

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 24-Jan-2018 | Report No: 123090



BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country	Project ID	Project Name	Parent Project ID (if any)
India	P164058	Uttarakhand Disaster Recovery Project Additional Financing	P146653
Parent Project Name	Region	Estimated Appraisal Date	Estimated Board Date
Uttarakhand Disaster Recovery Project	SOUTH ASIA	25-Jan-2018	20-Mar-2018
Practice Area (Lead)	Financing Instrument	Borrower(s)	Implementing Agency
Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience Global Practice	Investment Project Financing	The Republic of India	Government of Uttarakhand, Uttarakhand State Disaster Management Authority, Government of Uttarakhand

Proposed Development Objective(s) Parent

To restore housing, rural connectivity and build resilience of communities in Uttarakhand and increase the technical capacity of the State entities to respond promptly and effectively to an eligible crisis or emergency.

Components

Resilient Infrastructure Reconstruction
Rural Road Connectivity
Technical Assistance and Capacity Building for Disaster Risk Management
Financing Disaster Response Expenses
Implementation Support
Contingency Emergency Response

Financing (in US\$, millions)

SUMMARY

Total Project Cost	125.00
Total Financing	125.00
Financing Gap	0.00



DETAILS

World Bank Lending

100.00

Environmental Assessment Category

Partial Assessment (B)

'Have the Safeguards oversight and clearance function been transferred to the Practice Manager?' Yes

Decision

The review did authorize the preparation to continue

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

India continues to be one of the world's fastest growing large economies and has experienced a substantial decline in poverty. The Indian economy registered gradually rising growth from 5.5 percent in 2012-13 to 8 percent in 2015-16. This was supported by robust private consumption, a resilient services sector, and some revival in industrial activity. In recent months temporary disruptions from demonetization and uncertainty surrounding Goods and Services Tax (GST) slowed India's economic momentum and real GDP growth declined to 7.1 percent in 2016-17 and further to 5.7 percent in Q1 FY17/18. Private investments have remained subdued. However, economic activity is expected to stabilize during 2017-18 and growth will resume gradual acceleration in the near term. Since the 2000s, India has made remarkable progress in reducing absolute poverty. Between 2004 and 2011, poverty declined sharply from 38.9 to 21.6 percent at the international poverty line (\$1.90 PPP/day). With over a 100 million people escaping poverty, the pace of poverty reduction in India exceeded that of the developing world as well as that of Middle Income Countries (MICs) in this period. High economic growth, rapid rise in rural wages, greater rural-urban integration and increase in non-farm activity, especially construction, were the key drivers of poverty reduction. Since 2011, robust economic growth may have aided further reduction in poverty. However, trends in the construction sector and rural wages suggest that the pace of poverty reduction may have moderated.

India is prone to all major types of natural hazards including floods, cyclones, landslides, earthquakes, heatwaves, and droughts. The estimated average annual loss from natural disasters in India is US\$9.8 billion (UNISDR GAR 2015). Recent examples of large scale disasters include Bihar Kosi Floods (2007), Uttarakhand Floods and Cyclone Phailin (2013), Cyclone Hudhud (2014), and Srinagar Floods (2014). Recurrent floods occur in the northern plains, northeast and southeast of the country. The severity and recurrence of these types of extreme events are likely to be exacerbated due to climate change.



The Government of India (GoI) has made great strides in moving from a reactive emergency response to proactively implementing disaster preparedness and risk reduction initiatives. In 2016, the country's first ever National Disaster Management Plan was launched, and the GoI hosted the Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction which led to the signing of the "New Delhi Declaration; the Asia Regional Plan for the Implementation of the Sendai Framework."

The proposed Additional Financing (AF) is part of the Bank's response to support the GoI's efforts after severe floods in the State of Uttarakhand in June 2013. The pace of recovery in the State has been exemplary and among the most successful in recent past. The recovery has been supported by, among others, the GoI, the Asian Development Bank, civil society, donors, and the Bank. In the four and a half years since the disaster, all eligible houses have been rebuilt, critical connectivity and public services have been restored and improved. Importantly, the State's disaster risk management capacity has been strengthened along with the investment in long term resilience which translated into enhanced policies and institutions.

AF is being requested to further support the post-disaster recovery by financing priority investments based on the studies conducted under the Parent Project (PP). While the impacts of climate change in future disasters remain uncertain, efforts to ensure that the State has additional capabilities and resilient infrastructure to reduce the potential damages and more quickly recover from disasters will translate into important beneficial ripple effects on the State's economy and livelihoods in the long term. The proposed activities will serve to increase the effectiveness and extent of the PP's impact as well as its sustainability.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Original PDO – (Parent Project)

To restore housing, rural connectivity and build resilience of communities in Uttarakhand and increase the technical capacity of the State entities to respond promptly and effectively to an eligible crisis or emergency.

Current PDO – (Additional Financing)

To restore housing, rural connectivity and build resilience of communities in Uttarakhand and increase the technical capacity of the State entities to respond promptly and effectively to an eligible crisis or emergency.

D. Project Description

SCOPE OF THE ADDITIONAL FINANCING

The scope of the proposed AF constitutes a scale up of the Parent Project's activities which are:

- a) **Bridges, road protection, and river bank protection under Component 2 – Rural Road Connectivity:**
 - i. Reconstruction of about 42 bridges that are damaged to the point of needing replacement, or where the original bridge is no longer in use due to damage or total collapse;
 - ii. Road protection works to reduce the risk of landslides in about 18 selected critical slopes to protect and improve connectivity; and



- iii. River bank protection in about 15 critical stretches to reduce the risk of river bank erosion and resulting loss of connectivity.

- b) **Training facility for State Disaster Response Force (SDRF) under Component 3 – Technical Assistance and Capacity Building for Disaster Risk Management:** To finance a permanent physical training facility that will help impart specialized trainings to SDRF personnel as well as police, firemen, and local communities to strengthen the State's disaster response capacity to respond to disasters, most of which are linked to climate change. Specialized training will focus on the needs of the State's priorities: collapsed structures, medical first response, mountaineering and high altitude, and water search and rescue.

ADDITIONAL FINANCING PROJECT COST

The project cost by component is as follows:

No	Project Component	Total Project Cost	IBRD Financing - m\$	IBRD Financing - %
1	Component 2 – Rural Road Connectivity			80%
	Bridges	43.0	34.4	
	Road protection	20.0	16.0	
	River bank protection	30.0	24.0	
2	Component 3 – Technical Assistance and Capacity Building for Disaster Risk Management			80%
	Training facility for SDRF	20.0	16.0	
3	Project Implementation Support	12.0	9.6	100%
4	Contingent Emergency Response Component (CERC)	0.0	0.0	
Total		125.0	100.0	80%

LINKAGE TO THE COUNTRY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGY

The proposed activities remain relevant and aligned with the Bank's Country Partnership Strategy (CPS FY13-17, Report No. 76176-IN). The proposed AF is anchored within the "Strategic Engagement Area 1: Integration" of India's CPS (Outcome 1.1), which states that "the World Bank Group's support for the transport sector will focus on the reform and development of railways, highways, and rural roads, and on improving road safety and ensuring asset sustainability," and within the "Strategic Engagement Area 3: Inclusion," (Outcome 3.8) which states that "the Bank's work in this area has two strands: (i) helping building institutional capacity to prepare for and manage the impact of natural disasters; and, (ii) helping people protect themselves from natural disasters and recover quickly from them."

E. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

The institutional capacity of the existing Project Management Unit (PMU), Project Implementation Units (PIUs) and delivery mechanism established by the State with the Bank's support have proven to be increasingly effective. The institutional and implementation arrangements set up for PP will be maintained for the AF and will continue to be responsible of fiduciary, safeguards and M&E aspects of the AF under Uttarakhand State Disaster Management Authority (USDMA)'s oversight under the Government of Uttarakhand (GoUK).



Additional staff is being recruited to enhance the capacity of the PIUs to manage the additional works.

For implementation of the River Bank Protection work under Component 2, technical staff deputed from the Irrigation Department will be working together within the current PIU for Component 2. In addition, the Public Building PIU for PP's Component 1 (Resilient Infrastructure Reconstruction) will serve as the PIU for AF's SDRF Training Facility under Component 3.

F. Project location and Salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

The project is located in the 11 districts of the State which comprises of 13 districts grouped into two divisions (Kumaun and Garhwal) and has a total geographical area of 53,484 sq. km of which is about 45% is forested area (forest land covers about 60% of the total geographical area of the State). The State is endowed with rich biodiversity and has established six national parks and six wildlife sanctuaries for the conservation of flora and fauna.

According to 2011 census, Uttarakhand's population was around 10.1 million, with the last decadal growth being 19.17. Uttarakhand feeds approximately 0.84% of India's total population. Out of the total population, males account for 5,154,178 and females account for 4,962,574, persons. The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes population is about 15.17% and 2.56% respectively. The gender ratio is 963 and fares better as compared to average gender ratio of India (940). However, the child gender ratio of 886 in the State remains a matter of concern.

Given mountainous terrain in the Himalayan range, Uttarakhand has a very fragile terrain, and is prone to natural disasters including cloudburst heavy precipitation, floods, landslides, earthquake, etc. The entire State falls within Zone IV and Zone V (Zone V represents the highest level of seismicity) of the Earthquake Zoning Map of India. The districts of Bageshwar, Chamoli, Pithoragarh, Rudraprayag and Uttarkashi all fall within the Seismic Zone V. In the recent past, the State has witnessed two major earthquakes (Uttarkashi 1991 and Chamoli 1999). Every year, the State faces massive losses, particularly during the monsoon season, due to rains, cloudbursts, flash floods, landslides, floods, hailstorms and water logging events.

The economy of the State primarily depends on agriculture and tourism. The State is home to some of the most important pilgrimage centers known as the "Char-Dham", i.e. the Gangotri, Yamunotri, Kedarnath and Badrinath, all of which are situated in the northern region. The state receives over 32 million tourists annually, a majority of whom visit the state during the peak summer season (May-July). The region is also a well-known tourist destination and has many trekking trails. The sub-projects, to be supported under the proposed AF, will be in the 11 districts. Most of the activities, under the AF, will be located within the road RoW or its close vicinity, and/ or in already disturbed land.

G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Mridula Singh, Senior Social Development Specialist



Bokepalli Kanaka Durga Raja, Social Safeguards Specialist
Drona Raj Ghimire, Environmental Safeguards Specialist

SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	
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	

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:

The proposed AF takes up similar kind of works as that of the PP which required small parcels of land for some of the project components and did not cause any displacement or loss of livelihoods. The AF activities will take place within the original location/Right of Way(RoW)/land disturbed due to the disaster and the SDRF Training facility will use government land. Therefore, the safeguards category of the AF is expected to remain the same category (B) as of the PP. For this reason, the AF only triggers the same social safeguards as that of the PP, i.e., Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12 and does not trigger OP/BP4.10 as it is not expected to affect the Scheduled Tribes.

Compared to the PP, the AF scope does not include private housing and public building except SDRF, and village and other district roads that were in the PP. Consequently, the potential environmental impacts/issues are likely to be less significant than in the PP. Potential environmental issues/impacts of the AF are related to the construction and/or rehabilitation of bridges on existing roads, road protection, river bank protection works, and construction of SDRF building. The additional land required for the rehabilitation and improvement works is unlikely to fall in the



ecologically sensitive areas. Hence, the AF is unlikely to cause highly sensitive, irreversible, diverse, or unprecedented environmental impacts. However, the main environmental issues/impacts anticipated include environmental health and safety (EHS) at work sites, issues/impacts due to haphazard or inappropriate disposal of construction spoils/debris, construction wastes (e.g. wash water from concrete batching plant, bituminous materials, etc.), damage or degradation of local community amenity (e.g. foot-trails, access to houses/ village, tube-well/ water-pipes, etc.), dust generation, soil erosion and slope failures, degradation of local cultural sites, and potential degradation of forest/vegetation patches in subproject locality.

The contractor is likely to bring migrant workers for the construction works, although their number is unlikely to be huge in a subproject site. Engagement of the migrant workers may lead to adverse environmental and social impacts including improper waste disposal and pollution, pressure on local resources (water, forest, and burden on public infrastructure and services), social conflicts, risks of communicable diseases, traffic accidents, etc. However, these issues/impacts are limited to the activity sites and its close vicinity, and can be mitigated through readily known/available measures. The contract clauses will include provisions to avoid/minimize/manage issues related to labor camps and migrant workers.

Considering these impacts, OP/BP 4.01 Environmental Assessment, OP/BP 4.04 Natural Habitats, OP/BP 4.36 Forests, and OP/BP 4.11 Physical Cultural Resources have been triggered. Subproject level screening and EA/EMP will assess impacts and issues in each subproject and include specific mitigations tailored to the subproject sites and surroundings.

Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01 triggered as interventions proposed under the AF such as construction of SDRF, bridges on the existing roads, road protection and river bank protection works in the road right of way or its close vicinity may have potential site-specific adverse environmental impacts in their area of influence.

Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04. The NH policy is triggered mainly for precautionary reason. Depending on the site, some of the activities under AF, could have impacts on aquatic and territorial natural habitats/ natural ecosystem at activity sites and its vicinity. However, legally protected or critical natural habitat is unlikely to be affected and the additional land required for the rehabilitation and improvement works is unlikely to fall in the ecologically sensitive areas. The Assessment and Environmental Management Plan prepared under OP 4.01 will cover and address natural habitats related issues and impacts, if any.

Forests OP/BP 4.36. No commercial logging is to be supported under the AF. However, some activities could have impacts on the health of forests. For example, new approach to bridges, if necessary in some bridges, may affect forests. In such situations, subproject specific EMP will have site specific mitigation measures including avoidance through alternate approach and/ or plantation in lieu of forest loss.

Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11. Some of the AF activities may take place close to sites of local cultural and/ or historical values. However, as shown by the PP, renowned PCR sites are unlikely to be affected as the activities will largely take place within or near the existing RoW. The impacts on the PCR, where likely, 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.

Pesticides/herbicides will not be used for the maintenance / rehabilitation of bridges, roads and river banks.



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

Most of AF activities will involve construction within RoW, reconstructing/upgrading previously existing facilities. Hence, new indirect and/or induced long-term impact is not expected. The construction of bridges on the existing roads, and road protection works will enhance connectivity and hence likely to contribute in increased movement of people and goods (traffic). Road protection work is likely to contribute in reducing landslides and soil erosion in the road corridors. The Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) for the project encourages incorporation of suitable mitigation measures to address such aspects at subproject level EA/EMP.

Social: The proposed AF project will have several positive impacts on the community. These are such as improved public safety and security, reduced sufferings during monsoons and adverse climatic conditions, better infrastructure and connectivity, improved access to services, productive use of time, improvements in income patterns, health, life quality and human dignity improvements, opportunities for social interaction, enhanced community participation and sense of ownership, etc.

The proposed AF project works may not have significant adverse social impacts due to the nature, type and size of the works. However, certain social impacts such as land acquisition or construction related inconvenience and safety related issues, though short-term and significantly low in size and scope, could possibly arise out of the proposed sub-projects.

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

As this is an AF, project level alternative has not been considered. The project ESMF provides guidance to consider alternatives at subproject/activity level. Alternatives to minimize adverse impacts and promote environmentally sound practices will be explored during the design and preparation of specific activities (construction/reconstruction of bridges, road slope protection, river bank protection to safeguard roads, and SDRF building). However, each subproject will have opportunities to decide on the alternatives based on local conditions. Each subproject will consider alternatives to optimize the accrual of project benefits and to minimize adverse impacts through: a) minimizing land requirement and land acquisition; b) improved community consultations and design; c) stakeholder engagement; and, d) a robust grievance redress system.

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 measures taken by the borrower to address potential environmental issues and impacts remain broadly the same as was in the PP. The ESMF of the PP is being updated, tailoring to the AF's scope of works, internalizing the experiences of the PP, and changes in the country's safeguard requirements.

The ESMF has a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) and the contractors will be issued with a Social Management Plan (SMP) for each subproject implementation. The ESMF has been consulted with the stakeholders, will be translated and disclosed before appraisal. In addition, environmental site screening and environmental management plan for the first year subprojects will be prepared before appraisal. As per the ESMF, environmental site screening and environmental and social management plans will be prepared for all the subprojects/activities during implementation, and relevant mitigations will be internalized in the subproject details and bidding documents.

Capacity strengthening measures included in the PP were awareness/orientation, training and provision of human



resources (safeguard/environmental specialists). Under the AF, the borrower, inter alia, will further strengthen environmental safeguard support and supervision including independent environmental audit. The PMU/PIU will have environmental specialist(s) for project level oversight. Supervision consultant team will comprise of environmental specialist(s) for regular environmental supervision and support at sites. Contractor will be required to prepare site plans for environmental management and implement mitigation measures.

The PMU 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 World Bank. Within the PMU, an Environment Manager and Social Manager will be 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 Managers include: (a) orientation and training of implementing agency teams and the contractors on environmental and social management; (b) leading/providing oversight on the EA/SA process and its outputs; (c) review of monitoring reports submitted by the implementing agencies on ESMF/EMP and RPF/ RAP/SMP implementation; (d) conducting regular visits to project sites to review ESMF compliance during subproject planning, design and execution; (e) providing guidance and inputs to the implementing agency teams on environment and social management aspects. These managers will also deal with matters pertaining to integration of ESMF into the subproject design and contract documents, preparation of Terms of References for studies (such as for EA/SA), reporting, documentation, monitoring and evaluation on environment and social aspects and will ensure overall coordination with the Implementing Agencies and PIUs.

Besides safeguard compliance monitoring by PMU/ PIUs and supervision consultant, the AF will continue Environmental and Social Audit (ESA) through an independent consultant. The independent ESA will submit six monthly reports to the PMU, which will be an important resource for the Bank team's assessment on safeguards management of the project.

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, NGO/ CBOs, and citizens living in and around the subproject locations. The stakeholders have been consulted in the process of developing and updating ESMF and RPF. In addition, the draft updated ESMF and RPF have been disclosed in UDRP website for comments and feedbacks, and the same will be presented in a consultation workshop participated by wide range of stakeholders. The updated ESMF will be finalized incorporating the feedbacks and comments and suggestions received from the stakeholders.

Once the implementation begins, environmental and social safeguards experts and social mobilizers will disseminate relevant information to local communities living in and around the subproject to further increase awareness of the project and get their feedbacks at subproject/ activity levels. Subproject/ activity level screening and preparation of EA/ EMP and SA/ RAP/ SMP will also require consultation with relevant / potentially affected stakeholders.

Stakeholders / community meetings will be held in each subproject. The ESMF has guidance on carrying out subproject/ activity level consultations. The ESMF and subsequent implementation plans, as well as studies for investments, will be disclosed on the government websites and other public places accessible to the local people and NGOs in English and local language. The project's Management Information System (MIS) will also include key



information regarding environmental status and compliance.

B. Disclosure Requirements (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other

Date of receipt by the Bank

Date of submission for disclosure

For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors

05-Dec-2017

06-Dec-2017

"In country" Disclosure

20-Jan-2018 (<http://ukdisasterrecovery.in/index.php/downloads/viewdownload/4-udrp/1021-draft-esmf-environment-social-management-framework-udrp-af-dated-20-1-2018>)

Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process

Date of receipt by the Bank

Date of submission for disclosure

05-Dec-2017

06-Dec-2017

"In country" Disclosure

20-Jan-2018 (<http://ukdisasterrecovery.in/index.php/downloads/viewdownload/4-udrp/1021-draft-esmf-environment-social-management-framework-udrp-af-dated-20-1-2018>)

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level (to be filled in when the ISDS is finalized by the project decision meeting) (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment

Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report? No

If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report? NA

Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan? NA

OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats

Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats? No

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? NA

OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources

Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property? Yes

Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property? Yes



OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement

Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared? Yes
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan? Yes
Is physical displacement/relocation expected? No
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods) No

OP/BP 4.36 – Forests

Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out? Yes
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints? Yes
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system? Yes

The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information

Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank for disclosure? Yes
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

All Safeguard Policies

Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies? Yes
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost? Yes
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies? Yes
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents? Yes

CONTACT POINT

World Bank



Ignacio M. Urrutia Duarte
Senior Disaster Risk Management Specialist

Deepak Singh
Senior Disaster Risk Management Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

The Republic of India
Ms. Bandana Preyashi
Director, MI
bandana.preyashi@gov.in

Implementing Agencies

Government of Uttarakhand
Mr. Amit Negi
Secretary (PWD) and Project Director (UDRP)
amitnegi.gov@gmail.com

Uttarakhand State Disaster Management Authority, Government of Uttarakhand
Mr. Amit Negi
Project Director, UDRP
amitnegi.gov@gmail.com

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 473-1000
Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/projects>

APPROVAL

Task Team Leader(s):

Ignacio M. Urrutia Duarte
Deepak Singh



The World Bank

Uttarakhand Disaster Recovery Project Additional Financing (P164058)

Approved By

Safeguards Advisor:

Practice Manager/Manager:

Country Director:

Aki Tsuda
[Signature]
[Signature]

January 25, 2018
1/25/2018