

INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATASHEET **APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: 84953

Date prepared/updated: January 16, 2014

I. Basic Information

1. Basic Project Data

Country	India	Project ID	P148870
Project Name	India Cyclone Risk Mitigation Project -Additional Financing		
Task Team Leader	Saurabh Suresh Dani		
Appraisal Date	November 30, 2009	Appraisal Date (Additional Financing)	January 10, 2014
Estimated Board Date	March 31, 2014		
Managing Unit	SASDC	Lending Instrument	
Sector(s)	General Water, Sanitation and Flood Protection (100%)		
Theme(s)	Natural Disaster Management (80%); Other Urban Development (20%)		
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?			OP Yes
Project Financing Data (In USD Million)			
Total Project Cost	USD 137.0 million	Total Bank Financing	USD 105 million
Financing Gap:	-		
Financing Source		Amount	
Borrower/Recipient		USD 32 million	
International Development Association (IDA)		USD 105 million	
EC European Commission		-	
Environmental Category	A		
Is this a Repeater project?	Yes		
Is this a Transferred project?	No		

2. Project Objectives

The Project Development Objective is "to reduce the vulnerability of coastal communities to cyclone and other hydro meteorological hazards through (i) improved early warning and communication systems, (ii) enhanced capacity of local communities to respond to disasters, (iii) improved access to emergency shelter, evacuation, and protection against wind storms, flooding and storm surge in high risk areas, and (iv) strengthening disaster risk management (DRM) capacity at central, state and local levels in order to enable mainstreaming of risk mitigation measures into the overall development agenda." It remains the same as the original project.

3. Project Description

Background. The National Cyclone Risk Mitigation Project I (P092217, Credit 4772-IN) has been the first phase of an Adaptable Program Loan (APL) designed to assist the Government of India and the vulnerable coastal states in mitigating cyclone related risks by focusing on ex-ante risk mitigation interventions as part of a strategy to integrate disaster risk mitigation into the longer-term national

development process. About 5,700 kilometers of India's coastline is exposed to severe cyclones and approximately 40 percent of its total population lives within 100 kilometers of the coastline increasing potential natural disaster losses. The first phase of this APL focuses on the states of Odisha and Andhra Pradesh for early warning and cyclone risk mitigation infrastructure components while technical assistance strengthening disaster risk management capacity has been made/is available for all coastal states. The original credit in the amount of US\$255 million was approved by the Board of Executive Directors on June 22 2010, and became effective on March 30, 2011.

The original project included four components:

Component A: Early Warning Dissemination System (EWDS) and Capacity building for Coastal Communities (US\$15 million from IDA). This component reduces the vulnerability of coastal communities by addressing the existing gap in dissemination of warning to the communities. The component supports: (i) installation and operation of EWDS allowing the state and/or district/sub district level control centre to send communication directly to the villages; and (ii) strengthening the capacity of communities in disaster preparedness and response by preparing disaster management plans and arranging mock drills.

Component B: Cyclone Risk Mitigation Infrastructure (US\$186 million from IDA). This component improves access to emergency shelter, evacuation and protection against cyclone and other hydro meteorological hazards such as wind storms, flooding and storm surge in high risk areas. Each of the states reviewed the existing system and gaps and developed risk mitigation infrastructure portfolio. For emergency shelters, identification mechanism included assessment of total requirement, available shelters including other government and private buildings and the gap. The portfolio includes a broad set of measures such as investments in multipurpose emergency shelters, up-grading of existing roads and providing bridges suitable for evacuation, drainage improvement measures and repair and up-grading of existing embankments, and creation of corpus funds for operation and maintenance of cyclone shelters.

Component C: Technical Assistance for National and State Level Capacity Building and Knowledge Creation (US\$6 million from IDA). This component provides assistance to help understand risk and vulnerabilities better, and prepare the key institutions for addressing them effectively across all coastal states and Union Territories. This component consists of studies, assessments, training and capacity building activities related to risk and damage assessments, development of training modules and action plans and implementing them through identified partner agencies.

Component D: Project Management and Implementation Support (US\$20.7 million from IDA). This component provides support for project management by financing incremental operating costs for PMU, PIUs, nodal units in Line Departments and National Institute of Disaster Management (NIDM), office equipment, training and exposure visits and consulting services for specialist activities.

Current Implementation Status. Risk mitigation infrastructure is proving to be an important element of disaster resilience under present circumstances: currently under NCRMP I, 286 cyclone shelters are being built (150 in Odisha and 136 in Andhra Pradesh), more than 1000 kilometers of evacuation roads and 23 bridges to enhance connectivity and evacuation and around 200 kilometers of existing coastal/saline embankments are being strengthened.

Despite a slow start, the project achieved significant progress in its two and half years of implementation: it currently has 89 percent of its program committed and is on its way to achieve its project development objective. In terms of cyclone risk mitigation infrastructure under component B, the state agencies awarded 95 percent of the planned work contracts, including the majority of multi-purpose shelters and road contracts. The construction of nine shelters as well as 150 kilometers of evacuation roads and 7 bridges has already been completed; saline embankment works have been contracted in Odisha while one contract for similar works has been delayed in Andhra Pradesh. Capacity building contracts under component C have also been awarded including the hazard and vulnerability assessment and technical consultants to support the PMU within the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) and to develop Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) Guidelines

with NIDM. Project Implementation Performance was upgraded from Moderately Unsatisfactory to Moderately Satisfactory in October 2013 given recent progress.

Cyclone Phailin. The project was on course to achieve its Project Development Objective before cyclone Phailin. On October 12 2013, Cyclone Phailin hit the states of Odisha and Andhra Pradesh with wind gusts up to 220 kilometer per hour, heavy rains measuring up to 25 centimeter and storm surge over 3 meters; the sea pushed in as much as 40 meters along parts of the coast. It was the strongest cyclone to hit the Indian coast in the past 14 years: a category 4 cyclone (Katrina in comparison, was category 3 upon landfall) similar to the Super Cyclone 05B of 1999 to hit Odisha and kill more than 10,000, destroying 275,000 homes and leaving 1.67 million homeless. The cyclone hit a densely populated area, with 4.5 million people within the hurricane force wind path and significant informal housing.

Reports however came of a death toll of 44, 0.5 percent that of the 1999 cyclone. The state governments, in collaboration with the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) evacuated over 900,000 people from low-lying coastal areas in the states of Odisha and Andhra Pradesh - the target states of the NCRMP - the largest such operation in India's history. The NCRMP contributed to this enhanced resilience. State authorities set-up over 1,200 relief camps and stocked over 500 cyclone shelter with adequate food, water and supplies. Over 2,300 officers from the National Disaster Response Force and 600 personnel from the Indian Army fanned out to provide relief and assess the damage across 14,500 affected villages.

Despite limited loss of life, the impact on the lives of coastal residents is still massive. In the Ganjam District of Odisha alone, about 90,000 homes were partially or fully damaged along the coastal areas, many of them mud homes belonging to poor fishermen and farmers. Crops in over one million hectares of agricultural land have reportedly been destroyed. Power and communication lines were also severely affected across Odisha with estimates of over 6,000 km of power lines and 7,500 telephone poles damaged; over 30 km of water line and 10,000 km of roads were also severely damaged.

In response to a request for assistance from the Government of India dating November 16 2013, a Rapid Disaster Needs Assessment was conducted revealing a total damage of US\$1.45 billion. This same request also solicited an additional assistance under the existing NCRMP I project, which prompted the proposed additional financing.

Additional Financing

Given the particularly vulnerable coastal states of Odisha and Andhra Pradesh with large exposed populations and the observed increase in hazard frequency to cyclones of high intensity in the region, the Government of India considers resilient infrastructure worthwhile investments and is requesting to scale-up the project's impact and development effectiveness by increasing the amount of risk mitigation works under component B. In particular, it is requesting the construction of **162 additional multipurpose cyclone shelters with related 185 km of evacuation roads and bridges in Odisha and 150 additional shelters and 270 km of evacuation roads and bridges in Andhra Pradesh.**

For this, the Government of India has requested the proposed additional credit in the amount of USD 105 million, which would be complemented by additional counterpart financing in the amount of USD 32 million equivalent. The proposed additional financing would further the engagement of the state of Odisha and Andhra Pradesh in mitigating cyclone related risks by focusing on additional risk mitigation interventions. It would provide improved access to emergency shelter and evacuation against wind storms, flooding and storm surge in high risk areas currently not covered by the original project.

D. Project location and salient physical characteristics relevant to safeguard analysis

Like the parent project, the NCRMP I's additional financing proposes to support targeted interventions as mentioned above in the coastal areas of two Indian states, namely Odisha and Andhra Pradesh.

Andhra Pradesh: The 974 kms long coastline of Andhra Pradesh, a very productive stretch along the Bay of Bengal on the east coast of India, supports a variety of economic activities. Multifarious industrial complexes, human settlements, fisheries, tourism, are all coming up along the coastline. The areas proposed for investment under Additional Financing are the same as those under component B of the parent project. The sub-projects will be located in the coastal areas of the districts of Srikakulam, Vizianagaram, Visakhapatnam, East Godavari, West Godavari, Krishna, Guntur, Ongole, Prakasam and Nellore.

Odisha: The Odisha coast, which is 480 km long and 10 to 100 km in width, forms a part of east coast of India. The coastal territory is drained by a number of rives like Mahanadi, Brahmani, Baitarani, Devi, Budhabalanga, Subarnarekha and Rushikalya. The areas proposed for investment under Additional Financing are the same as those under component B of the parent project. The sub-projects will be located in the coastal areas of the districts of Ganjam, Khurda, Puri, Kendrapara, Jagjitsinghpur, Bhadrak and Balasore.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Neha Vyas, Senior Environment Specialist, SASDI

Venkat Rao Bayana, Social Development Specialist, SASDS

6. Safeguard Policies Triggered

Safeguard Policies Triggered	Yes	No	TBD
Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01)	✓		
<p>While the project interventions are likely to have an over-all positive impact in mitigating risks from disasters, specific interventions envisaged under the project such as upgrading/expansion of access/local roads if designed without adequate drainage provisions or due to poor siting of cyclone shelters may have some potential adverse environmental impacts in the local context. On the whole, such impacts may include: (i) direct/indirect impacts resulting due to poor site selection for sub-projects; (ii) impact on the drainage pattern of the area; (iii) felling of trees and clearance of vegetation for sub-project construction; (iv) impacts on water resources used by the people such as ponds, river/streams, canals and hand pumps; (v) occupational health and safety concerns during the construction stage; (vi) impacts due to construction material (such as sand, water, earth, aggregate) sourcing and transportation and; (vii) issues associated with improper disposal of debris and construction wastes.</p> <p>More so, like the parent project, the most environmental concern pertains to avoiding the highly sensitive ecological areas and/or environmental features in the vulnerable coastal environs, which is possible by using the screening mechanisms (including use of GIS) diligently. OP 4.01 has been triggered to facilitate creation/strengthening of mechanisms whereby sub-projects can be planned, designed and maintained in an environmentally sound manner through integration of appropriate approaches into the over-all decision making process of the project – as was done for the parent project.</p>			
Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04)		✓	
<p>OP 4.04 is not being triggered for this project as no interventions are envisaged in natural habitats, including those defined as 'critical' under the policy.</p>			
Forests (OP/BP 4.36)		✓	
<p>OP 4.36 is not being triggered for this project as no interventions are envisaged in forest areas and therefore no conversion/degradation of this natural resource is expected to occur. The screening mechanism that has been formulated for the project enables in early identification of such issues. Based on the screening result, site assessment and the availability of alternative sub-project site/s, further decision about inclusion/exclusion are made.</p>			

Safeguard Policies Triggered	Yes	No	TBD
Pest Management (OP 4.09)		✓	
OP 4.09 is not being triggered for this project as biological/environmental control methods or reliance on synthetic chemical pesticides is not envisaged.			
Physical Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11)	✓		
The implementation of the project/program is not likely to affect religious structures of local significance or other physical cultural resources. Impacts, if any would be addressed through design interventions. Chance-found cultural properties, if any will be addressed through contract requirements and project's due diligence process set forth in ESMF.			
Indigenous Peoples (OP/BP 4.10)	✓		
Assessment on tribal population both in parent project and for Additional Financing indicates that there are no tribal populations with unique socio cultural identity vis-a-vis the main stream population in the sub-project locations. However, the ESMF outlines the provisions to follow as and when any sub-project comes across tribal population unique to the features stated in the Bank's OP 4.10 – as was done for the parent project.			
Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12)	✓		
Almost all the road infrastructure sub-projects would use the existing alignments and therefore are unlikely to involve land acquisition except for widening/up-grading where required by design. The new multi-purpose shelters are also planned either within the existing school premises or on other vacant government land or on lands donated by the community/gram panchayat. The land acquisition will therefore be not there, except in very exceptional cases. The policy however, has been triggered to allow required mechanisms to be put-in place in cases where land may be required in such exceptional circumstances.			
Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4.37)		✓	
OP 4.37 is not being triggered for this project as there is no construction of new dams or activities that are concerned with safe functioning of existing dams.			
Projects on International Waterways (OP/BP 7.50)		✓	
OP 7.50 will not be triggered for this project as there are no interventions planned/ proposed over or around an international waterway that could cause a potential conflict. There are also no activities that may affect the use or pollute such a waterway.			
Projects in Disputed Areas (OP/BP 7.60)		✓	
OP 7.60 is not being triggered as the project is not proposed in any disputed area.			
Piloting the Use of Borrower Systems to Address Environmental and Social Safeguard Issues in Bank-Supported Projects (OP/BP 4.00)		✓	

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.

Creation of cyclone risk mitigation infrastructure has the potential to have both positive as well as some adverse environmental and social impacts, particularly in the construction of cyclone shelters, widening/improvement of roads, provision of bridges and drainage improvement measures. The planned investments under Additional Financing primarily involve either construction of multipurpose cyclone shelters and repair/improvement of the existing evacuation roads providing

connectivity to cyclone shelters. Under Additional Financing, it is proposed to construct about 162 additional multipurpose cyclone shelters with related 185 kms of evacuation roads and bridges in Odisha and 150 additional shelters and 270 km of evacuation roads and bridges in Andhra Pradesh. These sub-projects will have positive impacts on the community as a whole as these will help them to be better prepared to face the challenges of cyclone and other disasters. Community participation in disaster management at local level will also help in making the efforts sustainable. All the sub projects under the Additional Financing will come-up in the same geographical area where the sub-projects under the parent project are located.

As part of project preparation for the parent project, National Cyclone Risk Mitigation Project, the likely social and environmental impacts (both positive and adverse) associated with the project activities were identified in the Environment and Social Management Framework. The key issues identified then have been re-confirmed during the on-going implementation of the parent project. These are summarized below:

Environmental Issues: While the project interventions are likely to have an over-all positive impact in mitigating risks from disasters, specific interventions envisaged under the project such as upgrading/expansion of access/local roads if designed without adequate drainage provisions or due to poor siting of cyclone shelters may have some potential adverse environmental impacts in the local context. On the whole, such impacts may include: (i) direct/indirect impacts resulting due to poor site selection for sub-projects; (ii) impact on the drainage pattern of the area; (iii) felling of trees and clearance of vegetation for sub-project construction; (iv) impacts on water resources used by the people such as ponds, river/streams, canals and hand pumps; (v) occupational health and safety concerns during the construction stage; (vi) impacts due to construction material (such as sand, water, earth, aggregate) sourcing and transportation and; (vii) issues associated with improper disposal of debris and construction wastes. The activities per se are not likely to have any significant and/or irreversible adverse environmental impacts and can be managed/mitigated by adopting the standard/typical management measures.

More so, like the parent project, the most environmental concern pertains to avoiding the highly sensitive ecological areas and/or environmental features in the vulnerable coastal environs, which is possible by using the screening mechanisms diligently. In the case of the parent project, the application and use of GIS based tools, particularly by Odisha helped in not only avoiding unwarranted environmental impacts but also significantly helped in managing project's requirement of regulatory clearances. By and large, the nature, scale and level of interventions, however will continue to remain contextual and will vary between and sometimes, even within the state.

Social Impacts/Issues: Almost all the road infrastructure sub-projects would use the existing alignments and therefore are unlikely to involve land acquisition except for widening/up-grading where required by design. The new multi-purpose shelters are also planned either within the existing school premises or on other vacant government land or on lands donated by the community/gram panchayat. The land acquisition will therefore be not there, except in very exceptional cases, which so far going by field assessment has not identified till date. Assessment of Phase I sub projects (part of parent project) in both states reveals no land acquisition requirement with the exception of a small private land that was required for an approach road in Andhra Pradesh. Further, no livelihood disturbances have been observed in the parent project. The adverse impacts, if any, will therefore be largely restricted to a modest loss of land from the construction of new infrastructure that too at only a few locations.

Assessment on tribal population both in parent project and for Additional Financing indicates that there are no tribal populations with unique socio cultural identity vis-a-vis the main stream population in the sub-project locations. However, the ESMF outlines the provisions to follow as and when any sub-project comes across tribal population unique to the features stated in the Bank's OP 4.10.

There is also a very little possibility of impacting cultural properties in the project as the project interventions and construction activities are relatively flexible in nature. Chance-found cultural properties will be addressed through contract requirements and project's due diligence.

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

The long-term impacts will be generally positive as the project will help in bringing economic and social development in the targeted areas. Most significantly, the reduction in the vulnerability of coastal communities, in the two participating coastal states of Odisha and Andhra Pradesh, to the adverse impacts of cyclones and climate related hazards will be a desirable long term impact from the project. Considerations of environment and social dimensions in operation and maintenance cycle of assets would help in ensuring the soundness and sustainability of the program from an environmental perspective.

Further, the experience gained during the project implementation would help the implementing agencies, both at the central and state level, to address environmental and social issues more systematically in their regular disaster risk reduction operations as well. The project's treatment of environmental and social issues specifically with regard to the approach used for screening sub-projects (which is based on a robust and scientific methodology) has a potential to set an important precedent for non-project activities/areas now and in the future. At the same time, long-term/indirect adverse environmental and social impacts may result if road infrastructure is designed and implemented without due considerations to local environmental and social features, including drainage and safety aspects.

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

The environment and social screening tool developed as part of the Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF) for the parent NCRMP project has been used effectively for early identification of key environmental and social issues associated with sub-projects, which are not only many in number but also spread across a wide geographical coastal realm of two states. This exercise, carried out in parallel with the project identification/engineering feasibility study, has also helped in precisely identifying the location for a sub-project (primarily multi-purpose cyclone shelters and associated access roads). For location/s falling within the Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ) line, an alternative site was identified in Odisha. For sub-projects with significant social issues, land acquisition and displacement issues and the ones falling within the CRZ with no alternative sites, were either dropped or considered for Phase II, depending on the nature and scale of issues. The already established methodology for environment screening exercise, supported by use of scientific tools such as GIS and remote sensing techniques, has helped in avoiding/ minimizing adverse environmental impacts on sensitive habitats and in finding alternatives, wherever possible. This system adopted for the parent project will be followed for the Additional Financing project as well.

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.

Environmental and Social Management and Safeguards Instrument: Safeguard policy issues were considered by applying OP 4.01, OP 4.11, OP 4.10 and OP 4.12. This had resulted in preparation of a distinct safeguard instrument for the parent operation – the Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF). It includes: (a) Environment and Social Screening approach and methodology and (b) Environment and Social Assessment for certain type of sub-projects (such as saline embankments – while these were supported under the parent project, such type of works are not included under Additional Financing).

Management of Environmental and Social Issues/Risks: The ESMF prepared by the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) and endorsed/accepted by the State Governments of Odisha and Andhra Pradesh for NCRMP, the parent project, remains valid for the Additional Financing project as well. The document, finalized in November 2009 serves as a comprehensive guide covers policies, procedures and provisions, which are being/will be integrated within the over-all project cycle to ensure that the environmental and social aspects are systematically identified and addressed in all the sub-projects.

The implementing agencies will carry out an environmental and social screening of the individual sub-projects, based on methods described in the ESMF, prior to inclusion of sub-projects in the final list of works to be supported under the Additional Financing project – a system that has been successfully applied to the parent project. Based on screening results, if a sub-project does not require an EA, the generic/standard activity-specific EMP, developed as part of the ESMF, will apply. These generic/standard activity-specific EMPs provide over-all guidance on avoidance, minimization and/or mitigation measures to be adopted during the planning, design, implementation and operation stages of the concerned sub-project.

As in the parent project, environmental and social issues identified during such screening exercises will be integrated in the sub-project design and implementation, as required. In case significant impacts are identified or in case there are time constraints with regard to completing Additional Financing project, either the sub-project in question will be dropped or sub-project specific social and environmental management plans will be prepared in accordance with the ESMF.

The ESMF identifies the potential adverse environment and social impacts (such as land take, partial/full displacement, livelihood disturbances) and describes the measures that need to be taken to avoid/ reduce/ mitigate these impacts. These adverse impacts will be addressed following the already developed ESMF for NCRMP (parent Project) based on Bank's safeguard policies and also Central and State government's R&R policies. The framework has provisions to compensate the loss of land and structure at replacement cost and the vulnerable will be assisted with additional support measures over and above the compensation. Wherever appropriate, the better and enhanced provisions of the new Act - Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition and Resettlement and Rehabilitation Act (RFCT - LARRA), 2013 will be followed for the Project. The new Act though has become effective, will have to be adopted formally by Project States (Andhra Pradesh and Odissa) by forming appropriate rules and regulations. The provisions of new Act are largely in conformity with the provisions of the Project's R&R policy, except in case of non-titleholders (NTHs). In addition to the better provisions under the new Act, the R&R provisions of parent project on NTH will be adhered for all components under the Additional Financing.

Institutional Arrangements: The NDMA will continue to provide technical and monitoring support and will coordinate the over-all program. The preparation of safeguard documents and implementation of the RAPs and EMPs is the responsibility of the State PIUs and will be monitored by the concerned SDMA/nodal department. The state Project Implementation Unit in each state will have nodal Social and Environmental Experts to continuously review the ESMF implementation in the project. These experts will be responsible for ensuring proper preparation and implementation of safeguard documents/instruments. All the Detailed Project Reports prepared by the line/implementing agencies will be certified by the Environment and Social Development Experts of the State PIUs. The project also has a provision for Third Party Audit covering technical, environmental and social aspects to support NDMA/SDMA/Nodal Department in attaining quality and safeguard compliance objectives. All arrangements and staff positions would continue during the Additional Financing phase of the project.

In case of grievances, the matter will be brought to the notice of local tehsildar/Sub Divisional Magistrate (SDM). He/she shall hear the case in presence of all concerned and will try to reach an amicable solution. In case of non-satisfactory solution, the matter will be brought to the notice of the District Collector and he is the final authority to decide the case. As and if required, certain cases will be referred to State Steering Committee which would examine and address the grievances. The Social Management Specialist from the PIU/SDMA will be responsible for maintaining a record of the proceedings and the final decisions.

Borrower Capacity: The NDMA and the State implementing agencies now have the experience of implementing Bank financed NCRMP project. Insights into typical issues/problems have been developed at most levels, reporting and other monitoring mechanisms have been developed/standardized, sensitization/ awareness among implementers in the field (consultants, contractors and line agency staff) has been gradually built and the over-all institutional capacity to manage the program, including planning and implementation of actions to meet social and environmental needs and safeguards has improved.

While the Borrower's performance in Odisha has by and large remained satisfactory, there were a few institutional challenges at the national level and in Andhra Pradesh, particularly in the first two years of project implementation. The most pertinent issue was related to the staffing deployment and continuity (and also some capacity issues in case of Andhra Pradesh) required for systematic planning, integration and execution of environmental management measures as part of the over-all engineering works. However, with deployment of the Environmental and Social Experts in NDMA, integration of standard EHS conditions in the Bidding documents and some sensitization/training of the field staff, improvements have been noted, particularly after a close monitoring following slow progress of the over-all project since mid-term review.

Currently, Andhra Pradesh, where staff turn-over continues to be an issue, the PIU is in advanced stage of filling-in the vacant Environment Expert's position. It has already recruited Social Officer at PMU level. In addition to the market based experts, a govt. officer also is being given additional responsibilities to manage the safeguards aspects during staff transition/turn-over. Also, a firm (being competitively selected) will help in discharging the safeguard responsibilities, including those pertaining to screening and its documentation and capacity building of field personnel. Andhra Pradesh is in the process of recruiting Social Mobilisers to assist the implementation of the safeguard aspects of the project.

The current set-up of OSDMA in Odisha needs at least one additional Environmental and Social Specialist each to support implementation of activities under Additional Financing. This staff augmentation is required as OSDMA is vested with the responsibility for preparing and implementing ODRP, another Bank assisted project and safeguards documentation, including conducting of screening exercises for this project. For the field work, however Odisha has recruited about fifteen number of Social Mobilisers to assist the implementation of the safeguard aspects of the project.

With these, the borrower would have adequate capacity to manage the safeguard issues in the project. The Bank continues to regularly follow-up these issues on the institutional arrangements and capacity.

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

Stakeholders: The primary stakeholders include the local residents/villagers living along the coastline in the two states of Odisha and Andhra Pradesh and being supported by targeted interventions under the proposed operation. The secondary stakeholders include officials from NDMA, OSDMA, Revenue Disaster Management Department in Andhra Pradesh, local governments/village Panchayats; local NGOs; and selected government departments such as Public Works, Irrigation and other administrative officials/staff in the two said states associated with the planning and implementation of the NCRMP.

Consultations: Stakeholder consultation, information dissemination and social mobilization have remained integral part of NCRMP's planning and implementation. In accordance with the applicable Bank policies, public consultations (in areas where specific investments were proposed) have been carried out for investments funded under NCRMP (the parent project) in both Odisha and Andhra Pradesh. The public consultation process for the parent project was designed in a way that: (i) affected people are included in the decision making process; (ii) public awareness and information sharing on project alternatives and benefits are promoted; and (iii) views on designs and solutions from the communities are solicited. This process included a state level workshop that was organized (both in Odisha and Andhra Pradesh) to obtain inputs on the draft ESMF and to seek views the approach towards minimization/mitigation of potential negative impacts on people and the environmental resources.

The approach involved communities and local level institutions in identification, planning, implementation, operation and maintenance (in case of multi-purpose cyclone shelters) of the sub-projects. During the preparation of the ESMF for the parent project and planning of sub-projects, extensive consultation have been carried out with communities, intended beneficiaries, implementing departments, experts (as needed), local NGOs and other stakeholders. The outcomes of these consultations have been integrated in the ESMF and are also documented in the screening reports. Beneficiary consultations and participatory planning have continued through the implementation

period as well. The same approach and mechanisms will continue for sub-projects/interventions proposed under the Additional Financing project.

Disclosure: The Environment and Social Management Framework (November 2009 version) has been made public through NDMA (<http://ncrmp.gov.in/ncrmp>) and SDMA (www.osdma.org and <http://disastermanagement.ap.gov.in>) websites. The document and its executive summary have also been made available in the districts where major sub-projects were proposed and at concerned sub-project offices during the construction stage, including those of the project consultants. This document continues to remain valid for the Additional Financing project too.

Environment Screening Reports for investments supported under the parent project are also in public domain (in the state/SDMA websites). Similar mechanism will be adopted for disclosing for safeguard documents (such as Screening Reports) for the project interventions proposed under Additional Financing project.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	November 20, 2009
Date of submission to InfoShop	December 15, 2009
"In country" Disclosure	November 12, 2009
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	December 15, 2009
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process/Social Assessment	
Date of receipt by the Bank	November 20, 2009
Date of submission to InfoShop	December 15, 2009
"In country" Disclosure	November 12, 2009
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework (as part of SA)	
Date of receipt by the Bank	November 20, 2009
Date of submission to InfoShop	December 15, 2009
"In country" Disclosure	November 12, 2009
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.	
Pest Management – Not Applicable/Policy Not Triggered.	
Physical Cultural Resources - Done - Covered under EA.	
If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:	
Not Applicable	

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment					
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Sector Manager (SM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>

OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats					
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>
If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
OP 4.09 - Pest Management					
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>
Are PMP requirements included in project design?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources					
Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>
OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples					
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"/>
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement					
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Sector Manager review the plan?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>
OP/BP 4.36 - Forests					
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 type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
OP/BP 4.37 - Safety of Dams					
Have dam safety plans been prepared?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Have the ToRs as well as composition for the independent Panel of Experts been reviewed and approved by the Bank?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Has an Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) been prepared and arrangements been made for public awareness and training?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
OP/BP 7.50 - Projects on International Waterways					

Have the other riparians been notified of the project?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
What are the reasons for the exception? Please explain:	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Has the RVP approved such an exception?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
OP/BP 7.60 - Projects in Disputed Areas						
Has the memo conveying all pertinent information on the international aspects of the project, including the procedures to be followed, and the recommendations for dealing with the issue, been prepared	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the PAD/MOP include the standard disclaimer referred to in the OP?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information						
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
All Safeguard Policies						
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project includes 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"/>

D. Approvals

<i>Signed and submitted by</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>
Task Team Leader	Saurabh Suresh Dani	Jan. 21, 2014
Environmental Specialist	Neha Vyas	Jan. 20, 2014
Social Development Specialist	Venkat Rao Bayana	Jan. 20, 2014
Approved by		
Regional Safeguards Coordinator	for Francis V. Fragano	Feb. 6, 2014
Comments	Cleared & finalized	
Sector Manager	Bernice K. Van Bronkhorst	Feb. 10, 2014
Comments		