INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE

Report No.: ISDSA13000

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 30-Apr-2015

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 01-May-2015

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	India	**Project ID:**	P127725
Project Name:	IN: BIHAR KOSI BASIN DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (P127725)		
Task Team Leader(s):	Deepak Singh		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	27-Apr-2015	**Estimated Board Date:**	05-Jun-2015
Managing Unit:	GSURR	**Lending Instrument:**	Specific Investment Loan
Sector(s):	General water, sanitation and flood protection sector (70%), General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (30%)		
Theme(s):	Natural disaster management (70%), Other rural development (30%)		
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:	375.00	Total Bank Financing:	250.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		

Financing Source	**Amount**
BORROWER/RECIPIENT	125.00
International Development Association (IDA)	250.00
Total	375.00

Environmental Category:	A - Full Assessment
Is this a Repeater project?	No

2. Project Development Objective(s)

The project development objective is to enhance resilience to floods and increase agricultural production and productivity in the targeted districts in the Kosi River Basin, and to improve the Government of Bihar's capacity to respond promptly and effectively to an eligible crisis or emergency.

3. Project Description

The project is developed under a multi-sector framework, with investment activities aimed at reducing the volatility of agricultural outputs and increasing overall economic productivity in the Kosi River Basin. The investments in flood control infrastructure will not only protect human lives, but also agricultural assets and livelihoods.

To achieve the State's overall development objectives, the project will enhance the benefits gained from reduced flood risk by financing a series of complementary investments to unlock the agricultural potential of the area. Investments in irrigation will improve farmer access to water, which is necessary to grow crops year round. When coupled with agricultural extension services, training programs, the provision of high quality inputs, and the diversification of income sources, these investments will enhance agricultural productivity. Furthermore, an improved road network will allow farmers to transport their harvests to a wider market. Significant institutional strengthening and capacity building efforts will also be put in place in all line departments involved in the project to complement investments in physical infrastructure.

A. Project Components

The project will comprise the following six components:

- Component 1 – Improving Flood Risk Management (US$100 million)
- Component 2 – Enhancing Agricultural Productivity and Competitiveness (US$75million)
- Component 4 – Augmenting Connectivity (US$173 million)
- Component 5 – Contingent Emergency Response (US$0 million)
- Component 6 – Implementation Support (US$27 million)

Component 1 – Improving Flood Risk Management, US$100 million (with US$ 66.67 million Bank Financing)

The objective of this component is to increase the capacity of the Water Resources Department (WRD) to manage flood risk and to decrease vulnerability to floods in the Kosi River Basin. This objective will be achieved by investing in flood management infrastructure to reduce vulnerability and by strengthening institutional capacity to better understand how the Kosi River system functions. Activities will build on technical studies and flood modeling already underway in BKFRP and FMIS II, in addition to the pilot embankment strengthening works underway in BKFRP. The component is broken into two subcomponents.

Subcomponent 1.1 – Reinforcement of flood control infrastructure (US$95 million with US$63.33 million Bank Financing). The objective of this subcomponent is to strengthen and reinforce existing weak and vulnerable flood control infrastructure in the Kosi River Basin. Investments will primarily include: (i) restoration/strengthening of Eastern and Western Kosi embankments, approximately 45 km; (ii) strengthening existing spurs that are severely damaged and protecting critical erosion prone river banks; and (iii) procurement of dredgers for management of silt deposits in the river system. Alternative designs and construction materials including stone-filled machine-made gabions, reno-mattresses, and geo-bags will be used for the infrastructure works to improve performance at competitive costs.

Subcomponent 1.2 – Support to strengthen institutional capacity to manage flood risk (US$5 million

with US$ 3.33 million Bank Financing). The objective of this subcomponent is to strengthen and complement the studies and state level capacity to understand, manage, and communicate flood risks. Under this component the project will finance establishment of Center of Excellence, plans for which are currently being prepared in BKFRP, procurement of RTDAS (Real Time Data Acquisition System) for Bagmati basin and institutional strengthening at FMIS.

Component 2 - Enhancing Agricultural Productivity and Competitiveness, US$75 million (with US$ 50 million Bank Financing)

This component would work with organized farmers to increase agricultural production (including livestock) and productivity by expanding their access to and adoption of innovative farm technologies and practices (including irrigation) and extending their linkages to market infrastructure. Active farmer participation in planning, implementing, and evaluating project interventions will enhance the relevance of crops/varieties selected for cultivation, increase technology adoption, and contribute to the sustainability of both technical interventions and the local institutions supporting farmers. All activities are complementary to the GoB's Agricultural Road Map (2012-2017, 2017-2022). The component has three sub-components.

Subcomponent 2.1 – Intensification and Diversification of Production Systems (Agricultural/ Horticultural Crops) (US$24 million, with USD 16 million Bank Financing) would promote agricultural intensification through: (a) technology demonstration and diffusion; (b) increased water availability and efficiency via irrigation; and (c) improved agricultural inputs and practices packages. Business plans, financed through Matching Grants and prepared by farmer interest groups (FIGs) with support from service providers contracted under the project, would identify market potential and link it to investments needed to increase productivity and competitiveness. Business plans would consist of, inter alia: (a) fixed capital (e.g., plant and equipment, irrigation infrastructure); (b) input and other technology packages; and (c) capacity-building and technical assistance expenditures.

Subcomponent 2.2 – Strengthening of Agricultural Value Chains (US$15.0 million, with US$10 million Bank Financing) would facilitate produce aggregation and value-added activity through Agricultural Business Centers (ABCs) proposed, owned and operated by producer organizations with support from Service Providers. ABCs would vary in terms of scope and content based on needs expressed by the proposing producer organization. It is expected that some 200 ABCs will be financed, about one-half of which will promote food grains, oilseeds and pulses, with the remaining one-half would facilitate marketing of horticulture crops, livestock and dairy. Business plans would be developed for each ABC by eligible producer organizations and evaluated on technical criteria set forth in the Project Implementation Plan. Approved ABC business plans would be financed via Matching Grants, with cost-sharing on the part of producer organizations.

Subcomponent 2.3 – Institutional Development for Market-led Extension (US$12 million, with US $8.0 Bank Financing) would promote and strengthen the Agriculture Technology Management Agency (ATMA) in each of the five targeted districts. The Government of Bihar has already initiated actions to implement ATMA model of agricultural extension in all the 38 districts of the state. The ATMAs would promote: (a) convergence among state- and centrally-sponsored schemes in the agricultural sector; (b) inter-departmental coordination at the district, block and village levels; and (c) transformation of the production-centered extension system toward market-led agricultural development. Marketing extension employs the same best practices as in production extension, in that it would focus on enabling farmers to learn for themselves (i.e., experiential learning) and empowering them to engage directly with the market. The subcomponent would also leverage the

experience and lessons learned from the Bank-financed National Agricultural Technology Project (NATP) and the agriculture competitiveness projects in Assam and Maharashtra.

Subcomponent 2.4- Strengthening of value chains in Dairy development (US$24 million, with US $16.0 Bank Financing): The value chain in Dairy development in the Kosi region will be enhanced by organizing about 500 Dairy Cooperative Societies, setting up of Dairy plant, cattle feed plant, bulk milk coolers, artificial insemination centers, automatic milk collection centers and linking them with the producer group and dairy cooperative societies. This subcomponent would leverage the experiences from the Bank supported National Dairy Development project. While COMFED will use it's district level presence in the Kosi region for implementation the Department of Animal Husbandry will leverage with the ATMA level for capacity development and execution support.

Component 3 – Augmenting connectivity, US$173 million (with US$ 115.33 million Bank Financing)

The objective of this component is to improve farmers' access to markets through the expansion of the local transport network that connects rural roads to the main road network. To achieve this objective, the component will be structured in two subcomponents. These activities will be a continuation of the initiatives started under BKFRP, and will include the same specifications, implementation arrangements, and bidding plans already in place.

Subcomponent 3.1 – Construction of roads (US$80 million with US$53.33 million Bank Financing). This subcomponent will finance the construction of linking roads to major roads and the upgrading of rural roads to provide small villages (population less than 500) greater access to local markets. The sub-component will be implemented in the three flood-affected districts of the Kosi River Basin: Madhepura, Saharsa, and Supaul. An estimated 400 km of rural roads will be constructed as black top roads and will be built to the latest rural road standards followed under the GoI and Bank financed PMGSY Rural Roads Program. In addition to the large scale investments, pilot projects will be conducted to demonstrate new technologies that promote cost effective, modern, climate resilient, and environmentally friendly road reconstruction.

Subcomponent 3.2 -Institutional strengthening activities at RWD will amount to US$3.0 million (with US$ 2.0 million Bank Financing) that will focus on the development of asset management and maintenance system, as well as a road maintenance strategy. Activities will also be financed to support training in technical skills and management information systems for the staff of the Rural Works Department.

Subcomponent 3.3 – Construction of bridges (US$90 million with US$60.0 million Bank Financing). This subcomponent will finance the construction of small and medium bridges to provide greater access to local markets. About 57 bridges will be constructed in the five affected districts – Supaul, Saharsa, Madhepura, Araria, Purnea. New cross drainage structures will be provided where new streams have formed and where these were missing earlier. Bridges and culverts will be designed to withstand earthquake forces (per the guidelines of the Bureau of Indian Standards) and with regard to topography and hydrology (per the guidelines of the Indian Roads Congress, the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, and projected demographic changes).

Component 4 – Contingent Emergency Response, US$0 million

Following an adverse natural event that causes a major natural disaster, the GoB may request the

Bank to re-allocate project funds to support response and reconstruction. This component would draw resources from the unallocated expenditure category and/or allow the GoB to request the Bank to re-categorize and reallocate financing from other project components to partially cover emergency response and recovery costs. This component could also be used to channel additional funds should they become available as a result of the emergency.
Component 5 – Implementation and Capacity Building support, US$27.0 million (with US$ 18.0 million Bank Financing)

This component would finance activities required for project implementation that would include incremental operating costs cost of BAPEPS and the IAs. These funds are available to BAPEPS and Project Implementations Units of the IAs to employ subject matter experts, consultants, fiduciary agents, and support staff to be housed within each IA and assist with the preparation, implementation, and supervision of project activities. In addition, training, exposure visits, documentation, and monitoring and evaluation, equipment like computer, furniture etc. and project offices, Project Management Consultants, MIS and Third Party Quality Audit (TPQA) will be financed out of this component. BAPEPS in coordination with the IAs will derive a detail PIU set up plan for each IAs and help strengthening the PIUs for successful project implementation.

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

The project is located in the Kosi River Basin of the State of Bihar in India and focuses on the five affected districts- Supaul, Saharsa, Madhepura, Araria, Purnea. The State is a stretch of fertile plain that is divided into two unequal parts, separated by the Ganges River, which flows from west to east.

The northern part of the State is drained by the Ganges northern tributaries of Bagmati, Gandak and Kosi, which originate in Nepal. These three rivers are difficult to manage and regularly flood much of North Bihar. The lateral movement of the Kosi River has led to erosion, loss of land and water logging in its basin over the years. A considerable portion of the land in the project area is waterlogged, a phenomenon that has been exacerbated by development. Natural drainage has been impeded by embankments, canals, roads, and railway tracks often due to poor design and insufficient attention to the larger hydrological context of the region as a whole.

In the back drop of these factors, Bihar is India's most flood-prone state, with 76 percent of the population and 73 percent of total landmass living under the recurring threat of floods. A review by Kale (1997) indicated that the plains of north Bihar have recorded the highest number of floods in India during the last 30 years, and of these, the floods in 1978, 1987, 1998, 2004 and 2008 were especially damaging to the economy and population.

A review of floods in northern Bihar by the Flood Management Information System (FMIS) documented material flood events ever year between 1998 and 2009. Floods occur in each of the river basins listed above, with the Kosi River Basin being one of the most active areas of flooding. The Kosi River, known as "the sorrow of Bihar" affects sizable populations and destroys swaths of crops regularly. Consistent flooding has led to an environment in which investment in land and agricultural productivity measures is limited and hinders the economic growth and development of the State.

Apart from the natural factors linked to geomorphology and hydrology of the Kosi River Basin, human interventions (both in Nepal as well as in Bihar) have impacted changes in sediment load or run-off through water resource management schemes such as bunds, barrages and embankments and

accelerated erosion in the upper watershed due to deforestation and development works. The conventional flood-control measures have changed the agro-ecology of the Kosi River Basin. Flood-prone and waterlogged areas have increased, and erosion and sand casting has temporarily or permanently made huge areas of land uncultivable; and this, in turn, has increased landlessness and distress amongst the local community.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Harinath Sesha Appalarajugari (GENDR)

Shankar Narayanan (GSURR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	Specific interventions envisaged such as flood control, irrigation, and strengthening the transport network envisaged under the project may have potential adverse environmental impacts in their area of influence. Project hence has been categorized as 'Category A' and OP 4.01 has been triggered to ensure that such investments are planned and designed to be sound and sustainable by integrating environmental dimensions into the over-all decision making process. These will be carried out through an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) prepared for the project and environmental assessments will as per the agreed ESMF.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	The proposed activities under the project would not convert or degrade natural habitats. However, considering the proposed embankment works along the river and other interventions, the project proposes assessment procedures and mitigation measures through the ESMF so that any likely negative impacts on the natural environment are avoided / minimized. The framework proposes screening activities such as improvement/ strengthening of existing embankments, channel improvements, dredging and other flood protection works. Based on these screening exercises, environmental assessments for the respective sub-projects will analyze impacts on the natural habitats and formulate measures to avoid / mitigate impacts.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	OP 4.36 has not been triggered as the project activities do not impact any forest area.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	The proposed interventions for enhancing agricultural efficiency under Component 2 may trigger policy requirements of OP 4.09. While the proposed component largely aims to sustainably increase the productivity and profitability of agriculture in the greater Kosi River Basin,

		activities such as crop production enhancement/ management may require adoption of strategies that promote the use of biological/ environmental control methods and reduce the reliance on chemical pesticides, including issues related to handling, application, and disposal of waste products. An 'Integrated Pest Management Plan' has been prepared as part of the ESMF to ensure compliance to the policy.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	The proposed interventions on Flood Risk Management (Component 1) and Augmenting Connectivity (Component 3) could lead to impacts on cultural properties in the project area. Since the list of sub-projects, their location and alignments are not clear at this stage, this policy has been triggered and necessary safeguard measures including preparation of cultural properties management plan and procedures to address instances of 'chance find' have been incorporated in the Environmental and Social Management Framework prepared for the project. A few project interventions may be located close to sites, structures, natural/man-made features that have historical, archeological, religious or other cultural significance. The impacts on these resources will be determined through screening and EA/ SA process for each sub-project and management measures, as required, will be taken and integrated into the sub-project cycle.
Indigenous Peoples OP/ BP 4.10	No	No tribal communities (akin to Bank definition of Indigenous Peoples) exist in the project districts.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	Some project interventions are likely to trigger issues such as those related to land acquisition, loss of assets, and impact on livelihood sources as detailed in the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF). BAPEPS will conduct assessments and implement the necessary measures including Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) as per the Entitlement Matrix agreed in the ESMF and RPF for the project for Bank review and no objection well in advance of any project interventions.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The Project activities don't involve construction and operation of dams and hence the policy has not been triggered.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	Yes	The Kosi River is an international river and therefore this policy is triggered. Activities under the Component 1 of the project qualifies for an exception to the notification requirement under paragraph 7(a) of OP 7.50 (rehabilitation of an ongoing scheme), as these will not involve any works or activities that significantly alter or

		expand the embankments' scope and extent to make it appear a new or different structure. Furthermore, the project interventions will not adversely affect the quality or quantity of water flows downstream in Bihar or upstream in Nepal. However, shallow tube well activities supported through Component 2 of the project have been notified to Bangladesh, as these will tap into underground aquifer.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The project activities are not located in disputed areas as defined in OP 7.60, and hence the policy has not been triggered.

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:

While the project on the whole is designed to both benefit communities exposed to flood risk, as well as enhancing income from agriculture through rehabilitation of irrigation systems and investments in infrastructure and allied agriculture activities, the implementation of proposed components of the Project may result in adverse impacts on people and land, if not mitigated.

Considering the environmental and social vulnerability of Kosi Basin, the proposed investments to rehabilitate existing infrastructure and improve agricultural production in the Kosi Basin should be carefully planned to avoid significant and/or irreversible impacts. Some of the key environmental impacts that may arise due to the proposed project have been summarized component-wise below:

Improving flood risk management: The proposed activities such as the reinforcement of flood protection infrastructure and flood mitigation works could (a) impact aquatic flora / fauna of the Kosi River and its ecosystem; (b) increase local level water logging conditions due to improper design and restoration of embankments; (c) impact terrestrial and agriculture ecosystems due to the diversion of forest land and/or tree felling; (d) impact physical environment (air, water, soil, noise) due to construction activities and setting-up of temporary camps and plant sites; (e) have impacts associated with extraction and transportation of materials such as earth, sand, water and stones; (f) cause occupational health and safety issues related to various construction operations; (g) lead to temporary relocation or involuntary resettlement of households currently residing in areas such as embankment slopes or in the river bed; (h) lead to generation and improper disposal of construction debris and other wastes; and (i) impact physical and cultural properties that are located in the immediate influence area of the embankments.

Intensification and Diversification of Production Systems (Agricultural/Horticultural Crops): The proposed activities to develop private shallow tube wells and support agricultural schemes under these components could have (a) impacts on ground water quality and quantity, due to inadequate planning, installation and operation of tube wells; (b) environment and health impacts due to increased use of pesticides; (c) increased water logging due to the availability of excessive water for irrigation; (d) change in agriculture pattern leading to impacts on local ecosystems, etc.

Increasing access to markets: The proposed improvement of the road network, the construction of bridges, and other activities under this component could (a) impact natural drainage patterns due to inadequate cross drainage works; (b) possible diversion of a small amount of forest land and/or plantation belt area or some tree felling; (c) impact on physical environment (air, water, soil, noise) due to construction activities and setting-up of temporary camps and plant sites; (d) impacts associated with extraction and transportation of materials such as earth, sand, water and stones; (e) occupational health and safety issues related to various construction operations; and (f) generation and improper disposal of construction debris and other wastes.

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

The irrigation support to farmers through shallow tube well under Component 2 Enhancing Agricultural Productivity and Competitiveness- could have long term impacts on the availability of ground water, its quality and the water logging conditions in the project area. The proposed embankment strengthening activities under Component 1: Improving Flood Risk Management could also have long term impacts on the aquatic ecosystem. The proposed environment and social assessment process proposed in the ESMF for the project ensures that these impacts are identified early in the project planning stage through screening process and suitably addressed through environmental and social assessment studies that recommend suitable mitigation measures.

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

The implementation of project components will include several construction activities, which have a potential to create adverse environment impacts, particularly if such activities are not properly managed. Although the general thrust and broad project interventions are known at the time of project appraisal, the specific details pertaining to the planning and design of multiple sub-projects that the project envisages to support, will be known only later. In such a situation, where multiple sub-projects will be located across the targeted districts, an Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF) approach has been adopted for the project. While the project itself is designed to benefit the flood hit communities, the management of unwarranted/adverse impacts is proposed to be managed through the application and implementation ESMF principles and specific Environmental and Social Assessments for the sub-projects (as applicable). Environment Impact Assessments (EIA) are being carried out by the Implementing Agencies and careful consideration on mitigation measures if required are being undertaken by the Implementing Agencies and GoB.

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.

The Government of Bihar constituted the Bihar Aapada Punarwas Evam Punarnirman Society (BAPEPS) to coordinate the Bihar Kosi Flood Recovery Project implementation. BAPEPS has recruited Social and Environment Specialists working on the safeguard aspects. The Implementing Agencies are conducting EAs for the sub-projects for identification of mitigation measures and incorporation in the designs/bid documents.

This proposed project will benefit from this existing arrangement. The BAPEPS will act as the Project Management Unit (PMU) for all components and will be primarily responsible for the implementation of the project. The ex-officio Chairperson of the Society will be the Development Commissioner, GoB. BAPEPS will have the overall responsibility for project implementation including, but not limited to, reporting, monitoring and evaluation, procurement control, financial management, audit and disbursements, compliance with the environmental and social policy requirements, as well as coordination with the line agencies and the Bank. Within the PMU, an

Environment Specialist and Social Specialist (has been deployed to handle all matters pertaining to environment and social management under the project, including implementing the ESMF.

The key responsibilities of the Environment and Social Specialists include: (a) orientation and training of implementing agency teams and the contractors on environmental and social management; (b) leading/providing over-sight on the EA/SA process and its output(s); (c) review of monitoring reports submitted by the implementing agencies on ESMF/EMP implementation; (d) conducting regular visits to project sites to review ESMF compliance during sub-project planning, design and execution; (e) providing guidance and inputs to the implementing agency teams on environment and social management aspects. These specialists will also deal with matters pertaining to integration of ESMF into the sub-project design and contract documents; preparation of ToRs for studies (such as for EA/SA); reporting, documentation, monitoring and evaluation on environment and social aspects and will ensure over-all co-ordination with the Implementing Agencies and field offices of BAPEPS. To ensure that the Environment Specialist and Social Specialist are adequately conversant and capable to undertake these tasks, BAPEPS management would ensure that they are provided adequate opportunities for training and exposure to projects of similar nature.

Further to the support the environmental and social managers, an 'Independent Safeguard Monitoring and Audit (ISMA) consultant will review the implementation of various EMP / RAP activities by all the sub-projects. In addition to providing regular inputs on improving the safeguard implementation practices in the project, the ISMA will submit quarterly reports to BAPEPS, which will be an important resource for Bank team's assessment on safeguards management of the project. BAPEPS would need to ensure that the ISMA Consultant is staffed with fully capable and committed environmental and social safeguards specialists.

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

Key stakeholders of the project include the state government, local governments, and citizens living in flood prone areas in the Kosi River Basin have supported efforts related to flood mitigation in the area, especially given the severe impact of the 2008 Kosi flood. However, given the high profile of the project and the number of stakeholder groups, potentially there are certain groups that could feel negatively affected.

All stakeholders have a strong interest in the development of infrastructure that will lead to increased agricultural productivity. To achieve this goal, the project emphasizes the need for synergies among state level sectors and local stakeholders to maximize the impact of investments in flood management, transportation, and agriculture. The project explicitly links physical investments to better water resource management arrangements at the institutional level and livelihoods development plans at the local levels. Extensive awareness and capacity-building efforts, at start-up and through implementation, will aim to encourage communities to take ownership of investments.

Technical reviews have already been undertaken to ensure that critical works and activities related to flood management and rehabilitation of the transport network do not have a negative impact local residents. Once the implementation begins, environmental and social safeguards specialists will disseminate relevant information to farmers and people living in flood prone areas to further increase awareness of the project.

To ensure fairness of subsidies to support agriculture and irrigation amongst farmers, the Implementing Agencies will follow pilot phase approach. This type of approach gives local stakeholders a chance to share feedback on the initial investments and state and local officials can modify their approaches for future larger-scale investments based on this information. This type of flexibility that is built into the project is designed to lead to better results and higher impact. Ensuring rationale design of subsidies to support private tube wells and livestock investments is critical to promote fairness, and activities will not be rolled out until stakeholder interests are taken into consideration.

BAPEPS will serve as the PMU to coordinate project components among state level departments and the implementation of the components at the local level. It will address governance, transparency, and accountability issues among the stakeholders throughout the process and institute necessary arrangements to address grievances. This approach will help stakeholders manage expectations, while keeping various implementation agencies accountable for their work.

Community meetings will be held in each affected village on the project and also to inform the local population of their rights to compensation and options available in accordance with these guidelines. The ESMF and subsequent implementation plans, as well as studies for investments, are disclosed on the government websites and other public places accessible to the local people and NGOs in English and local language.

Grievance Redress Mechanism: BAPEPS shall put in place a strong, accessible and effective Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) both at the district and State levels. This mechanism will be well publicized and proactively made accessible to the poor and vulnerable and its effectiveness would be judged based on the close monitoring by BAPEPS management of grievances received and redressed in accordance with clearly outlined norms.

In case of a potential dispute on compensation, the local Sub Divisional Magistrate (SDM) shall hear and resolve the case in presence of (a) the affected party, (b) the in-charge of line department who is acquiring the land/ in-charge of the sub-project activity and (c) Pradhan of the village where the sub-project is being implemented. However, in case of non-satisfactory solution, the matter will be brought to the notice of the District Collector and he/she is the final authority to decide the case.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	04-Feb-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	04-Feb-2015
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	05-Feb-2015
"In country" Disclosure	
India	04-Feb-2015
Comments: Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF)	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	04-Feb-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	04-Feb-2015

"In country" Disclosure	
India	04-Feb-2015
Comments: Included as part of ESMF	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	04-Feb-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	04-Feb-2015
"In country" Disclosure	
India	04-Feb-2015
Comments: Included as part of ESMF.	
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 [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats	
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes [ ] No [×] NA [ ]
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 [ ] No [×] NA [ ]
OP 4.09 - Pest Management	
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design?If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources	
Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement	

Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/ process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
OP 7.50 - Projects on International Waterways	
Have the other riparians been notified of the project?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
If the project falls under one of the exceptions to the notification requirement, has this been cleared with the Legal Department, and the memo to the RVP prepared and sent?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
Has the RVP approved such an exception?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information	
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
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 [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
All Safeguard Policies	
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Deepak Singh	
Approved By		
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Bernice K. Van Bronkhorst (PMGR)	Date: 01-May-2015