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# Introduction

## 1.1 Background and context

The Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) has received a Project Preparation Advance (PPA) from the World Bank to assist in the preparation of the proposed RMI Maritime Investment Project (RMIMIP). The PPA will be used to fund the preparation of the necessary technical, economic, design, environmental and social studies for the projects, as well as establishing the operational framework within which the projects will be implemented.

An essential part of project preparation is the consultative process with stakeholders and the development of safeguards instruments. The project requires an assessment of environmental and social issues and impacts and the subsequent preparation of safeguards instruments in compliance with World Bank safeguards policies for Category B projects and the relevant national laws and regulations. Therefore, a Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) has been developed in accordance with the World Bank (WB) requirements.

The objective of this SEP is to assist the Ministry of Transport and Communications (MTC) to consult broadly and to effectively engage with all stakeholders who have an interest in, or will be affected by, the project components. This SEP describes the planned stakeholder consultation and engagement process for the project. It outlines a systematic approach to stakeholder engagement that will assist MTC and Port Authorities develop and maintain over time, a constructive relationship with their stakeholders throughout the duration of the project. The document also includes a grievance redress mechanism for stakeholders to raise their concerns about the project with the Port Authorities, MTC and World Bank. This SEP was reviewed and agreed upon by MTC, the Port Authorities and the World Bank.

This iteration of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) is updated as to include records of stakeholder engagement activities completed under scoping phase of the project in February 2019 (Chapter 6 and Annex G).

## 1.2 Project description

The RMI is located approximately midway between Hawaii and the Philippines and consists of 29 atolls, 5 islands and numerous small islets. The country covers an area of 1.9 million km2; but has just 181 km2 in land area. The overall population is about 55,000, but 75 percent live in Majuro (the capital) and Ebeye. RMI has a young population, 40 percent of which is under the age of 15. The population is sparsely distributed, but there is growing in-migration from the outer islands due, primarily, to a lack of employment opportunities and increased reliance on the cash economy, as compared to a subsistence lifestyle. At the same time, lower incomes and a rising cost of living is causing Marshallese residents to leave the country for better jobs and educational opportunities abroad, mainly in Hawaii, the United States mainland, and Guam.

Given the country’s geographic characteristics and distant outer islands, the provision of efficient, reliable and affordable sea transport services is considered essential for the country’s basic economic and social functions, and to achieving RMI’s national development plans. Therefore, ports at Ebeye, Wotje and Jaluit Atolls are proposed to be included in this project.

Majuro is regularly served by international cargo services from the United States, Asia and Australia. It is also the largest regional tuna transhipment port and transhipped 600,000 metric tons of tuna in 2016. Fishing vessels make-up as much as 75 percent of vessel traffic calling at Majuro. There are two principal docks (ports) at Majuro: (i) Delap Dock for international cargo; and (ii) Uliga Dock for domestic passengers and cargo, and tenders from international vessels.

At the time of preparing this SEP, specific project components at each port location have not been finalized and agreed upon. A current list of likely interventions includes:

1. Reconstruction of key building and facilities in the primary handling area, such as Customs Office, inspection facilities, fuel station, reefer connections, water and power supply, at Majuro Delap Dock;
2. Port control, tower, communications tools and equipment, hoist system and four passenger pontoons, at Majuro Uliga Dock;
3. Cargo handling equipment for both Majuro docks;
4. Repairs to port facilities structures at Jaluit and Wotje;
5. Repairs and improvements to existing quay structures at Delap, Uliga and Ebeye docks;
6. Levelling, subbase and pavement works at container storage areas;
7. Rehabilitation of terminal lighting and other utilities, as needed;
8. Improvements to fencing, gates and lighting to enable compliance with International Ship and Port Facility Security Code requirements;
9. Developing waste management arrangements;
10. Upgrading Aids to Navigation; and
11. Assess options and measures to counter trafficking in persons.

In undertaking the assessment, technical assistance will be provided in relations to:

* Enhancing Search and Rescue Awareness;
* Capacity Building; and
* Human Trafficking and Gender-Based Violence (GBV).

This section of the SEP should be updated once list of project components is agreed upon and finalized.

## 1.3 Summary of expected impacts

Given the known nature of the project activities, there are unlikely to be significant environmental and social impacts. Maintenance and upgrades will be carried out at primary ports across the four islands. Screening[[1]](#footnote-1) has identified the following potential negative social and environmental impacts from construction:

* seabed disturbances where aids for navigation are installed,
* health and safety of port users and workers, and
* influx of foreign workers with the increased fishing fleets, potentially causing harm or harassment (including gender-based violence) to host communities.

Potential positive impacts include:

* improvements to safety of passengers and workers following dock upgrades;
* increased security and safety for port users and the public;
* reduced water quality issues from the maintenance of waste water from port facilities; and
* improvements to spill and waste management.

## 1.4 Regulatory requirements

*National Environmental Protection Act 1984* provides a suite of regulations that might be applicable to infrastructure projects. Environmental Impact Assessment Regulation of 1994 prescribed a two-step approach to determining if an EIA is required: Step 1 initial evaluation; and if deemed required, Step 2 EIA for proposals with potential significant impacts. Copies of an environmental impact statement and of the comments and views of the appropriate Ministries, Departments, offices and agencies of the Government of the Marshall Islands shall be made available to the Authority, and to the public for inspection and copying, and the public shall be notified of the existence and availability of the statement a reasonable time before the completion of the Government of the Marshall Islands decision making process. Potential applicability of other regulations such as Marine Water Quality Regulation 1992, Solid Waste Regulation 1989, Coast Preservation Act, Historic Preservation Act etc., shall be determined once the design and description of each project activity are finalized.

World Bank Project Information Document/Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet (PID/ISDS) Concept Stage Document of February 12, 2018 classifies the proposed project as a Category B, where the impacts are considered moderate and readily prevented and mitigated. The assessment identified the following policies might apply:

**Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01:** An ESMF and ESMP will be prepared to document the assessment (commensurate with the nature and scale of impacts) to cover all components, including physical investments and technical assistance activities. Social impacts will be a key focus; the ESMF and ESMP will include a Stakeholder Engagement Plan, social assessment and a baseline assessment of social issues such as gender-based violence and human trafficking issues.

**Natural habitats OP/BP 4.04**: An assessment of the impact of upgrades on the marine ecosystem is required. The ESMF and ESMP will confirm the presence of natural habitats and the potential for impacts from physical works or future operations as a result of this project. Appropriate mitigation measures will be included in the ESMP.

**Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10:** Almost the entire population of the country are indigenous Marshallese and their rights are represented through administrative system of the country. Municipal Council is the key administrative body for representation at the local level and therefore consultations with the Council members should be included at each project development step.

**Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11:** The physical investments will all be carried out within the footprints of Government owned lands which are already highly modified environments, where impacts on physical cultural resources are not anticipated.

# Stakeholder engagement activities prior to development of SEP

A number of consultations, information disclosure and planning meetings have been completed during the RMIMIP initial project design stages and in development of environmental and social scope of works. The entities that oversee maritime operations in RMI are:

1. MTC, responsible for policymaking and some regulatory oversight, management and development of the maritime sector in RMI.
2. Republic of the Marshall Islands Ports Authority (RMIPA), a state-owned entity responsible for operating RMI’s publicly-owned ports, as well as all facilities and structures situated within the public ports and airport areas.
3. Majuro Stevedore and Terminal Company, a private company and the terminal operator at Delap Dock. It is a private company operating under a 10-year concession agreement with the RMIPA which will end in 2023.
4. Marshall Islands Shipping Corporation, a quasi-public corporation that provides cargo and passenger services to the outer islands from Uliga Dock.
5. RMI Environmental Protection Authority (RMIEPA) is responsible for nature conservation, solid waste disposal, public sanitation, public and marine water quality monitoring, and environmental education. The capacity of RMIEPA to address marine pollution is limited, as the required equipment and technical capacity is not in place to enable responses to spills or to clean-up contaminated sites. RMIEPA is also responsible for issuing environmental permits and supervising environmental aspects of construction works in RMI.
6. Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority (RMIRA) manages fishing in RMI and has an oceanic division, which focuses on tuna, and a coastal fisheries division. The oceanic division monitors local and international fishing vessels for illegal fishing, and issues licenses.

# Stakeholder identification and analysis

Stakeholder analysis determines the likely relationship between stakeholders and the project and helps to identify the appropriate consultation methods for each stakeholder group during the life of the project. The following four groups of stakeholders are identified for this project:

1. project partners;
2. people or groups likely to be affected by the project (project-affected parties);
3. other interested parties that may have an interest in the project; and
4. vulnerable segments of population.

Each of the groups specified here is further described in the following sections. Stakeholder identification and analysis will continue throughout the Project cycles and will remain dynamic.

## 3.1 Project partners

Project partners are defined as stakeholders that contribute to the execution and implementation of the Project. Project partners as identified for the Project Preparation stage are:

1. MTC;
2. RMIPA;
3. DIDA
4. RMIEPA;
5. Customs and Immigration;
6. The World Bank Regional Office; and
7. ESIA Team (ESIA Consult)

As suggested in the introduction, the list of partners will likely change over the project life cycle and hence will be updated accordingly.

## 3.2 Project Affected Parties (PAPs)

Individuals, groups, local communities, and other stakeholders that may be directly or indirectly affected by the project, positively or negatively, will be identified during the stakeholder identification and analysis stage of the SEP development.

As the project component designs progress, impact zones will be mapped against local communities in order to refine the project’s area of influence and hence the potentially affected parties (PAPs). The PAPs are not limited to the land owners and land occupiers, but also include people with the small businesses or livelihoods at or near the ports, dock / transport users, and customary (traditional) or legal rights holders to foreshore and seabed. Groups of PAPs identified to date are listed in Annex B. The list of PAPs will be continuously updated as it is likely to change as new groups become identified or the activities or designs change.

## 3.3 Other interested parties

Other interested parties include a wide range of broader stakeholders who may be interested in the project because of its location, its proximity to natural or other resources, or because of the sector or parties involved in the project. These may be local government officials, community leaders, civil society organizations (particularly those who work in or with the affected communities), private sector, development agencies, and media.

Moreover, civil society and nongovernmental organizations may have in-depth knowledge about the environmental and social characteristics of the project area and the nearby populations, and can help play a role in identifying risks, potential impacts, and opportunities to consider and address in the assessment process.

Broader stakeholders (other interested parties) identified for this project to date are listed in Annex B. The list of other interested parties is likely to be expanded as new groups become identified and hence will be continuously updated.

## 3.4 Disadvantaged/vulnerable individuals or groups

This project has a strong gender component and will aim at achieving gender mainstreaming in its design, management and implementation. Gender-based violence rates are high in RMI and women are vulnerable to trafficking, illegal sex work, unwanted pregnancies, harassment and violence. Imported and transient workforces such as the fishing industry and construction industry are known to contribute to these issues. Gender analyses will be conducted during the project design stage, and the findings will be incorporated into action planning for implementation stage. Other vulnerable groups, such as elderly and disabled, will also be consulted. Attention will be paid to specific vulnerabilities as well as specific benefits that projects can bring to women and other vulnerable members of society. Specifically, the project will continue identifying vulnerable or disadvantaged individuals or groups and the limitations they may have in participating and/or in understanding the project information. Additional support or resources needed to enable these people to participate in the consultation process will be provided.

In addition to gender analysis, an analysis of the potential for human trafficking will also be conducted. According to UNODC[[2]](#footnote-2), three types of human trafficking activities are occurring in the Pacific:

**Sexual exploitation:** There are indications that trafficking in persons for sexual exploitation possibly occurs in parts of the Pacific region, including in the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands. Such activities reportedly have close links to local and regional commercial and extractive industries, including fishing, logging and mining. According to reports, trafficking for sexual exploitation is prevalent in key port cities, where crews from foreign fishing vessels allegedly exploit both local and girls and women from East Asia (Chinese, Pilipino and more recently, Thai).

**Labor exploitation:** There have been reports of widespread labor exploitation of individuals from the Pacific region by distant water operators licensed to fish within the Pacific waters. Such activities possibly have links to human trafficking in and through the Pacific. In addition to workers from the Pacific region, there are reports of fishermen from Asian countries including China, Indonesia, the Philippines and Viet Nam being exploited in the Pacific region on fishing vessels originating from East Asia.

**Migrant smuggling:** Most recorded cases of migrant smuggling in the Pacific have been large numbers of people travelling via boat, with individuals from South and East Asia paying for transit to the United States.

Currently identified representatives of vulnerable people and groups are listed in Annex B. The list will be expanded and updated as new groups are identified.

# Stakeholder engagement approach

## 4.1 Principles

This SEP has been developed in accordance with the World Bank (WB) requirements. The objectives of participation in this project are thus not only to disseminate information about the project, but also to elicit input and advice from a range of stakeholders who might be affected by the project or might have specific expertise in the subject area, consequently:

* creating confidence and trust;
* ensuring local ownership;
* including different types of stakeholder groups in participation processes and benefit distribution;
* providing avenues for conflict resolution by consensus;
* disseminating results and lessons learned to the wider community, including both government and non-government; and
* generating, and responding to, feedback.

|  |
| --- |
| Box 1. RMIMIP Good Engagement Practice Principles  |
| Working closely with partners, ensure all are committed to a participatory approach; and roles and financial accountability for implementing the SEP are well understood.Identify stakeholders from wide range of areas ensuring diversity and representativeness and identify and highlight key stakeholder interests. Combine a range of consultation methods, procedures and mechanisms (including specific methods for women and vulnerable groups), in a timely, understandable, accessible and appropriate manner and format.Plan carefully, ensuring opportunities for consultation in the key steps of the design, implementation and review process.Set clear objectives for consultation and be clear what project and partners can influence.Enable two-way engagement by taking stakeholders’ views into account in project design and environmental and social performance. Clarify how the Grievance Redress Mechanism will be integrated.Maximize transparency, follow up and keep process dynamic. |

Participation is expected to allow the Project to:

* relate better to the local context;
* provide technical excellence;
* follow international good practice;
* harmonies with other development partners; and
* reflect a broad range of information and perspectives.

Principles of good engagement practice will be observed in RMIMIP (Box 1). Mechanisms for consultation will to take into account local values, traditions and culture.

Participation is central to the World Bank Environmental and Social Standards. There is no expected land acquisition or economic resettlement associated with this project, but this aspect will be confirmed during the ESMF and ESMP process. Participation will be gender inclusive and responsive, and tailored to the needs of disadvantaged and vulnerable groups, and good practice in engagement principles will also be observed in relation to development of social and gender action plans.

## 4.2 Techniques

A critical element in planning a participation and consultation strategy is selection of participation techniques to meet desired objectives. Considering wide geographic spread of the interventions selected for implementation, and potential resource constraints, the following participation techniques might be used:

**Information Dissemination and Information Sharing:** this technique can be used to inform the stakeholders on the Project and Project status, action taken, results of Project activities and similar. This technique can use either written (emails, fact sheets, newsletter, website) or face to face methods (meetings, workshops etc). For information dissemination to community representatives, use culturally appropriate techniques and local language;

**Information Gathering:** quantitative and qualitative information about projects, needs, best practices, lessons learnt, potential synergies etc., can be gathered either in written form (i.e. questionnaire surveys) or in face to face interactions (meetings, focus group discussions). When dealing with information elicited from community representatives, use culturally appropriate techniques such as focus group discussions; women’s gatherings etc., in local language; and ensure that information is collected separately from different segments of community (elders, youth, women etc.);

**Awareness techniques:** awareness, particularly of communities, about the forthcoming implementation process and projects can be raised using oral and culturally appropriate techniques in local language (including information boards);

**Two-way knowledge and information exchange** should be applied throughout the Project with all key stakeholder representatives and potentially affected or involved communities.

Specific engagement techniques proposed for this Project are listed in Annex C.

Particular attention will be towards identification and engagement with the vulnerable groups. Additional support or resources that might be needed to enable vulnerable people to participate in the consultation process will be identified (such as translation, choosing accessible venues for events, providing transportation, choosing appropriate time of the day, having small, focused meetings where vulnerable stakeholders are more comfortable asking questions or raising concerns).

## 4.3 Action Plan

For the continuation of the PPA phase, engagement activities with stakeholder representatives will continue in order to:

* Further identify stakeholders related to the Project;
* Introduce the project and ESIA process to key stakeholders;
* Consult with communities and their representatives;
* Ensure that views and needs of vulnerable segments of communities, including but not limited to poor, women, elderly; are addressed by projects;
* Gather stakeholder opinions on the proposed project and impacts and proposed management and mitigation measures. Ensure that these opinions are fed into the assessment process;
* Gather stakeholder feedback on the development of management and mitigation measures; and
* Identify and gain access to relevant data for the baseline.

Specific details for each activity listed above, including methods; frequency timelines; roles and responsibilities; and reporting requirements, can be found in Annex D.

At the completion of the PPA phase, the objective of engagement will be to provide feedback to the stakeholders on the draft impact assessment and associated management/mitigation measures (disclosure); and to gather their input on the initial impact assessment and identified mitigation and enhancement measures (consultation).

Engagement activities during the implementation phase of the project will include:

* Maintaining effective communication between project management unit and agencies/ organizations implementing project components;
* Raising awareness of project activities among potential beneficiaries;
* Maintaining consultation processes with all potentially affected communities and beneficiaries;
* Monitoring, evaluating and reporting on community involvement; and
* Agreeing on operations and maintenance systems.

## 4.4 Review of comments

At the end of each engagement activity specified in the Action Plan stakeholder (written and oral) suggestions, comments, requests for clarification, etc. will be gathered, reviewed and actioned; and the action will be reported in the Consultation Records attached to this SEP. At the next engagement opportunity, the decision and a summary of how comments were taken into account will be reported back to the stakeholder group initiating the original action.

In its final form, this SEP for the PPA phase will provide details of consultation, communications, attendee’s details, key discussion points and outcomes, stakeholder requests actioned, photos and compendium of consultation materials. It will become an integral part of the ESMP and ESMF.

Concerns voiced by the stakeholders and commitments consequently made by the project during the implementation stage will be recorded in the projects’ Complaints and Commitments Register.

# Implementation of SEP

## 5.1 Roles and responsibilities

During the PPA phase of the project SEP implementation by MTC and RMIPA will be assisted by ESIA Consult, with ESIA Consult responsible for carrying out, recording and reporting each of the stakeholder engagement activities. ESIA Consult will also record details of participating stakeholders and will contribute this information to DIDA stakeholder database. An adequate budget has been allocated toward stakeholder engagement during the PPA phase.

During the implementation phase, Mr Garry C Venus, the safeguards officer will oversee each activity. In addition, a safeguards specialist has been engaged by the MTC to further assist with institutional capacity building and will undertake the safeguards responsibilities for the project during project implementation. This position will act as a coordinating role for safeguards across the various stakeholders and components which will provide consistency and cohesion.

## 5.2 Complaints Register and Grievance Redress Mechanism

During the construction and implementation phases of any project, a person or group of people can be adversely affected, directly or indirectly due to the project activities. The grievances that may arise can be related to social issues such as eligibility criteria and entitlements, disruption of services, temporary or permanent loss of livelihoods and other social and cultural issues. Grievances may also be related to environmental issues such as excessive dust generation, damages to infrastructure due to construction related vibrations or transportation of raw material, noise, traffic congestions, decrease in quality or quantity of private/ public surface/ ground water resources during irrigation rehabilitation, damage to home gardens and agricultural lands etc.

Should such a situation arise, there must be a mechanism through which affected parties can resolve such issues in a cordial manner with the project personnel in an efficient, unbiased, transparent, timely and cost-effective manner. To achieve this objective, a grievance redress mechanism has been included in SEP and ESMF/ESMP for this project.

The project allows those that have a compliant or that feel aggrieved by the project to be able to communicate their concerns and/or grievances through an appropriate process. The Complaints Register and Grievance Redress Mechanism set out in ESMF/ESMP are to be used as part of the project and will provide an accessible, rapid, fair and effective response to concerned stakeholders, especially any vulnerable group who often lack access to formal legal regimes.

While recognizing that many complaints may be resolved immediately, the Complaints and Commitments Register and Grievance Redress Mechanism presented here and set out in detail in ESMF/ESMP encourages mutually acceptable resolution of issues as they arise. The Complaints Register and Grievance Redress Mechanism set out in this SEP and ESMF/ESMP has been designed to:

* be a legitimate process that allows for trust to be built between stakeholder groups and assures stakeholders that their concerns will be assessed in a fair and transparent manner;
* allow simple and streamlined access to the Complaints Register and Grievance Redress Mechanism for all stakeholders and provide adequate assistance for those that may have faced barriers in the past to be able to raise their concerns;
* provide clear and known procedures for each stage of the Grievance Redress Mechanism process, and provides clarity on the types of outcomes available to individuals and groups;
* ensure equitable treatment to all concerned and aggrieved individuals and groups through a consistent, formal approach that, is fair, informed and respectful to a complaint and/or concern;
* provide a transparent approach, by keeping any aggrieved individual/group informed of the progress of their complaint, the information that was used when assessing their complaint and information about the mechanisms that will be used to address it; and
* enable continuous learning and improvements to the Grievance Redress Mechanism. Through continued assessment, the learnings may reduce potential complaints and grievances.

Eligibility criteria for the Grievance Redress Mechanism include:

* Perceived negative economic, social or environmental impact on an individual and/or group, or concern about the potential to cause an impact;
* clearly specified kind of impact that has occurred or has the potential to occur; and explanation of how the project caused or may cause such impact; and
* individual and/or group filing of a complaint and/or grievance is impacted, or at risk of being impacted; or the individual and/or group filing a complaint and/or grievance demonstrates that it has authority from an individual and or group that have been or may potentially be impacted on to represent their interest.

Local communities and other interested stakeholders may raise a grievance/complaint at all times to the Office of Public Protector. Affected local communities should be informed about the SEP and ESMF/ESMP provisions, including its grievance mechanism and how to make a complaint.

### Complaints and commitments register

A complaints register will be established as part of the project to record any concerns raised by the community during construction. Any complaint will be advised to the World Bank and DIDA within 24 hours of receiving the complaint. The complaint will be screened. Following the screening, complaints regarding corrupt practices will be referred to the World Bank for commentary and/or advice along with the RMI’s Office of Public Protector.

Information about the mechanisms that will be used to address the complaint will be recorded in the Complains and Commitments Register (example of a possible template for the register is presented in Annex E).

Wherever possible, the project team will seek to resolve the complaint as soon as possible, and thus avoid escalation of issues. However, where a complaint cannot be readily resolved, then it must be escalated.

A summary list of complaints received and their disposition, including resulting commitments made, must be published in a report produced every six months by DIDA, MTC and RMIPA.

### Grievance mechanism

The Grievance Redress Mechanism has been designed to be problem-solving mechanism with voluntary good-faith efforts. The Grievance Redress Mechanism is not a substitute for the legal process. The Grievance Redress Mechanism will as far as practicable, try to resolve complaints and/or grievances on terms that are mutually acceptable to all parties. When making a complaint and/or grievance, all parties must act at all times, in good faith and should not attempt to delay and or hinder any mutually acceptable resolution.

The process for the Grievance Redress Mechanism is as follows:

1. The Aggrieved Party takes their grievance to the CIU, relevant Port Authority of Contractor. In the pre-construction period, there will be no contractor and the CIU is the appropriate entity. Once construction commences, the contractor becomes the initial focal point for information;
2. During both pre and post-construction period, CIU and/or relevant Port Authority will endeavor to resolve it immediately. Where the Aggrieved Person is not satisfied, the CIU and/or relevant Port Authority will refer the Aggrieved Person to the MIMIP Project Manager. For complaints that were satisfactorily resolved by the Aggrieved Person, the incident and resultant resolution will be logged and reported to the MIMIP Project Manager. For complaints that were satisfactorily resolved by the contractor, the incident and resultant resolution will be logged and reported to the MIMIP Project Manager;
3. If unsuccessful, the CIU and/or relevant Port Authority, and/or contractor notifies the MIMIP Project Manager;
4. The MIMIP Project Manager endeavors to address and resolve the complaint and inform the Aggrieved Party. For complaints that were satisfactorily resolved by the MIIMIP Project Manager, the incident and resultant resolution will be logged by the MIIMIP Project Manager. Where the complaint has not been resolved, the MIMIP Project Manager will refer to the relevant Port Authority General Manager and Secretary of MoTC for his/her action/resolution;
5. If the matter remains unresolved, or the Aggrieved Person is not satisfied with the outcome, the Secretary of MoTC refers the matter to the Project Steering Committee for a resolution. The MIMIP Project Manager will log details of issue and resultant resolution status; and
6. If it remains unresolved or the complainant is dissatisfied with the outcome proposed by the Project Steering Committee, the Aggrieved Person may refer the matter to the appropriate legal or judicial authority. A decision of the Court will be final.
7. Steps a through e should be undertaken immediately. Where the matter is referred to the MIMIP Project Manager, a resolution should be sought within two weeks. If unsuccessful and the matter is referred to the Project Steering Committee, this should occur within a month
8. Each record is allocated a unique number reflecting year and sequence of received complaint (for example 2019-01, 2019-02 etc.). Complaint records (letter, email, record of conversation) should be stored together, electronically or in hard copy.
9. Any grievance related to corruption or any unethical practice should be referred immediately to the DIDA.

In addition to the project-level and national grievance redress mechanisms, complainants have the option to access the World Bank’s Grievance Redress Service, with both compliance and grievance functions. Communities and individuals may request a Grievance Redress Service process when they have used standard channels for project management and quality assurance and are not satisfied with the response (in this case the project level grievance redress mechanism). Information can be found at <http://www.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/products-and-services/grievance-redress-service> for more details. For information on how to submit complaints to the World Bank Inspection Panel, visit [www.inspectionpanel.org](http://www.inspectionpanel.org).

## 5.3 Monitoring and Reporting

Procedures to monitor the progress of implementation of the environmental and social management plans, and relevant social safeguards, will be established and maintained throughout the Project. These will include, but not be limited to, monitoring of engagement outcomes related to gender.

During PPA phase, performance will be evaluated against activities specified in the Action Plan (Annex D).

Recording and monitoring of the engagement in the implementation phase of the projects should be carried out by the agencies involved in implementation, in collaboration with Central Implementation Unit (CIU), and should occur at regular intervals. Regular reporting of such information to other Project partners should also be established, including to people in the project areas. DIDA, MTC and RMIPA will be responsible for this.

Conduct of these tasks needs to involve qualified and experienced national experts, with the potential assistance from NGOs and international consultants. No involvement of potentially affected communities is planned.

The CIU will maintain an activity file detailing all public consultation, disclosure information, grievances collected, and commitments made throughout the project, which will be available for public review on request. Stakeholder engagement should be periodically evaluated by senior management of DIDA, MTC and RMIPA, assisted by the Community Liaison person. Project-level monitoring and evaluation also includes:

* Cargo vessel turnaround times at Delap Dock reduced (minutes);
* Reduced damage to vessels and maritime infrastructure at project ports (percentage);
* Strengthened maritime institutional and regulatory arrangements; and
* Grievances registered related to delivery of project benefits that are addressed (percentage).

Six-monthly reporting back to stakeholder groups identified during consultation should continue throughput the implementation stage. Stakeholders should always be reminded of the availability of the grievance mechanism.

# Record of stakeholder engagement activities under this SEP

## 6.1 Scoping mission

A range of stakeholder meetings were held in February 2019 with the objective of identifying and documenting any major risks, as well as stakeholders’ attitudes towards the project. In total, stakeholders from 14 organization/agencies and special interests’ groups (including those related to gender and human trafficking) were consulted. Details of the meetings, including records of the discussions, agenda, presentation and the lists of attendees, can be found in Annex G. All participants voiced their consent with the project, with the perception that the project is going to bring benefits far greater than potential negative impacts.

The issues discussed included current existing issues and general suggestions and concerns for future; and the suggestions and concerns related specifically to the proposed project. Findings of the scoping mission are summarized in sections below, and are also incorporated into relevant documents, namely, Environmental Assessment, Social Assessment, and the Gender and Human Trafficking Report.

The proposed grievance mechanism was also discussed and agreed in principle. It was however noted by participants that grievances (if any) are likely to be reported through their existing social networks, i.e. umbrella associations (such as women’s council for women’s issues) and/or through complaints to Council members and the Mayer.

### Existing issues and general suggestions and concerns for future

**Cross-cutting concerns voiced relevant to all ports:**

* Institutional arrangements around port facilities and longer-term maintenance of the docks and facilities: in the past there was a disconnect between Municipality and the Port Authority over who ‘owns’ the dock and related infrastructure and who should be responsible for the maintenance. This issue needs to be clarified in the future, as it is currently unclear to stakeholders ‘where the Port Authority areas start and end’. Also, impacts of 2023 change in funding on Ports operations needs planning for. In outer islands, this is managed by the Local Government
* Gender and youth: Gender discrimination is prevalent. Incidence of young people living together and having children, underage and without being married, is common. Although legal age for consensual sex is 15, many of the girls in such arrangements are younger. Sexual awareness is very low or nonexistent, and there is no enforcement of the age of consent laws. There is a need for general sexual education and awareness. The prevalence of tuberculosis and hepatitis; and also, of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), is very high.
* Possible mitigation of issues to related port related to human trafficking (HT) and gender in general are seen mainly through awareness and education of the general population and at schools - the largest population group in the country is 14-21 years of age and the main need is to educate them; and building of capacity of government agencies including health and education.

**Port specific concerns:**

* Jaluit - Cruise ship visits: Discomfort with the visiting cruise ships. No knowledge of and no procedure in place to inform villagers when the ship will be coming. They just all of a sudden have people walking around the village. They are concerned for safety; and also feel hassled. Visitors were not interested in purchasing handicrafts and shells.
* Ebeye - Human trafficking and sexual exploitation: A survey of sex workers was conducted in 2004 but perception is that the issue has increased since; and it is unclear what percentage of girls involved are under age. The risks on the island are however not linked to maritime sector but to contractors from the US Base. There is a good collaboration between immigration, police, government agencies and other organizations dealing with the subject on the island, and the development of “Ebeye Pass” (for the staff from the base) was discussed.
* Uliga and Majuro - Current social impacts form shipping includes prostitutions; border control not enforced properly, and poor enforcement of existing laws and policies. There is a 10pm curfew for seafarers, but there is no control over compliance.

### Suggestions and concerns related specifically to the proposed project

**Cross-cutting:**

* Clarification that no dragging or removal of wrecks will take place as a part of this project.
* Construction/rehabilitation works need to be staged so that ports remain open and functional throughout the construction period; so that supplies can reach communities.
* Participants supported proposed improvements to safety (fencing, lights) as there is currently a perceived risk to people during port operations.
* Poor capacity to deal with fire, for example Uliga dock has a sea hydrant which is not working and at Delap Port there is a freshwater hydrant only - noting that city water is not available 24/7. Strong support for installation of new hydrants and provision of oil spill kits, oil boom, etc.
* Opinion that a lot of new learning related to human trafficking (HT) has occurred over the last few years, so instead of conducting HT assessment project should move towards implementation (of capacity building and awareness campaigns). If a HT assessment is to be done, it should be conducted by local organizations – provide training to local staff on islands on how to do it and have it as a long-term activity. Maybe also conduct a training needs assessment for agencies: not just of immigration and police but also health, education etc.
* Youth, and in particular boarding school students, were identified as very vulnerable with the need to raise their awareness. Need go through Ministry of Education to provide awareness campaigns in boarding schools on outer islands. Training of officers (immigration and police) on victim identification; procedures and mechanisms in place; also, capacity building in associated agencies such as health and education. Also, need to work with taxi drivers who are sometimes facilitators. There is never any resistance to capacity building so this is a good avenue for furthering gender and HT discussions. Need for any training to be continuous and to use training and materials that exists rather than creating new modules. Also, the need for resources, assets and people for monitoring of mariner’s behavior.
* Project could assist with lobbing for inclusion of HIV/STD testing as a part of hiring process for maritime workers; increasing corporate social responsibility of vessel owners. Need to raise awareness of ship workers, so they know what is illegal behavior in the countries they visit; their rights to complain in cases or labor exploitation or processes to be followed. Suggestion to develop materials as hand-outs to the ships – so mariners are aware of laws, rights and responsibilities in general and while in RMI. Potential use of Fishing Registry for rising of awareness of HT issues for all RMI registered vessels was also discussed.

**Port specific**

Jaluit:

* Navigational aids: upgrades to existing navigational aids most welcome as there are currently concerns for safety of residents and 530 students travelling to the boarding school on the island. Participants also asked about possibility of installation of the additional markers and lights in the lagoon, especially for the second (western) pass. This is a commonly used route in the lagoon and currently has no navigational aids, making it extremely dangerous at nights and during the bed weather. Participants noted that the seascape of the lagoon beyond Port Authority jurisdiction is owned by the Municipality and thus installation of additional lights would not be a problem from the institutional point of view, as both community and Council members present indicated their agreement with the proposed. The repair of existing markers and lights, and installation of additional markers and lights was perceived by all stakeholder groups consulted as of utmost importance for maintaining safety of the fishermen, students, and the communities in general.
* Enquiries about cutting of the rusty rods on the dock for the safety of the users.
* Fencing and closing of the dock: The idea of closing the dock while in use (2-3days when ship is in port) was seen as a very good safety measure. However, it was noted that women and children use dock for fishing and that closing the access to the dock at all times, would negatively impact them by preventing engagement in this activity.

Ebeye:

* Waste management: Port and stevedoring areas currently used as ‘secondary rubbish areas’. Participants would like to see these areas cleaned but there was a concern of where those items could be moved to – need to move them away from island as they would create environmental impacts wherever they are dumped.
* The need to relocate the main point of entry to the port to outside stevedoring area near the fish market and restrict access from there on, as stevedoring area is very dangerous for public.
* Current practice of bringing the fuel for the power plant, which is bunkered into trucks and then driven through the settlement to the power plant, is very dangerous for the community. In addition, they have no spill prevention kits, and no capacity to deal even with the smallest spills at the moment; and no firefighting equipment. Supply of both spill kits and firefighting equipment was strongly supported (this is an issue at all ports but particularly at Ebeye due to bunkering); also, a feasibility study of mooring options outside of the power plant so that fuel can be pumped directly.
* Ships are not serviced on Ebeye at the moment, but it would be good to bring servicing capacity back to the island.
* Need for comprehensive Master Plan that would cover all of the docking areas (fisheries and ferry dock) not just the part administered by PA.
* Claims that passenger ferry dock is used as a dolphin (secondary lines are tied to it) while larger container ships are in commercial port. This claim would need to be investigated and if correct, safety measures need to be taken to ensure safety of the public at the ferry port during this period. Further, this would mean that there is no sea access to fishing dock while containerships are unloading (about 24hours twice a month)?
* Discussion on project bringing in work force during constructions: this could exacerbate current situation (existing prostitution with the US Base contractors, discussed above) and is a possible negative impact of the project. Prevalence of HIV and STDs is very high on the island and this needs to be noted in OH&S plans for construction companies; including understanding that infecting others with the HIV/STDs knowingly is a criminal offence under RMI law. In addition, there is a possibility that several construction projects will be happening on the island at the same time (several funded by the World Bank). Thus, a comprehensive management plans and cumulative impact assessment should be conducted in regard to foreign workforce.

Wotje:

* Passengers and goods at Wotje are trans-shipped as dock is too shallow to receive cargo vessels. Trans-shipment with tenders is a big issue for users with disabilities, illness, old people. Also, Wotje has a boarding school and students are also trans-shipped by tenders, so this is an additional safety issue. Better access for tenders at the existing docks - as it is currently very difficult to board, and lightening at the docks, were therefore strongly supported.
* DIDA will expand on this during consultation when available.

Uliga:

* Implementing ‘safety station’ at Uliga dock and providing immigration/police presence is strongly supported as this is seen as an important safety issue; this would raise public confidence.
* A need to mitigate current safety issue for officers: boarding parties use pilot boat to reach the newly arriving ship for clearance; this means that usually they board ship before it enters lagoon, which is a dangerous practice (due to high seas outside the lagoon). There is a need for a separate boat to take boarding party to the vessels once they are at anchor.

Delap:

* Flooding: dock area slopes towards the road and during rain events office and the road are flooded, resulting in disruption of the traffic on the road. Drainage system would thus need to be improved as a part of the dock paving activities.

# Annex A. Project Details

# Annex B. RMIMIP Project Stakeholders:

**NOTE: This Annex is completed the extent possible and will be continuously updated with the new information throughout the ESMF and ESMP phases.**

**Project Stakeholders identified will be added to DIDA Stakeholder Database, a central stakeholder database that covers all DIDA projects, as many of the SH overlap with other projects under consideration and/or implementation.**

**Project Partners:**

MTC

RMIPA

DIDA

Department of Immigration

Ministry of Cultural and Internal Affairs

Marine Resources Authority

Environmental Protection Authority

The World Bank Regional Office

ESIA Team (ESIA Consult)

**Project Affected Parties PAP:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Communities:  | Island Councils and Mayor of Jaluit Island Councils and Mayor of Wotje MIMA Mayors associationSenators for the relevant islandsKAL Government  |
| Traditional resource users and rights holders: |  |
| Other natural resources users |  |
| Dock/transport users |  |
| Businesses | Marshall Islands Shipping Corporation Kwajalein Atoll Port AuthorityPII Port Chamber of commerceStevedores Matson lines (Ebeye)  |
| Stevedores | Majuro Stevedore and Terminal Company |

**Other Interested Parties:**

Chief Secretaries office

MIMRA

CMAC s umbrella organization for coastal managements includes EPA

**Representatives of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups:**

Municipal church groups

Country Manager, International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Women United Together Marshall Islands (WUTMI)

# Annex C: Proposed Specific Engagement Techniques

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Information Boards | Establish Information Boards in each Project activity area |
| Correspondence by phone/email/messaging | Distribute project information to government officials, organizations, agencies and companies Invite stakeholders to meetings |
| Print, media and radio announcements | Disseminate project information to large audiences, and stakeholders with limited literacy /time Inform stakeholders about consultation meetings |
| One-on-one interviews | Solicit views and opinions Enable stakeholders to speak freely and confidentially about controversial and sensitive issues Build personal relations with stakeholdersRecording of interviews |
| Formal meetings | Present project information to a group of stakeholders Allow the group of stakeholders to provide their views/opinions Build impersonal relations with high level stakeholders Distribute technical documents Facilitate meetings using PowerPoint presentationsRecord discussions, comments/questions raised and responses |
| Public meetings  | Present project information to a large audience of stakeholders, and in particular communitiesAllow the group of stakeholders to provide their views and opinions Build relationships with neighboring communitiesDistribute non-technical project information Facilitate meetings using PowerPoint presentations, posters, models, videos and pamphlets or project information documents Record discussions, comments/questions raised and responses |
| Workshops | Present project information to a group of stakeholders Allow the group of stakeholders to provide their views and opinionsUse participatory exercises to facilitate group discussions, brainstorm issues, analyses information, and develop recommendations and strategies Recording of responses |
| Focus group meetings | Allow a smaller group of between 8 and 15 people to provide their views and opinions of targeted information Build relationships with neighboring communities Use a focus group interview guideline to facilitate discussions Record responses |
| Surveys  | Gather opinions and views from individual stakeholders Gather baseline data  |

# Annex D. Stakeholders Engagement Action Plan

| **Objective**  | **Method** | **Frequency**  | **Timelines** | **Responsibility**  | **Target group**  | **Completed, recorded?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PPA Stage of the Project**  |
| Identify stakeholders related to the Project  | One on one interviews Formal meetingsWorkshops during January and February 2019 mission | Commencement of the projectand throughout  | November 2018, February 2019 | ESIA Consult | All SH | YesNov 2018Feb 2019 |
| Introduce the project and safeguards process to stakeholders | One on one interviews Formal meetingsFocus group discussions | At the start of the project | November 2018, February 2019 | ESIA Consult  | All SH | YesNov 2018Feb 2019 |
| Consult with communities and their representatives  | Face to face meetings with community representatives Focus group discussions | At the start of the project | November 2018, February 2019 | ESIA Consult  | Potentially Affected People  | YesFeb 2019 |
| Ensure that views and needs of vulnerable segments of communities, including but not limited to the poor, women and the elderly, are addressed by projects  | Face to face meetings with representativesFocus group discussion with vulnerable people | At the start of the project and throughout  | November 2018, February 2019 | ESIA Consult  | Vulnerable groups and their representatives  | YesFeb 2019 |
| Gather stakeholder opinions on the proposed project and impacts and proposed management and mitigation measures. Ensure that these opinions are fed into the assessment process  | Correspondence One on one interviews Formal meetingsPublic meetings Focus group discussions | Field mission and design Consultation stage | February 2019March 2019 | ESIA Consult | All SH | YesFeb 2019 |
| Identify and gain access to relevant data for the baseline | Correspondence One on one meetings Formal meetings  | Preparation for field mission Field mission and design  | Throughout project | ESIA Consult  | Government agenciesInstitutes | YesFeb 2019 |
| **Implementation Stage of the Project**  |
| Maintaining effective communication between project management unit and agencies/ organizations implementing project components  | Electronic and face-to-face communication with representatives of relevant agencies/ organizations | Minimum monthly for the duration of each project  |  | CIU | Project partners |  |
| Raising awareness of project activities among potential beneficiaries  | Media advertising and targeted campaigns  | Throughout, during main project activities, as required |  | CIU | All SH |  |
| Maintaining consultation processes with all potentially affected communities, vulnerable groups and beneficiaries  | Face to face meetings with PAPs representatives (including town officers, women’s representatives etc); where appropriate, surveys and analysis of project's impacts on vulnerable populations  | Minimum biannual meetings with PAPs  |  | CIU | PAPVulnerable groups Beneficiaries  |  |
| Monitoring, evaluating and reporting on community involvement  | Collation of progress reports; Updates to this document; Self-evaluation by project team | Annually throughout the Project  |  | CIU | Project Partners |  |
| Agreeing on operations and maintenance systems  | Electronic or face to face communication  | Minimum one meeting with each relevant SH group |  | CIU | Project Partners Key NGO and government agenciesPAP representatives  |  |

#

# Annex E. An Example of a Project Concerns and Commitment Registrar (Template)



# Annex G. Consultation Records

Stakeholder Engagement Meetings during scoping stage February 2019

Stakeholder engagement meetings were held in Jaluit, Ebeye and Majuro during the week of 4-8 February 2019. The main goals of the meetings were to provide stakeholders with the outline of the proposed project activities and timelines; and to elicit and collate their opinions, concerns and suggestions. A sample of the invitation letter and the agendas disseminated to the stakeholders are provided in Appendix 1. Example of the presentation (similar presentation was used at each Port, with the change to relevant Port details) can be found in Appendix 2. Engagement techniques included public meetings; formal meetings; focus group meetings and face-to-face interviews.

Records of the engagement activities at each location are presented below.

**Jaluit Atoll**

* **Public meeting with the community members**

Meeting was held on Jaluit at the Catholic School Hall on the 5th of February 2019 and was attended by 26 community members, including Jaluit Senator and representatives from the Council, National and Local Police, Ministry of Justice, Education, MEC and the Jaluit WIJ Chapter. The meeting was held in local language, with translations to and from English.

The meeting started with welcome by the Senator, who also noted on limited participation of women in the meeting (five out of 26 attendees, including the senator, were females) and the need to encourage women of RMI to participate in the public life of the community. Welcome was followed by introduction of the project overall, specific proposed interventions for Jaluit Port, potential positive and negative impacts of such interventions, and the expected timelines. Open discussion followed, and the questions raised by stakeholder and discussed included:

* Navigational aids: proposed upgrades to existing navigational aids (two existing markers from Japanese times) were discussed, in particular the fact that they currently have no lights making navigation into lagoon specifically dangerous during bad weather and at night. Participants pointed that in addition to Jaluit residents, there are currently 530 students enrolled at the boarding school on the island, coming from eight neighboring islands. Safety at sea of the students and their visiting families is in addition to the safety of the local community on Jaluit.
* Participants also asked about possibility of installation of the additional markers and lights in the lagoon, especially for the second (western) pass. This is a commonly used route in the lagoon and currently has no navigational aids, making it extremely dangerous at nights and during the bed weather. In total, there are five channels used to enter lagoon with only one having markers/lights.
* Team members clarified that current project is proposing only repairs and upgrades and not installation of new aids; however, the participants noted that the seascape of the lagoon beyond port authority jurisdiction is owned by the Municipality and thus installation of additional lights would not be a problem from the institutional point of view, as Council members present indicated their agreement with the proposed.
* It was suggested that planning and preparation for additional navigational aids could be conducted as a part of this project (as a component of the Master Plan), with actual installation taking place at the later stage.
* Clarification that no dragging and no removal of wrecks will take place as a part of this project.
* Enquiries about cutting of the rusty rods on the dock for the safety of the users.
* Clarification on the scope of work, with international and commercial ports being the main target; hence smaller ports on the outer islands are not included in the scope of this project.
* Clarification by participants on the current use of the port facilities: government ship comes every 6 weeks to 3 months; intermittent supplies are provided by private ships that deliver supplies for both the community and the school (fuel and food). Supply ships take about 2-3 days to unload.
* In addition, there were two instances of a cruise ship visiting the lagoon; the ship stayed at anchor while tourists visited island using tenders. The ship carried around 150 passengers who were cleared by immigration party that arrived at the island for this purpose. The tenders transferring passengers used the main dock.
* Discussion on the use of the dock during the construction/ rehabilitation stage how is it going to be managed and how are supplies going to reach the community if the dock is not operational. The need for the dock to remain operational throughout the construction phase was reiterated.
* Discussion on longer-term maintenance of the dock and facilities: in the past there was a disconnect between Municipality and the Port Authority over who ‘owns’ the dock and who should be responsible for the maintenance. This issue needs to be clarified in the future.

* **Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with fishermen (PAPs)**

A focus group discussion was held with 7 potentially affected people, fishermen and small boat owners. They were of opinion that proposed project activities will bring benefits to the island. In terms of direct benefits to fishermen and boat owners, upgrades to the dock were not perceived as of much relevance as they do not use the main port dock as their landing site. However, they were very interested in proposed upgrades to navigational aids as their main current concern is in regard to safety while at sea. They also discussed the need for installation of the additional markers and lights in the lagoon, especially for the second (western) pass. This is a commonly used route in the lagoon and currently has no navigational aids, making it extremely dangerous at nights and during the bed weather, both for Jaluit community members and boarding school students and their families. The repair of existing markers and lights, and installation of additional markers and lights was therefore perceived by this stakeholder group as of utmost importance for maintaining safety of the fishermen and the communities in general.

The proposed grievance mechanism was also discussed and agreed in principle. In closing, all participants voiced their consent with the project, with the perception that the project is going to bring benefits far greater than potential negative impacts.

* **FGD with the Municipal Council Members**

Principles of stakeholder engagement and grievance mechanisms were presented first before moving to a general discussion. A concern additional to those voiced during the main meeting was put forward by this group. It related to potential fencing and closing of the dock. It was noted that women and children use dock for fishing and that closing the access to it would prevent them from engaging in this activity. On the other hand, the idea of closing the dock while in use (2-3days when ship is in port) was seen as a very good safety measure.

Past occasions of a cruise ship visit were also discussed. The assumption was that the executive council collects some sort of a fee from the visiting ship. As far as the village was concerned, they had no benefit from the visitors: they came ashore in tenders, walked around the village and then left.

* **FGD with the Women’s Group (Jaluit WIJ Chapter)**

Nine participants attended this meeting. In addition to proposed project components, principles of stakeholder engagement and grievance mechanisms were explained. The participants reported they would most likely use either Councilors or Group’s links to the National Women’s Council to voice their concerns, if they had any.

There was some discussion on how the fencing and gate would function. Again, participants noticed that having a fence and gate in place would be; and that closing the gate while ship is approaching and while at dock would be improve safety of children. However, they reiterated that they use the dock for fishing and that they would want to have a gate open while at other times, so they can continue to access and fish.

Participants then voiced their discomfort with the visiting cruise ships. They reported no knowledge of and no procedure in place to inform them when the ship will be coming. They just all of sudden have people walking around the village. They are concerned of safety; and also feel hassled. Women were additionally disappointed as they and children brought some shells and handicrafts for sale, but visitors were not interested to purchase (they noted that whenever US navy vessels visited in the past, they always purchased shells and handicraft from locals).

The groups were unsure even who approved the vessels to come, and how is the fee handled.

The use of the dock was discussed next. Participants clarified that private supply ship comes about once a month; while the government sheep might come once every 3-6 months. At least once a year this results in situations of having no food at the sand – the last incident occurred last month. Villagers do grow breadfruit, taro, pumpkin (depending on the season) and also have chicken. High school has a vegetable garden where they grow vegetables for their own consumption but also for sale – although reportedly there are only a few families on the island that use vegetables.

It was also clarified that fuel for the power plant comes on a different ship and is tanked; while normal supply ship brings only fuel or village car and boat consumption, in barrels.

Further it was noted that families do visit relatives on other islands and travel for other social occasions, however, have to return to the village well before dark due to lack of lights/navigational aids in the lagoon. The need for additional navigational aids for the safety of all was reiterated.

Participants were not aware of any cases of human trafficking (sexual or labor exploitations) occurring on the island or reported back by islanders living elsewhere. Discussion them moved to more general issues of gender discrimination on the island. Increasing incidence of young people living together and having children, underage and without being married, was discussed. Although legal age for consensual sex is 15, many of the girls in such arrangements are younger.

Further, increasing incidence of beetle-nut chewing (in both men and women with almost everyone on the island now reported to chew) and increasing use of kava on everyday bases were also discussed.

* **Interview with the boarding school staff**

Project, stakeholder engagement principles and the grievance mechanism were explained. In addition to already discussed, concerns over common pregnancies at the boarding school were voiced. It was noted that, for example, seven girls (mainly underage) came back to school pregnant after the last school holidays. Sexual awareness is very low or nonexistent, and there is no enforcement of the age of consent laws. The need for general sexual education, as well as rising awareness of students of ways in which sexual and labor exploitation might occur, was iterated. It was noted that any anti-trafficking capacity building for school staff or awareness training for students would be welcome.

* **Interview with the medical staff**

High prevalence of tuberculosis and hepatitis on the island, and common dengue fever outbreaks, were discussed, together with the need for rising hygiene levels and disease awareness.

Concern over incidences of early teenage pregnancies was voiced, noting that the youngest girl to give birth last year was 12. For safety, the standard practice was to have girls under 15 giving birth to the first child transferred to Majuro hospital; however, girls older than 15 or those having second or third child while still under 15 are giving birth on the island. Susceptibility and vulnerability of girls to human trafficking was noted. The need for education, awareness, but also law enforcement, was discussed.

** **

**Photos: Public meeting at Jaluit (left) and formal meeting at Ebeye (right)**

 **Ebeye**

* **Interview with the Port Manager**

Traffic in the port typically consists of international container ships (twice a month with 24hour unloading period); domestic privately-owned ship that brings supply twice a month (with 2-3days unloading time); government ship that comes less than once a month; and occasional contractors’ vessels. Fishing fleet does not visit the lagoon and sailing boats are managed by municipality.

Port Authority is administering commercial port only, with stevedoring are privately owned and fishing dock and ferry dock owned by other government agencies.

There is no specific large anchorage area in the lagoon. Waters are very deep and there are only two channel markers at the lagoon entrance and no navigational aids inside the lagoon.

The port is closed to civilians while ship is at the dock and operations do not interfere with fishing or ferry dock operations.

* **Formal Project Information Dissemination and Consultations Meeting with the Key Stakeholders**

The meeting was attended by 13 people from 10 stakeholder organizations (Appendix 3) and started with welcome from Deputy Chief Secretary from the Office of the Chief Secretary, Ms Abacca Anjain-Maddison. The welcome was followed by presentation of the project overall, specific proposed interventions for Ebeye Port, potential positive and negative impacts of such interventions, and the expected timelines. Questions raised by stakeholder and discussed included:

* Participants supported proposed improvements to safety as there is currently a perceived risk to people during port operation.
* Getting ‘good marks’ for port operations from the coastguard was also important
* Perception on the island that the port and stevedoring areas are ‘secondary rubbish areas’ with large items brought there and left for years. It would be very important to clean the area but where could those items be moved to? They would create environmental impacts wherever they are dumped? Also, stevedoring area is used as storage for large items such as constructions materials as there is no other space on the island.
* The need to relocate the main point of entry to the port outside stevedoring area to near the fish market and restrict access from there on, as stevedoring area is very dangerous for public.
* Utility company representative explained the process of bringing the fuel for the power plant, which is bunkered into truck and then driven through the settlement to the power plant. They have no spill prevention kits, and no capacity to deal even with the smallest spills at the moment. In addition, there is no firefighting equipment; and there are considerable safety issues to the community as the truck drive the oil through the settlement. It would be good to have a feasibility study of mooring options outside of the power plant so that fuel can be pumped directly.
* Ships are not serviced on Ebeye at the moment, but it would be good to bring servicing capacity back to the island
* Question on how project moneys will be divides among the ports, with the opinion that Ebeye should receive 40% of the total funds.
* Discussions of fisheries and ferry terminals which also need upgrades, however, are managed by local government and not Port Authority (PA) and are not part of this project.
* Need for comprehensive Master Plan that would cover all of the docking areas not just the part administered by PA.
* Claims that passenger ferry dock is used as a dolphin (secondary lines are tied to it) while larger container ships are in commercial port. This claim would need to be investigated and if correct, safety measures need to be taken to ensure safety of the public at the ferry port during this period. Further, this would mean that there is no sea access to fishing dock while containerships are unloading (about 24hours twice a month)?
* Currently Police is present while ships are at dock to ensure safety, in particular to prevent children from accessing working areas.
* It was clarified that passenger ferry dock is used on the daily basis by 10-12 private boats plus the ferry; and the rescue boat.
* Discussion on development of sectoral plans and the new Strategic Plan by the Ministry

The meeting proceeded with the introduction of the safeguards process, Stakeholder Engagement Plan, human trafficking issues in the context of maritime interventions, and the stakeholders’ rights (including grievance mechanism). Discussion followed, and the questions raised by stakeholder and discussed included:

* There is limited information on what happens on the island regarding human trafficking (HT), a survey of sex workers was conducted in 2004 but perception is that the issue has increased since.
* There is a good collaboration between immigration, police, government agencies and other organizations dealing with the subject on the island.
* The biggest perceived risks for prostitutions and HT on the island are not linked to maritime sector but to contractors from the US Base. Prostitution is seen as wide spread on the island; and it is unclear what percentage of girls involved are under age.
* Discussion on current programs and education campaign on what sexual exploitation is, assisted by IOM.
* Discussion on project bringing in work force during constructions: this could exacerbate the situation and is a possible negative impact of the project.
* In particular there is a possibility that several construction project will be happening on the island at the same time (several funded by the World Bank). Thus, a comprehensive management plans and cumulative impact assessment should be conducted in regard to foreign workforce.
* Prevalence of HIV and STDs is very high on the island and this needs to be noted in OH&S plans for construction companies; understanding that infecting other with the HIV/STDs knowingly is a criminal offence under RMI law.
* Possible mitigations of issues related to HT and gender in general are seen mainly through awareness and education of the general population and at schools; and building of capacity of government agencies including health and education. The largest population group on island is 14-21 years of age and the main need is to educate them.
* Opportunity to get all parties engaged in this work to work together (similar to what happens for disaster management) with joint training and processes of potential victim identification, reporting etc. in place.
* Mitigation related to service users were also discussed, including possibility to including HIV/STD testing as a part of hiring process for workers; increasing corporate social responsibility of vessel owners;

**Majuro**

* **Formal Project Information Dissemination and Consultations Meeting with the Key Stakeholders**

The meeting was attended by six people from five stakeholder organizations (Appendix 3). During this meeting potential activities in all ports were presented, and the following was discussed:

* Delineation between port areas and port operated areas and other areas – it is very unclear to stakeholders where the Port Authority areas start and end
* There are recent works in Jaluit, with new lights waiting to be installed – it is not even clear who is financing this activity
* Wotje does trans-shipment as dock is too shallow to receive cargo vessels. It was cleared that there is no dredging planned for this project. Trans-shipment with tenders is a big issue for users with disabilities, illness, old people. Wotje also has a boarding school and kinds are also trans-shipped by tenders, so this is additional safety issue. The dock needs better access for tenders as it is currently very difficult to board, and lightening.
* Discussion on expansion of port – not planned for this project.
* Issue of safety due to fuel shipped through town in Ebeye; also, environmental issues of potential for spills. There is no firefighting equipment nor spill containment equipment at the moment.
* After 2023 change in funding, how will Ports operate? - this needs planning for

The meeting proceeded with the introduction of the safeguards process, Stakeholder Engagement Plan, additional stakeholders to be included, human trafficking issues in the context of maritime interventions, and the stakeholders’ rights (including grievance mechanism). Discussion followed, and the questions raised by stakeholder and discussed included:

* Implementing safety station at Uliga dock for Immigration presence -request was already submitted to the port as this is an important safety issue.
* Training of officers (immigration and police) on victim identification; procedures and mechanisms in place.
* Human Trafficking (HT) capacity building in agencies is needed, collaborations and support structures are in place. It was iterated that capacity building for the agencies should not be as one off but a continuous effort. Port security training needs to be inter-agency and reoccurring for at least 3 years. There was some training in the past assisted by US coastguard.
* There was discussion on some of the previous cases, for example of a n RMI national being forced to work on the ship in conditions differing from those he signed for and he left the ship in Hawaii; this however is not an option for most Asian forced laborer as they are scared of reporting themselves. For example, one Indonesian national found information about IOM on Facebook and used that opportunity to complain about his working condition
* Discussion on need to raise awareness of ship workers: how are they to know about their rights to complain and processes to be followed?
* Clarification of current immigration processes: Once ships are in Majuro lagoon immigration boarding party goes out to vessels for clearance. However as there is only one pilot boat in reality boarding party goes with the pilot and usually boards ship before it enters lagoon. This is safety issue for officers. There is a need for a separate vessel to take boarding party to the vessels.
* In general, cruise ships, military vessels, sailing boats and fishing boats are cleared at anchor; Container ships come to dock and are cleared there.
* Need for comprehensive border control presence at the docks was discussed.
* Current social impacts form shipping includes prostitutions; border control not enforced properly, and poor enforcement of existing laws and policies
* There is a 10pm curfew for seafarers, they cannot stay on land overnight. But how is immigration to know who returned to the ship and who has not when they have no presence at Uliga dock? So, the curfew is just in theory, and breach is reported only if the person is spotted or reported to police.
* Shipping agents is responsible for covering all the fines and resolving the issues. There was recent increase in fines for breach of conduct for example breach of curfew is now 1,000$. In addition, once there is a breach the entire vessel goes on alert list and no one receives port passes next time they arrive.
* There would also be an added benefits of increased community confidence if there is presence of officials at the Uliga dock in particular – positive benefit for communities.
* However, it was also noted that, as the control in Uliga increases, it can be expected that small vessels will be landing on alternative locations along the shore.
* The need for resources, assets and people for monitoring to be increased was reiterated.
* Suggestion to develop materials as hand-outs to the ships – so mariners are aware of laws, rights and responsibilities while in RMI.
* Opinion that the Port Authority in Majuro is not very supportive of the new immigration systems and that they need to be more proactive and collaborative
* Situation at Ebeye appears better, where Ebeye has a working group and presence form Taskforce, with the Deputy Chie Secretary leading the taskforce
* Recent development of a policy that would allow to monitor arrivals and departures from ”Ebeye Pass”.
* In terms of potential HT assessment, the stakeholder was of opinion that a lot of new learning occurred over the last few years, so the opinion is that instead of conducting assessment project should move towards implementation (of capacity building and awareness campaigns)
* Boarding school students were identified as very vulnerable with the need to rise their awareness
* **Interview with IOM and Taskforce staff**

As IOM staff have previously attended project information dissemination meeting, general information about project was not repeated, rather, discussion concentrated on gender and issues of human trafficking:

* National legislation on victim protection was passed, with 30day decision time, victim protection visa stay for 3rd country national etc. – a good development
* Agency coordination in RMI could work better and needs further strengthening. Also, Taskforce is a bit weak with no one ‘high up’ is pushing it; there is a need for a strong ‘champion’
* Brothels locations are known but there is no action against them
* There are reported cases on teacher abuse in outer islands; and alcohol coming to islands and increasing violence
* In terms of human trafficking, labor exploitation of RMI nationals but RMI nationals is not uncommon (when they come to Majuro or in US). Sometimes this might also be sexual exploitation.
* Numbers of irregular immigrants on RMI are limited, and these are mainly tourist visa overstays. Smuggling is not a big use, and there were no reports that fishing vessels are used for migrant smuggling - although they could come of fishing vessel and use fake IDs to enter USA via airport

The following needs areas / potential interventions and activities were discussed:

* Strong need for awareness rising in the community
* There are powerful public figures who could prevent implementation of gender and HT awareness projects: this has not been an issue so far as culturally appropriate channels were sued, but could be a problem for a program that does not follow the protocol
* Rising awareness of taxi drivers who sometimes act as ‘pimps’; also need to rise their awareness that that ‘facilitating’ is also illegal, what the fines are etc.
* Handouts at ports and at the airport (booklet of sorts) with what is legal and what is not in RMI
* Business to enforce zero tolerance to sexual and labor exploitation cases
* Use of Compliance Program for fish on boats, and awareness of observer programs about issues of HT and signs that might indicate victims
* Potential use of Fishing Registry for rising of awareness for all RMI registered vessels was also discussed
* If a HT assessment is to be done, it should be conducted by local organizations – provide training to local staff on islands on how to do it and have it as a long-term activity. Maybe also conduct a training needs assessment for agencies: not just of immigration and police but also health, education etc.
* Also need go through Ministry of Education to provide awareness campaigns in boarding schools on outer islands.
* Need for any training to be continuous and to use training and materials that exists rather than creating new modules
* Also, there is never any resistance to capacity building so this is a good avenue for furthering gender and HT discussions
* Need for improving institutions and processes
* **Interview with the Port Manager**

This meeting provided clarifications on several issues raised during the visit, in particular in terms of institutional arrangement around Port operations, as well as further clarification of works proposed and likely impacts.

* Both Ebeye and Jaluit are controlled by PA and are international ports. PA administers docks; channels and anchorage areas at those ports. Wotje and Arno are not controlled by PA and are not international ports.
* However, institutional arrangements between PA and others (in particular other agencies and Municipalities) are not entirely clear and would need to be resolved, this issue should receive forthcoming attention.
* Clarification that there is room for immigration offices at each Delap and Uliga docks in existing buildings, they would need to be fitted up.
* Regarding fire control, Uliga dock has a sea hydrant; which is not working at Delap Port they have freshwater hydrant but noting that city water is not available 24/7.
* Request for new hydrants, oil spill kits, oil boom, etc.
* Discussion over the paving: dock area slopes towards the road and during the train office and the road are flooded. Disruption of traffic on the road as a current social impact
* Uliga dock is used by both domestic and international vessels; as a result, the dock is closed to domestic transport when international vessels are arriving (24 hour prior to arrival).

Appendix 1. Invitations and proposed agenda (example from Ebeye meeting)

RMI Maritime Investment Project

**Date**: 6 February 2019

**Department/Agency/NGO/CBO Name**:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**The RMI Ministry of Finance Division of International Development Assistance and the RMI Port Authority cordially invite you (or your delegate) to the Stakeholder Consultation Meeting for a proposed World Bank RMI Maritime Investment Project.**

**Date**: Wednesday 6 February 2019

**Venue**: Ebeye Hotel Conference Room, Ebeye

**Time**: 1:00am to 4:00pm

**Please see the attached Agenda.**

**Note**: *Coffee and Refreshment Served*

RMI Maritime Investment Project

Project Overview and Stakeholder Meeting Agenda

Goal:

The goal of this meeting is to provide stakeholders (SH) with the outline of the proposed project activities and timelines; and elicit and collate their opinions, concerns and suggestions.

Objectives:

* Consult with SH on the proposed project activities and timelines;
* Agree on the general content of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP), including SH lists and grievance process;
* Collated input on project design and SEP; and
* Consult on potential project progress indicators.

**This meeting is expected to last about 3 hours, as per agenda below:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1300-1315 | Welcome and introductions – DIDA and RMI Port Authority |
| 1315-1400 | Project overview – DIDA / RMI Port Authority with support from Mr Peter Wulf, ESIA Consult* Overview presentation of proposed project activities
* Potential impacts (positive and negative) of each proposed activity
* Project timelines and next steps
 |
| 1400-1415 | Project overview discussion – Led by Government / RMI Port Authority with ESIA Consult support |
| 1415-1430 | Break  |
| 1430-1500 | Stakeholder Engagement – Led by Dr Silva Larson, ESIA Consult * Draft Plan overview
* Stakeholder identification activity
* Discussion of proposed Grievance Mechanism
 |
| 1500-1600 | Discussion – Led by Government / RMI Port Authority with ESIA Consult mediating* How can this project support your work – how can you support the project
* How can the project be designed to be of grates value to you and others?
* How would you like to be involved/ informed in the future?
* Potential indicators of project success
* Wrap up
 |
| Closing  | Thank you and closing – DIDA and RMIPA |

Appendix 2. Stakeholder meetings attendees

**Date: 6th February 2019**

**Location: Ebeye**

**Project Information Dissemination and Consultation Meeting Participant List**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **First Name** | **Last Name** | **Role** | **Organization** | **Sex** |
| 1 | Sonia | Tagoilelagi | Sr Project Assistant | IOM | F |
| 2 | Malyia | Rudolph | Sr Project Assistant | IOM | F |
| 3 | Anastasia | Dujmovic | Aid Coordinator | DIDA | F |
| 4 | Daphine | Wase | Aid Coordinator | DIDA | F |
| 5 | Harden | Lelet | GM Stevedore | KASCO | M |
| 6 | Ben | Jacklick | Seaport Manager | RMIPA Ebeye | M |
| 7 | Anram | Kemem | Deputy Director | RMIPA | M |
| 8 | Scott | Paul | City Manager | KAL Gov | M |
| 9 | Abacca | Maddison | DCS | OCS | F |
| 10 | Romeo | Alfred | General Manager | KAJUR (utility company) | M |
| 11 | Mailynn | Konelios-Lang | Deputy Secretary | MOHHS | F |
| 12 | Kitlang | Kabua | Ebeye Project Rep | PREP II | F |
| 13 | Alosiana | Abner | MOCIA Rep | WUTMI / MOCIA | F |

**Date: 7th February 2019**

**Location: Majuro**

**Project Information Dissemination and Consultation Meeting Participant List**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **First Name** | **Last Name** | **Role** | **Organization** | **Sex** |
| 1 | Katherine | Walkiewicz | Project Manager | IOM | F |
| 2 | Damien | Jackuuk | Director | Immigration | M |
| 3 | Phil | Philippo | Secretary | MOTC&IT | F |
| 4 | Ange | Saunders | Head of office | IOM and NTHT secretary | F |
| 5 | Jashua | Larkabuy | Acting Director | MOTC& IT | M |
| 6 | James  | Bing | Director | RMIPA | M |

Project team members present at each meeting:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Garry | Venus | Safeguards | DIDA | M |
|  | Silva | Larson | Social safeguards | ESIA Consult | F |
|  | Peter  | Wulf | Managing Director | ESIA Consult | M |

# Annex H. Grievance Redress Mechanism

1. World Bank: Project Information Document/Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet (PID/ISDS) Concept Stage Document of February 12, 2018 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) Transnational Organised Crime in the Pacific: A Threat Assessment from September 2016 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)