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1.0 Introduction

This document provides the Public Consultation and Disclosure plan (PCDP) for the Bujagali Interconnection Project (IP). This PCDP outlines community engagement activities that were undertaken during the preparation of the Social and Environmental Assessment (SEA) for the HPP. It also provides an outline of planned community engagement activities that are to be undertaken leading up to, and during the construction of the IP which are to be done in association with the Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan (RCDAP) and Social and Environmental Action Plans (SEAPs). A separate stand-alone IP PCDP Report has also been prepared which includes additional details on the consultation and disclosure process.

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, it 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 minimize negative effects.

The PCDP has built on public consultation 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, UETCL has sought to obtain alternative views on the design and construction of the transmission system, including concerns of potential impacts and ways to mitigate such impacts. Based on this input, UETCL 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 RCDAP).

1.1 Project Description

The proposed Bujagali hydropower facility is located at Dumbbell Island, 70 km east of Kampala the capital city, and approximately 15 km north of Jinja, the second largest town in Uganda in terms of both population and industrial capacity. The hydropower project is being designed for a final capacity of 250 MW.
New transmission lines are required to evacuate power from the Bujagali hydropower plant to Kampala, the capital city, and disseminate electricity to other cities and rural areas of the country. Their routing was selected after comprehensive studies that assessed alternative design and route options taking into account environmental, technical and economic considerations.

UETCL evaluated multiple alternative schemes, each designed to evacuate power from the Bujagali HPP. The preferred system plan involves the following:

1. Construct a new 132 kV line between the proposed switchyard at the Bujagali HPP site to a new substation site in Kawanda. This line would be built as a double circuit 220 kV line (as previously proposed by AESNP), but would be operated at 132 kV initially;
2. Construct a new 132 kV line from the new substation site in Kawanda to the existing Mutundwe substation. This line would be built as a double circuit line, but only one circuit would be installed initially;
3. Breaking the existing 132 kV double circuit line between Nalubaale (Owen Falls) and Tororo and building two new double circuit lines to run through the Bujagali substation.

The proposed transmission lines will, for the most part, follow the routes previously approved for AESNP. The exception is portions of the 132 kV line between Kawanda and Mutundwe, where the previous alignment has been changed to minimize displacement impacts.

The proposed routing of the transmission system is provided in Figure 1.

A site for the Kawanda substation was identified and obtained by AESNP. The Government of Uganda currently holds title for the land. UETCL proposes to use the same site for the facility to be developed as part of the project.

1.2 Applicable Laws, Regulations and Policies to Public Engagement

The following provides an outline of the applicable laws and regulations as this 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
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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. UETCL 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]; and,
- NEMA has the right to hold a discretionary public hearing if it feels 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 will 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. UETCL 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:

**African Development Bank**

The African Development Bank (AfDB) is a potential lender to the IP, as such, 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 include:

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

For Category A projects, AfDB will disclose an ESRS on its InfoShop. This document will not be disclosed locally. AfDB requires a 120-day international disclosure period.
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 2.1: Consultation Activity Summary

<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 was circulated through NEMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs (national and local)</td>
<td>Numerous NGOs were identified and contacted to arrange meetings 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 and met with to assist in consultation activities with local villages. Public meetings, organised by the Sub-County Community Development Officers 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 include that own property, live and/or are involved in economic activities (typically farming) within the transmission line corridor and associated activities. As part of the RCDAP process, socio-economic surveys were undertaken to establish a profile of the PAPs. It is noted that PAPs within the boundaries of the Kawanda Substation were resettled by the previous project sponsor. An assessment of this past resettlement was undertaken and the results document in the APRAP Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable groups</td>
<td>Vulnerable group representatives were included on the Sub-county Consultation Committees. Their interests were considered based on the input provided by the Consultation Committees and through their meetings with the affected villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Operators</td>
<td>Business operations located within the transmission corridor were identified and profiled as part of the Rap process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist/visitors</td>
<td>A section of the transmission project parallels a section of the Nile River and has the potential for visual impacts and could potentially affect tourism activity. Tourist interests were represented through contact with tourist based organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Groups</td>
<td>The Kingdom of Buganda was 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.

2.2 Description of Stakeholders

The following provides a summary description of the stakeholders most affected by the project, which includes: Local Villages and PAPs; Tourist Operators/Tourists; and, Cultural Groups. Section 3.7 of the SEA Report and Section 4 of the RCDAP provide a detailed description of socio-economic conditions in the study area.

Local Villages and PAPs

The proposed transmission line corridor passes through the boundaries of Mukono, Wakiso and Mpigi Districts and within Kampala City Council (KCC). Within each District, a number of sub-counties (LC3s) and villages (LC1s) are affected. About eight sub-counties are intersected and about 55 villages are affected. The location of the communities that were consulted with are shown in Figure 6.1. Most of the lands affected by the IP involve small subsistence farming lots. Closer to Kampala, the land could be considered as an urban fringe area with fairly high population densities in the vicinity of the proposed line.

The RCDAP includes a detailed description of the PAPs that are to be affected by the IP.

Tourist Operators and Tourists

The proximity of a section of the transmission line to a section of the Nile River has the potential for visual effects from points along the east bank of the river which are frequented by tourists.

Cultural Groups

The main cultural group potentially affected by the IP project is the Kingdom of Buganda. The Kingdoms of Uganda are officially recognised cultural institutions by the GoU 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, 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 more recently, consultation activities undertaken by the BIU. By all indications, the starting point was a relatively high awareness level of the project, which was confirmed through the initial community consultations undertaken in August 2006.

3.1 Previous Consultation Activities

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 IP issues from the past consultation process, as well as those raised since the project was put on hold, are as follows:

- Need for and project benefits;
- Economic impacts;
- Environmental effects;
- Public health (disease);
- Transparency of the process;
- The need for electricity to local communities and the affordability of power;
- Improvements in local community infrastructure;
• Banking procedures for stakeholders;
• Protection of women, orphans, elderly and physically challenged;
• Jobs for local people;
• Disruption to culture;
• Crop damage compensation;
• Importation of labour from the outside;
• EMF effects from the transmission lines;
• Public health implications (HIV/AIDS increase) from construction workers; and,
• The need to address unresolved issues of the resettled persons.

The information collected in the previous consultation process was used as a starting point for the preparation of the 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 IP that have occurred include:

• Meetings with the 55 local communities (LC1s) along the proposed electrical transmission corridor (as formerly proposed by AES) were conducted in July 2005 to identify changes in land use and land ownership; and,
• In November 2005, letters were sent to all landowners along the proposed AES transmission corridor advising them that the UETCL would undertake a reassessment of the land that would be required for the transmission line.

Appendix A includes a summary of some of these early consultations by the BIU.

3.2 Implemented Community Engagement Activities

Consultation activities undertaken and to be undertaken by UETCL 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 Consultation Summary Report;
• Phase 4: Release of the Final Draft SEA Report and Action Plans;
• Phase 5: RCDAP Planning Consultation; and,
• Phase 6: Ongoing Project Consultation.

Figure 2 presents a schematic diagram of the key consultation activities and their timing.
| Phase I - Initial Stakeholder Consultation | January 2006 | Preparation of SEA ToR |
| Phase II - SEA ToR & PCDP Consultation | May 2006 | Release of SEA ToR & Draft PCDP |
| Phase V - CDAP Consultation Planning | September 2006 | SEA Report Updates (if required) |
| Phase VI - Ongoing Project Consultation | October 2006 | NEMA & International Lenders anticipated SEA approval/acceptance |
| | December 2006 | Anticipated financial close/construction start date |
| | June 2007 | |
| | July/August 2007 | |
| | 2011 | |
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A key guiding principle to the PCDP process is that it involved *free, prior and informed* consultation with the affected communities to enable informed participation. The following presents a summary of the extent to which this was achieved.

The project sponsor retained the services of a witness NGO (InterAid) in August 2006 to assess whether or not 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.

All consultations have been free and under the observation of a witness NGO (InterAid). Stakeholders have been encouraged to attend consultation events and/or to provide comments on disclosed materials directly to UETCL. There has been no evidence that stakeholder involvement and the comments provided have been as a result of coercion by another party. The review of media articles/editorials in various newspapers shows that there is much freedom to express one's views in Uganda.

Consultations have been undertaken prior to project decisions being made and have had influence on the design of the project. Consultations will also continue on issues such as the RCDAP design as well as other action plans in regards to mitigation prior to them being finalized and implemented.

There has been much information disclosed to the various stakeholders to ensure that they are informed about the project. Information that has been disclosed has included: the SEA ToR, the draft PCDP, a project newsletter (which was also translated into Luganda), an SEA Summary Report, meetings with the Sub-County Consultation Committees and local village meetings with the assistance of the Sub-County Community Development Officers. All of these items/activities contributed to creating community awareness about the project. The information disclosure activities (to keep people informed) have been focussed on those who have/will be potentially affected by the project. There have also been other notifications targeted at the general public and the NGO community in the form of newspaper/radio notices and letters. All of these activities have been described in this PCDP Report. UETCL is committed to keeping the local communities informed by making the SEA reports available to the local community as well as the release of future newsletters/information bulletins that are to be focussed on the RCDAP and other action plans/mitigation activities.
3.3 Project Sponsor's Community Engagement Plan

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 (Note that these consultations were for both the IP and HPP projects and were undertaken by the Burnside Consultation Team).

The agencies that were met with are outlined in Table 3.1 below.
Table 3.1: Initial Government Agency Consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consulting Activity</th>
<th>Agencies Groups/Consulted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| January 2006 Consultations | • BIU  
• Ugandan Electricity Generation Co. Ltd. (UEGCL)  
• Ugandan Electricity Transmission Co. Ltd. (UETCL)  
• Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD)  
• National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA)  
• Jinja District (reps. of Jinja, Budondo, Bujagali, Kyabirwa, and Namizi)  
• Mukono District (reps of Mukono, Wakisi, Kikubamutwe, Naminya, Buloba)  
• National Fisheries Resources Research Institute (NAFIRRI)  
• Uganda Wildlife Authority  
• Directorate of Water Development  
• National Forest Authority  
• Rural Electrification Authority  
• Ugandan Investment Authority  
• Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry  
• Electricity Regulatory Authority  
• Nile Basin Initiative |
| March 2006 Consultations | • BIU  
• Makerere University Institute of Environment and Natural Resources (MUIENR)  
• National Forest Authority (NFA)  
• Road Agency Formation Unit (RAFU)  
• Mukono District  
• NAFIRRI  
• Jinja District  
• NEMA  
• Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry (MTTI)  
• Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA)  
• Tourism Operators (Nile River Explorers, Equator Rafting, Adrift)  
• Mabira Forest Tourism Ecotourism Centre  
• Jinja tourism businesses networking meeting  
• Local hotel/lodge/tourism owners and operators  
• Operator of Kiira and Nalubaale Hydro Dams (Eskom)  
• Directorate of Water Development (DWD)  
• LC1 and LC3 representatives of Wakisi Subcounty |
| May 2006 Consultations | • BIU  
• National Forest Authority (NFA)  
• Wetlands Inspection Division  
• National Association for Professional Environmentalists (NAPE)  
• Save the Bujagali Crusade |

Minutes of these initial meetings are presented in Appendix B and key points raised, as they relate to the IP 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 audit the results of the previous RAP (for the Kawanda substation) (this has been undertaken and corrective action is being initiated);
- The need for land to compensate the removal of land in the Mabira forest;
- NGOs have suggested that the previous process was not transparent – it did not involve NGOs;
- The need for an EA process that promotes open dialogue;
- The need to consider and assess other electricity generation options in the EA;
- 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 provide training and employment recruitment; and,
- The need to provide opportunity for local women to participate during construction (e.g. breakfast/lunch/dinner kiosks).

**Business/Tourism Operator Meetings**

Discussions were held with the National Forest Authority/Mariba Ecotourism Centre regarding impacts of the proposed transmission line on forest activity.

**Assessment of Past Resettlement**

As part of the RAP process, surveys and discussions were undertaken with a sample of those people who had been previously relocated by the previous project sponsor from the Kawanda substation site. These people are now living in the host community Nansana. 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. The report on the work is found in Appendix F to the IP SEA report.

In summary, issues identified included:

- Although the resettlers were promised land title, at the time of the APRAP work, none had received land title;
- The hand pump put in place by the previous project sponsor is not operational;
- Land provided to some was reported to be less fertile than what they had before and land parcels are reported to be smaller (apparently some sold some of their land after it was provided to them); and,
That the previous project sponsors rushed them into the new houses when they were not quite ready to move (the BIU reported that they were given 6 months notice).

### Consultations with Mabira Forest Communities

As part of an assessment of the effects of the transmission line on the Mabira Forest, consultations (focus group discussions) were undertaken with several communities in the vicinity of the forest including: Buwoola, Ssanga and Ssesse. The number of people in each discussion group ranged from 30 to 40 individuals. In addition to the meetings, a questionnaire with 34 open-ended and close-ended questions was distributed to forty two (42) respondents. Respondents were selected at random from the villages of Nkaaga, Bakata, Ssanga, and Ssesse to find out their view about the benefits, costs and the likely compensation they expected due to the loss of part of the forest as a result of the 220 V power line. Issues raised during these meetings included:

- The communities did not raise significant concern with the proposal to develop a new transmission line through the forest;
- They requested that they be provided the trees that are cut down within the transmission corridor;
- They requested that they be provided employment opportunities;
- There seem to be some concern that nothing transpired since the previous consultations were undertaken;
- Suggested that some of the compensation money should be channelled in the form of community development initiatives (e.g. improving schools); and,
- Requested that they be provided with tree seedlings for agro-forestry activities.

The report regarding these consultations is found in Appendix D of the IP SEA report.

#### 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 and 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 pubic 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:

- New Vision (on August 5 and 8, 2006);
- The Monitor (on August 5 and 9, 2006); and,
- Bukedde (in Luganda) (on August 5 and 8, 2006).

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.

Appendix C contains a copy of the public notice.

**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 with 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 IP related key issues raised during the NGO meetings is provided in Table 3.2 below. Both the IP and the HPP was the subject of these discussions.

A follow-up email on August 22, 2006 was sent to the NGOs that were met with as a reminder to submit their comments on the SEA ToR and PCDP.

The only written comments formally submitted by an NGO on the SEA ToRs were from NAPE, although their comments were focussed on the HPP and not the IP.
### Table 3.2: Summary of Phase 2 NGO Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 27, 2006</td>
<td>Uganda National NGO Forum</td>
<td>• Their interests can be represented by ACODE &amp; NAPE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plot 25 Kabalagala Box 4636 Kla. 031 260373/ 041 510272/ 041 501674 e-mail;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ngoforum@infocom.co.ug">ngoforum@infocom.co.ug</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 27, 2006</td>
<td>Anti-Corruption Coalition Uganda (ACCU)</td>
<td>• Their role is mainly promotion of corporate social responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Godfrey Rwakabale (Coordinator)</td>
<td>• Knew the project history since the times of AES Nile Power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plot 243 Tuffnel Drive 041 535659/ 535660/ 0772611482 E-mail:</td>
<td>• Pledged their contribution to the SEA process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:rwakabale@anticorruption.or.ug">rwakabale@anticorruption.or.ug</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2006</td>
<td>International Union for the Conservation of nature and Natural resources (IUCN)</td>
<td>• Country Rep. was out of country but still promised to forward their input to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Alex Muhwezi (Country Rep.)</td>
<td>document. At the time of report writing no input has been received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plot 39, Acacia Avenue 041 344508/ 0772221499 e-mail;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:alex.muhwezi@iucn.co.ug">alex.muhwezi@iucn.co.ug</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 26, 2006</td>
<td>Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA)</td>
<td>• Needed to look at the SEA TOR’s as a guide to UWA’s input and old EIA documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director, tourism business development and planning Mr. Damian B. Akankwasa</td>
<td>• UWA is supportive of the project. Their role will be more of guidance throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Box 3530 kla. 041 355000/ 0772 790729 <a href="mailto:damian.akankwasa@uwa.or.ug">damian.akankwasa@uwa.or.ug</a></td>
<td>the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1, 2006</td>
<td>Green Watch Uganda</td>
<td><strong>Willing to participate.</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Had concerns on whether the affected communities were consulted or if the NGO feedback would be basis for consultation. (Explained to them that community consultation is ongoing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kanneth Kakulu/ Irene Ssekyana</td>
<td><strong>Willing to participate.</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Had concerns on whether the affected communities were consulted or if the NGO feedback would be basis for consultation. (Explained to them that community consultation is ongoing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite No.5, Ground Floor -Airways House. P.O. Box 10120, Kampala- Uganda Tel: 256-41-344 613 Fax: 256-41 343 787 E:mail- <a href="mailto:irene@greenwatch.or.ug">irene@greenwatch.or.ug</a> OR <a href="mailto:environment@greenwatch.or.ug">environment@greenwatch.or.ug</a> website: <a href="http://www.greenwatch.or.ug">www.greenwatch.or.ug</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2, 2006</td>
<td>Uganda Debt Network</td>
<td><strong>They were willing to participate in this development.</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Requested copies of the TORs to act as a basis of their input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Kapepwe Julius</td>
<td><strong>They were willing to participate in this development.</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Requested copies of the TORs to act as a basis of their input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>041 543974/ 041 533840/ 041 223152 jkapepwudnet.or.ug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 27, 2006</td>
<td>DENIVA</td>
<td><strong>Liked the concept of involving NGOs, unlike the way it was conducted previously.</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Promised to have a look at the TORs as a group and give feedback. At the time of report writing no input has been received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Wandera Peter</td>
<td><strong>Liked the concept of involving NGOs, unlike the way it was conducted previously.</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Promised to have a look at the TORs as a group and give feedback. At the time of report writing no input has been received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>041 530575/ 041 531150 <a href="mailto:info@deniva.or.ug">info@deniva.or.ug</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1, 2006</td>
<td>Environmental Alert</td>
<td><strong>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.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christine Nantongo (Programme Manager) Kabalagala off Gaba road P.O.Box 11259, Kla. Tel: 256 41 510215; 0772440926 e-mail <a href="mailto:envalert@envalert.org">envalert@envalert.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2006</td>
<td>Wildlife Clubs of Uganda</td>
<td><strong>SEA ToR and Draft PCDP sent.</strong>&lt;br&gt;• No comments received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tibakenya, Dr. Elly Africa Box 4596 Kampala Phone: +256.41.256534 Fax: +256.41.258351</td>
<td><strong>SEA ToR and Draft PCDP sent.</strong>&lt;br&gt;• No comments received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 27, 2006</td>
<td>National Association of Professional Environmentalists (NAPE)</td>
<td>• See HPP SEA/PCDP for a summary of their comments as all related to the HPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Muramuzi 041-534453/ 0772 492362 e-mail: <a href="mailto:nape@utlonline.co.ug">nape@utlonline.co.ug</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2006</td>
<td>Action for Development (ACFODE).</td>
<td>• SEA ToR and Draft PCDP sent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type: Non-indigenous. Physical Address:- Plot 623/624 ACFORD House Bukoto,</td>
<td>• No comments received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kampala.                      Postal Address:- Telephone &amp; Fax:- 532311 &amp; 530460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail:- <a href="mailto:ngoforum@starcom.co.ug">ngoforum@starcom.co.ug</a>. Contact Person:- Mrs. Annette Muwonge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2006</td>
<td>Uganda Fisheries and Fish Conservation</td>
<td>• SEA ToR and Draft PCDP sent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type:- Indigenous Telephone &amp; Fax:-</td>
<td>• No comments received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail:- <a href="mailto:ngoforum@starcom.co.ug">ngoforum@starcom.co.ug</a>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 28, 2006</td>
<td>Uganda Manufacturers Association (UMA)</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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>041 220831/ 041 221034/ 0772 861147 Mr. Mawanda Robert.</td>
<td>• Manufacturers only get electricity an average of 17 days per month. There is more than 50% decrease in production because of this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Promised to convene a UMA Environment sub-committee meeting and provide input into the project document (SEA ToR). At the time of report writing no input has been received.</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>
| July 28, 2006| Save Bujagali Crusade (SBC) Afunaadula| • Concerns of political influence in developmental projects and the need for political support for the alternatives and removal of all barriers to such developments.  
• There should be a grievance handling mechanism for the PAPs.  
• There is need for confidence building with the PAPs. |
| August 1, 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 report writing no input has been received. |
| August 1, 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 report writing no input has been received. |
| August 1, 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 their 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 report writing no input has been received. |
| July 31, 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. |
| July 31, 2006| JIDDECO (Jinja)  
Paul Bateeze (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 report writing no input has been received. |
| July 31, 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. No input received but have held separate meetings with Busogo Kingdom. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| August 4, 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 report writing no input has been received. |
| August 2, 2006   | **Energy Plus Ltd**  
535 Kisaasi Road, Bukoto  
041-533073- 077-2441953  
eng@utlonline.co.ug | • Glad to be considered for participation in this process as they have so many concerns.  
• 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 report writing 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 UETCL is not providing funding to NGOs) |
| August 4, 2006   | **ACODE**  
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 report writing no input has been received. |
Community Meetings

There are about 55 communities potentially affected by the transmission line within the districts of: Mukono, Mpigi, Wakiso and Kampala. To consult with the potentially affected villages, consultation committees were established within the following sub-counties:

- Mutundwe Parish;
- Nsahgi;
- Wakiso;
- Nabweru;
- Nangabo;
- Kira;
- Kawuga;
- Mukono;
- Nagojje;
- Najjembe;
- Wakisi, and,
- Njeru Town.

Each sub-county committee included representatives as outlined in Table 3.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Representation</th>
<th>Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Political              | L.C III Chairperson  
                       | Sub county Chief  
                       | L.C 1s of the affected villages. |
| Technical              | Environment  
                       | Health/Education  
                       | Works/Production/Community development |
| Special Interest /     | Women  
                       | People with Disability  
                       | Youth  
                       | Elderly  
                       | Directly affected persons (in case none of the above is) |
| Vulnerable Groups      |             |             |             |             |

The purpose of these committees was to sensitize the affected villages regarding the project and to obtain their concerns and suggestions. In Phase 1 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 along with a list of issues/questions to explore with the villages including:

- What general concerns do people have regarding the proposed development of the IP?
- Is there any specific information regarding your village that the project team should be aware of?
- What types of information are people interested in receiving?
- Are there any specific issues/topics that people would like more information on?
- How would people like to receive information about the project and the SEA study results in the future?
- How should the results of the Draft SEA and other project information be made available to the villages?
- Is the use of sub-county committees to consult with the villages appropriate?
- Are there other consultation approaches/methods that could be used?
- What mitigation measures should be undertaken to reduce negative effects?
- How do the villages/people want to be involved in the future?
- Are there any specific local interest groups that we should be consulting with?
- What expectations do the villagers have regarding community development opportunities as a result of the project?
- 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 findings to the study team in early August 2006. A summary of key issues raised in these meetings is provided in Table 3.4.
Table 3.4: Summary of Phase 2 IP Community Discussions

<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>
| Wakisi Sub-County (HPP & IP)              | HPP                      | Aug 7/06     | BPIU, InterAid, Consultant Rep | • It was noted that the sub-county is affected by both the dam and the transmission line.  
• The Committee indicated support for the project and look forward to the benefits from the project.  
• It was noted that the Committee was established to sensitise the community regarding the project.  
• Their key issue relates to compensation to be provided for the transmission line corridor. Some landowners expressed concern regarding 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 that these areas were not up kept in many cases. New property value rates should be applied.  
• Several issues were also raised regarding the resettlement community:  
  • Poor road quality into the community.  
  • The need for improved schools/health facility.  
  • The need for improved water supply.  
  • The latrines get filled in during the rains.  
  • Some houses are cracking.  
  • Property boundary conflicts with the host community.  
  • Uncertainty with land titles.  
  • The community is not close to markets – making it difficult to sell their products.  
  • Houses not conforming to the model home/no kitchens in the houses.  
• Other comments made include:  
  • That residents be given priority for jobs;  
  • The need for piped water to accommodate the large construction workforce; |
|                                           | Kikubamutwe, Buloba      |              |           |                    |
|                                           | Naminya, Malindi         |              |           |                    |
|                                           | IP                       |              |           |                    |
|                                           | Wabyinga, Lukaga, Kiyunga, Scoul |          |           |                    |
### Sub-County/Division Consultation Committee

<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>Aug 8/06</td>
<td>BPIU, InterAid, Consultant Rep, Property Valuator</td>
<td>Rural electrification and road lighting; Alternative roads for school children to travel along as the existing road will become too busy with truck traffic; and, Improvements for the fishers and provision of fish ponds in the affected villages. The committee asked whether funds could be released for community improvement prior to project initiation. Regarding consultation, it was suggested that dam and transmission-related issues be separated among the respective affected communities. The use of newsletters through a Q&amp;A format was also suggested as a means of communication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Najjembe (IP) Ssesse | | | | People want to know their fate – the project has taken too long People want to now about the line and whether they can use the land within the corridor. Suggestions were made with regard to community development initiatives: Assistance in new power supplies (e.g. solar or rural electrification) (but question the extent to which people could afford it); Provide trees for planting/agro forestry; Provide the trees that are to be cut to the villagers; New road culverts; and, School improvements. Should be allowed to raised animals in the corridor. Preference for contracting local people for jobs. Asked if people can be compensated in cash or new land? Indicated that the land has been left idle since the last evaluation so now has less value. Suggestions of cultural impacts from impact spiritual land? Communities want information on the timing of the project and |
<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>
|                                          |                         | Aug 6/06 (village meeting) | BPIU, InterAid, Consulting Team Rep., Survey Rep. | on the valuation process.  
* Suggested that project implementation/community development be worked through local NGOs and that the committee could prepare the ToRs.  
* The Committee wants to be informed of the valuation process and the property owners to be affected.  
| Nagojje                                  | Waswa, Kito, Wagala Ndeeba, Magada, Kanyogoga, Nakalasa Estate | BPIU | |  
* What would be valued, since crops valued in 2000 are not in the field now; and structures/ houses have collapsed?  
* Would loss of time be compensated for?  
* How will caretakers/ heirs without powers of attorney be compensated.  
* What consideration would the sponsor and the Gov’t take to reactivate the Bank accounts that were opened and later closed because of the delay of the project?  
* What about the PAPs who relocated their residential houses & graves in anticipation of resettlement be compensated?  
* How will those who have lost their valuation forms from 2000 be considered?  
* Is there a possibility of paying some of us by cash, rather than paying through the bank?  
* Since local council chairperson elections have been postponed, who will represent them at the Sub-county consultations with the consultants?  
| Nama Sub-County                          | Wakiso, Wabununu, Luwumga, Buyuki, Nama I & II, Lukojo, Nsanvu, Nkooki | Aug 14 | |  
* Noted that there were many new landowners in the area & many landowners who don’t reside in the area.  
* Raised question regarding how people who have abandoned their land would be compensated.  
* Noted that some people would prefer cash payment to avoid having to go through process of opening a bank account – past problems with this, as the accounts were not kept active and thus closed, which cost people money.  

### Sub-County/Division Consultation Committee | Communities Represented | Meeting Date | Attendees | Discussion Summary
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---

- Requested a firm outline of the project schedule.
- Noted that there is a community borehole within the corridor – will this be compensated for?
- There is some fear among women that once the men receive the money, that they will take off – The Committee indicated that they could assist in this.
- Request that a BIU rep. be present at the village meetings to build community confidence.
- Asked how the community could benefit from the project – perhaps rural electrification.
- Some indication of concern related to health effects of transmission lines.
## Sub-County/Division Consultation Committee

<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>
| Goma Sub-County                           | Nyenje, Jogggo, Namwezi, Nattonko, Nabusugwe | Aug 14       | BPIU, InterAid, Consulting Team Rep., Survey Rep. | - Need for proponent to show commitment to the project – need to move with it quickly.  
- Afraid that compensation payments for land will be low, as it is a government project.  
- Raised issues regarding transparency of the valuation process.  
- Suggested that radio ads and public meetings are the best way to get information out to the community.  
- Asked about whether the cutting of forests would be mitigated.  
- Asked about what community development initiatives would be offered – suggested rural electrification, improved health facilities, improved water supply, improved roads.  
- Requested that employment opportunities be made available during construction.  
- Noted that there are some small shrines along the route that will need to be relocated. |
| Kira TC                                   | Nsasa, Kira, Mulawa, Buwaate, Kungu              | Aug 15       | BPIU, InterAid, Consulting Team Rep | - Indicated a willingness to present info & receive feedback from the villages.  
- The committee had not yet consulted with the villages but indicated that they would do so and report back.  
- Questions asked about the compensation/resettlement process and use of the corridor lands.  
- Some indication that some perceive the T-line to be a health risk.  
- Doubt in the community that the project will go forward – need to build confidence.  
- Suggestion that the people don’t need to be retrained – just provided with the compensation money. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-County/Division</th>
<th>Communities Represented</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Discussion Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Nangabo Sub-County  | Kitetika, Lusanja, Kabaganda                | Aug 16/06    | BPIU, Consultant Rep       | • The committee had not yet consulted with the villages.  
• Suggested that it would be beneficial to have a BIU rep present at the meetings.  
• Requested information on the selected alignment, so that they would know who was affected.  
• Although some people had gone through the process before, there will be new people that will require education.  
• Questions asked about the land compensation process. |
| Kawempe Division    | Komamboga                                   | Aug 17/06    |                            | • No meeting held.                                                                                                                                 |
| Nabweru Sub-County  | Nanweru, Katoke, Kisimu, Maganjo, Nkokojeru, Nakyesanja | Aug 10/06    | BPIU, Consultant Rep       | • The Committee sent letters to the LC1 chairpersons and conducted meetings in each of the affected villages.  
• Most concerns expressed related to the land valuation process and the rates that will be applied. People are not aware of the process and need to be informed (particularly for those who have acquired the land since the first valuation).  
• Questions regarding who will be compensated for land that has been sold?  
• Suggested that as the land was left idle after the previous evaluation (as they were instructed to do so), that the land is now worth less than before.  
• Indication that communities are tired of consultations that result in no actions – people have been waiting for 5 years for their money.  
• The villages would prefer to see the project sponsor/BPIU at meetings rather than the sub-county committee.  
• It was reported that people are well sensitised to the Project and of its effects – people went through past training activities.  
• Questions were raised regarding whether people will be compensated for not being able to use their land for the past 5 years. |
<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>
| Nansana TC                               | Nansana East & West, Kibwa | Aug 11/06    | BPIU, Consultant Rep, Socio-econ Surveyor | • People in this community embrace this project, recognising the need for power.  
  • The community is not clear on issues relating to resettlement, compensation, the alignment, or corridor width.  
  • The affected people are expecting a revaluation of their lands.  
  • The committee requested that they be provided with advance notice of the valuations.  
  • They would like to see the community involved and are willing to work with the surveyors.  
  • Need to provide information to the community, such as who the project sponsor is, who is going to benefit from the project, and when will they see the benefits?  
  • Questions regarding what community development initiatives will there be?  
  • Suggested that valuation guidelines (district rates) be provided to the PAPs, so that people can assess for themselves whether the valuations are fair.  
  • Questions regarding how people who may have recently purchased property and high prices be compensated?  
  • Questions raised as to how often the Committee should meet. |
<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>
| Wakiso Sub-County                         | Gganda, Nakuwadde, Bulenga | Aug 11/06    | BPIU, Socio-econ Surveyor | • The delay in the previous process led to some frustration among the community and has hindered development in the area  
• People will vacate their property provided that they are promptly compensated  
• Although people are not opposed to the project, they have lost confidence in the exercise as it did not move forward  
• People should be given enough time to move out and resettle after they have received their compensation  
• Suggestion that some people have suffered health effects from the project delay (uncertainty) – many unfulfilled promises from the past project sponsor  
• Project delay has retarded development in the area  
• Residents should be provided employment opportunities  
• Proper plans should be develop to replace the loss of public utilities  
• Land compensation should be based on market prices |
<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>
| Nakawa Division                           | Nazareth, Walufumbe      | Aug 15/06    | BPIU      | - Meeting not held due to schedule mix-up  
- Notes provided from July 9/06 Consultation Committee Meeting, comments made (based on their discussions with the PAPs) include:  
  - The compensation rates are outdated;  
  - People are concerned that they will not be adequately compensated;  
  - Questions whether people who sold their land will be compensated; and,  
  - Request for technical people (consultants) to come to see their situation. |
| Nsangi Sub-County                         | Nkokonjeru, Kabojja      | Aug 17/06    |           | - Noted that residents are a little tired/fed up with the process, as nothing has happened.  
- They want firm timing on project scheduling and a clear indication of when compensation payments will be made.  
- Questions asked as to how compensation will be provided.  
- Community is uncertain as to the extent to which the corridor can be used in the future – people will need to be reminded of what uses are permissible.  
- Asked if the electricity tariff will be decreased for those communities that host the T-line.  
- Committee indicated a willingness to consult with the communities in the future – but will require this to be facilitated for this. |
<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>
| Rubaga Division                           | Mbaawo, Kitawuluzi Kigwanya | Aug 16/06    | BPIU, Consultant Rep. | • The Committee had not met with the villages, so had no report to make – indicated that they would meet and report back.  
• Requested a map to show the alignment.  
• Questions raised regarding the land compensation process and action to be taken to ensure that the corridor is not resettled.  
• The land valuation process was explained to the committee.  
• Suggestion that people are less confident that they will be fairly compensated for their land, as this is a government project.  
• Suggestion that the previous process/study was a waste of time/money. |
| Makindye Sub-County                       | Mirembe                  | Aug 8/06     | BPIU, Consultant Rep, Property Valuator | • Committee noted that they met with the village and undertook a visit of the proposed line location.  
• Key community question is project timing – when will it start?  
• Tenants/landowners want revaluation of their lands.  
• Indicated that the community would prefer to obtain info through the sub-committee  
• Reported that people are not aware of the environmental effects of the project.  
• Villagers indicated that they would like to be compensated for their land (which apparently is owned by the Buganda Kingdom) prior to them having to register (and pay a fee for it) |
Buganda Kingdom Meeting

The proposed transmission line route passes through the Kingdom of Buganda. An introductory meeting was held with representatives of the Kingdom of Buganda on August 15, 2006. The purpose of this meeting was to reintroduce the project/study, to identify concerns and identify how the Buganda Kingdom would like to be involved in subsequent steps of the process. Key issues raised during these meetings included:

- 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.
- Additional meetings with the technical committee will be required as well as with the Kingdom Parish Chiefs.
- It was suggested to the Technical Committee (TC) that a Buganda representative might want to monitor the land valuation process (for the T-line).

In follow-up to the above noted initial meeting on August 31 and September 5 2006, additional meetings were held with the Kingdom’s technical committee. Following these meetings, the Technical Committee submitted a statement of issues to UETCL. Appendix C contains the minutes from these meetings. A summary of the key issues from these meetings is provided below.

- The Kingdom has agreed to work closely with UETCL to ensure the successful implementation of the project;
- The Kingdom’s key concern relates to the project’s impact on land that the Kingdom owns and land that the Kabaka (King) owns. The Kingdom offered access to ownership mapping to assist in this identification process;
- Consultation with the communities should be done in conjunction with the Kabaka’s officers (“the Batongol”);
- Recognising that some of the Kingdom’s/King’s lands have “squatters” on it, how is each party to be compensated?
- The Buganda Land Board should be consulted to provide assistance on the process (the Board is the custodian of the Kingdom’s land is is not necessarily bound by the Ugandan Land Act);
- Related to compensation, is the need to properly identify the affected stakeholders;
• What will be the benefit of the line to the Kingdom? Some of the projects proceeds should go to the Kingdom;
• That the line will destroy lands that are important to people’s livelihoods and could be culturally significant. It will be necessary to create similar environments to replace those that are impacted;
• The Kingdom is concerned about wetlands that may be affected. Some of these wetlands provide watering areas for livestock;
• There are already two lines that pass through communities that have very little access to electrical power. The Kingdom proposes that for those communities which the line passes through, that they be provided with greater access to electrical power;
• There will be a need to monitor social, economic and environmental issues;
• The Kingdom is interested in reviewing environmental documentation. The Kingdom is interested in working with UETCL to ensure environmental protection;
• Where possible the line should be rerouted to avoid impacts shrines/graves. The Minister of Culture can assist in these matters;
• It was asked whether there is a social responsibility clause to guide project development; and,
• The Kingdom would form a coordinating committee to oversee the project.

National Government Agency Meetings

It was understood that NEMA had circulated the SEA ToR to relevant agencies and requested their comments. Comments received were then considered in NEMA’s decision on the SEA ToR approval (which was approved in September 06). Ongoing meetings were also held with a variety of agencies on IP related issues including:

• National Forest Authority;
• Wetlands Inspection Division; and
• Uganda Wildlife Authority.

Public Inquiries

A telephone number was provided in the public notices for the purpose of providing opportunity for information requests and inquiries to be made 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. Only a few calls were received during Phase 2, despite the contact numbers being advertised through the newspaper ads. Most of the inquiries were from job seekers.
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 (SCSR) for the purpose of obtaining input from various interests. The SCSR was produced in English as well as Luganda (See Appendix C). Activities that were undertaken and the input that was received are outlined below.

**SEA Summary Release Advertisements/Distribution**

A public notice regarding the release of the SCSR, 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. In addition to advertising the release of the SEA Summary, contact information was provided for people having 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 Summary Report was distributed to the Sub-County Consultative Committees and provided to the LC3/LC1 level governments.

Copies of the public notice are available in Appendix D.

**Newsletter**

A four-page newsletter was prepared which provided an overview of the project as well as a summary of key SEA findings to date. The newsletter was distributed to people who attended the public meetings and copies left with the LC3 and LC1 government levels. The Newsletter was produced in English and Luganda.

A copy of the newsletter is available in Appendix D.

**Community Meetings**

Recognising that there are about 55 villages potentially affected along the T-line, it was determined that the most effective manner to consult with the villagers was to have the Community Development Officers of each Sub-County arrange and hold the meetings. In preparation for this, an all day CDO training session was held on September 23, 2006, whereby the CDOs were informed of the project and presented with the objectives of the consultations that they were to undertake, as well as the key questions/issues that they were to explore with the villagers (See Appendix D).
CDOs were also provided with copies of the newsletter to provide to the villagers. It is noted that the meetings were available to all in the village to attend and participate, not just the PAPs. The CDO run village meetings occurred in late October/early November 2006.

The purpose of the meetings was to:

- To provide a project update to the villagers;
- To explain project benefits to the community; and,
- To identify concerns and if possible to answer questions.

Some of the meetings were attending by representatives of the BIU/Consulting team to audit the meetings and to assess the effectiveness of the CDOs in conducting the meetings. Based on the notes/CDO reports received, the following summarises the key issues that were raised. For the most part, the issues raised have dealt with land compensation issues as outlined in Table 3.5.

**Table 3.5: Local Community Comments and Concerns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Land Valuation/Compensation | - Will the project consider the original valuations or revised 2006 valuations;  
- What values/rates will be used?  
- When will people be advised as to the compensation amounts?  
- What happens when only part of a house is affected?  
- What will happen with new homes that have been built in the corridor since 2002?  
- Remaining small pieces of land (due to the corridor splitting up a parcel) should be purchased as they will be unproductive.  
- Why can’t UETCL purchase the entire 35 m wide corridor and then close it off to future use?  
- What are people to do if they are not satisfied with the compensation amount offered?  
- People don’t understand why the process is taking so long – they want their money now.  
- What happens to those who were within the old corridor but are now not affected by the new corridor? They were told to use/improve this land and in some cases the land has been sitting idle since then.  
- How will the compensation amounts be communicated to the people?  
- Questions were raised regarding how compensation will be paid for land that is owned by the Kakakba (Kingdom King) and has tenants on it? |
**The route has changed, what guarantees are there that it won’t change again?**

**Will communal lands/facilities be compensated?**

**People who have used the affected land for brick making should be compensated.**

**The initial line that had been marked had traversed their area but now it has shifted and they had stopped using their land, who will pay the damages they have suffered ever since it was identified?**

**That the PAPs should receive financial training prior to receiving the compensation money.**

**Will the project sponsor pay for the extension of electricity into our community?**

**Are we not going to be paid for all those years we were told to not use the land?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Improvement/Awareness Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Suggestions for community improvement initiatives included: school facility upgrades/new school, road upgrades, new water supply (not just wells but reserve tanks also), improved health care facilities, power line extension, job training, HIV/Aids awareness, and involving social development groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- That the community be educated and sensitised on how to avoid HIV/AIDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People need to be sensitised regarding the health effects of high voltage lines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The use of radio or informing the LC1 chairperson was indicated as the best means for public announcements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The people indicated that they were appreciative of these meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Safety concerns (to children) during the construction process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How will issues relating to the construction workers and HIV/Aids be dealt with?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A local committee should be struck to monitor the project and oversee the community development initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Delays to implement the project were reported to have caused “dragging” peoples’ economic status behind, as they were using the land for subsistence farming and were told to stop using it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Concerns raised in regards to effects on communal water supplies (e.g. for Wamala Village).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People are concerned about the bad language that power line workers often use. (and effects on children).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes from the CDO community meetings are contained in Appendix D [at the time of report writing not all CDO reports have been received].

**NGO Consultation**

SEA Summary documentation 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 Consultation Summary Report and a request for comments made by October 19, 2006 (comments on both the HPP and IP were requested). A follow-up letter and hard copy of the SEA Consultation Summary Report was subsequently sent to the NGOs in October and a request for comments made (in the end, attempts were made to reach about 50 NGOs with this information). 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 includes the list of NGOs that information was distributed to. No written comments on the SEA Consultation Summary Report were received from any of the NGOs.

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 to gauge their interest level in participating in social development and environmental restoration activities associated with the project. Although most of the discussion focussed on the HPP, some of the comments were also of relevance to the IP. Some of the 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 RCDAP initiatives;
- There is a need to start mitigation/restoration/RCDAP 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.
The Aids Support Organisation

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 much has changed since the initial programme was first developed about five years ago. In follow-up to the meeting, TASO submitted a conceptual plan for an AIDS/HIV programme.

National Government Agency Meetings

Copies of the SEA Consultation Summary Report were sent to various GoU organisations including:

- 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;
- Fisheries Resources Research Institute (FRRI);
- Uganda Wildlife Authority;
- Directorate of Water Development;
- National Forest Authority;
- Rural Electrification Agency;
- Ugandan Investment Authority;
- Ugandan Electricity Generation Co. Ltd. (UEGCL);
- UMEME Ltd.; and,
- Commissioner for Disaster Management.
No comments on the SEA Consultation Summary Report were provided. NEMA indicated that these comments would not be provided until the full SEA Report was submitted.

**Public Inquiries**

A telephone number was provided in the public notices for the purpose of providing opportunity for information requests and inquiries to be made 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. Very few calls were received during Phase 3, despite the contact numbers being advertised through the newspaper ads. Calls received were largely from job seekers.

Comments were submitted from landowners as well as the Uganda Tourism Association regarding the proximity of the proposed transmission line along the Nile River as it extends down to the Tororo line (See Appendix D). These stakeholders expressed concerns regarding impacts on property (residential as well as a tourist horse back riding camp that are along the river), as well as the visual effects of the line from the river and from along the east bank, which is frequented by tourists. The landowners were visited on their properties in mid October 2006 by representatives of the BIU, BEL and the Consulting Team. The routing of the line was reviewed with the landowners. A commitment was made to investigate whether this section of the corridor could be moved further west and away from the river. It was indicated that this would only be done if a route with overall equal or less impact could be identified. The examination of the routing was still pending when this PCDP was released.

**Associated Activities Consultation**

The main associated project to the Bujagali IP is the Bujagali Hydroelectric Project (HPP), which involves the development of a 250 MW hydroelectric facility on the Nile River. A separate, yet complementary SEA and PCDP programme was undertaken for the HPP. The PCDP programme was run concurrently with the consultation programme for the IP. The results of this consultation programme have been documented in the HPP SEA Report (Chapter 6) and a separate HPP PCDP report. Feedback received from the HPP consultation activities that related to the IP (as some of the IP project area overlaps with the HPP project area) was considered as part of the IP SEA process.
4.0 Summary of Key Issues

As a result of Phase 1-3 engagement and consultation activities, a number of issues were identified and were taken into account in the preparation of the SEA. Also considered in issue identification, were the interim reports of RAP Survey consultant and the witness NGO (InterAid). The key issues and how these issues were addressed are presented in Table 4.1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue 1: Past resettlement activities</td>
<td>To accommodate the Kawanda substation, residents/tenants were resettled by the previous project sponsor (Nansana village). There has remained some unfilled promises regarding the resettlement. An assessment of the past resettlement activities was undertaken and an <em>Assessment of Past Resettlement Action Plan</em> (APRAP) report prepared that outlines the concerns/issues and proposed activities to be undertaken. UETCL has committed to resolve certain of these past resettlement issues in the near term 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: Land Compensation for the T-line</td>
<td>The key concern relating to the IP process is the land/asset valuation process and what people can expect (and when) to receive as compensation. The issue has been complicated by the previous (2001) valuation exercise (see below). As well, along some sections of the line, land speculation has occurred, which has raised concerns regarding the legitimacy of some of the claimed assets on the affected properties. The RCDAP report provides a detailed description of these issues. The witness NGO (InterAid) has become very familiar with this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 3: Will the previous valuation results be considered?</td>
<td>As noted above, people are concerned that the previous land/asset valuations would not be honoured and that the new valuation would be lower because some lands have been idle since the original valuation was done. People were told not to improve/use their land by the previous project sponsor after this first valuation was completed. Through the consultation process, BEL has explained to the PAPs that based on a GoU directive, that the original valuation would be honoured (where records are available) so that people would not be worse off with the more recent valuation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issue 4: Will I be compensated for loss of land use over the past 5 years?

As people reported being told by the previous project sponsor to not improve/use their land after the original valuation, some have requested that they be compensated for this loss of land use for the past 5 years. These claims are to be assessed on a case-by-case basis as part of the RAP process.

### Issue 5: Community development opportunities/the need to consult

There is some expectation by the affected communities that they should receive some benefit from the project (beyond land compensation). An IP-specific community development plan is to be implemented whereby the communities will be required to propose projects and make application to UETCL for funding. UETCL will undertake consultations/awareness building exercises with the potentially affected communities prior to construction initiation. The RCDAP describes the proposed programme for community development.

### Issue 6: Construction workforce impacts

Local residents have expressed concerns in regards to the social and health consequences of construction workers coming into their community. They have expressed concerns regarding bad behaviour of these workers as well as HIV/AIDs.

No specific workers camps are to be created for the IP construction. Instead, workers will be bussed in from the Kampala area on a daily basis. As such, workers are only expected to be in each of the communities for a short period and largely during the work day.

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.

### Issue 7: Local community access to electricity

Access to electricity within many of the affected communities is generally poor. 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 is under the authority of UMEME, which is a private company. UETCL cannot simply direct UMEME to improve electrical connection in the area. Nevertheless, UETCL has committed to work with UMEME (who have access to an international funded programme) to improve electrical access in the area.
5.0 Future Consultation Events

UETCL is committed to the continuation of the community consultation programme as part of the SEA Review process (Phase 4), the planning of RCDAP activities (Phase 5) and long-term consultation through the project construction phase (Phase 6). UETCL'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 will be on the release of the SEA Report and associated Action Plans. This consultation period will be undertaken in conjunction with the review and approval process of the SEA Reports by both NEMA and the international lenders and is expected to last from the SEA submission date to financial closing. Phase 4 consultation activities are to include:

- Notices (by NEMA) in early December 2006 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 Bukedde (in local language);
- The IP SEA Report and Executive Summary is being made available at public locations such as libraries, government offices, UETCL and BEL offices;
- The SEA documentation will be accessible through the project website: www.bujagali-energy.com;
- A letter will be sent to the identified NGOs advising them of the release of the IP SEA Report and a request made for their comments;
Meetings will be set up with each of the Sub-County consultation committees (that have already been formed) to present the key SEA results. An issues based presentation will be made followed by a discussion period. The purpose of the meetings is to ensure that the local government representatives are aware of the key project findings and understand how the project will affect their communities;

- UETCL will consider and respond to questions 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;
- UETCL 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 necessary, meetings will be held.

Table 5.1 summarises how each of the stakeholder groups will be consulted with in Phase 4.

<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 will be 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. The purpose is to ensure that they understand the implications of the project on their communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Affected Persons</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>(PAPs)</td>
<td>Vulnerable group interests are represented through the Sub-County Consultation Committees. Input on how their interests should be taken into account will be considered at the above noted meetings. The need for specific meetings with vulnerable group representatives (in regards to the SEA) from the affected villages will be reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable groups</td>
<td>Business owners will be consulted with throughout the RCDAP process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Operators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholders | Consultation Activities
---|---
Tourist/visitors | Agencies such as the Uganda Tourism Association will be kept informed of the project.
Cultural Groups | Meetings with Buganda Kingdom will continue to address their concerns.

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 summary reports to public accessible locations;
- The project sponsor (UETCL) may have to respond to some of the comments received as requested by NEMA; and,
- An optional public hearing may be held at the discretion of NEMA.

**Grievance Management Mechanisms**

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 UETCL.

5.2 **Phase 5 – RCDAP Planning Consultation**

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

Included as part of the SEA Report is the Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan (RCDAP), which describes the proposed community development initiatives to be implemented as part of the project. The initiatives in the RCDAP are to be considered as draft and are in need of confirmation/further definition prior to
their implementation. There is a need to meet with the communities to make them aware of the programme and to assist them in the identification and prioritisation of initiatives. The communities also need to be aware that the RCDAP 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:

- Identify and retain the BEL Community Liaison Manager who would oversee the community consultation/engagement activities;
- Confirm membership and role of the Sub-County Consultation Committees. Meet with and explain the proposed RCDAP to the Consultation Committees;
- Keep the public informed on the progress of CDAP development and implementation through the preparation and release of the information bulletins/newsletters;
- Meet with vulnerable group representatives of the consultative committees and explore the needs of vulnerable peoples in the area;
- Train the Sub-County CDOs to allow them to undertake community initiative prioritisation exercises in the affected villages. With this input, roll-up their input to the Sub-County level with the assistance of the Consultation Committees;
- CDOs to work with the affected villages to make their applications for community development initiatives;
- The Sub-County Consultation Committees to review/pre-screen the community applications;
- If accepted, the Community Liaison Manager in consultation with the Sub-County Consultation Committees are to oversee the preparation of implementation plans; and,
- Oversee the start-up of the RCDAP initiatives that should be implemented prior to construction start-up (e.g. job training activities).

As well, during this period, the Community Liaison Manager 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’s progression, including employment opportunities.

5.3 Phase 6 - Ongoing Project Communication

Once the project has begun, the construction phase project updates are to be communicated to the public to inform communities on project activities including the RCDAP and other action plan activities. During this period, the Community Liaison Manager will:
• Coordinate the release of regular project information/updates with the EPC contractor during the construction period;
• Provide updates to the project website: www.bugagali-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 RCDAP activities;
• Coordinate the release of Annual Reports, which will among other things, report on RCDAP 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, UETCL 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, UETCL has disclosed the following:

- SEA ToR and the draft PCDP;
- IP Consultation Summary Report;
- The final draft IP SEA Report and SEA Summary;
- This PCDP Report;
- The Assessment of Past Resettlement Action Plan (APRAP) (for the Kawanda Sub-Station); and,
- The Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan (RCDAP).

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 Summary Report was released in late September 2006.

The final draft SEA Report and associated action plans were released in early December 2006.

There may be a need to prepare and release SEA addendum/update reports depending on issues that surface during the review of the Draft Final SEA Report.

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 project web site: www.bujagali-energy.com.

In addition to the above, a Social and Environmental Action Plan (SEAP) will be prepared and released to the local communities after the EPC Contractor has been selected. SEAP “update reports” will be released quarterly during the construction period.
PCDP Appendix A
Summary of Previous Consultation Activities
<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>06/29/05</td>
<td>Walusimbi Joseph</td>
<td>L.C C/man, Bujowali Namilya;</td>
<td>Opinion leader</td>
<td>Get updated on the nature of the corridor and deliver notification letter on exercise to update information</td>
<td>Cultivation ongoing, no buildings within corridor, births within families on the increase, land value slightly raised, new investors on the banks of the river, establishing resorts</td>
<td>Issues documented, to be of help during the updating exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/05</td>
<td>Ndikuno Moses</td>
<td>L.C C/man, Namilya, Kira zone;</td>
<td>Opinion leader</td>
<td>Get updated on the nature of the corridor and deliver notification letter on exercise to update information</td>
<td>Some original stakeholders sold off their interests to whites; no houses within the corridor, land rate a bit raised, eg. 1 acre at 3.5m ushs; death of original PAPs</td>
<td>Issues documented, to be of help during the updating exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/05</td>
<td>Maasa Yafesi</td>
<td>L.C C/man, Namilya, Kira zone;</td>
<td>Opinion leader</td>
<td>Get updated on the nature of the corridor and deliver notification letter on exercise to update information</td>
<td>Land rate is high, boreholes provided not functional; type of pump is inappropriate to women (more effort needed); not interested in revaluation, wants district to update rates and use them in previous enumeration</td>
<td>Issues documented, to be of help during the updating exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/29/05</td>
<td>Mbasaire Abdul</td>
<td>L.C C/man, Malindi village;</td>
<td>Opinion leader</td>
<td>Get updated on the nature of the corridor and deliver notification letter on exercise to update information</td>
<td>General fear of abandonment of the project. Land value a bit high; transfer of ownership rife; “sale of farms”</td>
<td>Issues documented, to be of help during the updating exercise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY OF BUJAGALI IMPLEMENTATION UNIT 2005 CONSULTATIONS

<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>06/29/05</td>
<td>Wanje Peter</td>
<td>L.C Secretary Kikubamatwe village</td>
<td>Opinion leader</td>
<td>Get updated on the nature of the corridor and deliver notification letter on exercise to update information</td>
<td>Anxiety for compensation; some buildings abandoned and have collapsed. Increase in family sizes, high land value; some developments registered (rock crashing plant) some structures under construction esp. toilets; no need to revalue</td>
<td>Issues documented, to be of help during the updating exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/05</td>
<td>Nganda</td>
<td>Former Defence sec Ssese village, Najjembe</td>
<td>Opinion leader</td>
<td>Get updated on the nature of the corridor and deliver notification letter on exercise to update information</td>
<td>No change in land use; slight increase in land value and family sizes; social services problematic (nearest trading center is 8km away)</td>
<td>Issues documented, to be of help during the updating exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/04/05</td>
<td>Mr. Kabagambe Kailisa</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary MEMD, Kampala</td>
<td>Project proponent (GoU)</td>
<td>Refresh on issues related to the project; analyse outstanding matters and forge way forward</td>
<td>Dam Site Title to be retrieved from ULC, Sudhir Ruparellia's issue at Bujagali Picnic site; The T-Line RAP needs to be updated;</td>
<td>Prepare TORs for the update; arrange procurement procedures for consulting firms; BIU to quickly survey route; need to obtain funds to execute the task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/05/05</td>
<td>Oringa Charles</td>
<td>Site Attendant Bujagali site (West Bank)</td>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>Site Monitoring and documentation of issues arising</td>
<td>Fence not secure (guards are negligent); activities of fishermen disrupted by guards; erosion of soil into the river through the tunnels</td>
<td>Guards to be summoned and sensitised on treatment of fishermen and site security (Management to be alerted); tunnels to be pegged to reduce the runoff to the river.</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>07/05/05</td>
<td>Hitesh Goya</td>
<td>Business Manager Speke Hotel, Bujagali</td>
<td>Business community</td>
<td>Check the nature of land dispute and obtain facts on claim/transaction and present project position on issue</td>
<td>Land leased to Sudhir by CM L.C 5, Jinja. Told land had no encumbrance</td>
<td>Matter to be documented and presented to PS MEMD for attention. L.C 5 to be informed about error; copies of documentation between AESNP and District for compensation of affected part to be availed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/06/05</td>
<td>Muganga Gerald</td>
<td>Manager, Engineering (services) UETCL, Kampala</td>
<td>Project proponent (GoU)</td>
<td>Discuss issue of recruiting new members for the update of the T-Line RAP; preparation of other logistical requirements</td>
<td>Need to justify need for new staff</td>
<td>Justification and list presented; matter to be followed up with HRM, UETCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/05</td>
<td>John Mwanja Magezi</td>
<td>Attorney Kampala/Jinja</td>
<td>Former attorney for AESNP</td>
<td>Consult on outstanding land issues of Nansana, Resettlement Titles and unallocated plots</td>
<td>Nansana Land was registered in his trust; Outstanding titles not processed due to lack of instructor, unallocated plots are vulnerable to grabbing</td>
<td>Nansana land to be handed over to MEMD. Arrangements to be made to process funds for titles; vacant land to be identified and secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/18/05</td>
<td>Buloba, Kira, Bujowali</td>
<td>Affected Villages west Bank Hydro villages</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Consult on current issues on the Line, document any concerns and opinion on way forward</td>
<td>Water Problem, Don't want revaluation, method of valuation/compensation, loss of hope in the project, no trust in government projects</td>
<td>Issues documented and will form report to be used for further consultation with key stakeholders to determine the way forward</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>07/18/05</td>
<td>Kikubamutwe, Malindi</td>
<td>Affected Villages (west Bank Hydro villages)</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Consult on current issues on the Line, document any concerns and opinion on way forward</td>
<td>Project taken too long to materialise, acute water problem, many speculative transactions between licensees, no need for revaluation, want old crop count and apply new rates</td>
<td>Issues documented and will form report to be used for further consultation with key stakeholders to determine the way forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/18/05</td>
<td>Wabikokoma, Wabuyinja, Lukaga</td>
<td>Affected Villages (west Bank Hydro villages)</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Consult on current issues on the Line, document any concerns and opinion on way forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/20/05</td>
<td>Wagala, Ndeeba</td>
<td>Affected Villages (west Bank Hydro villages)</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Consult on current issues on the Line, document any concerns and opinion on way forward</td>
<td>What happens to those who sold part of their property within the corridor? Some people relocated graves; how will they be compensated? High rate of land wrangles between families of deceased and heirs; changes in farming trends eg. from vanilla to aloe vera, no coffee</td>
<td>Issues documented and will form report to be used for further consultation with key stakeholders to determine the way forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/21/05</td>
<td>Wakiso, Wabununu</td>
<td>Affected Villages (west Bank Hydro villages)</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Consult on current issues on the Line, document any concerns and opinion on way forward</td>
<td>Most structures enumerated in 2000 have collapsed, time line for the project, mode of disclosure of compensation packages; changes in land values</td>
<td>Issues documented and will form report to be used for further consultation with key stakeholders to determine the way forward</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>07/22/05</td>
<td>Nsanvu, Nkooki</td>
<td>Affected Villages west Bank Hydro villages</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Consult on current issues on the Line, document any concerns and opinion on way forward</td>
<td>What happens if there is a discrepancy between private transactions and district rates? Is the AES information still valid? When will disclosure of compensation packages be done? Damaged crops were not paid; who will be responsible for payment? How many more meetings before compensation? What happens to the bank accounts that had been opened for compensation but now closed?</td>
<td>Government, thru UETCL is responsible for the line. Other Issues documented and will form report to be used for further consultation with key stakeholders to determine the way forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/22/05</td>
<td>Nama, Lukojo</td>
<td>Affected Villages west Bank Hydro villages</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Consult on current issues on the Line, document any concerns and opinion on way forward</td>
<td>Too much disruption; need to update rates for compensation; consider the houses that were there but now demolished</td>
<td>Issues documented and will form report to be used for further consultation with key stakeholders to determine the way forward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY OF BUJAGALI IMPLEMENTATION UNIT 2005 CONSULTATIONS

<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>07/23/05</td>
<td>Nkokojeru, Kaboja</td>
<td>Affected Villages west Bank Hydro villages)</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Consult on current issues on the Line, document any concerns and opinion on way forward</td>
<td>Can the line be diverted? What happens to new persons? How long will the studies take? When shall we be paid? Should we stop our developments now? Government projects take years to be done, can we be allowed to continue with our plans? How do we identify the corridor, there are no pegs; District need to be involved so as to include corridor in their plan.</td>
<td>Issues documented and will form report to be used for further consultation with key stakeholders to determine the way forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/23/05</td>
<td>Mirembe, Kitawuluzi, Mbawo</td>
<td>Affected Villages west Bank Hydro villages)</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Consult on current issues on the Line, document any concerns and opinion on way forward</td>
<td>Changes in values of commodities, property and land; time line for works and compensation, notice to vacate should give oustees ample time</td>
<td>Issues documented and will form report to be used for further consultation with key stakeholders to determine the way forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/27/05</td>
<td>Kitetika, Komamboga</td>
<td>Affected Villages west Bank Hydro villages)</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Consult on current issues on the Line, document any concerns and opinion on way forward</td>
<td>Too many developments within corridor, eg. cementers, projects; need to show project boundaries; for new persons, how do we get compensated when we don’t have original documents? Why should we undergo another SE survey? How will compensation be done considering all these years; should we go ahead with our plans?</td>
<td>Issues documented and will form report to be used for further consultation with key stakeholders to determine the way forward</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>07/30/05</td>
<td>Nakuwadde</td>
<td>Affected Village Transmission Line</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Consult on current issues on the line, document any concerns and opinion on way forward</td>
<td>The previous valuation is null, are you doing a fresh one? Changes in administrative structures (from Mpigi to Wakiso; The 5 years have had a great negative impact on the incomes of the affected people what strategy is there to compensate for that?</td>
<td>Issues documented and will form report to be used for further consultation with key stakeholders to determine the way forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09/05</td>
<td>Mr. Kabagambe Kaliisa</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary MEMD, Kampala</td>
<td>Project proponent (GoU)</td>
<td>Discuss initial findings and July ground report</td>
<td>Lots of changes that need detailed documentation, lots of challenges that need legal input and government policy, need to state Government position on situation</td>
<td>Project sponsor to call high profile meeting to discuss issues and advise way forward; meeting to have ERA, SG, CGV, UETCL, BPIU, PU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/17/05</td>
<td>Project Affected Persons</td>
<td>Directly Affected Transmission Line</td>
<td>PAPs</td>
<td>Plot by plot verification of changes within the line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/19/05</td>
<td>Muwuluzi Ekiria (NAMW-BP004-003-LO)</td>
<td>Stakeholder, Namwezi</td>
<td>Directly project affected person</td>
<td>Field Verification Exercise</td>
<td>Prefer the consideration of the 2000 valuation records, was not paid for the damaged crops</td>
<td>Concern noted and will be forwarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/19/05</td>
<td>Nakazzi Janat (NAMW-BP004-012-T1)</td>
<td>Stakeholder, Namwezi</td>
<td>Directly project affected person</td>
<td>Field Verification Exercise</td>
<td>Rates to be considered when preparing compensation packages, prices of goods have appreciated, poor health thus might die before getting their compensation</td>
<td>Respective district rates will be considered.</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>09/19/05</td>
<td>Namutebi Ziyada</td>
<td>Stakeholder,</td>
<td>Directly project</td>
<td>Field Verification</td>
<td>Need help to open up accounts</td>
<td>Issue noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(NAMW-BP004-010-T1) NEW</td>
<td>Namwezi</td>
<td>affected person</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>since those opened in 2000 remained dormant and were closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/03/05</td>
<td>Mubala Balamu</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Government agency</td>
<td>Resolve issue of dam site title to include Dambell island</td>
<td>Need to analyse the existing title and verify.</td>
<td>Avail copy of title for scrutiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/05</td>
<td>Mutimba Abdu</td>
<td>PDP- WAKISO</td>
<td>Directly project</td>
<td>Field Verification</td>
<td>Resettlement case but prefers to get his compensation package and relocate to area of preference</td>
<td>Concern noted and will be consulted when planning for resettlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/05</td>
<td>Ziraba Christopher</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
<td>Directly project</td>
<td>Field Verification</td>
<td>Needs tentative programme for project activities since he is a resettlement case and is constantly on the move</td>
<td>Advised to stay in touch with the LC I chairman, since the unit officers keep him updated about project activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/05</td>
<td>Nambi Mary</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
<td>Directly project</td>
<td>Field Verification</td>
<td>Assigning all documentations work to John Kakande but will handle her compensation package unless she is dead</td>
<td>Relevant legal document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/05</td>
<td>Wilberforce</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
<td>Directly project</td>
<td>Field Verification</td>
<td>Nakato N (sister to deceased) and Namagembe M (widow) to become co-tenants</td>
<td>LC I to write letter of consent as Powers of Attorney are processed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/05</td>
<td>Sunday Clement</td>
<td>Nama</td>
<td>Directly project</td>
<td>Field Verification</td>
<td>Claims the graves in Matama Vincent's (Nama-BP005-011-T1) records but whether Matama will effect the transfer,</td>
<td>Concern noted for LC I leader to handle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/05</td>
<td>Nyongeza Patrick</td>
<td>Nama</td>
<td>Directly project</td>
<td>Field Verification</td>
<td>Prefers receiving his resettlement package and relocate himself</td>
<td>Concern to be forwarded to authorities</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>10/12/05</td>
<td>Mukeka Dirisa</td>
<td>LC I Chairman Nama</td>
<td>Directly project affected person</td>
<td>Field Verification Exercise</td>
<td>Request for assistance to open up accounts, since the previous ones were closed due to inactivity</td>
<td>Advised to check the status of his account and update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/05</td>
<td>Nyanzi Edward (NAMA-BP005-021 LO)</td>
<td>Nama</td>
<td>Directly project affected person</td>
<td>Field Verification Exercise</td>
<td>Nyanzi registered land owned by two different people, each with a different title under his name but Katumba wants his part to be registered in his name</td>
<td>To be sorted out by the LC I leader and sign relevant documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/05</td>
<td>Project affected persons</td>
<td>Nama I</td>
<td>Directly project affected person</td>
<td>Field Verification Exercise</td>
<td>Old stakeholder is unwilling to sign forms for the new stakeholder due to partial payment for the plot in question</td>
<td>Follow up the old and new stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/05</td>
<td>Project affected persons</td>
<td>Nama I</td>
<td>Directly project affected person</td>
<td>Field Verification Exercise</td>
<td>Mailo land owner sells off tenants including those within the affected plot and availed the Buyer with processed title leaders</td>
<td>Stakeholders to solve the issue with the local council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/13/05</td>
<td>NEW Agaba Alex (LUKO-BP005-008-LO)</td>
<td>PAP, Lukojjo</td>
<td>Directly project affected person</td>
<td>Field Verification Exercise</td>
<td>Paid licensees who had structures in his land to relocate, broke down the structures to make further developments. Wondering if he will be paid for the structures since they had been valued in 2000</td>
<td>Government to give official statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/05</td>
<td>Mr. Charles Okolong</td>
<td>Principal Valuer ULC, Kampala</td>
<td>Government agency</td>
<td>Discuss Nansana land issue</td>
<td>Need to obtain value for Nansana land in order to obtain basis for negotiation with Buganda Land Board</td>
<td>Assign valuer to be taken to Nansana and make field notes to advise CGV on way forward</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>10/14/05</td>
<td>Mr. Kabagambe Kalisa</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary MEMD, Kampala</td>
<td>Project proponent (GoU)</td>
<td>Consult on best mode of obtaining views from key stakeholders regarding issues raised on the Bujagali Line</td>
<td>Need to organise a one-day workshop and invite key stakeholders</td>
<td>Organise venue; invite key stakeholders; NEMA, MEMD, UETCL, ULC, CGV, CV, WNGO, RDCs, BPIU, ERA, SG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/05</td>
<td>Musisi Njawuzi Fred (KOKI-BP004-030-LO)</td>
<td>PAP, Nkooki</td>
<td>Indirectly affected persons</td>
<td>Field Verification Exercise</td>
<td>Communicated to the unit about the closeness of his house to the wayleave which he thought could be dangerous but has never received any response</td>
<td>To cross-check and get back to him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/05</td>
<td>Nakiwala Kevina (NSAV-BP005-002-T1)</td>
<td>PAP, Nsanvu</td>
<td>Indirectly affected persons</td>
<td>Field Verification Exercise</td>
<td>The son's house was included in her records, but he is not certain that she will give him his full package</td>
<td>Make an agreement through the LC Chairperson detailing how to handle the compensation package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/05</td>
<td>Mr. Mboozi and Mr. Musa plus residents of Nakyesanja, Kawanda</td>
<td>CM Chairman, Defence secretary, PAPS Kawanda/ Nakyesanja</td>
<td>PAPs/Opinion leaders</td>
<td>To sensitise residents on the restriction on land use at the substation site; Encroachment on the land; rock mining, farming; the farmers request for time to harvest and then leave</td>
<td>Draft Notice of eviction, constant monitoring, bush clearing within the box; farmers to be allowed to harvest and totally vacate; land to be fenced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/05</td>
<td>Wife to Zimula Badru (NAMW-BP004-011-T3)</td>
<td>Stakeholder, Namwezi</td>
<td>Directly project affected person</td>
<td>Field Verification Exercise</td>
<td>No revaluation since many stakeholders abandoned their land after the 2000 valuation and caution not to affect any development by AES</td>
<td>Issue noted for consideration when compiling a report</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>11/23/05</td>
<td>Mr. Kabagambe Kaliisa</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary MEMD, Kampala</td>
<td>Project proponent (GoU)</td>
<td>Discuss solution for the water problem at the site, fencing the east bank, financing of works on the Bujagali line, commencement of works on the line</td>
<td>No spare parts for the broken pumps, and PAPs are raising this as a big issue since they have limited access to the river; need to identify source of funds for the line</td>
<td>Need to get cost of replacing pumps, need to agree on type of fence and get costing and implement asap. GoU to finance the line, GoU to prepare Notice to be served on the line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/05</td>
<td>Mr. Deo Nsereko Kayiwa</td>
<td>RDC Mukono</td>
<td>Central Government</td>
<td>Update office on works on the line, the content of the notice and expected reaction from PAPs</td>
<td>Stakeholders concerns need addressing; compensation should be prompt, fair and timely</td>
<td>RDC to assist in mobilisation and sensitisation of residents, need for more regular updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/05</td>
<td>Mr. Frank Ssebowa</td>
<td>CEO ERA</td>
<td>Regulator</td>
<td>Update office on works on the line, the content of the notice and expected reaction from PAPs</td>
<td>Compensation should be fair and prompt; process has been irregular and needs modification</td>
<td>UETCL to apply for License for the Line, ERA will announce to public and provide opportunity for response and then UETCL can go ahead with works after permission from ERA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/05</td>
<td>Nyanzi Edward</td>
<td>Nama</td>
<td>Directly project affected person</td>
<td>Field Verification Exercise</td>
<td>Claims Luyombya is a licensee not a tenant on his land</td>
<td>To be sorted out by the LC I leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/05</td>
<td>Mr. Maasa Apollo</td>
<td>LC III Chairman Wakisi Subcounty</td>
<td>Opinion leader</td>
<td>Provide feedback from field verification on the line seek input for solutions to issues raised; deliver the notices;</td>
<td>Government decision is to redo activities on the line (survey and valuation); timing of notice is bad, considering the engineering time; no need for revaluation in Wakisi sub county, may bring undue speculation</td>
<td>Concerns captured and will be communicated to relevant persons (UETCL, MEMD) and feedback given</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>12/14/05</td>
<td>Mr. Aaron Wasswa</td>
<td>LC III Chairman Nagojje Subcounty</td>
<td>Opinion leader</td>
<td>Provide feedback from field verification on the line, seek input for solutions to issues raised; deliver the notices;</td>
<td>How will the losses be handled (dilapidated houses, abandoned farms, etc.)? What is the relevance of the notice given by AES? Notice not translated</td>
<td>Concerns captured and will be communicated to relevant persons (UETCL, MEMD) and feedback given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/05</td>
<td>Ntanda Lugeza</td>
<td>LC III Rep Goam Subcounty</td>
<td>Opinion leader</td>
<td>Provide feedback from field verification on the line seek input for solutions to issues raised; deliver the notices</td>
<td>PAPs poorer than before; more consultations needed than was done previously; L.C facilitation, reduce influence of politicians; Complaints to ERA may not yield too much since PAPs don’t have legal representation.</td>
<td>Concerns captured and will be communicated to relevant persons (UETCL, MEMD) and feedback given</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PCDP Appendix B
Phase 1 Consultation Materials
### Meeting Notes: Bujagali ESIA Scoping Mission, January 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Attendees</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 | Project site/ESIA status  
- No major differences from AESNP design and operation, water releases, management etc.  
- Rock fill will be obtained 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 provided in 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 Victoria 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 Lake Victoria 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 meeting notes)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transmission Line</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* No compensation has been paid for t-line, other than Kawanda substation. Kawanda not fenced off, and some crops are present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* T-line re-valuation is a legal requirement of GoU/UETCL. Sithe/IPS team are to advise, take info back and report to international lenders/community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Riparian notification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WWR/Kalagala offset</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Commissioner to check with PS on Kalagala offset position, and advise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Will also check on Sector Revenue Waterfall project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* WWR - be aware that LCs may seek replacement revenue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEMD 9 Jan 06</strong></td>
<td><strong>PS Kaliisa</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Kalagala offset still exists, but will need to re-constitute multi-sector committee that was looking after this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEMA 9 Jan 06</strong></td>
<td><strong>Henry Aryamanya-Mughisha, ED</strong>  <strong>Waiswa Ayazika, EIA Coordinator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* New Code of Conduct for Environmental Practitioners – need to be registered with NEMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Addendum to old EIA sufficient, or start from scratch? OK to submit ‘Revised EIA’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* No Project Brief required as this project has already been subject to EIA and approved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Lake water levels should be addressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Fish passage – follow up with FIRRI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Consultation should focus on updating. Include new developments e.g. hotels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Capacity building – NEMA did a review/report. Waiswa to dig out and check relevance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultee Attendees Notes

**Communications:** write to ED, cc. Waiswa.

**New regulations:** air quality standards are going through Parliament, code of conduct, noise regulations (including blasting), public smoking. Uganda has signed up to Kyoto Protocol and Stockholm Convention on POPs.

**Other new policies/in progress:** malaria (DDT spraying), HIV control.

**Lead Agencies:** traffic mgmt= Ministry of Works, Transport and Communications and Local Authorities; dust/blasting=NEMA; cultural property - none (reviewed internally by NEMA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jinja leadership 11 Jan 06</td>
<td>RDC &amp; Deputy RDC Deputy Mayor of Jinja (apologies from Mayor) Budondo LC3 Bujagali LC1 Chair Kyabirwa LC1 Chair Namizi West LC1 Chair Namizi Central LC1 Chair DEO Jinja (Dick Lufafa) BIU – Eddie, Zac, George K, Thomas</td>
<td>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 &amp; 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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Jinja DEO 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 planting, and give sufficient time to find alternative locations. 100 m buffer zone required. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| FIRRI                   | John Balirwa, Director Jonna Kamanyi Bismus Babazi – catch assessment S Wandera G Namulemo | • Monitoring – DEO is required to carry out monitoring (all DEOs are Gazetted Environmental Inspectors). DL looking to set up Environmental Committees at parish level.  
• Sanitation – too many people per latrine? Bush has been removed. Needs education.  
• Address WWR issue.  
• FIRRI previously have AESNP (PON/Thomas) a proposal for how to proceed with training for changes in fish stocks/fishing types.  
• AESNP had permits to construct new landing sites/float jetties. These were not constructed.  
• 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.  
• Fish ladder – FIRRI happy to re-state earlier recommendation to NEMA, that this is not needed.  
• 2000 fisheries surveys need updating, to take into account both random change, and the effects of changes in Lake Victoria levels.  
• Water hyacinth in Lake Victoria has probably not changed.  
• Recent haplochromine work on Victoria Nile found the same as 2001 surveys. |
| Mukono leadership       | RDC Mukono LC3 Wakisi LC1 Kikubamutwe General Sec Kikibamutwe LC1 Naminya LC1 Buloba BIU | • RDC: power is the priority.  
• LC3 Wakisi – use local labour. Advise LC3 of workforce size in advance so they can mobilise.  
• Gen Sec Kikubamutwe – LC1 should approve employment offers – may be thieves or not locals.  
• LC3 Wakisi - what about schools, health centre, electricity, water tanks as promised?  
• LC1 Naminya – borehole spare parts, schools, electrification, establish market/committee.  
• Gen Sec Kikubamutwe – t-line surveyed but no compensation. Structures have collapsed, plants left to revert to bush. Should be compensated at 2000 rate.  
• RDC – access roads should be improved.  
• Zac (BIU) - original roads were well made. Maintenance was the responsibility of the local community.  
• RDC - bore water is primitive. Can we provide piped water?  
• LC1 Buloba – 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. |
| Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) | Damian Akankwasa (Acting ED) Charles Mwesigye (Community) | • Mabira conservation area needs to create similar habitat. Shouldn’t be existing forest – better to enhance a degraded area.  
• Need to assess effects of gazetting |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Consultation/Planning/EIA | Richard, Eunice Dule, Sam | • Can animals be translocated to Kalagala Islands?  
• Little animal translocation experience at UWA (re: animals on islands)  
• 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.  
• ED – possible to extend length of JWS?  
• 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. |
| Directorate of Commissioner Eng. | Luzira HQ is concerned with engineering. Need to consult DWD Ebtebe (Nsubuga/Twinomujune) re: hydrology and riparian notification.  
• DWD mobilises villages to form Water and Sanitation Committees (9 members including Chair, Secretary).  
• 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.  
• ss 6 & 18 permits only last 1 year. Need to re-apply at Entebbe. Ditto dredging licence.  
• No new permits required.  
• Dam Safety Management Unit/Commission must be struck. |
| National Forestry Authority (NFA) | Olav Bjella, ED Edward Mupada, Paul Buyerah, Samuel Vivian Matagi | • NFA has been an Authority since 26 April 2004, mandated under the National Forestry & Tree Planting Act 2003.  
• 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.  
• Act vested former Forest Department responsibilities into three:  
  o Policy & Regulatory role lies with Ministry of Land, Water & Environment  
  o Central Forest Reserve responsibilities lie with NFA (506 in total, 1.2 million hectares)  
  o District Forestry Services (local government) – meant to recruit officers to manage Local FRs (c. 200 in total) plus supervise private sector.  
• Mabira forest:  
  o Loss of land must be compensated (e.g. like-for-like)  
  o Trees must be compensated with cash  
  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 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NFA can provide consultancy arm to do surveys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kifu/Namyoya FRs are now licensed to provide individuals for plantation forest. Will need to be compensated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalagala Offset:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrift has a permit/licence for tourism lodge on islands (semi-permanent structures)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Query on ownership/legal status of Kalagala Islands – unsure if they are part of Kalagala Falls or Nile Bank FRs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will project flood the Kimaka FR? (no – c. 100 m from riverbank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED – why not gazette buffer area along river bank as well?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Ssenyonjo is NFA GIS officer – will provide GIS data (at a price).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM – doesn’t see any new issues with hydro site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission/distribution losses are 34% in terms of GWh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local amendments to t-line route will be difficult due to intensive settlement. Angle towers are also more expensive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 vs 2006 valuations: (encroachment/non-encroachment).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutundwe substation – Masaka line is starting construction (upgrade from 33 to 132 kV), not a new line. Bujagali will run parallel to this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New houses constructed under proposed Buj line, e.g. 2 story structure at AP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP9 area – considerable encroachment into Lubigi swamp – cattle grazing, draining, papyrus cutting etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee</td>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP14 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might be better to use Northern bypass corridor on opposite side of Lubigi swamp as people have been resettled off this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabira FR – UETCL is keeping 30 m wayleave clear of vegetation and has improved access road and culverts/bridges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might be better to use Northern bypass corridor on opposite side of Lubigi swamp as people have been resettled off this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabira FR – UETCL is keeping 30 m wayleave clear of vegetation and has improved access road and culverts/bridges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern bypass route – Burnside to draft letter to Min. Works Transport &amp; Communications and request this option be considered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of work for UETCL valuation exercise – 3 months in field, 1 month reporting. 3 packages – survey, valuation, Witness NGO.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToRs sent to Fred Giovannetti.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Electrification Development</td>
<td>PS Kaliisa</td>
<td>Mandate is to bring into implementation the Rural Electrification Master Plan. REMP is still under development – expected finalisation is Aug 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority 16 Jan 06</td>
<td>George K Eng Muganga, UETCL</td>
<td>GoU has also given mandate for a separate problem – to electrify centres which would otherwise not be commercially viable – new districts, headquarters etc. c. 15 in number which have no power at all. GoU allocates budgets every year for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Options used/examined include grid extension, mini-grid if resources available, solar, mini-hydro (&lt;20 MW), co-gen. Bagasse co-gen projects include Kakira (20MW of which 6 MW is used by plant) and Lugazi which is looking at 6 MW (3 MW to grid). Others also being investigated. Project Planning Manager = Grainne Rubomboras (based at Workers House).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Definition of rural – any area not currently connected to power. Also infilling of existing areas (70% contribution from REA in these situations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Target – 10% connection by 2010 – c. 400,000 new connections between 2001 and 2010 i.e 40k/year. Equates to around 130 MW in total.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GIS based system to match sources/transmission with demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRN criticism that Bujagali won’t increase rural connections – response is that REA programme needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee</td>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Uganda Investment Authority**<br>16 Jan 06 | Dr Maggie Kigozi<br>Issa Mukasa | 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. |
| **Ministry of Tourism, Trade<br>& Industry**<br>16 Jan 06 | Sam Nahamya – PS (TT&I)<br>Cankwo Jogeni Okulo (Principal Industrial Officer)<br>Cuthbert Baguma – Licensing, Tourism | 4 Ministries now combined – Mktg & Co-operation, Commerce, Industry & Technology, + Tourism, Wildlife & Antiquities.  
- 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 – probably sensitive and under-reported. Best to approach companies directly when ToR approved.  
- PS: Kalagala offset/access/development is best way to mitigate/compensate Bujagali. GoU needs to commit to improving access.  
- Future communications should be direct with MTTI – no local representation other than local |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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. • Land Act and Electricity Act define roles and responsibilities. • ERA do load and supply forecasting. • Supply forecast is difficult due to projects which are not announced early, plus shocks such as drought/lake level. • 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. • 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. • Looking to make NBI the forum for international notification. • 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. • Lake levels – NBI has no current information on lake levels. Soon launching a project in Addis for sharing such information. • See WB/CIDA/SNC-Lavalin/Hydro-Quebec SSEA Nov 2005. Norplan/WREM study.</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. Publis review period is 28 working days. • 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. • 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ministry of | Justus Tindigarukayo- | • From 1992 to 2002 MTTI has been developing a 10 year integrated Tourism Master Plan. This has
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism, Trade and Industry (MTTI), Tourism Department, 20 March, 06</td>
<td>Kashagire (Commissioner, Tourism &amp; Wildlife) Baguma Cuthbert Balinda, Tourism Officer</td>
<td>not been updated but there is a new policy that came out in 2003 and a Tourism Marketing Strategy in 2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Specific to Bujagali WWR is relatively new and draws largely on thrill seekers. MTTI has been unable to canvass specific proprietors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In the event of displacement by the dam Kalagala is considered an appropriate alternate option/tourist destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 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. 10 districts have been identified as focus areas for MTTI and Jinja is one of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Kalagala seen as Bujagali tradeoff but development is hampered by poor access and poor infrastructure as well as encroachment of locals along the shores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Forestry Authority (NFA), 20 March, 06</td>
<td>Olav Bjella, Paul Musamuli, C.D. Lagoya and Jones Ruhombe.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Would be looking to sponsor to assist NFA in carrying out NFA Plan for Kalagala as part of the overall commitment towards the Kalagala offset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nalubaale Rafting, 20 March, 06</td>
<td>Ian Baille - Owner</td>
<td>Fairly new operator (newest of the existing WWR operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Runs 1 day, 2 day and multiday trips. 2 day trips would become 1 day trips and there would be no more multiday trips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee</td>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ugandan Wildlife Authority (UWA), 20 March, 06 | Eunice Nyiramahoro Duli, Deputy Director, Planning, Monitoring and Research | - 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.  
- 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.  
- UWA is a sub ministry of MTrl.  
- UWA has a 5 year Strategic Plan as well as a Tourism Investment Plan. |
| Nile River Explorers       | John Dahl, Owner                                                          | - Started out about 9 years ago.  
- 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.  
- 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. |
| Equator Rafting             | Hitesh Vora, Manager                                                     | - Have been around for 4 years. Business owned by same operation who owes the Speke Hotel Group.  
- 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.  
- Runs mainly 1-day trips. Main clientele is backpackers and over Landers. Have a camping facility in Jinja and charge $75 for 1-day trip. $150 for 2 day trip. Had around 3,000 people last year (2005). Local guides get $20 to $30 per day. Overseas guides get $60 per day. Have about 45 employees. Spin off activities include family float trips, village walks and kayak school. Another proprietor runs quad |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder site meeting to Bujagali, East and West Bank of Kalagala, 23 March 06</td>
<td>Ugandan Wildlife Authority - Richard Kapere, MTTI - Cuthbert Balinda, NEMA - Waiswa Ayazika, NTA - Rueben Arinitwe.</td>
<td>- Mitigation measures include utilising impoundment area for new water sports. Move operations to new launch site downstream of dam and alter trip format. 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></td>
<td></td>
<td>- NEMA has authority over all land within 100m of the riverbanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- UWA requested more detailed information on the terrestrial ecology and plant and animal species on the Bujagali islands that will be inundated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- MTTI wants to confirm that heritage issues are reviewed to the satisfaction of the Ministry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- NFA wants review of the Kalagala tourism development plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCI and LC3 representatives for Wakisi sub-county (West bank of Nile), 27 March 06</td>
<td>Consultant team, Sponsor representative and BIU representative.</td>
<td>- 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Very important that hiring for the project construction be local. LCs stressed that they are in support of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eskom Engineer at Nalubaale Dam site (Owen Falls), 27 March 06</td>
<td>Engineer Elimu Esimu</td>
<td>- Volume of flow through the powerhouse is governed by the regulations imposed by DWD. Currently 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee</td>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mayor Elect Kezaala Basuale Muhammed, 27 March 06 | Mayor Elect Kezaala Basuale Muhammed | • 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. |
| LC1 and LC3 representatives for Budondo sub-county (East bank of Nile), 28 March 06 | Consultant team, Sponsor representative and BIU representative. | • 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. |
| Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD), 29 March 06 | Engineer Paul Mubiru, Commissioner | • In terms of alternative power supply geothermal is still a long way down the road. There is potential for possibly 450MW 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.  
• 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEMA, 30 March 06</td>
<td>Gerald Sawula, Deputy Executive Director; Waiswa Ayazika, EIA Coordinator</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWA, 30 March 06</td>
<td>Aggrey Rwetsiba, Monitoring and Research Coordinator; Kapere Richard, Planning and EIA Officer</td>
<td>Mission wrap up meeting. UWA reiterated that their main concern was mitigation/monitoring/implementation plan for sensitive species identified in areas to be inundated. Also wanted some sponsor assistance in planting of indigenous species in Kalagala - Itanda area to enhance local ecology. Wanted results of the ecological survey to be discussed with UWA prior to inclusion into the final report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTTI, 30 March 06</td>
<td>Justus Tindigarukayo-Kashagire, Commissioner, Tourism &amp; Wildlife; Baguma Cuthbert Balinda, Tourism Officer. Courtesy visit with MTTI</td>
<td>Mission wrap up meeting. MTTI concurred that cultural information centres would be a good idea. MTTI 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFA, 31 March 06</td>
<td>Addison Anbrua, Coordinator for Land Management</td>
<td>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. All lands in the Kalagala/Itanda area are in the process of being gazetted. No plans to gazette the Bujagali Islands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate of Water</td>
<td>Jackson Twinomujuni, Hydrologist</td>
<td>Main issues for DWD include sediment management with respect to the potential impact on the water head upstream of the dam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee</td>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Development (DWD), 1 April 06 | | • 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 cumecs, 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 Uganda's 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

ENNYANJULA

Bujagali Hydro Power Project (BHPP) esuubirwa okukola amasanyalaze agaweza 250 MW ng'essa ngiibwanga ku kizinga ekiyitibwa Dumbell, 8km mubukila kkonko bw'omugga, okuva mukibuga ky'e Jinja. Uganda kumugga Kiyira (Victoria Nile). Pulojekiti eja kubaamw okuzimba ebbibiro ly'a 50 MW turbines, daamu eweza obuwanvu bwa 28m wamu n'emirimu emirala egigerenderako. Ebbibiro ly'amasanyalaze lisuubirwa okubera kuttaka eriweza obugazi bwa yika 308 kumbalama zombi ez'omugga.

Bujagali HPP yasooka kutandikibwa ekitongole kya AES Nile Power Ltd. ng'emyaka gya 1990 giggawako, okubutoriza okukwata kungeri gyenekosaamu embere y'obutonde wamu n'embeera z'abantu 'Social and Environmental Assessment' (SEA) for the Hydro Power Project wamu n'emirimu gyonna egyekuusa kukukola amasanyalaze yakolebwa. Pulojekiti yonna okutwalira awamu (hydro and transmission facilities) yakakasibwa Govumenti ya Uganda (GoU) ng'egiyita ku National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA) mu mwaka gwa 1999/2001 era n'ekakasibwa ne Banka y'embeera wamu ne African Development Bank mu December 2001.


Era bwogatta ku BHPP waliwo ne Bujagali Interconnection Project. Munkola eriwo kati, BEL, kulwa Uganda Electricity Transmission Company Limited (UETCL), elja kukuulaakulanya wamu n'okukudakanya okuzimba byonna eby'eza agisa okukola amasanyalaze mu bbibiro ly'amasanyalaze esisuubirwa okuzimbwa e Bujagali.

Okwekeneenya engeri pulojekiti gyekosamaamu obutonde bw'ensi n'embeera z'abantu (Social and Environmental Assessment) BEL etekateeka okuwaayo n'okukakasibwa NEMA, World Bank Group

EKYIRANO

r'ebitongole ebiralaba ebiwola ensimbi omuli African Development Bank ne European Investment Bank, nebiwandiiko ebipya eby'a SEA.

Mungeri y'emu. BEL ewaddeyo eri NEMA ebigobererwa SEA (ToRs) eby'a BHPP ne Interconnection Project okubugeeneneenyana wamu n'okubikakasa. ToRs zinoziwa enkola kwebanasinziira okukola okuoonoyereza okupya okwa SEA wamu n'okukola ebibwandiiko ebipya eby'a SEA ki pulojekiti zombi. Lipoota ezenjewulo eza SEA zija kutegekebwa okukozeserwa mu BHPP ne Interconnection Project. Enkola ya SEA wamu n'ebibwandiiko ebinagenderako bijja kuba bituukagana bulungi n'amateeka ga GOU wamu n'ebitongole eby'ensi yonna ebiwola, amateeka eg'obutonde bw'ensi, ebingiro n'enkola egobererwa. SEA za pulojekiti zukuggwa omwaka guno.

Eby'okukola ku kwebuzaako

Abasasulira pulojekiti eno bewaayo okwebuza ku kwebuzaako enyo abakatibawako mukiseera kyonna eby'okunooonyereza kwa SEA. Okubutoriza eri abantu bonna wamu n'okukola puloanga 'Public Consultation and Disclosure Plan' (PCDP) kutegekeddwa nga kulaga enenteekateeka enegebererwa mukwebuzaako kuno. PCDP ne SEA ToRs bifunika okuva eri omuntu atuukirwako wamwanga wamu n'okukola puloanga gwaensy yonna ogwa pulojekiti 'website' www.bujagali-energy.com. Okububula oka obuwanuuko y'esa ToRs ne PCOPY biteekedwa okuweerezeerwa eri omuntu ono abana atuukirwako wamwanga.

Okwebuzaako kuzingiramu abantu bonna, ebyalo, ebibila by'anakyewa wamu n'ebitongole bya gavumenti era kugenda mumasa.

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 BUAJAGALI HYDROPOWER PROJECT &
THE BUAJAGALI 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 Ahalsibwe
IPS Uganda
Plot 109-112, Fifth Street,
Industrial Area, Kampala.
Tel: +256 41 258194
fabian@ipsuganda.com
ISSUES THAT REQUIRE ATTENTION BY THE BUJAGALI HYDRO POWER TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT.

By

Technical Committee,
Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry, Fisheries and Environment
Buganda Kingdom

Preamble:
In Buganda it is becoming apparent that in future we shall have a Federal State of Buganda Kingdom within Uganda. Therefore some of the issues are pertaining to the proposed transmission line from Bujagali power project are concerns for Buganda as Federal Kingdom.

General Issues:

a) The consultations with the local communities should be done in conjunction with the Kabaka’s officers “the Batongole” who are on ground. The officers of the Kingdom should also equally be consulted in addition to the consultations that were made by the LCs.

b) Some of the land belongs to the Kabaka, but the other land may be for the Kingdom. The two different entities. In both cases, some of this land has squatters on it. It is important that the various stakeholders in ownership of the land be compensated. How are the compensations going to be made? In what percentages per stakeholder?

c) What will be the benefit of the line to the Kingdom? We are of the view that whoever is going to generate power will sell it to make profits. Some of the proceeds should go to the kingdom who is the main mobiliser of the natural resources in catchments from which the power is generated.

Pertaining to the Environment

d) During the construction of the line, many trees, forest, wetlands, etc natural resources will be destroyed. Many of these sites are cultural and very important to the livelihoods of the people. It is necessary that similar environments be created to replace those that will be lost. The ones of the spirits may be difficult to replace hence need not be destroyed. It is proposed that

- The kingdom provides land for tree planting as a replacement
- Valley dams can be created in appropriate areas of the catchment
- Funds may be availed to restore degraded environments within the catchment.

e) The Kingdom is concerned about the wetlands that may be affected and these not only include the Lubigi in the project document but also many other including Sezibwa. The valleys from Bujagali to Kampala together with the wetlands are very important watering points for livestock in Buganda
Kingdom. There other issues of economic importance that include the goods in form of raw materials these natural resources provided to the people like the crafts industry, building materials, water, etc which are the main source of income to the people and therefore their livelihoods. Pertinent to the resources above are the services they offer and these include hydrological services like water purification and storage, and of course purification of air.

f) There already two lines that transmit power from Jinja to Kampala. What will happen when they are no longer in use? In future it may be identified that there are cheaper (new technologies) ways to transmit the power. We propose that the land in question be leased and when that time comes it reverts and is re-entrusted into ownership of the Kabaka’s Government.

g) There already two lines are passing in the area where the majority of the rural communities do not have access to electricity. We propose that the people in the area where the lines pass benefit from the electricity which pass overhead by constructing a distribution line to cater for them.

h) There is need for monitoring of the environment especially at the Gombololas (Sub-county). Since this is the third line, a monitoring plan for the social economic and environment issues should be designed and given to the chiefs to follow up. This will also assist the management of the catchments where the water is coming from.

Recommendations

1. In compensating people, identify the true stakeholders. The Kabaka’s officers are available to assist in this process.
2. Adequate compensation is necessary for our people to identify alternative homes especially for those who will be directly affected. The compensation should not be delayed to be affected by inflation.
3. We recommend that in future while addressing leader, to use the Batongole, Miruka, Gombolola and Ssaza chief as the main mobilisers of the Kabaka’s government in addition to the central government structures.
4. There is land in Buganda which can be used to plant trees and development of the valley dams. The office of the Katikiro and the Buganda land board can be used to identify these areas.
5. The Katikiro should establish a team to observe the processes of the Bujagali transmission power project from start to completion.

Fredrick W. K. Kwazi
CHAIRMAN
Bujagali Project team Consultation meeting with Buganda Kingdom (31-08-2006)

The meeting was held as a follow-up on the previous one held on the 15th Aug. 2006. A total of 22 technical people under the Buganda Kingdom Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry, Fisheries and Environment were met. It was chaired by the Hon. Minister of state for Agriculture and Environment.

The Bujagali Project was represented by Dr. Patrick Mwesigye (Burnside), Thomas Kasule (BPIU), Adnan Khalid (BEL), Mutesa Edward (BPIU) and David Bizimana (Witness NGO)

The meeting begun with opening remarks from the Minister (Owk. Lubega Ben). He did acknowledge the job ahead of the project team and emphasized the Kingdom’s commitment to work together with the project sponsors in making sure that the job is done.

The Bujagali Project team gave a brief on the project setup (BEL, Burnside, BPIU & Witness NGO). The project description was also done (Hydro and Interconnection projects).

The main intension of the meeting was to get feedback/ comments from the committee on the draft terms TOR for the project(s). This was in reference to the 15th Aug. 2006 meeting where the committee had promised to collect enough views/ comments on the same. These comments could also be submitted in writing.

The team went through the consultation process. An explanation of the lender/ NEMA requirements was made with clarification about NEMA also being one of the major stakeholders to be consulted in the process.

The following were the issues raised by the committee;

The Committee emphasized the need for the Bujagali SEA team to seek guidance on the representatives of the kingdom during the exercise. These are the custodians of the kingdom property along the affected communities. They gave examples of the parish chiefs (Abatongole) in each village that can clearly identify Kabaka’s land. Guidance should also be sought from other Stakeholders besides the Kingdom (like the Church and town councils).

During this stage of project development, the sponsors should consider the welfare of the project affected people. Economic and cultural issues need to be addressed. They called for transparency during the exercise and reasonable awareness through arrangement of radio programs. All stake holders need to be informed through the different media besides the physical consultations.
The committee noted that Buganda is one of the Stakeholders affected by the project and it was in their view that adequate compensation is given to the Kingdom. They gave an example of the land that houses the existing Mutundwe Sub-station. It belongs to the Kingdom but never been compensated since it was set up. All land-related issues for the kingdom are under the handled by the Buganda Land Board (BLB). They did request the project sponsor to work closely with the board during the land acquisition exercise. Project sponsor should also consider other resources like forests and wetlands that might be affected by the project and belong to the Kingdom. The committee through the BLB promised to avail copies of land titles to the project surveyor as guiding tools in the identification of the affected land and assets.

For a period of 40 years before 1993, Buganda land was under the Central Government (Uganda Land Commission). To date some of the land has been transferred back to the Kingdom but noted that so many changes had happened. Some of the Plot/ Block numbers were changed and also the change in measurements (cadastral data). There is need to review the old data.

They made a suggestion of entering a lease arrangement instead of outright purchase of the 5m right of way corridor.

The need for the project sponsors to sensitize the PAPs on land acquisition rights and limitations.

Marginalized stakeholders like traditional healers need to be considered. This can be coordinated through the ministry of Culture (Buganda kingdom).

The project team at this point briefed the committee on the PCDP timeline. They were informed of the summary report about the existing project activities coming out soon. It will be translated in Luganda and Lusoga. This report will be advertised through news papers and over local radio stations. They assured the committee of a very transparent exercise.

The committee also promised to read through the project documents as a group and make a written report will all views/ input from the Kingdom.
Buganda Kingdom Stakeholders’ consultative meeting with the Bujagali Hydropower Project Team (05-09-2006)

Summary of Discussion

The meeting was held at the kingdom offices (Cabinet room) - Bulange- Mengo chaired by the Katikkiro (Prime minister). It begun with the Buganda kingdom Anthem, a prayer, introduction of the participants, Opening remarks from Owek. Daniel Mulika (the Katikkiro), a project brief from the Bujagali project team, presentation of the technical committee report by the minister of Agriculture Animal Industry, fisheries and Environment (Buganda Government).

The briefing from the project team involved the description of the project right from the previous sponsor AES Nile Power (1997-2003), through the transition stage under Bujagali Project Implementation Unit (2003-2005) and finally to the new sponsors; Bujagali Energy Limited and Uganda Electricity Transmission Company Limited (UETCL).

The team briefed the Kingdom reps. about the purpose of the meeting as being part of the SEA process of Public Consultations and Disclosure Plan (PCDP), into which Buganda Kingdom is one of the major stakeholders. The meeting was intended to getting views/input (feedback) as agreed in the previous technical committee meeting (31st Aug. 2006) after internalizing the draft project documents (TORs for the Hydro project, Interconnection Project and the PCDP).

Issues raised by the Kingdom during the meeting

The team through the Katikkiro demonstrated their support for the project but there was strong emphasis on transparency in the project development stage. The project developers should ensure adequate compensation for the affected stakeholders. Proper identification of the affected stakeholders should be followed. This can be done using the existing Kingdom structure (The saza chiefs, Gombolola, Omuluka and Abatongole. Examples of Government projects implemented without adequate compensation like the Northern Bypass were given.

The Project sponsors were informed to take the issue of land as being the major concern for the Kingdom. In this, caution should be taken in identifying land belonging to the Kingdom and land solely owned by the Kabaka (King). Old maps (available in the Kingdom library) would be handy in this process as references. There is need to compare the present surveys with the old cadastral sheets to get a true picture of such boundaries.

A concern was raised on how the Hydro site land acquisition was conducted. Whether a proper procedure was followed in identifying the different categories of ownership. This
covers landowners, lease holders, sub-lease holders, tenants and licensees. These previous surveys need to be crosschecked to verify accuracy of the acquisition. Such issues should be considered during the T-line land acquisition process. Land Owners in this case are the best tool for guidance as no transactions can be effected without their consent from the other categories of ownerships. It was noted that most government projects do not consider this arrangement and caution should be taken by the project consultants not to repeat the previous mistakes.

A call was made for the involvement of Buganda Land Board (BLB) in this exercise to ensure adequate compensation for the Kingdom. A need for BLB to be availed copies of the survey and valuation reports from the project consultants, besides the consultant seeking guidance (clarification) from the Kingdom when it comes to the different categories of ownerships. All levels of leadership should be involved in this process not forgetting the participation of the Kingdom representatives at Sub-county and parish levels. This will help in avoiding fraudulent payments to people who actually are not the right beneficiaries.

It was also noted that the ownership of land in Uganda is different in the different regions. For the case of Buganda Kingdom, ownership of land is not fully bound by the Land Act. The constitution of Uganda fully empowers the Buganda Land Board as custodian for the Kingdom land. In most cases Buganda Kingdom does not sale land, it’s normally leased where there are such developments and this calls for negotiations prior to the project’s implementation.

The kingdom is also a major player when it comes to environmental protection. The impact of the project to water bodies (declining water levels of L. Victoria), Vegetation cover (forests), e.t.c. They were highlighted as issues of international concern and Buganda Kingdom has a role to play in the protection of these sources. A request was therefore made to the project sponsors to avail the Kingdom with all the project environmental documents (information) for review. Where possible, this could also cover documents for the previous projects like the Owen falls dam and the extension.

A need for coordination of all parties was raised during this SEA process. It should be a collective effort. The Kingdom needs to be updated/ furnished with all the progressive SEA reports. The project consultants and sponsors were advised to mitigate all the foreseen project impacts according to the environmental laws in place.

For areas with cultural significance (Shrines, graves e.t.c) a request was made in rerouting the line where possible to avoid them. Such sites normally have historical attachments onto them and can be good sources of tourism attractions in the near future. The Kingdom has a Ministry of Culture that can be handy in guiding the project consultant when it comes to cultural related issues.

The Kingdom also wanted to know whether the project is composed of a social responsibility clause from the developers to the affected stakeholders.
How the previous T-line valuation (year 2000) will be handled in comparison to the new exercise (year 2006). The valuation methods used need to be clarified.

A call for the entire project affected stakeholders to be compensated before construction was made.

A need for verification (cross-checking) of the titles issued by ULC for the hydro site to ensure that no parties were left without compensation. Some land could have been under the jurisdiction of the kingdom.

The Katikkiro suggested the formation of a coordinating committee to over-see issues/matters concerning the project and the Buganda Kingdom.

Summary

The project team gave a brief on some component of the project Community Development Action Plan, The timing of the SEA activities and publications.

It was agreed that the Kingdom representatives at grass-root levels (Sub-county chiefs) Would be included in all SEA activities and the idea of the forming a coordinating committee to be considered.

Arrangements are to be made for the consultant's surveyor and valuewer to work closely with the Kingdom authorities.

The project team gave a commitment to document all the views of the Kingdom and giving feedback on the same as the project developments move on.

At this point the meeting was adjourned by just after the Katikkiro giving his closing remarks.
PCDP Appendix D.1
Public Notices
PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT

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 LIPOOTA MUBUFUNZE (SEA SUMMARY REPORTS)

Ennyanjula

Bujagali Hydro Power Project (BHPP) lye bbibiro ly’amasanyalaze ensimbi. Ekiwadiisibwa okuva ku NDagiriro wamanga nekumuku-ensimbi. Ekigendererwa kya SEAs kwekulaba nti pulojekiti ziteekewateekewa era zikulakukulanyi-izibwa mungere eraga nti ekosa kitono embeera z’a-bantu n’obutonde bw’ensi wabula nga zitwala mu maaso okuganyulyula kwa pulojekiti. Pulani ku mbeera z’a-bantu n’obutonde bw’ensi zikolebwa okuva mubuya mu lipoota za SEAs okuyamba mukussa munkola pulojekiti.

Lipoota ya SEA eri mububage ezi bwa 250 MW lisangibwa ku kizin-bantu n’obutonde bw’ensi wabo nga zitwala mu Dumbell, kilomita 8 okuva ku bbibiro lya Kiira ne maaso okuganyula kwa pulojekiti. Puloani ku Emirimu gy’okwebuzaako Nalubaale, kumugga Kiira (Victoria Nile) mu bukiika kcona bwe biko nga y’Inyentari eya SEA.

Okunonyereza ku ngeri pulojekiti gy’okosamugye embeera za-bantu n’obutonde bw’ensi (SEAs) ku pulojekiti kuna jabo tutegekebwa okuweebwoyo eri eki-tongole kya Uganda cyo National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), era zekaanyizibwe ebitongole ebusuubirwa okuwa pulojekiti ensimbi okuweeza Banka Y’ensi Yonna (World Bank Group). SEAs zikolebwa okutuukiriza ebyetaago bya Gavumenti ya Uganda, wamu n’enkola egbererwa, omutindo n’ebinagobererwa abanaawola pulojekiti ensimbi. Ekiwadiisibwa okuva ku bwa Nalubale, kumugga Kiira (Victoria Nile) mu bukika kcona bwe biko nga y’Inyentari eya SEA.

Lipoota za SEA mububage kati zitegekeddwa ku Pulojekiti y’ebbibiro ly’amasanyalaze (Hydro Power Project) ne Interconnection Project. Lipoota zino zifunika ebbago ly’ebibiro ly’amasanyalaze (Hydro Power Project) ne Interconnection Project. Lipoota zino zifunika ebbago ly’ebibiro ly’amasanyalaze (Hydro Power Project) ne Interconnection Project. Lipoota zino zifunika ebbago ly’ebibiro ly’amasanyalaze (Hydro Power Project) ne Interconnection Project. Lipoota zino zifunika ebbago ly’ebibiro ly’amasanyalaze (Hydro Power Project) ne Interconnection Project.
PCDP Appendix D.2
SEA Consultation Summary Reports
The material in this report reflects best judgment 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 Entandikwa Ya Puloolojekiti Eno


Waliwo pulojojekiti endala emanyiddwa nga Bujagali Interconnection Project (IP) eneyungiibwa ku bbibiro lino ng’eno y’enetambuza amasannyalaze ng’esasulibwa ekitongole kya Uganda Electricity Transmission Company Limited.BEL ejja kuyambako UETCL okuzimba pulojekiti eno esobole okutambuza n’okusaasanya amasannyalaze gano mu ggwanga.


Mu 2003, kkampuni ya AESNP yajja entha mu puloolojekiti eno ekyawaliriza gavumenti ya Uganda okunoonya omuntu oba kkampuni enesobola okuzimba ebbibiro. Aba BEL abaalondebwa okukola omulimu ogwo era ne bateeka emikono ku ndagaano y’okukola amasannyalaze gano mu 2006.

Ekiwandiiko ekirala ekirimu kalonda yenna ku mbeera y’obutonde bw’ensi n’eyabantu ku nsonga eno, kitegekebwa era kigenda kuweebwa ekitongole kya NEMA, bbanka y’ensi yonna n’abalala abakwatiibwako ensonga eno.

Ekiwandiiko kina kigendereddwaamu okuyamba abakwatiibwako n’abo abaagala okumanya ebigenda mu maaso ku puloolojekiti eno. Okunoonyereza okwenjawulo kukoleddwa mu bantu bangi era kukyagenda mu maaso mu mwezi guno ogw’omwenda, 2006 nga babuulira abantu ku nsonga eno n’okufuna ebirowoozo byabwe.
2.0 Puloojekiti esangibwa wa?

Enkula y’ekitundu wakati wa Kampala n’omugga Kiyira erimu obuwonvu n’obugga. Mulimu emigga emitonotono. Enkuba etonnya biseera bigere. Etera kutonnya wakati w’omwezi ogw’okusatu n’ogwokutaano ate n’eddamu mu gwo’mwenda okutuuka mu gw’ekkumi n’ogumu. Walwo ekitooogo ekinene ekimanyiddwa nga Lubigi mu bukiika kkono bwa Kampala nga kitera okubera n’amazzi omwaka gwonna.

Mu kitundu ky’ekimu kino, mulimu abantu ab’enjawulo naye ng’abasinga bava mu lulyo lwa Bantu. Okusinziira ku byafaayo, Abasoga baasinga kusenga mu bitundu by’obukiikaddyo bw’omugga Kiyira ate Abaganda ne basisira ku ludda lw’obugwanjuba. Embeera ekyali bweti wadde wabaddewo okuwasangana abantu ne basala okuva ku ludda olumu ne badda ku lulala. Wadde Oluganda n’olusoga ziringa ezaagala okwawukanamu, zombi zitegeerekeka bulungi. Mu bantu bano bangi bakyakkiririza mu ddiini z’ekinnansi wadde oluusi bagattako n’amadiini amalala nga obukulisitaayo, obukatoliki wamu n’obuyisiraamu. Abawerako balina amasabo mwebasinizada bajajjabwe n’okwogera n’emizimu.

Ebifo omugenda okukolebwa omulimu guro ogwa IP okusinga byalo nga enkozesas y’etta ka yesigamye ku masamba n’ennimiro z’abantu kinnomu. Ebyobulimi okusinga bya mikono, mulimu okulima emmere n’ebimera ebitundwa okusinziira ku mbeera z’obudde mumwaka. Ebirime ebitundibwa mulimu Emwanyi, ebikajjo wamu ne Vanilla. Mu birala ebirimibwa nga biriibwa mulimu amatooke, muwogo, lumonde, amayuuni, obulo n’ebijanjaalo. Mu bitundu bye bugwanjuba bwa Kampala omunaayisibwaamasanyalaze, abantu abasinga amaka gaabwe gali mu biiga ate abalala mu bubuga obutonotono.

Ekibira Mabira (Mabira Forest Reserve) nakyo kisangibwa mu luwenda lw’amasanyalaze luno ng’onotera okulumalako e buvanjuba. Kirimu ebika by’emiti egy’omugaso mingi ng’egisinga obungi giri mu MFR. Ekibira kino kirina ebika bye bisolo ne’binyonyi ebierakako, newankubadde temului nsolo nnene ezimanyikiddwa. Layini ya’masanyalaze eno eya Bujagali-Kawanda eriko obuwonvu bwa kilomita 17 mu kibira kino mw’egenda okuyita. Layini eno egenda kuyitako ne mu bubira obulala nga Kifu ne Namyoya.
3.0 Obwetaavu bwa Puloojekiti eno


Abakugene ab'enjawulo bagezezzaako okusoma embeera eno n'okunoonya engeri y'okunogera ekizibubwa kye eddagala. Okunononyeexa kulaga nti tewakoeddwaawo kimala kusoggo kale puloojekiti y'okukola amabibiro g'amasannyalaze okuliiikeriza eggwanga. Mu kiseera keno, omugga Kiyira gwegutunuuluddwa ng'omuyinza okuva amasannyalaze singa guba gukwatiddwa bulungi.

Wabaddeko ebiroowoozo eby'okufuna amasannyalaze okuva mu busa bw'ente nga gasubirwa okuba ku bungi bwa megawaati 45. Wadde kiro kiri bwekityo nga n'ebikozesebwa tuyinza okubifuna, essaawa eno bijinza obutayamba nnyo nga kyetaagisa ekintu kugaba omuyinza okuva amasannyalaze okugasa eggwanga.

Amasannyalaze g'amanda gasobola okuyambako naye olw'okuba emikka egikozesebwa mu kino tetugirina wano ate ekirala ssente egikozesebwa okufuna amasannyalaze mu manda nnyingi nga bu w'ozigeraageranya n'eziyinza okokozebwa okufuna amasannyalaze mu mazzi. Kyokka wadde kiro kiri kityo, Uganda ebadde efubebe okunoonya ku bika by'amasannyalaze ebirala okukendeexa ku bbula eririwo.

Ebifis mukaagaga bimaze okuzuuulubwa mu mugga Kiyira nga bisobola bulungi okuvaamu amasannyalaze singa bina bizimbiddwaako amabibiro. Muno mulimu Murchison Falls ne Kalagala nga bino bitwalibwa nti bijja kutwala ssente ntono okuzimbako amabibiro. Bujagali y'eddako nga eyokusatu nti nayo ssente tejja kutwala nnyingi.

Bw'otunuulira ebirungi by'erina ate n'obusobozi bwayo okukola amasannyalaze agaweza megawaati 250, kitwalibwa nga Bujagali y'eba eriddemu zinaayo ak'endo. Ebiririyo bya Murchison Falls ne Ayago byasuulibwa tate olw'okuba birimu ekkuumiro ly'ebisolo n'ebiyobulambuzi ebirala. N'olwekyo nga kijia kwonoona eby'obulambuzi n'obutonde bw'ensi. Puloojekiti ye Masindi ne Karuma nazo zaasuulibwa tate olwokuba kyaazuulibwa nga ziija kutwala ssente nnyingi. Ebyo byonna bireka Bujagali nga ky'ekifo ekisoboka okuggyibwamu amasannyalaze.
Puloojekiti zeegatta

Okufaanagana ne Puloojekiti ya Bujagali, wajjayo emirimu emirala nga giva mu puloojekiti eyo. Mu kino, kyazuulibwa nga kyetaagisa okuteekawo ekkubo eddala ery’amasannyaalaze okugatambuza okuva ku libadde likozesebwa aba UETCL.

Ebintu bitaano byekkaanyakibwa okulaba ekinaasinga okukola obulungi era okukkakkana nga basaazewo kugenda n’ekyo ekyali kisaliddwaawo aba AES okuteekawo layini eya layini ebbiri nga zitwala amasannyaalaze ga buzito bwa 132 kv ng’ejja kuba wakati wa Nalubaale ne Bujagali.
4.0 Puloojekiti eneeba etya?

Mu ngeri y’okugatta ebbibiro lya Bujagali ku ggwanga lyonna, ekitongole kya UECTL kiri mu ntegeka okuteekawo ekitongole ekinaagatta Bujagali ku ggwanga lyonna ekimanyiddwa nga Bujagali IP. Aba UECTL beeagenda okukibaako n’obuvunaanyizibwa. Kigenda kubaako bino wammanga;

Kijja kubaako okuzimba layini endala nga zitwala obungi bw’amasanyalaze ga 220kv ne 132 kv. Ebifo ebinaasaasanya amasanyalaze ne layini ez’okuzimbibwa bye bino wammanga:

- Layini y’amasanyalaze ag’obuzito bwa 132 KV okuva ku bukiikaddyo bwa Bujagali okwegatta kw’eno eriwo eya Owen Falls okudda e Tororo ng’eriko obuwanvu bwa kiromita 4.5
- Layini endala nayo ng’etwala obuzito bwe bumu wabula nga ya buwanvu bwa kiromita 5.
- Endala ng’erina obuzito bwe bumu ejja kuva Bujagali okudda e Kawanda we bagenda okuteeka empya ng’eriko obuwanvu bwa kiromita 70.
- Sitenseni empya e Kawanda.
- Endala ejja kuva Kawanda okudda e Mutundwe nga ya buwanvu bwa kiromita 17.5.
5.0 Okutuukiriza emitendera n'ebyetaga

Enkola:

Omulimu guno gugenda kuba gugoberera ebiböndererwa n'amateeka agateekewba wavo gavumenti ya Uganda wamun'ebitongole by'ensimbi mu nsi yonna ebisuubirwa okusasulira omulimu guno. Omulimu gw'ekitongole kya SEA kwekulaba nga Puloojekiti ekolebwa mu butuufu bwayo nga tekosezza butonde bwa nsi wamun'abatuuze b'omu kitundu olwo eveemun'ebibala ebisuubirwamu. Lipooti y'ekitongole kina eri mu kutegekebwa era essawa yonna ejja kuba eyanjulibwa mu bantu be kikwatako.

Ebitu ya bire mi pipo eno binchooncholo bino wammanga:

- Ensonga z'amateeka ezitalina kubusubibwa amaaso,
- Emberea y'abantu n'obutonde bw'ensi mu kifo kino,
- Engeri ez'enjawulo endala ezandiyambweco,
- Puloojekiti erina okuba ng'eggayyo ebyo ebyategekebwa okubaamu,
- Okwebuuza ku bantu n'okumanya ebirowoozo byabwe,
- Ebizibu abantu byebanaafuna n'obutonde bw'ensi,
- Pulana ekuubirwa okugonjoola ebuzibu singa biaawo,
- Ebitu ya bintu ekitundu ye kinaafunamu, wamu
- N'abakuku abanaalambula omulimu guno.

Omulimu gw'ekitongole kina ekooya SEA gwatandika dda era ne mu 2006 gukyagenda mu maaso ng'okunoonyereza kikyakolebwa.

Okwebuuza ku bantu n'okubannyonyola ebinaakolebwa:


Pulogulaamu y'okwebuuza etegekeddwa mu mitendera bw'eti:

- **Omutendera ogusooka:** Ebigenderewa bya SEA bittekkiddwako era biwedde.
- **Omutendera ogwookubiri:** Okufulumya ebyatuukibwako ebigendererwa bya SEA n'enkola yaakyo era nakyo kiwedde.
- **Omutendera ogwookusatu:** Okufulumya ekiwandiiko kya SEA by'ezuddde era kino kikyagenda mu maaso.
- **Omutendera ogw'okuna:** Okufulumya ekiwandiiko ekisembayo ku byonna ebizuuliddwa nga kino ky'ekikyakolebwa.
Abasasulira puloojekiti eno beesigaliza emirimu gy’okutunuulira ebigenda mu maaso nga bakozeesa ekibiina kya InterAid mu mwezi gwa August 2006. Ekibiina kino era ky’ekigenda okukola ku mulimu gw’okubalirira n’okukung’aanya okwemulugunya kw’abantu.

Abantu ab’enjawulo bagenda babuuzibwa mu bintu eby’enjawulo nga bwe bimenyeddwa wammanga:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ebyokwebuuzaako mu bufunze</th>
<th>Emikutu egiyitibwamu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eggwanga okutwalira awamu</td>
<td>Puloojekiti eranga mu mpapula z’amawulire mu ggwanga, emikutu gy internet, okusindika ebiwandiiko eby’enjawulo eri buli akwatiwbako. Byonna ebizuulibwa byakutekebewa mu katabo ka Banka y’ensi yonna akasangibwa ku mukutu gwayo ogwa Website nga kakyusiddwa mu nnimi ennansi ez’enjawulo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebitongole bya gavumenti</td>
<td>Enkiiko ez’enjawulo zitezigekebewa n’abakungu ba gavumenti era lipoota ya SEA egenda kuweerezebewa nga biltyita mu kitongole ky’ebiyobutonde bw’ensi, ekyya NEMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebitongole by’obwannakyewa ku mutindo gw’eggwanga n’ebyaloro.</td>
<td>Ebitongole eby’enjawulo bizuuliddwa ne bisabibwa okutegeka enkiiko mwe binaayita okuwaayi okwemulugunya kwabyo. Ebikwata ku Puloojekiti eno byabawewezebewa dda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abantu abakoseddwa ne Puloojekiti eno</td>
<td>Ekitongole ekyasooka okusasulira omulimu guno kyali kisasudeko abamu naye era okwekkakaanya ensonga eno kukyagenda mu maaso okulaba nga bonna abatuusiddwako obuzibu bakoolebwako naddala abavubi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abantu abayinza okutusuwbwako obuzibu</td>
<td>Bano twafuna abaabakiikirira ku magombolola ne tutuula nabo wamu n’okwongera okutegeka enkiiko ez’enjawulo mu kitundu omulimu guno mweguli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannabizinensi</td>
<td>Ng’okunoonyereza kukyagenda mu maaso, bannabizinensi abakosebwa batuukirirwa mu ngeri ya kinnooma buli omu n’abuuzibwa obuzibu obwamutuuseekko naddala abo abaali bakola eby’obulambuzi n’abo abanaakosebwa olw’okwanjaala kw’amazzi ga Bujagali.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abalambuzi n’abagenyi</td>
<td>Ebigerendererwa by’abalambuzi byonna byakolebwako mu kunoonyereza kuno.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab’ebyo’obuwangwa</td>
<td>Obwakabaka bwa Buganda nObwakayabazinga bwa Busoga bwezuulibwako ku nsonga eno era enkiiko zikyagenda mu maaso okulaba nga tebanyigirizibwa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Emigaso egisuubirwa mu Puloojekiti eno.

Nga tuyita mu kukola amasannyaalaze, abantu n’ebitundu byabwe bijja kukulaakulana mu ngeri zino wammanga.

Ebintu ebigenda okuvaamu bigenda kuba n’omugaso gwa maanyi okusinga n’ebyo ebyagiteekesaawo.

- Ng’omulimu guwedde, obwannannyini bwa Puloojekiti eno bujja kukyusibwa okuva mu bakoze omulimu guno buteekebwe mu mikono gy’ekitongole ekitambuza amasannyaalaze ekya UETCL era olwo kifuuke kya Bannayuganda.
- Wadde bitono bitya, okulongoosebwa n’okuddaabiriza kw’enguudo okunaakolebwa ku nguudo zaffe kugenda kuyamba kinene nnyo abantu abali mu kitundu ekyo. Ekitongole ekivunaanyizibwa ku bibira kijja kuwa ekya UETCL amagezi okulaba oba basobola okwongera okutumbula Mabira Central Forest Reserve.
- Ekitundu n’abantu baakyo okutwalira awamu bajja kuganyulwa okuva mu mirimu eginajja oluvannyuma lw’okumaliriza Puloojekiti eno.
7.0 Ebizibu binaakwatibwa bitya?

Wammanga bye bimu ku bizibu bya Puloojekiti wamu n’engeri y’okubivvuunukamu. Lipooti enzijuvu eya SEA eja kwongera okunyonnyola ku nsonga eno n’okulaga ebyo ebinaakolebwa. Ejjia kuba eyawuddwaamu emirundi ebiri ng’eraga eby’abantu n’ebyobutonde bw’ensi:

Okupima ettaka n’okuliyirira.

Ekisinga okwetaagibwa kwe kupima ettaka erinaakozesebwa wamu n’okulaba engeri y’okuliyirira aobo abanaasengulwa ne bannannyini ttaka nga bayisaamu layini z’amasannyaalaze. Tewajja kubaawo kukuysa bwannannyini bwa kintu kyonna. Mu mbeera ng’ettaka liyitamu amasannyaalaze n’ebikondo, lyakusigala mu mannya ga mnyini lyo eyasooka. Sente ezigenda okusasulwa za kuba waggulu nnyo okuyamba okulemesa abantu okuyingira mu ttaka omuyita waaya z’amasannyaalaze.

Tewali kizimbe kigenda kukkirizibwa kuliraana bifo bino era ebizimbe bijja kutandikira mu mita 30 okuva awayita waaya. Abo bonna abanaasangibwa mu bitundu ebyo bagenda kuggyibwawo. Ebizimbe byennyini ebigenda okuzimbibwa tebijja kusukka buwanvu bwa mita 1.8 n’emiti wamu n’ebimera byakusaayibwa okutuuka ku buwanvu obwo.

Ekiwendo ky’okupima n’okubala emiwendo mu bintu eby’enjawulo ebigenda okwoonenebwa kigenda mu maaso. N’olwekyo, abantu bagenda kusasulwa okusinziira kw’ebyo ebinaazuulibwa akakiiko akakola omulimu guno. Ekiwenderera ky’okusasula n’okuzzaaowo ebinaayonoonebwa kwe kulaba ng’abantu tebabonaabona era basigala bali mu mbeera nnungi.

Ekitongole ekikola okunoonyereza kuno ekya RAP kiyamba ku bantu abayinza okutususibwako obuzibu bwonna era kikolera ku mateeka ga Uganda wamu n’okugoberera emitendera gya Banka y’ensi yonna, egya IFC, n’egya AFDB. Bye kinaazuula kigenda kubifulumya, abantu bona babimanye.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pulejekiti n'ebizibu byayo</th>
<th>Okunonyola kw'ebizibu n'okubivvuunuka.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Okufunira abantu we babeera n'okubaliyirira. | • Ekitongole kya UETCL kigenda mu maaso n'okunoonyereza wamu n'okulaba engeri abantu abakoseddwa gye bayinza okuliyirirwaamu. Bannannya itaka bagenda kusasulwa okusinziira ku bintu byabwe ebayonoonebwa.  
  
  • Ettaka okunaazimibwa sitenseni y'e Kawanda lyamala dda okufunibwa nga lyakukwasibwa ekitongole kya UETCL.. |
| Obuzibu ku ttaka n'obutonde bw'ensi | • Okukendeeza ku bizibu ebiyinza okutuuka ku ttaka,ekitongole kya EPC kijja kunoonya ekifo we kiyinza okukolera emirimu gyakyo nga kikolaganira wamu ne NEMA n'abakwatibwako abalala okukkaanya ku kifo ekituufu.  
  
  • Emitendera egy'enjawulo giteekeddawo okulaba ng'obutonde bw'ettaka n'ebika byalyo tebyonoonebwa.  
  
  • Layini z'amasannyalaze ziyinza okubeera ez'obulabe eri ebinyonyi n'ebisolo naddala enkima eziyinza okugwibwaako amasannyalaze ne gazookya. Okulwanyisa kino, tugenda okusabika waanga zino zibeere nga tezisobola kuyitamu masannyalaze.  
  
  • Ekikala layini y'amasannyalaze eggenda okuyita mu Mabira teriranya kifo kyonna ebinyonyi oba ebisolo bino mwe bibeera. Naye ekyo bwe kinaaba tekikoze, wajja kubaawo obuuma obukozesibwa okulabula ebinyonyi n'ebisolo byonna akabi akayinza okuvaamu. Eija kuba ekolaganana n'ekitongole ky'ebibira naddala w'esalira ekitoo kya Lubigi n'ebitoogo ebirala. |
| Okwonoona amazzi | • Okwewala kino, wajja kubaawo eddaala n'ebikosebwa ebirala ebisobola okutaasa kino.  
  
  • Okukendeeza omuze gw'oyiwa ettaka n'ebintu ebirala mu mazzi, wajja kuteekebwawo ebifo ebisaana okusuulibwamu ebisaaniko n'okutangira amazzi nga gateekebwako bbugwe.  
  
  • Layini esuubirwa okuleeta obulabe ku kitoogo kya Lubigi naddala mu biseera by'enkuba. Okukola ekisoboka emirimu gikolebwe mu biseera bya musana na kyeya. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pulojekiti n’ebizibu byayo</th>
<th>Okunyonyola kw’ebizibu n’okubivvuunuuka.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empewo</td>
<td>• Enfuufu n’omukka bisuubirwa okwonoona empewo naye tugenda kukola ekisoboka okuwonya enfuufu nga tubikka ku bimotoka ebitambuza ettaka n’okufukirira amakubo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Okuwoggana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Okwewala okumalako abantu emirembe ng’ebyuma bibaleekanira.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wagenda kuteekebwawo ekkomo ku biseera ki ebyuma we birina okuleekanira. Okuleekana kujju kutandikanga ku ssaawa 12 ez’oku makya kukome ku nnya ez’ekiro. Kirowoozebwa nti obwo obudde abantu baba bakyakola mu Uganda. Wajja kubaawo n’ebipande ebirabula abantu ebifo omuli okuleekaana okw’amaanyi wamun’okukyalira abantu nhu ku nhu okubannyonyola n’okubawa amagezi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enguudo</td>
<td>Ebizibu by’oku nguudo n’ebiyinza okuvaamu;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n’obulippagano</td>
<td>• Wagenda kuteekebwawo enkola y’okutaasa n’okulwanyisa obulippagano buno nga kimanyiddwa essaawa ebintu by’okuzimbisa we bitambuzibwa n’amakubo mwe binaayisibwanga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Okutaataganya kw’emmotoka naddala ebimotoka ebiri ku mulimu we binaakyamira nga;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pulaaani y’entambula ezikola emirimu yaakusindikibwa eri yinginya wa disitulikiti n’abakulembeze ab’enjawulo bamale okugikkaanyako olwo emirimu gitambule bukwakku.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebizibu ku bifo</td>
<td>• Oluvannyuma lw’okufiirwa hekiteeya z’ebibira 59, tugenda kukolagana n’ekitongole ky’ebibira okulaba nga tusimba emiti emiralwa okujjuza ekifo kino kyonna ekiba kyonooneddwa okusobola okuzzaawo ekibira.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ebikuumibwa.</td>
<td>• Oluvannyuma lwa Puloojekiti, ekitongole lya UETCL kijja kugenda kyetoolola nga bwe kyekkaanyo obuzibu obuguddewo kittereze buli kimu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Okutema ekibira kujja kwongoza okuyigga ensolo n’okubba emiti egy’omugasoweKino abakwatibwako bakyetegekera dda era tewali kutya buli kimu kijja kuba kukolebwako.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulojekiti n’ebizibu byayo</td>
<td>Okunyonyola kw’ebizibu n’okubivvuunuka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eby’obulambuzi n’ebirala.</td>
<td>- Okusinziira ku bigenda okukolebwa, tewali kiraga nti eby’obulambuzi binaatatagaanyizibwa n’olwekyo tekirina mutawaana gwonna. Obwo obutono obunaayitamu nabwo enkola eteerreddwawo okubulwanyisa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eby’obuwangwa n’ebintu</td>
<td>- Okusinziira ku kunoonyereza okukoleddwa, tewali kifo kya buwangwa kyokka singa babaako kyonna kye basanga nga bakolagana ne UETCL bajja kukiitereza okulaba nga tekyyoonoke. Mu ngeri y’emu, tugenda mu maaso n’okwogereganya n’Obwakabaka bwa Buganda okulaba nga buli kifo kya Buwangwa tekyyoonebwa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebyalo, eby’obulumu n’okwerinda.</td>
<td>- Emitendera egy’enjawulo gyakutekeebwawo okukendeeza obubenje naddala obuva ku kukwata ku waaya z’amasannyaalze, okutomera ebyuma n’engeri y’okubiterekamu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Okukendeeza obubenje obuyinza okuva mu bidduka ebiriraanye puloojekiti, wagenda kutekeebwawo enkola egenda okuteeka enteekteeka ennungamu eragirira engeri y’okutambuzaaamu ebikozesebwa n’okumanya engeri ebimotoka byabwe obudde kwe bitambulira n’enguudo z’olukale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Okukendeeza okukwonoona obutondere nga basuula ebisasiro, bajja kubisuula mu ngeri ya buvunaanyizibwa wamu n’okubikolamu ebintu ebirala.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Pulojekiti n’ebizibu byayo** | **Okunyonyola kw’ebizibu n’okubivvuunuka.**
---|---
- Tewajja kuba bisulo bya bantu kusulamu ebiyinza okuleeta bamalaaya. Abakozi bajja kuvanga Kampala. Tujjanga kubategekera emisono egikwata ku bulwadde buno n’okubawa kondomu ez’obwereere.  
- Waliwo eby’ogerwa nti omuntu bw’abeera wansi wa layini z’amasannyalaze ago, waliwo obulabe obujja ku bulamu bwe. Ekyo tubadde tetunnakituukako naye okunoonyereza kukyagenda mu maaso tufune n’eddagala.  
- Abakozi n’embeera mwe bakolera.  
- Ebizibu ebiyinza okujja ebirala.
- ABA EPC bajja kufuba okulaba nga bagoberera enkola n’amateeka ag’eggwanga nga bagoberera ebyetaagisa. Embeera yaabwe ey’obulamu nayo ennyo n’okulaba nga buli mukozi yeeyagalira mu mulimu gwe.
- Ekitongole kya UETCL kifuba okwewala ebizibu ebiyinza okuvaamu naddala okuyisa layini y’amasannyalaze ya buzito bwa 220 KV okuyita mu Mabira okuliraanya layini endala ey’obukiikakono. Mu ttaka ly’ekibira, tewajja kuba kusalaimbirayo mu mita 35. Okwewala ebizibu ebimu, basuubira okusalako ekitundu batandike okusimbanu emiti emitu. Ekirungi, layini eteereedwaamu ejja kuba ya maanyi nga tektyetaagisa kuddamu kusaawa kibira ate kuyisaamu masannyalaze.
8.0 Pulaani y’okukulaakulanya ebyalo n’okusenza abantu.

Ng’oggyeko eky’okuliyirira abantu bano abaakosebwa, waliwo entegeka ey’okukulaakulanya ebyalo byabwe okubayamba okwezimba n’okwekulaakulanya.

Ssente ezigenda okubaweebwa zijja kusinziira ku kiki omuntu ky’afiiriddwa. Kino kijja kukola bwe kityo ne ku bitundu ngu’ekyo ekinasinga okubeeramu abantu abangi ky’ekijja okufuna ssente ennyingi.

Embalirira ya mitwalo gya ddoola za Amerika 30 y’ekoleddwa. Ebizibu ebinaatuuka ku bifo ebine nga gamba nga SCOUL ne Metha wamu ne Mabira, bitwalibwa nti tebiri ku ttaka lya byalo era tebijja kufuna ku buyambi buno.

Puloojekiti z’ebryo nga zino wammanga z’ezigenda okulebwako:

- Okuyamba ku masomero g’omu bitundu, ebizimbe, enguudo, ebikozesebwa mu masomero ng’embaawo ne’ebirala.
- Okutumbula n’okuddaabiriza ebifo omulwaalirwa n’ebikola emirimu gy’obujjanjabi.
- Emigga, amasundiro g’amazzi, nayikondo n’okuzimba enguudo.
- Okutambuza n’okuzzaawo amasannyalaze mu byalo gye gaba gonoone.

Kyokka ebyalo bikkirizibwa okunooonya ssente endala okuva mu bifo eby’enjawulo nga ebitebe bya disitulikiti, eby’ababaka b’amawanga, ebitongole by’obwannakyewa n’ebirala okuyambako okubikulaakulanya. Ebyalo ebyagala okuyambiwako birina okuwaayo okusaba kwabyo eri be kikwatako okufuna obuyambi. Ekyo kijja kusoboka nga bikoze bino wammanga:

- Okuteekawo akakiiko akagoberera oba okuzimba puloojekiti yonna eba ebaweereddwa.
- Okunyonnyola puloojekiti eyo etegeerekeke.
- Okuwaayo ebyo byonna ebyateesebwako ku nsonga eyo.
- Okulaga nti puloojekiti eyo eri mu layini n’ebigendererwa eby’okukulaakulanya ekitundu nga bwe kirambikiddwa abakugu.
- Okutegeka lipoota eraga engeri puloojekiti eyo gy’enaayambamu abantu b’omu kitundu ekyo gye bujja mu maaso.
- Okulaga puloojekiti bw’egenda okuteekebwa mu nkola okuggyayo ebigendererwa.

Okukulaakulanya ebyalo kugenda kuteekebwa mu nkola abagya UETCL nga bayambiwako Bujagali Implementation Unit (BIU). UETCL ejja kwoongera okwebuuza ku bakwatiibwako okulaba engeri gy’eyinza okukung’anyaamu ssente.
9.0 Puloojekiti etambula etya?

Okusinziira ku lipoota ya SEA, esuubirwa okufulumizibwa mu mwezi October 2006, kisuubirwa nti gavumenti n’abasasulira puloojekiti eno bajja kwekkaanya lipoota eno bagiyise mu 2007 olwo omulimu gutandike gumale emyaka esatu
10.0 Okumanya ebisingawo:

Endagirro yiino

Bujagaai Energy Limited
IPS Uganda
Plot 109-112, Fifth Street,
Industrial Area, Kampala.
Tel.: +256 41 258194
info@bujagali-energy.com
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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 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 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 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 comments in November 2006.

### Consultation Summary Reports Released

Separate "Consultation Summary Reports" for each of the projects are now available for public review. They present the main 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, Nanywa Sub-county, Nabusere Sub-county, Namunyaku Sub-county, Gomba Sub-county, Kira TC, Nansana Sub-county, Kibishe Sub-county, Kawempe Division, Nalubaale Sub-county, Nansana TC, Wakiso Sub-county, Nakawa Division, Nansana Sub-county, Rubaga Division, Matugga 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.

### HPP 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 earthen dam will be built at the Bujagali site to create a corresponding 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 totally 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.
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 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 substation will be built as a 220 kV 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 spaces 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 and no worse off as a result of the project.

Public Consultation and Disclosure Process

As part of the assessment work, a comprehensive public consultation and disclosure process is being done. 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 tables summarize effects and actions identified to date.

Hydropower Project Predicted Effects and Proposed Management Actions

<p>| 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. |
| Kalagala offset | 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. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social &amp; Environmental Action Plans cont...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resettlement and Community Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People directly affected by the hydropower project have 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>
</tr>
<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 on their programs to re-route their business to downstream stretches including the Mubanga area that the Government has committed to protecting for environmental, cultural and tourism purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land</strong></td>
</tr>
<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 land will be rehabilitated as appropriate for their proposed future uses. To minimize impacts to natural habitats, the project sponsor will retain cleared land along the riparian zone and on the perimeters of stands that are not to be flooded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction activities may cause erosion to areas beside 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 at 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 Mabamba/Kaha 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The peak labour force will be more than 1000. There will be a need to upgrade and extend the site for 24-hour operations. Programs will be offered to ensure the health and safety of the workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction related noise and dust are not expected to be a significant nuisance for local residents. To manage the common effects related to construction traffic management, environmental monitoring and management, worker health and safety, and labour force management plans will be in place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interconnected Project Predicted Effects and Proposed Management Action**

| National and Local Economic Benefits         |
| Compensations 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 training provided for job 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 community development programs in the affected villages, including supporting existing education and health initiatives. |
| **Past Resettlement**                        |
| In 2001, land was acquired for the Karambi 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 not configured to minimize impacts on a neighboring school. |
| **Forest Reserves**                          |
| About 60 ha of land affected along the Budgali-Kyambale line is forest reserve land, primarily within the Mabanga 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 forest land, such as support of enhancement planting in other portions of the reserve. |
| **Lubisi Swamp**                             |
| To minimize resettlement the Kyambwa Mubangi line was routed across the Lubisi Swamp in several locations. Tall towers will be located to increase spans (the distances between towers to minimize the number of towers being located within the wetland. Where possible, towers will be located adjacent to existing roads or access areas. |
| **Visuality 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 banks 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. |
| **Public Health and Safety**                 |
| 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 assess the implementation of the plans, including monitoring of the projects' effects on vulnerable peoples.

Hydropower Project

The project sponsors are working with the eight directly affected villages of Namayara, Buloba, Mutebwa, Kasinga, Nakasongola on the west bank, and the villages of Bujagali, Masambi, Karambwa and Namasala 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 for 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 fishermen and training through the Beach Management Committees
- Capacity building with the local community in the agricultural sector
- Investment in local school facilities

Implementation Projects

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 (classrooms, etc.)
- Upgrades to health centers, including structural and interior 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

Kimanyidde bulungi nti wakira ebibiro ly'amosanyalaye mu Uganda. Gazita gakagaba bulungi nti ngembeera ene esusurwa ekwiyonyera olw'imbiro nga Nalubale ne Kira mwego moto ne olo'okundereza kw'amosi mu muyaza N'okwonya wakira. Ebibiro anu wakita owotuwasa obo manyo okukole ebibiro eddala okukola k'embira ena.

PULOJEKITI ya Bujagali Hydropower Project (HPP) z'imburembeza ebibiro ly'amosanyalaye ene Bujagali nga ikita amasanyalaye 'nto obungi ba wa meyansi 250. Ebibiro anu wakita ku gakhama ene Ezra okukondeza ku mu mukita y'ikima ene Ezra.

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

Pulojekiti ya Bujagali uneefaaana etya?


Pulojekiti ene akintuma okukondeza ne aminzo aminzo okutambuza ba wa anyi g'amba kw'amazzi mu nnyania. Pulojekiti zimbi okukwata ba wa anyi g'amba kw'amazzi 2,0 0 000 buli emu, ekijia obwa waka 50 buli emu.

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


Pulojekiti ene akintuma okukondeza ne aminzo aminzo okutambuza ba wa anyi g'amba kw'amazzi mu nnyania. Pulojekiti zimbi okukwata ba wa anyi g'amba kw'amazzi 2,0 0 000 buli emu, ekijia obwa waka 50 buli emu.

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

Ebinu ku bifunze abiri mu lipoota

Lipoota ez'enjawula nga zi'fahudde nga dikwata ku buli Pulojekiti kati wezi kere abantu bonna abandiyagadde okuzisomamu okumanya.

Lipoota zima osobola okukola ku mu biri bino wamagana:

- Wolfisi ya gavumenti ez'obweta nga Eggombolola bila Butindo, Wakiso Najjeone, Naggije, Nama, Nabwera, Nangabo, Makindye, Nsangi, Wakiso; Town Council ya Kira ne Nansana; divisoni ya Kasese, Nakawa ne Rubaga.
- Okwe mu matukula ge'okukola ly'okutambuza k'EBEL ega'web site: www.bujagali-energy.com
- Ku muku osapenda osowana abirwi.

Endagiriro endala ogisanga ku nkomerero y'akatabo kano.

Twagala nnyo okumanya abiroowozo byo n’obwera bwo k’ebi y’okwanyi okumanya era twagala abintu abo okubifuna ng’ennakuz’imwezi 191 ag’we kumi tezinayitawa.
Pulojekiti y'okutambuza amasanyalaze eneeba etya?

Okusobola okutambuza amasanyalaze gane, ekitongole kya ETEC, kitakeka okuzimba layin'egatambu nga lutu kirimita 09 nga egenda kububera ne sitenseni e Kawanda. Eko emite ne layin'amasanyalazla mwe bugenda okuyita. Brajoba wamunza ku 0.97 nga 0.97. Layini emyoo kusangga egenda kububera evakiri wa Bujagali ne Kawanda nga zirira amake z'okutambuza ne z'injanya ne njuju w'amasanyalaze eneeba etya.

Okwebuuza bu kantu ku Pulojekiti eno.

Ng'okutambuza amasanyalaze eneeba etya, okusobola okutambuza amasanyalaze gane, ekitongole kya UETCL kitegeka okuzimba layini egatambu na 0.97 nga egenda kububera ne sitenseni e Kawanda. Ebifo emi ne layin'amasanyalazla mwe bugenda okuyita. Brajoba wamunza ku 0.97 nga 0.97. Layini empya ezisinga zigenda kubeera wakati wa Bujagali ne Kawanda nga zirira amake z'okutambuza ne z'injanya ne njuju w'amasanyalaze eneeba etya.

Entegeka ekoolloido okuphuza bu kantu ku Pulojekiti eno.

Okweb collisions with the environment are seen as one of the main challenges for the project. The Bujagali Energy Limited has taken several measures to minimize the impact on the environment. The project is located on the Bujagali River, which flows through Kalagala Village.

The project has been designed to minimize the impact on the environment as much as possible. The project will help to reduce the reliance on fossil fuels, which are a major contributor to climate change. The project will also help to provide clean and affordable energy to the people of the area.

In conclusion, the Bujagali Energy Limited project is an important step towards a more sustainable future. The project will help to reduce the impact on the environment and provide clean and affordable energy to the people of the area. The project is expected to be completed in 2020.
Social & Environmental Action Plans cont...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bujagali Energy Limited | - Bujagali Energy Limited info@bujagali-energy.com

Plot 109-112, Fifth Street, Tel.: +256 41 258194 www.bujagali-energy.com

### Social & Environmental Action Plans

#### Participants

- **Okutumbwa:** Abantu (Human Rights)
- **Okutambuza:** (Environmental & Social Action Plans)
- **Entsenga ne’obwanga:** (Community)
- **Ombakazi ne’obwanga:** (Community)
- **Emirima gy’okugola:** (Community)

#### Activities

- **Okukulugguka:** Social & Environmental Action Plans continue.

#### Key Points

- **Abantu:** Abantu are involved in social and environmental action plans.
- **Okutambuza:** Environmental and social actions.
- **Entsenga ne’obwanga:** Community engagement.
- **Ombakazi ne’obwanga:** Community involvement.
- **Emirima gy’okugola:** Community involvement.

### Okutambwa: Amasamnyalza, Biki Ebyiynza Okusasa

- **Ogwaango:** A participation plan is being developed. The community is involved in the planning process.

### Okutambuza: Amasamnyalza

- **Abantu bone:** (Human Rights) are involved in environmental and social action plans.

### Entsenga ne’obwanga

- **Abantu:** (Community) are involved in environmental and social action plans.

### Ombakazi ne’obwanga

- **Abantu:** (Community) are involved in environmental and social action plans.

### Emirima gy’okugola

- **Okukulugguka:** (Community) are involved in environmental and social action plans.

#### Other Participations

- **Okutarabu:** (Participations) continue, and discussions are ongoing.

#### Other Activities

- **Okutangira:*** (Participations) continue, and discussions are ongoing.

#### Other Involvements

- **Okutambuza:** (Participations) continue, and discussions are ongoing.

### Conclusion

- **Emirima:** (Community) continue to be involved in social and environmental action plans.

---

Note: The text contains multiple references to abantu, okutambuza, entsenga, ombakazi, emirima, and okukulugguka, which are key participants and actions in the social and environmental action plans of the Bujagali Energy Limited project.
Ebyalo bigenda kukolebwa bitya?

Water and development action plan (DDAP) nga muna mwe bagenda okuyamba abantu abateesobola mu byalo ebinakoseddwa ebbibiro pya Bujagali

Abasulira omulimu guno bakolagana butereevu nga muna mwe bagenda okuyamba abantu abateesobola mu byalo ebinakoseddwa ebbibiro pya Bujagali

- Okutumbula eby'abulamu
- Okutendeka abantu b'omu byalo ebyo
- Okutumbula omulimu gu'amazi mu bitundu ebyo omunana
- Okuteekewo akastele eni abasubuzi abanaabera mu bitundu ebyo
- Okulongoosa omulimu ku Bujagali okuyamba abantu abakezi mu ku bbyalo ebyo
- Okukolewa abantu abatukwesigira mu by'obulamu
- Okutumbula omulimu guno bbyalo ebinakoseddwa

Okutumirwa masanmalyiza:

Ebitongoie ebisibuzi ise by'okulabirako ebisuubira okutukweli muna mwe bagenda okutambula kwa emite ne waaya basobole okuyamba. Biro wamamage by'ebi okutumirwa masanmalyiza okutukweli muna mwe bagenda okutumirwa masanmalyiza

- Okulongoosa abantu abatukwesigira mu by'obulamu
- Okutumira eby'obulamu n'ebifoo amumukwayizibwe
- Okutumira eby'obulamu n'ebifoo amumukwayizibwe

Pulojekiti enaamala bbanga ki?

Okutumirwa muna mwe bagenda okutukweli muna mwe bagenda okutumirwa masanmalyiza

- Okutumirwa masanmalyiza muna mwe bagenda okutumirwa masanmalyiza

Okutumirwa muna mwe bagenda okutumirwa masanmalyiza

Okutumirwa muna mwe bagenda okutumirwa masanmalyiza

Okutumirwa muna mwe bagenda okutumirwa masanmalyiza

Okutumirwa muna mwe bagenda okutumirwa masanmalyiza
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NGO Distribution
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
Plot 109-112 Fifth Street,
Industrial Area, Kampala.
Tel: +256 41 258194
info@bujagalienergy.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 GODFEGY
   0772 913045
   balwanagodfrey@yahoo.com

2. KAYUNGA DISTRICT
   NAMATOVU JULIET
   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 MUSAZZI
0772 405339
jmda_ngo@yahoo.com

9. KASIIBA BUSOGA YOUTH ENV'T PROTECTION
KIVEJINJA 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 KWAESSA
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 WANGOLO
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
yasinikirunda@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
NAKALEMA 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 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
PCDP Appendix D.5
CDO Training Session
The training was attended by about 19 participants all representing the different sub-counties (14) along the T-line corridor. In addition to these, the training program was witnessed by the Witness NGO (Inter-Aid) and a representative from ECOVIC/ UNBDF. The facilitation side included Dr. Patrick Mwesigye, Thomas Kasule, Edward Mutesa, Kenneth Kaheru and Edith Mukama. The training begun at 10:00 am with an opening prayer from one of the participants followed by the individual introductions.

The training
A project background was given to the participants. This included both the hydro and the Inter-connection projects. The new project set-up was then explained to the group that led to the composition of the lenders, BEL on the Hydro, UETCL on the Inter-connection Project; with Burnside being the consultant for both projects’ SEA.

The PCDP and SEA processes were then explained to the group. This included media like public notices (Newspapers, radio and public ads.), a brief on the SEA summary reports and newsletter was made. The need for the stakeholder involvement was emphasized during this process as feedback on the same would be more instrumental in the formulation of the main SEA reports. The role of the CDO’s in this process was stressed at this point that involved dissemination of the info. Or knowledge learnt from the training to the effected communities (SCCC, community meetings e.t.c). Through this various issues would be gathered and feedback got by the project sponsors/ consultants on the same.

Issues/ Questions that arose from the participants;

- Whether the project sponsors could support some of the existing Health Centres along the IP route.
- The possibility of considering the wider communities under the CDAP
- Proposals for poverty eradication programs focused on special interest groups (youth, women e.t.c)
- There was need to clarify the compensation procedure to the deceased.
- There was need to train/sensitize PAPs on their land rights (land ownership). This also calls for a grievance handling mechanism in case of any disputes.

- Needed clarity on how cultural sites (graves & shrines) would be compensated, their status within the Right of Way and way leave.

- How indirectly affected persons along the t-line route, would be compensated.

- How the Project will handle valuation of some structures that were assessed some time back and development was halted to date.

Most of the issues above issues were explained to the participants. The Witness NGO also explained his role in this process. All participants were grouped up, made their work plans and budget for implementing the sensitizations in their respective communities. It was therefore agreed that by 9th October 2006, the community meetings would begin, and between 11th to 18th October, all participants would be giving their feedback (reports) on the exercise.
Bujagali Interconnection Project
Sub-county CDO Training Session
Sept 23/06

Training Session Agenda

1. Participant Introductions
2. Purpose of the Village Consultations/Need for CDO Assistance
3. Description of the Project
4. SEA Process
5. Land & Asset Valuation Process
6. Description of Project Effects
7. Issues to Explore with the Villages
8. Feedback Process
Introductions / Purpose of the IP Village Consultations

- The proposed transmission line to support the Bujagali Hydropower Project passes through about 55 villages. To consult with these villages we are seeking the assistance of the Community Development Officers of each affected Sub-Country. We need your assistance as it would take several months for the BIU to conduct consultations with all the villages. The project schedule does not allow for the BIU to meet with every village.

- The purposes of these consultations is to 1) inform the villagers about the project and draft SEA results to date, 2) to present the draft findings of the SEA and 3) to receive feedback from the villagers.

- Today's training session is make each of the CDOs aware of the project and to provide necessary training so that you can conduct the information meetings with the villages within your respective sub-county.
List of Villages Potentially Affected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-County/Division</th>
<th>Communities Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wakisi Sub-County</td>
<td>Wabyinga, Lukaga, Kiyunga, Scoul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najjembe</td>
<td>Ssesse, Nkaga?, Ssanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagojje</td>
<td>Waswa, Kito, Wagala, Ndeeba, Magada, Kanyogoga, Nakalasa Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nama Sub-County</td>
<td>Wakiso, Wabununu, Luwumga, Buyuki, Nama I &amp; II, Lukojo, Nsanvu, Nkooki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goma Sub-County</td>
<td>Nyenje, Joggo, Namwezi, Nattonko, Nabusugwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kira TC</td>
<td>Nsasa, Kira, Mulawa, Buwaate, Kungu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nangabo Sub-County</td>
<td>Kitetika, Lusanja, Kabaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawempe Division</td>
<td>Komamboga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabweru Sub-County</td>
<td>Nanweru, Katoke, Kisimu, Maganjo, Nkokenjeru, Nakyesanja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nansana TC</td>
<td>Nansana East &amp; West, Kibwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakiso Sub-County</td>
<td>Gganda, Nakuwadde, Bulenga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakawa Division</td>
<td>Nazareth, Walufumbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsangi Sub-County</td>
<td>Nkokenjeru, Kabojja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubaga Division</td>
<td>Mbaawo, Kitawuluzi, Kigwanya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makindye Sub-County</td>
<td>Mirembe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Village Consultation Process

The consultation with the IP villages is to involve the following steps:

1. CDO to inform the Sub-county Consultation Committees on the training sessions and to seek their assistance in the scheduling/holding of village level meetings.

2. CDO's schedule and conduct information with each of their affected villages by **Oct 9**.

3. BIU to attend select village level meetings.

4. CDOs to document the feedback from the villages in the form of meeting minutes.

5. CDO's report the feedback received from the meetings to BEL from **Oct 11-18** (BEL to schedule meetings with the CDO for this).
Project Background

- The Bujagali Hydropower Project (HPP) is a 250 MW hydropower project proposed for the Victoria Nile, near Jinja.

- The Bujagali Interconnection Project (IP) is a system of high voltage electrical transmission lines and related facilities that is required to interconnect the Bujagali HPP with the national electrical grid.

- 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 sponsor of the IP is the Uganda Electric Transmission Company Limited (UETCL).
Description of the IP Project

- To evacuate the power from the hydropower project, UETCL proposes to build and operate about 97 km of new high voltage electrical transmission lines.

- The line from Bujagali to the Kawanda sub station will be built as a 220 kV (about 70.5 km in length). Much of the new transmission line between Bujagali and Kawanda will be located adjacent to UETCL’s existing line that connects the Nalubaale (Owen Falls) and Kampala North substations. It passes through the districts of Mukono, Wakiso, Mpigi, and Kampala.

- The new 132 kV lines, which are to be double circuit lines, include:
  - south from the Bujagali switchyard to the existing 132kV line from Owen falls to Tororo (Length), where that line is severed;
  - north from the severed Owen Falls-Tororo line to interconnect with the Bujagali switchyard (length – 5.0 km);
  - from the Kawanda substation to the existing 132 kV substation at Mutundwe in southern Kampala (length – 17.5 km).

- A switch yard on the west bank of the Victoria Nile adjacent to the Dumbbell Island Hydropower facility

- A new substation at Kawanda;

- Both the 220 kV and 132 kV lines will use steel lattice towers - similar to the towers used already in Uganda.
- There will be an outright acquisition of land for the 5 metre right-of-way corridor. Land ownership will be transferred to UETCL. No buildings or farming will be allowed within this 5 m RoW corridor.

- In addition to the RoW, there will be a wayleave of 35 m for the 220kV line and 25 m for the 132 kV line. Lands in the wayleave area will remain under the original ownership; no transfer of ownership will occur. Landowners and tenants will be compensated for loss of property and assets.

- Within the wayleave, no structures, such as houses, or tall vegetation such as trees or crops over about 2 m high, will be permitted. A resettlement and compensation program is being developed to ensure those directly affected are fairly compensated and no worse off as a result of the project.
Social and Environmental Assessment Process

- To meet the requirements of Uganda’s National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) and potential lenders to the projects, such as the World Bank Group, Social and Environmental Assessment’s (SEAs) are being prepared.

- The SEA process also includes a public and agency consultation process to receive input and feedback from all stakeholders.

- What does the SEA do:
  - It characterizes the natural and social environmental conditions of the area to be affected
  - It examines possible project alternatives (e.g. alternative transmission line routes)
  - It identifies the different project components and activities that might result in effects
  - It identifies and assesses the effects
  - It identifies measures to reduce the negative impacts and maximize positive effects.

- The results of the SEA are documented in a report and the report is then made available to stakeholders for their review and comments.

- In the report, the project sponsor (BEL) makes commitments on how they will manage the impacts of the project.
SEA Process Cont’d

- Related to the SEA will be the preparation of:
  
  - *Public Consultation and Disclosure Plan*
  - *Resettlement Action Plan (RAP)* - assesses the loss of land, structures and crops and proposes appropriate compensation to those losses.
  - *Social Action Plan* – will identify appropriate measures to mitigate negative social effects including issues such as employment, worker’s accommodation, & local community benefits.
  - *Environmental Action Plan* - to detail measures to avoid, prevent, reduce, mitigate, remedy or compensate any adverse environmental effects such as the removal of natural vegetation.
  - *Community Development Action Plan* – will outline any proposed community economic development/poverty alleviation activities.
Land Valuation and Compensation

- Land and assets within the RoW and wayleave is currently being valued by a surveying company. Land owners and tenants are being surveyed to assess how they could be affected by the project.

- Based on this land/assets valuation process, a compensation amount will be set. The value land and assets will be based on rates set by the District. This will determine the amount of compensation that the landowner & tenant will receive.

- Where the corridor will impact a residence, the owner/tenant will have the option of receiving cash compensation or be resettled in a new home at a different location.

- Where landowners provide proof of the previous land valuation process that was conducted by the previous project sponsor, the compensation can be based on the previous valuation.

- Landowners and tenants will receive advance notification of when the affected land will need to be vacated.

- In 2001, land was acquired by AESNP for the Kawanda Substation. People affected by the project were compensated and resettled as appropriate. An assessment of the past resettlement activities has been completed, including corrective actions to address identified deficiencies.
Community, Health, Safety and Security Effects and Action Plans

- Appropriate measures will be put in place to reduce risk to public safety including: accidental contact with lines, collision with construction equipment, excavations on ROW, material storage, tower construction.

- To reduce risk to students and staff of Kawanda Secondary School, as part of upgrading the access road, UETCL will erect a barrier to separate vehicles and pedestrian traffic. UETCL to post and abide by speed limits on this access road.

- To reduce the risk of environmental contamination from spillage or disposal of fuels, lubricants, oils and solvents on the construction site, UETCL and the EPC Contractor shall dispose of materials defined as hazardous waste in a responsible way.

- There will be no permanent construction camp(s) associated with the IP that might attract camp followers. Workers will be bused from Kampala. The EPC Contractor will provide public education information about HIV/AIDS transmission and preventative measures. Condoms will be made available to project workers at no cost.

- Regarding the health effects of Electro-Magnetic Fields (EMF) from high voltage transmission lines, available data have not demonstrated that power-line electric and magnetic fields cause human health effects. Prior to final design, the EPC Contractor will calculate the EMF levels generated by the various components of the interconnection project. No adverse effects on human health and welfare can be expected from operation of the proposed facilities.
Labour and Working Conditions Effects and Action Plans

o The 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 World Bank Group and other relevant lender policies.

o Sub-contractors will be contractually required to comply with labour and health and safety legislation as well.

o UETCL and the EPC Contractor will comply with relevant WB/IFC as well as Ugandan health and safety requirements.
Cultural Property Effects and Action Plans

- No archaeological sites have been identified to date within the IP vicinity. UETCL will ensure that the interconnection project route will be walked by an archaeologist upon approval of the SEA and prior to construction. Should any sites be identified, including graves, mitigation measures are to be agreed upon by the Department of Antiquities, the local community and UETCL.

- Discussions are ongoing with the Buganda Kingdom. Should any sites of spiritual significance be identified, the Kingdom will be consulted to determine the most appropriate means to address/mitigate impacts on these sites.

- The transmission corridor may pass over Amasabo sites. The location of these sites is being determined through the ongoing socio-economic surveys. Appropriate measures/ceremonies will be conducted prior to their relocation.
Access Roads and Traffic Effects and Actions Plans

- There exists the potential for increased traffic congestion on local roads as a result of project construction traffic.

- The movement of large loads to the wayleave, substation sites or storage areas may impede traffic flow on occasion along the Jinja-Kampala Highway. The estimated day-to-day vehicle requirements will not result in significant change in traffic flows or volume on this road.

- The selection of local access roads will be made in consultation with local officials to optimize the use of roads with adequate capacity.

- To reduce risk of accidents due to project related traffic, UETCL and the EPC Contractor will prepare and implement a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) that contains appropriate strategies for: moving materials, equipment and workers to and from the site, including abnormal loads; and, management of connection points between access roads and main public highways.
Air Quality Effects and Action Plans

- There exists the potential for dust in the immediate vicinity of construction activities, and along loose surface roadways. A variety of measures to control fugitive dust will be implemented such as the protection of soil stockpiles through wetting and grassing; and the watering of roadways to reduce dust when necessary.

Noise Effects and Action Plans

- To reduce noise levels during construction, a variety of measures will be implemented including restriction of noise-generating activities that take place near residential or sensitive institutional receptors to the period between 0600 and 2200 h, which is defined as ‘daytime’ in the draft Ugandan noise standards.
Water Effects and Action Plans

- To reduce the potential for microbial contamination of surface water and soil, a Waste Management Programme will be developed, to include measures such as the provision for on-site treatment of effluent at long term work sites.

- To minimize the deposition of eroded soils into watercourses and disturbance of flows and habitat, towers are to be located outside the top-of-bank of all watercourses; and a vegetated buffer will be maintained along both sides of all watercourse crossings.

- The line has the potential to impact the Lubigi Swamp. The transmission line will be located on the west side of the Lubigi Swamp to avoid permanently wet areas. Footings of towers will be built to address wet season conditions. Construction will occur during the dry season to minimize dewatering of foundation excavations.
Effects on Managed and Protected Areas

- To minimize land based effects, the EPC Contractor shall site and construct laydown and storage areas in non-sensitive areas. Mabira FR will not be used for staging area.

- Measures will be put in place to minimize topsoil compaction, rutting and soil mixing from construction activities (e.g. use of existing access roads where possible).

- To reduce effects of the wayleave within Forest Reserves this has been limited to 35 m, versus 40 m in non forest reserve areas.

- The resulting cleared corridor may pose a barrier to movement of “forest interior” wildlife species between the forested areas north and south of the route. The 220 kV line through the Mabira Forest Reserve has been routed immediately adjacent to the existing 132 kV line to minimize fragmentation effects.
Community Development Action Plans

- UETCL/BEL are proposing to dedicate funds to be available to affected communities along the routes for the IP. In addition to direct improvements, the community development activities are also viewed as a means to enhance community self-reliance in prioritizing projects, and project implementation capacity building within the communities. The allocation of funds will be based on the magnitude of impact to the community and the size of the permanent population. Thus, communities that have the greatest amount of potential impact with the highest population would receive a greater proportion of the allocated fund. 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 centers, 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.
Key Messages

- The Bujagali hydropower project is being implemented to increase the supply of electricity in Uganda.
- New transmission facilities are required to transmit the power.
- Landowners/tenants will be fairly compensated for loss of land & assets.
- A Social and Environmental Assessment is being undertaken which will require approval.
- Effects from the project will be minimal and largely limited to the construction period.
- A community development program will be implemented for villages along the transmission route.
Issues to Explore with the Villagers

1. Do you have any concerns regarding the development of the electrical transmission line through your community?

2. Is there any specific information regarding your village that we should be aware of?

3. Are there any specific project effects that you are concerned about?

4. Do you have any comments on the mitigation measures that we are proposing?

5. Are there any other mitigation measures that we should consider implementing?

6. What general comments can you provide us regarding the proposed community development initiatives?

7. Do you have any suggestions as to how to implement the community development initiatives?

8. What types of information (and in what form) would you like to receive leading up to and during the construction of the project.
Reporting Back the Feedback

- We will need the CDOs to report back to the project team on the meetings that were held with the villagers.

- Minutes of each meeting held with the villagers will need to be prepared and distributed to the project team. A summary of the key issues raised shall also be prepared and provided to the project team.

- We will contact each of the CDOs to arrange a time to meet the week of Oct 11.
Future Contact Information

For additional information and/or to submit comments in regards to the project, 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
Bujagali
Interconnection Project
Sub-county CDO
Training Session

Sept 23/06
Agenda

- Participant Introductions
- Purpose of the Village Consultations
- Description of the Project
- SEA Process
- Land & Asset Valuation Process
- Description of Project Effects
- Issues to Explore with the Villagers
- Village Meetings Action Plan/Feedback Process
Purpose of Village Consultations

- The proposed transmission line passes through about 55 villages.
- We are seeking the assistance of the CDOs of each affected Sub-Country.
- The purposes of these consultations is to 1) inform the villagers about the project and draft SEA results, 2) to present the draft findings of the SEA and 3) to receive feedback from the villagers.
- Today’s training session is make each CDO aware of the project and to provide training to conduct the information meetings with the villages.
Village Consultation Process

- The consultation with the IP villages is to involve the following steps:
  - CDO to inform the Sub-county Consultation Committees on the training sessions and to seek their assistance in the scheduling/holding of village level meetings
  - CDO’s schedule and conduct information with each of their affected villages by Oct 9
  - BIU to attend select village level meetings
  - CDOs to document the feedback from the villages in the form of meeting minutes
  - CDO’s report the feedback received from the meetings to BEL from Oct 11-18
Project Background

- The Bujagali Hydropower Project (HPP) is a 250 MW hydropower project proposed for the Victoria Nile, near Jinja.
- The Bujagali Interconnection Project (IP) is a system of high voltage electrical transmission lines and related facilities that is required to interconnect the Bujagali HPP with the national electrical grid.
- 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 sponsor of the IP is the Uganda Electric Transmission Company Limited (UETCL).
Description of the IP Project

- To transmit the power from the hydropower project, UETCL proposes to build and operate about 97 km of new high voltage electrical transmission lines.

- The line from Bujagali to the Kawanda sub station will be built as a 220 kV (about 70.5 km in length). Much of the new transmission line between Bujagali and Kawanda will be located adjacent to UETCL's existing line.

- The new 132 kV lines, which are to be double circuit lines, include:
  - south from the Bujagali switchyard to the existing 132kV line from Owen falls to Tororo (Length), where that line is severed;
  - north from the severed Owen Falls-Tororo line to interconnect with the Bujagali switchyard (length – 5.0 km);
  - from the Kawanda substation to the existing 132 kV substation at Mutundwe in southern Kampala (length – 17.5 km).
Description of the IP Project

- Both the 220 kV and 132 kV lines will use steel lattice towers - similar to the towers used already in Uganda.
- There will out right acquisition of land for the 5 metre right-of-way corridor. No buildings or farming will be allowed within this 5 m RoW corridor.
- There will also be a wayleave of 35 m for the 220kV line and 25 m for the 132 kV line. Lands in the wayleave area will remain under the original ownership. Landowners and tenants will be compensated for loss of property and assets.
- Within the wayleave, no buildings or tall vegetation over 2 m high, will be permitted. A resettlement and compensation program is being developed.
SEA Process

- To meet the requirements of NEMA and potential lenders to the projects, SEAs are being prepared.
- The SEA process also includes a public and agency consultation process to receive input and feedback from all stakeholders.
- What does the SEA do?:
  - It characterizes the natural and social environmental conditions of the area to be affected
  - It examines possible project alternatives (e.g. alternative transmission line routes)
  - It identifies the different project components and activities that might result in effects
  - It identifies and assesses the effects
  - It identifies measures to reduce the negative impacts and maximize positive effects.
SEA Process Cont’d

- The results of the SEA are documented in a report that will be made available to stakeholders for their review.
- In the report, the project sponsor makes commitments on how they will manage the impacts of the project.
- Related to the SEA will be the preparation of:
  - Public Consultation and Disclosure Plan
  - Resettlement Action Plan (RAP)
  - Social Action Plan Environmental Action Plan
  - Community Development Action Plan
SEA Summary Reports

- The SEA Summary Reports are available from the LC3 Offices and from the project website: www.bujagali-energy.com
- A project newsletter is also being released
Land Valuation and Compensation

- Land and assets within the RoW and wayleave is currently being valued. Based on this valuation process, a compensation amount will be set.
- Where the corridor will impact a residence, the owner/tenant will have the option of receiving cash compensation or be resettled in a new home at a different location.
- Landowners and tenants will receive advance notification of when the affected land will need to be vacated.
- An assessment of the past resettlement activities for the Kawanda Substation has been completed, including corrective actions to address identified deficiencies.
Community, Health, Safety and Security

- Appropriate measures will be put in place to reduce risk to public safety including: accidental contact with lines, collision with construction equipment, excavations on ROW, material storage, tower construction.

- There will be no permanent construction camp(s) associated with the IP. Workers will be bused from Kampala. The EPC Contractor will provide public education information about HIV/AIDS transmission and preventative measures.

- Available data have not demonstrated that power-line electric and magnetic fields cause human health effects. Prior to final design, the EPC Contractor will calculate the EMF levels generated by the various components of the interconnection project.
Labour and Working Conditions

- The 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.
- Sub-contractors will be contractually required to comply with labour and health and safety legislation as well.
- UETCL and the EPC Contractor will comply with relevant WB/IFC as well as Ugandan health and safety requirements.
Cultural Property

- No archaeological sites have been identified to date within the IP vicinity. UETCL will ensure that the interconnection project route will be walked by an archaeologist upon approval of the SEA and prior to construction.

- Discussions are ongoing with the Buganda Kingdom. Should any sites of spiritual significance be identified, the Kingdom will be consulted to determine the most appropriate means to address/mitigate impacts on these sites.

- The transmission corridor may pass over Amasabo sites. Appropriate measures/ceremonies will be conducted prior to their relocation.
Access Roads and Traffic

- There exists the potential for increased traffic congestion on local roads as a result of project construction traffic.
- The selection of local access roads will be made in consultation with local officials to optimize the use of roads with adequate capacity.
- To reduce risk of accidents due to project related traffic, UETCL and the EPC Contractor will prepare and implement a Traffic Management Plan (TMP).
Air Quality

- There exists the potential for dust in the immediate vicinity of construction activities, and along loose surface roadways.
- A variety of measures to control fugitive dust will be implemented such as the protection of soil stockpiles through wetting and grassing; and the watering of roadways to reduce dust when necessary.
Noise

- To reduce noise levels during construction, a variety of measures will be implemented including restriction of noise-generating activities that take place near residential or sensitive institutional receptors to the period between 0600 and 2200 h.
To reduce the potential for contamination of surface water and soil, a Waste Management Programme will be developed.

Towers are to be located away from watercourses; and a vegetated buffer will be maintained along both sides of all watercourse crossings.

The transmission line will be located on the west side of the Lubigi Swamp to avoid permanently wet areas. Footings of towers will be built to address wet season conditions. Construction will occur during the dry season to minimize dewatering of foundation excavations.
Managed and Protected Areas

- Laydown and storage areas will be located in non-sensitive areas. The Mabira FR will not be used for staging area.
- Measures will be put in place to minimize topsoil compaction, rutting and soil mixing from construction activities.
- The wayleave width within Forest Reserves this has been reduced to 35 m.
- The 220 kV line through the Mabira Forest Reserve has been routed immediately adjacent to the existing 132 kV line to minimize forest fragmentation effects.
Community Development Action Plans

- UETCL/BEL are proposing to dedicate funds to be available to affected communities along the transmission line.
- The allocation of funds will be based on the magnitude of impact to the community and the size of the permanent population. Communities that have the greatest amount of potential impact with the highest population would receive a greater proportion of the allocated fund.
- 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 centers, 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.
Key Messages

- The Bujagali hydropower project is being implemented to increase the supply of electricity in Uganda.
- New transmission facilities are required to transmit the power.
- Landowners/tenants will be fairly compensated for loss of land & assets.
- A Social and Environmental Assessment is being undertaken which will require approval.
- Effects from the project will be minimal and largely limited to the construction period.
- A community development program will be implemented for villages along the transmission route.
Issues to Explore with the Villagers

- Do you have any concerns regarding the development of the electrical transmission line through your community?
- Is there any specific information regarding your village that we should be aware of?
- Are there any specific project effects that you are concerned about?
- Do you have any comments on the mitigation measures that we are proposing?
- Are there any other mitigation measures that we should consider implementing?
- What general comments can you provide us regarding the proposed community development initiatives?
- How would you like to be involved in the formation of community development initiatives?
- Do you have any suggestions as to how to implement the community development initiatives?
- What types of information (and in what form) would you like to receive leading up to and during the construction of the project.
Reporting Back the Feedback

- We will need the CDOs to report back to the project team on the meetings that were held with the villagers.
- Minutes of each meeting held with the villagers will need to be prepared and distributed to the project team. A summary of the key issues raised shall also be prepared and provided to the project team.
- We will contact each of the CDOs to arrange a time to meet the week of Oct 11.
Future Contact Information

For additional information and/or to submit comments in regards to the project, 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
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CDO Community Meeting Reports
CDO COMMUNITY MEETINGS
This report presents four selected consultative meetings held between 17th and 20th October 2006. My general comment on the quality of facilitation by the CDO is that they are generally good, but may need further training if the project is to continue working with them. The CDO of Nansana TC is very poor, I talked to the CDO of Nabweru and she agreed to support her in subsequent meetings. The practice of giving newsletters to the community is good and appreciated, at least the community is left with reference. There are common issues coming out of the consultations, and are presented below:

- Will the project consider 2000 or 2006 valuations?
- What values are going to be used?
- When will they know how much they are getting?
- When are they to be paid?
- If part of the house is affected what happens?
- If the land left is too small to be used what happens?
- Why can't the project buy the whole 35m completely and seal it off?

The Community Development proposals
These are mainly to improve on water sources, schools and health centers.

The detailed reports are presented below.

COMMUNITY MEETING Katooke Village (Nabweru SUB-COUNTY)

CDO: NAKAZIBWE MARY
Date: 17th OCTOBER 2006

Introduction
The meeting, which was scheduled for 2.00pm, finally started at 2.45pm and the CDO explained the purpose stressing the following:

- To update the community as to where the project has reached and future plans.
- The meeting intended to get everybody in the village, not only those who are directly affected by the project, so that they can discuss general community development issues.
- To explain the benefits the community will get from the power line passing through their village.
- There was another survey evaluation going on.

She went through all the issues concerned with the project including compensation and mitigation issues. In addition she outlined the Community development action plan. The CDO was very good; she has the project at her fingertips. She is a good facilitator. The only thing that was missing was the visualization. She only talked without writing anywhere for people to see. We talked about and she reported that she had not yet got the facilitation funds to buy the flip charts and markers. Community members were then given a chance to ask questions, which are presented below:

Question
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Half of my plot was taken; can I build on the remaining part? The CDO explained that the line is to carry 250 MW, so people need to be far, from the Yellow stick, not near; that he can make it a compound (the yellow stick marks the end of the leave ways).

Question
If one has a plot, can he build on it, because we expect compensation in five years time? Can that person build, because by then somebody will have died? (This was a sarcastic question pointing to the fact that the project has delayed).

Again people are wondering why the meeting, for them they want compensation money. The CDO explained that before getting the money, there meetings that are intended to get views. That there is an NGO, InterAid that will handle peoples’ grievances and there is also the Sub-county consultative committee.

Question
A community member, Nakabugo complained that she was valued but was not left with a copy of what was valued, that her house and plants are affected.

Robina: Me, I was not there when they valued.

Buwembo Peter, says that if we want or not they will take it. Why is the process so long. Why don’t they do like they did for Northern by-pass. The process did not delay so much.

Sebulunyo, says that they were not valued.

Yiga Erisa, says that they need water

Nakatude, you may not give me enough compensation and I am not happy, what do I do? It was explained to him that there will be efforts for the project and the landowners to understand each other, but if not an NGO, Interaid is around to listen to peoples’ complaints, and they will be handled by relevant people.

The BIU staff came in at this moment to explain why the process is not as fast as people may think. That there are many people with interests in the project, Bujagali Energy Limited, World Bank, the Surveyors, the valuer, the owner of the land, LCs, the lands officer at Parish level, the Kabaka, because the land belongs to Kabaka. The Kabaka representative has to know. So there are lots of consultations that need to be done, after which they will come back to the owner to agree and sign the papers; the process is still long. In addition there is need to understand the relationship between tenant and landlord.

He further explained that the Northern By-pass took a short time mainly because it is in a wetland; so there were not many people to consult.

Nalongo Ssali
Are we getting the papers before the payment or not; I should know and complain early? The response to this was that Wakiso district has to produce the valuation list and the grievances will be put to the rightful people.
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Nakatudde - is also worried about grievances on compensation. The BIU staff assured her that the process will avoid grievances; even orphans will be given what is due for them. We have heard about plants; what about land, who gets the rate is it Buganda or Uganda Land Board. It was emphasized that the values will come from the district.

I am using land for agriculture. If you take my land and I buy far, where will I get transport? The BIU explained to her that “We are not going to force you to go where you don't want”.

Nakabugo, Bujagali and the new company who will pay? They explain that it is the still the same project, it is the sponsors and developers who are different.

Agnes
Her land is affected; but house remains and yet has little land remaining, so what will happened? They explain to her that the surveyor will determine how she is affected, whether partial or full.

Musisi
Will the valuation committee at Wakiso include other people from our communities or who want 60 million Uganda shillings (referring to the Members of Parliament who are asking for 60m for the purchase of four wheel vehicles)? The response is that the district has councilors from each of the lower administrative units so these are representative enough.

Peter: Our landlord said he does not have tenants, he even sold the sold the toilet, to this the LC responded that he knows about the matter so the tenant should go to him and they settle the issue.

There is the original line, which was valued, and people were told to stop doing any activities, so now what happens to the old one? We were told don't build, some are falling or about five years down the road, the line changes. What will happen? He was told that the issue is noted as it is the purpose of the consultations.

Semanda Ronald
Me I have a tree and the branches are affected, they will be cut off, so what will happen to the trunk. The response was that particular cases will be looked into and reach an agreement.

What will happen when it comes to payment, will you announce? But tell us in the subtle way, it needs to be secretive, the leaders should alert us. We want the project people to identify us and pay us cheques. We do not want to get problems.

Naggenda Godfrey - she say her photo was not taken. He was assured that the team is coming back for a clean up.
Suggestions
With the increasing population the trading centers will be full so there will be need for a public toilet; we shall donate land.

We need electricity, there will be extension, and we need electric poles. They were asked if they are ready to pay for the electricity bills; and not expect the project; they say that even if they put today; tomorrow the will connect.

We need improvement of the Health center, we need a house for the health worker to sleep and there more drugs, and improve on the Outpatient Department and beds.

We need access roads – tractors; so that they can also move easily.

Are there possibilities of jobs; let them think of us, e.g., cooking; builders

We do not have any government school in the area. The Kabaka will give us land the available school is two miles away at Jinja Kalori. We have one water source, we had some springs, but they are encroached by human settlement.

We have our shrines, we request the Bujagali project to compensate for some of the communal sites we are going to lose, to rehabilitate our shrine by thatching them with grass.

They were asked about their opinion as to what they would like to start with;, the community development projects or the line. They say, whatever starts. Let them pay us, after paying as people resettle, we can start as papers move; they are all ours.

The CDO asked about how they would want to be communicated to maters related to the project, they say that through radio Central Broadcasting Services (CBS) and through LC, that the LC should reach everybody and the CDO herself.

Other issues that should be known
- People steal motorcycles, so we have thieves in the area who can still your wires.
- The King who is buried in the area refused electricity inside the palace.
- You cannot grow a certain type of beans (Empande) in the area, if you do it would cause a storm.
- When the project starts, whoever is the leader has to report to the caretaker of the palace and tomb, before the work starts.
- The tombs used to be a tourist attraction, if they are rehabilitated so that they can develop the area.
- We have a tree Muwafu, they are communal fruit trees, and they are a source of food for princesses. So if one is taken up by the project, there need to be replacements in terms of planting other fruit trees.
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- What will be done in case of accidents or where metals hit children as they come to spectate. It was explained that there safety measures that will be put in place to safeguard this.
- Let them not offer children as sacrifice like we heard from the Northern Byepass.
- We have tombs for Nkorooji, his tomb is in the house, he used to be chief brewer for the King, isn’t there a way they can go around it?
- We need people to train us in money issues, we shall buy old vehicles. So we need advise on how to use the money.

Observations
The meeting was scheduled to take place at 2.00pm, it is time and we have only three people at the venue. They are giving different comments. They say they tired of meetings, the project has taken long, some people are dead, they did not “eat” their money. The CDO thinks that people already know many of the issues related to the project, so they do not want to hear what they have heard before. They are interested in asking questions about how they are going to be compensated. The attendance is poor, there are 6 women and 12 men. The chairman says that he mobilized but people have just not come. They say they are tired (Babikoowa) they are tired of being cheated (Bakoowa banyaga). That they ask him (the LC) many questions and you have nothing to show. One lady says: “Our friends have died, we are tired.”

NANSANA MEETING            TIME 3:00 P.M
CDO NDAGIRE LILIAN

The CDO here was not sure of the content and she talked more in English than Luganda. We were seated in a classroom and she talked more to the blackboard than the audience. We had to come in and help her here and there. We allowed people to ask questions, and when the BIU staff provided information, helped to bring out much of what the CDO would have brought out. We also gave them Newsletters for more detailed information.

I advised her to read the content about the project from the newsletter, once again and make small notes for herself and in Luganda because many of the people are not very comfortable with English. This was evident when they chose to take mostly Luganda Newsletters. Community members raised the following questions and concerns.

Issues
We understand there are going to be many people coming to our community, mainly workers, are you going to sensitize on HIV/AIDS?

The way people working on electric poles work is bad, they are loose with their words, they say very bad word, how are going to prevent this?
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Nsimbe is also concerned about HIV/AIDS increasing in the area, when workers come and they have money and there young girls around.

Lugumba James – There was an earlier assessment done in 2001, now there is another line, what are going to do to those whom you had stopped?

Suggestion; since the others were stopped from building they should be thought about. They lost, they should have done something fro themselves by now. They left the area waiting for you.

We were left with the land and property as if we were not owners.

Kalumba, when are you paying me?

Semuju, our house stopped at the wall plate, we were told not to continue building and not to sell.

What proof do we have that this time you are serious? The response is that things have to go through a process; that about two weeks ago they saw surveyors, but many people are involved and they all have to sign. These include: the landlords, LC, Surveyor, Valuer, Bujagali Implementation Unit. All these people have to agree and sign on the form, so the process is long.

The BIU staff explained that the project has to consult the Kabaka’s representative before giving a copy to the owner.

We fear that we will be treated like the old ones. As to when they are supposed to be paid, it was explained that there are many stakeholders as follows:
- Nansana Town Council
- Government
- Abamozi
- NGOs
- Buganda Kingdom

We have to consult first in order to get the right views make the right decisions. It is not likely to happen this year. THE BIU staff explained.

We have seen you before; are they two lines or more? If we find that things are like in the past, whom do we sue for wasting our time? Some of us have been building! We are told to stop; so we fear.

Douglas
I have fear over your project schedule; the fact is you are still consulting and government will take a decision in 2007. The Bujagali project will take 4 years to build, then the transmission line 3 years. Why are they making the assessment now? You would have made the assessment in 2010 with this inflation. The response to this was that, there
could have been mistakes that were done in the past, which the project does not want to repeat. There 56 villages to be assessed.

Waswa C. - How will you value the plots and plants so that we know early? The response to this was that; it is the responsibility for Wakiso district to produce the list of values.

Ruth Kombe
They may be taking a piece from my plot and the remaining part may be useless (too small to do anything on it), what will happen to me? The response was that the valuers and surveyors will eventually who goes completely and who remains.

We want our valuation so that we know, in fact we thought you had come with money, we almost came with polythene bags.

But the 15 meters you say you will compensate but then we can still use them, why not buy the whole place? You should compensate for the whole place; the 35 metres.

If part of my house is affected, will you pay for part or the whole? The response was that they will look at individual cases and make decisions.

Wasswa: Why should the district give values and yet the money is coming from outside, they should actually pay us in dollars. BIU explained that there two types of agreements when selling property: the “willing buyer” Seller agreement, and where government wants to make a project for people; such people will be compensated so the values come from the district.

What about us in the wetlands? Will they consider us? The response was that NEMA will make approvals depending on the project approvals.

We are on Kabaka’s land; will there be double compensation; to sitting tenant and Kabaka; are we to share? Will the money go to Kabaka and I get for house and trees? It was explained that consultations are going on, but all stakeholders; the Kabaka/Land owner, the tenant and licensee will be taken care of. There are consultations between BEL and Buganda land Board are going on.

Are you going to consult the Kabaka when the tenants are not represented? They will come with figures which we cannot question. The tenants should be represented those with Kibanja should be paid as Kibanja; because I bought and have a house.

We fear they will value a plot worth 3 million at one million; there is nowhere you will buy another. The plots, which have no structures on, are many. They are likely to be given a low value.
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For the Northern bypass, those valued were paid after 3 months. Why are you taking this long, for them they paid for the toilet, but your toilet is part of the household. The toilets may have different prices. If toilet is in the 15m, they would count and assess.

Settuba Jakob: They never counted the iron sheets, never entered to see the kind of doors; whether metal or wood.

Mugabe Muhammed. If you do not enter to see; some houses are concrete others not, and the, the type of doors.

What are you going to do? When we paid then; gave them 6 months, we give you money for everything and we allow you to take everything.

Why did you change the gazetted area? What guarantee is there that what you are valuing now will not change? The response was that the line changed after making a cost best analysis. The old line affected many community institutions, which they wanted to avoid now. This comes up after the Socio-economic and environment assessments. AES did not make consultation

Issues
We needed sensitization before valuation, we just saw people coming to our property.

Lubigi now has flooded and covered people’s land; they have agreements. When they are valuing they tell you to step on your land, but these cannot stand in the water. What is going to happen? The response was that BEL and NEMA are looking into it this issue; it could be that they acquired the plots wrongly.

Chairman
Will they build a house for them like Bujagali village in Nansana? The response was that, when time for resettlement comes, people will be asked how they will be compensated. There are different options and packages for licensees, tenants, or landowners. They can opt for cash or in kind compensation.

There is land which is supposed to be for orphans, will they be compensated? The response was that they will be compensated, and they will be monitored. It was emphasized that the project has special interests in vulnerable groups to see that they are not marginalized.

I am building, have not entered, I am, hoping to enter and I am told to stop and I may not have rent. The response is that they will get the details when the RAP starts.

Mindiesala
If resettled, will BEL give me land in my names? The response is that there are consultations going on and there will be a tenancy agreement.

---

1 Namuwongo was slum upgrading World bank funded project in Makindye Division of Kampala.


**Lubega Umar**

If my whole house goes, another one, the line passes on the verandah, what will happen? The response was that they will assess the danger and advise accordingly.

**Gertrude:** We have had no development for a long period, we were refused to build even for tenants, what should we do? Pay us and we go, we are getting old and others are dying.

**Ruth Kombe**

We do not know how we are mobilized? Some of us do not stay here. May be you use the radio; the chairman can only reach those on the village. We have telephones; you can also send us SMS.

Me I was going to enter my house and was refused, why don’t you leave us and then come when you are ready to pay. The response was that money is to be got from WB before we get it they need to know, how much money, and for what? There are conditions coming from the people who are going to give the project money.

**Settuba Suggestion**

These people doing the valuation are too fast. Let them come and sit and listen to us; we shall even give them tea. Let them give us time and listen to our ideas and suggestions.

Let us hope there will be no corruption.

**Night** I was not counted, the response was that the group is coming back to clean up for those who were not around.
Christine Katende CDO
Meeting in Kawempe

The meeting was mainly for leaders who would in turn sensitize others. The meeting started at 11:00am. The CDO started by asking the community members what they know about the project. The following were the responses:

- They came and gave us info like in 2002. They stopped people from constructing but when people saw they were not coming, they continued with their work.
- They promised to pay today, tomorrow and we even ate debts.

The CDO emphasized that the project is friendly and sensitive to culture. The line will go to Mutundwe to argument the existing line. The power to be generated is high/strong. She even demonstrated the width of the 5 meters using her steps. She further explained that when compensating they will be fair aiming to make them better or restore original status. The facilitator was very good; explaining issues first and then writing them on the flip chart for people to visualize. She seemed to be in control of the whole meeting.

Issues/concerns

Waliggo
If the wire breaks, and I am within the 35, will you pay me? I was suggesting that they should pay for all the 35m. Because that land is there and I have no power to do what I want with it.

In my view, I see the area is full of danger. There is no way we are going to stop children playing in that area. Let them fence off that land and it becomes theirs completely. We can put danger zone; or that you come here at your own risk.

However, one participant said he would like it to be left to me.

Question
Better do things very fast. Do I have the right to refuse?

Mukasa Nuwa
There are some communal things like play grounds, water source, tombs, will they be compensated?

Nuwa Waliggo: They valued in 2000 and took names, people died then sold to another, who do they pay?

Kafeero: When are they paying? In Komamboga we have not seen the new valuers.
We always thought that Bujagali will bring our line, which is cheap. Now you are putting it in UMEME (UETCL), they are already expensive. The response is that from Jinja to Kawanda the line will be 220 KV, then it will be reduced to 132 KV to Mutundwe. It will be the cheapest.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
We have been hunting from the land which is going to be taken over by the project. And others have been making bricks, so in order to be compensated as a community let the project build for us a community center. We have land and we had started building, although we still have problems with ownership. We were given the land by someone who died, now the heir wants the land back, however, he is willing to sell to us. Bujagali can help us to buy that one exactly. He cannot chase us away and we also cannot go further to build, so we are in a stalemate. But he is willing to sell and if we can buy it, the better.

Ssemakula
If the water source is in my land I should be compensated as the owner. But will you identify land for borehole construction? For water we need either of the following:
- Borehole
- Hand dug well
- Tap water for free

Pipe water to be extended; people can continue to pay. Because also the water source was not very good, could dry up or was not clean. We have the water pipe all around. The project should put in stand pipes because the boreholes are discouraged in the town council.

Those to give up their land for borehole should be paid.
Or they can bring us big water reservoirs (about 10,000 liters)

Those who have been using the land for brick making and extracting sand should be given credit to start business in other places; or other alternatives. Let them get jobs let the project think about them as laborers. There should be permanent people to slash along the line to maintain. Can we get potentials for the youth to get employment and also train others?

There are so many good things you have talked about, aren't you duping us into accepting them you turn around. The CDO explained that she had indeed talked about both the negative and positive effects of the project and how the negatives will be mitigated or prevented.

When is money coming, that one is very important?
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The valuation was done in 2000, the value should be current. The rates for Kampala are there; the consultative committees should have a copy and take to people.

If the land is taken and a small useless part remains, can I sell it to project? The response was that the project will deal with case by case.

What are you going to use to show demarcation of the project land? The response was that there will be a road to be well maintained. So whoever builds in the road will be in wrong.

Other suggestions:
- The owners of project should monitor. We talked about it, we can have a committee locally that should be paid to do the job. The monitoring committee should make sure that the corridor is clear.
- Upgrading of access roads
- Schools furnishing and upgrading
- Improving drainage in our area.
- Upgrading Komamboga health center III

Question
- When do we expect all these; after constructing the line or now? I think should come earlier so that you befriend us. This will instill hop in us and we know you are serious.
- Here people can steal wires and transformer, there is need for security. Before connecting to electricity the people may pull down whatever they put.
- We ask for training in financial management so that people do not regret. E.g. brick layer may be given 3 million shillings, they can immediately think of buying a radio. So before anything can be given, there is need for training in financial management.

The CDO concluded by saying that the project is here let us embrace it. There are negative effects but the project will try to mitigate them. We should put up with problems for the sake of development. Finished by planning for follow up meetings. They fixed a village meeting, Katalemwa Kwata zone 5th Nov. and then for Kamya and Central zone on the 8/11/06 at 4.00pm.

The Bujagali coordinator was introduced as Ms Ssemakula Harried

Participants appreciated the consultations. They said that the other time with AES, they were never consulted. We are happy about these consultative meetings, you should go ahead. Because being government can easily take things.

The CDO added that they are also happy to be involved and building their capacities.
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Kawanda meeting
Nakyesanyu Parish village

Chairman - Mboozi
Nakazibwe Maria - CDO

The meeting was not well attended; this was mainly because of confusion about the time. The CDO said she communicated 3.00 pm, but the community new 2.00 pm. Even then the CDO came later than 3.00 pm because she had another meeting at the sub-county. All the same the meeting started at around 3.30 pm. she gave an overview of the project and what it is expected to do. She explained very well about the project. This is the best CDO of all I have seen, who was in Nabweru. The following are the questions and concerns as follows:

Suggestion /Questions
Concerning the will they pay for extension of the power lines in our community? The response to this was that most of the CDAP will be demand driven, people will ask and be willing to pay. The people of Wabitembe village say that they need poles.

How deep in village will they go with the CDAP? This will be in project-affected areas.

At Kawanda sub-station, they changed the mark, why? The response was that five years ago there were few settlements, they changed to where there fewer people affected. For example there is a new structure for the school and there are many people affected, so they had to change and avoid the school. But people found in the new line will be compensated.

When do they expect to start? Because the more they delay, the more the changes.

My house is partly affected, the line passes the verandah, how do you I live there? What will happen? The response was that when it comes to the resettlement they will take case by case.

CDAP
In Wabitembe village we need water and improved roads. If they can extend pipes from national water borehole, main pipe to Wabitembe, and also upgrade community schools.

We want a health center nearer, Namalere is about 1½ - 2 km. We need one in Kawanda.

How do they value? You can come one value today, then come in 2007 when value has gone up.

If I am Kibanja and landlord are we charged the same. They are valued differently. We have three stakeholders; the land owner, the tenant and the licensee.
Is there a chance for negotiation? If you offer 2m in my plot and I say 5m, can we negotiate, if we fail, do you use force? The response was the project is for government and if government wants to do something that will benefit many, it compensates not buy.

If the workers of the project eat our fruits, what will be done? The electricity workers are known for talking bad word, what will you do to stop them? Will you give our children jobs?

Communication
They agreed that the Chairman should continue communicating any news related to the project. And the Bujagali committee to help accordingly.

Other concerns
It is not good to value thing before you are ready to pay.
- Start with training, surveyor should come last.
- You are very slow and lazy
- You should have deadlines. Should be fast, be fast please.
- I don’t trust you, I am going to complete my house.

Meeting Luzinga Peter CDO

Masiko - Nagoje sub-county, Mukono district
Parish - Waggla

You are giving us so many papers like the other time what we have is enough to cook beans for a month. You give us; we have a lot of beans we shall cook. (An old man commenting when being given the newsletter.

The Chairman opened the meeting and explained the purpose of the meeting that talk about the Bujagali project.

Issues / Questions
Tomusange Kibuuka – they first passed through when many of our things were there; they are going to come back when many have disappeared. Won’t we have problems. We used to have banana plantations there are not there anymore. Won’t we have problems to get what we did not expect?
Ssemukole M - I have a house it was too big, it started falling, now I have a small one, and it had been valued. I would not have continued when the line is coming. I need you to build for me a house and I just enter, don’t need your money.

Teopisita Nakyanzi - I had a house for orphans, we were refused to build, and it all fell down, what I am supposed to do?

Suggestion
Maliro Joseph
If the line passes through my land, can’t they buy my whole land and then build for me? They valued everything so I need a house so that I just enter. Better give me a house.

Nyanzi Salongo.
I was valued in Wakisi; I have land here given to me by my aunt Nanyanzi, we hear if you are in two places, they do not give you. How will that be?

Nanyanzi, I heard about cultural issues, I have a problem. I have a stone which belongs to Jjajja Sebuwufu. The line passes through the compound and when I consulted him he was asking if you cannot change the line, to go through another place.

First value – people had planted vanilla, now no vanilla but biroowa yet other people were paid by biroowa (the plants planted together with vanilla to support it). What are they going to do? They told us do not dig. Will they count the biroowa remaining since 2001.

Birungi Perus
I used to just use the land for agriculture, had a banana plantation and coffee so I did not go back; it is now bushy; what should I do?

Kibuuka
We hear the surveyors may not find you; we hear they are very rough; they just count, because people can’t be there all the time.

Nanyanzi: For all those years when they stopped people from using the land, aren’t they going to be paid? We used to dig, now we have been buying food. We want compensation for the 6 years. It has even brought conflicts with the tenants, we tell people do not use land, electricity will come, and they refuse. Like now you have come they may/will think you have brought money.

Sozzi Habibu
He had his coffee, his entire plantation is gone.

To answer all these questions which rotated around whether they will be compensated for according to the old valuation, the BIU staff asked the LC chairman to read a letter from the Government and UETCL, it was dated 12/08/06. It clarified that people will not be
left in a situation worse that where they were in 2000. And that the old and new valuations will be considered at the current market rates.

This cleared all the issues and they were happy about it.

**The Jajja Sebuwufu stone**
The lady Nanyanzi gave more information that the stone refused to be relocated. And she also fears that it may be blasted and used for construction. Community members explained that it is their stone they go there to ask for riches, rain and present other problems. The BIU staff explained that there will a small team that will come to discuss such issues in detail and get a way forward.

**Other issues**
- We do not have good schools and the school is poor, no structures/buildings
- The roads should be improved.
- The water sources are bad, they were protected, but pipes blocked so we improvise
- We need a health center we only have Nagojje – Health centre III which has only panadol; so we go to Kawolo / Mukono, which is very far.

The same old man once again reminds the project to build for him a house instead of giving him money.

**Salongo Mukibi**
People have waited for long; others have died, so pay them.
### ATTENDANCE LIST
CONSULTATIONS IN NANSANA ON 18/10/06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DESTINATION</th>
<th>TEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles Dramu</td>
<td>Community Liaison Officer</td>
<td>0772-053716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasswa Charles</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>0752-6617...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsubuga D. Douglas</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>0772-50578..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namusisi Damascus</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>0752-25777..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentumbwe J.H</td>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katumba Patrick</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>0712-99019...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magezi John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugumba James</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimber Imelda</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanyonga Rose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nalongo Molly</td>
<td>B/Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hajati Yudaya Makumbi</td>
<td>B/Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanuka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kizito Laston</td>
<td></td>
<td>0782-425605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabali Shaban</td>
<td></td>
<td>0782-188253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabugo Laston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kizito Ronald</td>
<td></td>
<td>0772-911112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther Mafumu</td>
<td>B/Women</td>
<td>0752-471971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asuman Mugambe Nadduli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakwelele Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukebe Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td>0782-402909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Kasujja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalumba Amini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selugo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muluuta Isa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Justine Mugerwa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Mugabi Beak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsubuga A. Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiyira Edward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakawuka Sarah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabuuma Scovia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Namayengo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabanda Gerald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexibwa Ssali Abdul</td>
<td></td>
<td>0772-194843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanwange Gertrude</td>
<td></td>
<td>0752-859083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maama Jane Narugwa</td>
<td></td>
<td>0782-193976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settuba Jacob</td>
<td></td>
<td>0772-444561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kivumbi Gerald</td>
<td></td>
<td>0782-776412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubega Umar</td>
<td></td>
<td>0712-488523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reports by Dr. Florence Nangendo

40. Joyce Nanyonga  Nansana East II
41. Kalungi Gorret         9772-947024
42. Haji Badru Ssekamanya  0712-833148
43. Kombo Ruth            0772-515692
44. Matovu David          0782-851726
45. Naava Zawedde         0772-522048
46. Nyende Moses          0772-632013
47. Kalambo Moses         0752-812381
48. Nagire Lilian         0774-024840
49. John Mindiweaala      
50. Luggya Ssebuuso       0712-497137
51. Patrick Sembatya      C/m E II zone  0752-657586
52. Pastor Lubwama Steven E II zone  0772-824053
53. Patrick Ssemwangga    East II zone
54. Mbatudde Harriet      East II zone
55. Baka Sulayiman        
56. Sseguya John          
57. David Bizimana        NGO
58. Dr. Nangendo Florence

ATTENDANCE LIST
MEETING HELD ON 19/10/06  NAKYESANJA – KAWANDA
TIME: 3.00 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>VILLAGE</th>
<th>TEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.  Wakuze Deo</td>
<td>Nakyesanja</td>
<td>0772-419194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.  Hajati Amina Ntege</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>0712-869179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.  Sserunjogi Twaha/Majangwa Paulo</td>
<td>Nakyesanja</td>
<td>0782-673552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.  Tayibu Mubiru</td>
<td>Nakyesanja</td>
<td>0772-381487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.  Kalemela Isaac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.  Teleza Nayoya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.  Ssekyanzi Paulo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.  Gavawala Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.  Ngulipa Waisara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mboozzi Samuel</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>0782-380634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Dr. Florence Nangendo</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mary Nakazibwe</td>
<td>CDO Nabweru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Charles Dranu</td>
<td>BPIU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTENDANCE LIST FOR CONSULTATIONS WITH LOCAL LEADERS – KAWEMPE

19/10/06

TIME: 11.00 am

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DESTINATION</th>
<th>TEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Luutu Abdul</td>
<td>C/Agent</td>
<td>0772-557200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kaggwa Lindah</td>
<td>Sec. for women</td>
<td>0772-641310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mukasa Noah</td>
<td>Central Zone</td>
<td>0782-848400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mukasa Lwanga</td>
<td>Central Zone</td>
<td>0712-981518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Musuuza</td>
<td>Inf. PDC Komboga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tamale Kiggundu</td>
<td>Councilor – Komamboga</td>
<td>0712-956605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Nuwa Waliggo</td>
<td>Kwata zone Komamboga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Maria Kasiita</td>
<td>Ranyanya/Komamboga II</td>
<td>0774178147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Kiwanuka G.</td>
<td>Komamboga III</td>
<td>0774-870757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hakim Kiro</td>
<td>Kanyanya C/man youth II</td>
<td>0752-538231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Mulumba Sam</td>
<td>C/man Kanyanya</td>
<td>0712-032409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Amanya Abal</td>
<td>Defence</td>
<td>0782-134777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Kafero Alibatafudde</td>
<td>Vice/chairman</td>
<td>0782-199798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Katende Christine</td>
<td>DCO Kawempe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Charles Dranu</td>
<td>BIU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Dr. Nangendo Florence</td>
<td>Burnside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Semakula Mike</td>
<td>Komamboga central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Semakula Harriet</td>
<td>Gen. Secretary</td>
<td>0772-471097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Sempa Saadi</td>
<td>D.F</td>
<td>0782-460017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Hajji Muhamed Kiyemba</td>
<td>Central zone</td>
<td>0772-621843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSULTATION ATTENDANCE LIST
COMMUNITY MEETINGS HELD ON 20TH OCTOBER 2006
NAGOJJE SUB-COUNTY, MUKONO DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAMES</th>
<th>VILLAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. J.C Mukiibi</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teopistor Nanyanzi</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bilungi Pelusi</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Malire Yozefu</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Semikole Matyansi</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ozana Getu</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tomu Kibuuka</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nalongo Nalwoga</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sizo Habibu</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Nuwa Nataja</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Reports by Dr. Florence Nangendo**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Kakumba</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Nzanzi Salongo</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Wanyama Robert</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Suvini Zazoga</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Nakyonyi J.</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Wandiba S.</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Zakeliba Lelema</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Kugobola Stefano</td>
<td>Masiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Luzinda Peter</td>
<td>CDO Nagojje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Dr. Nangendo Florence</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Charles Dramu</td>
<td>BIU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nama Sub/county
Nama I & II
CDO: Nantale Carol, she was assisted by the CDO of Najjembe Musoke Christine, because for her (CDO Nama), she did not attend the training.

Consultative meeting

This report combines the meetings of Nama I and II Local councils. The meeting started with sub-county chief welcoming participants and explained that the project not new, but has a different name. That the major issue is to talk about compensation. That this is a government project one cannot refuse, but cooperate and get something as compensation.

Reminded people that they were in a meeting and they were told to guard electrical poles and wires, that the reward for getting anyone stealing is 200,000/= once that person is taken to police.

Reminded them of having clear leave ways, that there should be no buildings and no banana plantations. That they are happy with the consultation meetings going on. That this is in line with the constitution to consult with people before doing anything in the community.

The CDO of Najjembe started presenting. But immediately they were asking why the presentation? For them they are interested in money. We do not have many problems now; they will come when the line has been constructed. Nevertheless the CDO presented from flip charts. She had tried to translate almost everything from the newsletter and at some point it became difficult for people to follow. I later advised her for the next meetings to summarize the information into understandable issues that people can easily understand and follow and also to write few points on the flip charts for better visualization. In the end however, people were able to ask questions and got response. Again the questions center around whether they will be paid for the old or new valuation. The letter from the Ministry and UECTL was read which clarified everything. The following are the issues that arose.

Community Development

Will government help them in a group or as individuals? It was explained that, Community development is not only for those affected but also for the whole community in general.

Questions

- If they have passed the line through my land and I have remained in the middle of the new and old line, how do I remain there? The response was that individual cases will be dealt with.
• I have land, should I build, how many meters from the line? They have already
surveyed, should I build? The response was to ask the valuers, let the people use
them.

• We are not required to dig under the line; what about vehicles like trailers,
passing under the line. The response was that the trailer passes through very fast,
but he family spends more time.

• My father is in Luzira; I am the big son he entrusted with the payment, the
surveyors doubted this and they have another person. He was assured that his case
will be looked into when time for payment comes.

• Will this go up to 2010? We have had such for so long, studying the same. What
is parliament refuses again?

• AES was giving 30% disturbance allowance, are you going to do that? The
response was that this is consultation and people are free to make
recommendations.

• When will they show me the values so that I decide whether to get cash or to be
settled?

• They stopped us from building, the old houses are falling, and will I sleep in the
bush?

• The earlier valuers spend a lot of time; so the landlords started selling us, and are
giving us little money, yet electricity would have given us much.

• The project has brought us problems. I was fat now I have reduced, because of
lack of what to eat, we cannot dig anymore; let them give use each a bag of maize
flour. We don’t have evidence to show they are serious.

• The letter from the government talking about compensation was read to clarify
issues of compensation. That they will be compensated according to the current
market rate.

Community development plan
The following are the Community Development suggestions for the two areas.
Nama I
• Upgrade Nama I health center II, in terms of extending the wards and
medicine/drugs, and health workers.
• Let them extend the electricity poles.
• Improve on roads
• Improve on water

Nama II
- We do not have a school; we need one with the facilities.
- We need boreholes.
- Improve our road from Nama to Wakisi.

**Suggestions**
We request that when the value list comes out, you share it with us.
Let them give us jobs.

**Fears about the project**
- Taking a lot of time.
- The line people; we fear the money they are to give will be little, and yet they are taking the whole piece of land. They have sent us away and electricity is going to be there forever.
- We need strong wires because you say the power is going to be too much.
- Those affected should be helped.
- We opened bank accounts; they are now closed because we did not deposit there any money. We need money to open now.
MINUTES FOR BUJAGALI INTERCONNECTION IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT COMMUNITY SENSITIZATION MEETING HELD ON 19/10/2006 and 5/11/2006 KOMAMBOGA-KAWEMPE DIVISION

Members who attended the meeting were Local leaders and community members.

The meeting started with a prayer at 11:00 am Conducted by Mr. Nour Waliggo. The Community Development officer Mrs. Chritine Katende chaired the meeting. The meeting had only one agenda, which was to sensitize community about the project, and to seek feedback on activities so far carried out about the project, and to guide community in identifying community development proposal where the project can support Komamboga Community to improve living conditions of the community.

The chairperson highlighted the objectives of the meeting as:

1. To create awareness to Komamboga community about the Bujagali project.
2. To get the feedback from the community about what is done so far on the project.
3. To collect proposals of development activities could the community need to be supported with by the project in order to improve on the standard of living on Komamboga community?
4. To try to enable community understand the importance of the project and to accept both the positive and negative effects of the project. Knowing that the project was to try as much as possible to mitigate the negative effects as much as possible.

ABOUT THE PROJECT
Bujagali Interconnection Implementation project is a Government of Uganda project that intends to boost the present power supply from the old Owen Falls Dam at Jinja on Lake Victoria.

The new line of Bujagali is to cross several sub-counties and town councils including Kawempe Division, and Komamboga parish in particular.

The Community was lead in the discussion on the previous meetings previously carried out and reviewed to resolutions reached between the
project and the community. The purpose was to note consistence of community’s satisfaction on what was agreed upon in the previous meetings and to note the new decisions if any.

What the community knew so far about the project was that:-
- Village meetings were held in 2002
- Land demarcations were done
- Homesteads to be demolished were numbered.

The following were brought out as important to the community;
Community wanted to know what was to be done to the new developments that have been put in place since the first evaluation done in 2002. These are things like, new tenants who bought land after demarcation, food stuff and other plants since that time, important events like grave yards and the like.

The project representatives who attended the meeting added their voices to the CDO’s that the project was here to listen to all the ideas from the community affected and is prepared to review afresh the evaluation that was done previously.

The Community Development Officer explained specific area that to be compensations by the project and how compensations will be handled. Compensation has two options;
   1) The affected people will be compensated in cash/cheque form. Or
   2) The affected people may take the option where the project will buy for the affected a piece of land and develop it on the affected person’s behalf.

Reactions From the Members:
Members reacted to the communication from the community development officer by asking questions /expressed concerns

They wanted to know about:
- The period of compensation.
- The compensation for the social sites i.e. graveyard, spring wells, etc. that will be destroyed or affected by the project.
- In case of change of ownership of hand resulting from death of a person who was originally was a party during impact assessment. Who is eligible for compensation?
In relation to evaluation exercise, is there any more evaluation exercise from the one conducted in 2002

Is there a relationship between Bujagali and UMEME?

Mr. Charles Drama from Bujagali project helped the community Development officer to answer some of the questions as follows:

- He said Bujagali is working as an independent entity under the Cooperate body of BE-LTD who were contracted to run the project for 30 years and that this line will be the cheapest than UMEME. He however, informed the members that, UMEME is authorized suppliers while Bujagali is the producer.
- That all compensation will be paid depending on the current market values and that price module for Kampala is already out.
- About social sites and amenities, members were informed that, Bujagali as a project will compensate or relocate all social amenities and gave example that, in case a spring well is damaged it will be replaced by a borehole where applicable.
- About valuation, members were informed that new valuation team is going on consulting culture institution and community.
- For resettlement of people, there will be constant monitoring by the project to see that such people access better services.
- The project will cost all the damages and will compensate the residents in the range of 15 meters either sides from the main power line. However, the owner is allowed to utilize the plot by cultivating crops, which are below the height of 6 feet.
- The affected will be compensated and be given the disturbance allowance

SUGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As an aspect of feedback, members recommended that:

- The restricted area of 30 meters wide be coasted and the owner be compensated and be declared dangerous zone by fencing it up.
- That monitoring Unit to supervise the activities along the way leave corridor and the right of way be formed the parish and be paid monthly allowance by the project.
Members also observed that, for small plots left after demarcation that can not be utilized effectively be bought out by Bujagali project

AREAS OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR KOMAMBOGA
- Up grading of access roads
- Up grading schools
- Limning and improving of drainage system
- Up grading Komamboga health center
- Introducing training in land policy, HIV/AIDS, Income generating etc
- Pre-compensation training to beneficiaries.
- To complete the Community center of Komamboga and to purchase of the land on which the Community center is situated.
- When replacing the water wells, they should provide water reserves tanks.
- To expand the taed water supply in Komamboga.
- Extension of power line through UMEME.
- Economic empowerment skills training to the jobless youth and others.
- Connecting development social groups to development Institution.

Chistine Katende
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OFFICE
NABWERU SUB COUNTY  
WAKISO DISTRICT  
Date: 06th November, 2006

TO: BUJAGAALI IMPLEMENTATION UNIT  
C/O VETCL.  
P.O BOX 7625,  
Kampala - Uganda.

RE: ACTIVITY REPORT FOR NABWERU SUB COUNTY FEED BACK CONSULTATIVE MEETINGS HELD IN SIX AFFECTED VILLAGES BY THE PROPOSED BUJAGALI PROJECT HIGH VOLTAGE TRANSMISSION LINE.

Introduction:

The report presents the community’s views that were raised after the presentation of the social and environmental assessment report. This activity followed the sensitization of all community development workers in all the affected sub counties at Mukono Collin Hotel. The views presented are for both the directly and indirectly affected persons in the six villages of Nabweru Sub County i.e. Nakyesanja, Kisimu, Katoke A., Wamala, Maganjo A and Kawanda Central.

The report also presents questions, responses proposals for community development action plans. The meetings begun with community mobilization to attend the meetings as indicated on the dates in the table below.

Activity:

- The activities involved mobilizing the village members in the six affected to attend the meetings and this was directly done through the chairpersons of all LCs
- Convening feedback meetings in the six affected villages.
- Data collection in all the meetings.

PROGRAMME/ ACTIVITY TIME TABLE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Villages and venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18/10/2006</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Katooke L.C I office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/10/2006</td>
<td>2.00p.m.</td>
<td>Kisimu chairman’s place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/10/2006</td>
<td>2.00p.m.</td>
<td>Nakyesanja Mr .Mbozi’s place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/2006</td>
<td>2.00p.m.</td>
<td>Kawanda Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th/10/2006</td>
<td>2.00p.m.</td>
<td>Wamala play ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/11/2006</td>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Maganjo L.C.1 meeting place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The report presents findings and major concerns of each village and general observations and recommendations for all the affected villages of Nabweru sub county.
FINDINGS FROM THE CONTACTED AFFECTED COMMUNITIES:

KATOOKIE A.
The meeting was held on 18th/10/2006 at the LC1 office and some members of Bujagali implementation unit attend the meeting

Questions from the community:

Muzee Makabugo: How will they know what the surveyors recorded because up to present they had no feedback? Which activity will be implemented first? The construction of the T-line or Compensation?

Richard Kaziro: “Mupangisa”/Tenant wanted to know how they will be considered when compensation takes place.

Buwembo Peter: Why the process is so long compared to other activities say the mother bypass yet they are all government programme.

Mrs. Ssebwuluyo Richard: Raised an issue that her concern was about not being at the site by the time the survey was carried out and she wanted to know how they will be considered.

Eriya Yiga: His concern was about the Community Development projects and he was interested in supply of water through public connections in the area.

Nakattudde: Being resettled with discontent. Her complained was about being relocated / compensated yet this was not her interest. She noted that what if she was not yet to be relocated and compensated what will happen?

Nalongo Ssali: She wanted to known when the evaluation forms would be brought back to them.

Mr. Ssali: His concern was about the consideration of different land users and how the rates for the land will be determined?

Agnes: How will the effect of those people who were using land as cultivation area be measured?

Mrs. Florence Lukwago: Are the 15 m used as way leave can be used as grazing area for animals?

Mr. Musisi Yokana: Who are those people make the valuation committee that will determine the rate for compensation, and will be affected people be represented on that committee which will determine the value?

Mrs. Nakiwala: The initial line that had been marked by AES Nile Power had traversed their area but now it has shifted and they had stopped using their land, who will pay the damages they have suffered ever since it was identified?
Kaggwa John Kabogoza: In cases where the original land lords died and the heir left behind is not very responsible; how will that be handled?

Sserwadda Richard: In some areas, branches of their tree touched the way leave and they were not valued in case they are destroyed who will pay such damages?

RESPONSES: BASICALLY DONE BY THE TEAM FROM BUJJAGALI IMPLEMENTATION UNIT:

Compensation, for the land users (tenants and other types of occupants) were informed that consultations are going on to determine the level of effect and land use and thereafter the compensation package will be worked out for all parties affected.

For issues of valuation rates, participants were informed that BEL was waiting for the District rates which will be used as a yardstick for compensation and all the three districts are to determine their rates which are different from each other and these will be used while compensating the affected people.

For the people who were not comfortable with the survey process, they were informed that the process was witnessed by all key stakeholders who will in turn sign the forms for each directly affected person i.e. BEL was represented, Surveyors, local LC1 chairperson LC1 and that the existence of all these party was to promote transparency.

Community’s Resolution:

In cases where the way leave changed those people who were originally surveyed should be compensated basing on the effects that they have suffered i.e. they were stopped from editing any value on their houses, using that land for cultivation, and today the way leave has changes.

Announcing on the radio while contacting or giving information to the affected people was refused by the people in Katoke A. and they suggested that they should contacted or informed through their chairperson LC 1 or personally contacted when the time for compensation comes.

IDENTIFIED PROPOSALS / PROJECTS FOR THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

ACTION PLAN /PROPOSALS FOR KATOOKE A.

- public toilets in the trading center
- Extension of public electricity in the village to allow public connections
- Provision of staff quarters and construction of another ward at Nassolo HCII
- Upgrading of access roads
- Support to existing schools in the area.
- Provision of a borehole and making public connections of water on NWSC lines
- Renovation of Wamala Tombs
- Financial management courses were listed among the proposals i.e. capacity building for the directly affected.

Other identified areas when the project begins include:

- Safety and security should be tightened when the project begins
• They were cautioned not to sacrifice their children as it has always been heard for such big projects.
• They were also asked to make sure that accidents are minimized as at times track drivers conduct themselves in a manner that is not very normal.
• Obscene language as it is known of the UEB people / workers, the communities warned that this should not be the cases with the Bujagali implementers.

The social issues identified and they are of a cultural value in the area;

- In Wamala cultivation of ‘Empande’ is forbidden and no body should dear to grow them in this area.
- The project co-coordinators were advised to make a courtesy visit to the Nalinya of Wamala.
- The Bujagali Implementation unit were advised to buy seedlings of ‘ Muwafu tree” to plant them in this area in compensation of the trees they are going to destroy as the tree fruits are known to be eaten by the princesses and these were culturally brought into the area to serve that purpose.
- There was a graveyard identified as “Nkologi” where the chef brewer of Kabaka Ssuuna was buried i.e. Nkologi and Kezaala are buried on this graveyard with several others which deserves more consultation before the implementation takes place because the line traversed this area.

Problems identified by the people in this meeting that deserved attention:

• The recent has brought on board new tenants, some were as a result of shifting the line and others are as a result of buying plots along the T-line. These people lack information and it has been recommended that BEL does community sensitization as it was earlier done with the old occupants.
• Delays in the project – delays to implement the project was reported to have caused drugging peoples’ economic status behind as the land they were using for subsistence, they were told to stop using it.
• Seasonal crops were not counted by the surveyors during the survey process thus the affected people felt that they were under valued.

WAMALA VILLAGE:

The contact person is Mr. Kisembo who is the chairman LC 1. The meeting was held 20th/10/2006.
The former surveys done by AES Nile Power only 4 people were affected and the recent survey done by BEL has shown an increase in the numbers of the affected persons thus bringing on board so many people who do not have first hand information on the programme and the immediate recommendation would be sensitization of the newly affected people by eth line.

After the presentations of the social and environmental assessment report the following issues were raised by the participants in this meeting:
- Wamala has no water source, no supply of National Water, however the concern was their only water source was traversed by the line i.e. Thomas Ssenfuma Water Source and the concern of this community is how to regain their natural water supply without any interruption which is free and accessible. The said water source is used by the communities from Kisimu and Wamala itself and during the dry season it is the only water point in the area.

Response:

Efforts by this committee to provide alternatives were fruitless as the community members could not accept all the possible alternatives i.e. rechanneling the water, putting the general to pump the water in a different direction, and the proposal is;

BEL should contact the areas chairperson Mr. Kisembo for appropriate recommendations from the community before the construction takes place.

Ssendege Phillip; was also worried of who will determine the compensation rates for their property.

The new affected people recommended that sensitizations be carried out in their area because they have less information

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACTION PLANS FOR WAMALA VILLAGE:

- To provide public electricity connection in the area as up to present the area has no power supply.
- Extent National Water to the village as access to clean water is still a problem.
- Upgrading of access roads and the more emphasis was Nansana- Kageye – Wamala Road and the road of Wamala to Senge.
- Upgrade Nassolo HCII by constructing another ward and staff quarters and increase the supplies in terms of drugs.
- It came out properly that in the area there is no Governmental Aided Primary and Secondary schools, however they has land where the schools could be put up.
- Preserving of Ssenfuma Water Source

NAKYESANJA VILLAGE:

The meeting was held on 19th/10/2006.
The village that hosts Kawnada sub station and it has an experience of the affected people who were resettled by the AES Nile Power and majority of the people in this village are on a freehold land tenure system not the mailo land as the case is in Wamala, Katooke and Kisimu villages.

There are also incidences of new people who were not in the T-line by the time of the previous survey and the reasons are similar to the earlier mentioned factors.

Issues raised from this community:
Mubiru Twaibu of Nakyesanja wanted to know how cases like line traversing part of the house will be handled.

Mubiru Twaibu Wakuze Deo and Hajati Ntege Aidah. The three presented a case where the survey was done when none of them was present. Also who were not present at the time of the survey were.

Response: By officers from BEL who attended the meeting:

Members in the meeting were informed them that clean up activity will be done and the chairperson will be contacted such that all people who were not there are present at the time of this exercises.

There was a concern raised by one of the participants where his land was traversed by the line and little was left behind and was not value which is of economic value to him, how will such be handled.

Response:
After the survey process, issues such as the effects caused will be considered before compensation is done.

Issues of concern by the community:
How the project implementers will consider peoples property especially for those who are not directly affected i.e. employees on such big projects are characterized by quire behaviors and at times destructive who will compensate the community of their lost/destroyed property by the workers?

Using abusive language as it is known by the UEB Employees as it is a trade mark of the UEB Employees Compensation should not be made public however it should be through personal consultations or through the L.C. 1 chairperson.

People commended that their children be given the jobs to work on the T-line and the sub station.

COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN / PROOPOSALS FOR NAKYESANJA:

- Public connections of Water to Wabitembe should be
- Spring protection
- Upgrading of community schools
- Upgrading of Kawanda health center and increase on the drug supplies.
- Public electricity connections to Wabitembe where there is no electricity supplies.

KISIMU VILLAGE:

THE MEEETING WAS HELD ON 25TH/ 10/2006 Like in Wamala village the changes in the T-line brought many new affected persons on board who even have less information about the project and the recommendation is that they should also be sensitized.
Questions raised by the community:

Grace Bazanye: The line traversed his house which is still under construction. Should stop constriction of he continues because even this time the project can be stopped when they have not been compensated.

Musoke: What is the health effects associated with this line?

Mrs. Nyanzi: Her plot was traversed by the line and the little that remained cannot necessitate construction and she does not want to be relocated to another place, what will the project do for her? Her plot is 35-40 feet and it so near her family she does not want to separate from her family.

Ntege Peter: The way leave traversed his compound where his children play from, is he going to be compensated? And what will be the effect to his children?

Ssenyendo David: His brother’s graveyard is in the way leave, can’t it be left there.

Responses:
All things in the way leave and the right of way will be compensated and if need be relocated to allow the construction of the T-line to take place.
There is no health problem that so far has been recorded / be associated with this line. However, the project is trying to safeguard against the accidents that can occur.

Recommended Practices by the People in Kisimu:

- It was recommended that whoever will be employed on this line be him / her permanent of casual be given uniforms and identity cards so that they can easily be differentiated from local community for easy identification in case of anything.
- Like in Wamala Parish “Epande” is not to be grow in whatever way or condition in Kisimu.

In cases of the compensation the affected people should be directly contacted and not through anyone else.

MAGANJO A VILLAGE:

The meeting was held on 05th Nov. 2006 and after presentation of the social and environmental assessment report.

Like other communities questions and mysteries regarding this line are still prevailing especially to those who are not directly affected and those who were not surveyed during the previous surveyed by AES Nile Power.

Questions rose from this meeting included:

- That power of this nature 220KV will make all the men in the area impotent.
- That who will be liable for the accidents that might occur during the process of constructing the T-line
- That security in this area is at stake i.e. theft reports are rampant; what are the plans for the Bujagali implementers?
- Like other affected people who will determine the compensation rates for the peoples’ property in Maganjo?

Responses:
- There is no health problems associated with 220KV power and the provisions for the right of way and the way leave were intended to safeguard for even the accidents that were pre-determined.
- That the compensation rates will be based on the districts rates
- That the consultations that are going on are in the interests of learning more about the communities and documenting their social feeling / concerns that will be catered for during the implementation.

However, the chair person village members resolved that another meeting be held on 19th November, 2006 to capture all the views all the people in the village who did not attend because of the bad weather.

RAISED ISSUES /CONCERNS:

Mr. Mazangwe Paul, suffered double effect where some of his land was taken by the sub station and the line again traversed his remaining land leaving him in the middle of the sub station and the line. Hence the members in Nakyesanja consultative meeting recommended that he should entirely be valued, paid and he relocates.

General observation and Recommendation:

1. It was observed that sensitizations of the entire community should be carried out though with much emphasis on the directly affected that in this case some are new and others are simply successors of the former affected persons.
2. It was observed that the formerly affected persons who were surveyed by AES Nile power were sensitized and were informed about the project. However with the recent trend where there new affected people who were brought on board as a result of the new survey and some formerly surveyed that were dropped, it is recommended that sensitizations that were earlier done by AES Nile power be repeated so as to have a common understanding of the project by the newly directly affected persons. and with the recent intervention of bringing all community members on board general community meetings/ village meetings need to be held to avoid miss conceptions that prevail in the wider community as the cases was in Maganjo A
3. Consideration of the dormant five year period where the property owners were not utilizing their property economically and where in this new case the line has changed leaving behind those who were initially valued.
4. There is needed to be speedy change of Land ownership of the T-line in the names of the project to avoid the issues faced by the previous implementers.
5. In all the community meetings held, the directly affected people who had property of cultural value or sites of any cultural importance were requested to identify them
and lists be given to the area chair persons LC1 or the community development officer for identification to enable the smooth consultations on how best they will be better relocated.

6. Communities recommended that the community development action plan be implemented much more faster

7. It's recommended that workers on the said project when construction starts be inducted on the better practices and be told that the ob sin language that is known of the “UEB” /UETCL workers is not used by the Bujagali implementation workers as communities have strongly denounced such practices by the present company.

8. It's recommended that HIV/AIDS sensitization packages/community trainings be held in all the affected villages prior the implementation and during the course of construction to raise and beef up the communities capacity and readiness to interact with the people who will be working

Conclusion

Consultations from the feedback meetings that were held in the six affected villages by Bujagali transmission line revealed that there are new affected people that were brought on board following the recent re survey process that was carried out need sensitizations on the project with emphasis on the expected outcomes both social and economic and environmental health issues as majority of them indicate that they are not aware of the likely outcomes of the project. The new people brought on board need more sensitizations and community views are still needed from the wider community in all the affected villages as the non directly affected seem not to be aware of the issues that surrounds the project.

SIGNED

..................................

NAKAZIBWE MARY
CDO NABWERU SUB COUNTY.
Introduction
The exercise of gathering information from the community on social environmental Assessment has been successfully completed in the seven affected areas of Nagojje sub-county namely Wasswa, Kito, Masiko, Waggala, Ndeba, Mayada and Kanyogoga respectively.

I would like to thank the chairperson of the above villages who endeavored to mobilize the communities to attend the meetings and give their views and questions. I would also like to thank the project BEL more do BFPIU for facilitating me do the exercise. You may find that some of the views, questions are common from the communities of these villages.

I have presented views and questions from village to village and names of people who presented has been identified and put forward.

LUZINDA PETER
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
OFFICER NAGOJJE
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VIEWS, COMMENTS AND QUESTION FROM MASIKO VILLAGE

Tomusange Kibuuka: Who is responsible for our property which got off from the first assessment and are no longer Existence? - Answered.

Nanyanzi Teopista: She had a house which was for orphans the house collapsed, since no ore renovation was accepted, is the project Bel responsible for compesation? – answered

Simikole Matiyansi: He suggests that the project buys him land somewhere and constructs a house for him.

Maliro Joseph: He suggests that the project buys him land some where and constructs a house for him.

Nyanzi Salongo: If some one was assessed in Wakisi sub – county and he has another land in Masiko will it be possible to have double assessment? - answered!

Nyanzi Salongo: People who had Vanilla were first assessed when the vines were preset now the vines are off, will the project assess only Birowa?

Birungi Perusi: Coffee and matooke which was on her land is no longer in existence how shall her be assessed?

Tomusange Kibuuka: He complains about people who are very far and never present during the assessment they are not fairy assessed.

Nanyanzi: She has a culture stone where the line is to pass, this stone Sebuufu can never be transferred , what shall the project do?

Nanyanzi: She was stopped by the first project Nile power o do any cultivation on her land six years back. Is the current project ready to compensate for the food she has been buying?

Tomusange Kibuuka: He comments that the project should assist the community of Masiko by improving the Education by constructing school building and also a Health Centre be accessed to the community.
VIEWS / COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM KITO VILLAGE

Ogwama Richard: He request the project to improve the Education status, by constructing a school and a Health centre nearby.

Mutebi Robert: He requests the project assist the community buy protecting spring and grading their road for easy accessibility.

Oyalo John: Let the LCI Kito be assisted with a well constructed and furnished office.
Mutebi Robert: Community be trained on Micro Finance Management before they receive the compensation.

Ogwan Richard: The community be educated and sensitized on how to avoid HIV / AIDS.

Mugisha Emanuel: The community be assisted with construction of a church.

Mutebi Robert: The project should consider the LCI's who have assisted during surveying and valuation with some funding.
Nyanzi Ssalongo: The affected people should be paid for the money they have spent buying food since the first project Nile power.
Ogwana Richard: The community of Kito is complaining about the valuation exercise which is going on, that their items, like trees which are being omitted.

Onyango Salongo: The project should initiate a livestock project to improve on the financial status of the community.
Mugisha Emmanuel: The project should re-open up their accounts, since the one they had opened were closed.

Ogwana Richard: The affected people should receive a copy of what is valued before compensation.
COMMENTS AND VIEWS NDEBA VILLAGE

Nviri Fred: Suggest that the project should construct a Health centre to cut down the distance to Nagojje Health Centre.

Nabakooza Anna: The project assist the community by constructing them an Infant school in their area.

Kyasa George: The project should assist people with re-stocking of high breed animals.

Nabakooza Anna: Since the community have so many stones quarry in their area the project assist them with a stones query as part of their income generating activity.

Kyasa George: The project should assist the community by unblocking the fro Ndeba to Magada.
COMMENTS AND VIEWS FROM MAGADA VILLAGE

Mr. Ddamulira: The community of Magada wants to be considered by giving them jobs.

Mr. Ddamulira: The community of Magada be considered at least with 3 boreholes for better water.

Mr. Mugomba: Magada should be assisted with at least one primary school.

Mugomba: People who opened up accounts with Nile power – be considered and their accounts be re-opened by the current project.

Mr. Mugomba: The community be assisted with exotic bulls to improve on their cow breeds.

Omitta Valiano: A fish pond be provided for the community in order to improve on their Nutrition.

Mr. Matovu Lawrence: The project should set up a hardware for the affect people to buy items at a subsidized price.

Mr. Mukasa Robert: The youth be with a play ground, balls and uniforms.
VIEWS / COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM WAGGALA VILLAGE

Mr. Ali Lubowa: Suggests that the community be considered and get jobs in the project.

Mr. Mugambe Edirsia: The project should pay as in persons not constructing houses for the affected people.

Mr. Swaibu Najiki: The community of Waggala be provided with at least 2 boreholes.

Mr. Mugabe Edirsia: Waggala community should be built a health centre for easy access.

Mr. Segujja Peter: Suggest that the community of Waggala should at least receive a transformer and power.

Mr. Lubega Joseph: The community be provided with a secondary school.

Swaibu Nayiziki: Some people were assessed with Nile power and now the new line is as if its eliminating them, will they be compensated?
VIEWS / COMMENT AND QUESTIONS KANYOGOGA VILLAGE

Kagwa Richard: The community borehole which is affected should be replaced and two more boreholes be drilled for the community of Kanyogoga.

Kagwa Richard: The community of Kanyogoga should benefit by supply of power to the village.

Musuba Bosco: The community of Kanyogoga be considered with a health centre since their as far from Nagojje Health centre.

Irene Nasirubi: Complains that the existing line did not compensate her when Nile power came it did not assess and value her home, she is now left 5m in between the existing line and the proposed line who is to pay / compensate for her house.

Musumba Bosco: Request the project to keep on maintaining the road from Kanyongoga to Namataba since its vehicles are also using the same route.

Werima Bonny: The project shoulds give a sum of money to the affected people for delaying for six years.

Wasswa Stephen and Wepima Bonny: Would like the project to buy land for them and construct houses.
Wandera Lawrence: Proposes that the project build them a health centre since they are far from Kawolo and Nagojje health centre.

Mr. Kasibante: Complains about some of his property, which was not assessed, giving an example of his water tank who is to compensate for that?

Mr. Magala: Suggests that let the community receive at least two boreholes.

Mr. Kasibante: Suggests that the community of Wasswa be assisted with a supply of power.

Mr. Tukambe John: Is there any compensation for the six years they have wasted without having any project on their land?

Mr. Buchumi: Says that the valuation was not free and fair according to him. Can it be repeated?

Mr. Kukambe John: Who is responsible for re-opening up accounts, which were closed it the bank.
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Introduction.
The training sessions were conducted in all the affected villages of Wakisi sub-county.
These villages include:
- Wabiyinja.
- Lukaaga.
- Wabikookoma.
- Kikubamutwe.
- Buloba.
- Malindi
- Naminya.
- The villagers were informed on the project background.
- The villagers were described how the I.P Project will look like.
- The villagers were informed on the social and Environmental Assessment Process.
- The villagers were informed on the Land valuation and Compensation.
- The villagers were informed on Labour and working conditions effects and Action Plans.
- The cultural property effects and Action Plans were informed to villagers on how to handle them or how are going to be handled.
- Air quality and Noise effects were all handled in the meetings.
- Access roads and Traffic effects were handled in the meetings.
- Water effects were handled in the meetings with the villagers.

Objectives of the Meetings.
1. Inform the villagers about the Project and draft S.E.A result to date.
2. To present the draft findings of the S.E.A.
3. To receive feedback from the villagers.

Reporting

Min. 1

- The residents were concerned about the Land area taken by the T. line whether it is 65m or 100m.
- The residents were concerned that the line being of high voltage won't it be a danger to the nearby resident's health. Wire guards should be put on wires so that they protect them in case of an accident.
- The villagers want the technical people from transmission line to come and sensitise them on the line being of high voltage.
- The villagers were concerned on when the T-line boundary will be cleared.
- The land evaluation should be reasonable even though no crops in the land.
- The villagers want prompt payments of damaged crops and also want compensation to be made before the project begins.
- Access roads should be made on the piece of land to be compensated i.e. the area beneath the T-line.
- The villagers want to be employed in the setting up of the transmission line.
- Because the line passes through some water sources the villagers want more water sources.
- The villagers need rural electrification to go through those places, which are affected and have no electricity.
- Wakisi health centre III should be upgraded so that it caters for cases that might occur in the course of the construction and setting up the line.
- The villagers are worried with that high voltage line and the only guarantee to safety is to insulate the wires.
- Strong metals should be used to prevent people from vandalizing the mental poles.
- In case of an accident, say the wire breaking and falling on people's property they should compensate for the damages caused.
- The small pieces of land that remained in the transmission line not bought should be bought because they are very small and unproductive.
- The transmission company should come to the help of the sub-county in paying property tax and hence in the development of the sub-county.
- The villagers want to be given jobs to clear the line before and after the setting up of the transmission line.
- The market should be put into all the villages affected.
- The villagers want to know when they should remove their food, is it before or after the dam has been finished.
- Is the transmission line and the dam going to be done co-currently.

**Min 2**

**Wabiynja**
- The village doesn't have enough water for the people.
- The health unit is far away from the village this makes the people move a distance to the health unit.
- The village lacks a recreation centre for the youth and women where they can go and learn the different activities.
- Many people are illiterate and this contributes to under development in the village.

**Lukaaga.**
- The village lacks electricity and this has made the people slow developers.
- The village doesn't have any school in the area and this makes pupils to move along distances.
- The health services are not enough for the village because they don’t have any health unit.
- There is lack of a recreation facility in the village.

**Wabilookoma.**
- The village doesn’t have electricity.
- The roads are too poor that makes the roads impassable during rainy season.
- There is no community centre which can help the youth and women to develop their talents.
- There is a problem of HIV/AIDS in the village.

**Kikubamutwe.**
- The project site is in this village.
- The village lacks a health unit to serve the people and the population is high.
- The village lacks clean water because they have been using the river water.
- The tarmacked road is too narrow and needs humps to reduce the speed.

**Buloba.**
- The narrow tarmac road that passes through the village is causing a lot of accidents.
- The village has an access road but it is impassable during rainy season.
- The village lacks enough water sources.
- The village lacks a recreation centre for people to relax and develop talents.

**Malindi.**
- The road is too narrow and there are no humps to control speed that is Jinja- Kayunga road.
- The water sources are not enough for the people in the village.
- There is a lot of under development because of illiteracy in the village.
- Many people in this village have been into fishing and now the project is taking over the river. People are concerned.

**Naminya**
- The village doesn’t have electricity and this has retarded development.
- Health unit is too far away and this has led to the people walking long distances.
- Water sources are not enough in the village hence making people drink dirty water.

**Min 3**
- People have been very concerned that the area, the project is going to pass through have been used as food area. But now the project is going to restrict the people from using the area.
- The people are concerned on compensation. They are scared that the compensation might be too little to improve their welfare and also to be able to buy other pieces of land.
- Many people have a fear that the micro waves from the wires might cause healthy related problems and hence death among the people.
- The project is going to come with so many people and these mighty bring in so many diseases which can affect the people and hence suffering.
- The people are concerned with the security of their lives and property as they will be an influx of people into the area.
- The project might come in with so many vehicles and the road is too narrow with no humps on it and this might cause a lot of noise and air pollution hence causing health problems.

**Min 4**
The mitigation which have been proposed are very good but the people would like to add more on that.

- On the issue of land evaluation, the people in all the villages are saying let the land valuation rates be displayed in all the villages in time before the projects begin so that they can see how much they will benefit in their assets.

- On the labour and working conditions effects and Action plans, the people want the casual labourers strictly to come from within the sub-county especially from the areas which are affected.

- People’s view on air quality effects they say the watering might not be consistent; they suggest a light tarmac should be put on the access roads.

- On the access road the people suggested that let the Jinja – Kayunga road be widened and also put on humps to reduce speed.

- On the access roads they should put a light tarmac on the road to reduce on the dirty.

- On the main road the people are requesting road lights on the trading centre of Kikubamutwe, Naminya and Malindi. This will provide light for the night duties.

- The people say the water sources provided are not enough for the people in the areas set in because they will be an influx of more people in the area.

Min 5

- The people feel there should be more sensitizations on the issues concerning the deadly disease HIV/AIDS.

- The people are also concerned too much on the new high voltage line passing through their villages and they are saying let the U.E.T.C.L come in and try to sensitise the people on the dangers of the line.

Min 6
- The proposed community development initiatives are wonderful according to the people. There general comment is only to add on those initiatives to include:
  - Contribution towards adult literacy in the field of proving text books, black boards and chalk.
  - The people also urge that they should be provided with a community centre which will help the people during the severe trainings like HIV/AIDS, income generating projects etc.
  - Besides the two above the people especially the youth feel they should be helped in setting up recreation centres like play fields. This will help them to utilize their days effectively and gainfully. They wish if they can also be given balls.
  - The other community development initiative they proposal was a vocational school to train the youth further after the project has ended this will impart skills into the youth and thereafter reducing the levels of unemployment in the area.

**Min 7**
- People say they should be used to put up the structures especially in building, furniture making and other activities.
- The company which will be contracted to do all the community development initiatives should ensure it uses the youth from the place.
- The initiatives should be implemented before the project construction kicks off.

**Min 8**
- Detailed work plan showing when and how the project is going to be implemented.
- The people would like to know how the payments would be made, Is it on daily basis, weekly or monthly before the project kicks off.
- The people need sensitization on this high voltage line so that they can know on how to protect themselves on this powerful line.
- The people want to know on the insurance of the workers/labourers before the project begins that is to say in case there is an accident during the set up of the line how will that person be catered.
- The people further want to know in writing when the money for damages and compensation will paid.
- The people want to know the information about the market before the project kicks off. And how and when what requirements they should fulfill before they occupy the market.
- Copies of the valuation forms approved by the district land board.
- They want to know on the issue of displacement for those who have bases in the T.Line.
- They should be alerted in advance when they should be evaluated.
- They want information on how traffic is going to be controlled before and when they should be evaluated.
- They want information on how traffic is going to be controlled before and when the project is going on.
PCDP Appendix D.7
Public Comments
Dear Sirs,

In your advert in the New Vision of Saturday, 05th August 2006, you make repeated reference to AES Nile Power and the consultative process, which took place in 2001 in Jinja and Washington and thereafter.

The Uganda Tourism Association was then able to demonstrate, that the economic impact assessment of AES Nile Power, in regard of the tourism businesses in Jinja, was patently flawed and grossly understated the investments by tourism companies along the upper Nile valley and their incomes and contributions to the local economy.

AES Nile Power under the direction of the World Bank and the IFC then engaged with UTA and other stakeholders in a dialogue to establish the true value of tourism businesses and their contribution to the local economy, and work on defining mitigating measures (including the Kalagala offset). However, before these extensive negotiations came to a fruitful conclusion, AES Nile Power went into financial decline in the US and around the world and eventually had to withdraw from the project altogether.

Therefore, and subsequent to your media advert, UTA now once again goes on record that we wish to re-enter discussions with you on mitigating measures, to support tourism businesses which have invested substantially along the upper Nile valley in accommodation, hospitality and adventure facilities, and substantially discuss the economic impact the dam will inflict on the viability of those businesses.

Under the direction of the World Bank we had reached the stage in negotiations with AES Nile Power, that the financial impact was to be determined and that AES Nile Power would set aside a financial support package for qualified recipients, to assist them if necessary re-locate river entry points for rafting and kayaking but also, as and where found necessary relocated their logistics bases and other ventures.

UTA is therefore requesting you to take note of our standing as tourism apex body in Uganda and that it is our desire to constructively engage in discussions and negotiations with you, to mitigate the impact of the dam on our stakeholders.

As we said in 2001 in our verbal contributions during the Jinja consultations and in the paper submitted at the World Bank / IFC public hearing in Washington, we are not anti power and we are not misguided by questionable 'principles' on environmental issues, when our country suffers the most severe power crisis in its history. The tourism industry appreciates the need to take a nationalistic stand on the matter, and in fact has done so, but at the same time we cannot overlook the economic impact of the development vis-a-vis our stakeholders, whose entire livelihood now depends on their venture along the upper Nile valley.

We are looking forward to hearing from you in due course. Until then we remain

yours sincerely
Prof. Dr. Wolfgang H. Thome
President

Uganda Tourism Association
Member of ICTP - The International Council of Tourism Partners
Member of PSF U - The Private Sector Foundation Uganda

Plot 31, Kanjokya Street, Kamwokya, Kampala
P.O. Box 24503, Kampala, Uganda
Website: www.uta.or.ug (sponsored by INFOCOM, Uganda's leading ISP company)
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in various upcountry locations - details available on request

Notice: This mail is privileged information and for the intended recipient only. Should you receive this mail in error, please revert to us immediately and then delete this mail from your system altogether. This mail may under no circumstances be forwarded, copied or otherwise distributed without our prior, explicit written consent. Breach of this confidentiality may result in appropriate legal action being instituted.
This mail / attachment from us is screened with the latest updated versions of NAV and AVG, monitoring all outgoing mails for known computer viruses at the time of sending. This does not absolve the recipient however from exercising due care and caution, when opening mails and attachments from us. Use of an appropriate and updated Anti Virus Programme is recommended.
Good morning,
this is to establish that you got our mail and will be responding to it in
due course.
Attached is also below a feedback from one of the Jinja based tourism
stakeholders
for your information.
Yours faithfully
Uganda Tourism Association

'Also we would like to bring to your attention the visual impact that the
transmission line is going to have. We are hoping to be able to push the
whole thing back by quite a way, to stop it being an eyesore from the river.
We understand a new survey is about to begin (possibly this week) and we
would like the developers to move it back, now would be a good time it would
seem. This would not only help our existing developments, but would
certainly be pertinent in view of the proposal.'
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Naminya and Bujagali Area Stakeholders  
PO Box 1610  
Jinja, Uganda  

21 August 2006  

Bujagali Energy  
Hydroelectrical Power Project  
Transmission Line Surveyors  

Cc: Professor Dr. WH Thorne President UTA  
Cc: Ugandan Investment Authority  

To Whom It May Concern:

TRANSMISSION LINE(S)

We are a group of companies that have all purchased or leased land on the western banks of the River Nile from 2000 to 2006. We understand that construction of a transmission line to service the new Bujagali Hydropower project is scheduled to be built at some time in the future.

We would like to note that whilst we accept the new hydropower scheme and applaud the benefits it will bring, we have some concerns that the transmission line will be quite literally on our back fences and we would respectfully request this line be pushed back.

The reasons we would like the transmission line pushed back are:

1. Environmental issues.
   a. We have several massive protected trees ie Mvule that are right in the transmission line path, some at over 100 years old.
   b. We have a lot of tourism in the form of rafting, kayaking, river boarding, quad-biking, hotels, horse riding and mountain biking, that the transmission line would impact on from visual pollution. Tourists don’t want to see huge towers marching down the side of the river. Pushing the line back would help that immensely.

2. Land issues
   a. If the transmission line is built where it is scheduled to go, it will devalue land that investors have put a lot of money into over the last few years. It will also stop expansion backwards by new and existing investors. It will also affect some rental agreements that have been undertaken with local landowners.
   b. The riverfront land is now worth a lot more than it was 6 years ago affecting compensation amounts that have been offered.

Therefore, in light of the above issues, we would like to discuss with you where the transmission line could go. We feel that pushing it back by at least
100 metres would be very beneficial to the flourishing tourism sector in Jinja and allow continued growth in our industry.

Please contact our representative Natalie McComb on 0772 667 040 so we can discuss this matter in more detail.

Kindest regards
Interested Persons of the companies below.

African Minerals Limited
Monkey Business Limited
The Pavilion Limited
Nile Flyer Limited
Silverback Adventures Limited
Malachite Bird Safaris Limited
Brony Carne Limited
Bikes Uganda
Nugent Limited
White Nile Tree Company
Gomba Fisheries
Nile River Explorers Limited
Nalubale Rafting Limited
Kayak the Nile Limited
Far Out Limited
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Phase 3 Consultation Materials
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?
   1- YES                  2-NO

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
Appendix F
Kawanda Sub-Station Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan (APRAP)
# Contents

1 INTRODUCTION..................................................................................................................4
  1.1 PROJECT GENERAL BACKGROUND........................................................................4
  1.2 BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION................................................................................5
  1.3 SCOPE OF THIS DOCUMENT......................................................................................6
    1.3.1 The Social Documentation within the SEA.........................................................6
    1.3.2 Scope of this Document.....................................................................................6
  1.4 THE IMPACTS OF THE KAWANDA SUB-STATION ON LAND AND PEOPLE............7

2 AESNP’S RESETTLEMENT AND COMPENSATION ACTIVITIES.....................................7
  2.1 THE 2001 RAP........................................................................................................7
  2.2 RESETTLEMENT SITE ..............................................................................................8
  2.3 RESETTLEMENT AND COMPENSATION ACTIVITIES ............................................8

3 METHODOLOGY OF THE ASSESSMENT.........................................................................8
  3.1 STUDY TEAM........................................................................................................8
  3.2 METHODOLOGY......................................................................................................8
    3.2.1 Sampling ..........................................................................................................8
    3.2.2 Methods and Instruments ..............................................................................8

4 MAIN ISSUES..................................................................................................................9
  4.1 LAND TITLES .........................................................................................................9
  4.2 ACCESS TO PUBLIC SERVICES..............................................................................9
    4.2.1 Water Supply ....................................................................................................9
    4.2.2 Electricity .........................................................................................................9
    4.2.3 Access .............................................................................................................9
    4.2.4 Health and Education ....................................................................................9
  4.3 LIVELIHOOD RESTORATION .................................................................................10
    4.3.1 Agricultural Land ............................................................................................10
    4.3.2 Incomes ..........................................................................................................11
  4.4 VULNERABLE PEOPLE .........................................................................................11
  4.5 CONSULTATION .....................................................................................................11

5 ACTION PLAN................................................................................................................12
  5.1 CONCLUSIONS OF THE ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....................12
  5.2 ACTION PLAN.........................................................................................................12
    5.2.1 Overview .........................................................................................................12
    5.2.2 Implementation Responsibilities and Linkage with the HPP CDAP .....................13
    5.2.3 Monitoring & Evaluation .............................................................................14

APPENDIX – TRANSCRIPT OF A FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION WITH RESETTLERS IN NANSANA RESETTLEMENT SITE .................................................15
Tables

Table 1: Impacts of Kawanda Sub-Station on Land and People ....................................................... 7
Table 2: Agricultural Land Before and After Resettlement ................................................................. 10
Table 3: Comparison of 2000 and 2005 Incomes for Resettlers Interviewed ........................................ 11
Table 4: Action Plan to Address Observed Deficiencies ........................................................................ 12

Acronyms

AESNP AES Nile Power
AIDS Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
BEL Bujagali Energy Limited
BIU Bujagali Implementation Unit
CDAP Community Development Action Plan
DWD Department of Water Development
EIA Environmental Impact Assessment
GoU Government of Uganda
HPP HydroPower Project
IFC International Finance Corporation
IFI International Financial Institutions
IP Interconnection Project
LC Local Council
MW MegaWatt
NEMA National Environmental Management Authority
RAP Resettlement Action Plan
RCDAP Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan
SEA Social and Environmental Assessment
TOR Terms of Reference
UEB Uganda Electricity Board
UETCL Uganda Electricity Transmission Company Limited
UGX Uganda Shilling
USD United States Dollar
WBG World Bank Group

Exchange Rate considered in this document: USD 1 = UGX 1,800
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT GENERAL BACKGROUND

The Bujagali Hydropower Project 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. Bujagali Energy Limited ("BEL") is the proponent of this project.

The Bujagali Hydropower Project requires a new interconnection system, the Bujagali Interconnection Project ("Bujagali IP"), including, but not limited to, new transmission lines, to deliver the electricity power at Bujagali HPP to the national grid of Uganda, particularly to the main demand center of Kampala, the capital city. The Bujagali IP will also support other planned initiatives to expand and strengthen the national grid in future.

The Bujagali Interconnection Project ("Bujagali IP") is developed by the Uganda Electricity Transmission Company Limited (UETCL).

Development of the Bujagali HPP and of the Bujagali IP was first initiated by AES Nile Power Ltd., ("AESNP") in the late 1990's. Amongst other activities, AESNP prepared Environmental Impact Statement documentation for both projects 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.

The overall project (both hydropower and transmission facilities) was approved by the Government of Uganda's (GoU) National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA) in 1999/2001, and by the World Bank and African Development Bank Boards in December 2001. However, in 2003 AESNP withdrew from the Project. Subsequent to AESNP pullout, the GoU initiated an international tendering for the development of the hydropower project, which was awarded to BEL, a project-specific partnership of Sithe Global Power (USA) and IPS Limited (Kenya), whereas UETCL took responsibility for the development of the Interconnection Project.

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 – Kawanda Sub-Station) is part of the required SEA Documentation for the Interconnection System, prepared by BEL on behalf of UETCL. For this 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 was 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, lecturer at Makerere University (Department of social work and social administration) in July 2006.

The Kawanda sub-station is a key component of the interconnection system between Bujagali HPP and the main power consumption center, the capital city Kampala. The site was identified in 1999-2000 following an analysis of alternatives, which is reflected in the Environmental Impact Statement EIS submitted in 2001. Resettlement and compensation activities took place in 2001 and were implemented by AESNP based on the Resettlement Action Plan submitted to NEMA and IFC in early 2001. For the rest of the transmission lines component, resettlement and compensation were not implemented by AESNP, but identification and valuation of affected assets, and census of affected people took place in 2000 and 2001.
The Terms of Reference for the new SEA of the Interconnection System, 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.

The Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities addresses the activities undertaken in the area affected by the hydropower facilities, which are presented in another report, and those carried out at Kawanda Substation, which are presented in this report.

1.2 BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed Bujagali hydropower facility is located at Dumbbell Island, 70km east of Kampala the capital city, and approximately 15km north of Jinja, the second largest town in Uganda in terms of both population and industrial capacity. The hydropower project is being designed for a final capacity of 250MW. The need and rationale for this project, together with its detailed description, are presented in the SEA main report for the HPP.

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.

The routing of the transmission lines that form the main component of the Interconnection Project was selected after comprehensive studies that assessed all the alternative design and route options taking cognizance of the environmental, technical and economic considerations. In conjunction with the above criteria, the final route alignment considered the GoU’s power requirements and its future infrastructure strategy.

The Interconnection Project comprises amongst other the following components (details in the SEA main report for the IP):

- a 200kV / 132kV switchyard on the west bank of the Victoria Nile adjacent to the Dumbbell Island hydropower facility;
- a new 220kV transmission line from the Bujagali switchyard to a new substation at Kawanda, north of Kampala (length 70.4 km);
- a new 132 kV line from the Kawanda substation to the existing substation at Mutundwe in southern Kampala (length – 17.4 km). Internal improvements (i.e. new bay and switching gear) at Mutundwe to accommodate this new 132 kV line will also be required.

Other lines are planned from the Dumbbell Island switchyard to the existing 132 kV line from Owen Falls to Tororo and from the Owen Falls-Tororo line to interconnect with the Bujagali switchyard.

The IP also includes the construction of a new substation in Kawanda in the northern outskirts of Kampala. Kawanda was selected as the most appropriate location:

- To facilitate the emergency needs of Kampala, the main load center,
- To support the medium to long term infrastructure development for supply from other potential sources and distribution to the whole of Uganda.
The 2001 EIS for the transmission system presents a detailed comparative analysis of potential sites for the Kawanda sub-station.

As mentioned above, a RAP was developed in 2000 – 2001 for the whole transmission system. However, it was implemented only at Kawanda sub-station. While socio-economic surveys and consultation with potentially affected persons were undertaken by AESNP in the 2nd and 3rd quarters of 2000 for the whole route, while the valuation of affected assets was carried out by independent valuers, the compensation and resettlement program was put on hold for the transmission lines themselves. The actual implementation of compensation and resettlement took place in the 3rd and 4th quarters of 2001. The area where the Kawanda sub-station is to be built is now substantially vacated by its former owners and users.

To minimize impacts on a neighboring school, UETCL plans to change the Kawanda sub-station layout slightly. This will result in very limited additional land acquisition. Compensation for this land acquisition will comply with principles described in the new RAP, which is part of the SEA documentation for the IP (see next section).

1.3 SCOPE OF THIS DOCUMENT

1.3.1 The Social Documentation 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 Interconnection Project:
  - Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan (Kawanda sub-station – this document),
  - Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan;
- Bujagali Hydropower Project:
  - Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan (this document assesses mitigations implemented by AESNP from 2000 to 2002 in the Hydropower Project area),
  - Community Development Action Plan,
  - Environmental and Social Action Plan (Section 8 of the general SEA report for the Bujagali HPP)

In addition, the general SEA for the Bujagali Interconnection Project presents an assessment of social impacts entailed by that project, as well as an action plan to mitigate these impacts.

1.3.2 Scope of this Document

In 2000 and 2001, AESNP developed a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP), which was approved in 2001 as part of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Transmission System 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 at Kawanda sub-station. All compensation for identified land use was effected. It included:

- Resettlement of physically displaced people,
- Cash compensation of assets such as land and land use rights, perennial crops and trees, structures.

The purpose of this document is to assess whether AESNP’s commitments to comply with the publicly-released 2001 RAP were met. As mentioned above, this document addresses only impacts at the Kawanda sub-station. Where gaps are observed, recovery activities are recommended.
1.4 THE IMPACTS OF THE KAWANDA SUB-STATION ON LAND AND PEOPLE

Table 1 below presents a summary of the impacts of the Kawanda sub-station on land and people:

Table 1: Impacts of Kawanda Sub-Station on Land and People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acreage of land compensated (acres)</th>
<th>12.75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of affected households</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of affected structures</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of affected residential structures</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of physically displaced households</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total paid in compensation (UGX)</td>
<td>227.34 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total paid in compensation (USD)</td>
<td>145,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 AESNP'S RESETTLEMENT AND COMPENSATION ACTIVITIES

2.1 THE 2001 RAP

AESNP with assistance from a specialized consultant produced a RAP in 2001 (disclosed in April 2001) for the transmission lines, which included mitigation of land impacts at Kawanda sub-station.

In contrast with previous practice in Uganda for similar projects, AESNP committed to compliance with World Bank Group safeguard policies (OD 4.30 “Involuntary Resettlement”). For the Kawanda sub-station, the principles for compensation included in the transmission lines RAP were the following:

- Full land acquisition\(^2\) by AESNP acting on behalf of the then licensing authority (the UEB - Uganda Electricity Board), with transfer of the land title from the present owner to the UEB;
- 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;
  - cash compensation for the lost residential structure and/or provision of building materials, plus disturbance allowance;
  - cash compensation against the value of lost perennial crops plus disturbance allowance;
  - cash compensation against the cost of moving.
- Cash compensation for households who would 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.

\(^1\) While AESNP was committed to comply with the “old” WBG involuntary resettlement policy (OD 4.30), new versions of this policy are now in force, respectively (i) OP 4.12 “Involuntary Resettlement”, which is applied by the World Bank, and (ii) PS5 “Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement”, which is applied by the International Finance Corporation and Equator Banks.

\(^2\) In contrast with “wayleaves” and “right-of-ways” along the transmission lines themselves, which did not require land acquisition but only the creation of an easement (or encumbrance).
2.2 RESETTLEMENT SITE

A resettlement area was identified in Nansana community, about 4 km from the Kawanda sub-station location. Land was purchased by AESNP from a private landowner. The site was demarcated into plots of 1/8 acre for residential purpose, each resettler being allocated one such plot; the rest of the area was dedicated to replacement agricultural land.

AESNP built an access road and a low-tension electricity line to bring power to the site. A borehole was drilled and equipped with an “Orbit” handpump. It is currently not operational.

2.3 RESETTLEMENT AND COMPENSATION ACTIVITIES

AESNP implemented the RAP for the Kawanda sub-station in the third and fourth quarters of 2001. People were moved in late 2001. Most physically-displaced people opted for the allocation of a plot in Nansana resettlement site, while their previous structures in Kawanda was compensated in cash. They were then assisted in rebuilding their house at the Nansana resettlement site.

3 METHODOLOGY OF THE ASSESSMENT

3.1 STUDY TEAM

The assessment was carried out in the field in July 2006 by a Ugandan senior social scientist from Makerere University, Dr. Florence Nangendo, coordinator of the field assessment, with assistance from one other experienced social scientist from Makerere University.

Support was obtained from the Bujagali Implementation Unit, in terms of qualitative information and access to existing documentation.

3.2 METHODOLOGY

3.2.1 Sampling

Given the small numbers of affected people for this site, there was no sampling per se, but it was attempted rather to meet with all affected people. While this was quite successful for physically displaced people resettled in the Nansana resettlement site, it was not for other people (mostly sharecroppers and tenants who were cultivating plots at Kawanda but were not residing). In spite of different attempts (through the local councils), it was not possible to identify the whereabouts of most of these people.

3.2.2 Methods and Instruments

A questionnaire (similar to the 2001 AESNP questionnaire) was administered to 7 of the 8 resettled households, who could be identified and found in the Nansana resettlement site. In addition, a group meeting was held with them.

Out of the 7 resettler households at the Nansana resettlement site, 3 are female-headed and 4 male-headed. Five are primarily farmers and two are retired public servants (nurse and teacher).

In addition, a focus group discussion was held with all seven heads of households together.

The host community’s perceptions were captured through an interview with a local LC1 representative (female), who was closely involved in the negotiations with AESNP.
4 MAIN ISSUES

4.1 LAND TITLES

The land at the Nansana resettlement site was purchased by AESNP from the Uganda Lands Commission in 2001. Resettlers were promised a land title, as per commitments made in the RAP.

To-date, none of the resettlers has been issued a land title. This is a significant problem, as resettlers unanimously report in interviews that they feel insecure without any documentation showing that they are the rightful owners of the land. The situation seems to be rather complex, as follows:
- The Buganda Kingdom has a claim over this land, as it appears that it formerly belonged to the Kingdom before 1960, when this land as well as other land was expropriated from the Kingdom without compensation by the Government;
- After the traditional institutions were reinstated into their property rights, negotiations took place between the Kingdom and the Government through the Uganda Lands Commission, to compensate the land at Nansana either by replacement by a piece of land of similar value, or by payment of compensation; it appears that the Kingdom, through its Buganda Land Board, opted for the latter solution, but the Government has never been able to pay the compensation;
- The Ministry of Energy is apparently well aware of this situation, and is reportedly in the process of securing funds to pay this compensation.

If this compensation is paid, the Buganda Land Board would then be able to clear the land title requests for eventual issuance by the competent authority.

This situation needs to be fixed for the following two reasons:
- It is a non-compliance with earlier commitments made in the RAP;
- In the sub-urban area where the Nansana resettlement site is located, there is a significant risk of people without land titles being evicted, as land pressure is high and many might want to acquire a well-placed, already developed piece of land.

4.2 ACCESS TO PUBLIC SERVICES

4.2.1 Water Supply

AESNP installed a drilled well with an Orbit handpump. As most similar pumps put in place by AESNP, it is not operational. The source of water for resettlers (and neighbouring residents) is a spring catchment, which was improved by AESNP. Host community members have concerns about the potential impact of houses and latrines in the resettlement site on the quality of water at that spring. According to the BIU, these concerns were substantiated by a hydrogeological expert from DWD. It is therefore important that the pump be replaced by a more reliable model. This is indeed planned by BEL as part of the CDAP (see Bujagali HPP – CDAP).

4.2.2 Electricity

All households interviewed in Nansana resettlement site have access to electricity. This is a significant improvement of their living conditions.

4.2.3 Access

Vehicular access to the site is possible at all times. There are some complaints from resettlers that the road to the site has deteriorated since AESNP built it. The responsibility for maintenance of this road rests with the local authorities.

4.2.4 Health and Education

The offer of health units and of primary and secondary is better and more diverse in Nansana, a larger town, than it was in Kawanda. This is recognized by resettlers themselves in face-to-face interviews.
4.3 LIVELIHOOD RESTORATION

4.3.1 Agricultural Land

The comparison of agricultural land before and after the resettlement is shown in Table 2 below:

Table 2: Agricultural Land Before and After Resettlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent's Gender</th>
<th>Land before</th>
<th>Land after (excluding the residential plot)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 F</td>
<td>2 acres – ownership</td>
<td>2 acres – ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 F</td>
<td>¾ acre – ownership</td>
<td>¼ acre – ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 M</td>
<td>1 acre, including ½ in ownership and ½ in tenancy</td>
<td>1/8 acre – ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 M</td>
<td>½ acre – ownership</td>
<td>¼ acre – ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 M</td>
<td>1 acre – ownership</td>
<td>1.25 acre – ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 M</td>
<td>3/8 acre, including ¼ in ownership and 1/8 in tenancy</td>
<td>1/8 acre – tenancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 F</td>
<td>1.5 acre, including ½ in ownership and 1 acre in tenancy</td>
<td>¼ acre – ownership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the seven resettler households interviewed (out of eight), the total agricultural surface available has been overall reduced by 40%. Five out of seven have less land, sometimes significantly less, one has the same surface, and one has more.

It seems, however, that several resettlers sold part of the land that was allocated to them for agricultural purposes, keeping only the residential plot, because the land value at the resettlement site increased considerably after AESNP built a permanent access road and brought electricity. In addition, several of these resettlers were not primary farmers, and the land they owned at Kawanda was in fact farmed by others, who were their sharecroppers or tenants.

It is clear anyway that with surfaces of ¼ acre or less (about 1,200 m2), some resettlers have no option but shift to a more urban way of life. They cannot expect agriculture to sustain them with such surfaces (it is generally estimated in Uganda that an agricultural surface of about 0.8 hectare (or about 1.75 acre) is required to sustain an average household).

In addition, resettlers also complain about land fertility, as indicated by these quotes from the Focus Group Discussion in Nansana Resettlement Site, below:

What has changed for me is the fact that I was removed from my fertile land and given a relatively small piece of land, which is even infertile. This has reduced the economic activities that I could carry out on my land and therefore reduced on my agricultural income.

Personally, I think I am not well off but what I miss most is my land in Kawanda which was fertile and which would support the growth of a number of crops. I have no other means of employment apart from my land which used to sustain my life. It is now a different story, here the soils are infertile and I am unable to sell crops because of the low productivity).
4.3.2 Incomes

Resettlers interviewed at the Nansana resettlement site were asked by the social researcher to compare and quantify their sources of cash and non-cash income in the pre- (2000) and post- (2005) resettlement situations. They were assisted in assessing incomes from the different sources identified.

Table 3: Comparison of 2000 and 2005 Incomes for Resettlers Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent's Gender</th>
<th>Cash income</th>
<th>Non-cash income</th>
<th>TOTAL 2000</th>
<th>Cash income</th>
<th>Non-cash income</th>
<th>TOTAL 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 F</td>
<td>15 600 000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15 600 000</td>
<td>4 800 000</td>
<td>3 690 000</td>
<td>8 490 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 F</td>
<td>1 200 000</td>
<td>1 920 000</td>
<td>3 120 000</td>
<td>1 920 000</td>
<td>1 200 000</td>
<td>3 120 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 M</td>
<td>10 200 000</td>
<td>380 000</td>
<td>10 580 000</td>
<td>12 000 000</td>
<td>300 000</td>
<td>12 300 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 M</td>
<td>1 800 000</td>
<td>550 000</td>
<td>2 350 000</td>
<td>1 830 000</td>
<td>1 250 000</td>
<td>3 080 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 M</td>
<td>4 680 000</td>
<td>360 000</td>
<td>5 040 000</td>
<td>4 860 000</td>
<td>120 000</td>
<td>4 980 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 M</td>
<td>14 760 000</td>
<td>1 380 000</td>
<td>16 140 000</td>
<td>5 400 000</td>
<td>2 000 000</td>
<td>7 400 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 F</td>
<td>3 030 000</td>
<td>336 000</td>
<td>3 366 000</td>
<td>720 000</td>
<td>980 000</td>
<td>1 700 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>51 270 000</td>
<td>4 926 000</td>
<td><strong>56 196 000</strong></td>
<td>31 530 000</td>
<td>9 540 000</td>
<td><strong>41 070 000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table, which must be interpreted with some caution as such income assessments may not be fully reliable, seems to indicate the following:
- The non-cash income, which is an indicator of self-consumption of agricultural production, was low in 2000 in comparison with the cash income, which indicates that this group was not primary farmers (except respondent 2);
- The non-cash income has increased in 2005, which is paradoxical given the fact that people complain about their lower agricultural production in the new site;
- The cash income has significantly decreased between 2000 and 2005 for three in the group, and is more or less stable for four;
- The overall income has significantly decreased.

These results tend to indicate that about five years after resettlement, livelihood is not restored for three out of seven of the interviewed resettlers.

4.4 VULNERABLE PEOPLE

While vulnerable people were apparently identified and may have received some specific assistance from AESNP at the time of moving, they nowadays appear not to be identified or monitored per se in the existing records of resettlers and compensatees for the Kawanda sub-station. This is an area of potential non-compliance with WBG operational policies, and is certainly not in line with current good practice. Given the small number of Project-Affected People for the Kawanda sub-station, vulnerable people must be identified (including amongst the non-resettled affected people), located, and assistance measures need to be devised where necessary.

4.5 CONSULTATION

Resettlers express numerous complaints about the way the process was handled by AESNP. They indicate that they were "rushed" to relocate to their new houses, while these were not quite ready yet. Also, a misunderstanding has arisen about the disturbance allowance. As per Ugandan law, the disturbance allowance is 15% of the total compensation if people have more than 6 months notice before vacating the land that is
acquired from them, and is 30% if they have less than 6 months notice. According to the BIU, people in Kawanda did receive more than 6 months notice, and therefore the 30% disturbance allowance was not to be paid. However, a 15% disturbance allowance was indeed paid to them. It does not seem that this issue is properly understood by the affected people, who still claim payment of the disturbance allowance in general, without being specific about the 15% or 30% rates.

5 ACTION PLAN

5.1 CONCLUSIONS OF THE ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The main conclusions and recommendations are the following:
- People in the Nansana resettlement site do not have land titles; this is a non-compliance with the RAP, which needs to be fixed;
- The defective handpump needs to be removed and changed to mitigate the impact of the resettlers’ community on the spring used by the host community;
- Livelihoods are not restored, and some households need to be supported in their efforts to restore them; these are not households living in an agricultural economy any more (if they ever were), and they need to be supported in non-farming activities;
- Vulnerable people need to be identified, and assistance measures need to be devised if necessary;
- Further explanations need to be given on issues such as the payment of the disturbance allowance;
- Monitoring of resettlers and other affected people needs to be resumed, based on comprehensive information for each affected household, preferably to be incorporated in a household-level database summarizing compensation information at household level and allowing to include further monitoring information.

5.2 ACTION PLAN

5.2.1 Overview

Table 4 below presents the activities identified to address the deficiencies observed in the assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Issue</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Cost (USD)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Titles</td>
<td>- Resume and finalize negotiations between the Buganda Land Board and the Ministry of Energy to settle the issue of compensation of the Nansana resettlement site in favor of the Buganda Kingdom - Issue land titles to all resettlers</td>
<td>Ministry of Energy, with facilitation by UETCL</td>
<td>Unknown(^3)</td>
<td>To be started as soon as possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) The amount claimed by the Buganda Kingdom is unknown. Assuming land value in the area is currently in the order of UGX 15M per acre, the total claim could be around UGX 200M, or about USD 111,000. This number is given for information only. It is likely, however, that there is a lot of space for negotiation, with other, more political, considerations in the balance.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Issue</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Cost (USD)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water supply</strong></td>
<td>- Replace the Orbit handpump by an India Mark 2 handpump</td>
<td>UETCL with facilitation and support from BEL</td>
<td>Part of the CDAP Pre-Construction phase, currently being implemented</td>
<td>In progress (August 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Train a mechanic in the community (either resettlers or host community)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to take care of the pump</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Livelihood</strong></td>
<td>- Include Nansana settlers in the CDAP Construction Phase activities</td>
<td>UETCL with facilitation and support from BEL</td>
<td>Addition of USD 15,000 to the HPP CDAP Construction Phase budget to take care specifically of these two communities</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restoration</strong></td>
<td>intended for the HPP affected people, particularly the agriculture component for those whose livelihood is based on agriculture and the small business component for the others – See HPP CDAP Document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Include non resettler affected people in these activities as well (see below “Monitoring”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vulnerable</strong></td>
<td>- Identify and locate vulnerable people, amongst resettlers and other affected people</td>
<td>UETCL with facilitation and support from BEL through its Social Unit</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>To be started as soon as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People</strong></td>
<td>- Develop specific assistance measures for vulnerable people if needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation /</strong></td>
<td>- Resume contact with the community of resettlers in Nansana</td>
<td>UETCL with facilitation and support from BEL through its Social Unit</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>To be started as soon as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td>- Clarify the disturbance allowance issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Establish a database of all affected households to allow for further socio-economic monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Monitor affected people on a regular basis before and during the livelihood restoration activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring of</strong></td>
<td>- Identify the whereabouts of non-resettler affected people, investigate their current social and economic circumstances, and include them in livelihood restoration activities</td>
<td>UETCL with facilitation and support from BEL through its Social Unit</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>To be started as soon as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affected</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.2 Implementation Responsibilities and Linkage with the HPP CDAP

General responsibility for implementation of the activities identified in Table 4 above rests with UETCL.

BEL has developed a Community Development Action Plan for the HPP Project, as well as an Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities for the HPP Project. BEL plans to put in place a dedicated Social Unit to implement the action plan foreseen in the framework of the APRAP for the HPP Project, and to implement the...
Community Development Action Plan for the HPP Project. This Social Unit will assist UETCL in the implementation of the measures envisioned in this action plan.

The livelihood restoration measures envisioned in this document will benefit from the implementation of the HPP CDAP. As for measures planned under the HPP APRAP, they will be implemented jointly with the Construction Phase CDAP for the HPP, although a specific budget is earmarked for the people affected by the Kawanda sub-station as per indications in Table 4 above.

5.2.3 Monitoring & Evaluation

Internal monitoring of the Action Plan will be carried out by the Social Unit mentioned in the previous section. Internal monitoring will be based on the following indicators (the list is not limitative):

- Output indicators:
  - Land titles;
  - Identification of vulnerable people and related assistance measures;
  - Consultation indicators (meetings held, number of attendees);
  - Water supply indicators (operation of the handpump, management, revenue);

- Outcome indicators:
  - Agricultural productivity;
  - Business activities;
  - Incomes and livelihood restoration, based on the baseline gathered in 2000 and 2006;
  - Resettler satisfaction.

An external evaluation will be carried out after 3 years of implementation of the agricultural and small business enhancement programs. Potential for expansion (in time) of these programs will then be assessed.
APPENDIX – TRANSCRIPT OF A FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION WITH RESETTLERS IN NANSANA RESETTLEMENT SITE

MODERATOR: JJUKO EDWARD
NOTE TAKER: DRICI HUDSON

PARTICIPANTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>31yrs</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Nansana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>38yrs</td>
<td>Self employed</td>
<td>Nansana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>41yrs</td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>Nansana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>32yrs</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Nansana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>30yrs</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Nansana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>56yrs</td>
<td>Peasant</td>
<td>Nansana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qn1: How were you prepared for the resettlement and compensation process?

R3: There wasn’t much preparation as far as the whole process was concerned. However, the project officials came to us and informed us about the upcoming national program of relocating people from our area and they simply notified us that they would therefore need our land. They told us that they had acquired an alternative piece of land in Nansana where they intend to take us to.

They really disturbed us a lot because they hurried us to build out houses in Nansana to an extent that all of us were forced to enter wet houses. We had indicated in our meetings with them that we need to be transferred to a mailo land but they kept hiding the truth from us that the land on which we were being transferred belonged to the Kabaka.

R6: I think all I wanted to say has been said by Mr. Luutu. I only want to add that we had a number of meetings with the Nile power Project officials but all they told us in these meetings was that we need to be calm because everything was going to be okay. Eventually we reached a consensus with them that we need to be transferred to a place which was not very far away from Kampala but things eventually changed because they way we were relocated to this place was not in good faith and totally centrally to what we had agreed upon.

R1: Actually, a fortnight ago, I went to the Land office and got information from there that our land titles were being processed but surprisingly up to now nothing has been processed and even no communication to that effect has been made.

Qn2: Were your views taken into consideration?

R1: No, and none of us is happy with the way these people treated us because everything we told them was not fully taken into consideration.

R3: When we tried to resist to their ideas, they threatened us that they were going to sue us if we had not left the land in time and that we would pay for the damaged. At this point in time, all of us had surrendered our land titles to them, so we did not have any way out apart from conceding to what they wanted us to do.

R6: When we tried to put them on pressure for our land titles, they apologised to us going to talk to the Kabaka and have this issue solved but this has taken 5 years now. They latter told us that they had got us a lawyer who was working with one Mr. Levi Zzimbe a commissioner in Buganda Land board to process out land titles but since then nothing has been done up to now.
Qn: How did you utilise your compensation packages?

R1: I think it is not right for you to ask us this question right here when we are in a group because this information should have been captured very well in one to one discussion we had the previous day. It will expose out business ventures to the public which I think is not right but as we indicated we used our money to build these houses.

Qn: Have you been able to restore your past livelihood?

R3: Our livelihood has not really changed much compared with the life we led before coming to this place. The biggest difference between there and here is that while there, we had many friends, we had no thieves but here we have no friends and we are disturbed by thieves.

R6: Personally, I have not changed much, but as a family my children have grown up and are now in secondary schools. The other things is that the oils here are not productive as the soils in Kawanda where I lived before coming here but am only happy about the availability of water in this area than there.

Therefore, I would say that to a small extent my livelihood has been restored.

Qn: Are you currently well off or worse off than before?

R3: This is an interesting question but I have this to say: things have not really changed much to me because determining whether I am well off or worse off is not easy for me. What has changed for me is the fact that I was removed from my fertile land and given a relatively small piece of land which is even infertile. This has reduced my economic activities that I could carry out on my land and therefore reduced on my agricultural income.

R6: Personally, I think I am not well off but what I miss is my land in Kawanda which was fertile and which would support the growth of a number of crops. I have no other means of employment apart from my land which used to sustain my life. It is now a different story, here the soils are infertile and am unable to sell crops because of the low productivity.

Qn: Are there any unfulfilled promises?

R3: One of them and very important one is the issue of land titles. We feel very insecure on this land without anything to show that we are the rightful owners. Anytime we can be evicted from this land in case the Kabaka wants to set up any development venture on his land without any compensation. In addition, these people promised us to build a good road in the resettlement site, a bore hole which they have not done up to date.

R2: They also promised to pay us a disturbance allowance of 30% each of the total amount we received from the project which they haven’t done up to now.

R6: The road was not properly made, we get sick most times because we are located next to a forest and valley but we have to walk long distances in search of treatment, we need a health centre here as they had promised us to reduced on the distance and costs of medication.

R4: They promised a school and a health facility.

Qn: Any recommendations?

R2: We request Nile power AES project team to pay us our disturbance allowance which they promised so that we can buy things/items that got destroyed in the resettlement process. They should also honour their promised by building for us a road, repair the broke down borehole and finally but most importantly, we need our land titles.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Project

The Bujagali project is a proposed hydropower facility on the Victoria Nile in the Republic of Uganda. It is located approximately 8km downstream (i.e. north) of the Town of Jinja. Bujagali Energy Limited (BEL) has entered into an agreement with the Government of Uganda to Build, Operate, and Transfer this facility. In order to evacuate power from the proposed hydropower facility effectively, new transmission lines and improvements to some of Uganda's existing transmission and distribution system are required. These new lines and system improvements are the subject of a Social and Environmental Assessment (SEA), this Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) being part of this SEA.

New transmission lines will evacuate power from the Bujagali hydropower plant to Kampala, the capital city, and disseminate electricity to other cities and rural areas of the country. Other transmission lines will link the new power plant to the existing Owen Falls switch-yard in Jinja, and to the existing high voltage line from Owen Falls switch-yard to Tororo. The total length of the transmission lines is approximately 100km. The project also includes the construction of a new substation in Kawanda in the northern outskirts of Kampala.

Along the route of the transmission lines, the construction and the future operation and maintenance of the transmission lines will require land acquisition and/or temporary occupation. Land acquisition is also needed to build the substation in Kawanda. As a result, present land owners and users of the land to be encumbered or acquired will be affected. This Resettlement Action Plan has therefore been developed to mitigate this impact, in accordance with Ugandan law and applicable World Bank Group policies.

The legal and policy background

Both the SEA and this RAP have been prepared to comply with the requirements of the National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA), the Ugandan national agency in charge of environmental protection. The World Bank Group (WBG) institutions and the African Development Bank are potential lenders for the project. This document has therefore been prepared in accordance with WBG RAP requirements, as they stand in Performance Standard 5 “Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement” and OP 4.12 “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.

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 decentralized at District and Parish levels, according to the general framework of decentralized powers in Uganda.

Some aspects of the WBG requirements are more favourable to Project Affected Persons than the Ugandan regulations in terms of compensation amounts (valuation at “full replacement” value as per WBG instead of depreciated cost as per Ugandan laws) and in terms of resettlement (WBG strongly recommends “land-for-land compensation” while there is no such provision to this effect in Ugandan law). For this Project, specific uplifts are intended at fully meeting WBG requirements on top of Ugandan requisites.
Mitigating the scale of resettlement

The route for the transmission lines has been finalized following a selection and optimisation process where social parameters have been of paramount importance. The first stage of this process has been initiated when AESNP was the Project sponsor, from late 1998 to mid-2000, and was later fine-tuned by UETCL and BEL in the framework of the current SEA.

The UETCL route is generally the same as the previous AESNP route. The land required for the new UETCL/BEL plan is the same as the land that would have been required for the AESNP plan. Both plans have the same lines and substations – the only difference being that while the Bujagali-Kawanda Line will be constructed at 220 kV it will be operated initially at 132 kV. As the constructions standards are the same, the land area remains the same too.

It was determined that, where no significant changes have occurred to land use, then the route for the transmission lines should adhere to the routing previously identified by AESNP. Field observations in the Kampala area indicated, however, that significant changes in land use had occurred in some sections of the AESNP route between Kawanda and Mutundwe sub-stations, and that a fresh route optimization was necessary. This detailed corridor optimization was undertaken in the second quarter of 2006 by a team including representatives of UETCL/Bujagali Implementation Unit, RJ Burnside International and Siemens PTI (Consultants to BEL). Details are provided in the full report below.

Project Impacts

Project Impacts - Land

Land affected by the construction and operation of the Interconnection System falls into the following categories:

- Transmission Lines:
  - Wayleave,
  - Right-of-Way,
  - Temporary land needs for construction purposes;
- Sub-stations:
  - Permanent land acquisition,
  - Temporary land needs for construction purposes.

Wayleave

The Wayleave is recognized as the safety corridor out of which negative impacts from transmission lines are assumed to be negligible. The width of the corridor depends on the line voltage. The Ugandan standard is a 30m wide corridor for a 132kV Wayleave and 40m for 220kV lines.

Titles for Wayleave land will not be transferred from its present owners; this land will remain their property. This land is, however, subject to the following restrictions:

- No construction is allowed in the corridor;
- All vegetation is to be kept below 6 feet height (1.8 metre).

In the Wayleave, cultivation or other uses of land may continue provided the above-mentioned restrictions are complied with by the owner and the occupants of land. Compensation will therefore match the diminution in land value associated with the restrictions.

Right-Of-Way

The Right-Of-Way is the land required for a maintenance track under the line and the location of the towers. This corridor is 5 metres in width which suffices for both the access path and the 4 legs of towers.

UETCL will determine whether land falling within the 5-metre wide Rights of Way will remain the property of its current owners (titles would then not be transferred), or whether it should be fully transferred to UETCL, which is preferable, as all usufruct rights will belong to UETCL.
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This land must be accessible at all times by UETCL for maintenance purposes. Whether titles are transferred or not, land falling in the Right-Of-Way is deemed not to have any residual value for its current owners, and will, therefore, be compensated in full to its present owners.

Kawanda Sub-Station
Land required for the substation in Kawanda was formally acquired by ULB based on compensation paid by AESNP in 2001 (See Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities – APRAP, Kawanda Sub-Station).

Some limited additional land acquisition will be performed at Kawanda Sub-Station to accommodate a slight change in the general lay-out of the station, intended to minimize impacts on a neighboring school.

Temporary Land Needs for Construction Purposes
During construction, some areas may have to be temporarily occupied by the contractors in charge of the transmission lines construction. Owners and occupants will be compensated against the loss of crops if any, and will receive a rent from the contractors for temporary occupation. There will be no transfer of rights in this case. Damaged crops will be compensated for, as required.

"Orphan" Land
Over a length of approximately 75 kilometers, the new transmission line will follow an existing UETCL-operated transmission line. UETCL’s standards require that a five-metre strip separate the two corridors. In most situations, it is not anticipated that access to this strip will be hindered, as on both sides of it, is land that will not be taken permanently, but will only be encumbered by restrictions on building and higher crops. However, it is possible than in a limited number of specific field configurations (particularly if a residential structure is located in this strip), access may be hindered or a loss in value may be experienced. In line with usual practice on similar projects (transmission, pipelines, etc...), these cases will be considered on a case-by-case basis for potential compensation.

The following table presents a summary of the Project required corridor width:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Voltage (kiloVolt)</th>
<th>Width of Right-Of-Way (m)</th>
<th>Width of Wayleave (m)</th>
<th>Total Land Take (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutundwe – Kawanda</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawanda – Bujagali (except for Mabira Forest)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabira Forest</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Impacts – Land

The Project construction and operation will require:
- Permanent Land Take: 52 hectares, as follows:
  - Right-of-Way: About 51.6 hectares (128 acres) – as mentioned above, this is land that will be permanently required, and to which current land users will lose right of access;
  - Kawanda Sub-Station: About 0.4 hectare (1 acre); 12.5 acres were already acquired in 2001;
- Land with restrictions on buildings and higher crops (Wayleave): About 301 hectares (743 acres).

It is currently (31 October 2006) estimated that the number of affected plots is about 2,485. As different household members within the same household may hold several distinct plots under different land tenure arrangements, this number is higher than the actual number of affected households (about 1,900).
**Project Impacts - People**

Physically Displaced People

Physically Displaced People are people whose residence has to be displaced because it is located within the Project land acquisition area.

It is estimated that about 120 households with 319 people will have to be physically displaced as a result of the Project. This is because their current residence is located within the Right-Of-Way or within the Wayleave.

Most potentially physically displaced people live in densely settled areas around Kampala and along the West Bank of the Nile River, particularly:
- Nansana north to Kampala near Kawanda sub-station;
- Kitawuluzi next to Mutundwe sub-station;
- The West bank of River Nile, including villages Kikubamutwe, Buloba, Malindi, which is densely populated and where the overall footprint of the Project is wider.

Out of the total 319 physically displaced people, it is anticipated that a small number (about 15 in the more rural areas) will be able to relocated their residence to the remaining part of their plot. This potential “self-relocation” is, however, most unlikely in the densest areas in the suburbs of Kampala and along the Nile River Valley, where there will be little if any land remaining available to affected people for self-relocation after the Project has vacated the transmission corridor.

Economically Displaced People

Economically Displaced People are defined here as people whose livelihoods are affected by the Project land acquisition to such an extent that even if they are not physically displaced they will have to move to regain similar economic opportunities. In an agricultural setting, this is usually the case because people are affected by the acquisition of a significant proportion of the land they farm that leaves the remainder unsustainable.

Impacts on land for non-physically displaced people are usually benign. The total surface area of the Wayleave is only about 50 hectares over a length of 100 kilometres and over 55 communities, which in average is less than one hectare for each community. Meanwhile, affected people will retain usufruct rights of the wider Right-Of-Way, with restrictions that usually affect subsistence agriculture only marginally, as matooke banana and grain crops still can be grown while complying with the 6-foot height restriction. It is therefore not anticipated that the number of economically displaced people from Kampala to Mabira Forest will be high. According to provisional results of the socio-economic surveys, this number must not exceed 10. These situations will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

This may, however, not be true of villages located along the Nile River West Bank, where people have already been affected by the HPP land acquisition, and where cumulative effects of successive phases of land acquisition can be expected. At the time of submitting this RAP, it is difficult to estimate the effect of this cumulative impact. Tentatively, it will be estimated for planning and budgeting purposes that about 30 households might be economically displaced in this area.

Total Number of Affected Households

About 1,902 households are affected by the Project land acquisition. This number includes the 120 physically displaced households and the 40 potentially economically displaced households.
Project Impacts - Summary

The following table summarizes Project impacts on land, structures and people:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface Area of Right-Of-Way (permanent land take)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Area of Wayleave (land affected by restrictions of use)</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Area of Land Additionally Required for the Extension of Kawanda Sub-Station</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Surface Area Required for the Project</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Area of Right-Of-Way (permanent land take) (Kawanda Sub-Station)</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>Hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Area of Wayleave (land affected by restrictions of use) (Kawanda Sub-Station)</td>
<td>300.7</td>
<td>Hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Area of Land Additionally Required for the Extension of Kawanda Sub-Station (Kawanda Sub-Station)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Surface Area Required for the Project (Kawanda Sub-Station)</td>
<td>352.9</td>
<td>Hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Affected Households</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Affected Individuals</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Physically-Displaced Households</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Physically-Displaced People (individuals)</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Economically Displaced Households</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Economically Displaced People (individuals)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Affected Residences</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Affected Non-Residential Structures</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Affected Graves</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Affected Shrines</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the compensation and resettlement measures are designed to ensure compliance with the laws and regulations of Uganda and international requirements contained in the Equator Principles, particularly that project-affected persons are better off or, at least, no worse off as a result of the project.

Compensation and Resettlement Strategy

Principles for Compensation and Resettlement

Key Principles

The key principles committed upon by UETCL in this RCDAP are the following:

- Resettlement and compensation of Project-Affected People will be carried out in compliance with Ugandan legislation, IFC’s Performance Standard 5 and WB OP 4.12,
- All physically or economically displaced people will be offered an option between either a full resettlement package, including the provision of replacement residential land and a house, or cash compensation,
- Past experience in Uganda has shown that cash compensation, although very sought after by many household heads, could be detrimental in the medium term, to other household members, particularly the females and children; the Project will make every effort to promote resettlement rather than cash compensation, and this plan is designed accordingly.
A majority of Project-Affected People (PAP) derive their livelihood from agriculture. Where farmers are physically or economically displaced, they will be offered a resettlement option including the provision of agricultural land of potential equivalent to that of the land they have lost,

- UETCL will assist PAP in restoring their affected livelihoods, and will provide transitional assistance as necessary as long as livelihoods are not restored to their previous level,
- The RCDAP implementation and outcomes will be monitored and evaluated as part of a transparent process,
- PAP and host communities will be informed and consulted during the whole course of RCDAP development, implementation and evaluation.

General Approach of Compensation and Resettlement

**Situation 1: The Affected Household Is Neither Physically Nor Economically Displaced**

This means in practice that the remaining land is deemed economically viable and no residential building has to be removed.

Such situations of rather benign impact apply to the overwhelming majority of affected households. In these cases, cash compensation will be offered and no resettlement option will be offered. Cash compensation will be at District Land Board rates for land, crops, and structures, with payment of disturbance allowance as per Ugandan regulations. An uplift will be added to this compensation to meet full replacement value requirements, as rates established by District Land Boards usually do not meet this requirement.

**Situation 2: The Affected Household Is Physically Displaced but not Economically Affected**

The construction of a replacement house will be offered wherever the residential building has to be removed. Depending on situations, resettlement may involve the construction of a replacement house:

- either on the remaining part of the plot if the remaining land holding in the neighborhood of the affected plot is deemed economically viable, or if the household’s livelihood is not based on agriculture, and if the affected household agrees to such a solution; in such cases, no replacement agricultural land will have to be provided and the household will simply continue to use the land they previously farmed or continue to engage in their non-agricultural activities, while dwelling in their new residence;
- or on another resettlement plot if the remainder of the affected plot is not economically viable; in such situations, replacement agricultural land of similar potential will also have to be provided in the vicinity of the residential resettlement plot.

Residential land will be provided to resettlers under secure tenure (either freehold or very long term leases), regardless of the previous regime of occupation. Agricultural land will be provided under the same regime of occupation as the land it replaces in the previous location.

**Situation 3: The Affected Household Is Economically Displaced but not Physically Displaced**

In such situations, the residential building of the affected household is not affected, but land take is such that their agricultural sustainability is jeopardized. These situations will be compensated through the provision of replacement agricultural land with or without physical relocation of the homestead, depending on whether replacement land is available in the vicinity.

It is envisioned at this stage that resettlement would require four different sites, in Kampala South, Kampala North, Wasswa and on the West Bank of the River Nile.

Details on resettlement and compensation strategies are provided in the full report below.
**Grievance Management**

In practice, in similar compensation and resettlement activities, many grievances arise from misunderstandings of the Project policy, or result from conflicts between neighbours, which can usually be solved through adequate mediation using customary rules or local administration at the lowest level. Most grievances can be settled with additional explanation efforts and some mediation using customary dispute settlement mechanisms. In contrast, resorting to the judicial system often results in long delays before a case is processed, may result in significant expenses to the complainant, and requires a complex mechanism involving experts and lawyers, which can fall well beyond the complainant’s control, and be counter productive to him/her. Also, courts may declare themselves not competent in matters related to informally owned property, which is the case in this project for all affected properties.

The Project, thus, will put in place an amicable, extra-judicial mechanism for managing grievances and disputes based on explanation and mediation by third parties. Each of the affected persons will be able to trigger this mechanism, while still being able to resort to the judicial system. Procedures relevant to this amicable mechanism are detailed below. It will include three different levels:

- Registration by UETCL of the complaint, grievance or dispute;
- Processing by UETCL of the grievance or dispute until closure is established based on evidence that acceptable action was taken; and
- In the event where the complainant is not satisfied with action taken by UETCL as a result of the complaint, an amicable mediation can be triggered involving a mediation committee independent from the Project.

**Vulnerable People**

Vulnerable people include:

- Disabled people or people suffering from serious illnesses,
- Orphans, widows and the elderly,
- Women and children at risk of being dispossessed of their productive assets –land– as a result of the land compensation process that may solely benefit the male household head.

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.

**Monitoring & Evaluation**

Monitoring, evaluation and auditing are key components of the Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan and is an integral part of UETCL’s responsibility and obligations. These components have the following general objectives:

- **Monitoring** (as defined here) looks at progress of resettlement and compensation and at specific situations of economic or social difficulties arising from the implementation of the compensation and resettlement process,
- **Auditing** (as defined here) looks at compliance and completion of the resettlement program,
- **Evaluation** (as defined here) looks at outcomes, through an assessment of the short- mid- and long-term impacts of the compensation and resettlement programme on affected households, their incomes and standards of living, the environment, local capacities, housing, etc.
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The following monitoring and evaluation approach will be used, whereby different levels of monitoring and evaluation are used:

- Internal progress (or Input/Output) monitoring: measures whether inputs are delivered on schedule and as defined in the RCDAP, and their direct measurable results, for instance:
  - amounts of compensation paid in a given month,
  - progress of construction of resettlement houses,
  - people completing livelihood restoration training courses, etc...

Monitoring will also seek to document and investigate specific conflict or hardship situations arising from the implementation of the resettlement and compensation program. Monitoring keeps track of project implementation efficiency, and indicates whether changes need to be made to make the programme operate more efficiently. Progress monitoring is done internally by the Project at a frequency determined by the RCDAP for every indicator (in general say every 3 months).

- Audit of compliance and completion: Defines whether the RCDAP and applicable requirements have been complied with, and if the implementation can be deemed complete. Following a model successfully implemented during earlier stages of the Bujagali project and during the 2006 census and valuation exercise, an external entity (“Witness NGO”) will independently monitor and audit the implementation of the RCDAP.

- Outcome evaluation: Defines the extent to which the project is achieving or is likely to achieve the objectives of a program. Resettler businesses being established and earning acceptable returns over a reasonable period is an example of outcome. Outcome evaluation, coupled with output monitoring results, will indicate whether the programme is genuinely working and should continue to be implemented as is, or whether some fundamental changes need to be made. In other words, outcome evaluation looks beyond numerical compliance to the longer term impact of programme inputs and outputs, to determine what works, what does not work, and what needs to be changed. Outcome evaluation will be done by an independent entity.

Outcome evaluation often uses proxy (or indirect) indicators. Many people, for example, are reluctant to divulge their actual income. Proxy indicators can be used to help determine whether resettlers are reestablishing (or improving) their livelihoods and standard of living. Indirect indicators may include nutritional status, school attendance, or the purchase of “luxury” items such as motorbikes, generators or televisions.

Outcome evaluation reports will be publicly disclosed.

Community Development Activities

The Bujagali Interconnection System is overall a linear project with fairly benign impacts on land use and livelihoods, as the extent of affected land is generally limited, and affected people will in most instances recover land after it has been impacted by the Project for agricultural use. UETCL and BEL have, however, proactively decided to dedicate some funds to general development objectives, with communities taking the lead in determining which priority project they would be willing to implement.

The CDAP for the Interconnection System aims to provide intersected communities with developmental benefits beyond mitigation impacts and compensation for loss of assets. The following principles are proposed:

- Focus of the CDAP on quick-impact social infrastructure projects,
- Allocation by UETCL of a community development budget proportional to the magnitude of impacts experienced by each to each of the communities intersected by the system;
- Establishment of eligibility criteria for projects eligible for funding under the CDAP;
- Disbursement of funds against eligible activities, based on procedures that will ensure a certain level of UETCL control over the actual destination of the funds.

Beyond the obvious benefits to communities in terms of social infrastructure, the CDAP is also viewed as a means to enhance community self-reliance in prioritizing projects, and to build project implementation capacity within the community.
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The formula to allocate community development funds to a given community will be based on:
- Partial proportionality to the magnitude of impacts,
- Partial proportionality to the permanent population living in the community,
- Minimum amount for villages with small population and small length of transmission lines.

Details on the proposed fund allocation formula are given in the main report. As an example, for a total budget of USD 300,000, and assuming 60 communities (LC1) are interested, the average funding received by a community is USD 5,000. Based on the proposed formula, no community would receive less than USD 2,000. Through the application of the proposed formula, assuming the total budget is USD 300,000, a community of 1,000 in population intersected by 1.5 km of transmission line would receive USD 4,850.

Areas where the Interconnection System intersects large estates, such as the SCOUL sugar cane plantation and the Mehta tea plantation, as well as the Mabira Forest, are not considered to be community-land and will therefore be excluded from the calculation.

Only community projects will be eligible. Projects benefiting individuals or companies are not eligible to the CDAP funding. Examples of typical eligible projects include:
- Upgrades to community schools, including upgrade to buildings, furniture, and school equipment (blackboards etc...),
- Upgrades to health centers, including structures and/or equipment,
- Community water points or upgrades thereto, including hand-dug wells and drilled wells, with or without handpumps,
- Upgrades to access roads,
- Connection to public electricity networks.

Communities will be allowed and encouraged to seek additional funding to be able to develop more substantial projects. Communities will have to demonstrate that their project is sustainable for their application to the CDAP funding to be considered. This will usually involve:
- Establishing a management committee, which will take care of construction, funding, and further management once the project is operational,
- Preparing a brief project document (1 to 2 pages) as part of the application procedure for CDAP funding, demonstrating how long-term sustainability will be achieved, particularly when the project involves recurrent cost (water points, maintenance of community buildings), for instance through household contributions or otherwise.

**Implementation Arrangements**

UETCL and BEL will put in place a dedicated unit for the implementation of this RCDAP, under the leadership of a RCDAP manager. This unit, which will be established for a period of 24 months, will include the following sub-units:
- Survey identification and valuation
- Resettlement,
- Cash compensation,
- Database management,
- Livelihood Restoration,
- Vulnerable people,
- Community development

Other parties will be involved in the implementation of the RCDAP, particularly representatives of local governments at LC1, LC2 and LC5 levels. A specific Cultural Features Compensation mechanism will be put in place to review compensation for shrines and possibly other cultural features, particularly to review and validate with affected persons the cost of the relocation of shrines and associated ceremonies. Lastly, a Mediation Committee will be established at District level to review and mediate claims and disputes.

The budget for RCDAP implementation is about 17 million US Dollars.

_F.Giovannetti – December 2006_
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT GENERAL BACKGROUND

The Uganda Electricity Transmission Company Limited (UETCL) is proposing to develop the Bujagali Interconnection Project (“Bujagali IP”) to interconnect the proposed Bujagali Hydro Power Project (hereinafter “Bujagali HPP” or “HPP”) to the national grid in Uganda. The Bujagali IP will also support other planned initiatives to expand and strengthen the national grid in future.

The Bujagali HPP is being developed by Bujagali Energy Ltd. (BEL), a project-specific partnership of Sithe Global Power (USA) and IPS Limited (Kenya). BEL is the proponent for the hydropower dam and related facilities that are within the boundary of the hydropower site located on the Victoria Nile River about 8km north of Jinja. BEL is also managing the development and construction of the Bujagali IP on behalf of UETCL.

The Bujagali HPP was first initiated by AES Nile Power Ltd. (AESNP) in the late 1990’s. Among other things, AESNP prepared Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) documentation for the Hydropower project and for the associated transmission system facilities that AESNP was also developing. The overall project (both hydropower and transmission facilities) was approved by the Government of Uganda’s (GoU) National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA) in 1999/2001, and by the World Bank and African Development Bank Boards in December 2001. However, in 2003 AESNP withdrew from the Project. Subsequent to AESNP pullout, the GoU initiated an international tendering for the development of the hydropower project, which was awarded to BEL.

To facilitate completion of the Bujagali IP, UETCL has selected BEL to manage the planning and approvals and construction activities of the transmission facilities on UETCL’s behalf. The current planned transmission facilities are very similar to the previously approved scheme that was proposed by AESNP, and BEL plans to build on the previous development work as appropriate.

The Board approvals by the lenders for AESNP’s project, and the permits issued by NEMA to AESNP, are both no longer valid. Thus, UETCL and BEL will be required to prepare and submit for approvals new SEA documentation. The SEA documentation shall need to address the requirements of NEMA, the World Bank Group, and other lenders. This includes, amongst others, the preparation of a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP), as the Project entails impacts related with land acquisition and displacement.

In addition, UETCL and BEL are committed to enhance community development both in the HPP area and long the interconnection system route. A brief Community Development Action Plan has been prepared in this perspective, and is submitted together with the RAP as a global document, the Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan (RCDAP).

UETCL has based its preparation of this RCDAP on IFC’s Performance Standard 5 “Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement”. For the SEA assignment in general, BEL has appointed a consulting team lead by R.J. Burmside International Limited of Canada to conduct and oversee the SEA tasks, manage the SEA process on behalf of UETCL, and author the SEA documentation to comply with GoU and international lender requirements. Within the Burnside team, the 2006 RCDAP has been prepared by Frederic Giovannetti, an independent consultant specializing in resettlement, who also prepared the 2001 RAP.

1.2 BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed Bujagali hydropower facility is located at Dumbbell Island, 70km east of Kampala the capital city, and approximately 15km north of Jinja, the second largest town in Uganda in terms of both population and industrial capacity. The hydropower project is being designed for a final capacity of 250MW. The need and rationale for this project, together with its detailed description, are presented in the SEA main report for the hydropower project.
New transmission lines are required to evacuate power from the Bujagali hydropower plant to Kampala, the capital city, and disseminate electricity to other cities and rural areas of the country. Their routing was selected after comprehensive studies that assessed all the alternative design and route options taking cognisance of the environmental, technical and economic considerations. In conjunction with the above criteria the final route alignment considered both the GoU and UETCL’s power requirements and their future infrastructure strategy.

UETCL evaluated multiple alternative schemes, each designed to evacuate power from the Bujagali HPP. The preferred system plan, which is similar to the system plan that was proposed by AESNP, and which is the subject of the SEA (including the RCDAP), involves the following:

1. Construct a new 132 kV line between the proposed switchyard at the Bujagali HPP site to a new substation site in Kawanda. This line would be built as a double circuit 220 kV line (as previously proposed by AESNP), but would be operated at 132 kV initially;
2. Construct a new 132 kV line from the new substation site in Kawanda to the existing Mutundwe substation. This line would be built as a double circuit line but only one circuit would be installed initially;
3. Breaking the existing 132 kV double circuit line between Nalubaale (Owen Falls) and Tororo and building two new double circuit lines to run through the Bujagali substation.

The proposed transmission lines will, for the most part, follow the routes previously approved for AESNP. The exception is portions of the 132 kV line between Kawanda and Mutundwe, where the previous alignment has been changed to minimize displacement impacts.

The general location of the overall project is provided in Figure 1. The proposed routing of the transmission system is provided in Figure 2.

A site for the Kawanda substation was identified and obtained by AESNP. The Government of Uganda currently holds title for the land. UETCL proposes to use the same site for the facility to be developed as part of the project. The general location for the substation site is shown on Figure 3. As mentioned above, a RAP was developed in 2000 – 2001 for the whole transmission system. However, it was implemented only at Kawanda sub-station. While socio-economic surveys and consultation with potentially affected persons were undertaken by AESNP in the 2nd and 3rd quarters of 2000 for the whole route, and while the valuation of affected assets was carried out by independent valuers, the compensation and resettlement programme was put on hold for the transmission lines themselves. The actual implementation of compensation and resettlement took place in the 3rd and 4th quarters of 2001. Most of the area where the Kawanda sub-station is to be built is now vacated by its former owners and users. Some limited additional land acquisition will have to be carried out at Kawanda to accommodate the re-designed station in order to minimize impacts on a neighboring school.

1.3 ASSOCIATED FACILITIES

As indicated above, the proposed transmission system facilities are needed, in part, to interconnect the Bujagali HPP to the national grid. In brief, the Bujagali HPP involves construction and operation of a new hydro dam structure with associated ancillary facilities including a powerhouse and switchyard on the Victoria Nile at Dumbbell Island, approximately 8 km north of Jinja. By the IFC terminology, the transmission system will be an “associated facility” of the Bujagali HPP. A complementary SEA associated with the proposed HPP is included in the overall suite of documents for the project.

Detailed descriptions of the projects are provided in the SEA documents, so that all interested parties will know exactly what UETCL is proposing and seeking approval for as well as what BEL is proposing and seeking approval for. The detailed descriptions include all project components directly required for, and ancillary to, both the electrical transmission and hydropower generation components of the project.
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Figure 2
PROPOSED ROUTING OF THE TRANSMISSION SYSTEM (MAP 5 OF 5)
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1.4 **SCOPE OF THIS DOCUMENT**

1.4.1 The Social Documentation 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 were prepared:

- **Bujagali Hydropower Project:**
  - Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities and Action Plan,
  - 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 (Kawanda sub-station),
  - Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan – this document.

1.4.2 Scope of this Document

In 2000 and 2001, AESNP developed a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP), which was approved in 2001 as part of the Environmental Impact Statement for the Transmission System that was cleared successively by NEMA and by the International Finance Corporation prior to the Project approval by IFC’s Board.

As mentioned above, the approval of these documents is no longer valid. This document is an updated Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan submitted by UETCL for approval by relevant authorities in Uganda, as well as clearance by IFIs for further consideration of the Project for funding.

1.5 **KEY DEFINITIONS**

*Note: Several of the definitions below are sourced from the IFC’s “Handbook for Preparing a Resettlement Action Plan”, 2001, with or without modifications as relevant to this Project.*

**Project:** A project to develop transmission lines and related facilities to link the Bujagali HPP with the Mutundwe sub-station near Kampala in Uganda.

**Project-Affected Area:** An area which is subject to a change in use as a result of the construction or operation of the Project.

**Project-Affected Person (PAP):** 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, pasture or undeveloped/unused land), annual or perennial crops and trees, or any other fixed or moveable asset, either in full or in part, permanently or temporarily. Not all PAP need to move due to the Project. PAP may include:

- Physically Displaced People, ie people subject to Physical Displacement as defined hereunder,
- Economically Displaced People, ie people subject to Economic Displacement as defined hereunder.

**Physical Displacement:** Loss of shelter and assets resulting from the acquisition of land associated with the Project that requires the affected person(s) to move to another location.

**Economic Displacement:** Loss of income streams or means of livelihood resulting from land acquisition or obstructed access to resources (land, water or forest) caused by the construction or operation of the Project or its associated facilities. Not all economically displaced people need to relocate due to the Project.

**Project-Affected Household (PAH):** A PAH is a household that includes one or several Project-Affected Persons as defined above. A PAH will usually include a head of household, his/her spouse and their children,
but may also include other dependents living in the same dwelling or set of dwellings, like close relatives (e.g., parents, grandchildren).

Compensation: Payment in cash or in kind at replacement value for an asset or a resource that is acquired or affected by the Project at the time the assets need to be replaced.

Resettlement Assistance: Support provided to people who are physically displaced by the Project. Assistance may include transportation, and social or other services that are provided to affected people during their relocation. Assistance may also include cash allowances that compensate affected people for the inconvenience associated with resettlement and defray the expenses of a transition to a new locale, such as moving expenses and lost work days.

Replacement Value: The rate of compensation for lost assets must be calculated at full replacement value, that is, the market value of the assets plus transaction costs (taxes, registration fees, cost of transport associated with registration of new land and land transfer, etc...). The replacement value must reflect the cost at the time the item must be replaced. With regard to land and structures, “replacement value” is defined as follows:

- Agricultural land: the market value of land of equal productive use or potential located in the vicinity of the affected land, plus the cost of preparation to levels similar to or better than those of the affected land, plus the cost of any registration and transfer taxes;
- Land in urban areas: the market value of land of equal size and use, with similar or improved public infrastructure facilities and services, preferably located in the vicinity of the affected land, plus the cost of any registration and transfer taxes;
- Household and public structures: the cost of purchasing or building a new structure, with an area and quality similar to or better than those of the affected structure, or of repairing a partially affected structure, including labor and contractors’ fees and any registration and transfer taxes.

In determining the replacement cost, depreciation of the asset and the value of salvage materials are not taken into account, nor is the value of the benefits to be derived from the Project deducted from the valuation of an affected asset.

Vulnerable Groups: 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.
2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND ADJUSTMENTS TO MINIMIZE DISPLACEMENT IMPACTS

2.1 SUMMARY PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In summary, the system plan involves developing the infrastructure listed below to provide three initial interconnection points at UETCLs existing Mutundwe, Nalubaale and Tororo substations:

- **Bujagali Substation:** This facility, which will be built and operated by BEL, will be located on the west bank of the Victoria Nile adjacent to the Dumbbell Island hydropower facility. This station will be designed and constructed to allow operation at 220 kV, but will be initially operated at 132 kV. In the future, switching operation to 220 kV will only require installation of new step-up transformers. BEL will build and operate this facility as part of the BHPP. All power from the Bujagali Hydro Project will flow through this substation.

- **“Bujagali to Tororo” and “Bujagali to Nalubaale” Lines:** Two new 132 kV double circuit lines will run about 5 km south from the Bujagali Substation to a junction point along the existing Nalubaale to Tororo line. The existing line will be severed with one end reconnected to the new lines so as to create a new line between Nalubaale and Bujagali and a new line between Bujagali and Tororo. Power for Tororo would now be delivered from Bujagali substation rather than the Nalubaale substation. Power could flow in either direction between the Bujagali and Nalubaale substations depending on the operational status of the generation stations.

- **“Bujagali to Kawanda” Line:** This new 70 km long line will be designed and constructed to 220 kV standard but initially operated at 132 kV. In the future switching operation to 220 kV will only require installation of new transformers at the Bujagali and Kawanda substations.

- **Kawanda Substation:** This station will be designed and constructed to allow operation at 220 kV, but initially operated at 132 kV. In the future switching operation to 220 kV will only require installation of new transformers. The station will be sized and laid out to allow interconnection of future lines in line with UETCL longer range system plan.

- **“Kawanda to Mutundwe” Line:** a new 17 km, 132 kV double circuit line will interconnect the Kawanda substation and the existing Mutundwe Substation and thus comprise the third interconnection point for the BHPP. Internal improvements (e.g., new bay and switching gear) at Mutundwe will be needed to accommodate this new line.

2.2 SUMMARY ROUTE DESCRIPTION

The following paragraphs provide an overview of the environmental and settlement features of the transmission line route. Figure 4 hereunder gives an overview of these features.

2.2.1 **Bujagali to Owen Falls/Tororo connection**

The lines will run approximately 5 km along the west bank of the Nile from the Bujagali switch-yard adjacent from Dumbbell island and will interconnect (after severance of this line) with the existing 132kV line supplying the Tororo substation and also connecting Nahubaale (Owen Falls) switch-yard with that at Bujagali. This section of the route runs across gently undulating landscape into which the River Nile is incised at this point and not readily visible. The plains above the river are characterised almost entirely by smallholder farming. This has created a landscape of fairly dense vegetation from ground level up to medium height trees with the canopies of taller trees occasionally rising above. Lines of view are generally fairly short except across larger fields. Access to the Wayleave will be via the existing tracks within the area.
Figure 4
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2.2.2 Kawanda Substation to Bujagali

The proposed Kawanda substation will be situated on a hilltop at Maganjo, about 1 km south of Kawanda township. The substation will occupy an area of 4.7 ha. The Kawanda Secondary School is located adjacent to the proposed site, and the school buildings are approximately 100 m from the site boundary. As stated above, this site has been selected from a total of three technically feasible locations as the one with the least social and environmental impact. Details are provided in the EIS, chapter 4 (AESNP, 2001). The substation will be fenced, and the school buildings are well outside the safety area as far as potential exposure to Electromagnetic Radiation is concerned.

Between the Kawanda substation and Bujagali, the land use can be split into three distinct types: general human use, Mabira Forest Reserve, and plantations. The route crosses gently rolling hills interspersed with valleys until it reaches the switchyard at Bujagali. The valleys generally contain seasonal swamps although they have recently begun to be cultivated. Typical cultivation along the route includes banana plantations and mixed plots growing cane, yam, sweet potato, eucalyptus and cassava.

The route passes through the Mabira Forest Reserve (MFR) for about 17km, running parallel to the existing single circuit 132kV transmission line which originates from the Nalubaale (Owen) Falls Dam. The route runs to the south of the central and most ecologically significant Strict Nature Reserve Zone by a minimum of 2.4km. It traverses land zoned as either Protection Zone or Recreation and Other Uses - effectively production forest and buffer zone.

Anyone living in the Mabira Forest Reserve, other than in the gazetted village areas, does so illegally. For the most part, the houses that are in the area lie to the south of the existing line. However, there are scattered settlements along the existing Wayleave and to the north Matoke banana plantation within the regenerating forest.

The route also passes through large tea and sugar estates.

2.2.3 Mutundwe-Kawanda

The route passes from the existing substation at Mutundwe (on the western side of Kampala) to the site of the proposed substation at Kawanda, skirting the west side of the Lubigi swamp. This area contains the highest population density along the transmission line route, due to its proximity to Kampala. Although it would be impossible to avoid all settlements in this densely inhabited area, the selected route is the optimum corridor in this regard.

From the Mutundwe substation, the route passes within the existing Wayleaves of transmission lines to avoid settlements, then runs close to the railway line. It also crosses the Masaka road, then reaches Lubigi swamp. The western bank of the swamp was selected to avoid settlements rather than the eastern bank which has higher population density. The route then crosses agricultural land and reaches the Kawanda substation site.

2.3 ROUTE OPTIMIZATION AND ADJUSTMENTS TO MINIMIZE DISPLACEMENT IMPACTS

2.3.1 Route Optimization (1998-2001)

The route selection process was undertaken from late 1998 to mid-2000 by AESNP and consultants working in close cooperation with relevant Ugandan authorities, specifically the then UEB (no longer in existence). This process aimed to achieve the selection of economically and technically feasible options that considered the following criteria:

- avoidance of settlements wherever possible,
- minimizing passage through areas of high environmental sensitivity,
- avoidance of major infrastructure (i.e. highways, railway lines etc.),
- utilizing existing infrastructure corridors wherever possible,
- minimizing the total length of the route.
A number of corridor options were first compared and the corridor with the most benign impact on settlements was selected. The presence of heritage sites (such as the Martyrs Memorial of Namungongo) was also taken into account, and the selected corridor avoided any impact on this site. This scoping study investigated a proposed corridor (Northern Route), which would slightly affect the Mabira Forest Reserve but with overall significantly less impact on settlements and small scale agriculture than the Southern Route.

A second stage of route optimisation was undertaken in March 1999. Adjustments to the selected alignment were made, and the study recommended an optimised corridor 1 km in width, on environmental, social and technical grounds.

AES NP commissioned Carl Bro International to carry out a study to identify the preferred line route, including topographical and geotechnical surveys of the route and a detailed route description. Specific mitigation measures were taken to minimize disturbance to the existing population.

In the 2nd and 3rd quarters of year 2000, AESNP retained Young Stuart and Associates and Geomaps Ltd to survey the angle towers and Wayleaves of the definitive transmission system identified by Carl Bro. All technical and socio-economic criteria were taken into account in an iterative process carried out on the field with geologists, electricity engineers and socio-economists all providing input to the final siting. Alignment optimisation was made so as to take into account the results of detailed studies and avoid houses wherever possible. This process resulted in minimal impact on houses, churches and schools.

Socio-economic surveys and consultation with potentially affected persons were undertaken by AESNP in the 2nd and 3rd quarters of 2000 as part of the iterative process described above, while the valuation of affected assets was carried by independent valuers. This provided the basis for the census referred to by OD 4.30, the then applicable WBG policy on involuntary resettlement.

A site comparison was also undertaken for the Kawanda substation. 3 sites were compared on environmental and socio-economic criteria. The preferred site is the Maganjo site. The major criterion for selection was avoidance of impact on houses.

2.3.2 2006 General Route Confirmation

Section 4 of the Interconnection System Social and Environmental Assessment (SEA) presents the approach that was taken to optimize the route, based on previous studies carried out by AESNP (described above in the previous section), and on further studies undertaken by UETCL and BEL.

After a detailed assessment of the present and future load of the system (described in the SEA), the “AESNP” general route was validated as the preferred option. The preferred system plan is almost the same as the AESNP plan. The land required for the new UETCL/BEL plan is the same as the land that would have been required for the AESNP plan. Both plans have the same lines and substations – the only difference being that while the Bujagali-Kawanda Line will be constructed at 220 kV it will operated initially at 132 kV. As the constructions standards are the same, the land area remains the same also.

Recent consultations with the potentially affected villages along the routes indicated that in many places villagers and PAP know where the AESNP Line was routed, and in many cases concrete markers can still be located by affected individuals. Comments were received by some PAP previously surveyed by AESNP that they have been waiting all these years (since the identification and valuation exercise in 2000/2001) for their compensation, and that they have not maintained their buildings that were within the Wayleaves. To locate the line elsewhere would leave such affected parties with no compensation for the disruption caused as a result of the earlier routing work, and thus, legacy issues that would need to be addressed.

Therefore, it was determined that, if no significant changes have occurred to land use, then the route for the transmission lines should, wherever possible, adhere to the routing previously identified by AESNP. Field observations in the Kampala area indicated, however, that significant changes in land use had occurred in some sections of the AESNP route between Kawanda and Mutundwe sub-stations, and that a fresh route optimization was necessary. This detailed corridor optimization was undertaken in the second quarter of 2006 by a team.
including representatives of UETCL/Bujagali Implementation Unit, RJ Burnside International and Siemens PTI (Consultants to BEL).

A field reconnaissance and analysis of satellite imagery was completed for the entire route. Table 4.4 provides the key observations for various sections of the route, and for the Kawanda substation. Based on these observations, it was deemed necessary to complete a routing and site update and optimisation for the Kawanda Substation and for the 132 kV Kawanda-Mutundwe Line, as presented below.

Table 1: Key Changes to Routine Corridor Previously Identified by AESNP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/Route</th>
<th>Key Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 x 132 kV lines Bujagali to cut-off point on existing Bujagali-Tororo line</td>
<td>No significant changes to land use or settlement patterns. Portions of route within the fenced area acquired for the HPP have re-vegetated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 kV line Bujagali to Kawanda</td>
<td>No significant changes to land use or settlement patterns, much of land use in eastern portion remains plantation lands and Mabira Forest Reserve. In the western portion the growth of peri-urban land surrounding Kampala remains south of the routing corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawanda Substation</td>
<td>Additional development of the school immediately southwest of the site constrains the routing of lines as planned by AESNP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 kV Kawanda to Mutundwe</td>
<td>Residential land-use along portions of the route has intensified – several stretches of route that were clear of houses are now occupied by recently constructed buildings and dwellings, which would significantly increase resettlement requirements along those stretches. East of the Lubigi Swamp the new construction has started on the new Kampala Northern Bypass road, presenting a possible routing opportunity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3 Kawanda Substation Optimisation

Approximately 12.75 acres of land were acquired by AESNP for the development of the Kawanda substation. The boundary of the acquired property, and the layouts of the substation within the property and transmission line connections, are shown on Figure 5.

As shown on figure 6, the original layout required the transmission lines to be interconnected from the east and west sides. As is also shown on Figure 5, the school buildings on the property adjacent to the west side of the substation constrain the routing of new lines into/out of the substation.

Figure 6 shows an optimised layout for the substation, allowing the transmission lines to be interconnected from the north and south sides of the substation. This layout effectively avoids the need to route new transmission lines across the school property. Figure 6 also shows the extent of new property that will need to be acquired to allow for the new layout, as well as accommodate laydown area for construction. The figure also shows the adjustments that have been made to the transmission line routing in this particular area.
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2.3.4 132 kV Kawanda-Mutundwe Route Optimisation

Figure 7 shows the route that was identified by AESNP for the 132 kV line between the Kawanda and Mutundwe substations, along with the optimised route. Reconnaissance in the first quarter of 2006 of the AESNP route indicated that extensive new housing has created a significant constraint along that route, roughly between the Wobulenzi Road and the Mutundwe substation. Construction of the line along the AESNP route would have resulted in significantly more physical resettlement than was anticipated in the 2001 RAP developed by AESNP.

For this reason, an optimisation exercise was initiated to determine if an alternative route could be found that would reduce the number of people that would potentially be physically resettled.

Because this line is within the major urban centre of Kampala, new cross-country routes are constrained by dense urban and peri-urban residential and commercial land uses. Thus, the two main alternatives for routing the line are the east side and the west side of the Lubigi Swamp. The optimisation considered two new alternative routes along the east side of the swamp and one new alternative route along the west side.

The new Northern By-pass Road is being constructed along the eastern side of the swamp, adjacent to existing residential areas that extend to the edge of the eastern boundary of the swamp. The road, and its orientation relative to residential areas and the swamp, is clearly visible in Figure 7. Observations made along the road indicated that locating the transmission line route on the eastern side of the road would result in similar, if not higher, numbers of people resettled. For this reason, routing east of the bypass road was not considered a viable alternative to the existing AESNP Route.

The possibility of locating the transmission line on the west, or swamp side of the road was also considered. Discussions were held with the road authority in charge of constructing the Northern By-Pass. They indicated that while the roadway was being constructed as a single carriageway, it was ultimately designed to be a dual carriageway road. The second carriageway would be constructed to the west, or swamp, side of the road. Thus, the transmission line would need to be located at a minimum of about 30 meters away from the edge of the existing road, and so require a significant amount of activity to take place within the swamp, including building access roads to each tower. While this route would avoid much resettlement, the complexity of construction and the potential impacts to the wetland all indicated that this alternative was not preferred when compared to the existing AESNP route.

The routing team walked most of the west side of the swamp, with the objective of identifying a feasible alternative routing for the line. The original route and the optimised route are shown on Figure 7. Table 2 provides the rationale for the optimised route.
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**Table 2: Kawanda to Mutundwe Transmission Line Route Optimisation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Segment</th>
<th>Optimisation Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP3 to AP5</td>
<td>The new route is located alongside an abandoned railway bed, thereby avoiding numerous houses that are located along the roadway where the original route was located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP5 to AP9B</td>
<td>The AESNP route ran along the south and west sides of Lubigi swamp, affecting many properties and houses in Kyengera Parish and Sumbwe Parish. An alternative route was identified that uses the existing road crossings of the swamp as opportunities to locate the transmission line towers. The alternative route would result in somewhat more construction activity within the swamp. However, it would avoid numerous properties, and thus was selected as the preferred route for this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP9b to AP11</td>
<td>Field observations indicated that shifting the route about 30 m eastward would avoid several properties and have little to no effect on the swamp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP14 to AP15B</td>
<td>Land use around Masaka Road has intensified significantly since the AESNP route was selected. As a result, numerous homes would be affected along the AESNP route. An alternative route was identified that requires two, and possibly three, towers in the swamp. One tower would be adjacent to the existing road, and therefore would result in minimal disturbance of the swamp. Impacts from the other towers in the swamp would be managed by locating the towers as close to &quot;dry land&quot; as possible, construction during the dry season, and using special wetland construction techniques, such as using mats to create temporary access routes to the tower locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

3.1.1 Central Level

The Ministry of Water, Lands and Environment is responsible for policy, regulation and coordination of matters pertaining to land in Uganda. Land management is decentralised by the Land Act between the District Land Boards and the Uganda Land Commission (ULC). The District Land Boards are responsible for the management of land in the districts and ULC manages all land vested in the Government of Uganda.

Within this Ministry, the Chief Government Valuer’s Office deals with valuation of assets in connection with the acquisition of land for public interest.

The Uganda Land Commission (ULC) is in charge of holding and managing all Government land. The Land Act details ULC mandate.

The Ministry of State for Disaster Preparedness, under the Office of the Prime Minister, is responsible for resettlement of refugees and persons displaced by disasters. The experience of this Ministry in managing resettlement is important although the circumstances of displacement are very different from those prevailing on this project. There is no central ministry or department responsible for resettlement or compensation as such although it is understood that a national policy on re-settlement is soon to be developed.

The Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries has responsibilities relating to overall rural development. The Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development has responsibilities for the social and economic welfare of the population including cultural affairs, youth, labour and disadvantaged groups. The Ministry of Local Government is responsible for local administration.

The National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) is responsible for environmental affairs and in particular the supervision and review of Environmental Impact Assessments.

3.1.2 Decentralized Level

In the last few years, the government of Uganda has been pursuing a policy of decentralization of functions to district level in an effort to stimulate economic and community development, to facilitate a higher degree of transparency in government administration and greater accountability in the use of public funds and resources.

The country is presently divided into some 77 Districts, which are responsible for an increasing range of functions including economic planning, statistics, information gathering, agriculture, health, education and land administration. Each district has a Resident District Commissioner (RDC) who is appointed by the President as his/her representative in each district.

The RDC is not the political head of the district but is responsible for co-ordinating the central government policies and departments’ activities at the district level.

Within each district the system of local government includes five levels:
- LC5 - District level
- LC4 - County level
- LC3 - Sub-county level
- LC2 - Parish level
- LC1 - Village level

Local Councils are responsible for local policy matters, economic development, resolving local conflicts and providing orderly leadership and democratic practices at the grass roots level in their respective areas. The system has facilitated mass participation in government affairs and awakened the rural population to their rights of citizenship and obligations particularly regarding their involvement in development programmes and projects in their areas.
Four District-level entities (LC5) are affected by the Project:
- Mukono District,
- Wakiso District,
- Mpigi District,
- Kampala City Council (KCC).

Matters pertaining to land mainly involve Land Boards and Committees at Parish level (Parish Land Committee), at District level (District Land Board).

3.1.3 Traditional Entities

Traditional Kingdoms enjoy a certain level of recognition in Uganda. The whole Project-Affected Area is within the boundaries of the Buganda Kingdom, whose head (the King) is called the Kabaka. The Kingdom holds land rights in the Kampala area, usually as a Mailo owner. The Kingdom has been expropriated of its land holdings after independence, but was later re-established. A lot of land occupants in the Kampala area are in fact tenants of the Kingdom under a land tenure regime locally known as “Bibanja”. This is a complex issue that will need to be carefully addressed in consultation with both Buganda Kingdom and Government of Uganda representatives.

3.2 APPLICABLE LAWS OF THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA

3.2.1 Overview

Applicable laws with relevance to land tenure, compensation and resettlement, are the following:
- The Land Act, 1998
- The Land Acquisition Act, 1965
- The Electricity Act, 1999

3.2.2 The 1995 Constitution

The 1995 Constitution restored all private land tenure regimes (which had previously been abolished under the Land Reform Decree – 1975 – during the Amin regime), divested the state and the Uganda Land Commission of radical title to the land that was expropriated in 1975, and vested this directly in the citizens of Uganda. The Constitution prescribes the tenure regimes in accordance with which rights and interests in land may be held. These are listed as customary, freehold, mailo and leasehold. It also creates for the government and local authorities a statutory power of compulsory acquisition of land in the public interest, and makes provision, inter alia, for the “prompt payment of fair and adequate compensation” prior to the taking of possession of the property.

3.2.3 The Electricity Act, 1999

S.54 of the Electricity Act requires every person intending to construct, own or operate a transmission line to obtain a transmission license. The application for the transmission license is submitted to the Electricity Regulatory Authority (ERA), which is mandated with the issuance of such licenses. The ERA is required to review the various aspects of the proposed project including the impacts of the project on electricity supply, socio-economics, cultural heritage, the environment, natural resources and wildlife prior to making of the decision whether to grant the license.

As per the Electricity Act, UETCL is a licensee of the ERA for the Bujagali Project.

Part VIII of the Act provides for acquisition of land. Under S.68 (1)(d), a licensee for transmission or his or her representative is authorized, inter alia, to enter any land private or public to perform any activity necessary for establishing, constructing, repairing, improving, examining, altering or removing an electric supply line. However, in undertaking such activity, the licensee is required to do as little damage as possible to the land and the environment and is required to ensure prompt payment of fair and adequate compensation to all interested parties for any damage or loss sustained (S.68 (3)). Further, under S.68 (2), a licensee or his or her
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representative does not acquire any other right in the land other than the right of user of the land under, over, across, in or upon which the electric supply line or post is placed.

Under S.68 (4), prior to entering any private land, a licensee or his or her representative, is required to give 60 days notice to the owner of the land, stating as fully and accurately as possible the nature and extent of acts intended to be done. AES served these notices to all people living in a 1km corridor identified for the future transmission line corridor. Sensitisation meetings were also held in all villages transgressed by the 1km corridor.

In the case of land under the management of the Uganda Land Commission, S.69 (2) the Electricity Act requires service of 30 days notice prior to entry, stating the nature and extent of acts intended to be done. Along the route, this provision, applies to land situated within the boundaries of Mabira, Namuyoya and Kifu Forest Reserves, as well as in Lubigi swamp.

A person objecting to entry in to his/ her land for purposes of constructing a transmission line may lodge an objection to the ERA within 30 days from the date of receipt of the notice. The ERA will consider the objection and if found inadequate may cause compulsory entry in to the land although the affected person would still have the recourse to appeal to a tribunal or the High Court.

S.71 of the Electricity Act deals with compensation. Compensation for affected people should be determined in accordance with the Land Act, 1998 and the Land Acquisition Act, 1965. Where an interest in land greater than the right of use is required for purposes of construction of the line, government may exercise compulsory acquisition.

3.2.4 The Land Act 1998

In general, the Act addresses four issues namely, holding, control, management and dispute processing. As regards tenure, the Act repeats, in Section 3, the provisions of Article 237 of the Constitution which vests all land in the citizens of Uganda, to be held under customary, freehold, mailo or leasehold tenure systems. It then defines the incidence of each tenure regime (s.4), provides mechanisms of the acquisition of certificates of customary ownership (ss.5-9), or the conversion of customary tenure to freehold (ss.10-15), or collective management of land held under customary law (ss.16-27), the protection of the rights of women, children and persons with disability (s.28), the conversion of leasehold into freehold (s.29), the security of tenure for ‘tenants by occupancy’ (ss.30-39), and the creation of a Land Fund to assist various people wishing to obtain secure rights in land (s.42).

Regarding control of land use, the Act addresses three issues. First it reaffirms the statutory power of compulsory acquisition conferred on the government and local authorities under articles 26 (2) and 237(2) (a) of the Constitution (s.43). Since the Act does not repeal the Land Acquisition Act No. 14 of 1965, it is assumed that this legislation, with appropriate modification, meets the requirements of Article 26(2) of the Constitution which requires that a law be in place for the payment of compensation and access to the courts, Second, the Act requires that land owners manage and utilise land in accordance with any law relating to land use and land use planning (ss.44 and 46). These include, but are not limited to, the Forest Act (Cap 246), the Mining Act (Cap 248), the National Environment Statute (No. 4 of 1995), the Water Statute (No.9 Of 1995), the Uganda Wildlife Statute (No.14 of 1996) and the Town and Country Planning Act (Cap.30). And third, it reaffirms the trust obligations of the government and local authorities in respect of certain natural resources under Article 237 (2)(b) of the Constitution (s.45).

The provisions regarding land administration (referred to in the Act as ‘management’) are the most elaborate. The Act creates a series of land administration institutions consisting of Parish Land Committees, District Lands Boards and Uganda Land Commission (ULC). Each of these levels is by and large autonomous of one another and is entrusted with functions that range from the holding of lands not subject to private ownership, the management of land thus held, the processing of applications for various grants and certificates, the registration and transfer of interest in land (ss.47-74). The ULC is, in addition, charged with the management and administration of the Land Fund.
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An equally decentralized system is created to process land disputes in the country (ss.75-90). The Act requires that Land Tribunals be established at all levels of local government and that all land disputes be first processed through them before any resort can be made to ordinary courts. No other organ, except informal traditional authority mediators (s.89) will henceforth have jurisdiction over land disputes (s.98). Thus the Act has opted for a process that is both localised and free from the formalities associated with judicial proceedings.

Although the Land Act came into effect on July 2nd 1998, some facilities necessary for its operation are not yet in place, and may not be for some time. While ULC, District Land Boards, land offices and district registries are actually established, land tribunals, the land fund, together with the personnel needed to run them are only partially in place.

The Land Act provides for acquisition of land or rights of use of land for execution of public works. A licensee under the Electricity Act is an Authorized Undertaker under the Land Act authorized to execute public works (S.68 (9)). S.74 of the Land Act provides for acquisition of land for execution of public works. Where it is necessary to execute any public works on any land, an authorised undertaker should seek to enter into mutual agreement with the occupier or owner of the land, and if no agreement is reached, the Minister responsible for land may compulsorily acquire the land.

The Constitution of Uganda requires "prompt payment of fair and adequate compensation" where land is compulsorily acquired. Such compensation is assessed in accordance with the valuation principles laid out in S.78 of the Land Act, briefly outlined below:

- The value for customary land is the open market value of the unimproved land;
- The value of buildings on the land is taken at open market value for urban areas, and depreciated replacement cost for rural areas;
- The value of standing crops on the land is determined in accordance with the district compensation rates established by the respective District Land Board. Annual crops which could be harvested during the period of notice to vacate given to the landowner/occupier of the land are normally excluded in determining the total compensation;
- In addition to the total compensation assessed, there is a disturbance allowance paid of fifteen per cent or, if less than six months' notice to give up vacant possession is given, thirty per cent of the total sum assessed.

A licensee for transmission only acquires a right of use of the land - not title to the land - except for land required for substations. The assessment of compensation for the right of use is based on the diminished use of the land by owner/occupier of the land.

3.2.5 Land Tenure Regimes and Transfer of Land

3.2.5.1 Definitions

Article 237 of the Constitution, 1995, vests land in the citizens of Uganda and identifies four land tenure systems, namely:
- customary;
- freehold;
- mailo; and
- leasehold.

The incidents of these systems are detailed under section 4 of the Land Act, 1998. Those relevant to the Bujagali project are the following.

3.2.5.2 Customary tenure

- is governed by rules generally accepted as binding and authoritative by the class of persons to which it applies (in other words "customary regime is not governed by written law");
- is owned in perpetuity
customary occupants are occupant of former public land, and occupy the land by virtue of their customary rights; they have proprietary interest in the land and are entitled to certificates of customary ownership;
- certificates for customary ownership may be acquired, through application to the Parish Land Committee and eventual issuance by the District Land Board;

3.2.5.3 Freehold tenure
- derives its legality from the Constitution and its incidents from the written law;
- involves the holding of land in perpetuity or for a period less than perpetuity fixed by a condition;
- enables the holder to exercise, subject to the law, full powers of ownership;

3.2.5.4 Mailo tenure
The Mailo land tenure system is a feudal ownership introduced by the British in 1900 under the Buganda Agreement. "Mailo" is a Luganda word for mile as the original grants under the agreement were measured in square miles. Prior to the 1975 Land Reform Decree, Mailo land was owned in perpetuity by individuals and by the Kabaka (hereditary King). Persons who lived on this land, as well as new entrants, were legally protected to live on and use the land, but they were obliged to pay certain taxes. The 1975 Land Reform Decree abolished Mailo land and the rights of customary tenants on such lands, but the decree has not been effectively implemented except in so far as the customary tenants usually ceased to pay taxes to the landlords.

The Mailo system:
- derives its legality from the Constitution and its incidents from the written law;
- involves the holding of land in perpetuity;
- permits the separation of ownership of land from the ownership of developments on land made by a lawful or bona fide occupant (1);
- enables the holder to exercise all the powers of ownership, subject to the rights of those persons occupying the land at the time of the creation of the mailo title and their successors;

3.2.5.5 Leasehold tenure
- is created either by contract or by operation of the law;
- is a form under which the landlord of lessor grants the tenant or lessee exclusive possession of the land, usually for a period defined and in return for a rent;
- the tenant has security of tenure and a proprietary interest in the land

Although only these latter forms of tenure are legally defined under the Land Act, the context of common law also recognises the statute of “Licensee” or “Sharecroppers”, these terms having similar meanings in practice. Licensees are persons granted authority to use land within for agricultural production. Traditionally, such production would be limited to annual crops. Licensees have no legal security of tenure or any propriety right in the land. Their tenure is purely contractual.

3.2.5.6 Right of spouse and children
The rights of spouse and children are protected under the Constitution of Uganda and the Land Act. The consent of spouse and children must be acquired prior to any transaction on land on which the family ordinarily resides by the head of household.

The Land Act, 1998, includes the following provisions under Section 40:

quote
No person shall-
- sell, exchange, transfer, pledge, mortgage or lease any land; or

(1) Lawful and “bona fide” occupants are defined under the Land Act, Section 30. They are called “kibanja” occupants in the Kampala area.
- enter into any contract for the sale, exchange, transfer, pledging, mortgage, lease of any land;
- give away any land *inter vivos*, or enter into any transaction in respect of land-
  o in the case of land on which the person ordinarily resides with his or her spouse, and from which they derive their sustenance, except with the prior written consent of the spouse;
  o in the case of land on which the person ordinarily resides with his or her dependent children of majority age, except with the prior written consent of the dependent children of majority age;
  o in the case of land on which the person ordinarily resides with his or her dependent children below the age of majority, except with the prior written consent of the Committee (2);
  o in the case of land on which ordinarily reside orphans below majority age with interest in inheritance of the land, except with prior written consent of the Committee.

3.2.6 Compulsory acquisition

Under Chapter Four (Protection and promotion of fundamental and other human rights and freedoms), Article 26 (Protection from deprivation of property), the Constitution states that:

Every person has a right to own property either individually or in association with others

No person shall be compulsorily deprived of property or any interest in or right over property of any description except where the following conditions are satisfied-
- the taking of possession or acquisition is necessary for public use or in the interest of defence, public safety, public order, public morality or public health; and
- the compulsory taking of possession or acquisition of property is made under a law which make provisions for-
  - prompt payment of fair and adequate compensation, prior to the taking of possession or acquisition of the property; and
  - a right to access to a court of law by any person who has an interest or right over the property.

The Land Acquisition Act, 1965, provides the incidents of compulsory acquisition. Although both the Constitution and the Land Act prevail upon the Land Acquisition Act, this latter remains good law for those provisions which are not inconsistent with these former.

According to the Land Acquisition Act, compulsory acquisition procedural pre-requisites are the following:
- a statutory instrument should be prepared and signed by the Minister responsible for Lands;
- this statutory instrument should be gazetted.

Due to historical reasons, compulsory acquisition is a sensitive issue in Uganda.

3.2.7 Valuation and Compensation of Lost Assets

Valuation and compensation are in accordance with rates set at district level for crops and “non-permanent” structures. Rates are established and updated at District level, and are enacted by District Land Boards. Permanent structures are valuated on a case-by-case basis.

3.3 INTERNATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

IFC’s social and environmental policies, that UETCL is committed to apply for the implementation of the Bujagali Interconnection Project, have recently been restructured into one new overarching policy, the Policy on Social and Environmental Sustainability, and eight Performance Standards. This new policy is applicable

(2) "Committees " are defined under Section 65 of the Land Act ; they are Parish Land Committees.
since April 30, 2006, and the International Finance Corporation has later released guidance notes intended to
guide in the implementation of each of the eight Performance Standards.

The following provisions of the fifth Performance Standard (PS5) “Land Acquisition and Involuntary
Resettlement” are identified as being of particular relevance to this RAP:

- PS5 reaffirms the concepts of physical displacement (loss of shelter) and of economic displaced
  (loss of means of livelihood); both Physically Displaced and Economically Displaced People are
to be considered in resettlement planning;
- Stated objectives of resettlement planning should be: (quote)
  o To avoid or at least minimize involuntary resettlement wherever feasible by exploring
    alternative project designs,
  o To mitigate adverse social and economic impacts from land acquisition or restrictions on
    affected persons’ use of land by: (i) providing compensation for loss of assets at replacement
    cost; and (ii) ensuring that resettlement activities are implemented with appropriate
    disclosure of information, consultation, and the informed participation of those affected,
  o To improve or at least restore the livelihoods and standards of living of displaced persons,
  o To improve living conditions among displaced persons through provision of adequate housing
    with security of tenure at resettlement sites (unquote)
- The Project is expected to “offer displaced persons and communities compensation for loss of
  assets at full replacement cost and other assistance to help them improve or at least restore their
  standards of living or livelihoods”;
- “Where livelihoods of displaced persons are land-based, or where land is collectively owned, the
  client will offer land-based compensation, where feasible”,
- The Project is to “consult with and facilitate the informed participation of affected persons and
  communities, including host communities, in decision-making processes related to resettlement.
  Consultation will continue during the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation”;
- The Project is expected to “establish a grievance mechanism consistent with Performance
  Standard 14 to receive and address specific concerns about compensation and relocation that are
  raised by displaced persons or members of host communities, including a recourse mechanism
designed to resolve disputes in an impartial manner”,
- The Project is expected to “carry out a census with appropriate socio-economic baseline data to
  identify the persons who will be displaced by the project, to determine who will be eligible for
  compensation and assistance, and to discourage inflow of people who are ineligible for these
  benefits. In the absence of host government procedures, the client will establish a cut-off date for
  eligibility. Information regarding the cut-off date will be well documented and disseminated
  throughout the project area”;
- “If people living in the project area must move to another location, the client will: (i) offer
  displaced persons choices among feasible resettlement options, including adequate replacement
  housing or cash compensation where appropriate; and (ii) provide relocation assistance suited to
  the needs of each group of displaced persons, with particular attention paid to the needs of the
  poor and the vulnerable. Alternative housing and/or cash compensation will be made available
  prior to relocation. New resettlement sites built for displaced persons will offer improved living
  conditions.”
- “If land acquisition for the project causes loss of income or livelihood, regardless of whether or
  not the affected people are physically displaced, the client will meet the following requirements:

---

Provisions that are not necessarily applicable to this RAP have not been included in this review. For a
complete version of PS5, the reader is referred to [www.ifc.org](http://www.ifc.org). The guidance note supporting PS5 is
available at the same address.

Quote from PS1: “The client will establish a grievance mechanism to receive and facilitate resolution of the
affected communities’ concerns and grievances ... The grievance mechanism ... should address concerns
promptly, using an understandable and transparent process that is culturally appropriate and readily
accessible to all segments of the affected communities, and at no cost and without retribution. The
mechanism should not impede access to judicial or administrative remedies. The client will inform the
affected communities about the mechanism in the course of its community engagement process.”
Bujagali Interconnection Project – Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan

- Promptly compensate economically displaced persons for loss of assets or access to assets at full replacement cost
- In cases where land acquisition affects commercial structures, compensate the affected business owner for the cost of reestablishing commercial activities elsewhere, for lost net income during the period of transition, and for the costs of the transfer and reinstallation of the plant, machinery or other equipment
- Provide replacement property (e.g., agricultural or commercial sites) of equal or greater value, or cash compensation at full replacement cost where appropriate, to persons with legal rights or claims to land which are recognized or recognizable under the national laws
- Compensate economically displaced persons who are without legally recognizable claims to land for lost assets (such as crops, irrigation infrastructure and other improvements made to the land) other than land, at full replacement cost. The client is not required to compensate or assist opportunistic settlers who encroach on the project area after the cut-off date
- Provide additional targeted assistance (e.g., credit facilities, training, or job opportunities) and opportunities to improve or at least restore their income-earning capacity, production levels, and standards of living to economically displaced persons whose livelihoods or income levels are adversely affected
- Provide transitional support to economically displaced persons, as necessary, based on a reasonable estimate of the time required to restore their income earning capacity, production levels, and standards of living.

3.4 GAP ANALYSIS

Some of WBG requirements are not met by certain aspects of the Ugandan legislation and practice in the field of compensation. The following table summarises the main differences between Ugandan law provisions and WBG requirements as per OD 4.30, as far as compensation is concerned, for various categories of Project Affected Persons.

**Table 3: Comparison of Ugandan law and WBG/Equator Principles requirements regarding compensation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of PAP Type of lost assets</th>
<th>Ugandan Law</th>
<th>WBG/Equator Principles Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OWNERS – Land</td>
<td>Cash compensation based upon market value of unimproved land + disturbance allowance (15%)</td>
<td>Strongly recommend land-for-land compensation. Compensation is at replacement cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENANTS - Land</td>
<td>Entitled to compensation based upon the amount of rights they hold upon land</td>
<td>Must be compensated whatever the legal recognition of their occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARECROPPERS – Land</td>
<td>Not entitled to compensation for land, entitled to compensation for crops</td>
<td>No specific provision as to land compensation, but income must be restored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNERS – “Non permanent” Buildings</td>
<td>Cash compensation based upon rates per sq.m. established at District level + disturbance allowance (15%) - Rates are based on depreciated market value</td>
<td>Recommend in-kind compensation or cash compensation at full replacement cost including labour and transaction costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNERS – “Permanent” buildings</td>
<td>Valuation by valuer + disturbance allowance (15%). Valuation is based on depreciated market value</td>
<td>Recommend in-kind compensation or cash compensation at full replacement cost including labour and transaction costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Category of PAP Type of lost assets | Ugandan Law | WBG/Equator Principles Requirements
--- | --- | ---
**PERENNIAL CROPS** | Cash compensation based upon rates per sq.m./bush/tree/plant established at District level + disturbance allowance (15%) – Rates are calculated as the one year net agricultural income – Disturbance allowance is meant to take care of the establishment period for these crops with establishment more than one year. | Transition period should be taken into account. This period may be more than one year for some crops.

**ANNUAL CROPS** | No compensation. The 6 month notice is supposed to allow people to harvest their annual crops | No specific provision. Income restoration. Land for land compensation allows people to re-establish annual crops immediately

**BUSINESS INCOME** | No compensation. The 6 month notice is supposed to allow people to re-establish their business | Establish access to similar opportunities

In a number of cases, as shown by the table above, WBG requirements are more favorable to PAP than the provisions of Ugandan law. UETCL is committed to fulfil WBG requirements. Appropriate compensation approaches are therefore needed, with a first part of compensation meeting Ugandan law requirements, and an additional uplift from UETCL where needed to comply with WBG requirements, that is if these requirements are not met by the Ugandan provisions.
4 SOCIO-ECONOMIC BASELINE

4.1 INITIAL AESNP INFORMATION

The 2001 RAP, submitted by AESNP, was based on a comprehensive survey, valuation, and socio-economic survey of affected assets and affected people, which was carried out mainly in 2000, and is reflected in the 2001 RAP. As mentioned above in Sections 1 and 2, the need appeared in early 2006 to update this information, as many developments have occurred since then, particularly in the Kampala area.

4.2 2006 UPDATE

4.2.1 Methodology

The previously proposed transmission line Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) was prepared based on information gathered during 1999 and 2000. However, considering the developments, which have occurred within the mapped corridor since 2000, UETCL and BEL found it necessary to slightly refine the alignment, as described in Section 2 above, and then to resurvey the entire route. This included a fresh assessment of the general social, economic and environmental issues relating to the acquisition of the line and the preparation of the RAP.

BEL, through RJ.Burnside International, awarded to East African Consulting Surveyors and Valuers a contract to provide the main following services:

- Topographical survey of the center line and delineation of the Wayleave and Right-of-Way,
- Identification of land owners, land users and generally all stakeholders holding interest in land within the delineated Wayleave and Right-of-Way, and establishment of a cadastral map of the route,
- Valuation of all immoveables, including structures, trees, perennial and annual crops, within the delineated Wayleave and Right-of-Way

Meanwhile, UETCL-BIU team conducted a socio-economic survey of all affected households (e.g. households holding interest in land or immovable assets within the delineated Wayleave and Right-of-Way).

The studies commenced on the 17th of August, 2006 with physical surveys, PAP identification, property valuation and administration of socio economic surveys. The strategy was to handle the corridor from both ends, with both teams meeting in the middle of the route. The surveys were completed on the 31st of October 2006. The whole exercise was independently monitored by Interaid, acting as independent "Witness NGO", which provided invaluable advice, was an avenue for PAP to lodge claims and grievances, and flagged a number of issues for consideration by the Project sponsor and its consultant. In addition, BEL and UETCL organized internal audits, including verification in the field of the accuracy of PAP and assets identification and associated valuation.

The valuation forms used by East African Consulting Surveyors and Valuers can be found in Appendix 1. The socio-economic questionnaire used by the BIU is presented in Appendix 2.

4.2.2 Limitations

During the identification and valuation exercise, it was observed that extensive speculation was taking place as an attempt to maximize compensation. Specifically:

- In two Mailo blocks in the villages of Buloba and Malindi (where people have had experience of the 2000 compensation for the HPP), plots held by bona fide tenants to the mailo owners have been subdivided into multiple sub-plots, with new sub-tenants identified as the affected land users;
- In general in this area, it seems that speculators from Jinja have actively attempted to enter into sub-tenancy agreements with local tenants; the lists of affected households reveal a repetition of certain names in different villages between the Nile River and Mabira Forest; once they had secured a tiny piece of land as sub-tenants, the speculators planted high value crops and hastily erected non-permanent structures;
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- It was observed that high value crops not typical of the area were found within the identified corridor, while no example of such crops was observed outside of the corridor. These uncommon high value crops include cocoa, coffee, avocado, mangoes, vanilla, aloe verra as well as pineapple and ornamental trees;
- In the Nile River West Bank villages, a number of makeshift shrines have appeared overnight just before the valuers came.

In terms of the socio-economic baseline information and of the assessment of the displacement impacts, these speculative attempts have the following implications:
- The number of affected households is artificially high, and accordingly the average size of affected households is artificially low (as shown below); new households were artificially created during the identification and valuation exercise in the anticipation that this will maximize compensation (by creating more eligible units than if declared as one single household). For example, older children and elderly dependents (such as grandparents) may have been declared as separate households, whereas they in fact do “eat from the same pot” (the usual practical definition of a household in rural Africa); this is demonstrated by numbers provided in section 4.4.1.1;
- The average size of plots is artificially small (sometimes plots as small as 2m x 2m have been identified);
- The number of physically displaced households may be over-estimated.

These speculation activities do not affect much the results of land and structure valuation. Crop valuation may be over-estimated as a result of speculation. Socio-economic information, as shown below in section 4.4.1.1., is also biased to a certain extent by speculative activities.

4.3 GENERAL BACKGROUND

4.3.1 Administrative Subdivisions

The proposed transmission line corridor passes through the boundaries of Mukono and Wakiso Districts and within Kampala City Council (KCC). Within each District, a number of sub-counties (LC3s) and villages (LC1s) are affected. Table 4 shows the 56 villages that are affected (Table 4):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>VILLAGE</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>KITAWULUZI</td>
<td>Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MBAWO</td>
<td>Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MIREMBE</td>
<td>Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>KIGWANYA</td>
<td>Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BULENGA</td>
<td>Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NAKUWADDE</td>
<td>Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GGANDA</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NANSANA WEST 11</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NANSANA EAST 11</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KIBWA</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>KATOOKE</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>WAMALA</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>KISIMU</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>KAWANDA</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>NAKYESANJE</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>MAGANJO</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>KABAGANDA</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>VILLAGE</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>LUSANJA</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>KITETIKA</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>KOMAMBOGA</td>
<td>Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>WALUFUMBE</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>NAZARETH</td>
<td>Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>KUNGU</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>BUWATE</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>KIRA</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>MULAWA</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>NSASA</td>
<td>Wakiso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>NABUSUGWE</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>NATONKO</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>NAMWEZI</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>JOGO</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>NYENJE</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>NKOKI</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>NSANVU</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>LUKOJO</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>NAMA</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>BUYUKI</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>LUWUNGA</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>WAKISO</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>WABUNUUNU</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>KANYOGOGA</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>MAGADA</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>NDEEBA</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WAGALA</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>MASIKO</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>KITO</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>WASSWA</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>SSESE</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>LUKAAGA</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>WABINYINJA</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>WABIKOKOMA</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>KIKUBAMUTWE</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>MALINDI</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>BULOA</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>NAMINYA</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>BUJOWALI</td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2 Land Use and Settlement

This section describes the broad land use characteristics and settlement pattern along the route of the proposed transmission line.

4.3.2.1 Hydro facility switchyard to Tororo Line

The land use along the River Nile in this area is small-scale subsistence agriculture. The area is intensively farmed and plots are relatively small.

The transmission lines would travel through the villages of Kikubamutwe, Malindi, Buloba and Naminya. Settlement is mainly concentrated on the higher land along local tracks which lead from the Njeru to Kayunga road, as well as along this road itself. Settlement in this area, as in most of rural Uganda, takes the form of compounds where there are a group of buildings accommodating various members of an extended family. The alignment of the transmission lines is to the east of the majority of settlement to minimize their impact.

4.3.2.2 Hydropower facility in Dumbbell Island to Nsambwe

From the power plant switchyard, the transmission line would travel in a south-westerly direction across the Njeru to Kayunga road and through a small area of subsistence agriculture in the village of Malindi. It would then travel through the SCOUL sugar estate, before joining the corridor through the Mabira Forest.

The route then joins the corridor of the existing single circuit 132kV transmission line from Nalubaale (Owen Falls) to Kampala North. It passes through the degraded eastern part of the Mabira Forest Reserve which is largely Recreational Zone. The route then passes through the village of Ssese and a small area of small scale farming before re-entering the forest for approximately 1 km more.

To the west of the forest, the route passes through the villages of Waswa and Kito and small scale farmland. From Kito it passes through the villages of Wagala and Ndeeba crossing small sections of small scale farming and woodland. In this area, there is widespread scattered rural settlement, mainly along roads and access tracks.

West of Ndeeba the line passes through the village of Magada and small sections of tea estates at Kanyagoga and Nakalasa. West of these estates the route crosses sections of bushland and small scale farming at the villages of Wakiso, Buyuki, Nama and Lukojjo where there is extensive scattered settlement. The route then crosses the Kifu Forest Reserve and the main road from Mukono north to Nakifuma.

4.3.2.3 Nsambwe to Kawanda

From Nsambwe the route leaves the corridor of the existing transmission line and turns in a north-westerly direction passing to the north of Nyenje over small scale farmland. It then crosses a small section of the Namyoya Central Forest Reserve and continues over farmland and bushland to Goma and Kira. Settlement in this area is very sparse.

West of Kira it crosses small-scale farmland before passing through areas of bushland and degraded forest to the east and west of Naalya. Again settlement in this area is very sparse although there is a large brickworks to the north of the route at Naalya.

The route to the substation site at Kawanda crosses bushland, short sections of small-scale farming and part of the estate of the Kawanda Agricultural Research Institute.

4.3.2.4 Kawanda to Mutundwe

The route from the substation site passes through an area of small-scale farming, the estate of the Agricultural Research Station and some degraded forest on low lying land before reaching the village of Kisimu.

South of Kisimu the route traverses low lying land to the Lubigi swamp, passing through patches of degraded forest and crossing farmland in the village of Katoke. The route passes to the east of the dense settlement at Nansana. The route then skirts the fringes of the Lubigi swamp passing in a south westerly direction, mainly
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along the west bank. The land use is mainly small-scale farming, but a number of structures were built since the 2000 survey, which made it necessary to revisit the alignment in this area, as described in Section 2.

At the southern edge of the swamp the route turns east along the railway line reserve to reach Mutundwe substation. The density of settlement and urban development is overall lower on this southern side of the swamp than to the north, but again, this is an area where optimization of the alignment has been required to minimize impacts on dwellings (Refer to Section 2).

4.4 SUMMARY 2006 BASELINE SOCIO-ECONOMIC INFORMATION

4.4.1 General Demographic Information

4.4.1.1 Average Affected Household

The average affected household as identified by the affected people themselves as their household in the 2006 socio-economic survey includes 2.66 individuals, as follows:
- One household head;
- 0.21 spouse;
- 0.63 children under 18;
- 0.44 children above 18;
- 0.38 dependents.

These numbers are surprisingly low. The average household as identified in 2000 had 4.9 individuals with 0.8 spouse and 3.1 children under 18, which is much more in line with usual demographic trends in rural Uganda.

The 2006 numbers likely reflect the multiplication of artificial households that was observed during the identification and valuation exercise: new households were artificially created in the anticipation that this will maximize compensation (by creating more eligible units than if declared as one single household). The older children and the elderly dependents (such as grandparents) are declared as separate households, whereas they in fact do "eat from the same pot" (the usual practical definition of a household in rural Africa).

4.4.1.2 Gender and Age Distribution of Household heads

37% of all affected household heads are women and 63% are male. The average age of affected household heads is 39.2 years. As an average, female heads of household are slightly older than men (by one year: 39.8 for females versus 38.8 for males).

Table 5: Age Distribution of Affected Household Heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age class</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and more</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The following characteristics need to be noted, as they bear significance in terms of potentially vulnerable people:

- There is a significant proportion of very young household heads, with 21 household heads less than 18 years of age, including a few as young as 10 to 12; it must, however, be also kept in mind that some of these may result from the artificial splitting of households mentioned above;
- Similarly a number of elderly household heads can also be found.

4.4.1.3 Marital Status of Household Heads

The disaggregation by gender of marital status information shows an interesting profile: only 50% of females are married, the other 50% being widows (almost 25%), divorced, single or separated women. In contrast, the proportion of divorced, separated or widowed men is almost negligible (4% in total), with 83% of males being married and 13% single.

This has an important implication in terms of potential vulnerability of females: widowed, divorced or separated women are more likely to be vulnerable. It is also an indicator of a certain volatility of married couples, which is more likely to be detrimental to women, for whom chances are high that they will not be able to remarry, whereas males are almost always able to remarry. This is certainly a factor that needs to be taken into consideration when devising compensation measures. Experience of the 2000/2001 AESNP compensation exercise for the hydropower project has also shown that a significant proportion of men used their compensation to remarry younger women, hence the importance of proposing resettlement options (rather than cash compensation).
4.4.1.4 Religious Profile of Household Heads

The following graph shows the religious profile of affected household head:

![Religious Profile of Affected Household Heads](image)

- Protestant: 30%
- Catholic: 32%
- Muslim: 31%
- Pentecostal: 5%
- Others: 2%

4.4.2 Land Tenure

When asked under which regime they occupy the affected plot, 64% of affected household heads respond that they are tenants (see diagram hereunder). This is a sharp increase against 2000 results, which indicated that 48% of landusers were tenants. It might again reflect the subdivision of plots that took place during the 2006 valuation exercise in anticipation of compensation.

![Status of Occupation](image)

- Tenants: 64%
- Licensees: 11%
- Landowners: 25%

The following graph shows that amongst affected household heads, males usually enjoy better security of tenure than females: the proportion of female licensees is higher than the proportion of female landowners, and than the proportion of females in the general population of affected households.
4.4.3 Livelihoods

4.4.3.1 Occupations

Overall, 39% of affected household heads declare themselves as primarily peasant farmers. There are significant differences between occupations declared by females and males as shown below:
4.4.3.2 Agriculture

The general landscape of the Buganda region in the vicinity of the proposed alignment comprises flat or round topped hills, valleys incised into the plateau with farmlands and occasional swamps. Minimum annual rainfall is over 760 mm and most of the area has over 1000 mm, well distributed throughout the year. Most of the original rainforest vegetation has been cleared for the growing of sugarcane, tea, bananas and coffee. Elephant grass and thickets grow when the land falls out of use.

From the East, the agricultural activities are characterized by small-scale coffee banana based inter-cropping or intermixed systems in the Nile River area, large scale sugarcane production both to the east and west of the Mabira forest and more small scale coffee-banana systems in Wakiso district. The suburbs of Kampala have small scale backyard farming mainly of the various subsistence food crops. The average size of a holding along the alignment is about 0.3 ha.

4.4.4 Income (2000 Data)

4.4.4.1 Overall monetary income

The average yearly income per household is 4.025 millions of Ugandan Shillings (USD 2,230).

The distribution of this overall income is shown on Table 3 hereunder:

Table 6: Average distribution of yearly income for all households (2000 information)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of income</th>
<th>Yearly income per affected household (UGX)</th>
<th>Yearly income per affected household (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>1,542,000</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1,305,000</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>656,000</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents</td>
<td>241,000</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social benefits and others sources</td>
<td>281,000</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,025,000</td>
<td>2,517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the global level of all affected households, non-agricultural activities, especially employment in the formal sector, generate more income than farming due to the vicinity of Kampala. But in fact, not all households are actually involved in non-agricultural occupations, and the overall income is far from being evenly distributed among affected households.

4.4.4.2 Farming income

Farming households were asked for their yearly income from the affected plots. Table 4 shows the results:

Table 7: Average farming income for farming households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average agricultural income per household (UGX/year)</th>
<th>2,355 M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average agricultural income per household (USD/year)</td>
<td>1,472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although predominantly farming households may be involved to some extent in non-agricultural activities, it is clear from above figures that these predominantly farming households have significantly lower monetary incomes than households predominantly involved in other activities.
4.4.3 Spending patterns
The spending patterns of affected households are shown on the diagram below:

4.5 PUBLIC SERVICES

Household heads were asked from where they obtain their water from. The results are shown on the following graph:

13% of households have electricity at home. These are mainly the residences located near Kampala in Kampala and Wakiso Districts. Electricity is mainly used for lighting. For cooking, most people use either gas in the suburban areas of Kampala or charcoal in the more rural areas.
5 PROJECT DISPLACEMENT IMPACTS

5.1 LIMITATIONS

At the time of submitting this Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan, all information gathered by East African Consultant Valuers and by the Bujagali Implementation Unit had not been processed. About 80% of the field identification and valuation information collected by EACV and about 85% of the socio-economic information gathered by the BIU had been processed and submitted to the author of this RCDAP as of November 14, 2006.

Numbers presented in the sections below are therefore estimates of the actual Project impacts established in good faith based on available information. They take account of probable impacts in those areas where fully processed information was not available. However, limited unanticipated variations in these estimates may occur. These variations should not exceed 20% as a maximum, and should generally be much lower.

A revised, final, version of this RCDAP will be publicly disclosed when the final results of the census are available and duly checked.

5.2 MINIMIZING DISPLACEMENT IMPACTS

Section 2.3 above presents details on the avoidance of displacement impacts through route fine-tuning, with a description of steps taken to avoid densely populated areas.

5.3 DEFINITION OF PROJECT-AFFECTED LAND

5.3.1 Categorization of Land Affected by the Project

Land affected by the construction and operation of the Interconnection System falls into the following categories:

- Transmission Lines:
  o Wayleave,
  o Right-of-Way,
  o Temporary land needs for construction purposes;
- Sub-stations:
  o Permanent land acquisition,
  o Temporary land needs for construction purposes.

5.3.2 Wayleave

The Wayleave is recognized as the safety corridor out of which negative impacts from transmission lines are assumed to be negligible. The width of the corridor depends on the line voltage. The Ugandan standard is a 30m wide corridor for a 132kV Wayleave and 40m for 220kV lines. Within the Wayleave, no house is permitted and crops are not to be more than 6 feet in height.

Titles for Wayleave land will not be transferred from its present owners; this land will remain their property. This land is, however, subject to the following restrictions:

- No construction is allowed in the corridor;
- All vegetation is to be kept below 6 feet height (1.8 metre).

In the Wayleave, cultivation or other uses of land may continue provided above-mentioned prescriptions are complied with by the owner and the occupants of land.

Owners and occupants will be compensated against the loss of value resulting from the restrictions (diminished value).
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5.3.3 Right-Of-Way

The Right-Of-Way is the land required for a maintenance track under the line and the location of the towers. This corridor is 5 metres in width which suffices for both the access path and the 4 legs of towers.

UETCL will determine whether land falling within the 5-metre wide Rights of Way will remain the property of its current owners (titles would then not be transferred) or whether it should be fully transferred to UETCL, which solution is preferable as all usufruct rights will belong to UETCL.

This land must be accessible at all times by UETCL for maintenance purposes. Whether titles are transferred or not, land falling in the Right-Of-Way is deemed not to have any residual value for its current owners, and will, therefore, be compensated in full to its present owners.

5.3.4 Kawanda Sub-Station

Land required for the substation in Kawanda was formally acquired by ULB based on compensation paid by AESNP in 2001 (See Assessment of Past Resettlement Activities – APRAP, Kawanda Sub-Station).

Some limited additional land acquisition will be performed at Kawanda Sub-Station to accommodate a slight change in the general lay-out of the station, intended to minimize impacts on a neighboring school, as described in Section 2.3.

5.3.5 Temporary Land Needs for Construction Purposes

During construction, some areas may have to be temporarily occupied by the contractors in charge of the transmission lines construction. Owners and occupants will be compensated against the loss of crops if any, and will receive a rent from the contractors for temporary occupation. There will be no transfer of rights in this case. Damaged crops will be compensated for, as required.

5.3.6 “Orphan” Land

Over a length of approximately 45 kilometres, the new transmission line will follow an existing UETCL-operated transmission line. UETCL’s standards require that a five-metre strip separate the two corridors. In most situations, it is not anticipated that access to this strip should be hindered, as on both sides of it is land that is not taken permanently but only encumbered by restrictions on building and higher crops. However, it is possible than in a limited number of specific field configurations (particularly if a residential structure is located in this strip), access may be hindered or a loss in value may be experienced. In line with usual practice on similar projects (transmission, pipelines, etc...), these cases will be considered on a case-by-case basis for potential compensation.

5.3.7 Mabira Forest

In order to reduce environmental impacts on Mabira Forest, the width of the Wayleave is reduced in the forest crossing to 30 metres, instead of the usual 35 metres for a 220kV line.

5.3.8 Summary

The following table presents a summary of the Project required corridor width:

Table 8: Summary of Required Corridor Width

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Voltage (kiloVolt)</th>
<th>Width of Right-Of-Way (m)</th>
<th>Width of Wayleave (m)</th>
<th>Total Land Take (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutundwe – Kawanda</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawanda – Bujagali (except for Mabira Forest)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabira Forest</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 IMPACT ON LAND

The Project construction and operation will require:

- Permanent Land Take: 52 hectares, as follows:
  - Right-of-Way: About 51.6 hectares (128 acres) – as mentioned above, this is land that will be permanently required, and to which current land users will lose right of access;
  - Kawanda Sub-Station: About 0.4 hectare (1 acre); 12.5 acres were already acquired in 2001;
- Land with restrictions on buildings and higher crops (Wayleave): About 301 hectares (743 acres).

Table 9 below presents the breakdown by District of these land requirements.

Table 9: Summary of Project Land Requirements (Estimates as of 31 October 2006 Pending Full Completion of Field Surveys – Excluding Kawanda Sub-Station)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Surface Area of Right-Of-Way (acres)</th>
<th>Surface Area of Wayleave (acres)</th>
<th>Surface Area of Total Land Take (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kampala District</td>
<td>29.74</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>105.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakiso District</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>208.00</td>
<td>237.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukono District</td>
<td>68.11</td>
<td>460.24</td>
<td>528.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127.56</td>
<td>743.24</td>
<td>870.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is currently (31 October 2006) estimated that the number of affected plots is about 2,485. As different household members within the same household may hold several distinct plots under different land tenure arrangements, this number is higher than the actual number of affected households (about 1,900).

5.5 IMPACT ON STRUCTURES

5.5.1 Impact on Residential Structures

There are about 230 residential structures located in the Right-Of-Way and in the Wayleave, of which about 150 are categorized as “permanent” structures (made out of perennial materials), and about 80 are categorized as “non permanent”.

In addition, about 50 non-inhabitable structures declared by their owners as residential were also identified, particularly in the Mukono District villages, located on the West Bank of the Nile close to Jinja. These have usually been hastily erected in anticipation of the valuation exercise.

5.5.2 Impact on Other Structures

Table 10 below presents the Project impact on non-residential structures (excluding graves and shrines).
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Table 10: Project Impacts on Non-Residential Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type / Use of Structure</th>
<th>Categorized as Permanent</th>
<th>Categorized as Non-Permanent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrine</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Shed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 IMPACTS ON PEOPLE AND LIVELIHOODS

5.6.1 Physically Displaced People

Physically Displaced People are people whose residence has to be displaced because it is located within the Project land acquisition area.

It is estimated that about 120 households will have to be physically displaced as a result of the Project. This is because their current residence is located within the Right-Of-Way or within the Wayleave.

Most potentially physically displaced people live in densely settled areas around Kampala and along the West Bank of the Nile River, particularly:
- Nansana north to Kampala near Kawanda sub-station;
- Kitawuluzi next to Mutundwe sub-station;
- The West bank of River Nile, including villages Kikubamutwe, Buloba, Malindi, which is densely populated and where the overall footprint of the Project is wider.

The following table shows the villages where most of these 120 physically displaced households are located:

Table 11: Villages where the Majority of Physically Displaced Households are Located

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VILLAGE</th>
<th>Number of Potential Physically Displaced Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NANSANA EAST</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KITAWULUZI</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KATOUGE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULAWA</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASSWA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIKUBAMUTWE</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When Kikubamutwe is grouped with five other villages of the same area near the Nile River West Bank, the total number of physically displaced households in this particular area reaches about 25.

All other 48 affected villages have five or less than five potentially physically displaced households.

5 Businesses are usually located in houses whose main purpose is residential. Only structures solely intended for business purposes are counted here.
Out of the 120 physically displaced households, it is anticipated that a small number (about 15 in the more rural areas) will be able to relocate their residence to the remaining part of their plot. This potential "self-relocation" is, however, most unlikely in the densest areas in the suburbs of Kampala and along the Nile River Valley, where there will be little if any land remaining available to affected people for self-relocation after the Project has vacated the transmission corridor.

5.6.2 Economically Displaced People

Economically Displaced People are defined here as people whose livelihoods are affected by the Project land acquisition to such an extent that even if they are not physically displaced they will have to move to regain similar economic opportunities. In an agricultural setting, this is usually the case because people are affected by the acquisition of a significant proportion of the land they farm that leaves the remainder unsustainable.

Impacts on land for non-physically displaced people are usually benign. The total surface area of the Wayleave is only about 50 hectares over a length of 100 kilometres and over 55 communities, which on average is less than one hectare per community. Meanwhile, affected people will retain usufruct rights of the wider Right-Of-Way, with restrictions that usually affect subsistence agriculture only marginally, as matooke banana and grain crops still can be grown while complying with the 6-foot height restriction. It is therefore not anticipated that the number of economically displaced people from Kampala to Mabira Forest will be high. According to provisional results of the socio-economic surveys, this number should not exceed 10. These situations will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

This may, however, not be true of villages located along the Nile River West Bank, where people have already been affected by the HPP land acquisition, and where cumulative effects of successive phases of land acquisition can be expected. At the time of submitting this RAP, it is difficult to estimate the effect of this cumulative impact. Tentatively, it will be estimated for planning and budgeting purposes that about 30 households might be economically displaced in this area.

5.6.3 Total Number of Affected Households

It is currently estimated, pending full completion of the data treatment, that about 1,902 households are affected by the Project land acquisition. This number includes the 120 potentially physically displaced people and the 40 potentially economically displaced people.

5.7 IMPACT ON GRAVES AND CULTURAL SITES

5.7.1 Graves

According to socio-economic and valuation information, there is a total of about 55 graves in the land required for the Project. About 15 of these are located in the Right-Of-Way and the rest (40) in the Wayleave.

Graves located in the Right-Of-Way will have to be relocated. There is, in principle, no deterrent to leaving a grave in the Wayleave, and the majority of graves located in the Wayleave will remain without being relocated. However, if the owner is physically or economically displaced and has to move, the choice will be left with the grave owner: either the grave is relocated with the household, and the Project will bear the cost thereof, or the grave remains where it is. For planning and budgeting purposes, it is estimated that 20 of these graves will have to be displaced. The total of potentially affected graves is therefore 35.

5.7.2 Shrines and Other Cultural Features

A limited number of genuine shrines have been observed in the Right-Of-Way. It is estimated that about 10 such shrines are located in the permanent land take and will have to be moved.

A few opportunistic shrines were also observed to have been hastily built, particularly in the area near Jinja. Local cultural mediums have usually confirmed that these were not genuinely cultural and had been erected solely for compensation purposes.
5.8 SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS

The following table presents a summary of Project impacts as they can be estimated at the time of submitting this draft RCDAP:

Table 12: Summary of Project Impacts (estimates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface Area of Right-Of-Way (permanent land take)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Area of Wayleave (land affected by restrictions of use)</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Area of Land Additionally Required for the Extension of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawanda Sub-Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Surface Area Required for the Project</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Area of Right-Of-Way (permanent land take) for Kawanda</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>Hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Area of Wayleave (land affected by restrictions of use) for</td>
<td>300.7</td>
<td>Hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawanda Sub-Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Area of Land Additionally Required for the Extension of</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawanda Sub-Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Surface Area Required for the Project</td>
<td>352.9</td>
<td>Hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Affected Households</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Affected Individuals</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Physically-Displaced Households</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Physically-Displaced People (individuals)</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Economically Displaced Households</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Economically Displaced People (individuals)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Affected Residences</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Affected Non-Residential Structures</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Affected Graves</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Affected Shrines</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 COMPENSATION AND RESETTLEMENT STRATEGY

6.1 KEY PRINCIPLES

The key principles committed upon by UETCL in this RCDAP are the following:

- Resettlement and compensation of Project-Affected People (PAP) will be carried out in compliance with Ugandan legislation, IFC’s Performance Standard 5 and WB OP 4.12,
- All physically or economically displaced people will be offered an option between either a full resettlement package, including the provision of replacement residential land and a house, or cash compensation,
- Past experience in Uganda has shown that cash compensation, although very sought after by many household heads, could be detrimental in the medium term, to other household members, particularly the females and children; the Project will make every effort to promote resettlement rather than cash compensation, and this plan is designed accordingly,
- A majority of PAP derive their livelihood from agriculture. Where farmers are physically or economically displaced, they will be offered a resettlement option including the provision of agricultural land of potential equivalent to that of the land they have lost,
- The RCDAP will be implemented in a gender-sensitive manner: consents of female spouses will be sought, as provided by Ugandan regulations, and, as mentioned above, resettlement-based options will be strongly promoted, as cash is often detrimental to women,
- UETCL will assist PAP in restoring their affected livelihoods, and will provide transitional assistance as necessary as long as livelihoods are not restored to their previous level; specific livelihood restoration activities will target women,
- The RCDAP implementation and outcomes will be monitored and evaluated as part of a transparent process,
- PAP and host communities will be informed and consulted during the whole course of RCDAP development, implementation and evaluation.

6.2 LESSONS LEARNT FROM PREVIOUS RESETTLEMENT AND COMPENSATION ACTIVITIES

AESNP’s resettlement and compensation activities have been evaluated in the framework of this overall Social and Environmental Assessment. Specific documents (“APRAP” for both the HPP and the Kawanda sub-station) present these assessments and propose action plans to meet observed gaps. The main lessons learnt with relevance to the planned resettlement and compensation activities for the Interconnection System are the following:

- Land-for-land compensation options (resettlement, as opposed to cash compensation) tend to protect the weakest in the community (females and children, vulnerable people), whereas cash compensation is often detrimental to females and children as it is much more likely to be used (and sometimes misused) to the sole benefit of males; this tendency is not easy to mitigate given the current place of females in rural Ugandan communities, but needs, however, to be recognized and mitigated, as follows:
  o Seeking full consent of females in the households with proposed compensation options, not only to achieve formal compliance with Section 40 of the Land Act (which requires a sign-off of spouses, amongst others, on compensation options) but to put spouses at equal level with the household level in the discussion and decision-making on compensation options;
  o It has been observed in a similar program in neighbouring DRC that the payment of large amounts of cash compensation in carefully distributed installments (sometimes over several years) mitigated to a large extent the potential for cash misuse; paying cash compensation in installments will be the choice option for any amount larger than USD 500;
  o Monitoring will be key in ensuring that female spouses are not put at risk of being entirely deprived of Project benefits, particularly when compensation will be paid in installments over long periods of time.
- Livelihood restoration support activities need time to achieve results, particularly when households have less land to farm and need to rely on non-farming activities that they are not fully
familiar with; resettlement and compensation programmes need to accommodate the constraints, budget, and time-scales of livelihood restoration plans;

- The “Witness NGO” mechanism of on-going auditing and monitoring has given remarkable results, with limited numbers of grievances altogether.

6.3 ELIGIBILITY

6.3.1 Census

A first census was undertaken in 2000-2001 by AESNP, acting on behalf of the then UEB. As mentioned in previous sections, it was observed in early 2006 that some areas had been affected by a significant change in use and occupation patterns since 2000, particularly - but not only - the section between AP 13 and AP 16 between Lubigi swamp and Nansana.

As a result of these observations, it was decided to fine-tune the alignment in these areas, and to resurvey the route accordingly. This process was launched in August 2006, after suitable Ugandan consultants were selected jointly by UETCL, BEL and R.J. Burnside International.

This exercise includes the update for 2006 economic conditions of the old compensation rates applied for the 2001 RAP. Compensation rates were determined at District level by the District Land Boards under supervision of the Chief Government Valuer’s Office. At the time of submitting this RCDAP, only Kampala District had finalized and approved the determination of their compensation rates. It is expected that Kampala District rates are usually higher than rates in other districts, and therefore use has been made of Kampala District rates for other districts for planning and budgeting purposes.

6.3.2 Cut-Off Date

The Cut-Off Date is the starting date of the fresh 2006 census of affected people and affected assets (14 August 2006). No structure or field established in the Project-Affected Area after 14 August 2006 shall be eligible for compensation. This has been explained during the census exercise to all interested parties in the area, including:

- Project-Affected People, who were identified and surveyed individually,
- District Land Boards (LC5 level),
- Parish Land Committees (LC2 level),
- LC1 representatives.

6.3.3 Speculative Structures

Opportunistic uninhabitable structures established for the sole purpose of compensation pose a specific eligibility problem, which will be addressed through the use of the following methods to ascertain the validity of the compensation claim:

- Use of satellite imagery to determine whether a structure was indeed established prior the cut-off date;
- Visual inspection of the structure to determine whether it is indeed a residential structure or not;
- Consultation with representatives of local authorities to ascertain whether the contested structure was indeed there at the time of the census and whether it was established in good faith or in an opportunistic compensation purpose;
- Involvement of the Witness NGO as one of the potential avenues to redress and mediate contestations;

Claims and contestations related to eligibility will be processed via the grievance mechanism described in Section 9.
6.3.4 Potential Claims Related with the Old Identification and Valuation Survey

As mentioned above, AESNP undertook a survey of the old route in 2001. Consultation with potentially affected people and their LC1 representatives revealed the following specific issue in relation with the "old" survey. In some instances (such as in Kikubamutwe – West Bank), PAP indicated that they had been served a notice in 2001 that they understood meant they were supposed to vacate the land shortly; as a result, they indicate that they did not maintain their houses, which collapsed as a result; the situation is now that where they used to have a house, they might receive little or no compensation; these situations will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, based on the 2001 survey records, which are still available in Uganda.

6.3.5 Eligibility

Assets, including structures and fields, that were surveyed in the Project-Affected Area at the Cut-Off Date are eligible for compensation. People residing or holding affected assets in the Project-Affected Area at the Cut-Off Date are eligible for compensation.

6.4 OVERVIEW OF ENTITLEMENTS

6.4.1 Compensation and Resettlement Packages - An Individualised Approach

6.4.1.1 Situation 1: The Affected Household Is Neither Physically Nor Economically Displaced

This means in practice that the remaining land is deemed economically viable and no residential building has to be removed.

Such situations of rather benign impact apply to the overwhelming majority of affected households. In these cases, cash compensation will be offered and no resettlement option will be offered. Cash compensation will be at District Land Board rates for land, crops, and structures, with payment of disturbance allowance as per Ugandan regulations. An uplift will be added to this compensation to meet full replacement value requirements, as rates established by District Land Boards usually do not meet this requirement.

6.4.1.2 Situation 2: The Affected Household Is Physically Displaced but not Economically Affected

The construction of a replacement house will be offered wherever the residential building has to be removed or relocated nearby. Depending on situations, resettlement may involve the construction of a replacement house:

- either on the remaining part of the plot if the remaining land holding in the neighborhood of the affected plot is deemed economically viable, or if the household’s livelihood is not based on agriculture, and if the affected household agrees to such a solution; in such cases, no replacement agricultural land will have to be provided and the household will simply continue to use the land they previously farmed or continue to engage in their non-agricultural activities, while dwelling in their new residence;
- or on another resettlement plot if the remainder of the affected plot is not economically viable; in such situations, replacement agricultural land of similar potential will also have to be provided in the vicinity of the residential resettlement plot.

Residential land will be provided to resettlers under secure tenure (either freehold or very long term leases), regardless of the previous regime of occupation. Agricultural land will be provided under the same regime of occupation as the land it replaces in the previous location.

6.4.1.3 Situation 3: The Affected Household Is Economically Displaced but not Physically Displaced

In such situations, the residential building of the affected household is not affected, but land take is such that their agricultural sustainability is jeopardized. In these situations, compensation will be provided through the provision of replacement agricultural land, with or without physical relocation of the homestead, depending on whether replacement land is available in the vicinity.

6 Compensation: Payment in cash or in kind at replacement value for an asset or a resource that is acquired or affected by the Project at the time the assets need to be replaced.
6.4.2 Summary – Entitlement Matrix

The Entitlement Matrix associates entitlements with losses for each of the three categories of Project-Affected People defined above and each category of lost asset. It is presented in Table 13 hereunder.

6.5 RESETTLEMENT PACKAGES

6.5.1 Resettlement Sites

The analysis of the numbers of physically displaced people in the villages along the transmission corridor (See Table 11 above) leads to the planning of the following four resettlement sites:

- Kampala South: for the village of Kitawuluzi (southern suburb of Kampala near the existing Mutundwe sub-station) and neighbouring localities;
- Kampala North: for the villages of Nansana and Katooke (two different but neighbour localities in the northern suburbs of Kampala near the proposed Kawanda sub-station, where people affected by the sub-station have already been resettled in 2002);
- Wasswa: a locality situated near the Western boundary of Mabira Forest;
- Nile West Bank, for the village of Kikubamutwe and neighbouring villages, including Mulawa: near Jinja on the West Bank of the Nile River.

The existing resettlement site developed by AESNP at Naminya village has 15 houses and plots available. However, given the numbers of physically and economically displaced people in this area, it is likely that another 15 plots will be necessary. This will require another site to be developed.

In other villages, the numbers of physically displaced people do not justify the development of dedicated resettlement sites. Resettlers will be relocated into houses constructed within existing communities and on plots identified on a case-by-case basis. It is estimated that this will be necessary for about 30 households.

The following table shows the numbers of plots/houses that will serve as a guide for resettlement site planning.

**Table 13: Resettlement Site Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resettlement site</th>
<th>Indicative location</th>
<th>Potential number of resettlers to be accommodated</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kampala South</td>
<td>Mutundwe – Masaka Road</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala North</td>
<td>Nansana</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasswa</td>
<td>Wasswa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nile West Bank</td>
<td>In one of the communities between the Eastern boundary of Mabira Forest and the Nile River</td>
<td>35 (not including 15 to Naminya)</td>
<td>15 resettlers can be relocated to the existing resettlement site in Naminya – These 15 households are deducted from the number in this table</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 14: Entitlement Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Affected Households</th>
<th>Residential Land</th>
<th>Residential Structures</th>
<th>Non-Residential Structures</th>
<th>Graves / Shrines</th>
<th>Agricultural Land</th>
<th>Crops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physically displaced households</td>
<td>If feasible, relocation to the unaffected part of the land in a residential structure rebuilt by the Project.</td>
<td>If feasible, relocation to the unaffected part of the land in a residential structure rebuilt by the Project.</td>
<td>Cash compensation at replacement value</td>
<td>Graves: Option between: - Exhumation and body relocation by a certified undertaker OR - Grave remains in place (if in the WL and household is relocated nearby) Shrinres: - Ceremonies required to relocate the affected spirits OR - Shrine remains in place (if in the WL and household is relocated nearby)</td>
<td>If feasible and household is relocated nearby, household will continue to farm their current land.</td>
<td>Cash compensation at replacement value of any standing crops that the farmer is unable to harvest during the notice period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Otherwise, option between: - Resettlement, strongly promoted by Project, including replacement of residential land on a square metre per square metre basis - Cash compensation, subject to the cash option being approved by a local resettlement committee</td>
<td>Option between: - Resettlement, including replacement of lost house by a resettlement house of similar or better standing - Cash compensation, subject to the cash option being approved by a local resettlement committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically displaced households</td>
<td>Option between: - Resettlement, strongly promoted by Project, including replacement of residential land on a square metre per square metre basis - Cash compensation, subject to the cash option being approved by a local resettlement committee</td>
<td>Option between: - Resettlement, including replacement of lost house by a resettlement house of similar or better standing - Cash compensation, subject to the cash option being approved by a local resettlement committee</td>
<td>Cash compensation at replacement value</td>
<td>Graves: Option between: - Exhumation and body relocation by a certified undertaker OR - Grave remains in place (if in the WL and household is relocated nearby) Shrinres: - Ceremonies required to relocate the affected spirits OR - Shrine remains in place (if in the WL and household is relocated nearby)</td>
<td>Option between: - Resettlement, including replacement of lost agricultural land by replacement land of similar or better potential - Cash compensation, subject to the cash option being approved by a local resettlement committee</td>
<td>Cash compensation at replacement value of any standing crops that the farmer is unable to harvest during the notice period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Giovannetti – December 2006
### Bujagali Interconnection Project – Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Affected Households</th>
<th>Residential Land</th>
<th>Residential Structures</th>
<th>Non-Residential Structures</th>
<th>Graves / Shrines</th>
<th>Agricultural Land</th>
<th>Crops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Affected households that are neither physically nor economically displaced | Cash compensation at replacement value of any affected portion of the residential plot | Not applicable | Cash compensation at replacement value | Graves:  
- Exhumation and body relocation by a certified undertaker if the grave is in the RoW OR  
- Grave remains in place if in the WL  
Shrines:  
- Ceremonies required to relocate the affected spirits if shrine is in the RoW OR  
- Shrine remains in place (if in the WL) | Cash compensation at replacement value of any affected portion of the agricultural plot | Cash compensation at replacement value of any standing crops that the farmer is unable to harvest during the notice period. |
6.5.2 Plot Pattern and Development

The standard resettlement residential plot will be 600 square meters (0.15 acre) in surface area. As detailed below, this does not include agricultural land, which will be provided separately in the majority of situations.

All plots will be served by a road. All houses will have their own pit latrine. Water supply will be by drilled wells equipped with a handpump (based on the usual Ugandan standard of one handpump for 300 individuals), and by a roof rainwater catchment system built-in for every house.

In the two urban sites (Kampala South and Kampala North) and in the Nile River new site, low voltage power will be made available. In the rural site of Wasswa, power supply will not be provided.

6.5.3 Resettlement Housing

UETCL’s standard replacement houses will be of a model similar to that built by AESNP for the resettlement of people displaced by the HPP at Naminya resettlement site (see HPP APRAP).

These houses are based on a standard type developed by the NGO “Habitat for Humanity”. It is shown in photographs hereunder. This house has four rooms.

The house is built in bricks with a corrugated iron roof. It is well protected against run-off water. Floor inside is concrete. 4 rooms are provided with a total surface of ca. 75 m².

A Ventilated Improved Pit (VIP) two-stance latrine is provided.
Following observations made in the framework of the assessment of past resettlement activities carried out for the current Project (see HPP APRAP), the following improvements will be made to these resettlement houses:
- Provision of ceilings,
- Provision of inside plastering,
- Improvements to the roof rainwater catchment system.

6.5.4 Land Titles
All resettled households will be provided with a land title for their residential plot on the resettlement site. This will be either a long-term lease or a freehold title.

6.5.5 Replacement Agricultural Land
One of the lessons learnt from the past resettlement activities, is that it is difficult to combine in the same site, both residential land and agricultural land in sufficient quantity. This combination would require very large pieces of land, which are most unlikely to be easily available in any of the affected areas.

Generally, agricultural land will therefore be acquired by the Project in separate pieces from the residential land. The following table presents an estimate of the surfaces required for each resettlement site:

**Table 15: Agricultural Land Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resettlement site</th>
<th>Indicative location</th>
<th>Potential number of settlers to be accommodated</th>
<th>Agricultural Land Requirements (Hectare / Acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kampala South</td>
<td>Mutundwe – Masaka Road</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0 / 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala North</td>
<td>Nansana</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8 / 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasswa</td>
<td>Wasswa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8 / 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nile West Bank</td>
<td>In one of the communities between the Eastern boundary of Mabira Forest and the Nile River</td>
<td>35 (not including 15 to Naminya)</td>
<td>28 / 70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experience indicates that a distance of 3 to 4 kilometres between residence and agricultural land is usually acceptable to PAP, who tend in most cases to commute to their agricultural land on bicycles. Where replacement agricultural land is necessary, every effort shall be made to identify agricultural land within a radius of 4 kilometres of the relocated residence.

6.5.6 Impacts on Host Communities
Depending on their final location, resettlement sites could entail the following impacts on host communities:
- In-flux of additional school children into existing community schools, resulting in facilities and staff being overwhelmed,
- Additional load on water supply and power supply,
- Secondary displacement (the development of the resettlement site generates its own displacees).

If a resettlement site entails limited secondary displacement impacts, these will be addressed in conformance with principles established in this RCDAP.

Additional load on existing community and public infrastructure will be addressed through construction of additional facilities where needed, such as additional classrooms in existing schools.
In general, even if resettlement land is acquired in the framework of private land transactions (as was the case for Naminya resettlement site), host communities will be consulted, and a formal agreement establishing commitments of both sides (UETCL and the host community) will be sought.

6.6 CASH COMPENSATION

6.6.1 Principles

Compensation must comply with two sets of requirements, the Ugandan law and Equator Principles, the latter being potentially more advantageous to PAP, especially with regard to the valuation at “full replacement cost” as opposed to the depreciated value taken into consideration by Uganda valuation methodologies.

To address this issue, it is proposed to distinguish clearly two terms within the compensation amount:

- C1 will be the amount calculated under Ugandan law, according to official District Land Board rates, including the legal disturbance allowance (usually 15% - see Section 6.6.6 below),
- C2 will be an UETCL uplift intended at fulfilling Equator Principles requirements.

with C the total compensation = C1 + C2.

No disturbance allowance shall be paid on top of C2, as it is not a compensation per se under Ugandan law.

An important Ugandan requirement is that contained in Section 40 of the Land Act that makes it compulsory to seek spousal agreement before any compensation package is agreed upon. As mentioned earlier (see section 6.2), cash compensation entails a number of risks of impoverishment of female spouses and children. In addition to seeking formal consent of spouses in compliance with Section 40, the following steps will be taken to mitigate these risks:

- Payment in installments (see section 6.9);
- Establishment of cash compensation review committees (see section 6.7.3).

6.6.2 Compensation Rates – Land

6.6.2.1 Rate Calculation

The following table shows the general basis for land compensation calculations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Compensation under Ugandan law (C1)</th>
<th>Project uplift (C2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right-Of-Way – Land is permanently acquired</td>
<td>Valuation based upon “market value of unimproved land”. In practice, standard rates are applied as defined by District Land Boards + 15 % or 30% disturbance allowance – See Section 6.6.6</td>
<td>Uplift based on average transaction prices in the area, to meet full replacement value requirements – Usually 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayleave – Land can still be farmed subject to restrictions</td>
<td>Valuation of the loss resulting from the restriction of use – See Appendix 5 + 15 % or 30% disturbance allowance – See Section 6.6.6</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawanda substation – Land is permanently acquired</td>
<td>Valuation based upon “market value of unimproved land”. In practice, standard rates are applied as defined by District Land Boards + 15 % or 30% disturbance allowance – See Section 6.6.6</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6.2.2 Split of Land Values between Mailo Owners and “Kibanja” Bona Fide Occupant

The Mailo regime of land tenure and the related “Kibanja” bona fide occupants are defined in Section 3.2.5.

In conformance with recent practice in Uganda, the split of cash compensation between mailo owners and kibanja occupants will be 66% (mailo owner) / 34% (kibanja occupant). This may apply to situations where the Buganda Kingdom has a pending claim as a Mailo owner.

6.6.3 Compensation Rates - Structures

The following table shows the general basis for structure compensation calculations:

Table 17: Basis for Structure Compensation Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lost asset</th>
<th>Compensation under Ugandan law (C1)</th>
<th>Project uplift (C2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERMANENT HOUSES</td>
<td>Valuation on a case-by-case basis, based upon the depreciated cost + 15% or 30% disturbance allowance</td>
<td>C2 = Replacement cost - Depreciated cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The replacement cost is based on actual cost of construction of an equivalent structure - The difference is generally 10% - The project uplift therefore meets the gap between depreciated value per Ugandan regulations and “full replacement value” per WBG and AfDB requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-PERMANENT HOUSES</td>
<td>Valuation based upon official District Land Board rates with type of materials, condition and age taken into account – See Appendix 4 + 15% or 30% disturbance allowance</td>
<td>Ditto above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER STRUCTURES (graves, granaries, latrines, amasabos...)</td>
<td>Valuation based upon official rates with type of materials, condition and age taken into account + 15% or 30% disturbance allowance</td>
<td>Ditto above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6.4 Compensation Rates - Crops

The following table shows the general basis for crop compensation calculations:

Table 18: Basis for Crop Compensation Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lost asset</th>
<th>Compensation under Ugandan law (C1)</th>
<th>Project uplift (C2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERENNIAL CROPS ON LOST LAND (RoW and Kawanda Sub-Station)</td>
<td>Valuation based upon count and official rates + 15% disturbance allowance</td>
<td>5% uplift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERENNIAL CROPS ON ENCUMBERED LAND OR LAND SUBMITTED TO RESTRICTION OF USE (WL)</td>
<td>Valuation based upon official rates and count of those trees that must be cut as a result of the height limitation + 15% disturbance allowance</td>
<td>5% uplift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost asset</td>
<td>Compensation under Ugandan law (C1)</td>
<td>Project uplift (C2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNUAL CROPS ON PERMANENTLY ACQUIRED LAND (RoW)</td>
<td>No compensation as long as the crop can be harvested. Notice to vacate land is normally 6 months which allows to harvest annual crops. If notice to vacate less than 6 months, disturbance allowance is increased to 30% instead of 15%.</td>
<td>No specific uplift for annual crops as long as they can be harvested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNUAL CROPS ON RESTRICTED LAND (WL)</td>
<td>No compensation</td>
<td>No uplift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAMAGE TO ANNUAL CROPS</td>
<td>Valuation of damaged crops based on official rates and count of damaged crops</td>
<td>5 % uplift</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6.5 Compensation Rates - Moving

The cost of moving will be compensated in cash at USD 200 per displaced individual in the household.

6.6.6 Disturbance Allowance

The disturbance allowance is 15% of the C1 amount when prior notice of 6 months or more is given to vacate the land. Otherwise, it is 30% of C1. No uplift will be paid on top of the disturbance allowance.

6.6.7 Salvaging

All assets that can be removed, such as building materials, will be an additional benefit to affected people. Their value will not be deducted from the amounts of compensation.

6.7 Consultation with PAPS on Compensation Options

6.7.1 Option Disclosure at Sub-County and Village Level

As a first stage of disclosure, meetings will be organised at sub-county level with LC1s of all affected villages. The principles of compensation for the various types of loss and of land transfer will be detailed. The list of plots to be acquired will be disclosed at sub-county and Parish Land Committee offices with surfaces, locations, and landowners’ names. Meetings at the village level will allow for the same information to be disclosed. Additionally, at this level, timeframes for consultation meetings with each affected individual will be published (lists).

The importance of amicable transactions will be stressed, and the dispute settlement procedures will be presented.

6.7.2 Individual Disclosure Meetings

Meetings will be held on an individual basis, with each affected head of household. This could take place either in the affected landowner’s house or at sub-county offices. PAP may be assisted by whoever they wish, including LCs, family members, lawyers and legal counsellors.
The proposed compensation package will be detailed. So as to expedite the process and where appropriate, land compensation will be discussed together with compensation for all other landowner’s lost assets, such as crops and buildings.

Family members having to express consent under Section 40 of the Land Act must be identified and their consents must be sought at this level where applicable (See above section 3.2.5). This specifically applies to the rights of wives to be consulted and to the obligation for them to give their consent to any transaction that their husband would be willing to engage in.

When the deal is agreeable to both parties, a compensation certificate will be signed (see “Payment” hereunder).

6.7.3 Local Cash Compensation Review Committees

For physically or economically displaced people, past experience in Uganda has shown that cash compensation impacted badly on the household’s long-term economic sustainability. This proves particularly detrimental to women and children in the household.

UETCL’s intention is to strongly promote resettlement options rather than cash compensation. However, not proposing cash compensation as an option would be a violation of Ugandan law, and more generally, a violation of human rights. To avoid potentially vulnerable households opting for cash compensation if they are obviously unable to manage the sudden influx of cash, the following provisions are proposed:

- Establishment at local level (LC1 or LC3) of a Cash Compensation Review Committee;
- Any physically or economically displaced household that preliminarily opts for cash compensation instead of resettlement would be reviewed for sustainability by this committee; only once the committee is satisfied that the household indeed has a project that ensures long-term sustainability of the cash compensation option will the household be declared eligible for cash compensation.

6.8 LIVELIHOOD RESTORATION

6.8.1 Overview

While a majority of affected people are peasant farmers, there are a significant proportion of them who are engaged in small business activities (see Section 4.4.3), particularly in the suburban areas around Kampala. Livelihood restoration programmes will therefore target two areas:

- Improved agriculture
- Small business development.

Women are known in Uganda to often react more positively than men to both improved agriculture and income-generating programmes. They will be specifically targeted through gender sensitive engagement and training methods, and through specific activities in both the agricultural field and in income-generating activities.

6.8.2 Eligibility

Project-Affected Households who are either physically displaced or economically displaced are eligible to one of the two livelihood restoration packages proposed, in reason of one such package per household. Broader community development efforts targeting the general community are described in Section 11 of this RCDAP.

6.8.3 Household Preference

The total number of eligible households is about 160. Household preference has not been investigated at the time of completing this RAP. It is assumed, for budgetary purposes, that:

- 60% of households will opt for the agriculture enhancement package, e.g. about 100 households,
- 40% will opt for small business development, e.g. about 60 households.
6.8.4 Agriculture Enhancement

This package will include the following:
- Practical training course on improved agricultural techniques, including improved crop varieties, fertilization, small scale irrigation, animal traction and related equipment, post harvest grain conservation;
- Subsidies (in the amount of USD 600 per household) against the purchase of agricultural equipment, eligible items being traction oxen, carts, plows, and similar agricultural equipment;
- Provision of fertilizers and improved seeds;
- Extension services and related monitoring for five years.

Training and extension services will be delivered by an experienced organization with permanent presence in the area. Women will be targeted as a specific group of interest, with specific engagement methodologies.

6.8.5 Training and Business Support

This package will include the following:
- Selection of one activity by the household members from a list of feasible non-farming income-generating activities;
- Technical and managerial training for this activity;
- Subsidies (in the amount of USD 600 per household) against the purchase of equipment related to this activity;
- Monitoring and technical assistance for a period of five years.

Training and further technical assistance will be delivered by an experienced organization with a permanent presence in the area. In this programme too, women will be targeted specifically group of interest, with specific engagement methods and specific activities and small business areas.

6.9 PAYMENT

6.9.1 Principles

For the Wayleave and Right-Of-Way, compensation will be paid when all transactions are agreed upon for a certain section of the transmission lines. This will be in all cases prior to the actual commencement of the works.

For Kawanda site supplemental land acquisition, the Notice to Vacate will be served as per the Ugandan regulations. The date of commencement of the notice to vacate period will be the date of signature of the compensation certificate, regardless of the actual date of signature of the transfer deed. The Notice to Vacate may be for a period of no less than 3 months, or of 6 months or more, in which cases, a disturbance allowance of 30% or 15% respectively is due to the affected landowner.

6.9.2 Payment Procedure

6.9.2.1 Compensation Agreements

When options have been selected by the affected household for the compensation of lost assets, all parties involved will sign a compensation agreement. These compensations agreements will clearly separate the compensation term paid for under Ugandan law requirements (C1), and the term resulting from the UETCL uplift (C2).

Signatories of the compensation agreements will be as follows:
- Parties:
  - Compensation Recipient,
  - UETCL representative,
Witnesses:
- Witness NGO representative,
- Member of the Parish Land Committee.

Where payment will be in installments, the compensation certificates will include the detailed schedule of payments.

6.9.2.2 Payment
Payments of all amounts more than Ush 100,000 will be made by cheque. Payment will be made by UETCL. On payment, a receipt will be signed by the same parties as above.

As justified above in Section 6.2, payment in several installments will be proposed for any amount larger than USD 500, as a mitigation of the risk of cash misuse, recognized as particularly detrimental to females and children. Ugandan law (and to a certain extent WBG policies) require, however, that compensation be “prior” to the loss, and fully effected before entry into land. Experience in neighbouring countries with similar requirements indicate that this contradiction can be overcome as follows:

- Obtain a clear, in-writing, consent to the payment being effected in installments rather than as a “one-off”;
- Sign a compensation agreement (see section above) making it clear what the payment schedule will be.
7 MANAGEMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL PROPERTY

7.1 AFFECTED CULTURAL PROPERTY

The final alignment has been selected to avoid any significant cultural property. Consultation with the Commissioner for Antiquities and Museums in the Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities took place twice in 2000 before the selection of the AESNP corridor. Specifically, no site of archaeological interest has been identified along the route, and no culturally significant site has been brought to the attention of the sponsor following the consultation that was carried out in all affected villages at detailed survey stage in 2nd and 3rd quarters of 2000. Additionally, no significant cultural property is known to be affected by the transmission system project based upon consultations held to-date. Consultations being held currently (2006) aim, amongst others, at checking that this assumption is still valid. A pre-construction archaeological survey of the route will be undertaken as part of the Environmental and Social Management System for the Project.

Section 5 provides details on affected cultural property and affected graves.

7.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

Wherever possible, any impact on such structures as graves or amasabos (places of offerings) and cultural property in general shall be avoided.

7.2.1 Graves

Graves may be affected by the project. Depending on situations encountered, the following measures will be taken (See also Entitlement Matrix in Table 14):

- The grave is in land which is to be vacated for the Right-Of-Way:
  - in this case, the grave will have to be relocated; where exhumation is required, a certified undertaker will be used to relocate the body to a new grave. The structure itself will be compensated for in cash, according to rates produced by District Land Boards for typical graves.

- The grave is not on land which is to be vacated for the Right-Of-Way but the household is offered relocation because they have a building which falls in the area where houses are prohibited:
  - in this case, the household will remain the owner of the land, and the graves don’t necessarily need to be relocated; the owner will have choice between grave relocation (according to above-mentioned procedure), or leaving the graves in place.

7.2.2 Shrines (Amasabos)

Amasabos may also be affected by the project. Amasabos are small structures which are used by the residents for offerings to the spirits. They may be found either within the family compound or house, or in more distant areas. They are privately-owned, and are used for ceremonies at family level whereby family spirits are consulted and offerings made to obtain their support and advice. Where Amasabos are affected, they will be compensated according to the rates applicable to non-permanent structures. Consultation with residents has shown that it is possible to relocate Amasabos, subject to certain ceremonies, including offerings at both the old and the new location or residence.

For compensation purposes, most Amasabos fall under the category of non-permanent buildings and are compensated for accordingly.

Appropriate procedures to deal with the relocation of family spirits are well known by the local residents and many households have already performed these ceremonies at the time of moving from one place to another. Where required, specific compensation will be offered to take care of the required ceremonies.
7.2.3 Procedure for Archaeological and Cultural Chance Finds

Although the works for the transmission system do not include much earthmoving and the overall land take impact is low, it may be that chance finds are made during the course of the construction. These may include the following:

- Archaeological heritage which has remained unnoticed in the past;
- Sites of cultural significance such as sacred woods or trees or rock outcrops which the local residents may have not mentioned at the survey stage.

Prior to the commencement of the works, an archaeologist will walk the corridor to check for any potential finds.

The EPC Contractor will develop a procedure in their Environmental Management Plan to address cultural chance finds. This procedure will include the following:

- Prior consultation with local residents and neighbours wherever clearing and earthmoving works are anticipated (clearing of the Right-Of-Way, excavations for tower legs); this consultation will be documented by the Contractor and kept available for compliance auditing;
- Immediate notice to the EPC Contractor Environmental Manager (EM) wherever a cultural find happens or when the local residents would signal a potentially impacted site with cultural significance; the EPC Contractor EM will in turn make notice to UETCL and the Ministry in charge of Culture where the issue cannot be solved with the local residents;
- Sensitization and training of foremen involved in clearing and earthmoving works to make them able to identify culturally significant features and to report them where required.

Where the site appears to require a specific intervention (such as excavation and further curation of artifacts), notice will be given to the Ministry in charge of Culture. Consultation between the Ministry, UETCL, and the local authorities will take place to develop an appropriate response.
8 VULNERABLE PEOPLE

8.1 IDENTIFICATION OF VULNERABLE PEOPLE

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;
- households made vulnerable as a result of the resettlement and/or compensation process, such as situations where the wife is abandoned after the husband has received cash compensation;
- widows and orphans.

8.2 POTENTIAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES FOR VULNERABLE PEOPLE

UETCL will assist vulnerable people insofar as they are affected by the displacement and resettlement process. Such assistance may include the following activities:
- Identification of vulnerable people and identification of the cause and impacts of their vulnerability, either through direct interviews by a Project social worker or through the community; this step is critical because often vulnerable people do not participate in community meetings, and their disability/vulnerability may remain unknown;
- Identification of required assistance at the various stages of the process: negotiation, compensation, moving;
- Implementation of the measures necessary to assist the vulnerable person; and
- Monitoring and continuation of assistance after resettlement and/or compensation, if required, and/or identification of those entities, whether Governmental or not, that could sustain the Project’s assistance beyond its period of activity.

This process as summarized above is described in greater detail in Section 8.3.

Assistance may take the following forms, depending upon vulnerable persons’ requests and needs:
- Assistance regarding the compensation payment procedure (e.g., specifically explain the process and procedures, make sure that documents are well understood);
- Assistance in the post payment period to secure the compensation money and reduce risks of misuse/robbery;
- Assistance in moving: providing vehicle, driver and assistance at the moving stage, and assisting the person in identifying his/her resettlement plot;
- Construction assistance: providing materials, workforce, or building houses;
- Counselling in matters such as family, health, money management, and livelihood restoration
- Assistance during the post-resettlement period, particularly if the solidarity networks that the vulnerable person was relying on have been affected: food support, health monitoring, etc.; and
- Health care if required at critical periods, particularly the moving and transition periods.

If vulnerable people are moved, or if people locally involved in taking care of non affected vulnerable people are moved, consideration will be given to re-establishing adequate networks of solidarity for vulnerable people.
8.3 PROCESS

UETCL will work with LC1 Councils in identifying vulnerable people and preparing specific assistance measures where needed. The following process will take place:

- Formation of a sub-committee, within each of the significantly affected LC1s, to handle issues related with vulnerable persons,
- Identification by the sub-committee of vulnerable persons requiring assistance, through applications by the vulnerable persons themselves and through identification by social networks in the villages,
- Identification of assistance measures on a case-by-case basis, with the following process:
  o Review of each case by a UETCL/BEL social worker with one sub-committee member, including a visit at home and a detailed interview,
  o Discussion on required assistance measures between the two individuals above and the vulnerable person,
  o Report to the sub-committee on proposed assistance measures,
  o Review and decision by the sub-committee,
  o Implementation of assistance measures,
  o Monitoring.

UETCL will allocate a specific budget to assistance to vulnerable persons (see section Budget).
9 GRIEVANCE MANAGEMENT AND REDRESS

9.1 LIKELY TYPES OF GRIEVANCES AND DISPUTES

In practice, grievances and disputes that are most likely during the implementation of a compensation and resettlement programme such as the Bujagali IP are the following:

- Misidentification of assets or mistakes in valuing them;
- Disputes over plot limits, either between the affected person and the Project, or between two neighbors;
- Dispute over the ownership of a given asset (two individuals claim to be the owner of this asset);
- Disagreement over the valuation (either the unit rate applied or the count) of a plot or other asset;
- Successions, divorces, and other family issues, resulting in disputes between heirs and other family members, over ownership or ownership shares for a given asset;
- Disagreement over resettlement measures, for instance on the location of the resettlement site, on the type or standing of the proposed housing, or over the characteristics of the resettlement plot; and
- Disputed ownership of a business (for instance where the owner and the operator are different persons), which gives rise to conflicts over the compensation sharing arrangements.

9.2 MANAGEMENT MECHANISM

9.2.1 Overview

It often appears that many grievances derive from misunderstandings of the Project policy, or result from neighbor conflicts, which can usually be solved through adequate mediation using customary rules or local administration at the lowest level. Most grievances can be settled with additional explanation efforts and some mediation using customary disputes settlement mechanisms:

- Through explanations (for instance explaining in detail how the Project calculated the complainant’s compensation and that the same rules apply to all); or
- Through arbitration, resorting to elders or individuals well-regarded by the community and external to it.

In contrast, resorting to the judicial system often results in long delays before a case is processed, may result in significant expenses to the complainant, and requires a complex mechanism, involving experts and lawyers, which can fall well beyond the complainant’s control, and be counter-productive to him/her. Also, courts may declare themselves not competent for matters related to informally owned property, which is the case in this project for all affected properties.

The Project thus will put in place an extra-judicial mechanism for managing grievances and disputes based on explanation and mediation by third parties. Each of the affected persons will be able to trigger this mechanism, while still being able to resort to the judicial system. Procedures relevant to this amicable mechanism are detailed below, and will include three different levels (see also Figure 9):

- Registration by UETCL of the complaint, grievance or dispute;
- Processing by UETCL of the grievance or dispute until closure is established based on evidence that acceptable action was taken; and
- In the event where the complainant is not satisfied with action taken by UETCL as a result of the complaint, an amicable mediation can be triggered involving a mediation committee independent from the Project.
Figure 9: Grievance / Dispute Management Mechanism

1st TIER – INTERNAL TO UETCL

Registration by UETCL of the grievance or dispute

Treatment by UETCL of the grievance or dispute

Closure by UETCL of the grievance or dispute

2nd TIER – MEDIATION

Complainant happy with outcome

YES

Final closure

NO

Resort to Mediation Committee

Grievance processing by Mediation Committee

Response of the Mediation Committee

3rd TIER – JUSTICE

Complainant happy with outcome

YES

Final closure

NO

One or the other party resort to Justice
9.2.2 Grievance Registration and Monitoring

UETCL will establish a register of grievances, which will be available at several locations along the route to be determined, including at least Jinja, Mukono, Nansana and Kampala.

The existence of this register, as well as procedures to lodge a complaint (where, when, etc.), will also be broadly communicated by UETCL. The register will be established as of the commencement of resettlement and compensation activities.

For each grievance, a grievance file will be opened, including the following elements:

- Initial grievance sheet (including the description of the grievance), with an acknowledgement of receipt handed back to the complainant when the complaint is registered;
- Grievance monitoring sheet, mentioning actions taken (investigation, corrective measures); and
- Closure sheet, one copy of which will be handed to the complainant after he/she has agreed to the resolution and signed-off.

Grievances will be registered within 7 days of receipt and a response will be provided to the aggrieved party in 30 days or less.

Complaint closure does not necessarily mean that the complainant is happy with action taken (UETCL may decide that the complaint is not founded, and that the RAP principles have been complied with). Closure means that the complainant agrees that action has been taken by UETCL to address the grievance without necessarily being happy with the outcome.

9.2.3 Mediation Committee – Amicable Resolution Mechanism

9.2.3.1 Mediation Committee

Complaints that cannot be closed to the complainant’s satisfaction will be handed over to a mediation committee established at District (LC5) level that will include the following individuals:

- One representative of the LC5 Administration;
- One UETCL representative acting as an observer;
- Three representatives of the affected people, including at least one woman, chosen from LC1 Councillors and/or amongst community based organizations, elders, customary authorities;
- One representative of the witness NGO.

The mediation committee will meet as needed, depending on registered complaints and disputes.

9.2.3.2 Processing

After a complaint or dispute has been registered, UETCL will prepare the technical background to the complaint (for instance, the proposed compensation amount, the list of meetings and interviews with the complainant, a description of the exact reason of the dispute, etc.) for consideration by the mediation committee. The complainant(s) will be invited before the mediation committee, which will mediate and attempt to propose a solution acceptable to both parties (UETCL and complainant). If need be, other meetings will be held and the committee may resort to one of its members to arbitrate in a less formal framework than meetings, if appropriate.

If reached, the agreement will be sanctioned by a memorandum of understanding signed by the parties, and the President of the mediation committee will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of this MoU.

In case this mechanism does not allow to reach an amicable agreement, the aggrieved person keeps at any time the possibility to resort to Justice.
10 MONITORING, EVALUATION AND COMPLETION AUDIT

10.1 GENERAL OBJECTIVES AND APPROACH

Monitoring, evaluation and auditing are key components of the Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan and are an integral parts of UETCL's responsibility and obligations. It has the following general objectives:

- **Monitoring** (as defined here) looks at progress of resettlement and compensation and at specific situations of economic or social difficulties arising from the implementation of the compensation and resettlement process,

- **Auditing** (as defined here) looks at compliance and completion of the resettlement program,

- **Evaluation** (as defined here) looks at outcomes, through an assessment of the short- mid- and long-term impacts of the compensation and resettlement programme on affected households, their incomes and standards of living, the environment, local capacities, housing, etc.

The following monitoring and evaluation approach will be used, whereby different levels of monitoring and evaluation are used:

- **Internal progress (or Input/Output) monitoring:** Measures whether inputs are delivered on schedule and as defined in the RCDAP, and their direct measurable results, for instance:
  - amounts of compensation paid in a given month,
  - progress of construction of resettlement houses,
  - people completing livelihood restoration training courses, etc...
  Monitoring will also seek to document and investigate specific conflict or hardship situations arising from the implementation of the resettlement and compensation program. Monitoring keeps track of project implementation efficiency, and indicates whether changes need to be made to make the programme operate more efficiently. Progress monitoring is done internally by the Project at a frequency determined by the RCDAP for every indicator (in general say every 3 months).

- **Audit of compliance and completion:** Defines whether the RCDAP and applicable requirements have been complied with, and if the implementation can be deemed complete. Following a model successfully used during earlier stages of the Bujagali project and during the 2006 census and valuation exercise, an external entity ("Witness NGO") independently monitors the implementation of the RCDAP.

- **Outcome evaluation:** Defines the extent to which the project is achieving or is likely to achieve the objectives of a program. Resettler businesses established and earning acceptable returns over a reasonable period is an example of an outcome. Outcome evaluation, coupled with output monitoring results, indicate whether the programme is genuinely working and should continue to be implemented as is, or whether some fundamental changes need to be made. In other words, outcome evaluation looks beyond numerical compliance to the longer term impact of programme inputs and outputs, to determine what works, what does not work, and what needs to be changed. Outcome evaluation will be done by an independent entity.

Outcome evaluation often uses proxy (or indirect) indicators. Many people, for example, are reluctant to divulge their actual income. Proxy indicators can be used to help determine whether resettlers are reestablishing (or improving) their livelihoods and standard of living. Indirect indicators may include nutritional status, school attendance, or the purchase of "luxury" items such as motorbikes, generators or televisions.

10.2 INTERNAL PROGRESS MONITORING

During the active phase of resettlement and compensation, the following key progress indicators will be measured internally by UETCL on a quarterly basis:

- Percentage of the Right-Of-Way compensated for;
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- Percentage of the Wayleave compensated for;
- Numbers of households and individuals affected by Project activities;
- Numbers of households and individuals physically displaced as a result of Project activities;
- Numbers of households and individuals economically displaced as a result of Project activities;
- Numbers of households and individuals resettled by the Project;
- Numbers of resettlement houses built;
- Numbers of resettlement houses taken possession of by resettlers;
- Grievances (open, closed); and
- Amounts of compensation paid for each category of lost assets (structures, land, crops, others).

A brief quarterly internal monitoring report will be prepared on this basis. It may be publicly released depending on lenders’ requirements.

Progress monitoring will be carried out internally by UETCL resettlement and compensation unit.

10.3 COMPLIANCE AND COMPLETION AUDITS

10.3.1 Overview

The independent compliance and completion audit will focus on the assessment of compliance with requirements contained in this RCDAP, in the Ugandan legislation, and in the WBG policies. Following the model successfully implemented by AESNP in early stages of the project, it will be based on the involvement of an independent Ugandan entity (“Witness NGO”). It will include:
- Quarterly external reviews (about one-week in duration each) during the active phase of compensation and resettlement,
- A final completion audit at least one year after the last compensation has been effected, or at such time that the auditor will deem appropriate.

10.3.2 Compliance Reviews

Objectives of these quarterly reviews are as follows:
- To assess overall compliance with the RCDAP and applicable legislation and requirements, particularly the following:
  - Compliance with eligibility criteria as described in this RCDAP,
  - Actual delivery of entitlements (compensation and resettlement packages) as described in this RCDAP,
  - Compliance with implementation mechanisms as described in this RCDAP;
- To verify that measures to restore or enhance Project-Affected Peoples’ quality of life and livelihood are being implemented and to assess their effectiveness,
- To assess the extent to which the quality of life and livelihoods of affected communities are being restored in an appropriate manner, based on results of the outcome evaluation mentioned above.

External monitoring reports will be prepared independently by the reviewer and released to the lenders and to the public after review by UETCL for factual accuracy.

10.3.3 Completion Audit

The purpose of the Completion Audit is to establish whether UETCL has implemented all activities needed to ensure compliance with resettlement commitments defined by the RCDAP and applicable policies, and whether resettlement and compensation can be deemed complete.

A key objective of the RCDAP is that resettlement, compensation and other mitigation measures should lead to sustainable restoration or enhancement of affected peoples’ quality of life and income levels. At such time as affected peoples’ quality of life and livelihood can be demonstrated to have been restored, the resettlement and compensation process can be deemed “complete”.
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The completion audit will be carried out by the same auditor as the compliance audit mentioned in the section above ("Witness NGO"). Based on progress indicators gathered by the internal UETCL teams, and on outcome evaluation indicators gathered and validated by the external evaluation team, the auditor will formulate conclusions on the main following topics:

- Have the objectives set forth in the RCDAP been reached in terms of:
  - Identification of affected people and identification of impacts,
  - Compensation for all impacts of all affected people,
  - Timely delivery of entitlements and compliance with Ugandan constitution requirement of "prompt" compensation,
- Has compensation been fair and adequate to mitigate experienced impacts,
- Have livelihoods been restored.

10.4 OUTCOME EVALUATION

10.4.1 Indicators for Outcome Evaluation

Simple socio-economic parameters will be established and monitored annually for a sample of about 20% of PAP, for instance the following:

- Average monetary income, and total income including self-consumption;
- Income indicators, such as nutritional indicators and welfare indicators, including the possession of certain household items (see initial baseline questionnaire),
- Breakdown of household expenditures;
- Surface area of land holdings,
- Crops and estimated or observed yields,
- Number of affected people employed directly by the Project, including contractors and sub-contractors,
- Number of affected people remaining unemployed; and
- Number of children at school.

These indicators will be measured internally by UETCL resettlement and compensation unit, based on specifications established by the external evaluator mentioned in the section below.

10.4.2 Implementation of Outcome Evaluation

UETCL will hire a suitably qualified external evaluator with significant experience in resettlement to carry out two evaluation reviews based on indicators measured by the internal team:

- One review will take place at mid-term of RCDAP implementation (about one and a half year after commencement of implementation);
- The second review will take place two years after the end of RCDAP implementation, when livelihoods are likely to be restored or about to be restored.

Participation of communities in outcome evaluation will be warranted through the following mechanisms:

- Focus groups with affected people (gender specific),
- Focus groups with community leaders,
- Focus groups with representatives of host communities.

Evaluation reports will be publicly released.
11 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACTION PLAN

11.1 PRINCIPLES

The Bujagali Interconnection System is overall a linear project with fairly benign impacts on land use and livelihoods, as the extent of affected land is generally limited, and affected people will in most instances recover land after it has been impacted by the Project for agricultural use. UETCL and BEL have, however, pro-actively decided to dedicate some funds to general development objectives, with communities taking the lead in determining which priority project they would be willing to implement.

The CDAP for the Interconnection System aims to provide intersected communities with developmental benefits beyond mitigation impacts and compensation for loss of assets. The following principles are proposed:

- Focus of the CDAP on quick-impact social infrastructure projects,
- Allocation by UETCL to each of the communities intersected by the system of a community development budget proportional to the magnitude of impacts experienced by each;
- Assistance to communities in identifying eligible projects and preparing project documents for consideration under the CDAP;
- Establishment of eligibility criteria for projects eligible for funding under the CDAP;
- Disbursement of funds against eligible activities based on procedures ensuring a certain level of UETCL control over the actual destination of the funds.

Beyond the obvious benefits to communities in terms of social infrastructure, the CDAP is also viewed as a means to enhance community self-reliance in prioritizing projects, and project implementation capacity building within the community.

11.2 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BUDGET ALLOCATION FORMULA

The formula to allocate community development funds to a given community will be based on:

- Partial proportionality to the magnitude of impacts,
- Partial proportionality to the permanent population living in the community,
- Minimum amount for villages with small population and small length of transmission lines.

The proposed formula is the following:

If:

- \( L \) is the total length of the transmission system (km) – \( L \) is in the order of 100 km (double corridors in the Bujagali area are counted twice)
- \( N \) is the total number of affected communities (\( N \) is in the order of 60)
- \( P \) is the total population of all communities intersected (number of individuals, including both affected and non-affected people) – \( P \) is in the order of 60,000 inhabitants
- \( l_i \) is the length of the transmission system in community \( i \) (in km)
- \( p_i \) is the population of the community \( i \) (number of individuals)
- \( \text{Avg}(l_i) \) is the average length of transmission system intersection (\( L/N \))
- \( \text{Avg}(p_i) \) is the average community population (number of individuals) (\( P/N \))
- \( B \) is the total budget allocated to the whole CDAP for the interconnection system
- \( b_i \) is the budget allocated for community \( i \)

\[
b_i = B/N \cdot \left[ \frac{l_i}{\text{Avg}(l)} \times 0.3 + \frac{p_i}{\text{Avg}(p)} \times 0.3 + 0.4 \right]
\]

This formula gives equal weight to population and length of impact (each weighted by a coefficient of 0.3). Through coefficient 0.4, a minimum amount is made available to smaller communities with limited impacts (no
community would get less than B/N x 0.4, or about USD 2,000. These coefficients can easily be changed after consultation if consulted communities would prefer to give more weight one given factor.

As an example, for a total budget of USD 300,000, and assuming 60 communities (LC1) are interested, the average funding received by a community is USD 5,000. Based on the above formula, no community would receive less than USD 2,000.

Through the application of the above formula, assuming B (total budget) is USD 300,000, a community of 1,000 in population intersected by 1.5 km of transmission line would receive USD 4,850.

Areas where the Interconnection System intersects large estates (such as the SCOUR sugar cane plantation and the Mehta tea plantation, as well as the Mabira Forest) are not considered to be community-land and should therefore be excluded from the calculation.

11.3 ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

11.3.1 Categories of Eligible Projects

Only community projects are eligible. Projects benefiting individuals or companies are not eligible to the CDAP funding.

Examples of typical eligible projects include:

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

Communities will be allowed and encouraged to seek additional funding (from local or international NGOs, from embassies, from LC5 budget, from affluent individuals or from private companies) to be able to develop more substantial projects.

There will need to be further community consultation to determine whether projects such as the following could be considered as eligible:

- LC1 officials' accommodation,
- Teachers or health center staff accommodation,
- Religious buildings, such as churches or mosques.

11.3.2 Sustainability and Management Requirements

Communities will have to demonstrate that their project is sustainable for their application to the CDAP funding to be considered. This will usually involve:

- Establishing a management committee, which will take care of construction, funding, and further management once the project is operational,
- Preparing a brief project document (1 to 2 pages), demonstrating how long-term sustainability will be achieved, particularly when the project involves recurrent cost (water points, maintenance of community buildings), for instance through household contributions or otherwise – this project document will be part of the application form described in further sections.
11.4 AWARENESS AND CONSULTATION

UETCL will consult with interested communities ahead of the CDAP implementation with the following objectives:
- Creating awareness of the program, of its eligibility criteria, and of its procedures;
- Fine-tuning coefficients in the formula described above, to reflect general community consensus as best as possible,
- Establishing management committees in each of the intersected communities, in view of the preparation of the community application, of the management of the construction phase, and of the further management of the operation of the facility built or upgraded as part of the CDAP.

11.5 DISBURSEMENT PROCEDURES

11.5.1 Community Application

As mentioned above, communities will have to apply to benefit from the CDAP. Application dossiers will include the following:
- List of the members of the management committee,
- Description of the project,
- Minutes of meetings demonstrating consensus on the proposed project,
- Brief demonstration that the proposed project meets CDAP eligibility criteria,
- Brief demonstration that the proposed project is sustainable,
- Budget and sources of funding, including the CDAP contribution,
- Proposed implementation arrangements (who will construct, community contribution to construction).

Where the budget of a project does not exactly match the available funding, the community could benefit from limited amounts of construction materials (such as cement or iron sheets) to balance the difference. These would then be delivered in-kind, on the condition that the community can demonstrate that these materials will indeed be used for community purposes.

11.5.2 Project Review Committees

Project Review Committees will be established at District level, including the following members:
- UETCL representatives,
- LC5 representatives,
- Selected LC1 representatives.

These project review committees will review community application, and will also process grievances related to the CDAP implementation if any.

11.5.3 Disbursement Procedures

The disbursement process will involve the following:
- Establishment by the community of a detailed budget (see above 11.5.1),
- Payment by UETCL against actual expenditures, based on contractors’ or suppliers invoices.

Community committees will be audited by UETCL representatives at least once to check that actual expenditures match UETCL’s disbursements.
11.6 IMPLEMENTATION

11.6.1 Responsibilities for Implementation

See Section 12 of this document. Assistance to communities in identifying projects for consideration under the CDAP will be provided by a dedicated team within the implementation unit described in section 12.1.1 and Figure 10.

11.6.2 Budget

The CDAP budget, excluding implementation costs (See Section Budget) is USD 300,000.
12 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RCDAP

12.1 IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

12.1.1 RCDAP Implementation Unit

UETCL and BEL will put in place a dedicated unit for the implementation of this RCDAP, under the leadership of a RCDAP manager.

The organization chart of this unit is presented in Figure 10 below. It will be established for a period of 24 months. Staff involved in livelihood restoration activities will have longer assignments, as deemed appropriate given the results observed and assessed. In general, the staffing will be sized to match the project needs at any given moment.

12.1.2 Involvement of Other Parties

Other parties will be involved in the implementation of the RCDAP, as follows:

- At LC1 level: LC1 representatives will take an active part in further identification of affected households and valuation of affected assets, particularly where speculative attempts are suspected, and in Cash Compensation Review Committees as described in Section 6.6 above;
- At LC2 level: Parish Land Committees are involved in the validation and sign-off of compensation certificates;
- At LC5 level: District Land Boards are to establish and update compensation rates.

In addition, following the model successfully used by AESNP in earlier phases of the Project, a specific Cultural Features Compensation mechanism will be put in place to review compensation for shrines and possibly other cultural features, particularly to review and validate with affected persons the cost of the relocation of shrines and associated ceremonies.

Lastly, a Mediation Committee will be established at District level as described in Section 9 to review and mediate claims and disputes.
Figure 10: Implementation of the RCDAP – Organization Chart

- **Witness NGO**
  - Support staff: secretarial services, drivers, security personnel, general accounts, legal
  - Monitoring & Evaluation: internal monitoring officer, grievance officer, external auditors

- **BEL**
- **UETCL**

- **RCDAP Manager**

- **Survey, Identification & Valuation**
  - Surveyors
  - Valuers
  - "Option disclosure and agreement" officers

- **Resettlement**
  - Urban planner and architect (consultants)
  - Engineers / construction supervisors

- **Cash Compensation**
  - Compensation officers
  - Accountant – Security officer

- **Database Management**
  - Database officers

- **Livelihood Restoration**
  - Agriculture specialist
  - Small business specialist

- **Vulnerable People**
  - Social worker

- **Community Development**
  - Engineer
  - Community mobilizer

---
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12.2 BUDGET

The preliminary budget for implementation of the RCDAP is presented in Table 19 hereunder. A detailed budget for the RCDAP has been prepared based on preliminary estimates of cash compensation for large estates (tea plantations and Mabira Forest), structures, land and businesses. Only summaries are provided as the detailed budget is kept confidential.

Table 19: RCDAP Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Cost (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RESETTLEMENT SITES AND HOUSING</td>
<td>2 932 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CASH COMPENSATION</td>
<td>9 087 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LIVELIHOOD RESTORATION</td>
<td>305 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural package, Training, &amp; Business Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>2 148 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing, Consultants, Witness NGO, Logistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>300 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CONTINGENCIES 15%</td>
<td>2 170 913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>16 943 663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDICES
APPENDIX 1 – IDENTIFICATION AND VALUATION DOSSIER
PLOT REF: ____________

SURVEYOR: ________________

UETCL/B.E.L. – TRANSMISSION LINES

AFFECTED PLOT - IDENTIFICATION AND SURVEY FORM

DATE: ________________

VILLAGE: ____________________________

MAIN AFFECTED LAND USER:
(Surname, First Name, Other Names – If Several Land Users Are Affected Please Refer to Table on Page 5 of this Form)

RESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: __________________________________________________________

POSTAL ADDRESS: _____________________________________________________________

TELEPHONE NUMBER: ___________________________________________________________

TYPE OF LAND:
Circle appropriate codes / line out incorrect codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Land</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailo</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Land</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freehold</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATUS OF LAND OCCUPATION BY AFFECTED LAND USER:
Circle appropriate codes / line out incorrect codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Occupation</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td>LO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Owner</td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Tenant</td>
<td>COT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensee</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibanja</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaseholder</td>
<td>LH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customary Tenure</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify below)</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If applicable:
NAME / ADDRESS / PHONE NUMBER OF LANDOWNER
## Plot Co-ordinates

### Projection / System of Coordinates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point Number</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Monument / Marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use additional sheet if more points are needed

- **Total Plot Acreage:** __________ Acres Or __________ m²
- **Of Which Total Affected Acreage:** __________ Acres Or __________ m²
- **Of Which:** Wayleave: __________ Acres Or __________ m²
- **Right of Way:** __________ Acres Or __________ m²
Sketch of Entire Plot with Affected Area

IN THE FIELD: Rough Sketch shape and size of plot indicating structures, gardens, boundaries between land users within the plot if applicable and structures if applicable. Number the structures consistent with numbering on valuation form.
ONCE BACK IN OFFICE: Final sketch as per coordinates above
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land User's Name</th>
<th>Status (L/T/CO)</th>
<th>DESIGNATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEIGHBOUR BOUNDARY VERIFICATION**

I hereby verify that these are the borders between the above plot and myself described on this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBOURS SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DIRECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SURVEYOR'S COMMENTS**

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________
LAND USER BOUNDARY VERIFICATION

I (Land User) hereby verify that these are my borders described on the above form.

DATED this ________________ day of ________________ 2006

LAND USER
Sign: __________________________
Name: __________________________
Title: __________________________

SURVEYOR
Sign: __________________________
Name: __________________________
Title: __________________________

FOR - PARISH LAND COMMITTEE
Sign: __________________________
Name: __________________________
Title: __________________________

REPRESENTATIVE – LC 1
Sign: __________________________
Name: __________________________
Title: __________________________

REPRESENTATIVE UETCL/BEL / BIU
Sign: __________________________
Name: __________________________
Title: __________________________
**AFFECTED HOUSEHOLD - IDENTIFICATION FORM**

**DATE:** ____________  **VILLAGE:** ________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

**PLOT LOCATION:** ________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________  **PLOT REFERENCE:** ________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

**MAIN AFFECTED LAND USER:** ________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

(Surname, First Name, Other Names — If Several Land Users Are Affected Please Refer to Table on Page 5 of this Form)

**RESIDENTIAL ADDRESS:** ________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

**POSTAL ADDRESS:** ________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** ________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

**HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Member</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Residing on Affected Land (YES / NO)</th>
<th>Photo File Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (18 and more)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (Under 18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Dependents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**AFFECTED PLOT - VALUATION FORM**

**Stakeholder Information**

Date of valuation: ____ / ____ / ____  
Name of Village: ________________________

Sub-County: ________________ County: ________________ District: ________________

Land Owner: ____________________________  
(Surname, First Name)

**Services on Affected Plot (Tick Applicable Box):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power with private meter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped Water with metered private connection</td>
<td>Other (specify):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped Water with public standtap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFFECTED LAND USERS ON THE AFFECTED PLOT OF LAND**  
(LICENSEES/TENANTS/CO-OWNERS, NOT INCLUDING OCCUPANTS OF STRUCTURES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFFECTED LAND USER'S NAME</th>
<th>STATUS (L/T/CO)</th>
<th>REFERENCE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### UETCL/B.E.L. – TRANSMISSION LINES

**Affected Structures – Non Permanent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Building Type (e.g., kitchen residence, latrine, etc...)</th>
<th>Category (see numbering of categories below)</th>
<th>Conditon</th>
<th>Owner of structure (Full Name of Owner)</th>
<th>Occupant of structure (Full Name of Household Head – Use several lines for one structure if several households occupy it)</th>
<th>Status of Occupation (Owner/Co-Owner/Tenant/Other: specify)</th>
<th>Dimensions (m x m)</th>
<th>Number of Rooms</th>
<th>Surf. Area (m²)</th>
<th>Photo (file reference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bee hive shaped grass hut earth floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mud and wattle grass roof earth floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mud and wattle roof earth cemented walls and grass roof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mud and wattle earth cemented walls and grass roof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mud and Wattle Debe roof cemented floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mud and Wattle Debe roof cemented floor smooth walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mud and Wattle Mabati roof earth floor smooth walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mud and Wattle Mabati roof earth floor rough walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mud and Wattle Mabati roof earth floor smooth walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mud and Wattle Mubati roof cement floor smooth walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mud and Wattle Mubati roof cement floor rough walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mud and Wattle Mubati roof cement floor rough walls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Bee hive shaped grass hut earth floor
2. Mud and wattle grass roof earth floor
3. Mud and wattle grass roof smooth floor
4. Mud and wattle earth cemented walls and grass roof
5. Mud and Wattle grass roof cemented floor rough walls
6. Mud and Wattle grass roof cemented floor smooth walls
7. Mud and Wattle Debe roof cemented floor
8. Mud and Wattle Mabati roof earth floor rough walls
9. Mud and Wattle Mabati roof earth floor smooth walls
10. Mud and Wattle Mubati roof cement floor smooth walls
11. Mud and Wattle Mubati roof cement floor rough walls
12. Mud and Wattle Mubati roof cement floor rough walls

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># (consistent with sketch on survey form)</th>
<th>Building Type (e.g. kitchen residence, latrine, etc.)</th>
<th>Type of Construction</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Owner of structure (Full Name of Owner)</th>
<th>Occupant of structure (Full Name of Household Head - Use several lines for one structure if several households occupy it)</th>
<th>Status of Occupation (Owner/Co-Owner/ Tenant/ Other: specify)</th>
<th>Dimensions (m x m)</th>
<th>Numb. Of Rooms</th>
<th>Surf. Area (m²)</th>
<th>Photo (file ref.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1- New</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2- Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3- Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4- Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5- Ruin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Graves on Affected Plot**

Number of Graves / Identification / Description / Dimensions / Finish

**Fences on Affected Plot**

Identification / Description / Dimensions / Finish

**Religious / Spiritual Sites / Shrines**

Identification / Description / Dimensions / Finish

**Others**
**Crop Survey**  
Stakeholder (Landowner/Co-owner/Tenant/Licensee)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Crop / Tree</th>
<th>Quantity and Unit of Measurement</th>
<th>Description/Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INITIALS:**  
Valuer:  
Name:  
Stakeholder:  
Name:  
Rep. Parish Land Committee:  
Name:  
Rep. LC 1:  
Name:  
Rep. BEL / BIU:  
Name:  
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NOTICE:

I understand that this form is not the agreement to buy my land or place an encumbrance upon my land or to compensate me. I understand that I must continue farming as usual until further notice.

I have read the above information and agree that the information on this form is true, full and complete.

Dated this _____ day of ____________, 2006

LAND/CROP OWNER
Sign: ____________________________
Name: ____________________________

VALUER
Sign: ____________________________
Name: ____________________________
Title/Firm: ________________________

REPRESENTATIVE – LC 1 (In witness)
Sign: ____________________________
Name: ____________________________
TITLE: ____________________________

PARISH LAND COMMITTEE MEMBER (In witness)
Sign: ____________________________
Name: ____________________________
TITLE: ____________________________

REPRESENTATIVE – BEL / BIU
Sign: ____________________________
Name: ____________________________
Title: ____________________________
APPENDIX 2 – SOCIO-ECONOMIC QUESTIONNAIRE
### AFFECTED HOUSEHOLD – SOCIO-ECONOMIC FORM

**Date of Interview:** [______]  
**Village:** [______]

### SECTION 1  
**FAMILY INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LO</th>
<th>Tenant</th>
<th>Licensee</th>
<th>Co-owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Household Head** [___________  
(Surname, First Name)]

**Photo Ref:** [______]  
**Sex:** [______]

**Date/Year of Birth:** [______]  
**Age:** [______] **exact/approximate**  
(circle appropriate response)

Where were you born? [______]  
When did you come here? [______]

Are your parents alive? [Yes/No]  
If alive, which? [______]

Where do/did your parents live? [______]

Identecard/Graduated Tax/Other ID [______]  
Presented? [Yes/No]  
**ID No:** [______]

Name on ID [____________________]  
Address on ID [____________________]

**Marital Status:** (circle appropriate response)  
Single  Married (no of spouses)  Divorced  Widowed

**Tribe/Clan:** [____________________]

**Village:** [____________________]

**Main Occupation of Head of Household:** [____________________]

Where do you work? [____________________]

**Religion:**  
Catholic  Protestant  Muslim  Other [____________________]

Is the affected plot a principal place of residence? (circle appropriate response)  
Yes / No.
### HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Member</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Residing on Affected Land (YES/NO)</th>
<th>Literacy Level (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (18 and more)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (Under 18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Dependents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Literacy Levels:  
1: Illiterate  
2: Can read and write  
3: Complete Primary Education  
4: Complete Secondary Education  
5: Complete University Education
### SECTION 2 HOUSEHOLD LAND HOLDINGS AND ASSETS

#### Agricultural Plots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Village)</th>
<th>Surface Acres</th>
<th>Status of Occupation (Owner/Co-Owner/Tenant/COT/Licensee)</th>
<th>Agricultural Use (Crops typically grown)</th>
<th>Affected (Yes/No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O CO T/COT L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O CO T/COT L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O CO T/COT L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O CO T/COT L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O CO T/COT L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Residential Plots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Village)</th>
<th>Surface Acres</th>
<th>Status of Occupation (Owner/Co-Owner/Tenant/COT/Licensee)</th>
<th>Structures on Plot</th>
<th>Affected (Yes/No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O CO T/COT L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O CO T/COT L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O CO T/COT L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Village)</th>
<th>Construction materials (Permanent/Non Permanent)</th>
<th>Status of Occupation (Owner/Co-Owner/Tenant)</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Affected (Yes/No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>O CO T/COT L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>O CO T/COT L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>O CO T/COT L</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION 3  
#### LIVELIHOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cash Ug. Shillings for year 2005</th>
<th>In Kind e.g. Cow/Labour/Grain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income from Household Enterprises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop Farming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agricultural Income (eg Livestock, Poultry)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Agricultural Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent received from rented property (land, housing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family allowances/social security benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remittances and assistance received from others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (inheritance, alimony, scholarships, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal employment income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have a bank account? *(circle appropriate response)*  
Yes / No  
If yes, where? (e.g. bank name, location, distance): 

### SECTION 4  
#### HEALTH & VULNERABILITY

Are there disabled or chronically ill people in the household?  
**YES**  **NO**  
If YES:  
- Type of disability/illness: 
- Type of care required: 

Number of births & deaths over the last 12 months in the household:  
- Births: 
- Deaths: Cause: 

What are the most common diseases that affect the family?  
-  
-  
-  
-  
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What is the nearest health facility known to the family? 
Is it actually used by the family? YES NO
If NO, why? 
Do you practice family planning? YES NO
Have you heard of HIV/AIDS? YES NO
How is HIV/AIDS contracted? 
How can HIV/AIDS be avoided? 

**SECTION 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare Indicators</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does everyone in the household have at least two sets of clothes?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does anyone in the household own a radio? <em>(add telephone/fixed or mobile)</em></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does anyone in the household own a mobile telephone?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does anyone in the household own a fixed telephone?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the household have a bicycle?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the household have any other transport equipment other than a bicycle?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what type of vehicle?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If someone in the household had a serious problem, is there anybody in this settlement that you could ask assistance from?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where do you get drinking water from: Distance from residence ________ metres
Do you fish in the present situation: YES NO
If YES, where? ________________ How often? ________________
Do you hunt in the present situation: YES NO
If YES, where? ________________ How often? ________________

What fuel do you use in the household:
- Firewood
- Paraffin/Kerosene
- Gas
-Blogas
- Charcoal
- Electricity
- Solar
- Other

**SECTION 6**

Include Relocation Preferences if the Household is potentially physically displaced
**NOTICE:**

*I understand that this form is not the agreement to buy my land or place an encumbrance upon my land or to compensate me. I understand that I must continue farming as usual until further notice.*

I have read the above information and agree that the information on this form is true, full and complete.

Dated this ____ day of ____________, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSEHOLD HEAD</th>
<th>ENUMERATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign: _______________</td>
<td>Sign: _______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: _______________</td>
<td>Name: _______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title/Firm: _______________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPRESENTATIVE – LC 1 (In witness)</th>
<th>PARISH LAND COMMITTEE MEMBER (In witness)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign: _______________</td>
<td>Sign: _______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: _______________</td>
<td>Name: _______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE: ____________________</td>
<td>TITLE: ____________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPRESENTATIVE – BEL / BIU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign: _______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: _______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: ____________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3 – MABIRA FOREST VALUATION REPORT (EXECUTIVE SUMMARY)
Bujagali Interconnection Project – Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan

Economic Assessment of Resource Values Affected by the 220 KV Powerline Wayleave Traversing Mabira, Kifu and Namyyo Central Forest Reserves

October, 2006

Yakobo Moyini, PhD, Principal Associate, YOMA Consultants

Executive Summary

In order to evacuate electricity from the proposed power plant at Dumbell Island on the River Nile and carry it to Kampala and other parts of Uganda, a 220 KV transmission line is to be installed. The proposed routing of the line passes through Mabira, Kifu and Namyyo CFRs. The powerline Wayleave traversing the three forests is 40 metres wide on the northern side of the existing 132 KV line.

Both the National Environment Act and the National Forestry and Tree Planting Act require that for certain major developments such as the installation of the powerline through the three forests, an environmental impact assessment (or environmental impact study) should be carried out. The same requirement holds in respect of the World Bank environmental and social safeguard policies. This report constitutes part of the environmental impact assessment process. In particular, the study is concerned with assessing the economic impact of the development in terms of resources lost and benefits foregone. The estimates were derived from both primary and secondary data and follows the principle of total economic value of forests.

The results of the study suggest a timber stock (50 cm + dbh) worth UShs 224.7 million will be lost in Mabira CFR. The present value of benefit streams obtained from long-run sustainable yield in Mabira CFR and timber values foregone in the plantations of Kifu and Namyyo CFRs was estimated at UShs 138.3 million. Furthermore, the present value of other annual benefit streams from forest products, biodiversity, domestic water, carbon storage and ecotourism – was estimated at UShs 32.8 million. The present value of annual ground rent payments was calculated to be UShs 11.8 million. Other values which include: compensations for private land enclave and immature tree plantings; and incremental management costs had a present value of UShs 28.5 million. Hence the total values lost or foregone was estimated at UShs 436.1 million.

Of the total amount of values lost or foregone, the NFA realises UShs 224.7 million from the disposal of the standing crop in Mabira CFR through its auction process. The Developer on the other hand, should compensate the NFA for lost forest benefits and added management responsibilities to the tune of UShs 211.4 million. The table below shows a summary of economic values lost or foregone.
## Impact Area Economic Values (UShs '000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Sources</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. NATURAL FOREST GROWING STOCK</strong></td>
<td>224,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. PRESENT VALUE OF BENEFITS STREAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Timber</td>
<td>138,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Poles + Firewood</td>
<td>4,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Non-Timber Forest Products</td>
<td>4,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Biodiversity</td>
<td>1,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Domestic Water</td>
<td>3,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Carbon Storage</td>
<td>16,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ecotourism</td>
<td>2,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Landtake</td>
<td>11,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SubTotal B</strong></td>
<td>182,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. OTHERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Private Land Enclave</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Immature tree plantings</td>
<td>1,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Management Costs</td>
<td>26,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SubTotal C</strong></td>
<td>28,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. TOTAL (B+C)</strong></td>
<td>211,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. TOTAL (A+B+C)</strong></td>
<td>436,127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4 – KAMPALA DISTRICT COMPENSATION RATES
## PART ONE: FOOD CROPS / VEGETATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS</th>
<th>RATE PER (SQUARE METER UNIT, STOOL, TREE, CLUMP) (SHS.)</th>
<th>STEM</th>
<th>ACRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BANANA (MATOOKE) GONJA</strong></td>
<td><strong>a)</strong> Mature and good; maximum of three plants per clump which at least one stems with a bunch well-pruned, weed free well mulched. Well water channeled. (<em>Per Clump</em>)</td>
<td>7,500/=</td>
<td>2,000/=</td>
<td>3,000,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) <strong>Mature and Average;</strong> Four to five plants per clump, localized pockets of weed, distorted spacing, disintegrated mulch, average maintenance of drainage and water channels.</td>
<td>6,000/=</td>
<td>1,500/=</td>
<td>2,250,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) <strong>Mature and Poor;</strong> Neglect field, intercropped, spacing of clumps not easily determined poorly maintained drainage and water channels.</td>
<td>1,500/=</td>
<td>750/=</td>
<td>1,680,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) <strong>Young and Good;</strong> Well-spaced, intercropped, significant cost for land preparation and sucker procurement and treatment.</td>
<td>4,500/=</td>
<td>1,500/=</td>
<td>1,850,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) <strong>Young and Poor:</strong> Neglected weed paste and disease infected, poor spacing.</td>
<td>800/=</td>
<td>500/=</td>
<td>840,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BANANA (SWEET) BOGOYA, NDIZI, MBIDDE, KISUBI</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>Mature and Good (Per clump)</strong></td>
<td>6,000/=</td>
<td>1,500/=</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Mature and Average</strong></td>
<td>4,500/=</td>
<td>1,500/=</td>
<td>1,800,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Mature and Poor</strong></td>
<td>3,000/=</td>
<td>750/=</td>
<td>1,350,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Young and Poor</strong></td>
<td>850/=</td>
<td>300/=</td>
<td>600,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASSAVA</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>Mature and Good:</strong></td>
<td>3,700/=</td>
<td>1,480,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Mature and Average</strong></td>
<td>2,500/=</td>
<td>1,000,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Young and Good</strong></td>
<td>1,650/=</td>
<td>660,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Poor</strong></td>
<td>750/=</td>
<td>300/=</td>
<td>700,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COFFEE (CLONEL)</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>Mature and Good (Per Tree)</strong></td>
<td>9,000/=</td>
<td>3,600,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Mature and average</strong></td>
<td>6,000/=</td>
<td>2,400,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Mature and Poor</strong></td>
<td>4,500/=</td>
<td>1,800,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Young and Good</strong></td>
<td>3,500/=</td>
<td>1,400,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COFFEE (ARABICA)</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>Mature and Good</strong></td>
<td>9,500/=</td>
<td>3,800,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>ASSUMPTIONS</td>
<td>RATE PER (SQUARE METER UNIT, STOOL, TREE, CLUMP) (SHS.)</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mature and average</td>
<td>8,000/=</td>
<td>3,200,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mature and Poor</td>
<td>4,800/=</td>
<td>1,920,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young and Good</td>
<td>5,600/=</td>
<td>2,240,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young and Poor</td>
<td>3,800/=</td>
<td>1,520,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COFFEE (ROBUSTA)</td>
<td>Mature and Good (Per Tree)</td>
<td>7,500/=</td>
<td>3,000,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mature and average</td>
<td>6,000/=</td>
<td>1,200,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mature and Poor</td>
<td>3,500/=</td>
<td>900,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young and Good</td>
<td>5,250/=</td>
<td>335,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young and Poor</td>
<td>2,250/=</td>
<td>675,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRISH POTATOES</td>
<td>Good and mature; expected yield 3 kgs per square meter, 4,000 mounds an acre, pest and disease free. (Per Square meter)</td>
<td>1,200/=</td>
<td>1,200,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor/Mature</td>
<td>1,000/=</td>
<td>720,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor spacing and agronomy diseased and poor soils</td>
<td>800/=</td>
<td>470,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young and Good</td>
<td>500/=</td>
<td>315,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND NUTS</td>
<td>Well attended and good</td>
<td>Per plant 400/=</td>
<td>850,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>225/=</td>
<td>480,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>150/=</td>
<td>320,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIZE</td>
<td>Mature, young and good expected yield of 15 bags per acre at least weeded twice, good spacing:</td>
<td>Per plant 150/=</td>
<td>380,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>100/=</td>
<td>250,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>75/=</td>
<td>185,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORGHUM</td>
<td>Good; pest free, expected yield 1000 kgs/acre (Per Square meter)</td>
<td>225/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILLET</td>
<td>Good; weed free, well maintained, pest free</td>
<td>250/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEANS</td>
<td>Mature and Good; not harvested, well spaced, pest free</td>
<td>675/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>ASSUMPTIONS</td>
<td>RATE PER (SQUARE METER UNIT, STOOL, TREE, CLUMP) (SHS.)</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>ACRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mature and Poor; green yellow leaves due to nitrogen deficiency practice of crop husbandry.</td>
<td>450/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mature &amp; Poor neglected, weed infected</td>
<td>300/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEET POTATOES</td>
<td>Mature and Good; if not harvested, pest free, good soils, about 4000 mounds per acre expected, spacing 1m x 1m. (Per Square meter)</td>
<td>750/=</td>
<td>500,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mature and Poor; if not harvested, not properly managed</td>
<td>500/=</td>
<td>330,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young and Good</td>
<td>340/=</td>
<td>250,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young and Poor</td>
<td>225/=</td>
<td>165,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABBAGES</td>
<td>Mature and Good; pest and weed free, spaced about 90 x 60 cm, 4000 plants per acre average (Per Plant)</td>
<td>500/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mature and Average</td>
<td>400/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young and Good</td>
<td>300/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young and Poor</td>
<td>200/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOMATOES</td>
<td>Mature and Good (Per Plant)</td>
<td>1,500/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved variety; well spaced about 90 x 45cm staked and sprayed, weed free</td>
<td>800/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Variety: Young and Good</td>
<td>500/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN VEGETABLES</td>
<td>Mature and Good (Per square meter)</td>
<td>900/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACK-FRUIT</td>
<td>Mature and Good (Per tree)</td>
<td>75,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>45,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium size</td>
<td>30,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mature and Poor</td>
<td>7,500/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young (up to 1 year old)</td>
<td>3,750/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINEAPPLE</td>
<td>Mature and Good (Per plant)</td>
<td>1,000/=</td>
<td>1,500,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sucker and Poor</td>
<td>450/=</td>
<td>600,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUGAR CANE</td>
<td>Mature and Good</td>
<td>1,000/=</td>
<td>1,200,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mature and Poor</td>
<td>400/=</td>
<td>500,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average and Poor</td>
<td>600/=</td>
<td>750,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEPHANT GRASS</td>
<td>Per Square Meter</td>
<td>50/=</td>
<td>450,000/=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANGO TREE</td>
<td>Mature and Good (Per Tree)</td>
<td>60,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average yielding</td>
<td>45,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young and Poor</td>
<td>12,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young (above 4 months old)</td>
<td>4,500/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young (below 4 months old)</td>
<td>800/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ITEM                | ASSUMPTIONS                           | RATE PER
(SQUARE METER UNIT, STOOL, TREE, CLUMP) (SHS.) | STEM | ACRE |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAWPAW TREE</td>
<td>Mature and Good (Per Plant)</td>
<td>15,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young and Poor</td>
<td>2,100/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young (below 2 months old)</td>
<td>750/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUMPKIN</td>
<td>Mature and yielding (Per Plant)</td>
<td>7,500/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young and Poor</td>
<td>1,500/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAMS (BALUGU/ENDAGU)</td>
<td>Balugu/Mature</td>
<td>750/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balugu/Young</td>
<td>300/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endagu/Mature</td>
<td>450/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endgu/Young</td>
<td>150/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOBE/MPINDI</td>
<td>Mature (Per Square meter)</td>
<td>3,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>1,500/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAS (PIGEON)</td>
<td>Mature and Good</td>
<td>3,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NKOLIMBO]</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>2,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIMA PEAS/CASTROR OIL PLANT</td>
<td>Per tree</td>
<td>1,200/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAWO/COW PEAS</td>
<td>Good (Per Plant)</td>
<td>550/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>450/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOYA BEANS</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>750/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>225/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGG PLANT (BILINGANYA, NTULA, ETC.)</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>1,200/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>750/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITRUS TREES (LEMON, ORANGE, TANGERINE)</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>25,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young and Good (over one year)</td>
<td>7,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor and Mature</td>
<td>5,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young (up to 1 year)</td>
<td>3,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUAVA AND NSALI</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>12,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>6,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVOCADO</td>
<td>Mature and Good</td>
<td>65,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mature and Average (medium size)</td>
<td>45,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young (below one year)</td>
<td>2,500/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMBULA</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>45,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>30,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>7,500/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSION FRUIT</td>
<td>Local Breed:</td>
<td>20,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mature and Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bujagali Interconnection Project – Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS</th>
<th>RATE PER (SQUARE METER UNIT, STOOL, TREE, CLUMP) (SHS.)</th>
<th>STEM</th>
<th>ACRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average and Yielding</td>
<td>10,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young and Poor</td>
<td>3,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young (below 6 months old)</td>
<td>5,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exotic Breed:</td>
<td>Mature and good</td>
<td>30,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average and Yielding</td>
<td>20,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young and Poor</td>
<td>5,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young (below 6 months old)</td>
<td>2,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RICE (Paddy)</strong></td>
<td>Mature (Per metre square)</td>
<td>200/=</td>
<td></td>
<td>800,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>150/=</td>
<td></td>
<td>300,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>500/=</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>300/=</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HERBAL TREES/PLANTS</strong></td>
<td>Moringa, Nim, etc</td>
<td>Good/mature</td>
<td>7,000/= per plant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>3,500/= per plant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young and Good</td>
<td>Young and Good</td>
<td>2,000/= per plant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seedling</td>
<td>Seedling</td>
<td>1,000/= per plant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VANILLA</strong></td>
<td>Mature and Good (Per plant)</td>
<td>15,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mature and Poor</td>
<td>10,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young (above 4 months old)</td>
<td>5,000/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young (below 4 months old)</td>
<td>3,500/=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Giovannetti – December 2006
### TIMBER TREES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMBER TREES (FIRST CLASS)</th>
<th>60cm diametre and above</th>
<th>65,000/= per tree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahogany, Mvule, Nkoba, Nzingu, Nkalati, Mukusu, Mpewere, Nongo, Mugavu, Mukebo, Mumuli.</td>
<td>Below 60cm diametre (medium)</td>
<td>45,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pole size</td>
<td>30,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young (about one year)</td>
<td>5,000/=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMBER TREES (SECOND CLASS)</th>
<th>Below 60cm diametre (medium)</th>
<th>45,000/=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nkuzanyana, Lufugo, Cypress, Musizi, Muwafu, Musambya, Eucalyptus, Pine, Nkulaido (for Match Sticks), Coniferous.</td>
<td>Pole size (tel. Size)</td>
<td>1,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rafter size (build size about one year)</td>
<td>1,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below one year but not seeding</td>
<td>500/=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TIMBER TREES (THIRD CLASS) | 60cm diametre and below (medium) | 7,000/= |
|----------------------------| Pole size and below | 3,000/= |
| Nkago, Mubajjangalabi, Lunaba, Kirudu, Mutuba, Mukokowe, Mululu, Mutumba, Cassia, Mukunyu, Ekifabakazi | Young (below 6 months old) | 2,000/= |
### Part Three: Other Trees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ASSUMPTION</th>
<th>RATE PER (SQUARE METER UNIT STOOL, TREE, CLUMP) (SHS.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bambu</td>
<td>Clump</td>
<td>8,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconut</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>20,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>10,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1,200/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponges (Kyangwe)</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>1,500/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>500/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental Trees</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Per plant 5,200/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3,000/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other flowers (Small 700/=) (300/=)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,700/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedge Tree (Fences)</td>
<td>Cypress hedge</td>
<td>5,000/= per metre run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kie-apple</td>
<td>5,500/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Hedge trees</td>
<td>2,000/=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART FOUR: SEMI PERMANENT STRUCTURES

| i. | Grass thatched roof, mud and wattle walls, earth floor | 15,000/= |
| ii. | Grass thatched roof, smooth mud and wattle walls, earth floor | 20,000/= |
| iii. | Grass thatched roof, plastered mud and wattle walls, earth floor | 30,000/= |
| iv. | GCIS roof, rough mud and wattle walls, earth floor | 40,000/= |
| v. | GCIS roof, smooth mud and wattle walls, earth floor | 50,000/= |
| vi. | GCIS roof, plastered mud and wattle walls, rough floor | 75,000/= |
| vii. | GCIS roof, plastered mud and wattle walls, cement screed floor | 50,000/= |
| viii. | GCIS roof, un-burnt brick walls, earth floor | 80,000/= |
| ix. | GCIS roof, un-burnt walls, cement floor | 100,000/= |
| x. | Asbestos Sheets roof, un-burnt brick walls, cemented floor | 20,000/= |

PART FIVE: OTHER CONSTRUCTIONS

| Grave | Earthed | 200,000/= |
|       | Cemented | 350,000/= |
|       | Tiled (ceramic, marble, etc.) | 500,000/= |

| Racks | Reeds | Per m² 2,500/= |
|       | Sheets | 2,000/= |
|       | Wire Mesh | 1,500/= |

| Coffee Drying tables | Cemented | Per m² 12,000/= |
|                      | Wooden | 8,000/= |
|                      | Wire mesh | 10,000/= |

| Fences | Barbed wire on bush poles | 3,500/= metre run |
| Timber shed | Timber walling with iron sheet roof | 2,500/= metre run |
| Murrum | Loose density murrum | Per Cubic metre 1,200/= |

PART SIX: DISTURBANCE ALLOWANCE

A disturbance allowance shall be added to the computed compensation amount as per Section 77(2) of the revised edition (2000) of the Land Act 1998 as below:

- 15% if quit notice is given after 6 months
- 30% if quit notice is given within 6 months.
APPENDIX 5 – VALUATION METHODOLOGY FOR THE WAY LEAVE
HISTORY OF THE METHODOLOGY

There is no current statutory guidance on the method of valuation for a Wayleave in Uganda. As a result, we were contracted to come up with an acceptable methodology.

Valuation of Wayleaves has been a protracted negotiation between the line Valuers and the claimants, with the basis being, a combination of payment for all the crops, land and buildings in the Way leave prior to line construction.
The aspect of diminution paid historically has not been documented.

There are cases of the smaller power lines with a width of up to 10 meters having land fully paid for (please note that if this approach is adopted wholly on the BEL Power Project it would mean 100% payment for land in the Way leave).

The land Act 1998 brings into play new regulations governing the ownership of land and as such landowners must be paid fairly.

A project of this size has not been attempted and properly documented in the last 20 years.

Historically payments to the stakeholders have been through a negotiated agreement between the landowner and the various tenants on the land. Please note that with the new Land Act (1998) the Mailo owner only receives a ground rent of 1,000/= per annum. A correct valuation under the act would mean capitalization of this 1,000/= to get a capital sum payable. At the date of the inspection, practice on the ground has not taken into account this aspect of the 1998 Act.

East African Surveyors and Consultant Valuers (EASCV) came up with a draft methodology. This methodology was approved for the project in lieu of an existing statutory guide for valuation of Wayleaves.

ASSUMPTIONS OF THE VALUATION METHODOLOGY

As a summary, described below are the assumptions used the following valuation basis:

- The valuation of land is based on current market transactions. The exercise isolates the portion of land that is permanently injured by the pads and the power lines; it is treated as land taken but still in the ownership of the landowner.
- There is a secondary valuation seeking to identify the effect of the above injurious action on the rest of the land that is left in the ownership of the landowner. (Compensation here is for the diminution in value for existing use. The customary approach is a percentage drop in value that is a sliding scale depending on the existing use).

The percentage drop is arrived at by using a number of methods of valuation one of which will include the before and after development valuation or:

After arriving at the above value, adjust it to arrive at what is reasonable, given the different circumstances that will dictate each parcel of holding.

The level determined by this process differs from case to case and involves professional judgment subject to negotiation skills. In certain cases due to planning regulations or total diminution in value, the percentage drop in value may be 100%.

Buildings that are in the path of the line/corridor are to receive full replacement value compensation.

Licensees and tenants will receive compensation for their small holdings (crops etc as per District Compensation Rates)
Valuation is based on existing use value or in mitigating situation used as per existing planning permission (but not speculative value).

**DIMINUTION IN VALUE OF LAND AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED T-LINE (BUJAGALI-KAWANDA-MUTUNDWE).**

We have inspected the land affected by the proposed T-line and submitted an interim valuation report.

The valuation of land has been based on the following:

**The Right-Of-Way:**
This is land that is being taken wholly for the use of the Line and will represent the right of the line also proposed as a route for servicing of the line at a future date.

The value of the land in this category has been valued at 100% of the value of land as per the open market comparables.

**The Wayleave:**
The interim report has taken a diminution of value along the whole extent of the line as 60% for the Wayleave.

*This will be adjusted to the values proposed in the table in the annex below, which range from 5-100% when the full sizes of individual land holdings are in place.*

**BASIS OF DIMINUITION IN LAND VALUE.**

The Basis of compensation for the deterioration in value of land is based on the loss to the landowner by the construction of the power line and not the gain to the electricity Supply Company.

Factors that determine the diminution in value include:
- The user of the land.
- The size of land holdings that are to be affected.
- The past and future trends of land value (land as an investment land bank).
- The immediate neighborhood.
- Services available in the area.
- The level of sensitivity of the affected people.
- The ability of the enforcing authorities to actually enforce the Wayleaves.
- The socio economic conditions prevailing on the affected people.
- The Extra costs of reinstating the land in the Wayleaves to its original use subject to the restrictions.
- Additional costs of working severed land.
- Future loss in productivity of land in Wayleaves after construction works.
### Table: Diminution Rates Applied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lower Range</th>
<th>Upper Range</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grazing land</td>
<td>Pastoral farmer with no clear boundaries but takes the animals to water within the land and allows mixed grazing. No paddocks.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing land</td>
<td>Pastoral farmer with clear boundaries</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing land</td>
<td>Commercial farmers with clear boundaries with paddocks and clear fencing.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing land</td>
<td>Pastoral farmer with no clear boundaries but takes the animals to water within the land and allows mixed grazing. No paddocks.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential housing</td>
<td>Permanent house in a clearly residential area. (The house has to be demolished and the only clear user in this area is residential.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential housing</td>
<td>Permanent house in a clearly residential area. (The house is not to be demolished but part of the compound is the Wayleave)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential housing</td>
<td>Built of semi-permanent/permanent materials and has an adjacent subsistence farm. The house is not affected but the main source of food is affected</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential housing</td>
<td>Built of semi-permanent/permanent materials and has an adjacent commercial farm. The house is not affected but the main source of income is affected</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Property</td>
<td>Commercial building used for retail etc.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>The value of the interest will be calculated as per the guidelines given in the district compensation rates and compensation will apply to the whole interest and not just the land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Bujagali Interconnection Project – Resettlement and Community Development Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lower Range</th>
<th>Upper Range</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial property</td>
<td>Commercial building used for retail etc. the building is not to be removed but future plans for development are restricted.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>The value of the interest will be calculated as per the guidelines given in the district compensation rates and compensation will apply to the whole interest and not just the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial land</td>
<td>Industrial building used for production etc. the building has to be removed or part of a vital building has to be demolished.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>The value of the interest will be calculated as per the guidelines given in the district compensation rates and compensation will apply to the whole interest and not just the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial land</td>
<td>Industrial building used for production etc. The building is not to be removed but the rest of the undeveloped land is affected and there can be no further redevelopment on this land.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>The value of the interest will be calculated as per the guidelines given in the district compensation rates and compensation will apply to the whole interest and not just the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing land</td>
<td>Warehouse building used for storage etc. The building is to be removed. There can be no further redevelopment on this land except for restricted agricultural uses.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>The value of the interest will be calculated as per the guidelines given in the district compensation rates and compensation will apply to the whole interest and not just the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing land</td>
<td>Industrial building used for production etc. The building is not to be removed but the rest of the undeveloped land is affected and there can be no further redevelopment on this land.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>The value of the interest will be calculated as per the guidelines given in the district compensation rates and compensation will apply to the whole interest and not just the land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The main critical issues are as follows:

Disbursement condition for the IDA Credit for the distribution upgrade component was lifted in August 2006 as a result of the engagement of a management services contractor for KPLC (Manitoba Hydro International) in July 2006 and the conversion of the adoption of a satisfactory customer connection policy by KPLC in to a dated covenant which is due by January 2007. This covenant is likely to be met by the due date.

Difficulties were encountered in the pre-qualification of bidders for the EPC contract for Olkaria II Geothermal Power Plant expansion in that out of the 10 firms that purchased the prequalification document only two Japanese firms submitted proposals. The low response to the prequalification was discussed with the OPRC committee which directed application of the ICB method of procurement, recognizing however, the prequalification of the two firms and proposing post-qualification with the new firms using Bank's SPQD. The preparation of the EPC bidding document was slowed by the BIB introduction of a covenant of integrity focusing on corruption and fraudulent practices. The bidding document was finally distributed on July 28, 2006 but bid closing date had to be extended four times to January 5, 2007 due to requests from bidders.

Bidding documents for energy meters were distributed on ... with a closing date of January 31, 2007. Bidding documents for distribution upgrade are being finalized.

Rising international prices for copper, aluminum, steel and fuel suggests higher cost estimates for the distribution component than those made at the IDA appraisal stage. Also, the low bidder interest in the EPC contract for the Olkaria II geothermal plant may result in higher than estimated bid prices. The team recommends leaving the ISR cost estimates and financing plan unchanged until after the results of the bidding process are available in late January. The Team will update the cost and financing plan during the next mission in late January. Additional IDA financing of the order of US$15 million may be needed.

There has been a delay in completing the tariff study. As a result, ERB has requested postponement of the project covenant requiring tariff adjustment and the signing of PPA between KenGen an KPLC by December 31, 2006 to June 30, 2007. The Team recommends that postponement is granted to March 31, 2007 to avoid deterioration of KPLC's financial performance.

Key Pending Actions for Bank Management Attention
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Copies to Others

Names

Janine A. Speakman
Colin Bruce
Philippe Charles Benoit
Paivi Koljonen

New Actions

Establish separate cost centers for KPLC's distribution and transmission functions

Amend DCA to include investment support for LPG import and storage facilities in Mombasa, which was inadvertently omitted in the DCA despite that it is recorded in the Minutes of Negotiations dated May 28, 2004

Amend due date for tariff adjustment covenant

Review project cost and financing plan and reallocate IDA Credit.

Previous Actions

By Whom? By When? Addressed?

Date over to next ISR

Project Data

Original Amount: USD 50 000M Last Archived ISR Date: 06 30 2006
Revised Amount: USD 0 000M End Date of Last Field Visit: 11 24 2006
Board Approval Date: 07 13 2004 Mid Term Review Date (Planned):
Effectiveness Date: 11 04 2004 Mid Term Review Date (Actual):
Original Closing Date: 03 31 2010 Restructuring Change Date (if changed):
Formally Revised Closing Date: 03 31 2010 Type Of Restructuring Change:
Number Of Closing Date Extensions:
Environmental Category: B-Partial Assessment

Implementing Agency: [from PAD data sheet]

Name Country URL Contact #
Ministry of Energy Kenya
Kenya Power and Lighting Co Ltd Kenya
KenGen Kenya

Members of Task Team
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The development objectives of the Project are to: (i) enhance the policy, institutional and regulatory environment for private sector participation and sector development; (ii) support efficient expansion of power generation capacity to meet the economy's supply deficits projected to occur by 2006/07; and (iii) increase access to electricity in urban and peri-urban areas while improving the efficiency, reliability and quality of service to existing customers.

### Board Approved Revised Project Development Objective: [if project is formally restructured]

#### Status of agreed outcomes indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PDO Indicator</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Expand generation capacity to meet the economy's projected supply deficits by 2006/07</td>
<td>5520 GWh generated power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase access to electricity in urban and peri-urban areas</td>
<td>600,000 customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improve efficiency, reliability and quality of power supply to existing customers</td>
<td>System losses of about 18.7 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Progress To Date</th>
<th>End-of-Project Target Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number or text</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number or text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5520 GWh</td>
<td>06 30 2004</td>
<td>09 30 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>06 30 2004</td>
<td>06 30 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.7 per cent</td>
<td>19.2 per cent</td>
<td>14.5 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. enhance policy, institutional and regulatory environment for private sector participation and sector development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate outcome indicator(s)</th>
<th>Last ISR</th>
<th>This ISR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. award turnkey contract for generation expansion at Olkaria II power plant</td>
<td>Bidding not started 07/31/2004</td>
<td>Bid closing date extended to January 5, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of the information on outcomes: [ ] good [ √ ] fair [ ] poor [If poor, mention in Issues and Actions for Management Attention]

| PDO rating explanation: | PDO is retained as satisfactory despite implementation delays because PDO is still attainable before project closing. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Development Objective Rating</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Project Component Ratings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Implementation Progress (IP)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Component Cost Last Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL 0.00 S S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>AND CAPACITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterpart Funding</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>BUILDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>STUDIES AND 0.00 S S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Monitoring and Evaluation

Portfolio system flags [system generated]:
Project effectiveness delay flag: No
Project disbursement delay flag: No
Country Environment flag: No
Country record flag: Yes

Explanation if IP rating has changed or is Unsatisfactory:
To be filled out only if there is a change in the rating from the previous ISR or if the IP rating is MU, U, or HU. Include what actions are to be taken and target dates.

Procurement is downgraded to moderately satisfactory because of significant changes needed in bidding documents.

Generation component is downgraded because of significant delay in processing requiring extension of bid submission date.

Distribution upgrade is downgraded to moderately satisfactory because of delay in issuing bidding documents for distribution upgrade.

Ratings: HS=Highly Satisfactory; S=Satisfactory; MS=Moderately Satisfactory; MU=Moderately Unsatisfactory; U=Unsatisfactory; HU=Highly Unsatisfactory; NA=Not Applicable; NR=Not Rated

Disbursements [system-generated]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Form Revised</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 Q1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Q1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Q1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Q1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Q1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Q1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disbursements (as of 12/19/2006)
Amount Disbursed to Date: XDR 3.51M
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PROJECT STATUS REPORT

Original Disbursement Lag %: 86.80
Original Disbursement Lag Months: 13.00
Formally Revised Disbursement Lag %: 0.00
Formally Revised Disbursement Lag Months: 0.00
Expected Disbursement for FY2007:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>5,002,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>5,002,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>5,002,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected Disbursements for FY2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2,070,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Latest Formal Revision of Forecast

Reason(s) for Formal Revision

### Audits [system-generated]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overdue</th>
<th>Qualified</th>
<th>Accountability Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Statements - Continuing Entity</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Statements - PIU</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Opinions</td>
<td>N N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Compliance with Applicable Safeguard Policies

If compliance is MU, U, or HU for any policy, enter the relevant information in Critical Issues and Actions sections.

**Overall Safeguard Compliance:**

Safeguard Policies Triggered (from PAD plus any new ones triggered after approval):

- Overall Safeguard Compliance
- Environmental Assessment (OD 4.01)
- Involuntary Resettlement (OP 4.12)

Ratings: HS = Highly Satisfactory; S = Satisfactory; MS = Moderately Satisfactory; MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory; U = Unsatisfactory; HU = Highly Unsatisfactory; NA = Not Applicable; NR = Not Rated

#### Critical Legal Covenants

If compliance with any critical covenants is overdue, enter the relevant explanation and actions in the Critical Issues and Actions section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Reference</th>
<th>Description of Covenant</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCA, Sch 4, S IV (A) (b)</td>
<td>Power purchase agreement to be concluded between KPLC and KenGen</td>
<td>12/31/2006</td>
<td>NYD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA, Sch 4, S IV (A) (a) (ii)</td>
<td>Design and adopt revised retail tariff structures</td>
<td>12/31/2006</td>
<td>NYD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA, Sch 4, S IV (A) (a) (iii)</td>
<td>Establish separate tariffs for transmission and distribution</td>
<td>12/31/2006</td>
<td>NYD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA, Sch 4, S IV (A) (a)</td>
<td>Prepare and adopt tariff study recommendations</td>
<td>12/31/2006</td>
<td>NYD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DCA, Sch 4, S. IV (A)  
(e) prepare and adopt secondary legislation for the Energy Law within 180 days of the establishment of the Energy Commission pursuant to the Energy Law  
12/31/2006 NYD

DCA, Sch. 4, S IV (Af)  
(f) establish separate transmission and distribution units in KPLC  
12 31 2006 NYD

PA. Kengen. S 4 03  
(f) Achieve following financial indicators: self financing of at least 25% each year; debt service coverage ratio of at least 1.5 times and maintain a current ratio of 1 5  
Recurrent SOON

KPLC, S 4 03  
(f) Achieve following financial indicators: self financing of at least 25%, debt service coverage of at least 1.2 times, current ratio of 1.0 and receivables of no more than 60 days  
Recurrent SOON

Status options: C=Complied with; CD=Complied with after delay; CP=Partially complied with; NC=Not complying with; NYD=Not yet due; UNKN=Unknown.

MANAGERS' COMMENTS
For managers to send and record comments

Sector Manager's (or designee's) Comments
Name: Subramaniam V. Iyer
ISR Submitted on: 00 00 0000
Not yet submitted

Previous Comments from Disapproved ISR
Name: Country Director's (or designee's) Comments
Name: Geoffrey H Bergen
ISR Submitted on: 00 00 0000

Previous Comments from Disapproved ISR
Name: Comments