

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: ISDSA8724

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 05-Jun-2014

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 09-Jun-2014

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Country: | India | Project ID: | P132418 |
| Project Name: | Efficient & Sustainable City Bus Services (P132418) | | |
| Task Team Leader: | Nupur Gupta | | |
| Estimated Appraisal Date: | 05-Jun-2014 | Estimated Board Date: | 09-Jul-2014 |
| Managing Unit: | SASDT | Lending Instrument: | Specific Investment Loan |
| GEF Focal Area: | Climate change | | |
| Sector(s): | Urban Transport (100%) | | |
| Theme(s): | Infrastructure services for private sector development (5%), Gender (5%), Other urban development (65%), Climate change (25%) | | |
| Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)? | | | No |
| Financing (In USD Million) | | | |
| Total Project Cost: | 127.90 | Total Bank Financing: | 0.00 |
| Financing Gap: | 0.00 | | |
| Financing Source | | | Amount |
| Borrower | | | 118.70 |
| Global Environment Facility (GEF) | | | 9.20 |
| Total | | | 127.90 |
| Environmental Category: | B - Partial Assessment | | |
| Is this a Repeater project? | No | | |

2. Global Environmental Objective(s)

The project's Global Environment Objective (GEO) is to promote environmentally sustainable city bus transport within Indian cities and specifically in the demonstration cities through efficiency and

service improvements.

3. Project Description

This proposed project intends to fund the incremental activities aimed to enhance sustainability, energy efficiency, and quality of city bus services, and therefore the potential for GHG emissions reductions from the baseline project.

The project comprises the following components:

Component 1: Capacity building and Technical Assistance on Policy, Regulatory, Fiscal issues (GEF US\$ 0.7M, co-finance US\$ 2.0M): As part of this component, policy, regulatory and fiscal constraints will be reviewed at national, state and city levels to promote efficient and high quality city bus services and policy notes developed for discussion and debate among key stakeholders. Capacity building initiatives involving development of knowledge materials, training activities, knowledge sharing through website/newsletters and cross learning events etc. in cutting edge areas aimed at development of the overall urban bus sector in the country shall form part of this component.

Component 2A: City Demonstration Projects (GEF US\$ 6M, co-finance US\$ 113 M): This component shall support physical improvements targeted at modernizing the city bus services in demonstration cities including (i) modern depot equipment for improved maintenance and life of buses, (ii) modern Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) and Management Information Systems (MIS) - to make the services more user friendly and for improved planning and management of operations to enable optimal use of resources. Four cities have been selected as demonstration pilots. These are Bhopal, Chandigarh, Jaipur and Mira Bhayandar.

Component 2B: Capacity Building & Technical Assistance to Demonstration Cities (GEF US\$ 2.1m, co-finance US\$ 0.92m) : The capacity building and technical assistance component is targeted at supporting the modernization efforts of selected demonstration cities. These shall include to the following kinds of activities (i) institutional strengthening, capacity building and training, (ii) business planning including route planning and rationalization for better utilization of buses, (iii) marketing and branding, (iv) technical support with private sector participation including mainstreaming of informal sector, (v) vehicle and driver performance management with a view to improving fuel efficiency, (vi) incremental operational expenses.

4. Project location and salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

The candidate cities for demonstration investments are Bhopal (population 1.7 million), Chandigarh (1 million), Jaipur (3 million), and Mira-Bhayander (0.8 million). Mira-Bhayander is part of the Mumbai Metropolitan Region on the west coast of India. Chandigarh is a federally administered high income city that serves as a capital of two north Indian states – Haryana and Punjab. Jaipur is the capital of Rajasthan, the largest state in India. Bhopal is the capital of Madhya Pradesh in Central India and is known for its lake system.

The physical improvements under component 2A, targeted at modernizing city bus services in demonstration cities are largely planned to be executed in the existing bus depots and bus stops. However, in some cases such physical improvements and installation may be proposed at new sites for bus depots too. In such cases both existing and new sites when identified would require to be screened for any possible impacts on surrounding natural resources as applicable as well as need for

resettlement and loss of livelihood etc. For Mira Bhayander, due to its proximity to the coast, mangroves covered areas are located close to two currently identified candidate sites and would require protection/ suitable management measures. In Jaipur, one of the sites has a school located close to its entry where increased noise could be an issue to be handled. An environment and social framework prepared for ongoing India Sustainable Urban Transport Project shall be updated to reflect new cities, sub project level activities any additional issues based on the potential sites to be identified during the project preparation.

Most of the proposed sites for depots are on land already available with local government. No impacts linked to LA and R&R have been identified with respect to the sub projects (depot sites) screened currently. The screening also confirmed non presence of scheduled tribes close to the sub project locations. However, the likelihood of additional depot sites with impacts on non-titleholders cannot be ruled out. In situations where impacts on non-title holders are anticipated may be identified in future, an Entitlement Framework has been prepared as part of the ESMF to address the impacts.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Gaurav D. Joshi (SASDI)

Sangeeta Kumari (SASDS)

| 6. Safeguard Policies | Triggered? | Explanation (Optional) |
|--------------------------------------|------------|--|
| Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01 | Yes | Currently identified activities include construction of bus maintenance infrastructure and installation of passenger information components in bus-stops in cities. This will be city-specific and guided by a common environmental and social management framework (ESMF). This is based on one prepared for the SUTP. It includes a description of overall environmental conditions in candidate cities, and provides for a generic environmental and social management plan (ESMP) that can be used in case of common activities. It includes a screening matrix to exclude activities with unacceptable levels of impact (such as acquisition of land), and also provides guidance for detailed environmental and social assessments where found necessary. An outline capacity building plan for city officials and an indicative budget are also included in the ESMF. |
| Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04 | Yes | While no recognized protected areas are known to be present in the current locations, since some of the areas are in the outskirts of cities, there is a possibility of presence of patches that may act as havens for wildlife, such as mangroves close to some candidate sites in the city of Mira Bhayander. This will be investigated further as project preparation progresses. This will be done |

| | | |
|--|-----|---|
| | | through secondary data and site visits during preparation of city-specific investment plans. |
| Forests OP/BP 4.36 | No | No Forests are likely to be impacted by the project. The project activities are likely to be in urban areas where Forests are unlikely to be found. |
| Pest Management OP 4.09 | No | The project activities do not require use of pesticides. |
| Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11 | Yes | While no important cultural properties are known to be close to the currently proposed locations, there may be locally important shrines/other resources that may be identified during the ongoing studies. Moreover, chance-finds procedures have been included in the ESMF for reflection in the contract documents for works under the project. |
| Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10 | No | None of the cities have any recognized tribal groups with distinct identity. |
| Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12 | Yes | No land acquisition is anticipated in the project nor any involuntary resettlement is identified so far based on the screening checklists prepared by the project cities. However, any additional sub-projects location for depots proposed in future may have their edges/boundaries encroached. This is being assessed as part of project preparation for each city as part of Detailed Project Report preparation. A separate chapter will be provided in the DPR to reflect the benefits and likely negative environmental and social impacts of the project activities. In case need for displacement is identified a sub-project specific Resettlement Action Plan shall be prepared based on the Resettlement Framework provided under the ESMF. |
| Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37 | No | No dams are involved in the project. |
| Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50 | No | The project does not affect any international waterway. |
| Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60 | No | The candidate cities do not fall in Disputed Areas. |

II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:

| |
|--|
| <p>The significant adverse impacts of the project are likely to be confined to the areas close to the proposed depot sites and mostly concentrated within the depot sites. The construction of the depots will require consideration of drainage, and of construction safety. In addition, in locations close to or in populated areas can have traffic related issues that would be managed. For example, in one location in Jaipur, the impact on a school close to one of the depot sites would need to be minimized. Mitigation measures like shielding receptors, or redesigning the depot lay out would be adequately considered and documented in the city specific plan. In Mira Bhayander, a city on the west coast, there can be impacts on mangrove plantation close to the sea in some candidate locations. These would be subject to more comprehensive assessment if and when sites are included in the project, and adequate mitigation will be planned for the removal/damage to these. No other large scale significant impacts are expected. There will be permanent change in land-use and drainage patterns where new depots are proposed.</p> |
| <p>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</p> |
| <p>Indirect impacts may occur in areas where new operated routes may lead to development of more economic activity or expansion of residential activity. Long term impacts are likely to be positive since the bus depots will have improved facilities to maintain buses at a higher efficiency than without the project.</p> |
| <p>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</p> |
| <p>Several different sites were considered for development of depots and sites with limited and manageable environmental and social impacts are being developed under the project. Some sites have been pushed into later phases to ensure that the environmental and social impacts are properly assessed and adequate management plans are prepared. Alternative sources of energy to power the depot equipment were considered and in cities like Jaipur, where local conditions are suitable, solar photovoltaic cell as source of electricity have been included in the project. In addition, specification for power equipment includes consideration of energy efficiency, and life cycle considerations rather than just capital cost.</p> |
| <p>4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.</p> |
| <p>The cities (will) have agreed to the ESMF and will be/are preparing their city-specific plans to mitigate adverse environmental and social impacts. They have also carried out screening of the candidate sites already identified to establish the extent of impacts in advance. JCTSL has shared a draft EIA document for their proposed activities, which is currently being reviewed by the Bank and will be finalized by the completion of appraisal and duly disclosed. Other cities are also preparing the EIA/EMP documents based on the ESMF which will be reviewed by the Bank.</p> <p>In line with the ESMF, each city will designate an environmental and social officer for the project who will ensure the implementation of the ESMP and/or EMP/RAP where required. This officer, along with other city officials, will be trained in line with the ESMF to familiarize them to the potential issues. Some of the implementing agencies have prior experience of handling construction, while others like Jaipur and Chandigarh intend to outsource supervision of construction to the respective specialized agencies – RSRTC and Chandigarh PWD respectively. These agencies’ staff will also be briefed on the requirements of the ESMF through the environmental and social officer.</p> |
| <p>5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.</p> |

The key stakeholders for the project are staff of the specialized agency responsible for providing the bus service in each city and people located close to the proposed depot sites. The users of the bus services, and general population of the city are also part of the wider stakeholder group.

The ESMF and ESMP, as part of the ESMF, are disclosed in the website of the implementing agency in each city. In addition, specific plans for each location will be available in each site. Consultations (will) have be(en) organized in each city to inform the people about the project proposals and their feedback sought on the proposed management measures. These have been taken into account in finalizing the ESMF. In addition, a consultation framework to guide consultations during the implementation phase is also included in the ESMF.

B. Disclosure Requirements

| Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other | |
|---|-------------|
| Date of receipt by the Bank | 15-May-2014 |
| Date of submission to InfoShop | 03-Jun-2014 |
| For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors | |
| "In country" Disclosure | |
| India | 03-Jun-2014 |
| <i>Comments:</i> | |
| Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process | |
| Date of receipt by the Bank | 15-May-2014 |
| Date of submission to InfoShop | 03-Jun-2014 |
| "In country" Disclosure | |
| India | 03-Jun-2014 |
| <i>Comments:</i> | |
| If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP. | |
| If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why: | |
| | |

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

| OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment | |
|---|---|
| Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report? | Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>] |
| If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Sector Manager (SM) review and approve the EA report? | Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>] |
| Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan? | Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>] |
| OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats | |
| Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats? | Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>] |

| | |
|---|---|
| If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank? | Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] |
| OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources | |
| Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property? | Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>] |
| Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property? | Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>] |
| OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement | |
| Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared? | Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>] |
| If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Sector Manager review the plan? | Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>] |
| The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information | |
| Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop? | Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>] |
| Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs? | Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>] |
| All Safeguard Policies | |
| Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies? | Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>] |
| Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost? | Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>] |
| Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies? | Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>] |
| Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents? | Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>] |

III. APPROVALS

| | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Task Team Leader: | Name: Nupur Gupta | |
| Approved By | | |
| Regional Safeguards Advisor: | Name: Francis V. Fragano (RSA) | Date: 09-Jun-2014 |
| Sector Manager: | Name: Karla Gonzalez Carvajal (SM) | Date: 09-Jun-2014 |