensation and resettlement packages were fair to te very one?

Answer: All people received their compensation packages. We did not receive any complaints about their packages during the compensation process. Such complaints emerged much later after those who decided to invest it in second hand vehicles which they failed to managed. Otherwise, for those who invested their money as they were advised to by the project, their current livelihood had greatly improved compared to what they were before the compensation and resettlement. Those people whose plants were not compensated had planted those crops after they had learnt about this arrangement in order to gain more from the project.

Qn: Do you think that affected people have been able to restore or improve them livelihood?

Answer: A good number of people who benefited from this project invested their money into viable projects and only a few wasted it almost deliberately because they were sufficiently advised on how to invest their money into simple, and manageable income generating activities. Those who took heed to this advice are living much better lives and their incomes per household has greatly improved. For instance, many household heads are currently in position to provide their families with the basic household requirements such as sugar, milk, clothes, education and medical attention which they were not able to provide before the compensation and resettlement process.

Household incomes from agricultural produce has reduced in the area. But this has not affected people had were affected by the project only because this is a general problem in the while country which would have affected them even if they had not been victims of the resettlement process. This should not be taken as an
indication for measuring likelihood conditions of the affected people because even those who were not affected by this process are also experiencing a similar problem.

Qn: Are there grievances that you think have not been settled?

Answer: The project had promised to do a number of things in the resettlement area which it has failed to fulfil up to now. For instance it had promised to construct a market in Kikubamutwe, a school in Naminya resettlement site, a health facility in the same site and all these things were not worked on at all. The local government realised this gap and together with local people decided to start up a lower primary school in the site and a health centre as we are waiting for the project to fulfil its promises. The good thing is that the new investors have also committed themselves to implementing those promises.

Qn: Is there land pressure problem in the are as a result of the project land taken?

Answer: No, there is still a lot of free land in the sub-county. Besides that many affected people relocated to Busoga area where they bought other land to replace the one which they had lost to the project. So there is nothing like land pressure problem that was created by the project land taken.

Qn: Did the courses organised by AESNP provide sufficient opportunities to replace people’s lost agricultural income by other activities.

Answer: Those who neglected the skills they acquired from these course did not benefit definitely and those who took heed to the advice are doing very well. Many of them started retail shops, others set up workshops for carpentry and motor vehicles repairs, others are drivers of their own vehicles while others bought boda boda and are generating daily incomes out of them.

Qn: Is there any specific impact on health and education related with the resettlement and compensation process?

Answer: Yes, some people were resettled in areas where there were no school and health units. Some children are not going to school because of this while many of them do not have easy access to health facilities. The number of people in Naminya resettlement site increased and need for social services also increased as a result. These include: medical care services, education and many more.
CLERK, BUDONDO SUB-COUNTY LC3 COUNCIL

Qn: Do you think that affected people as well as yourself and compensation process?

Answer: That is very true because the project officials communicated physically to all the affected people through meetings which they held with them in the presence of their leaders both at the western and the eastern banks. In these meetings the project officers explained to the people why there was a need to construct a dam in their area which was going to benefit them and the entire nation as a whole. They told them that it was not possible for the project to start constructing the dam and operationalise it when people were still staying in the catchment area because they would be exposed to danger. This therefore pointed to the need to have all those that would be found residing or cultivating in the catchment area to be relocated to another land. The assured them that they would properly compensate all the affected people and finally resettle them to places of their own choice and preference.

Similar meetings were also held specifically to give affected people advice on how best they should invest their compensation packages either into agriculture or other alternative activities. They also requested them to be transparent to each other at a family level in deciding on the different options in which they intended to invest their money to avoid going into problems such as broken marriages which were experienced in other areas where similar projects had been undertaken. They also promised the people that they would always be there to assist them morally even after the affected people had been fully compensated and finally resettled in their new homes.

Qn2: Do you think that affected people as well as yourself had sufficient opportunity to express yourselves about resettlement and compensation, and that your opinions were sufficiently taken into consideration?

Answer: People were given ample time to give their opinions but they were so excited about the money they were expecting to get which made them over look many other critical issues such as the resettlement and restoration of their livelihoods. This led them into doing very strange businesses such as buying vehicles which they eventually failed to manage so the opportunity that was given to them to express their opinions was not properly utilised due to the excitement that surrounded their expectations for money.

However, during their meetings with the project officials, the people asked them for health services in the area, they also asked them for an improvement in the education services which led to the renovation of some class rooms of Budondo primary school and Kyabira P/S respectively. The project also promised them to improve on the health services in the area especially at Budondo health centre which it has not done up to now. The project had also promised to construct boreholes in the resettlement areas to increase on the number of available water sources but the project managed to did only two boreholes in every affected villages which were not even fully constructed to completion.

The people had also asked for fishing facilities such as nets, boats, hooks and many more but the project did not honour their request although it had accepted and also committed itself to provide them to those who wanted them.

Qn3: Do you think the compensation and resettlement packages were fair to every one?

Answer: No. It was not fair at all to every one. Initially, people’s property was valued at higher rates than those that were finally used to effect their payments. So people were confused and discontented with how the final compensation packages were computed and how they arrived at the final figures which were contradicting those that were reflected in their forms. Also, towards the end of the entire process the project refused completely to compensate crops between 1-4 months old which greatly affected the compensation packages for the people who were engaged in the cultivation of horticulture crops such as vegetables, beans, maize, etc.. Majority of the affected people were horticultural farmers
Because out of experience it is more benefitting and paying to grow such crops which generate incomes at every end of a season which are normally two for each crop in every year.
**Qn4: Are there grievances which have not yet been settled?**

Answer: Yes, for instance in Ivunamba village a case is still pending in court about failure of the project to compensate on affected person the right amount of money which is reflected in this compensation forms. Besides that, the project had promised the affected people whose land was not completely taken to provide them with land titles for the remaining places of their land which they have not done up to now. These inconsistencies and irregularities in the implementation process have created suspicion among the affected people about the sincerity of the project officials.

**Qn5: Do you think that the affected people have eventually been able to restore or improve their livelihood.**

Answer: I don’t think so, instead they have declined because many of them did not invest their money properly to enable them replace their agricultural income with other activities. Majority of them lost their land and could not replace it with other land of the same size and potential and they no longer have any where to plant their crops although they were warned in advance about these consequences.

The only good thing is that many of them managed to build permanent house made of bricks, cement and sand but their cash incomes and subsistence condition have greatly deteriorated due to lack of land for agricultural production.

**Qn6: Is there a land pressure problem in the area as a result of the project land taken?**

Answer: The affected people were farmers and they are still farmers up to now. Their land was taken away and they did not properly utilise their compensation packages into alternative income generating activities. They have very small pieces of land on which more than 10 people on average stay at each household. Those that survived on renting/hiring land are also affected because the land is no longer available for such purposes since most of it was taken away by the project.

**Qn7: Did the courses organised by AESNP provide sufficient opportunities to replace PAPs lost incomes by other activities?**

Answer: The course were not useful to a large extent because most affected people did not implement them. These courses had prepared people to engage themselves in simple manageable business which did not require too much supervision and coordination skills. People did not heed to these courses and instead they went into the transport industry which many failed to managed because of the nature of competition and innovation that is involved in the industry. Majority of them did not have the necessary skills of experience to manage such businesses. Surprisingly, though expected, is the fact that nearly all of them who had invested their money in such businesses have failed to managed them. For instances, in just one village of Namizi west, there were over 16 vehicles shortly after the compensation process was completed but none of these is still there currently.

**Qn8: Is there specific impact on health related with the resettlement and compensation process?**

Answer: Yes, there is some negative impact on health resulting from this process although not very significant. For instances, due to scarcity of land, people are now congested on small pieces of land which increases their vulnerability to diseases just, in case of an outbreak of an epidemic.

In education, the schools of Budondo and Kyabirwa primary have had some of their class rooms which were originally in a sorry state being improved by the project. Also, the soft power project realised that there was a gap in the education services that was created as a result of the resettlement and compensation process and decided to renovate many schools throughout the sub-county including building a clinic in the village of Kyabirwa.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT GENERAL BACKGROUND

The Bujagali Hydropower Project (hereinafter "Project" or "HPP") is a proposed 250 MW hydropower facility on the Victoria Nile in the Republic of Uganda. It is located at Dumbbell Island, approximately 8 km downstream (i.e. north) of the Town of Jinja (see Figure 1). Bujagali Energy Limited ("BEL") is the proponent of this project.

Development of the HPP was first initiated by AES Nile Power Ltd., ("AESNP") in the late 1990's. Among other things, AESNP prepared Environmental Impact Statement documentation for the Project that was approved by the Government of Uganda's National Environmental Management Authority ("NEMA") in 1999/2001, and by the World Bank, IFC and African Development Bank Boards in December 2001.

In 2003 AESNP withdrew from the Project. Subsequent to AESNP pullout, the Government of Uganda ("GoU") initiated an international bidding process for the development of the project. BEL, a project-specific partnership of Sithe Global Power (USA) and IPS Limited (Kenya), won that bid.

The lenders' Board approvals and the permits issued by NEMA for AESNP's, are no longer valid. Thus, BEL was required to prepare and submit for approvals new Social and Environmental Assessment (SEA) documentation. This report (Community Development Plan) is part of that SEA Documentation.

For this SEA assignment, BEL has appointed a consulting team led by R.J. Burnside International Limited of Canada to conduct and oversee the SEA tasks, manage the SEA process on behalf of BEL, and author the SEA documentation to comply with GoU and international lender requirements. Within the general SEA exercise, this specific report has been prepared by Frederic Giovannetti, a sub-consultant to R.J. Burnside International Ltd. SEA work started in January 2006.

1.2 BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The hydropower facility will consist of a power station housing five 50-megawatt turbines with an associated 28 m high earth-filled dam and spillway works. The project will require about 125 ha of permanent land take (45 ha for the project facilities themselves and 80 ha of newly inundated area adjacent to the Victoria Nile River) and about 113 ha of temporary land take for the project's ancillary facilities (concrete batching plant, roads, cofferdams, rock quarries and stockpile areas).

The dam will impound a reservoir extending back to the tailrace area of the Nalubaale (Owen Falls) and Kiira (Owen Falls Extension) facilities, inundating Bujagali Falls amongst others (see inset of Figure 1). The reservoir waters will be contained within the steeply incised banks of the Victoria Nile between Dumbbell Island and Owen Falls, thereby minimizing the amount of newly inundated land.

In order to interconnect the HPP with the National Grid, the Uganda Electrical Transmission Company Limited ("UECTL") is developing the Bujagali Interconnection project ("IP"). The IP will be constructed, owned, and operated by the UECTL. The IP constitutes an "associated facility" for the Bujagali HPP according to the IFC's definition of "Area of Influence" (IFC Performance Standard 1, 2006). UECTL has contracted BEL to assist with the development of the IP, including the SEA documentation. The "Integrated SEA Summary for the Bujagali Hydropower Project and the Bujagali Interconnection Project" that accompanies the SEA integrates the findings of the HPP SEA and the IP SEA in one place. A specific CDAP is prepared and submitted for the Interconnection Project as part of the Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan.
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1.3 PROJECT SCHEDULE

BEL was awarded the HPP in 2005 following an international tendering process. In overview, BEL expects to complete financing and start construction by mid-2007. Construction would be completed in early 2011.

1.4 SCOPE OF THIS DOCUMENT

1.4.1 Social Documentation submitted within the SEA

The contents of the general SEA report are designed to meet requirements of the GoU as well as the policies and guidelines of the various International Financial Institutions (IFIs) that are expected to finance the project.

As far as documents presenting social mitigations and action plans are concerned, the following documents are prepared:

- Bujagali Hydropower Project:
  - Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan,
  - Community Development Action Plan (this document),
  - Environmental and Social Action Plan (Section 8 of the general SEA report),
- Bujagali Interconnection Project:
  - Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan,
  - Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan.

1.4.2 Scope of this Document

BEL with consultants has prepared this Community Development Action Plan to address proposed efforts to participate in the promotion of long term local economic and social development. These efforts will supplement mitigation measures committed upon by BEL as part of the Social and Environmental Assessment (SEA) and contained in the Environmental and Social Action Plan and in the Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan. Measures described in the two above-mentioned documents (SEA and APRAP) focus on mitigating identified Project impacts. The CDAP addresses support the Project will provide to communities beyond compliance, as well as in some cases to help local communities deal with more indirect impacts (such as indirect impacts on water supply) and to enhance socio-economic development. The following sketch summarizes the scope of these three different documents (but see also Section 3.4, below, re: linkages):

**Figure 2: Linkages Between the Different Social Documents Presented within the SEA**

```
[Diagram showing linkages between social documents]
```

F. Giovannetti – December 2006
2  OVERVIEW OF THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE CDAP AREA

2.1  ADMINISTRATIVE AND POLITICAL ORGANIZATION

Uganda has a decentralized form of Government, with a large level of devolution to Districts. Districts are further divided into counties, sub-counties, parishes and villages. At each level the area is run by elected local councils (LC5 at District level to LC1 at village level). Districts (LC5), sub-counties (LC3) and villages (LC1) generally play the most important role in local government.

In the project area, the River Nile forms the boundary between Jinja District on the east bank and Mukono District on the west bank. Within Jinja District, the area directly affected by the project lies within Budondo Sub-county (LC3) within which lie the villages (LC1) of Kyabirwa, Ivunamba, Bujagali and Namizi. Within Mukono District the area directly affected lies in Wakisi sub-county within which lie the villages of Naminya, Buloba, Malindi and Kikubamutwe. Administrative areas are shown on Figure 2.

The Nile River also forms the limit between the traditional kingdoms of Buganda to the West and Busoga to the East.

2.2  HISTORY

In the pre-colonial period both river banks were settled but the east bank was particularly densely populated being the heart of Busoga land. In the second half of the 19th century, however, the population decreased due to a sleeping sickness epidemic. The west bank was less severely affected.

During the colonial period, the east bank was repopulated and there was extensive settlement and clearing of forest. On the west bank, extensive areas of forest were cleared following the eradication of the mbwa fly (the sleeping sickness vector) in 1952. Settlers came from all parts of Uganda, particularly the south-eastern part of the country, as well as from other East African countries. As a result both banks have a very heterogeneous population. The best land was cleared first and cash crops were planted, particularly cotton. Bush vegetation was left in swampy areas and on the dry hills. Later, coffee was planted and cassava, sweet potatoes and groundnuts introduced as subsistence food crops. Jinja town grew rapidly in the 1950s in the wake of the construction of the Owen Falls dam (now renamed Nalubaale).

After Independence, coffee was developed as the main cash crop. Jinja continued to expand and became a marketing centre and industrial base. The area was relatively prosperous.

However, with the onset of political instability there was economic collapse. Jinja town was adversely affected. People were afraid of accumulating wealth and reverted to subsistence agriculture.

Since the return of political stability in 1985, population pressure in the area has increased, and the subdivision of land has intensified. Plots were divided into long strips stretching from the roads to the hills or swamps to include both fertile and poorer quality land. Virtually the entire area is now cultivated and very little forest remains.

2.3  DEMOGRAPHIC CONDITIONS

Demographic data at the district level was obtained from the 2002 census (GoU, 2002). The total populations of Jinja and Mukono Districts in 2002 were 387,573 and 785,393, respectively, with population in Mukono District presumably having dropped from 824,606 in the 1991 census as a result of the creation of Wakiso District. The growth rates of the population in the two districts were 2.5 percent and 2.6 percent per annum respectively between 1991 and 2002, which was below the national average of 3.3 percent per annum.
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The population of both districts was 49 percent male and 51 percent female for Jinja District; 50 percent male and 50 percent female for Mukono District. In Mukono District 49 percent of the population was under the age of 15 while in Jinja District the proportion was 46 percent. In Mukono District 82.8 percent of the population lived in rural areas whilst in Jinja District the proportion is only 77.9 percent due to the presence of the Jinja urban area, Uganda’s second largest urban centre.

Sixty-seven percent (73.4%) of the population over 10 years of age is literate in Jinja District whilst in Mukono it is 79 percent. In both districts it is higher than the national average (68 percent). The proportion of the population over the age of six who have never attended school is 13.2 percent in Jinja District and 13 percent in Mukono compared to a national average of 32 percent. Overall literacy rate was 68 percent for persons aged 10 years and above, with 76 percent male and 61 percent female. In conclusion, standards of education in the study area are generally higher than at the national level, particularly in Jinja District.

The proportion of economically active population (defined as between 10 and 64 years) is higher in Jinja District (53 percent) than in Mukono (29 percent), and both are lower than the national average (60.5 percent). These trends relate closely to the trends in educational enrolment described above. The proportion of economically active population engaged in agriculture is 43 percent in Jinja District compared to 53 percent in Mukono and 71 percent nationally. In Jinja, the proportion of the population in the sales and service sector is 0.9 percent, whereas in Mukono, it is 18.7 percent. Within the project-affected area, 46 percent of affected people are primarily involved in agriculture, while 16 percent are involved in business, 15 percent are students, 4 percent are fishermen and 4 percent are bicycle or taxi drivers (AESNP RCDAP, 2001).

2.4 SETTLEMENT PATTERNS

The town of Jinja is the second largest town in Uganda and the administrative centre for Jinja District. Located on the East Bank, it forms an urban agglomeration with the smaller town of Njeru on the West Bank. Together, these two towns are an industrial center with paper, textile, beer, plastics, flour milling, food processing, leather and other industries. Jinja has a substantial commercial center providing hotel, business and social services. It also functions as a tourist base for visitors to the source of the Nile and the Bujagali Falls and as a marketing centre for agricultural produce from the surrounding area. The town has a strategic location on the main route from Kampala to Mombasa in Kenya, which also gives it a significant trading function.

Outside of Jinja on the east bank, settlement is concentrated along the main road from Jinja to Kamuli, and along tracks between this road and the Nile River. It is more dispersed and evenly distributed than on the west bank. The villages of Kyabirwa, Namizi and Buyala are clearly defined by pronounced valleys. Ivunamba is a sizeable trading centre with grocery shops, butchers, tailors, workshops, restaurants and market stalls.

On the west bank, settlement is concentrated along the main Jinja -Kayunga road. There is almost continual linear development along this road through the project area. Between the main road and the river a number of minor roads and tracks give access to clusters of homesteads within the villages of Nkokonjeru, Naminya, Buloba, Malindi and Kikubamutwe. Settlement is generally on higher land.

Figure 2 above gives an overview of settlement patterns.
2.5 HOUSING AND PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE

Housing in the rural areas is constructed mainly in family compounds. Buildings are either ‘temporary’ (built with traditional materials), ‘semi-permanent’ (with traditional walls and corrugated iron roofs) or ‘permanent’ (with brick or concrete walls). The majority of housing is owner-occupied. Water is obtained from the river and from boreholes, wells and springs. Sanitation is normally via traditionally-built pit latrines.

Charcoal is generally used for cooking and kerosene for lighting. Electricity is in theory available from a low voltage line running along the roads on both banks, but in fact it is cut off at least 50% of the time as a result of load-shedding.

There are six primary schools in the project area. Several organizations, including AESNP, have participated in refurbishing primary schools in the recent past. Secondary schooling is provided in Jinja town. There are no significant recreation facilities for local people in the area, other than the Bujagali picnic site. There are no fixed line telecommunication in the rural areas but cellular phone services are available everywhere.

2.6 PUBLIC HEALTH

2.6.1 Availability of Health Services in the Project Area

Health centers in Uganda are categorized according to the level of services they are able to provide, from 1 (village level health posts) to 5 (district and regional hospitals). Two local health centers serve the population of the project area, as follows:

- On the west bank of the Nile (Mukono District), approximately 20 km from Jinja, is the Wakisi health center level 3; this center supports lower level health facilities, such as the Kalagala (north to Wakisi) and Naminya (in the Project-Affected Area) health centers (both level 2);
- On the east bank of the project area, approximately 15 km north of Jinja, is Budondo Health Centre level 4, which amongst others supports the Iivunamba level 2 health centre.

These rural health units refer difficult cases and emergencies to Jinja Hospital, which is a general hospital with complete medical, surgical, laboratory, radiological and other diagnostic and treatment services.

2.6.2 Health Baseline Situation

Table 1 hereunder gives basic health statistics for Jinja and Mukono Districts in comparison to Uganda national figures. Jinja District ranks better than Mukono District, and both districts rank higher than the national averages.

Table 1: Health Indicators for Jinja and Mukono Districts as Compared with Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Category</th>
<th>Jinja District</th>
<th>Mukono District</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (per km²)</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertility and mortality rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fertility rate</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate/1000</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Mortality Rate /1000</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities and inpatients Beds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Units</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Beds</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>25,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population within 5 km radius of health facility (%)</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deployment of Trained Health personnel</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>16,866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Abstract, 2002, Republic of Uganda & District Planning Offices (Jinja and Mukono)
Morbidity data for 2005-2006 were obtained from recorded outpatient diagnoses in the health institutions of the project area. Disease incidence patterns were similar at all health facilities. Specific data for the Wakisi and Budondo health centers are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

### Table 2: Outpatients Diagnoses for Wakisi Health Centre - June 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnoses</th>
<th>Under five years old</th>
<th>Five years and above</th>
<th>All ages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of all</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaria</td>
<td>2054</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARI-Not Pneumonia</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarrhoea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intestinal Worms</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARI- Pneumonia</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin Diseases</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaemia</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Diseases</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma (Injuries and Wounds)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear Diseases</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schistosomiasis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Directorate of Health Mukono District (Annual report)

### Table 3: Outpatients diagnoses for Budondo Health Centre - 2005-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnoses</th>
<th>Under five years old</th>
<th>Five years and above</th>
<th>All ages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>% of all</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaria</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>2,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARI-Not Pneumonia</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>1,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarrhoea</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intestinal Worms</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARI- Pneumonia</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin Diseases</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Diseases</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma (Injuries and Wounds)</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear Diseases</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastro intestinal disease</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Directorate of Health Jinja District
2.6.3 HIV/AIDS

In an estimated total population of 24 million, 1,050,555 million people living in Uganda are estimated to have HIV/AIDS, of which about 120,000 have developed AIDS. Nearly 80 percent of those infected with HIV are between the ages of 15-45 years, a most economically productive age group and often fenders of families. Adolescent girls between 15-19 years are 4-6 times more vulnerable than their male age mates. Children have felt a gruesome impact. About 2 million children of less than 18 years are orphans with one or both parents dead. They experience orphanhood at an age when parental guidance and socialization is most desirable. The quality of care, education, nutrition and socialization among these children is often poor.

Three major AIDS Service Organisations exist within the project area:
- The AIDS Service Organisation (TASO),
- AIDS Information Centre (AIC) and
- St Francis Health Care.

These all network with the existing health units of Budondo on the east bank and Wakisi on the west bank. Some HIV/AIDS statistics for the project area are summarized in table 4, with further details in Section 3.6.3. of the SEA report:

Table 4: Cumulative HIV/AIDS cases per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jinja Hospital</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budondo Health Centre</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Directorate of Health Services Jinja District

2.6.4 Other Diseases

Schistosomiasis is a serious public health issue in the Project area. Intestinal infection due to Schistosoma mansoni is the only form infecting man found in the general area of the project. Surveys carried out using Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) techniques (Brooker et al., 2005) indicate infection rates of around 50 percent of population within the project-affected area, and in communities downstream of the project site. This was confirmed by other investigations (NAFIRRI, 2006).

Under the National Bilharzia and Worm Control programme, infections are treated with praziquantel, which is also effective against intestinal worms. Schools and communities are treated in sub-counties where prevalence is >50 percent. Where prevalence is between 20 and 50 percent, treatment concentrates on school-aged children only. In areas where prevalence is below 20 percent drugs are provided to the local health facilities for the treatment of any presentable cases. Schools and communities in the Jinja District area of the project have been subjected to praziquantel treatment. The fact that prevalence remains at around 50 percent of the population indicates that there are high rates of re-infection following this treatment.

As shown by Tables 2 and 3 above, malaria is the main reason why outpatients consult in local health centers. In the country as a whole, malaria is responsible for about 30 percent of all hospital attendances and is listed first in the top ten causes of mortality in all age groups under 16 years, and second only to HIV/AIDS as a cause of death in those over 16 (Ministry of Health, 1994).

Because malaria is hyperendemic among the local population, the level of immunity is correspondingly high. The principal risk of serious consequences of infection therefore lies with expatriates and any workers coming from non-malaria areas.

Due to financial constraints, residual insecticides for house spraying are in short supply. Boarding schools are treated routinely with permethrin. Ideally the schools should take responsibility but are unable to do so for financial reasons. People are willing to use bed nets which can be treated with permethrin to control mosquitoes but at UGX 8-10,000 each, the nets are not affordable for the majority of the population. In addition nets
require re-treatment after about six months. General advice includes screening houses against mosquitoes and closing windows before dark.

No incidences of onchocerciasis (river blindness) have been recorded by the two District Health Directorates of Jinja and Mukono in recent years.

In former times there were a number of serious outbreaks of human trypanosomiasis in the Busoga region. The principal vector is the tsetse fly Glossina fuscipes. Flies were found to breed extensively around villages and in areas where the plant Lantana camara is prolific. An active control programme was instituted in the early 1990s, which involved active case finding and passive surveillance, combined with fly control, by spraying along the Nile and use of treated traps.

Infections were reduced by 96 percent over four years and by 2000 the point was reached where only nine or ten new cases of sleeping sickness occurred in a year in a population of about 300,000, and tsetse flies were no longer a problem. Traps are still used, essentially to monitor the occurrence of flies (including other related blood-sucking species).

Animal trypanosomiasis occurs in the area (Acting District Veterinary Officer, Jinja).

Further details on the above diseases can be found in Section 3.6.3. of the SEA report.

2.7 ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES

2.7.1 Overview

46% of households are primarily peasant farmers. While the vast majority of people in the area undertake some farming, a significant number of people are involved in other occupations. These include business / trade, fishing, and bicycle taxi driving.

According to 2001 agricultural statistics from the Jinja District Agricultural Office, the average sustainable land holding in the District is 0.8 ha per compound/household, with a net annual income of UGX 3.7 million or USD 2,055 per compound/household. Based on an average of 8.4 persons per household in the project area (WSAtkins, 1998), the average annual agricultural income per individual is USD 245.

The average annual household income from fishing, according to the AESNP baseline survey is UGX 527,400 (USD 293). As with agricultural income derived from AESNP surveys, the reported income from fishing may have been exaggerated in anticipation of possible compensation for loss of income.

Average income per household from business activities or formal sector employment, according to the baseline survey, is UGX 3.481 M (USD 1,950). Other sources of income include rents and social benefits. The total average annual income per household in the project area is estimated at approximately UGX 8 M or USD 4,440. However, income is not distributed evenly among households in the project area.

The important categories of expenditure are education, food/household essentials, health care, farming, taxes, transport, credit and home building. The costs that are considered to impose hardships on a family are, in general order of importance:

- education,
- acquiring land and health services;
- marriage, death and transport requirements;
- starting a household and having a first born child; and,
- paying taxes and hosting visitors.

People are able to save during the productive seasons of May to July and September to December. However savings are inadequate to address needs during the lean months of January to March when incomes are low and expenditures high.
Any savings are normally used to cover anticipated costs. If more unexpected financial burdens, e.g., a death, occur during a period when income is high, the expense may be manageable but if it occurs during a low income period these costs may have a very negative impact on the household. In such cases, routine needs such as school fees or even money for food may be sacrificed.

Affordable and reliable opportunities for saving and obtaining credit are limited. About 10% of households have a bank account. Micro-Finance institutions are currently not playing an important role in the area. About a third of all households are in debt with the average debt being UGX 850,000 (US$565). Borrowing mainly takes place from friends and relatives rather than financial institutions.

2.7.2 Agriculture

Agriculture is practised as a labour intensive, intercropping system with both cash crops and subsistence crops. The main cash crops grown today are coffee and some sugar cane whilst there has recently been extensive planting of vanilla. The main subsistence food crops grown are bananas, cassava, sweet potatoes, maize, beans, groundnuts, cocoyam, millet, sorghum, peas, sesame, and yams. A range of horticultural crops is grown throughout the year including tomatoes, onions, cabbages, pepper, eggplants and carrots.

Trees are planted for a wide range of reasons including: to demarcate plots; provide shade and windbreaks; to provide a source of fuel and building materials; to produce fruit for sale and household consumption; to provide fodder; and, to improve soil moisture and fertility. The main fruit trees are jackfruit, avocado, mango, oranges and pawpaw.

Few livestock are kept due primarily to a shortage of grazing land although wealthier families on larger plots tend to keep livestock. A few cattle are kept for milk although yields are low. Goats, turkeys and poultry are the main livestock kept, along with some pigs.

There is a clear subdivision of responsibilities between men and women with regard to farming. Women are responsible for food supply including planting, weeding, harvesting, collection of firewood and the preparation of meals as well as childcare, fetching water and household tasks. They generally do more work than men who are responsible for cash income including cash crops, trading and providing income from other activities. They clear the land and are responsible for building houses and looking after trees and animals. Despite the hard work, women generally do not own family land but merely have access to it. This has inhibited women's economic advancement by blocking avenues to credit schemes.

Land is being subdivided and production is being intensified. The number of plots into which a holding was traditionally subdivided was usually proportional to the size of the holding because the largest families tended to have the largest holdings.

In his study of Budondo sub-county, Anderson (1994) considers the smaller holdings to be not only poorer but also less environmentally sustainable. He considers a holding of less than 0.5 ha to be below the threshold to support an average family.

Other problems and constraints to production include:
- Steep slopes and erosion;
- Low capital base and high costs of inputs;
- Pests and plant diseases, especially in coffee and bananas;
- Mechanization not possible due to topography;
- Lack of business planning and management skills;
- Low prices for crops;
- High transport costs and poor roads that become impassable during the rainy season; and,
- Lack of a co-operative approach, which could assist in bulk purchase of inputs, value added to crops and/or access to more lucrative markets.
2.7.3 Fisheries

Four quarterly surveys carried out by FIRRI during 2000 indicate that the most important commercial fish species in the Upper Victoria Nile are the introduced Nile perch and Nile tilapia.

Fishing effort in terms of active fishing canoes showed no major change in 2006 from the April 2000 counts (50 fishing canoes in 2000 vs 51 fishing canoes in 2006) for all the four transects sampled. However, in terms of type of canoes used, there was a 57 percent increase in the more robust Ssese type of craft and a 39 percent decrease in the active dugout type of fishing canoe. The April 2006 survey also revealed an increase in the number of fishers from 89 during 2000 to 128 during 2006. Similarly, there was an increase in the number of fish traders from 12 to 47 (a 74 percent increase) by the April 2006 survey. Further details can be found in the SEA report, Section 3.6.4.4.

The total monthly yield from the four transects was much higher in April 2006 (16,816 kg valued at UGX 12M) compared to April 2000 (7,969 kg valued at UGX 4M) in 2000. However the 2006 figure is heavily influenced by the report from one owner, who may have overstated his catches. If this latter is omitted from the analysis, the overall fish catch in 2006 is similar to that in 2000.

The commercial fishing gears were the same as in 2000, i.e. multifilament gill nets, hooks, cast nets and mosquito nets.

It should be noted that the Uganda Fisheries Master Plan Study (Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries) states that average income for full-time fishermen in Uganda is \textit{circa} USD 280 per annum, which accords well with the estimate for the Bujagali area of USD 350 per annum.

2.7.4 Tourism

The site of the Bujagali hydropower facility is approximately 8 km downstream of the "source of the Nile" (i.e. where Lake Victoria empties into the Victoria Nile). Due to the history and scenic topography of the area, it is attractive to tourists, especially to white water rafters who come to take advantage of the sequence of rapids on the upper reaches of the Victoria Nile.

Four companies currently operate one- or two-day WWR excursions near Bujagali: Adrift, Nile River Explorers (NRE), Equator Rafting and Nalubaale Rafting.

Many white water rafters are primarily adventure and overland tourists. In such cases, Jinja represents a convenient stopping point for tours, where WWR is available as an optional activity.

Research carried out in 2006 as part of this SEA indicates that total rafter numbers are approximately 10,000 per year, with Adrift and NRE each carrying 4,000-5,000 per year, and 800 to 1,000 per year being carried by Equator and Nalubaale combined.

Further details on tourism can be found in the SEA main report, Section 3.6.
3 CDAP STRATEGY AND KEY AREAS OF INTERVENTION

3.1 AESNP'S COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACTION PLAN

3.1.1 Planning

AESNP had prepared in 2000 and 2001 a Community Development Action Plan\(^1\), which was disclosed to the public together with the Environmental Impact Statement in February 2001.

The AESNP Community Development Action Plan (CDAP) was planned to take place in two successive phases:
- Phase I: up to commencement of commercial operations of the Bujagali Hydropower facility (about 5 years);
- Phase II: during the operations phase (30 years), termed “Social Responsibility” program by AESNP in consistency with their overall corporate policies.

For Phase I, AES had committed per the disclosed CDAP to a disbursement of USD 1.8M prior to commercial operations of the facility, excluding compensation and mitigations.

For Phase II, during the operational term, a “Social Responsibility” fund was to be established, whereby monies would have been allocated from the Operational and Maintenance budget to sustain implemented projects and to help develop future projects. In Phase II, the area concerned by the project could have been expanded to include a regional and national viewpoint.

The CDAP prepared by AESNP included the following components:
- Vocational training to enhance employability of local residents, including Project-Affected People (was to be budgeted by the EPC Contractor),
- Development of a commercial area next to the Project’s main construction site, to make it possible for local women to sell food and other goods to Project workers (USD 40,000),
- Water supply to 8 communities in the Project-Affected Area (USD 154,000),
- Extensions to the electricity low tension network into village trade centers in the Project-Affected Area from an existing line (USD 300,000),
- Construction of new landing sites for fishermen, technical assistance and provision of fishing gear (USD 280,000),
- Business creation training and technical assistance, and micro-credit (USD 110,000),
- Upgrades to 5 existing primary, secondary and vocational schools (USD 420,000),
- Tourism (construction of a visitor center at the dam and construction of a cultural centre – budget: USD 150,000),
- Upgrades to existing community health centers at Budondo and Naminya (USD 300,000),
- Community resource centers established in existing buildings, intended to provide services such as small business support, libraries, training and meeting rooms, etc… (USD 50,000).

3.1.2 Implementation

Before withdrawing from the Project in 2003, AESNP had undertaken some of the community development activities committed upon in the publicly-disclosed RCDAP, mainly the following:
- Upgrades and/or expansions of some primary schools, particularly the one in Kyabirwa (East Bank),
- Drilling of 8 boreholes fitted with “Orbit” handpumps in the Project-Affected Communities (plus one in the Naminya resettlement site),
- Limited upgrades at the existing Budondo health centre and establishment of the Naminya health centre in the “model house” at the Naminya resettlement site.

However, other activities anticipated under the RCDAP were not implemented, particularly the following:
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- Construction of an additional classroom block at the Naminya R/C primary school,
- Electricity supply, although detailed design was indeed undertaken,
- Support to the development of tourism activities,
- Support to fisheries,
- Micro-credit,
- “Community resource centres”.

The current situation of drinking water supply in affected communities is a matter of specific concern. While the initial CDAP made provision for equipment of the wells with India Mark II pumps, a proven model, AESNP with support from DWD equipped wells with “Orbit” handpumps from South Africa, previously unknown in Uganda. No maintenance system (trained artisans and spare parts) was in place for these pumps, and as a result all are now out of order except one (in the resettlement site). These pumps therefore need to be changed to a more common model such as India Mark II. In addition, a maintenance system needs to be established.

3.2 BEL’S COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

3.2.1 Socio-Economic Background for the BEL CDAP

Extensive socio-economic surveys have been carried out in the Project-Affected Area, by WS Atkins as part of the EIA in 1998, and by AESNP in 2000 prior to the RAP implementation. Focus is put here on those relevant to the CDAP strategy, which are the following:

- There is an overwhelming expectation in communities that the Project sponsor develop basic infrastructure such as power, water, and education and health facilities;
- Land is scarce and agricultural land is not easily accessible to all; younger people and women may have difficulties in this regard;
- Cash crops tend to be men’s crops and women find it difficult to get monetary incomes from agricultural activities, since they are mainly in charge of subsistence crops;
- The extreme subdivision of land, intercropping and the topography together with the limited investment capacity at household level, make it impossible to achieve significant increases in crop productivity through mechanization; improvements in farming incomes may result mainly from better marketing;
- The income analysis has shown that there are contrasting categories of PAPs, with the full range of intermediary incomes in between:
  -About 10% of affected household heads are already involved in business, whether in connection with agriculture or in other fields; they are accustomed to financial services and may use a bank account or borrow money from various institutions in order to invest into small enterprises; usually, these people have sufficient land in the area or elsewhere and own other assets such as buildings or livestock;
  - At the other end of the social scale, some people have obvious difficulties during the lean season, have to borrow to meet the family’s basic needs at these periods; usually, they own little or no land;

Overall, the implications for the BEL CDAP of this analysis are the following:

- Quick-impact activities in the social infrastructure field are critical to manage community expectations, particularly as there is some frustration with activities left incomplete by AESNP;
- As land is scarce and agricultural potential remains limited, new opportunities in non-agricultural fields must be developed, especially to women and the younger generation;
- But not all in the area will be able to take these opportunities; as in many other areas in Africa, agriculture will be the safety net that will allow those who are not able to capture new business opportunities to maintain their livelihoods; opportunities in agriculture must also be developed, particularly to the benefit of more vulnerable women.
3.2.2 Key Principles of the BEL CDAP

Key principles underlying the proposed BEL CDAP strategy are the following:
- Build on the existing CDAP framework prepared by AESNP, and complete activities started but left incomplete by AESNP when they left Uganda,
- Avoid taking over or competing with responsibilities that belong to the different levels of the Government, particularly the LC5, LC3 and LC1;
- Avoid an ad-hoc, charity-type approach, whereby BEL would meet supposedly urgent community needs without a long term sustainability perspective;
- Ensure consistency with broader regional development planning objectives as put forward by the Government of Uganda, as well as other planned development projects conducted with bilateral or multilateral agencies;
- Provide a multiplier effect to impact mitigation measures committed upon by BEL, specifically through training and capacity building to ensure long-term sustainability of re-established livelihoods, community infrastructure and services;
- Put a specific focus on activities beneficial to females, both in the business development and agriculture enhancement components;
- Develop some “quick-impact” activities that will help build or restore confidence within the community;
- Anticipate from the very beginning of activities the eventual disengagement of BEL from their funding and management, particularly in areas where BEL may participate in infrastructure upgrades.

3.2.3 Strategic Orientation of the BEL CDAP

The general strategy which underlies the proposed Community Development Action Plan is the following:

- Focus the CDAP on the following areas:
  1. Improve local social infrastructure as part of quick-impact activities to enhance community support and confidence and fix projects left incomplete by AESNP:
     - improve water supply;
     - improve education and health facilities;
  2. Support sustainable economic development:
     - Enhance direct and indirect employment opportunities:
       - the construction of the dam will provide direct sources of employment; the job opportunities will be directed to the affected communities to the extent possible and employability must be improved;
       - measures will be taken to enhance indirect employment;
     - Enhance agricultural productivity and farm produce marketing;
     - Develop non agricultural sources of livelihood;
- Schedule the CDAP in two successive phases:
  o Pre-construction: Quick-Impact activities before commencement of construction (from June 2006 to June 2007);
  o Construction: CDAP activities during the construction phase (from July 2007 to 1st quarter 2011).

Further to these two phases, BEL will monitor implemented projects and will be able to intervene to fix observed problems. Some limited community development initiatives might be initiated and implemented during this phase, depending on communities’ requests.
3.3 **PROJECT AREA FOR THE BEL CDAP**

The area that will benefit from the Community Development Action Plan comprises of the 8 affected villages (LC1s), as follows:

- West Bank (Mukono District): Naminya, Buloba, Malindi, Kikubamutwe;
- East Bank (Jinja District): Bujagali, Ivunamba, Kyabirwa, Namizi.

In addition, the two LC3 headquarter localities of Wakisi (West Bank) and Budondo (East Bank) could be considered for activities in the areas of health and education.

3.4 **LINKAGES WITH MITIGATION PLANS**

The SEA includes mitigation measures that are expected to provide community benefits well beyond their mitigation purpose. Amongst others, these include the following:

- BEL's hiring policies will give priority to local residents for Project-related employment, at both construction and operation phases; these policies apply not only to BEL but also to its construction and operation contractors.
- BEL develops a procurement/outsourcing policy that will give priority to local and regional small and medium businesses wherever these can provide services.
- Following the assessment of past resettlement activities carried out in the framework of this SEA, BEL will promote activities aimed at enhancing livelihood restoration of Project-displaced people, including:
  - Agricultural improvement activities, with a focus on market gardening,
  - Promotion of small-scale animal husbandry,
  - Support to small businesses through awareness, promotion and training, micro-credit, technical assistance and marketing assistance.

Mitigation measures are commitments the Company makes to abate environmental, economic and social impacts of its project, whereas the CDAP is a supplemental BEL initiative aiming to provide long term benefits to the community, above and beyond impact mitigation. However, there are many areas of linkages between the CDAP and mitigation measures, particularly those anticipated under the APRAP. As it would be ineffective to have two separate initiatives aiming, for example, at agricultural improvement, these will be implemented jointly. Budgets are nonetheless presented separately, to provide a clear distinction between funds earmarked for livelihood improvement activities resulting from the APRAP and those resulting from the CDAP.
4 PRE-CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

4.1 WATER SUPPLY

Water is clearly mentioned as the 1st priority by communities in the Project area. Only one of the 9 water wells installed by AESNP as mitigations to hindered access to the Nile River in the affected communities is currently operational, the one installed at the Naminya resettlement site. The 9 AESNP water wells are drilled boreholes with PVC casing and a concrete pad, and were fitted with one “Orbit” handpump each. No spare parts appear to be available for these handpumps, and no maintenance system had been put in place when they were installed (no trained artisans for maintenance, no spare part retail system). Although these water supply enhancement measures could be regarded as mitigations, they are addressed in this CDAP as they clearly include a community development component, particularly in terms of community empowerment in view of management and maintenance.

BEL has decided to change the Orbit handpumps for a more reliable and more common model, the India Mark 2 handpump. This model is widely distributed in East Africa, spare parts are available, and artisans have been trained to take care of them.

Another 8 boreholes were drilled by AESNP but were not fitted with a handpump at the time. These 8 boreholes will also be equipped with a new India Mark 2 handpump, subject to well productivity testing.

In terms of equipment of the communities, the final situation after installation of new handpumps on all 17 boreholes will be as follows:

- **West Bank:**
  - Kikubamutwe: 2 wells,
  - Malindi: 2 wells,
  - Buloba: 2 wells,
  - Naminya: 2 wells,
  - Naminya resettlement site: 1 well.

- **East Bank:**
  - Kyabirwa: 2 wells,
  - Bujagali: 2 wells,
  - Ivunamba: 2 wells,
  - Namizi: 2 wells.

BEL is entering into a turnkey contract with a trustworthy Ugandan contractor, with the following scope:

- dismantle existing pads and pumps,
- clean-up wells (airlift),
- test wells (pump or airlift),
- re-install well pad,
- install new India Mark 2 handpump,
- supply initial batch of wear parts,
- train village caretakers,
- supply initial artisan equipment.

The cost of these services is estimated at about UGX 80M (about USD 45,000). The works should take about 2 months to complete, and kick-off is expected in August 2006.

---

\(^2\) In addition to the AESNP "Orbit" pump at the resettlement site, which is still operational, there is another drilled well with an India Mark 2 handpump at the other end of the resettlement site, that was drilled by DWD before AESNP was involved there, and a spring with improved catchment, that was built by AESNP. In spite of resettlers' complaints about the water situation, it is in fact much better than in the vast majority of Ugandan rural communities with 3 different water points for a population of about 300 individuals (including people living in the neighborhood), while the usual standard of service is one water point for 300 people.
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4.2 EDUCATION

In this pre-construction phase of the CDAP, BEL will dedicate a total budget of USD 15,000 to urgent works in education facilities in the 8 affected communities. A detailed program is being established by BEL in cooperation with the BIU and the Education authorities of both districts. This may include:

- Provision of furniture,
- Construction of additional latrines,
- Repairs of roofs, water supply or other works.

4.3 HEALTH FACILITIES

BEL has consulted with health authorities in both Mukono and Jinka Districts, and with communities in the 8 affected villages. This consultation has revealed that one of the most urgent issues was that the personnel posted by the Mukono Health District in the Naminya level 2 health center did not have accommodation at the site, and had to commute everyday from Jinja. BEL will focus on this issue for the pre-construction phase of the health component of the CDAP, with the following activities:

- Allocation of three vacant houses in the Naminya resettlement site to the Mukono Health District
  - one – the former model house, already used as a health center – for the clinic itself,
  - two for staff accommodation;
- Transfer of the title for the clinic itself to the Mukono District Administration (currently the title is in the name of ULC – Uganda Lands Commission), whereas the ownership for the houses intended for staff accommodation would remain with ULC;
- Limited upgrades to the existing clinic as per agreement with the Mukono District Directorate of Health.

This will be beneficial both to the resettled community and to the village of Naminya at large.
5 CONSTRUCTION PHASE ACTIVITIES

5.1 PARTNERSHIP WITH UETCL

BEL’s remit from UETCL for project management includes implementation of the Construction phase CDAP. However, UETCL will own and operate the interconnection system associated with the Bujagali HPP. UETCL would co-steer the Construction phase of the CDAP with BEL, and participate in its funding.

5.2 ENHANCEMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICES

5.2.1 Water Supply

In the second phase of the CDAP, BEL will work with communities to improve their water supply further, as there is overwhelming demand for improved water supply. AESNP-led consultation, confirmed by consultation carried out by the BEL SEA consultant, indicates however that several communities expect BEL to install piped schemes, drawing water from either Jinja (East Bank) or Njeru (West Bank). Such a solution is nevertheless not advisable at the present time for the following reasons:

- Piped systems will require electricity to operate (booster pumps); as a result of the current load-shedding situation, these would operate only intermittently,
- Communities need to demonstrate the capacity to manage smaller systems, such as handpumps, as a step towards development of a more sophisticated system.

In the second phase of the BEL CDAP, the technology for enhancing community water supply will therefore be the same: drilled wells equipped with handpumps. Subject to further consultation with affected communities, it is tentatively envisaged to add one well in each of the eight affected communities, i.e. 8 wells in total at a cost of about USD 80,000.

5.2.2 Education Facilities

The AESNP CDAP established a detailed program in the educational sector, which included significant works and additional buildings for 5 schools, as follows:

- East Bank:
  - Kyabirwa Primary School: administration block; 2 new classrooms blocks consisting of 14 classrooms; new furniture;
  - Budondo Primary School: renovation of 12 classrooms; construction of new classroom block to accommodate 10 classrooms; furniture; provision of 6 new sanitation facilities.
  - Budondo St Stephens Secondary School: completion of the construction of the laboratory blocks; provision of equipment and furniture.

- West Bank:
  - Naminya Primary School: new classroom block for 10 classes; 12 stance pit latrines; underground water tank; new headmaster office and furniture for the above. This school was intended to accommodate resettlers’ children;
  - Nile Vocational School in Njeru, which was intended as a potential pre-employment training center for the EPC Contractor.

Only Kyabirwa and Budondo primary schools were fully implemented by the time AESNP left.

The situation has considerably changed since 2002, and this component needs to be revisited, in consultation with interested communities on both banks:

- The Nile Vocational School now receives significant funding from the DED, one of the technical cooperation organizations of the German government,
- The NGO “Soft Power”, based in Jinja, has funded upgrades in several schools on the East Bank, and is preparing to launch a similar program on the West Bank.

In addition, adequate balance must be achieved between both banks and between communities on each bank. This component will therefore need comprehensive consultation with:

- The education authorities of both Mukono and Jinja districts, which has started in July 2006;
The local councils at LC5, LC3 and LC1 levels;
- The communities themselves.

The upgrade of the Naminya R/C primary was a commitment made by AESNP, which had two goals:
- Mitigate the additional number of pupils resulting from the resettlement of 34 households at Naminya resettlement site,
- Enhance educational facilities for the community of Naminya as a whole.

Consultation with both the resettled community and the host community indicates that these works are indeed a priority. The school will be upgraded as part of the CDAP, as follows:
- Construction of one 10-classroom block,
- Provision of furniture in respect of the above and upgrade of existing furniture,
- Construction of a headmaster office,
- Construction of a 12-stance pit latrine

The cost of works at the Naminya R/C primary school had been estimated at USD 100,000 in 2001. This cost is re-evaluated at USD 120,000.

5.2.3 Health Facilities

In the Construction Phase CDAP, BEL will consider participating in the upgrade of the following health centers:
- East bank:
  - Budondo (level 4),
  - Ivunamba (level 2),
- West Bank:
  - Wakisi (level 3),
  - Kalagala (level 2).

According to health authorities at District level, all four above-mentioned centers are in need of significant upgrades, interesting structures, staff accommodation, power and water supply, sanitation, security (fences), inadequacy of transport equipment and of medical equipment. A detailed assessment of the condition and needs for each of these 4 health facilities remains to be done, in cooperation with both District Health Directorates and relevant staff at center level.

5.3 Economic Development

5.3.1 Commercial Area Near the Construction Site

BEL with its EPC Contractor will build a commercial area in the vicinity of the contractor’s main base in Kikubamutwe, Dumbbell Island. This market will mainly aim at selling food and basic goods to construction workers. The area will be served with drinking water, latrines, proper run-off water sanitation, and will be made accessible to matatu mini-buses. The necessary surface of the platform is in the order of 5,000 m², with 4 public taps and 4 latrines. One 400 m² roofed structure will be erected, with small concrete stalls underneath.

The daily management of the area will be under the responsibility of a society to be created by the shopkeepers, with assistance from BEL and a local NGO if required.

It is estimated that about 50 jobs could be created, mainly for women. Marketing of local food crops will also indirectly benefit farmers. So that both banks can actually benefit from this opportunity, a boat service or a temporary bridge will be created for women from the East Bank to come and work on this area. The contractor could also utilize this transport/crossing to transport staff from the East Bank.

The general design and implementation details, together with eligibility criteria, will be discussed with local communities and the EPC contractor. Before construction of the commercial area is initiated, consultation will take place with the following groups from both Banks:
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- currently active shopkeepers of the area;
- women currently marketing processed food in the area;
- women’s community-based organizations of the area;
- local leaders (LC1s and LC3s).

The total cost of earthmoving required to create the platform, water supply, latrines and roof work is estimated at USD 50,000.

This area could be further developed into a proper catering facility for the construction phase and beyond, based on a model that has successfully been implemented by several contractors at construction sites on the Chad-Cameroon pipeline: local women with experience in preparing and vending dishes are brought in to prepare and sell cooked dishes to workers. The contractor provides clean drinking water and can provide sanitary control of food and food handling techniques by Project medical staff, as well as training in these areas. Rather than taking their lunches at the construction site mess, non-resident local workers are given a time allowance of say 40 minutes at lunch time and a basket allowance that covers the cost of the meal purchased from a local vendor. This has many advantages:

- Local workers are served the food they like in the quantity they want, while experience indicates that it is not always easy to get catering companies to prepare proper African dishes, as cooks are trained to prepare so-called “continental” food rather, with construction workers also complaining about small quantities of food;
- It avoids congestion of the messes;
- It can boost local businesses and support women willing to start a small catering business.

The introduction of bottled gas, rather than firewood, should also be promoted at this site, as an environmental protection measure.

5.3.2 Small Business Support and Micro-Credit

5.3.2.1 Overview

Subject to consultation with interested stakeholders, BEL will implement a small business support and micro-credit program in the Construction phase of the CDAP.

This program will include the following three components:

- Establishment of a basic business support center on each of the banks, with the following services:
  - Training in business planning and business management, with focus on fisheries, petty trade and agricultural businesses;
  - Support services (assistance in setting up businesses, telecommunication and secretarial services);
- Micro-credit;
- Linkage with BEL and EPC contractor supply chain departments, and support to local businesses being outsourced construction or operation services by BEL or its contractors.

5.3.2.2 Business Support Center

Training services: A set of basic training modules will be developed by an external Ugandan SMME training specialist using existing material and experience. Training modules will need to be simple, practical and follow a building-block approach, involving role-plays and simulation games. It should be assumed that some participants will be illiterate and/or innumerate. Modules will include a basic introduction to the local business environment, identification of products and services and the market for these, understanding budgets and cash flow, sourcing finance for a business, understanding and managing credit, paying taxes, and so forth. Training would be available to any member of the community subject to payment of a small fee (UGX 5,000 for instance). As a linkage with the perspective of end of construction, this training could also be delivered to construction staff about to be retrenched (then at Contractors’ expenses).

Support services: The business support center will be open to potential businesspersons seeking advice in the following matters:

- Legal and paperwork support for those willing to establish a formal business,
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- Tax advice,
- Business planning, economic and financial advice,
- Assistance in preparing loan applications, and in contacting external parties (banks, government institutions, NGOs),
- Translation support from local languages to English and vice versa,
- Typing, photocopying (at a modest charge),
- Tele-communication (phone and fax when available, at a modest charge)

5.3.2.3 Micro-Credit

A revolving credit line will be funded by BEL, and will be managed by an existing Micro-Finance Institution. A credit committee will be set up with the selected Micro-Finance Institution and BEL. This committee will define criteria of eligibility and criteria of priority, together with procedures for appraisal of the sustainability of the credit project.

Loans could be in the order of USD 200 to 1,000 with a repayment period of 3 to 6 months. The retained MFI will be instructed to develop a specific micro-loan package for farmers, whereby the repayment period could be slightly longer to accommodate agricultural calendars and seasonality factors.

5.3.2.4 Linkage with Contractors’ and BEL Procurement

Experience indicates that on major construction projects like the Bujagali HPP, seldom is there significant benefit to small businesses because it is difficult to establish the proper linkages between procurement/outsourcing departments in the construction and operations companies on the one hand, and community development initiatives aiming at developing small business on the other. Reasons for this situation are usually:

- Inability of local small businesses to organize themselves together to be able to deliver large quantities (of food for example);
- Hygiene and quality criteria derived from industrial world standards, that local produces are unable to meet immediately;
- Companies’ preference for managing few contracts with large suppliers rather than multiple contracts with smaller suppliers.

Building on this lesson from other projects, it is proposed to assign a dedicated task manager to activities aimed at enhancing local small businesses through outsourcing by BEL and contractors, at both construction and operations phase, for a period of one year. Areas of focus for outsourcing supplies and services to local small and medium businesses will be the following:

- Security and patrolling services,
- Laundry, cleaning and catering services,
- Market gardening and provision of fresh produce in general, such as poultry, meat, vegetables, eggs, fish,
- Restoration, revegetation and landscaping of temporarily occupied areas such as borrow and staging areas,
- Construction works.

5.3.2.5 Budget

The following table shows the budget for the business support and micro-credit sub-project:
Table 5: Budget for the Business Support Sub-Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establishment of two business support centers</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Training sessions for 500 people, including trainers and logistics</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Credit line</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Administration and management of the credit line</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Linkage with procurement – Ugandan task manager for 12 months</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Contingencies 10%</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>286,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.3 Fisheries

5.3.3.1 Overview

As a result of studies and consultations carried out by AESNP, the following Community Development activities were then proposed to the local community in the field of fishery development:

- training and contribution to a better organization and equipment by fishermen of catches, stock management, and marketing;
- financial services to fishermen who may be willing to acquire appropriate equipment;
- buying of this equipment on their behalf to get better prices and better quality.

Also, the access to the reservoir may be more difficult to fishermen after inundation due to the operational drawdown of water within the reservoir, which may leave a muddy margin on the bank. It is proposed to build landing site structures (metallic, rock, concrete or wood), at appropriate places. This is actually an impact mitigation measure, but as detailed hereunder, it will provide the opportunity for more developments in terms of facilities, equipment and training.

BEL will consult again with communities, and will develop an updated fisheries program in collaboration with NAFIRRI, the Uganda national fisheries research institute based in Jinja.

5.3.3.2 Landing Sites and Related Facilities

Consultations with the fishermen associations regarding potential development location of landing sites concluded with 4 new locations being proposed. Three locations were identified on the West Bank, two slightly upstream of Dumbbell Island and one further upstream. The East Bank proposed a single location at Namizi upstream of Dumbbell Island. One additional site could be located along the east bank in the Kyabirwa vicinity.

Three potential landing site structures were investigated and consulted upon; the Associations (due to high maintenance costs) disregarded a floating jetty; gabions were also discounted due to the severe topography of the riverbank and erosion concerns. The Associations’ preferred structure is a stepped bench with concrete flooring. This has the advantage of low maintenance and a stable platform suitable for a large number of boats to use.

With improved access and landing facilities, AESNP had proposed to develop a market area at each of these locations consisting of a small trading center with stalls and sanitation. The objective of these developments would be to provide a dedicated local fish market within the parishes of the affected area where villagers and fish mongers from Jinja could purchase fresh produce.

The Associations’ management committees (now called “Beach Management Committees” under the Fish Act) will take the administrative responsibility of these facilities. Land rights necessary for these facilities have been acquired during the resettlement process. Temporary land required for construction purposes when freed up will be developed and land title will be transferred to the respective management committees.
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5.3.3.3 **Boats and fishing equipment**

BEL could also consider the provision of fishing equipment to each Management Committee in the form of boats, lifejackets, paddles, nets of various sizes, hooks, mooring ropes and other miscellaneous fishing tackle. Mobile phones can be useful to allow fishermen to access markets more easily.

5.3.3.4 **Training**

Due to the inundation the river’s characteristics will change. AESNP had proposed that a training scheme be implemented to prepare the Associations members for this change. A training proposal and program had been developed by NAFFIRI, which has local knowledge of the area, river, ecological conditions and current local fishing methods employed. This proposal will need to be updated. The program was designed to provide fishermen with sufficient knowledge and build up their skill base to allow them to safely fish in the deeper, slower flowing waters of the Nile after inundation. The training program will be conducted in the affected villages on both the eastern and western banks.

It will involve practical demonstrations of the different equipment and fishing methods to be employed, and incorporate discussions regarding safety on water, boating techniques and limitations, maintenance and use of new equipment and advice regarding marketing and the fishing industry in general, with a specific focus on empowering fishermen in their relationship with middlemen.

5.3.3.5 **Budget and implementation schedule**

This program will be phased in consistency with the construction and impoundment planning. Table 6 below presents the provisional budget for the fisheries sub-project.

**Table 6: Budget for the Fisheries Sub-Project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consultation with Fishermen Management Committees</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provision of equipment</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Construction of landing facilities and market areas, technical studies</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Contingencies 10%</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>182,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.4 **Agriculture**

Considering the scarcity of land, support to agriculture should focus on intensification and high-value added crops. Linkage with construction catering needs will be sought, but as this is clearly not sustainable in the long term, better marketing in general should be supported.

Areas of intervention will include the following:

- Organization of producers in groups to support extension services and to better structure marketing of local produce in Jinja and Kampala;
- Agricultural extension services:
  - Provision of technical advice and assistance for new crops, new varieties, fertilization, soil preparation, agro-forestry and erosion control, intensification and market gardening;

---

As a mitigation to the potential increase in local erosion, which is likely to increase around reservoir margins, it is proposed to plant trees along these banks. Farmers, however, have an obvious role to play in the reservoir protection, as well as in the protection and potentially the management of these plantations.
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- Subsidized provision of improved seeds and fertilizers to groups;
- Promotion of intensive modes of cultivation (mushrooms, tree nurseries);
- Integration agriculture / livestock (use of organic matter);
- Animal husbandry extension services:
  - Promotion of new animal species (grasscutters) and breeds (higher productivity pigs and poultry for instance);
  - Integration agriculture / livestock (use of agricultural by-products);
  - Better methods for animal nutrition;
  - Improved slaughtering and hygiene management;
- Management support ("farming as a business").

Agricultural extension requires time to produce results. The agriculture program is therefore scheduled to last for five years, slightly beyond the Construction phase. An evaluation at the end of this five-year period will consider the possibility to expand this program beyond the initial five years, in case it appears a longer support period is needed.

Table 7 below shows the budget for this component.

**Table 7: Budget for the Agriculture Sub-Project (5 years)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extension services (5 x 100,000)</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Demonstration projects and subsidies to pilot groups in agriculture</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstration projects and subsidies to pilot groups in animal husbandry</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Training sessions</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Contingencies 10%</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>935,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 IMPLEMENTATION

6.1 ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

The CDAP will be directly implemented by BEL in both Pre-Construction and Construction phases, with participation from recognized NGOs, consultants and contractors for certain components. UETCL is expected to participate in the funding of the Construction phase. The Bujagali Implementation Unit will also participate in consultation activities, bringing in its knowledge of the communities and of the Project history.

For the implementation of the CDAP, as well as for other purposes related with social and economic monitoring of affected people (see APRAP), BEL will put in place a Social Unit, which will include the following personnel:
- One head of unit, specifically responsible for the implementation of the CDAP,
- One officer in charge of monitoring affected people,
- One database officer,
- One agricultural officer,
- One social worker, specifically in charge of monitoring vulnerable people.

This Social Unit will be in place by financial close. Ugandan and international consultants will support the Social Unit as the need arises.

6.2 OVERALL CDAP BUDGET

6.2.1 Pre-Construction and Construction Phases

The total funding needed for identified activities is presented in Table 8 below.

Table 8: Overall CDAP Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>PRE-CONSTRUCTION PHASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-a</td>
<td>Water supply</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-b</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-c</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total Pre-Construction Phase</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION PHASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-a</td>
<td>Water supply</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-b</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-c</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-d</td>
<td>Commercial area</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-e</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>182,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-f</td>
<td>Small business support</td>
<td>286,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-g</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>935,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total Construction Phase</td>
<td>1,753,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-a</td>
<td>Social Unit – Five years of operation</td>
<td>361,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total Implementation</td>
<td>361,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONTINGENCIES – 10%</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>2,399,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.2.2 Further Activities

During Operations, BEL will focus on completing and monitoring activities launched during the Pre-Construction and Construction phases. In addition, a Social Fund will be established to finance community development initiatives in the same area. Lessons learnt from the initial phases will be used to improve the implementation of these further activities.

6.3 IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

Figure 4 below shows the implementation schedule of the CDAP.
### Figure 4: CDAP Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Name</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRE-CONSTRUCTION PHASE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drilling and testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpump installation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of school facilities and work plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and contracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of staff access to Mukono health district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed need assessment for 2nd phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION PHASE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of BEL'S Social Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drilling and testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handpump installation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of plots and stalls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Support and Micro-Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of business support centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with Beach Management Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification and construction of landing sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification and procurement of equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of agricultural extension organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First pilot projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing extension and training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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