

# INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET APPRAISAL STAGE

**Report No.:** ISDSA3857

**Date ISDS Prepared/Updated:** 26-Feb-2014

**Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed:** 10-Mar-2014

## I. BASIC INFORMATION

### 1. Basic Project Data

<b>Country:</b>	India	<b>Project ID:</b>	P132623
<b>Project Name:</b>	Sustainable Livelihoods and Adaptation to Climate Change (P132623)		
<b>Task Team Leader:</b>	Priti Kumar		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	10-Mar-2014	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	27-Aug-2014
<b>Managing Unit:</b>	SASDC	<b>Lending Instrument:</b>	Specific Investment Loan
<b>GEF Focal Area:</b>	Climate change		
<b>Sector(s):</b>	General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (100%)		
<b>Theme(s):</b>	Climate change (100%)		
<b>Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?</b>			No
<b>Financing (In USD Million)</b>			
Total Project Cost:	8.00	Total Bank Financing:	0.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
<b>Financing Source</b>			<b>Amount</b>
Borrower			0.00
Global Environment Facility (GEF)			8.00
Total			8.00
<b>Environmental Category:</b>	B - Partial Assessment		
<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	No		

### 2. Global Environmental Objective(s)

The Project Development Objective (PDO) is to improve adaptive capacity of the rural poor, to climate variability and change affecting farm based livelihoods, through community-based interventions.

### 3. Project Description

The project components and activities to be financed are described below.

**Component 1 – Component 1 – Planning, Service Provision and Implementation of Climate Change Adaptation:** The objective of this component is to support risk assessment, planning, service provision and implementation of climate adaptation interventions. The key activities include: (a) community-led adaptation assessment, participatory planning, of climate adaptation interventions in cooperation with resource persons and entities; (b) creating the enabling services for delivering strategic climate change adaptation investments through partnerships with research institutions, thematic resource organization or private sector providers; and (c) community-based implementation of off-the-shelf and other specialized interventions utilizing the community adaptation grants to poor rural households (SHGs/Federations) upon approval of a community adaptation plan. The climate adaptation interventions will be locale-specific, focus on climate risk management and involve interventions both at the household level and/or community level. Funds for implementation of climate adaptation interventions will be provided by the SLACC project, by NRLP's Community Investment Support, as well as through convergence with other Government programs (such as MKSP, MGNREGS). The key outputs of this component are: (i) community based climate adaptation measures are implemented by atleast 200 community institutions financed by the community adaptation fund; (ii) enhanced community capacity for planning and implementing climate adaptation plans in 200 community institutions; and (iii) consortium of research and other partner organizations formed. The key outcomes of this component are: (i) strengthened awareness of adaptation and climate change processes at the local level and (ii) strengthened adaptive capacities to reduce vulnerabilities and risks to climate-induced losses.

**Component 2 – Scaling and Mainstreaming Community Based Climate Adaptation:** The objective of this component are to build core operational capacity and relevant knowledge base/networks for broader scaling and mainstreaming of climate adaptation interventions. The key activities include: (a) training and capacity building of NRLP national and state staff and creation of a cadre of CRPs in non-SLACC areas; (b) building a knowledge support system for climate adaptation, including policy inputs and programmatic guidelines for scaling-up of the community-based climate adaptation approach within the NRLM. The key outcomes of this component are: (i) strengthened operational and adaptive capacity of national and state officials and representatives for integrating climate adaptation into livelihood support activities; (ii) evidence of climate change mainstreaming into national and state livelihood program frameworks.

**Component 3 – Project Management and Impact Evaluation:** SLACC will augment the management units within the NRLM and SRLM institutional structure to enable coordinated functioning and efficient implementation of SLACC. The activities that the project will invest in include: (a) establishment of climate adaptation units staffed with full-time professionals within the NMMU and the SMMUs of the participating states; (b) appointment of state-level implementation teams for providing field implementation support to CRPs and community institutions; (c) establishment of a monitoring system and evaluation arrangements (baseline, mid-term and end-of-term). The key outputs of this activity are: climate adaptation units in NMMU and SMMU, delivery of services by state level implementation teams as per agreed Terms of Reference, and evaluation reports (baseline, mid-term and end-of-term). The key outcome of this component is efficient and effective management of SLACC components.

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

The SLACC project will be implemented in 2 states of the NRLP reaching about 200 villages corresponding to approximately 8-10 blocks. The states of Bihar and Madhya Pradesh have been identified for implementation of the project based on the readiness of the SMMU, existing capacity and experience in sustainable agriculture, the agro-ecological profile of the state, and anticipated climate change risks. The key beneficiaries of the SLACC project will be the institutions of the rural-poor supported by the NRLM – including, self-help groups of women and their federations, common interest/producer groups such as farmers' groups, livestock rearers' groups, and their higher order collectives such as producer companies. These institutions represent the rural-poor, the majority of whom directly depend on climate-sensitive sectors such as agriculture, livestock and fisheries and have limited adaptive capacity. Also, as these institutions are women-led, it will help SLACC to focus on the distinct vulnerabilities and adaptive capacity of women.

#### 5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Ruma Tavorath (SASDI)

Varun Singh (SASDS)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	Yes	The project activities are likely to contribute to better environmental quality and individual activities may have small-scale impacts or may be environmentally benign, without significant and/or irreversible impacts. However clustered groups of such activities can have a collective detrimental impact on surrounding ecosystems, environmental resources and habitats, including soil erosion, poor water availability and quality, depletion of groundwater, decreasing fodder availability etc. These issues need to be properly managed and capacities need to be strengthened to implement due diligence measures along with effective supervision and monitoring. Since the SLACC is anchored in the existing institutional set up of National Rural Livelihoods Program (NRLP), and complementary to its livelihood interventions, the Environmental Management Framework (EMF) of NRLP has been adapted for the SLACC. The EMF has been updated and revised to meet the distinct requirements of SLACC and will be disclosed through the websites of the Ministry of Rural Development and all the state departments of rural development, and on the Bank Infoshop.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	Activities within critical natural habitats (wildlife sanctuaries and national parks) will not be supported under the project. The policy is

		triggered to ensure avoidance of degradation in prime habitats and inclusion of mitigatory measures for sustainable management.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	Activities within the critical natural habitats (wildlife sanctuaries and national parks) will not be supported under the project. The policy is triggered to ensure avoidance of degradation in prime habitats and inclusion of mitigatory measures for sustainable management.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	Some of the agriculture livelihoods activities could involve collective procurement and distribution of chemical pesticides. It is thus important that the EMF address this safeguard and therefore the policy has been triggered
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	Both demonstration and expansion villages are likely to have the presence of tribal people. Hence, this OP has been triggered to ensure compliance with the policy provisions on informed consultations, broad community support, culturally appropriate information and benefit sharing.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	No	
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	

## II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

### A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

<p><b>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</b></p> <p>Environment: The project would provide finances to institutions of the poor against livelihood and vulnerability plans as well as introduce special initiatives for livelihood enhancement such as sustainable agriculture, community-managed dairy, etc. The project activities are likely to contribute to better environmental quality, but insufficient diligence could result in: (i) land degradation including soil erosion, (ii) poor water availability and quality, depletion of groundwater, (iii) improper use of agro-chemicals (imbalanced use of fertilizers, unsafe use of hazardous pesticides), (iv) decreasing fodder availability, and (v) degradation of forests (unsustainable extraction of forest produce, shifting agriculture, grazing). These impacts could be wide-scale by cumulative effect, though potential significant and/or irreversible impacts are not</p>
---

envisaged. The Safeguards Policies on Pest Management (OP 4.09), Forests (OP4.36) and Natural Habitats (OP4.04) have been triggered recognizing the importance of integrating sustainable management practices in forest-dependent and agriculture-based livelihoods, with possibility of use of pesticides. Activities within critical natural habitats (wildlife sanctuaries and national parks) will not be supported. The safeguard policy on Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4.37) has not been triggered as the project funds are unlikely to be used for community-level civil works such as small dams, embankments, etc. Project funds would not support activities involving excavations, etc., that may impact physical cultural resources and hence, OP 4.11 is not triggered. As no international waterways and disputed areas are involved OP 7.50 and 7.60 are not triggered.

Social. The project aims to improve adaptive capacity of the rural poor, to climate variability and change and secure and sustain the livelihoods of the poor through community-based interventions on agriculture, land and water, fodder, livestock, fisher and other financial and institutional measures etc. The key beneficiaries and partners will be representative institutions of the rural poor such as farmers' groups, livestock rearers' groups, and their higher order collectives such as producer companies. Also, as these institutions are women-led, it will help SLACC to focus on the distinct vulnerabilities and adaptive capacity of women. So overall, the project would provide significant and direct socioeconomic benefits to the rural poor households. The key social safeguard issue is to ensure that tribal people as well as other traditionally excluded social and livelihood groups such as the scheduled castes, migrant workers, marginal farmers and other vulnerable groups in remote and dispersed rural habitations get identified and systematically included in the implementation processes, community level planning and capacity building activities, funding for adaptation measures and finally benefits.

**2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:**

No severe or long term impacts are expected due to SLACC funded activities. Agriculture, livestock, minor forest produce and fisheries are the predominant sectors in which rural poor households are involved. Also the possibility of scale-up beyond local areas is low, so the environmental due diligence put in place for specific areas will be sufficient with regard to long-term impacts. The long term social impacts are assessed to be beneficial in the form of increased livelihood security and sustainability, and increased capacity to undertake collective action.

**3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.**

No large-scale or significant adverse and non-reversible environmental and/or social impacts are anticipated in the project. The EMF provides a strong tool for safeguarding the environment with a view towards sustainable livelihoods and also emphasizes generate green and sustainable jobs. Site-specifics EMPs will identify issues with respect to the local natural resources impacted by livelihood choices, indicate actions for mitigation and better environmental management and identify resources for implementation. The NRLP Social Management Framework reinforces the NRLP focus on poorest of the poor household, and recommends specific interventions for inclusion of the tribal and non-tribal beneficiaries in community institutions (SHGs, Federations), as well as livelihood financing and promotion interventions.

**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.**

Given that the SLACC is complementary to the larger National Rural Livelihoods Project, with the same institutional set-up, the existing Environmental Management Framework (EMF) has been simplified/adapted for the SLACC project. The EMF will help strengthen environmental

management systems of these institutions so as to ensure sustainability of the livelihood enhancements undertaken. The screening tool included in the EMF will be used to determine an appropriate level of environmental assessment. Screening includes verification against an environmental requirements (negative) list designed to ensure compliance with all safeguard policies and a determination of the extent of EA required. Following screening and assessment, measures to control environmental risks and enhance benefits. The EMF also provides for training and capacity building in its application to various stakeholders and for an environmental agency contracted under the project to supervise the implementation and its continuing refinement. A third-party external environmental audit will be undertaken after 18 months of implementation, which will assess cumulative impacts and identify ways of strengthening implementation of the EMF.

The key social safeguard policy requirement is to ensure equitable and culturally-compatible benefits to tribal people in the project areas (OP 4.10). The Social Management Framework (SMF) for the NRLP has been adapted to the SLACC project. The SMF provides for i) priority targeting and mobilization of tribal and other poorest social groups; ii) informed consultations to ensure continuing community support for project interventions; iii) regular and culturally appropriate information sharing; iv) inclusion of tribals as community resource persons; v) capacity building of tribal SHGs, federations. Project implementation in Tribal areas would be monitored through regular field visits and monitoring reports. The SMF also includes the institutional arrangements and capacity-building activities for project staff, community institutions and partners at all levels.

The EMF and SMF prepared for the SLACC project will be disclosed before Appraisal through the websites of the Ministry of Rural Development and all the state departments of rural development, and on the Bank Infoshop.

**5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.**

The key beneficiaries will be the institutions of the rural-poor supported by the NRLM – including, self-help groups of women and their federations, common interest/producer groups such as farmers' groups, livestock rearers' groups, and their higher order collectives such as producer companies. These institutions represent the rural-poor, the majority of whom directly depend on climate-sensitive sectors such as agriculture, livestock and fisheries and have limited adaptive capacity. Also, as these institutions are women-led, it will help SLACC to focus on the distinct vulnerabilities and adaptive capacity of women.

A consultation workshop on the safeguards aspects of the project is planned for during the appraisal discussions in the states of Bihar and Madhya Pradesh.

**B. Disclosure Requirements**

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	05-Mar-2013
Date of submission to InfoShop	07-Mar-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
India	07-Mar-2014
<i>Comments:</i> The EMF and IPDF has been disclosed in the websites of the Ministry of Rural Development and the websites of the State Rural Livelihood Missions, State Departments of Rural Development, Bihar and Madhya Pradesh.	

<b>Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	05-Mar-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	07-Mar-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
India	07-Mar-2014
<i>Comments:</i> No comments	
<b>Pest Management Plan</b>	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	NA
Date of receipt by the Bank	NA
Date of submission to InfoShop	NA
"In country" Disclosure	
India	07-Mar-2014
<i>Comments:</i> No separate Pest Management Plan; requirements for this policy are subsumed within the EMF	
<b>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.</b>	
<b>If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:</b>	

### ***C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level***

<b>OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment</b>			
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"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats</b>			
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP 4.09 - Pest Management</b>			
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or SM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples</b>			

Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	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"/> ]
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Sector Manager?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.36 - Forests</b>	
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information</b>	
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"/> ]
<b>All Safeguard Policies</b>	
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: Priti Kumar	
<b>Approved By</b>		
Regional Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Francis V. Fragano (RSA)	Date: 03-Mar-2014
Sector Manager:	Name: Bernice K. Van Bronkhorst (SM)	Date: 04-Mar-2014