



STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN (SEP) & GRIEVANCE REDRESS MECHANISM (GRM)

FOR

**Replacement of the Main Water Transmission Line Project
(Transmission Pipeline from McCauley Hill, Johnsonville through
Paynesville to Congo Town)**

Project Ref: (P-L-R-EAC-002-REMAWATL-MR)

**Prepared for: LIBERIA WATER and SEWER CORPORATION (LWSC)/Co-
Financed by: OPEC Fund & AfDB Bank Group**

**Submitted to: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) of Liberia
Mamba Point, Sekou Toure Avenue
Monrovia, Liberia**

**Prepared by:
Forest & Environment Research Institute, Inc. (FERI)
Apt. # 2, Kaly's Building,
RLJ Hotel Junction, Kendeja
Paynesville City
Liberia.**

**Phone: (231) 886593292/770215789
Email: forestcryliberia04@yahoo.com/forestenviroment@gmail.com**

December 2025

Executive Summary

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) has been prepared for the Replacement of the Main Water Transmission Line (P-LR-EAC-002-REMAWATL-MR) Project, which is a flagship initiative under the Government of Liberia's infrastructure development agenda. The project involves replacing 15.2 km of the aging 36-inch pipeline that conveys treated water from the White Plains Water Treatment Plant to Monrovia and its surrounding areas. The Project is Co-financed by three key partners, the African Development Bank, contributing US\$2.2 million, the OPEC Fund for International Development, providing US\$20 million; and the Government of Liberia, committing US\$2.8 million. The project development objectives are to increase access to safe, reliable water supply in Monrovia and its environment, and to strengthen the operational efficiency of the Liberia Water and Sewer Corporation. The project is a transformative initiative aimed at addressing the urgent infrastructure needs of the Liberia Water and Sewer Corporation and the quality of life of the people of Monrovia and its surroundings.

The Replacement of the main Water Transmission Line Project is located in Montserrado County, extending through densely populated urban and peri-urban regions, from McCauley Hill in Johnsonville to White Flower in Congo Town. An estimated 1.2 million individuals are expected to benefit directly and indirectly from this initiative. This demographic includes women and girls (~52%), men and boys (~48%). A further breakdown indicates that youth and students (~35%), health workers and patients (~5%, and small businesses (~10%) will be direct beneficiaries of the project. Indirect beneficiaries include communities on the outskirts of Monrovia.

The SEP outlines a structured approach to stakeholder engagement across all phases of the project cycle—planning, construction, and operation. It identifies key stakeholders, analyses their interests and influence, and establishes tailored engagement methods such as public consultations, focus group discussions, community meetings, radio announcements, and door-to-door outreach. Special emphasis is placed on ensuring the inclusion of women, youth, persons with disabilities, informal workers, and other vulnerable groups. The plan also details the roles of the Project Implementation Unit (PIU), the Contractor, and the Community Liaison Officer (CLO) in facilitating continuous communication and information disclosure.

Three sets of Stakeholders were identified, which include

- **Primary Stakeholders (Directly Affected Parties):** This includes of Project Affected Persons (PAPs) including Landowners, Tenants & households, Local businesses and the following communities namely; McCauley Hill Community, Johnsonville Roundabout Community, Pipeline Community, Pipeline Supermarket Community, Red Light Community, Police Academy Junction, Duport Junction Community, GSA Road Junction Community, ELWA Junction Community, SD Copper Road Junction Community, Boulevard Junction Community, and Congo Town Community along the pipeline. This also includes Workers, Consultants & Contractors.

- **Secondary Stakeholders (Indirectly Affected Groups):** This includes Local Residents indirectly affected by traffic congestion, noise, dust, and temporary disruptions. Influence through public opinion and community acceptance. This also includes Vulnerable Groups (Women, Youth, Elderly, Persons with disabilities).
- **Tertiary Stakeholders (Institutional Stakeholders):** This includes Development Partners & Financiers such as the AfDB, OFI, Civil Society & NGOs, Local NGOs, CBOs, Civil society watchdogs, Media groups etc.

Consultations were made with key identified stakeholders. The following summarizes key outcomes of the consultations.

Stakeholders raised several concerns during the consultation. Mr. James T. Ngandee asked about the pipeline's distance from the road and its proximity to the Johnsonville cemetery; the project team clarified that at least three meters of working space is required, and the alignment will be adjusted to avoid disturbing the cemetery. Jacob Boakai inquired about reinstating his container in an alley after removal, but LWSC/PIU explained that it cannot authorize such reinstatement as it is outside its mandate. Alphons D.N. Teah Jr. questioned whether his structure on public property would be rebuilt if affected, and was informed that while no resettlement or compensation is planned, public structures will be restored to equal or better condition if impacted. Another participant asked about connecting off-route communities like Kpah Town, and was told that the current project scope covers only the 15.2 km pipeline corridor, excluding off-route areas. Abu J.S. Kromah raised the cost of removing his roadside container, and the project confirmed it would bear removal costs, if necessary, though efforts will be made to avoid removals through realignment. Finally, Hon. Randall Johnson emphasized the lack of water in Johnsonville, White Plains, and Louisiana; the project team welcomed the concern and noted that inclusion of underserved communities will be considered during the design phase

The Grievance Redress Mechanism component provides a transparent, culturally appropriate, and easily accessible system for receiving, documenting, and resolving grievances. Multiple channels—including in-person submissions, phone calls, written complaints, suggestion boxes, and community meetings—ensure that all stakeholders can raise concerns without fear of retaliation. The mechanism outlines clear steps for grievance acknowledgment, assessment, investigation, resolution, and feedback, with defined timelines and escalation pathways. Sensitive grievances, including those related to labor issues or sexual exploitation and abuse/sexual harassment (SEA/SH), are handled through confidential and survivor-centered procedures.

Monitoring and reporting are integral to the Stakeholder Engagement Plan. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for measuring the effectiveness of the SEP include; a) Engagement & Participation: the number of consultations held, attendance rate, diversity of participants, percentage of stakeholder reached; b) Communication Effectiveness: Timeliness of information dissemination, percentage of stakeholders who report being adequately informed, Number of communication channels used; c) Grievance Management; Number of grievances received, Percentage of grievances resolved, average

resolution time for complaints, stakeholder satisfaction rate; d) Trust & Relationship Building; Stakeholder perception survey, level of stakeholder support, reduction in conflict or dispute; e) Socio-economic Outcome; number of local jobs created, percentage of affected households compensated, community benefit projects implementation. Etc.

Monitoring and reporting will be carried out throughout all stages of implementation to ensure transparency and accountability. Reports will be prepared and shared on a monthly, quarterly, and annual basis, with findings communicated to communities. Monthly monitoring reports will be prepared by the Contractor and Community Liaison Officer (CLO). Quarterly reports will be compiled and submitted by the Project Implementation Unit (E&S Safeguard Specialist). Annual summaries will be submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the African Development Bank/ OPEC Fund. This structure reporting process promotes accountability, encourages community engagement, and supports continuous improvement.

The estimated cost of implementing the SEP is \$84,150.00 as summarized in the table below

Table 1: Estimated Cost of implementing SEP

Phase	Key activities covered	Estimated budget	Notes
Preparation/ preconstruction	Radio announcements, flyers/posters, community forums, OHS training, GBV awareness, GRM setup & maintenance, safety walks, inspections	\$21,600.00	Based on 3 months preparation period.
Implementation/ Construction	Daily/weekly radio alerts, flyers/posters, dust suppression, waste disposal workshops, OHS training cycles, GBV awareness, utility coordination, grievance desks	\$39,000.00	Based on an 18-month construction period, with multiple cycles of training and workshops.
Completion/ post-construction	Restoration of structures, environmental rehabilitation, labor demobilization & GBV safeguards, community safety audits, water quality monitoring, traffic normalization, governance forums, GRM closure	\$23,550.00	Covers the 3-month demobilization and handover period.
Total:		\$84,150.00	

Overall, the SEP provides a robust, practical, and responsive framework guided by principles of inclusivity, transparency, Free, Prior and Informed Consultation (FPIC), gender and social inclusion, cultural sensitivity, and grievance redress mechanism (GRM). By ensuring effective consultation, participation, and inclusion, the project enhances efficiency, promotes transparency, and strengthens social acceptance. The effective implementation of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan will support the successful delivery of the Replacement of the Main Water Transmission Line Project, which will not only deliver climate-resilient water infrastructure but also ensure that the voices, rights, and well-being of affected communities remain central to project decision-making.

Abbreviation

AAID	ARREST Agenda for Inclusive Development
AfDB	African Development Bank
CLO	Community Liaison Officer
CSP	Country Strategy Paper
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EPML	Environmental Protection and Management Law
ESIA	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
ESMP	Environmental and Social Management Plan
GBV	Gender Based Violence
GRM	Grievance Redress Mechanism
ISS	Integrated Safeguard System
LWSC	Liberia Water and Sewer Corporation
OPEC	Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries Fund
OS	Operational Safeguard
PAPs	Project Affected Persons
PCLGRM	Project Community Level Grievance Redress Mechanism
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PIUGRM	Project Implementation Unit Grievance Redress Mechanism
REMAWATL	Replacement of the Main Water Transmission Line Project
SEA/SH	Sexual Exploitation and Abuse / Sexual Harassment
SEP	Stakeholder Engagement Plan

Table of Contents

Abbreviation.....	
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Purpose and Objectives	1
Chapter 2: Legal Policies & Laws Relevant to SEP	3
2.1 Liberia's Framework on Stakeholder Engagement, Information Disclosure, & FPIC	3
2.1.1 Environmental Protection and Management Law (EPML), 2003	3
2.1.2 Freedom of Information Act, 2010.....	3
2.1.3 Public Procurement and Concessions Act, 2005 (Amended 2010).....	3
2.1.4. Land Rights Act, 2018	3
2.1.5. Community Rights Law with Respect to Forest Lands, 2009.....	4
2.1.6. National FPIC Guidelines (2019) & FPIC Communication Strategy (2022)	4
2.1.7. Stakeholder Engagement Plans (SEP) – Sectoral Policies	4
2.2 International Laws, Policies & Regulations	4
2.2.1 AfDB's Integrated Safeguards Systems (ISS)	4
2.2.1.1 OS1: Assessment & Management of Environmental & Social Risks & Impacts.....	5
2.2.1.2: OS2: Labor and Working Conditions.....	5
2.2.1.3: OS3: Resource Efficiency & Pollution Prevention & Management.....	5
2.2.1.4: OS4: Community Health, Safety, and Security	5
2.2.1.5: OS5: Land Acquisition, Restrictions on Land Use, and Involuntary Resettlement	5
2.2.1.6 OS6: Biodiversity Conservation & Sustainable Management of Living Natural Res.	6
2.2.1.7: OS7: Indigenous Peoples/Sub-Saharan African Historically Marginalized Communities ..	6
2.2.1.8: OS8: Cultural Heritage.....	6
2.2.1.9: OS9: Financial Intermediaries	6
2.2.1.10: OS10: Stakeholder Engagement and Information Disclosure.....	7
2.2.2 The Aarhus Convention (1998, UNECE)	7
2.2.3 The Espoo Convention (1991, UNECE)	7
2.2.4 The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP, 2007)	7
Chapter 3: Description of Priority E&S Issues Requiring Stakeholder Engagement	8
3.1 Traffic and Mobility Disruption	8
3.2 Community Health and Safety.....	8
3.3 Occupational Health and Safety (OHS)	9

3.4 Dust, Noise, and Air Quality Deterioration.....	9
3.5 Waste Generation and Disposal	9
3.6 Water Contamination Risks	9
3.7 Utility Disruption	9
3.8 Labor-Related Risks.....	9
3.9 Damage to Public Structures and Wetland Disturbance.....	10
3.10 Cumulative Impacts.....	10
3.11 Contextual Risks	10
3.12 COMMUNITY GRIEVANCES.....	10
Chapter 4: Stakeholders Identification & Mapping	12
4.1 Key Principles	12
4.2 Stakeholder Mapping	12
4.2.1 Stakeholder Identification	13
4.2.1.2 Identification of Indirectly Affected Groups	14
4.2.1.3 Identification of Institutional Stakeholders	14
4.3 Stakeholder Categorization.....	14
4.4 Stakeholder Influence, Role & Responsibilities.....	15
4.4.1 Government Agencies and Regulators.....	16
4.4.2 Development Partners and Donors (AFDB, OPEC Fund)	16
4.4.3 Contractors and Subcontractors.....	16
4.4.4 Utility Service Providers	16
4.4.5 Local Government and Municipal Authorities	16
4.4.6 Community Members and Roadside Traders	17
4.4.7 Vulnerable Groups.....	17
4.4.8 Civil Society and NGOs	17
4.4.9 Media and Public Opinion Leaders	17
Chapter 5: Comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan	20
5.1 Preparation Phase	20
5.2 Implementation Phase	22
5.3 Completion Phase	25
5.4 Stakeholder Engagement Plan-Consolidated Budget.....	27
Chapter 6: Institutional Arrangement for SEP Implementation	28
6.1 Project Implementation Unit (PIU)	28

6.2 Contractor/Sub-contractor	28
6.3 AfDB Bank's Safeguards and Compliance Department	29
6.4 Community Stakeholders	29
6.5 Government & Institutional Level:	29
6.6 Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM Team)	30
6.7 Municipalities & Line Ministries, Agencies & Commissions	30
6.8 Stakeholder Consultation & Engagement Conducted	30
Chapter 7: Grievance Redress Mechanism	34
7.1 Grievance Redress Process	34
7.2 Project Community Level Grievance Redress Mechanism	36
7.3 PIU Level Grievance Redress Mechanism.....	37
7.4 Judiciary Level Grievance Redress Mechanism.....	39
7.5 Grievance Log.....	40
Chapter 8: Monitoring and Reporting.....	41
8.1 Monitoring of the SEP and GRM.....	41
8.2 Key Monitoring Indicators	41
8.2.1 Stakeholder Engagement Indicators	41
8.2.2 GRM Performance Indicators.....	41
8.3 Monitoring Methods	42
8.4 Reporting Requirements and Frequencies	42
Chapter 9: References:	44
Annex I: Grievance Registration Form.....	45
Annex II: Evidence of Stakeholder Engagement Meeting.....	46
Annex III: Attendance Listing.....	47

List of Tables

Table 1: Estimated Cost of implementing SEP	iii
Table 2: Stakeholder Categorization, Group & Description.....	14
Table 3: Stakeholder Categorization & Specific areas of Influence.....	18
Table 4: Stakeholder Engagement Plan- Preparation Phase	20
Table 5: Stakeholder Engagement Plan- Implementation Phase.....	23
Table 6: Stakeholder Engagement Plan-- Completion Phase.....	25
Table 7: Consolidated SEP Budget.....	27
Table 8: Main concerns raised by stakeholders/participants	32
Table 9: Comparative Analysis of Project Community Level GRM & PIU Level GRM	39

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background

The Replacement of the Main Water Transmission Line (P-LR-EAC-002-REMAWATL-MR) Project is a flagship initiative under the Government of Liberia's infrastructure development agenda. The project involves the replacement of 15.2 km of the aging 36-inch pipeline that conveys treated water from the White Plains Water Treatment Plant to Monrovia and its surrounding areas with a new 48-inch Ductile Iron (DI) transmission line.

The project seeks to address the following challenges within the water supply system, namely: a) The aging and highly vulnerable transmission infrastructure, b) inadequate transmission capacity to meet current and projected urban water demands, c) frequent service interruptions due to pipe failures and leakages, and d) limited flow and pressure monitoring mechanisms along the primary transmission corridor. The Project development objectives are to provide access to a safe, clean, affordable, and reliable water supply to the population of Monrovia and strengthen the operational efficiency of the Liberia Water and Sewer Corporation (LWSC).

The project is co-financed by three key partners: the African Development Bank, contributing US\$2.2 million, the OPEC Fund for International Development, providing US\$20 million; and the Government of Liberia, committing US\$2.8 million. The joint financing structure reflects strong national ownership and international support for Liberia's water infrastructure development. The project supports Liberia Water and Sewer Corporation's Five-Year Strategic Plan (2025-2029), which focuses on enhancing water treatment, transmission, distribution, and sustainability. It also aligns with the Government of Liberia's ARREST Agenda for Inclusive Development (AAID), particularly Pillar 2 on infrastructure and 6 on human capital development, both of which emphasize universal access to clean water and sanitation. Additionally, the project aligns with the African Development Bank (AfDB) Country Strategy Paper (CSP) 2019-2025 and its extension to 2025, which prioritizes infrastructure growth, governance reforms, and climate risk management.

1.2 Purpose and Objectives

The SEP is designed to establish a structured and transparent framework for engaging all relevant stakeholders throughout the project lifecycle. Its overarching purpose is to foster trust, inclusivity, and accountability while ensuring compliance with international best practices and donor requirements. The specific objectives of the SEP are to:

- Promote transparent, inclusive, and culturally appropriate engagement that respects local contexts and ensures meaningful participation of all stakeholder groups, including vulnerable populations.

- Ensure timely and accessible public disclosure of project information, enabling stakeholders to make informed contributions and decisions.
- Identify, prioritize, and actively involve stakeholders in a manner that reflects their interests, influence, and potential impacts on the project.
- Manage expectations and gather feedback by creating mechanisms to incorporate stakeholder perspectives into project design, implementation, and monitoring.
- Maintain full regulatory and donor compliance, particularly with the African Development Bank's Integrated Safeguards System (ISS, 2023) and Operational Safeguards OS1 - OS10.

1.3 Regulations and Requirements

This SEP has been developed in accordance with the legal and procedural requirements of Liberia's Environmental Protection and Management Law (EPML) and the guidelines of the Environmental Protection Agency of Liberia (EPA). These guidelines require stakeholder identification and consultation during scoping and assessment phases; documentation of stakeholder concerns and integration into project design, and establishment of a grievance redress mechanism to address complaints and disputes arising from project impacts.

In addition, both the SEP and GRM are fully aligned with the African Development Bank's Integrated Safeguards System (ISS) and its environmental and social safeguard requirements, ensuring compliance with donor obligations for stakeholder engagement, transparency, and grievance resolution throughout the project lifecycle.

Chapter 2: Legal Policies & Laws Relevant to SEP

Infrastructure projects, in particular, often carry significant environmental, social, and economic risks. To mitigate these potential impacts, clear responsibilities spanning environmental, social, economic, and legal dimensions must be integrated into the project design and thoroughly considered during the planning phase. Hence, a robust set of regulatory requirements has been established at both the national and international levels. These frameworks are designed to ensure that projects are planned, implemented, and monitored in a manner that safeguards public welfare, promotes sustainability, and upholds transparency and accountability.

2.1 Liberia's Framework on Stakeholder Engagement, Information Disclosure, & FPIC

2.1.1 Environmental Protection and Management Law (EPML), 2003

This law established the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and serves as the cornerstone of Liberia's environmental governance. It requires that all major development projects undergo Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs). A critical part of this process is public participation: communities and stakeholders must be consulted before projects are approved. The law also requires that environmental reports be made public, ensuring transparency. While FPIC is not explicitly mentioned, the requirement for meaningful consultation aligns with FPIC principles by giving communities a voice in decisions that affect their environment.

2.1.2 Freedom of Information Act, 2010

Liberia was the first West African country to pass a Freedom of Information law. This act guarantees citizens the right to access information held by public institutions. It obligates government agencies to disclose requested information unless it falls under specific exemptions such as national security or personal privacy. In terms of stakeholder engagement, the FOI Act empowers civil society and communities to demand transparency and hold government accountable. It is a key instrument for information disclosure, ensuring that stakeholders can make informed decisions and participate meaningfully in governance.

2.1.3 Public Procurement and Concessions Act, 2005 (Amended 2010)

This act governs the awarding of public contracts and concessions. It emphasizes transparency, fairness, and accountability in procurement processes. Stakeholder engagement is built into the law by allowing bidders and interested parties to contest procurement decisions. Importantly, it requires that concession agreements and procurement notices be published, which strengthens information disclosure. This act is particularly relevant in sectors like mining, forestry, and agriculture, where concessions can have significant impacts on communities.

2.1.4. Land Rights Act, 2018

The Land Rights Act is one of Liberia's most progressive laws. It recognizes customary land ownership, giving communities legal rights over land they have traditionally occupied. The

act requires community consultations and consent before land concessions are granted, embedding FPIC directly into law. It also mandates transparency in land transactions, ensuring that agreements are disclosed and communities are not excluded from negotiations. This law is crucial for protecting rural communities from exploitation and ensuring that development projects respect local rights.

2.1.5. Community Rights Law with Respect to Forest Lands, 2009

This law is the clearest expression of FPIC in Liberia's legal framework. It states that no decision, agreement, or activity affecting community forest resources can proceed without the free, prior, and informed consent of the community. It empowers forest-dependent communities to manage their resources and participate in decision-making. The law also requires that communities be fully informed of the impacts of forest resource use, making information disclosure a legal obligation. This law is particularly important in Liberia, where forests cover a significant portion of the country and are central to both livelihoods and biodiversity.

2.1.6. National FPIC Guidelines (2019) & FPIC Communication Strategy (2022)

These instruments were developed to operationalize FPIC across different sectors. The National FPIC Guidelines (2019) provide standardized procedures for how FPIC should be implemented, ensuring that communities are consulted consistently and fairly. The FPIC Communication Strategy (2022) complements the guidelines by establishing methods for effectively informing communities about projects and their potential impacts. Together, they ensure that FPIC is not just a principle but a practical process, supported by clear communication and institutional collaboration among the EPA, Forestry Development Authority (FDA), Liberia Land Authority (LLA), and the Ministry of Agriculture.

2.1.7. Stakeholder Engagement Plans (SEP) – Sectoral Policies

Beyond national laws, Liberia also implements Stakeholder Engagement Plans (SEPs), particularly in donor-funded projects. These SEPs require structured consultations with affected communities, disclosure of project impacts, and grievance mechanisms. While SEPs are project-specific, they align with Liberia's broader legal commitment to FPIC and transparency. Examples include SEPs in the health sector (Ministry of Health, 2022), trade and investment projects (LIFT Project, 2021), and extractive industries. They ensure that stakeholder engagement is not only a legal requirement but also a practical reality in development projects.

2.2 International Laws, Policies & Regulations

2.2.1 AfDB's Integrated Safeguards Systems (ISS)

The Replacement of the Main Water Transmission Line Project is expected to meet the requirements of AfDB's Operational Safeguards (OS) under the African Development Bank's Integrated Safeguards System (ISS). These safeguards ensure that the project is designed and implemented in a manner that protects people, the environment, and the long-term sustainability of the investment. Given the project's location within a densely populated urban corridor and the nature of the construction activities, below presents a summary of the Bank's OSs

2.2.1.1 OS1: Assessment & Management of Environmental & Social Risks & Impacts

This safeguard is the foundation of the ISS. It requires borrowers to identify, assess, and manage environmental and social risks throughout the entire project cycle. Projects likely to pose environmental and social risks and impacts must prepare Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs) which shall include Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs), depending on the level of risk. OS1 emphasizes integrating climate change vulnerability, gender equality, and human rights into risk assessments. It ensures that risks are not only identified but also mitigated through monitoring and adaptive management. In practice, OS1 sets the stage for applying all other safeguards consistently.

2.2.1.2: OS2: Labor and Working Conditions

OS2 focuses on protecting workers involved in AfDB-financed projects. It requires fair treatment, non-discrimination, and equal opportunity for all workers. The safeguard prohibits child labor and forced labor, while ensuring safe and healthy working conditions. It also recognizes workers' rights to collective bargaining and freedom of association. Importantly, OS2 requires that a worker's grievance mechanisms be established so workers can raise concerns without fear of retaliation. This safeguard ensures that development projects contribute positively to labor standards and uphold international conventions. It also establishes various classes of workers, which include Community workers and Primary supply workers

2.2.1.3: OS3: Resource Efficiency & Pollution Prevention & Management

This safeguard promotes sustainable use of resources such as energy, water, and raw materials. It requires borrowers to adopt measures that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, improve energy efficiency, and minimize waste. OS3 also mandates proper management of hazardous materials and pollution prevention strategies. Projects must adopt best practices for waste disposal and recycling, ensuring that environmental footprints are minimized. By focusing on resource efficiency, OS3 aligns AfDB projects with global sustainability goals and climate commitments.

2.2.1.4: OS4: Community Health, Safety, and Security

OS4 addresses risks and impacts that projects may pose to project-affected communities. It requires borrowers to implement measures that avoid, or minimize risks of accidents, reduce exposure to hazardous materials, and control communicable diseases. Projects must also consider risks from construction activities, traffic, and natural disasters. When security personnel are engaged, OS4 requires that they operate in a manner consistent with human rights standards, avoiding excessive force or abuse. This safeguard ensures that communities benefit from projects without being exposed to undue harm.

2.2.1.5: OS5: Land Acquisition, Restrictions on Land Use, and Involuntary Resettlement

This safeguard protects people affected by land acquisition or restrictions on land use and aims to avoid forced eviction. It requires that displacement be minimized and, when unavoidable, that affected persons receive fair compensation and livelihood restoration.

OS5 emphasizes participatory resettlement planning, ensuring that communities are meaningfully consulted and involved in decisions. It also requires monitoring of resettlement outcomes to ensure that displaced people are not worse off. This safeguard is critical in Africa, where land rights are often contested, and vulnerable groups risk marginalization.

2.2.1.6 OS6: Biodiversity Conservation & Sustainable Management of Living Natural Res.

OS6 ensures that projects avoid or minimize impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems. It requires the protection of critical habitats, endangered species, and ecosystem services. Projects must adopt sustainable practices in forestry, fisheries, and agriculture, and avoid introducing invasive species. This OS also addresses the sustainable management of primary production and the harvesting of living natural resources. OS6 aligns AfDB operations with international biodiversity conventions such as the Convention on Biological Diversity. By safeguarding biodiversity, OS6 ensures that development does not come at the expense of ecological integrity.

2.2.1.7: OS7: Indigenous Peoples/Sub-Saharan African Historically Marginalized Communities

This safeguard protects the rights of indigenous peoples and historically marginalized communities in Africa. It requires that projects respect their identity, culture, and traditional livelihoods. Most importantly, OS7 mandates Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) for projects that affect their lands, resources, or cultural heritage. FPIC ensures that communities have the right to say “yes” or “no” to projects before they proceed. OS7 strengthens inclusion and prevents exploitation of vulnerable groups.

2.2.1.8: OS8: Cultural Heritage

OS8 ensures that projects respect and protect cultural heritage, both tangible and intangible. This includes archaeological sites, historical monuments, sacred places, and traditional practices. Borrowers must consult with communities to identify cultural heritage and establish chance-find procedures in case artifacts are discovered during construction. OS8 requires measures to avoid the destruction or misuse of cultural assets, ensuring that development projects do not erode cultural identity.

2.2.1.9: OS9: Financial Intermediaries

OS9 recognizes that strong domestic capital and financial markets are essential for economic growth and poverty reduction. Since the AfDB often channels funds through financial intermediaries (such as commercial banks, private equity funds, microfinance institutions, or leasing companies), this safeguard ensures that those intermediaries apply the Bank's environmental and social standards to the projects they finance. This safeguard further recognizes that indirect financing can have significant environmental and social impacts, even if the Bank itself is not directly funding the subprojects. However, without proper oversight, these activities could lead to environmental harm, social conflict, or reputational risks. By requiring intermediaries to establish robust Environmental and Social Risk Management Systems (ESMS), OS9 ensures that risks are identified, assessed, and managed consistently across all levels of financing.

2.2.1.10: Os10: Stakeholder Engagement and Information Disclosure

This safeguard ensures communities and stakeholders are actively involved in projects that affect them. It requires borrowers to identify stakeholders early in the project cycle and engage them continuously throughout planning, implementation, and monitoring. Under OS10, project information must be disclosed in a timely, accessible, and understandable way, using local languages and culturally appropriate formats so that affected people can make informed decisions.

The safeguard emphasizes inclusivity, meaning that vulnerable groups such as women, youth, the elderly, persons with disabilities, and indigenous peoples must be given special attention to ensure they are not excluded from consultations. It also requires the establishment of a grievance redress mechanism, which allows communities to raise concerns and complaints without fear of retaliation, and obligates project developers to respond promptly and fairly.

2.2.2 The Aarhus Convention (1998, UNECE)

The Aarhus Convention is one of the most influential international treaties on environmental governance. It establishes three fundamental rights: access to information, public participation in decision-making, and access to justice in environmental matters. By legally requiring governments to consult communities before approving projects with environmental impacts, it ensures that stakeholder engagement is not just a procedural formality but a binding obligation. The Convention has been ratified across Europe and Central Asia, but its principles have influenced global standards for participatory rights in development projects.

2.2.3 The Espoo Convention (1991, UNECE)

The Espoo Convention focuses on Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in a transboundary context. It obliges countries to notify and consult neighboring states and affected communities when projects may have cross-border environmental impacts. This framework ensures early and meaningful participation in EIA processes, reinforcing the principle that development projects must consider not only local but also regional stakeholders.

2.2.4 The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP, 2007)

UNDRIP is a landmark declaration that recognizes the collective rights of indigenous peoples. It establishes the principle of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC), requiring governments and developers to consult and obtain consent from indigenous communities before undertaking projects that affect their lands, territories, or resources. This principle has become a cornerstone of international development practice, ensuring that indigenous peoples are not excluded from decisions that directly impact their livelihoods and cultural heritage.

Chapter 3: Description of Priority E&S Issues Requiring Stakeholder Engagement

The Replacement of the Main Water Transmission Line Project poses several environmental and social risks and impacts that must be carefully managed through continuous stakeholder engagement. These risks extend from the early identification stage of the project, through construction, and into completion. Effective management requires transparent communication, active community participation, and accountability at every step.

Stakeholder consultations will play a central role in shaping the project requirements and setting standards that reflect community needs and expectations. These engagements will directly inform the development of the Management Strategies and Implementation Plan (MSIPs) prior to project commencement. Key instruments to be prepared by the contractor include:

- **Site-Specific Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP)** – to address localized environmental and social impacts.
- **Waste Management Plan** – to ensure proper handling, storage, and disposal of construction and operational waste.
- **Emergency Preparedness and Response Plan** – to safeguard workers and communities against accidents, spills, and unforeseen hazards.
- **Traffic Management Plan** – to minimize disruptions, ensure safe mobility, and protect vulnerable groups during construction activities.
- **Other plans:** Additional plans, as may be required to address measures outlined in the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment prepared for this Project, such as OHS Plan, Emergency Preparedness & Response Plan

Integration of stakeholder engagement into the design and implementation of these plans will not only mitigate risks but also build trust, ownership, strengthen accountability, and ensure that community concerns are addressed proactively. Key E&S priority issues requiring stakeholder engagement are described below;

3.1 Traffic and Mobility Disruption

Traffic and Mobility Disruption will be one of the most visible impacts. Excavation, trenching, lane narrowing, and diversions along the McCauley Hill, Johnsonville – Congo Town, and White Flower Community will cause congestion, delays, and queuing. These disruptions increase accident risks and slow emergency response times. Vulnerable groups such as school children, roadside traders, and daily commuters will be disproportionately affected. Stakeholder engagement is necessary to plan diversions, communicate work schedules, and ensure that communities understand and can adapt to mobility changes.

3.2 Community Health and Safety

Community Health and Safety risks are also significant. Open trenches, heavy equipment movement, and night work expose residents to hazards, particularly children, the elderly, and persons with disabilities. Poor fencing and inadequate lighting could lead to accidents.

Engagement with communities is essential to design and implement visible safety measures, reassure residents, and prevent grievances that could damage the project's reputation.

3.3 Occupational Health and Safety (OHS)

Occupational Health and Safety hazards affect workers directly. Deep trenches, lifting of heavy ductile iron pipes, and handling of chemicals pose risks of trench collapse, struck-by incidents, slips, and trips. With a large workforce and subcontractor mix, strict safety protocols are required. Stakeholder engagement with contractors, regulators, and labor representatives ensures that training, protective equipment, and monitoring systems are in place to prevent injuries and fatalities.

3.4 Dust, Noise, and Air Quality Deterioration

Dust, noise, and air quality deterioration will affect roadside traders, schools, clinics, and residents. Dust from excavation and haul routes reduces visibility, settles on goods, and causes respiratory irritation, while noise from heavy machinery disrupts learning, sleep, and patient recovery. Vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly, and those with pre-existing respiratory conditions are particularly at risk. Engagement with communities ensures that mitigation measures such as dust suppression, noise barriers, and restricted working hours are communicated and adjusted based on feedback.

3.5 Waste Generation and Disposal

Waste Generation and Disposal is another priority issue. Spoil, asphalt debris, packaging, and pipe offcuts will accumulate during construction. Limited disposal facilities increase the risk of improper final disposal, which can clog drains, create unsanitary conditions, and fuel grievances. Engagement with municipal authorities, regulators, and communities is required to agree on disposal sites, stockpile management, and compliance monitoring.

3.6 Water Contamination Risks

Water Contamination Risks are critical because many households rely on shallow wells vulnerable to runoff, spills, and trench water. Polluted water can cause gastrointestinal illness and erode trust in the project. Communities must be engaged early to design protective measures, establish monitoring systems, and ensure transparent reporting of incidents.

3.7 Utility Disruption

Utility Disruption is likely when excavation occurs near telecom, electricity, and water lines. Even short-term outages can disrupt businesses, households, and essential services. Engagement with utility providers and affected stakeholders ensures rapid repair protocols and compensation mechanisms are in place.

3.8 Labor-Related Risks

Labor Related Risks include poor worker welfare, exploitation, and gender-based violence (GBV) due to weak HR systems and workforce influx. These risks can escalate into social tensions between workers and communities if grievances are ignored. Engagement with workers, community leaders, and civil society organizations is essential to enforce fair employment practices, prevent GBV, and manage grievances effectively.

3.9 Damage to Public Structures and Wetland Disturbance

Such impacts may arise where drains, culverts, ramps, sidewalks, and wetlands lie directly along the alignment of the transmission line and cannot be avoided. In these cases, it is essential to engage both communities and municipal authorities to ensure that restoration commitments are fulfilled, technical specifications are honored, alternative routes, detours, and access are clearly agreed upon. And ecological concerns are properly addressed.

3.10 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative risks arise when the impacts of the Replacement of the Transmission Line Project overlap with those of other ongoing urban activities, such as road expansion, drainage rehabilitation, and settlement growth. When these projects occur simultaneously, their combined effects can intensify traffic congestion, increase flooding risks, and worsen air quality. Communities may experience greater disruption than from any single project alone, leading to frustration and reduced tolerance for construction activities. These overlapping impacts also place additional strain on municipal services, such as drainage maintenance and traffic management, which can heighten costs and reduce efficiency. Continuous engagement with communities, contractors of parallel projects, and municipal authorities is therefore essential to coordinate schedules, harmonize mitigation measures, and reduce the compounded burden on residents.

3.11 Contextual Risks

Contextual risks are linked to Liberia's broader governance and socio-economic environment. Fragile institutions, limited regulatory enforcement capacity, and dependency on donor financing can undermine the consistent application of environmental and social safeguards. If safeguards are poorly enforced or financing is disrupted, the project may face delays, reputational damage, or even suspension. In addition, weak governance can compromise accountability and reduce public confidence in project management. These risks are further amplified by social vulnerabilities, including poverty, unemployment, and limited access to services, which make communities more sensitive to disruptions. Engagement with government institutions, donors, and civil society organizations is critical to strengthen oversight, maintain financing, and uphold human rights obligations. Transparent communication and inclusive participation help build trust and ensure that the project remains resilient despite the challenging political and economic context.

3.12 COMMUNITY GRIEVANCES

Project activities have the potential to generate community grievances, particularly when they result in restricted access, property damage, or perceptions of unequal distribution of project benefits. If these concerns are not managed openly and fairly, they may escalate into disputes or even conflict. A SEP ensures that communities have accessible channels to voice concerns, receive timely responses, and participate in decisions that affect them, thereby building trust and reducing the risk of disputes.

To address these risks effectively, the project has developed a comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) and Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM). The SEP outlines strategies for inclusive communication, consultation, and participation, ensuring that affected communities are informed, their concerns are acknowledged, and their feedback integrated into project decisions. The GRM complements this by providing a transparent and accessible process for resolving complaints and disputes throughout the project lifecycle. Additionally, the Contractor's Environmental and Social Management Plan (CESMP), the SEP, and GRM form a comprehensive safeguard framework. These instruments are critical for managing environmental and social risks, fostering community trust, community ownership, and ensuring the project is implemented responsibly and sustainably.

Chapter 4: Stakeholders Identification & Mapping

The Replacement of the Main Water Transmission Line Project has embarked on the development of this Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) to serve as a formal roadmap designed to ensure that all relevant parties are identified, informed, consulted, and involved throughout the lifecycle of the Project.

4.1 Key Principles

The stakeholder Engagement Plan is guided by a set of core principles that ensure stakeholder involvement is meaningful, inclusive, and aligned with both national and international standards. These principles serve as the foundation for building trust, promoting transparency, and enhancing the effectiveness of project implementation. They include;

- **Inclusiveness:** Engagement must be inclusive of all stakeholder groups, especially vulnerable and marginalized populations. This ensures that diverse perspectives are considered and that no group is excluded from the decision-making process.
- **Transparency:** Project information should be disclosed in a timely, accurate, and accessible manner. Stakeholders must be informed about project objectives, risks, benefits, and progress through appropriate communication channels.
- **Accountability:** The Project team must be responsive to stakeholder concerns and feedback. Mechanisms such as the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) should be in place to ensure complaints are addressed fairly and promptly.
- **Participation:** Stakeholders should be actively involved throughout the project lifecycle- from planning and design to implementation and monitoring. Their input should influence key decisions and mitigation strategies.
- **Cultural Sensitivity:** Engagement approaches must respect local customs, languages, and social norms. Communication should be tailored to the cultural context of each community to ensure clarity and relevance.
- **Continuous Engagement:** Stakeholder engagement is not a one-time activity but a continuous process. Regular updates, consultations, and feedback loops are crucial for maintaining trust and adapting to evolving project dynamics.

4.2 Stakeholder Mapping

Stakeholder Mapping is the systematic process of identifying, analyzing, and organizing stakeholders to understand their relationship to the project, their level of influence, and their interest. It provides a structured framework for understanding who the stakeholders are, how they are affected, and the extent to which they can influence project outcomes.

Mapping stakeholders guarantees and ensures that project teams are able to prioritize engagement strategies, allocate resources efficiently, and ensure that consultation efforts are both inclusive and effective.

Key Elements of Stakeholder Mapping

- 1. Stakeholder Identification:** The first element of stakeholder mapping is identifying all individuals, groups, institutions, and organizations that may be affected by the project or have an influence on it. This step ensures that no relevant party is overlooked, including project-affected persons, government agencies, donors, contractors, and civil society actors.
- 2. Stakeholder Analysis:** Once stakeholders are identified, their interests, expectations, and potential impacts are analyzed. This involves assessing how the project affects them, what concerns they may have, and what benefits they may gain. It also examines their capacity to influence project outcomes positively or negatively.
- 3. Categorization and Grouping:** Stakeholders are then categorized into groups such as primary stakeholders (directly affected), secondary stakeholders (indirectly affected), and tertiary stakeholders (institutional actors). This grouping helps clarify the nature of their relationship to the project and guides tailored engagement strategies.
- 4. Influence and Interest Assessment:** A critical element of mapping is evaluating each stakeholder's level of influence (decision-making power, authority, or resources) and interest (degree of concern or benefit from the project).
- 5. Prioritization of Engagement:** Based on analysis, stakeholders are prioritized to determine who requires intensive engagement, who needs regular updates, and who should be monitored. High-influence and high-interest stakeholders typically require close collaboration, while low-influence groups may need targeted communication to ensure inclusivity.

4.2.1 Stakeholder Identification

Stakeholder Identification is critical, especially at the inception of project approval and throughout the project lifecycle, because it ensures inclusivity, reduces risks, improves project outcomes, and aligns with funding requirements, including the national regulatory standards. More importantly, it ensures that the voices of both powerful actors and vulnerable groups are captured, prevents anticipated conflicts and grievances, and builds trust, legitimacy, and shared ownership of decisions among stakeholders. To ensure a successful stakeholder engagement plan, the following steps have been used to identify stakeholders relevant to the Project.

4.2.1.1 Identification of Directly Affected Parties

This step involves identifying the Project's Directly Affected Persons (PAPs), including landowners, tenants, businesses, and communities located along the project corridor. It also covers workers and contractors who are directly engaged in project implementation. These stakeholders are the most immediately impacted and therefore require continuous consultation and mitigation measures.

4.2.1.2 Identification of Indirectly Affected Groups

Indirectly affected stakeholders include residents impacted by traffic diversions, noise, or environmental changes resulting from project activities. This category also encompasses vulnerable groups such as women, youth, the elderly, and persons with disabilities living along the corridor. Their concerns may not be as visible as those of directly affected parties, but they are critical to ensuring equity and inclusivity in project outcomes.

4.2.1.3 Identification of Institutional Stakeholders

Institutional stakeholders include government ministries, municipal authorities, and regulatory agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Development partners and financiers, such as the African Development Bank (AfDB) and the OPEC Fund. In addition, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society organizations play important roles in advocacy, monitoring, and community mobilization. These institutions hold significant influence over project design, compliance, and sustainability.

4.3 Stakeholder Categorization

Stakeholder categorization involves the process of classifying stakeholders based on their relationship to the project, level of impact, and influence. It helps to distinguish between those who are directly affected, indirectly affected, or institutionally involved. This categorization ensures that engagement strategies are tailored to each group's needs, expectations, and responsibilities.

- Primary Stakeholders:** Directly affected by the project (e.g., landowners, owners, communities), along the corridor.
- Secondary Stakeholders:** Indirectly affected (e.g., nearby residents, vulnerable groups).
- Tertiary Stakeholders:** Institutional actors (e.g., government agencies, donors, NGOs) who regulate, finance, or oversee the project.

The table below provide detailed classification and summary of all the stakeholders identified in terms of categories, groups, and descriptions.

Table 2: Stakeholder Categorization, Group & Description

Category	Stakeholder Group	Description
1. Primary Stakeholders (Directly Affected Parties)	Project Affected Persons (PAPs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Landowners along the 15.2km Pipeline CorridorTenants and households facing temporary access disruptionLocal businesses affected by construction activities (petty traders, motorcyclists, roadside vendors, etc.)Communities situated along the pipeline route (exposed to dust, noise, traffic diversions)
	Workers, Consultants & Contractors	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Construction Workers directly engaged in pipeline replacement.Sub-contractors and service providers (transport, catering, equipment suppliers)

Category	Stakeholder Group	Description
2. Secondary Stakeholders (Indirectly Affected Groups)	Local Residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technica consultants (engineers, safeguard specialists) responsible for ESMP implementation. • Residents affected by traffic congestion, noise, dust, and temporary disruptions. • Households experiencing indirect impacts such as reduced access to services during construction.
	Vulnerable Groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women (market women, household caregivers) who rely on water access and safe mobility. • Youth (students, informal workers) impacted by school attendance or livelihood disruptions. • Elderly residents with limited mobility and higher sensitivity to health risks. • Persons with disabilities requiring special consideration for accessibility and safety.
3. Tertiary Stakeholders (Institutional Stakeholders)	Government Ministries & Agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Public Works (MPW) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oversight of infrastructure standards • Environmental Protection Agency of Liberia (EPA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental compliance and monitoring • Liberia National Police (LNP) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic Management & public safety • Liberia Electricity Corporation (LEC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordination to avoid utility disruptions • Ministry of Labor (MOL) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Labor rights and OHS compliance • Paynesville City Corporation (PCC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - local governance and community liaison • Johnsonville Township Commission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - local governance and community liaison • Congo Town Township Commission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - local governance and community liaison
	Development Partners & Financiers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • African Development Bank (AfDB) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Primary financier and safeguard compliance • OPEC Fund for International Development (OFID) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Co-financing and monitoring
	Civil Society & NGOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local NGOs advocating for environmental and social safeguards, Media Group. Etc. • Community-based organization (CBOs) mobilizing grassroots participation. • Civil Society Watchdogs monitoring transparency and accountability. • Media groups disseminating project information and amplifying community voices.

4.4 Stakeholder Influence, Role & Responsibilities

Stakeholders in the Replacement of the Main Water Transmission Line Project hold varying levels of influence and interest, shaping both its implementation and outcomes. The influence and responsibilities of each stakeholder is provided below;

4.4.1 Government Agencies and Regulators

Government ministries and regulatory bodies, such as the Ministry of Public Works, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Liberia Water & Sewer Corporation, the Ministry of Labor, the Ministry of Finance, and the Ministry of Development Planning, have a high level of influence throughout the project lifecycle. Their roles include granting permits, enforcing environmental and social safeguards, coordinating utility relocation, and ensuring compliance with national laws. They should provide oversight, technical guidance, and enforcement to guarantee that the project aligns with national development priorities.

4.4.2 Development Partners and Donors (AFDB, OPEC Fund)

Development partners exert a strong influence during project design, financing, and monitoring stages. Their roles include setting safeguard requirements, providing funding, and conducting periodic compliance audits. They should ensure that project implementation meets international standards, while also supporting capacity building and institutional strengthening within local agencies.

4.4.3 Contractors and Subcontractors

Contractors and subcontractors have direct influence during the construction phase. Their responsibilities include implementing mitigation measures, adhering to occupational health and safety standards, managing labor relations, and ensuring the timely delivery of work. They should establish dedicated environmental and social units, train workers, and maintain transparent communication with communities to minimize risks.

4.4.4 Utility Service Providers

The Liberia Water and Sewer Corporation, the Liberia Electricity Corporation, the Ministry of Public Works, the Liberia Telecommunication Corporation, and other utility providers influence both construction and operational phases. Their roles include coordinating utility relocation, maintaining service continuity, and expanding networks after project completion. They should reinvest increased revenue into system upgrades and ensure an uninterrupted water supply to communities.

4.4.5 Local Government and Municipal Authorities

Municipal authorities influence the project during the planning and community engagement stages. Their responsibilities include facilitating stakeholder consultations, resolving grievances, and coordinating with contractors to minimize disruption. They should act as a bridge between communities and project implementers, ensuring that local needs are addressed. These relevant local government and municipalities include Johnsonville Township, Paynesville City Corporation, the Superintendent of Montserrado County, the Township of Congo Town, etc.

4.4.6 Community Members and Roadside Traders

Communities and traders are directly impacted during construction and benefit most during operation. Their influence lies in shaping project acceptance and sustainability. Their roles include participating in consultations, voicing grievances through the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), and cooperating with contractors during temporary disruptions. They should engage actively to ensure sustainable implementation and protection of livelihoods. The relevant communities along the corridor include: McCauley Hill Community, Johnsonville Roundabout Community, Pipeline Community, Pipeline Supermarket Community, Red Light Community, Police Academy Junction, Duport Junction Community, GSA Road Junction Community, ELWA Junction Community, SD Copper Road Junction Community, Boulevard Junction Community, and Congo Town Community.

4.4.7 Vulnerable Groups

Vulnerable groups (children, the elderly, women, & disabled) influence the project indirectly by highlighting equity concerns. Their roles include participating in targeted consultations and benefiting from differentiated mitigation measures such as safe crossings, accessible diversions, and GBV awareness programs. They should be prioritized to ensure that adverse impacts do not fall disproportionately on them.

4.4.8 Civil Society and NGOs

Civil society organizations influence the project through advocacy, monitoring, and community mobilization. Their roles include supporting awareness campaigns, monitoring safeguard compliance, and providing independent feedback to donors and government agencies. They should act as watchdogs to ensure transparency and accountability.

4.4.9 Media and Public Opinion Leaders

The media influences the project by shaping public perception and disseminating information. Their role is to provide accurate reporting on project progress, impacts, and community concerns. They should contribute to transparency and accountability by ensuring that information reaches all stakeholders.

The matrix below summarizes the key stakeholders' categories and specific areas of influence for each stakeholder.

Table 3: Stakeholder Categorization & Specific areas of Influence

Category	Stakeholder Group	Specific Area of Influence	Influence Level	Roles & Responsibilities to Ensure Project Success	Project Phase
Primary Stakeholders (Directly Affected Parties)	Project Affected Persons (PAPs) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landowners • Tenants & households <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local businesses • Communities along the pipeline 	Directly impacted by construction activities and service disruptions. Influence through acceptance, grievances, or cooperation.	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate in consultations and grievance redress mechanisms. • Provide feedback on risks and impacts and mitigation measures. • Cooperate with compensation and resettlement processes. • Support monitoring of community-level impacts. 	Pre-construction, Construction, Operation
	Workers, Consultants & Contractors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction workers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-contractors • Technical consultants 	Direct control over construction quality, safety, and timelines. Influence through adherence to ESMP and OHS standards.	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement work according to technical specifications. • Ensure occupational health and safety compliance. • Apply environmental and social safeguards. • Report progress and challenges to PIU. 	Construction
Secondary Stakeholders (Indirectly Affected Groups)	Local Residents	Indirectly affected by traffic congestion, noise, dust, and temporary disruptions. Influence through public opinion and community acceptance.	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage in consultations and provide feedback on indirect impacts. • Use grievance mechanisms to report concerns. • Cooperate with temporary traffic and access adjustments. 	Construction
	Vulnerable Groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women • Youth • Elderly • Persons with disabilities 	Influence through advocacy for equitable access and protection of rights. Sensitive to health, mobility, and livelihood impacts.	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate in targeted consultations. • Highlight specific needs (e.g., accessibility, livelihood support). • Actively use grievance mechanisms. • Support awareness campaigns for inclusivity. 	Pre-construction, Construction, Operation

Category	Stakeholder Group	Specific Area of Influence	Influence Level	Roles & Responsibilities to Ensure Project Success	Project Phase
Tertiary Stakeholders (Institutional Stakeholders)	Government Ministries & Agencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPW • EPA • LNP • LEC • MOL • PCC, Johnsonville & Congo Town Commissions 	High-level influence through regulation, permits, and enforcement. Authority over infrastructure standards, environmental compliance, labor rights, and public safety.	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve designs, permits, and ESMP. • Monitor compliance with environmental and labor laws. • Manage traffic and public safety during construction. • Coordinate utility services to avoid disruptions. • Act as liaison between the project and local communities. 	Pre-construction, Construction
	Development Partners & Financiers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AfDB • OFID 	Strong influence through financing, safeguard compliance, and monitoring. Authority to enforce donor standards and reporting requirements.	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide funding and technical oversight. • Monitor safeguard compliance (ISS, OS1, OS4, OS7, OS10). • Require transparent reporting and accountability. • Support capacity building for implementing agencies. 	Pre-construction, Construction, Operation
	Civil Society & NGOs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local NGOs • CBOs • Civil society watchdogs • Media groups 	Influence through advocacy, monitoring, and public communication. Ability to amplify community voices and hold institutions accountable.	Low-Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocate for environmental and social safeguards. • Mobilize grassroots participation. • Monitor transparency and accountability. • Disseminate project information to the public. 	Construction, Operation

Chapter 5: Comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement Plan

5.1 Preparation Phase

The Preparation Phase is the stage at which the project team identifies and prioritizes environmental and social risks prior to commencement of construction activities. During this phase, stakeholders are informed about potential impacts through culturally appropriate communication methods, including radio announcements, community forums, posters, and digital channels. It is also the period when participatory planning activities are organized, including traffic management workshops, dust and noise mitigation planning, and occupational health and safety training. The preparation phase ensures that communities are aware of the project, safeguards are integrated into planning, and grievance redress mechanisms are established to handle concerns in advance. The matrix below provides insights and the practical steps to be taken during the preparation/ preconstruction phase to address potential risks and impacts associated with the project.

Table 4: Stakeholder Engagement Plan- Preparation Phase

Priority E&S Issue	Prior Information / Communication	Participatory Planning Activity	Expected Outputs / KPIs	Conflict Resolution (GRM)	Estimated Frequency & Duration	Estimated Cost
Traffic & Mobility Disruption	Radio announcements on diversions; flyers to commuters/traders	Traffic mgmt workshops with unions, police, community reps	% reduction in accidents & congestion complaints	Hotline & grievance desks/uptake points for traffic complaints	Radio: monthly (3months); Workshops: 2 sessions	~\$ 400/month (radio); ~\$700/workshop
Noise Pollution	Flyers/posters at schools/clinics; clinic briefings	Noise mitigation planning with schools, clinics, traders	# complaints logged vs resolved; adherence to working-hour restrictions	GRM logging & resolution within 14 days	Flyers: 2 batches; Clinic briefings: quarterly	~\$1,500/batch flyers
Dust & Air Quality	Radio alerts; posters for roadside traders	Dust suppression planning with schools, clinics, traders	# suppression measures/week; reduction in dust grievances	Hotline for dust-related grievances	Radio: monthly (3 months); Posters: 2 batches	Included in radio/forums
Waste Generation & Disposal	Posters in community centers; radio reminders	Waste disposal strategy co-designed with municipal authorities	% waste disposed at approved sites; # illegal dumping incidents prevented	GRM desks for waste complaints	Workshops: 2 sessions; Posters: 2 batches	~\$3,000/session

Occupational Health & Safety	Contractor briefings; posters in worker camps	OHS training & PPE enforcement sessions	% workers trained; PPE compliance rate; lost-time injury frequency	Hotline for worker grievances	Training: 2 contractor cycles	~\$3,000 per contractor cycle
Community Health & Safety	Flyers/posters; school & clinic sessions	Community safety walks with residents	# trenches fenced/illuminated ; reduction in community accidents	Hotline & grievance desks	Flyers: 2 batches; Safety walks: quarterly	Included in forums/workshops
Damage to Public Structures	Flyers/posters; community forums	Joint site inspections with residents & authorities	# structures restored; reduction in grievances	GRM logging & escalation	Forums: 2 sessions	Included in forums
Wetland/Drainage Disturbance	Radio announcements; posters in affected areas	Awareness campaigns & site monitoring with residents	Reduction in turbidity/mosquito breeding reports	Hotline for environmental complaints	Radio: monthly (3 months); Posters: 1 batches	Minimal (integrated in forums)
Labor-Related Risks (GBV, welfare)	Posters in camps, radio spots, and worker briefings	GBV awareness campaigns; grievance channels	# GBV sessions; % grievances resolved within timeframe	Hotline & escalation to PIU/Donor	Awareness sessions: 2 Posters: 2 batches	~\$1,500/session
Water Contamination Risks	Flyers/posters; clinic briefings	Joint monitoring with clinics & residents	# contamination complaints resolved; monitoring reports	Hotline for water-related grievances	Flyers: 2 batches; Clinic briefings: quarterly	~\$1,500/batch flyers
Utility Disruption	Radio alerts; coordination meetings with utilities	Joint planning with utility companies	# disruptions resolved within timeframe	Hotline & escalation	Radio: monthly (3months); Meetings: 2	Included in radio/forums
Delivery & Excavation Hazards	Radio alerts; flyers for roadside traders	Forums with traders & commuters	Reduction in roadside hazard complaints	Hotline for excavation grievances	Radio: monthly (3 months); Forums: 2	Included in forums/ workshops
Cumulative Impacts	Donor briefings; municipal coordination forums	Joint planning forums with authorities	Reduction in overlapping grievances; improved coordination	Escalation to PIU/Donor Safeguards Unit	Forums: 2	Include in forums

Contextual Risks	Donor briefings; community forums	Governance risk workshops with PIU/donors	# escalated cases resolved; donor satisfaction reports	Escalation mechanism	Forums: 2	Included in GRM
------------------	-----------------------------------	---	--	----------------------	-----------	-----------------

Conflict Resolution (GRM Integration)

- Hotline & SMS grievance system (\$300 setup; ~250/monthly maintenance x 3 months = 750) = \$1,050
- Community grievance desks at corridor points (staffed & maintained throughout the preparation phase)
- Formal GRM process (logging, categorization, resolution within 14 days)
- Escalation mechanism to PIU/Donor Safeguards Unit

Budget Summary

- Radio announcements: \$400/month x 3 months = \$1,200
- Flyers/posters: \$1,500/batch x 2 batches = \$3,000.00
- Community forums: \$700/workshop x 2 sessions = \$1,400.00
- Waste disposal workshops: \$3,000/session x 2 sessions = \$6,000.00
- OHS training: \$3,000/cycle x 2 = \$6,000.00
- GBV awareness sessions: \$1,500/session x 2 = \$3,000.00
- GRM hotline: \$300 setup + 250/month x 3 = \$1,050.00

Total Estimated Engagement Budget (Preparation Phase): \$21,650.00

5.2 Implementation Phase

The Implementation Phase occurs during active construction and focuses on managing impacts in real-time. This phase requires continuous communication with communities about traffic diversions, dust suppression, work schedules, and noise control measures. Daily participatory monitoring activities are conducted, such as community safety patrols, waste disposal oversight, and toolbox talks for workers. Schools, clinics, hospitals, traders, and commuters are kept informed to minimize disruption, while grievance systems operate around the clock to resolve issues quickly. The implementation phase is essentially about maintaining trust, ensuring safety, and actively reducing risks while construction is ongoing.

Table 5: Stakeholder Engagement Plan- Implementation Phase

Priority E&S Issue	Prior Information / Communication	Participatory Planning Activity	Expected Outputs / KPIs	Conflict Resolution (GRM)	Estimated Frequency & Duration	Estimated Cost
Traffic & Mobility Disruption	Daily radio announcements; flyers to commuters/traders	Traffic mgmt workshops with unions, police, community reps	% reduction in accidents & congestion complaints	Hotline & grievance desks	Radio: monthly (6 months); Workshops: 3	\$250/month x 18 = \$4,500; \$500/workshop x 6 = \$3,000
Noise Pollution	Flyers/posters at schools/clinics; clinic briefings	Noise mitigation planning with schools, clinics, traders	# complaints logged vs resolved; adherence to working-hour restrictions	GRM logging & resolution within 14 days	Flyers: 3 batches; Clinic briefings: bi-monthly	\$1,500/batch x 3 = \$4,500
Dust & Air Quality	Radio alerts; posters for roadside traders	Dust suppression planning with schools, clinics, traders	# suppression measures/week; reduction in dust grievances	Hotline for dust-related grievances	Radio: monthly (6 months); Posters: 3 batches	Included in radio/forums
Waste Generation & Disposal	Posters in community centers; radio reminders	Waste disposal strategy co-designed with municipal authorities	% waste disposed at approved sites; # illegal dumping incidents prevented	GRM desks for waste complaints	Workshops: 3; Posters: 3 batches	\$3,000/session x 3 = \$9,000
Occupational Health & Safety	Contractor briefings; posters in worker camps	OHS training & PPE enforcement sessions	% workers trained; PPE compliance rate; lost-time injury frequency	Hotline for worker grievances	Training: contractor cycles 3	\$3,000/cycle x 3 = \$9,000
Community Health & Safety	Flyers/posters; school & clinic sessions	Community safety walks with residents	# trenches fenced/illuminated; reduction in community accidents	Hotline & grievance desks	Flyers: 3 batches; Safety walks: bi-monthly	Included in forums/workshops
Damage to Public Structures	Flyers/posters; community forums	Joint site inspections with residents & authorities	# structures restored; reduction in grievances	GRM logging & escalation	Forums: 3	Included in forums
Wetland/Drainage Disturbance	Radio announcements; posters in affected areas	Awareness campaigns & site monitoring with residents	Reduction in turbidity/mosquito breeding reports	Hotline for environmental complaints	Radio: monthly (6 months); Posters: 2 batches	Minimal (integrated in forums)

Priority E&S Issue	Prior Information / Communication	Participatory Planning Activity	Expected Outputs / KPIs	Conflict Resolution (GRM)	Estimated Frequency & Duration	Estimated Cost
Labor-Related Risks (GBV, welfare)	Posters in camps, radio spots; worker briefings	GBV awareness campaigns; grievance channels	# GBV sessions; % grievances resolved within timeframe	Hotline & escalation to PIU/Donor	Awareness sessions: 3; Posters: 3 batches	\$1,500/session × 3 = \$4,500
Water Contamination Risks	Flyers/posters; clinic briefings	Joint monitoring with clinics & residents	# contamination complaints resolved; monitoring reports	Hotline for water-related grievances	Flyers: 3 batches; Clinic briefings: bi-monthly	\$1,500/batch × 3 = \$4,500
Utility Disruption	Radio alerts; coordination meetings with utilities	Joint planning with utility companies	# disruptions resolved within timeframe	Hotline & escalation	Radio: monthly (6 months); Meetings: 3	Included in radio/forums
Delivery & Excavation Hazards	Radio alerts; flyers for roadside traders	Forums with traders & commuters	Reduction in roadside hazard complaints	Hotline for excavation grievances	Radio: monthly (6 months); Forums: 3	Included in forums/workshops
Cumulative Impacts	Donor briefings; municipal coordination forums	Joint planning forums with authorities	Reduction in overlapping grievances; improved coordination	Escalation to PIU/Donor Safeguards Unit	Forums: 3	Included in forums
Contextual Risks	Donor briefings; community forums	Governance risk workshops with PIU/donors	# escalated cases resolved; donor satisfaction reports	Escalation mechanism	Forums: 3	Included in GRM

Conflict Resolution (GRM Integration – Implementation Phase)

- Hotline & SMS grievance system (\$300 setup; \$250/month × 18 months = \$4,800)
- Community grievance desks staffed throughout construction
- Formal GRM process (logging, categorization, resolution within 14 days)
- Escalation mechanism to PIU/Donor Safeguards Unit

Budget Summary (Implementation Phase)

- Traffic & Mobility: \$250 × 18 months = (\$4,500.00) + (\$500 × 6 = \$3,000.00) = \$7,500.00
- Noise Pollution: \$1,500 × 5 batches = \$4,500.00

- Waste Disposal: $\$3,000 \times 5 = \$9,000.00$
- OHS: $\$3,000 \times 5 = \$9,000.00$
- GBV/Labor Risks: $\$1,500 \times 5 = \$4,500.00$
- Water Contamination: $\$1,500/\text{batch} \times 3 = \$4,500$
- GRM Integration: $\$4,800.00$

Total Estimated Budget (Implementation Phase) = \$39,000.00

5.3 Completion Phase

The Completion Phase begins once construction activities are finished and emphasizes restoration, monitoring, and closure. During this phase, damaged public structures such as drains, culverts, ramps, and sidewalks are reinstated, and disturbed sites are rehabilitated through landscaping and erosion control. Water quality testing is carried out to reassure communities about safe drinking sources, and all remaining waste is properly disposed of. Contractors demobilize equipment and workforce safely, while community forums are held to present outcomes, gather feedback, and close out grievances. The completion phase ensures that communities see tangible restoration, that donor requirements are met, and that trust in project management is reinforced through transparent closure.

Table 6: Stakeholder Engagement Plan-- Completion Phase

Priority E&S Issue	Prior Information / Communication	Participatory Planning Activity	Expected Outputs / KPIs	Conflict Resolution (GRM)	Estimated Frequency & Duration	Estimated Cost
Restoration of Public Structures	Flyers/posters; community forums	Joint inspections with residents & authorities	% of damaged structures restored; # grievances resolved	GRM logging & escalation	Forums: 2	\$700/workshop $\times 2 = \$1,400$
Environmental Rehabilitation	Radio announcements; posters in affected areas	Community monitoring of wetlands/drainage restoration	Reduction in turbidity/mosquito breeding reports	Hotline for environmental complaints	Radio: monthly (3 months); Posters: 2 batches	\$400/month $\times 3 = \$1,200$; \$1,500/batch $\times 2 = \$3,000$
Labor Demobilization & GBV Safeguards	Posters in camps; worker briefings	Exit awareness campaigns;	% of grievances resolved within	Hotline escalation & to PIU/Donor	Awareness sessions: 2; Posters: 2 batches	\$1,500/session $\times 2 = \$3,000$

		grievance channels maintained	timeframe; # GBV sessions			
Community Safety (Post-works)	Flyers/posters; school & clinic sessions	Safety audits with residents	# of residual hazards removed; reduction in accidents	Hotline & grievance desks	Flyers: 2 batches; Safety walks: 2	\$1,500/batch × 2 = \$3,000
Water Quality Assurance	Flyers/posters; clinic briefings	Joint monitoring with clinics & residents	# contamination complaints resolved; water quality reports	Hotline for water-related grievances	Flyers: 2 batches; Clinic briefings: 2	\$1,500/batch × 2 = \$3,000
Traffic & Mobility (Post-works)	Radio announcements; flyers to commuters/traders	Traffic flow assessments with unions, police	% reduction in congestion complaints	Hotline & grievance desks	Radio: monthly (3 months); Workshops: 2	\$400/month × 3 = \$1,200; \$700/workshop × 2 = \$1,400
Cumulative Impacts	Donor briefings; municipal coordination forums	Joint planning forums with authorities	Reduction in overlapping grievances; improved coordination	Escalation to PIU/Donor Safeguards Unit	Forums: 2	\$700/workshop × 2 = \$1,400
Governance & Donor Accountability	Donor briefings; community forums	Governance risk workshops with PIU/donors	# escalated cases resolved; donor satisfaction reports	Escalation mechanism	Forums: 2	Included in GRM

Conflict Resolution (GRM Integration – Completion Phase)

- Hotline & SMS grievance system maintained until project closure (\$250/month × 3 months = \$750)
- Community grievance desks are operational during demobilization
- Formal GRM process (logging, categorization, resolution within 14 days)
- Escalation mechanism to PIU/Donor Safeguards Unit

Budget Summary (Completion Phase): ≈ \$23,550

- Restoration of Structures: \$1,400.00
- Environmental rehabilitation: \$4,200.00

- GBV/Labor demobilization: \$3,000.00
- Community Safety: \$3,000.00
- Traffic & Mobility: \$3,600.00
- Cumulative Impacts: \$1,400.00
- Governance & Donor Accountability: \$1,400.00
- GRM hotline: \$750.00

Grand Total: \$23,550.00

All priority E&S issues (traffic, noise, dust, waste, OHS, community safety, damage to structures, wetlands, labor/GBV, water contamination, utilities, excavation hazards, cumulative impacts, contextual risks) are fully captured in the Implementation Phase. All post-construction issues (restoration, environmental rehabilitation, labor demobilization, community safety, water quality, traffic normalization, cumulative impacts, governance/ donor accountability) are captured in the Completion Phase.

5.4 Stakeholder Engagement Plan-Consolidated Budget

The consolidated budget is presented in the table below.

Table 7: Consolidated SEP Budget

Phase	Key activities covered	Estimated budget	Notes
Preparation/ preconstruction	Radio announcements, flyers/posters, community forums, OHS training, GBV awareness, GRM setup & maintenance, safety walks, inspections	\$21,600.00	Based on 3 months preparation period.
Implementation/ Construction	Daily/weekly radio alerts, flyers/posters, dust suppression, waste disposal workshops, OHS training cycles, GBV awareness, utility coordination, grievance desks	\$39,000.00	Based on an 18-month construction period, with multiple cycles of training and workshops.
Completion/ post-construction	Restoration of structures, environmental rehabilitation, labor demobilization & GBV safeguards, community safety audits, water quality monitoring, traffic normalization, governance forums, GRM closure	\$23,550.00	Covers the 3-month demobilization and handover period.
	Total:	\$84,150.00	

Chapter 6: Institutional Arrangement for SEP Implementation

The successful implementation of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) requires dedicated technical personnel at each level of the project. These resources ensure that consultation activities are properly coordinated, documented, and aligned with both national regulatory requirements and international safeguard standards.

6.1 Project Implementation Unit (PIU)

- The PIU shall provide overall coordination and oversight of SEP activities.
- **Responsibilities:**
 - Develop the SEP, work plans, and budget
 - Ensure compliance with AfDB's Integrated Safeguards Systems and requirements
 - Supervise contractors and safeguard specialists.
 - Monitor KPIs (complaints resolved, PPE compliance, accident reduction).
 - Document and report grievances through the GRM system.
 - Consolidate reports on engagement activities and grievances status to the Bank.
 - Escalate unresolved grievances to the PIU Level GRM Committee.
- **The Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialist (PIU)**
 - Shall be the technical lead for environmental and social risks management.
 - Identify priority E&S issues requiring engagement.
 - Design culturally appropriate communication strategies
 - Facilitate participatory planning workshops (traffic, dust, GBV, OHS).
 - Monitor KPIs and document outcomes of engagement activities.
 - Provide technical reports to the PIU and the AfDB
 - Work closely with the Community Liaison Officer (CLO) who act as the primary interface between the project and affected communities, facilitating dialogue and follow-up.
 - He also tracks consultation activities, prepares reports,
 - Leads and manages grievances and complaints with the Grievances Redress Committee, and ensures lessons learned are integrated into project management.

6.2 Contractor/Sub-contractor

- Shall be the frontline implementers of SEP measures during construction.
- **Responsibilities:**
 - Conduct OHS training and enforce PPE compliance.
 - Share information with workers and communities (posters, briefings).
 - Maintain safe worksites (fencing trenches, signage, dust suppression).
 - Co-operate with grievance desks and respond to complaints.
 - Contractually bound to PIU and report monthly and quarterly status of the SEP and Grievances.

- Report incidents and corrective actions to PIU.
- The Environmental Officer, Social Safeguards Officer, and the Health and Safety Officer of the Contractor shall ensure day-to-day engagement with local communities during construction, manage grievances along with the Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), and document interactions.
- The Health and Safety Officer shall provide technical input on occupational and community health and safety issues raised during consultations.
- Site Supervisors: Support communications with workers and local residents, ensuring timely updates on construction activities.
- Shall nominate the Community Liaison Officer (CLO); His/her responsibilities include;
- Disseminate information via radio, flyers, WhatsApp groups, and forums.
- Work closely with the PIU's E&S Safeguard Specialist to organize community safety walks and focus group discussions.
- Collect grievances and forward them to GRM desks.
- Ensure inclusion of vulnerable groups (women, traders, schools, clinics).
- Provide feedback loops to communities on grievance resolution.

6.3 AfDB Bank's Safeguards and Compliance Department

- The AfDB shall provide external oversight, technical support, and compliance assurance.
- Responsibilities:
 - Review and approve SEP
 - Review SEP Implementation reports and KPIs
 - Monitor grievance escalation cases.
 - Provide technical guidance and corrective actions
 - Ensure the project aligns with AfDB's safeguard standards.

6.4 Community Stakeholders

The community stakeholders include residents, traders, schools, clinics, & vulnerable groups.

- Responsibilities:
 - Primary beneficiaries and participants in SEP activities.
 - Attend forums, workshops, and safety walks.
 - Report grievances through hotline, SMS, or grievance desks.
 - Monitor project impacts and hold PIU accountable.

6.5 Government & Institutional Level:

- Responsibilities:

- Provide oversight on environmental and social compliance and ensure consultations meet regulatory standards.
- Facilitate community mobilization, ensure inclusivity, and support grievance redress mechanisms.
- LWSC Technical Staff: Offer technical clarifications on pipeline design, water supply connections, and service delivery.
- Participate in joint inspections and monitoring.
- Coordinate with utility companies to minimize service disruptions.

6.6 Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM Team)

- GRM Team will serve as a dedicated unit for conflict resolution.
- Shall be responsible for;
 - Operate hotline and SMS grievance system.
 - Staff community grievance desks along the corridor
 - Categorize, log, and resolve grievances within 14 days.
 - Escalate unresolved cases to the PIU Level GRM Committee
 - Report monthly to the PIU and Quarterly to the Donor.

6.7 Municipalities & Line Ministries, Agencies & Commissions

- Role: Local governance and technical support.
- Responsibilities:
 - Co-design waste disposal strategies and traffic management plans.
 - Provide oversight on utility coordination (water, electricity, telecom).
 - Support the enforcement of environmental and safety regulations.
 - Collaborate with PIU and report to sector ministries.

6.8 Stakeholder Consultation & Engagement Conducted

During the preparation of this SEP, a stakeholder consultation meeting was conducted within the project corridor. The targeted stakeholder includes: a) Primary Stakeholders (Directly Affected Parties); Secondary Stakeholders (Indirectly Affected Groups); and Tertiary Stakeholders (Institutional Stakeholders).

Details of the engagement meetings are provided below;

- **Date and Location of the Consultations**
 - First Meeting: November 17, 2025- Johnsonville Township Commissioner's Office
- **Stakeholders Consulted**
 - **Primary Stakeholders:** Directly affected communities (McCauley Hill, Whein Town, Pipeline Community, Red Light Community, Police Academy Community, Duport Road, Paynesville Joe Bar, ELWA Junction Community, Paynesville Community, Congo Town, etc.)

- **Secondary Stakeholder:** Indirectly affected groups (Bike Riders Association, Petty Traders Union, Liberia Marketing Association, Business Community representatives).
- **Tertiary Stakeholders:** Institutional Stakeholders (Liberia Water and Sewer Corporation, Environmental Protection Agency of Liberia, Ministry of Public Works, Paynesville City Corporation, Johnsonville Township, Township of Congo Town, Office of the Representation of the District No. 2, Montserrado County, etc.).

- **Name of Participants/Stakeholders**

Please see Annex III for the Attendance List of participants who attended the November 17, 2025, Stakeholder consultative meeting at the Johnsonville Township Commissioners' Office.

- **Risks and Impacts Presented**

The consultation session focused on Stakeholder Engagement Strategies and the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM). Participants were presented with key issues to ensure clarity, transparency, and accountability in project implementation.

Key Discussion Points:

- **Stakeholder Categories and Roles:** Participants reviewed the different categories of stakeholders—primary, secondary, and tertiary—and their respective roles in the project. This distinction helps clarify responsibilities and ensures inclusive participation.
- **Legal and Safeguard Requirements** The session emphasized compliance with national laws and donor safeguard policies, particularly regarding stakeholder consultation and information disclosure.
- **Project Activities Requiring Consultation and Engagement:** Several project-related risks were identified as requiring active stakeholder involvement, including:
 - Traffic and mobility disruption (restricted access, pedestrian safety, movement constraints).
 - Community health and safety (open trenches, heavy-duty vehicle movement, night works).
 - Occupational health and safety (worker safety, incidents, slips, trips, and falls).
 - Dust, noise, and air quality deterioration (impacts on roadside traders, schools, and residents).
 - Waste generation and disposal (unsustainable management of spoil, asphalt debris, packaging, and pipe offcuts).
 - Water contamination risks (shallow wells, runoff, spills).
 - Labor-related risks (GBV, SEA, SH, disease transmission).
 - Damage to public structures along the corridor.
 - Cumulative impacts from overlapping urban works.
- **Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM):** The GRM was presented as a key tool to mitigate project-related complaints fairly and promptly.

- **Grievance Platforms** Available platforms include written submissions, verbal reports, hotlines, and anonymous filing options, ensuring accessibility for all community members, workers, businesses, institutions, and vulnerable groups.
- **Complaint Filing Methods** Procedures were explained to guarantee that grievances can be filed easily and equitably, regardless of literacy, access, or social status.
- **Importance of the GRM:** The GRM was highlighted as essential for building trust, preventing conflicts, and strengthening accountability between the project and its stakeholders.
- **Roles of Grievance Representatives:** Representatives of the grievance platform are responsible for receiving, documenting, and following up on complaints to ensure timely resolution.
- **Confidentiality Principle** The principle of confidentiality was emphasized, ensuring that sensitive grievances—particularly those involving vulnerable groups—are handled discreetly and respectfully.

- **Main Concerns Raised by Participants**

Table 8: Main concerns raised by stakeholders/participants

No.	Issues/Concerns Raised	Responses Provided
1	Mr. James T. Ngandee (0777385580): He asked about the allowable distance from the road to the pipeline and expressed concern about the Johnsonville cemetery, which is very close to the road, with graves almost on the roadside. (Roadside Seller)	The project requires at least three meters of working space to conduct civil works, trenching, and pipe laying. The pipeline alignment will be deflected as much as possible to avoid disturbing the cemetery.
2	Jacob Boakai (0777145944): As a businessman selling in a container located in the alley, asked whether he would be allowed to bring back his container after removing it for the pipeline construction.	LWSC/PIU clarified that it is not responsible for enforcing laws regarding the protection or maintenance of alleys. Therefore, LWSC cannot approve the reinstatement of containers in alleys.
3	Alphons D.N. Teah Jr. (077760784): Raised concern about his structure built on public property, asking whether the entity would rebuild it if removed or demolished during construction.	The project does not involve resettlement, and no compensation will be provided. However, if a public structure is unavoidably affected, it will be restored or reinstated to an equal or better condition.
4	Unnamed Participant: Asked whether off-route communities, such as Kpah Town, would be connected to the water supply services.	The project's target is to construct the outstanding 15.2 km of pipeline corridor using a 48-inch ductile iron (DI) pipeline. Off-route communities are not included in the current scope.

5	Abu J.S. Kromah: Explained that removing his roadside container would cost around US\$50–60 and asked if the project would cover this.	The Project will bear the cost of such removal if there is indeed any need to remove any container. However, the first option will be to avoid such removal in line with OS5 and the mitigation hierarchy. This could involve slight re-alignment of the pipes.
6	Hon. Randall Johnson (0775228395): Emphasized that Johnsonville Township has no water and demanded access. He also highlighted similar concerns from White Plains Township and Louisiana, noting that water currently flows straight to Monrovia while these communities remain underserved.	The concern was welcomed. Since the project is still in its early stages, inclusion of underserved communities such as Johnsonville, White Plains, and Louisiana will be recommended during the design phase.

- **Key Outcome Summary**

- Participant gained clarity on the distinction between primary, secondary, and tertiary stakeholders, and their respective roles in project implementation.
- Stakeholders noted that the consultative meetings and engagement are a legal and compliance requirement.
- Stakeholders acknowledged several risks requiring consultation and mitigation,
- The GRM was presented as a key to mitigate complaints fairly and promptly. Stakeholders were informed about the available grievance platforms (written, verbal, hotlines, anonymous filing) and filing methods accessible to all groups, including vulnerable populations
- The GRM was highlighted as essential for building trust, preventing conflicts, and strengthening accountability. Confidentiality principles were emphasized to ensure sensitive grievances are handled discreetly.
- Stakeholders expressed acceptability of the project and hope that the project's positive impacts could be translated immediately.

Chapter 7: Grievance Redress Mechanism

The Replacement of the Main Water Transmission Line Project will establish a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) within the project corridor. The GRM will serve as the platform in which queries or clarifications about the project are responded to, problems that arise out of implementation are resolved, and grievances are efficiently and effectively addressed. The Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) shall provide a formal process for stakeholders to raise concerns, complaints, or suggestions related to project activities. It ensures that grievances are addressed promptly, fairly, and transparently.

The objectives of the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) are to:

- Establish a formal and accessible process through which project-affected persons (PAPs) and other stakeholders can raise concerns or grievances.
- Respond promptly to grievances to minimize disruption to project activities and reduce risks of escalation.
- To resolve grievances promptly within the earliest possible time to avoid escalation
- Strengthen stakeholder confidence in the project by demonstrating fairness, transparency, and responsiveness in handling complaints.
- Protect the interests of vulnerable groups (women, youth, elderly, persons with disabilities) by ensuring their voices are heard and addressed.
- Use grievance feedback to identify weaknesses in project processes, enhance mitigation measures, and improve service delivery.
- Provide a structured mechanism to resolve disputes at the community level, thereby minimizing potential litigation and reputational damage.
- Maintain records of grievances and resolutions to inform future projects, improve institutional learning, and enhance safeguard compliance.
- Encourage continuous dialogue between the project, contractors, and communities, ensuring inclusive participation and collaboration.

7.1 Grievance Redress Process

The Grievance Redress Process for the Replacement of the Main Water Transmission Pipeline Project is summarized below;

Step 1: Receipt of Grievance

- Grievances may be submitted verbally, in writing, via phone, email, or through community leaders.
- Complaints are logged into the Grievance Register by the Grievance Redress Committee (GRC).
- Each grievance is assigned a reference number and acknowledged within a specified timeframe (e.g., 48 hours).

Step 2: Screening and Categorization

- The GRC screens grievances, to determine its nature, severity, and eligibility to see if it is related to or resulting from the Project.

- Grievances are categorized as:
 - Minor (easily resolvable at the site level)
 - Moderate (requiring contractor or PIU intervention)
 - Major (involving significant risks, requiring escalation to LWSC, PIU, or Funding agencies).

Step 3. Investigation and Assessment

- A field investigation is conducted to verify facts and collect evidence.
- Stakeholder consultations are held with complainants, contractors, and relevant parties.
- Findings are documented and shared with the GRC.

Step 4. Resolution and Action

- Corrective measures are identified and implemented (e.g., repairs, compensation, access restoration, safety improvements).
- Contractors and PIU are responsible for executing agreed actions.
- Complainants are informed of the resolution and asked to confirm satisfaction.

Step 5: Escalation (if Unresolved)

- If grievances remain unresolved at this level (Project Community Level), they are escalated to;
- PIU/LWSC Senior Management Level for further review
- If the PIU cannot resolve it, the complainant may decide to seek litigation.

Step 6: Closure and Documentation

- Once resolved, grievances are marked as Closed in the register.
- Documentation includes:
 - Date of receipt of complaint
 - Nature of grievance
 - Action taken
 - Resolution outcome
 - Date of resolution
 - Date of closure.
- Records are maintained for accountability and future audits.

Step 7: Feedback and Learning

- Lessons learned are extracted from grievances to improve project design and safeguard compliance.
- Regular reports are shared with stakeholders and donors.
- Continuous improvement mechanisms are integrated into project operations.

The Replacement of the Main Water Transmission Line Project will adopt a two-tier Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), namely, the Project Community Level GRM

Platform and the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) Level GRM Platform. See next section for more details.

7.2 Project Community Level Grievance Redress Mechanism

This is the first tier of grievance handling, closest to the affected people. Community members can lodge complaints verbally, in writing, through suggestion boxes, or via community leaders. A Community Grievance Committee (CGC) is established, including representatives of women, youth, elders, and vulnerable groups. Minor grievances (e.g., restricted access, dust, noise, minor damages) are addressed quickly at the site level by contractors or community liaison officers. All grievances are logged in a minor register with details of the complainant, nature of the grievance, date, and action taken. Feedback is provided directly to the complainant, ensuring they know the status of their grievance.

The Project Community Level GRM ensures accessibility and rapid resolution. The Project Community Level GRM shall have the following composition;

- Monitoring and Supervision Consultant-Chair
- Representative of each Project Affected Communities-Members
 - Youth
 - Women
 - Elder
 - Vulnerable group
- PIU's E&S Specialist-Member
- Contractor E&S Officer-Member
- Contractor Health and Safety Officer -Member

Role and Responsibilities

- **Monitoring and Supervision Consultant—Chairperson**
 - Rationale: As an independent party, the consultant provides neutrality, technical oversight, and credibility.
 - Role: Preside over meetings, ensure grievances are documented, guide resolution processes, and report outcomes to the PIU and donors.
- **Representative of Project Affected Communities (PACs) – Co-Chairperson**
 - typically selected from among the community representatives (e.g., elder or women's group leader).
 - Rationale: Ensures community ownership, accessibility, and trust in the process.
 - Role: Represent community voices, co-sign resolutions, and ensure decisions reflect local concerns.

- **Supporting Members**
 - **PIU's E&S Specialist:** Provides technical safeguard guidance and ensures compliance with donor standards.
 - **Contractor E&S Officer:** Ensures contractor accountability and immediate corrective actions.
 - **Contractor Health & Safety Officer:** Advises on OHS-related grievances and mitigation.
 - **Community Representatives (Youth, Women, Elder, Vulnerable groups):** Ensure inclusivity and representation of diverse voices

7.3 PIU Level Grievance Redress Mechanism

This is the second tier of grievance handling, managed by the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) of LWSC. Grievances unresolved at the community level are referred to the PIU. The PIU level has the authority to enforce corrective actions, update method statements, and ensure compliance with the AfDB Integrated Safeguards Systems. Their role will include consolidating grievance data, tracking resolution timelines, preparing reports, and ensuring grievances are resolved in line with contractual obligations, safeguard frameworks, and legal requirements.

Advantages of the PIU Level GRM include providing oversight and ensuring consistency in grievance handling, strengthening accountability to funding agencies, and enabling systemic improvements by analyzing grievance trends and lessons learned.

The PIU Level GRM shall comprise the following members;

- Project Coordinator-Chairperson
- E&S Safeguard Specialist-Co-chair
- M&E Engineer
- Managing Director-LWSC
- Deputy Managing Director for Technical Service
- Internal Audit-Member
- Project Affected Persons Representative (Female)
- Project Affected Persons' Representative (Male)

Roles and responsibilities

- **Project Coordinator--Chairperson**
 - Provides overall leadership and oversight of the PIU GRM.
 - Ensures grievances are addressed consistently, decisions are documented, and outcomes are reported to funding agencies.
 - Holds accountability for coordination across all PIU members and external stakeholders.
- **E&S Safeguard Specialist--Co-Chairperson**

- Supports the Chair by ensuring that grievance handling aligns with environmental and social safeguard standards.
- Provides technical guidance on compliance with donor requirements (AfDB/World Bank).
- Oversees the integration of lessons learned from grievance trends into systemic improvements.
- **Other Members**
- **M&E Engineer**
 - Tracks grievance trends, ensures lessons learned are integrated into project monitoring and evaluation.
- **Managing Director – LWSC**
 - Provides executive oversight, ensures grievances are addressed at the institutional level.
- **Deputy Managing Director for Technical Services**
 - Ensures technical issues raised in grievances are resolved promptly and effectively.
- **Internal Audit Representative**
 - Strengthens accountability, ensures transparency in grievance handling and reporting.
- **Project Affected Persons’ Representative (Female)**
 - Ensures women’s voices and gender-specific concerns are represented in grievance resolution.
- **Project Affected Persons’ Representative (Male)**
 - Ensures community perspectives and local concerns are incorporated into decision-making.

The PIU Level GRM Committee shall ensure that all relevant grievances are resolved within fifteen (15) days from the day the case was escalated from the Project Community Level. The Chairperson of the committee shall communicate the committee’s decision to the aggrieved PAPs in writing. The decision reached at the PIU GRM Committee level will be the final decision. If the PAP is not satisfied with the GRM process set for the project, the PAP will have the right to seek a remedy through the court. The committee shall keep a record of all decisions related to each case.

A comparative analysis of the Project’s Community-Level GRM and PIU-Level GRM is presented in the table below.

Table 9: Comparative Analysis of Project Community Level GRM & PIU Level GRM

Parameter	Community-Level GRM	PIU-Level GRM
Primary Role	First point of contact for grievances;	Oversight and escalation body;
	Ensures accessibility and inclusivity at the local level.	Ensures compliance with donor and national safeguard frameworks.
Responsibilities	Receive and register grievances	Review escalated grievances.
	Screen and categorize complaints.	Conduct detailed investigations
	Conduct local investigations.	Enforce corrective actions with contractors.
	Facilitate dialogue and resolution.	Monitor safeguard compliance.
	Provide feedback to complainants.	Report to donors and government agencies.
	Escalate unresolved cases to PIU	Document lessons learned.
Timelines	Acknowledge grievance within 48 hours.	Review escalated grievances within 7 days.
	Resolve minor grievances within 7-14 days.	Resolve moderate/major grievances within 15 days.
	Escalate unresolved cases promptly.	Provide quarterly reports to donors.
Escalation Path	Escalates unresolved or complex grievances to the PIU Level GRM	Escalate unresolved grievances to the LWSC Senior management or funding agencies (AfDB).
Community Engagement	Raise awareness of GRM	Conduct stakeholder consultations.
	Ensure vulnerable groups (women, youth, elderly, persons with disabilities) are included.	Ensure systemic improvements based on grievance trends.
	Maintain transparency at the community level	Provide donor-aligned reporting and safeguard audits.
Documentation	Maintain grievance register.	Consolidate grievance data.
	Record actions taken and outcomes.	Maintain compliance records.
	Submit monthly reports to PIU	Submit quarterly and final safeguard reports to donors.

7.4 Judiciary Level Grievance Redress Mechanism

All aggrieved persons have the right to appeal to the law. Efforts shall, however, be made to ensure that grievances are resolved amicably at the Project's Community Level or at most the PIU-Level GRM and within the project's GRM framework. It is not expected that grievances shall be taken to the Judiciary Level GRM. However, it is important that aggrieved parties are informed about their rights, including the right to access a court in case they are not satisfied with the grievance resolution mechanism at the Project Community Level and the PIU-Level GRM.

7.5 Grievance Log

The Replacement of the Main Water Transmission Line Project shall keep a harmonized grievance log at both the Project Community Level and the PIU Level. The log shall include information on the following for compliance monitoring and audits.

- Date of the complaint is received.
- Individual reference/tracking number
- Name of the person submitting the complaint, question, or other feedback, address, and/or contact information (unless the complaint has been submitted anonymously)
- Details of the complaint, feedback, or question, location, and details of his/her complaint.
- Name of person assigned to deal with the complaint (acknowledge to the complainant, investigate, propose resolutions, etc.)
- Details of proposed resolution, including person(s) who will be responsible for implementing corrective actions that are part of the proposed resolution.
- Date when the proposed resolution was communicated to the complainant
- Date when the complainant acknowledged, in writing if possible, being informed of the proposed resolution.
- Details of whether the complainant was satisfied with the resolution, and whether the complaint can be closed out.
- Date when the resolution is implemented (if any).

Chapter 8: Monitoring and Reporting

Effective monitoring of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) and the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) is essential to ensure that stakeholder concerns are addressed promptly, communication remains transparent, and the project maintains strong social performance throughout its lifecycle. Monitoring also helps verify that engagement activities are inclusive, culturally appropriate, and aligned with the commitments outlined in the ESMP.

8.1 Monitoring of the SEP and GRM

Monitoring of the SEP and GRM will be carried out through a combination of routine data collection, field verification, stakeholder feedback, and periodic performance reviews. The Project Implementation Unit (PIU), supported by the Contractor's Community Liaison Officer (CLO) and E&S Team, will maintain continuous oversight of engagement activities, grievance handling, and community interactions.

Monitoring will focus on:

- The quality and frequency of engagement activities
- The effectiveness of communication channels
- The timeliness and fairness of grievance resolution
- The level of stakeholder satisfaction
- The inclusion of vulnerable groups
- The documentation and reporting of all engagement processes

8.2 Key Monitoring Indicators

Monitoring indicators are grouped into Stakeholder Engagement Indicators and GRM Performance Indicators.

8.2.1 Stakeholder Engagement Indicators

- Number of stakeholder meetings held (community, institutional, thematic)
- Attendance levels disaggregated by gender, age, and vulnerability
- Number of information materials distributed (flyers, notices, radio announcements)
- Frequency of engagement with local authorities and community leaders
- Level of participation and feedback received during consultations
- Evidence of stakeholder concerns integrated into project decisions
- Number of site visits or joint inspections conducted with stakeholders
- Accessibility of engagement activities to vulnerable groups

8.2.2 GRM Performance Indicators

- Number of grievances received (categorized by type)
- Percentage of grievances acknowledged within 48 hours
- Percentage of grievances resolved within the agreed timeframe (e.g., 14 days)
- Number of grievances escalated to higher levels
- Number of unresolved or recurrent grievances
- Stakeholder satisfaction with grievance resolution
- Functionality of grievance channels (hotline, suggestion boxes, CLO outreach)

- Quality and completeness of grievance documentation

8.3 Monitoring Methods

Monitoring will be conducted using the following methods:

- Review of GRM logbooks and digital records
- Verification of meeting minutes, attendance sheets, and consultation reports
- Field observations and interviews with community members
- Feedback sessions with local leaders, women's groups, youth groups, and traders
- Spot checks on the visibility of project information (signboards, notices)
- Assessment of the responsiveness of the CLO and PIU
- Random sampling of complainants to assess satisfaction

All monitoring data will be consolidated into monthly and quarterly reports.

8.4 Reporting Requirements and Frequencies

Monitoring results will be reported at different intervals depending on the nature of the activity. The Monthly Reporting shall be prepared by the Community Level GRM & Contractor's CLO and PIU Safeguard. The report shall include;

- Summary of stakeholder meetings
- List of grievances received and resolved
- Outstanding grievances and action plans
- Engagement activities planned for the next month
- Challenges and recommendations

• **Quarterly Reporting:**

Shall be prepared by: PIU Environmental & Social Specialist, the Report shall include;

- Analysis of engagement trends
- GRM performance assessment
- Stakeholder satisfaction analysis
- Inclusion of vulnerable groups
- Summary of corrective actions taken
- Recommendations for improvement

• **Annual Reporting**

Shall be prepared by PIU's E&S Specialist and submitted to EPA and AfDB. The report shall include;

- Analysis of engagement trends
- GRM performance assessment
- Stakeholder satisfaction analysis
- Inclusion of vulnerable groups
- Summary of corrective actions taken
- Recommendations for improvement

Immediate/ Incident Reporting

Prepared by Contractor

Triggered by:

- Serious grievances
- Community safety incidents
- Protests or disruptions
- Sensitive complaints (e.g., SEA/GBV)

Reported within **24–48 hours** to the PIU and relevant authorities

Chapter 9: References:

- IFC Stakeholder Identification Guide
- Global Infrastructure Hub-Stakeholder Identification
- Udall Foundation- Principles for Effective Stakeholder Engagement in Infrastructure Permitting and Review Processes.
- www.ifc.org Stakeholder Identification and Analysis
- Stakeholder Engagement Plan-SAPZ

Annex I: Grievance Registration Form



Replacement of the Main Water Transmission Line Project
Liberia Water and Sewer Corporation (LWSC)
Project Implementation Unit
Fiamah Sinkor

GRIEVANCE REDRESS MECHANISM GRIEVANCE REGISTRY FORM

Date of complaint	Name of Complainant & Address	(Nature) Channel of Complaint				Summary of Complaint	Action Taken to Resolve Complaint	Responsible Person	Current Status
		Walk in	Call in	Verbal	Written				

Annex II: Evidence of Stakeholder Engagement Meeting

	
Consultative Meeting	
	
	
A mixture of stakeholders in attendance	

Annex III: Attendance Listing

