Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet
Restructuring Stage

Restructuring Stage | Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 29-Aug-2019| Report No: ISDSR27755

Regional Vice President:	Hartwig Schafer
Country Director:	Junaid Kamal Ahmad
Regional Director:	John A. Roome
Practice Manager/Manager:	Michael Haney
Task Team Leader:	Xavier Chauvot De Beauchene

Note to Task Teams: The following sections are system generated and can only be edited online in the Portal.

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA

Project ID	Project Name
	IN Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project for Low Income States
Task Team Leader(s)	Country
Xavier Chauvot De Beauchene	India
Approval Date	Environmental Category
30-Dec-2013	Partial Assessment (B)
Managing Unit	Is this a Repeater project?
SSAW1	

PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US$, Millions)

SUMMARY

Total Project Cost	1,000.00
Total Financing	1,000.00
Financing Gap	0.00

DETAILS

World Bank Group Financing

International Development Association (IDA)	500.00
IDA Credit	500.00

Non-World Bank Group Financing

Counterpart Funding	500.00
Borrower/Recipient	500.00

2. PROJECT INFORMATION

Current Project Development Objective

The project development objective is to improve piped water supply and sanitation services for selected rural communities in the target states through decentralized delivery systems and to increase the capacity of the Participating States to respond promptly and effectively to an Eligible Crisis or Emergency.

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is supporting the implementation of a dedicated rural Water Supply and Sanitation (RWSS) Project aiming at improving piped water and sanitation coverage in four Low Income States, Assam, Bihar, Jharkhand and Uttar Pradesh, through a USD 1 billion (USD 500 million IDA, and USD 500 million counterpart funding). The project is implemented through a special window of assistance under the on-going National Rural Drinking Water Program (NRDWP) of the Government of India. The project interventions will be at all four levels: National, State, Districts, and Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRI), in particular Gram Panchayats.

The Project promotes decentralized service delivery arrangements with increased Panchayati Raj Institution (PRI) and community participation, improved financial sustainability and enhanced accountability. The Project is supporting the development of Single Village Schemes (SVS), where the local groundwater resources are sufficient, and Multi Village Schemes (MVS) where the water resources are not sufficient, and the water has to be conveyed from far through a bulk water system.

The following are the key elements of the RWSS Program:

- Placing GPs and communities in the central role - supported by higher levels of PRI, by State governments, and by local NGOs and the private sector - for facilitating, planning, implementing, monitoring and providing a range of O&M back-up services.
- Using sustainable, community or local government managed models for intra-GP RWSS schemes and using State-PRI partnership models for MVSs.
- Putting water resources security as a core theme of the new model, including increased community management of scarce resources.
- Moving the RWSS sector to achieve the recovery of at least 50 percent of O&M and replacement costs, and initiating contributions to capital costs.
- Integrating water supply and sanitation, through convergence with the Clean India mission for rural areas.

The Project was recently restructured to reduce the IDA Credit amount to USD 250million, update the disbursement projections accordingly and revise the performance indicators and target values.

Project Components:

The Project comprises the following three main components: (A) Capacity and Sector Development; (B) Infrastructure Development; and (C) Project Implementation Support.

Component A: Capacity and Sector Development (15%): This component will support the building of institutional capacity for implementing, managing and sustaining the project activities, along with sector development studies to inform policy decisions. The main sub-components include: (a) Capacity Building activities for the Department of Drinking Water and Sanitation (DDWS) of the Ministry of Jal Shakti (MoJS); (b) Capacity Building and Training activities for State, district, and village level institutions, PRIs, and sector stakeholders; (c) Information, Education and Communications (IEC) Program; (d) Innovative Pilot Programs and Sector Development Studies; and (e) Monitoring and Evaluation Program at the State and Sector level (across participating Low Income States), along with on-line system for financial management and reporting. Governance and Accountability Action Plan will also be implemented by the MoJS and the States.

Component B: Infrastructure Development (80%): This component will support investments for improving water supply and sanitation coverage, including construction of new infrastructure or rehabilitation and augmentation of existing schemes, along with engineering support costs. Most villages are expected to be served by Single Village Schemes (SVSs) using local groundwater sources. In places where local water sources are either not sustainable or not of acceptable quality, Multi Village Schemes (MVSs) will be developed, mainly relying on surface water sources. The sanitation component will complement the Swachh Bharat mission activities and will support the implementation of Gram Panchayat action plans for the development of solid and liquid waste management activities, aiming at developing adequate grey and black water management systems in areas where the Project would have brought water supply. In addition, pilot programs will include 24/7 water supply provision in select areas, and the introduction of the use of solar energy and SCADA systems. The project will support the universal provision of household connections, meters for bulk water supply in all schemes, and the promotion of household meters, where appropriate.

Component C: Project Management Support (5%): This component includes project management support to the various entities at the national, state, district, and village levels for implementing the project, including staffing, consultancy and equipment costs, and internal and external Financial Audits.

Note to Task Teams: The following sections are system generated and can only be edited online in the Portal.

4. PROJECT LOCATION AND SALIENT PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS RELEVANT TO THE SAFEGUARD ANALYSIS (IF KNOWN)

Under this project, interventions have been taken up in four low income states of the country – Assam, Bihar, Jharkhand, and Uttar Pradesh (UP) -, which are also low in terms of capacity, across two Batches – Batch I and II. The size of sub-projects taken up vary from multi-village water supply schemes (MVS) covering several GPs or villages to single village level (SVS) rural water supply schemes, sometimes as small as to cover only one habitation. A total of 551 (529 SVS and 22 MVS) schemes have been taken up in these four states

under Batch I. These comprise: Assam (3 MVS), Bihar (127- SVS and 4 MVS), Jharkhand (182 – SVS and 2 MVS), Uttar Pradesh (220 – SVS and 22 MVS). Under Batch II, another 531 schemes, comprising 421 SVS and 110 MVS, are under implementation or at advance stage of procurement. The state-wise break-up for Batch-II is as follows: Assam (none), Bihar (147 SVS), Jharkhand (5 MVS) and UP (274 SVS and 105 MVS). The Project's interventions promise substantial environmental social benefits to the community in the form of improved health, reduced incidence of water-borne diseases, cleaner surroundings and reduction in drudgery on account of access to safe drinking water in the village and creation of sanitary conditions. Tribal population exists in project locations in the states of Jharkhand (having Schedule V areas with predominantly tribal population) and Assam (having tribal population but not falling within Sixth Schedule Areas). These two states also have substantial geographical area under forests. UP, particularly the eastern region, is characterized by high water table and poor drainage resulting in high incidence of water transmitted diseases. Several districts in the four states have low availability of groundwater and groundwater quality issues, with presence of iron, fluoride, nitrate and/or arsenic. Many habitations do not have potable water available locally. There is therefore a need to convey water from surface sources (rivers, streams, etc.) located far away via large and complex multi-village piping and distribution networks. All scheme require securing lands for the key infrastructure (intake works, tubewells, water treatment plants - WTPs, pumphouses, and ESRs) and associated conveyance and/or distribution pipeline networks.

5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS SPECIALISTS ON THE TEAM

Gopalaswamy Srihari, Social Specialist
Pyush Dogra, Environmental Specialist

6. SAFEGUARD POLICIES TRIGGERED

Safeguard Policies	Triggered	Explanation
Environmental Assessment (OP) (BP 4.01)	Yes	Some of the schemes implemented across all four states potentially lead to limited, localized environmental impacts. Possible impacts pertain to, but not necessarily be limited to, the following: a. Ecologically sensitive zones such as forests, natural habitats, river systems, physical cultural resources, tribal areas, etc. b. Water availability: quantity and quality c. Topographical features and natural drainage patterns d. Other (pre-existing) infrastructure such as roads, buildings, structures of historical/cultural importance, etc. e. Sites where sludge and other kinds of wastes generated from water supply schemes are disposed

		Hence, an Environmental Management Framework (EMF), which provides the basic criteria and procedures was used for environmental screening of all sub-projects. The EMF provides further guidance for undertaking more focused environmental assessments of individual sub-projects wherever required leading to the preparation of Environment Management Plans (EMPs). The EMF also provides guidance on institutional mechanisms and monitoring procedures to ensure adherence to the EMPs.
Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03	No	
Natural Habitats (OP) (BP 4.04)	Yes	In all four states there are specific areas which are unique native habitats for certain flora and fauna. Destruction of these habitats could adversely affect the species survival. The environmental screening procedure includes a component for determining whether any such area is impacted by any of the investments in the project thereby enabling the project staff to undertake appropriate mitigation measures for protecting / preventing conversion of such natural habitats wherever relevant.
Forests (OP) (BP 4.36)	Yes	In all four states there are a number of forest and wooded areas which could be affected by sub-projects or components thereof within or in close proximity to them. Alternatively, construction activity may necessitate felling of some trees. The environmental screening procedure would include a provision for determining whether any forest area is impacted or if any trees are likely to be felled during implementation activities.
Pest Management (OP 4.09)	No	
Physical Cultural Resources (OP) (BP 4.11)	Yes	Most infrastructure creation activities proposed under this project are expected to take place in the vicinity of rural or peri-urban human habitations. In the ongoing project sufficient care has been taken to avoid such impacts in all four states. However, in case of Jharkhand, which is a predominantly a tribal state, in one of the large Multi Village scheme grievances were received relating to selection of site impacting cultural resources. It is plausible that some such sub-project sites might impact monuments, places of cultural significance or

		sacred groves protected by communities through local traditions and cultural values located nearby. Hence this policy is now triggered to safeguard against potential impacts on any known or currently unknown Physical Cultural Resources (PCR) that might be located at or in close vicinity of any of the proposed sub-project sites. Accordingly, a PCR procedure and implementation guideline has been prepared as an Annexure to existing EMF to screen sub projects for PCR.
Indigenous Peoples (OP) (BP 4.10)	Yes	Schemes in Jharkhand are located in Fifth Schedule areas and comprise schedule tribes that meet the characteristics outlined in this OP. Though schemes in Assam do not fall within Sixth Schedule Areas and do not meet the characteristics outlined in the OP, scheme beneficiaries include tribal households.
Involuntary Resettlement (OP) (BP 4.12)	No	Though schemes have largely been prepared by avoiding involuntary resettlement impacts, agricultural and structural encroachments and squatters in government/public lands cannot be fully ruled out. Besides acquisition of small quantum of private land, particularly in MVS is likely, though will be undertaken only as the last resort. RPFs are being prepared in each of the States and will be the focus of an upcoming restructuring. Meanwhile, the team is working closely with our counterparts to ensure that any case arising is managed using appropriate measures, in compliance with OP4.12.
Safety of Dams (OP) (BP 4.37)	No	
Projects on International Waterways (OP) (BP 7.50)	No	Cleared by RVP with Exception.
Projects in Disputed Areas (OP) (BP 7.60)	No	

II. KEY SAFEGUARD POLICY ISSUES AND THEIR MANAGEMENT

A. SUMMARY OF KEY SAFEGUARD ISSUES

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

As a part of project preparation, social and environmental assessments were conducted to identify social and environmental issues associated with the proposed project activities and to design appropriate management measures to enhance the positive impacts and mitigate potential adverse impacts. The project is not expected to

have significant adverse environmental and social impacts, but on the contrary has the potential to offer significant environmental and social development benefits.

Social Issues: The communities comprising are quite diverse: social (scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, others), economic (landless, small, marginal, and large farmers), female headed households and geographical setting (hills, plains, forests, flood prone). Project areas comprised of areas affected Naxalites and other Extremist Groups, rendering accessibility highly difficult. Additionally, the approach to planning and implementation had been traditionally top-down and hierarchical in decision making. Key social issues included:
(i) participation;
(ii) ensuring inclusion and enhancing equity;
(iii) decentralizing service delivery underpinned by the principle of subsidiarity;
(iv) customer base and demand generation and; marketing the schemes and driving home the health and hygiene benefits;
(v) human and institutional development.

The other important issues are enabling participation, especially of women; Gram Panchayat (GP) strengthening; change management initiatives for changing the role of Government from 'provider' to a 'facilitator' to ensure; improving accountability and transparency; and Information, Education and Communication (IEC) campaign along with capacity building activities. Given the physical as well as socio-economic and culturally diverse conditions, success of the project depends upon efforts aimed to mobilize local communities to participate in the development of water supply and sanitation facilities and enable them to take on the responsibility for the operation and maintenance and derive benefits on a sustained basis. The results helped in designing the delivery system and addressing safeguards, thus ensuring positive and sustainable impacts – all of which formed the basis for preparation of the Social Management Framework. SMF provides for step-wise integration of social issues into the overall project cycle, besides providing for capacity building to functionaries at all levels.

During project implementation, shortcomings and constraints, in varying degrees, were observed and these included:
i) during DPR preparation, lack of screening of selected sites to identify, avoid or minimize adverse social impacts and/or impacts on culturally sensitive sites;
ii) lack of adequate prior and informed consultations with members of the project affected areas/habitations and its documentation, particularly during preparation of scheme level DPRs;
iii) delays in obtaining or not obtaining of No-objection certificates from relevant government departments, for siting project infrastructure on identified government lands;
iv) non-transfer of private lands taken on donation basis, for construction purposes, to respective project implementing agencies;
v) non-collection of socio-economic profiles to ascertain extent of loss of land by land donors;
vi) Specifically, in Jharkhand, it was observed that even when schemes were duly endorsed by the responsible GP, these were not well represented by community members of the affected habitation within the GP, besides which the required quorum for conducting Gram Sabha meetings for discussion and approval of schemes (as is mandated under PESA provisions that are applicable to Schedule V areas i.e. having preponderance of tribal population), were not met;
vii) also in Jharkhand, it was observed that scheme-specific social assessment towards preparation of a scheme level TDP was not undertaken as was required for compliance with requirements under Bank's OP 4.10;
viii) staffing issues – absence of staff or with staff inadequate capacity in the States and District Project Management Units (S/DPMUs) constrained adherence to the provisions of the SMF and TDP;
ix) delays in conducting or non-conducting of baseline surveys of beneficiary households leading to poor design that in turn resulted in partial coverage of project areas and therefore poor participation;

x) lack of an accessible and well-monitored GRM, even though all state-level implementing agencies use multiple modes of grievance redressal such as a toll-free number, website or verbally or in writing to the Village Water and Sanitation Committee (VWSC), the Mukhiya or the Jal Sahiya i.e. GP level water and sanitation worker; and finally;
xi) the disclosure of key scheme-specific documents at the scheme level and in local languages.

Land is primarily required for intake well/water source, water treatment plants, construction of Elevated Storage Reservoirs (ESRs) and pump houses. Transmission and distribution lines are laid mostly in public land or along public streets and mostly cause temporary disruptions to access, damage to pavements, etc. for which road restoration works are carried out. Thus far project has been avoiding or minimizing adverse impacts by:
i) avoiding involuntary acquisition of private land;
ii) using alternative encumbrance free parcels for siting infrastructure; and
iii) changing designs or routing of pipelines, etc.

Land take thus far has happened either using government lands i.e. parcels owned by the implementing agency or by other government departments; lands on donation and land on long term lease (for one scheme in Bihar). However, there have been a few cases of land take using direct purchase thus far, particularly in UP. The project might also need to take lands with encroachments – mostly agricultural and in a few cases with possible impacts to encroached structures and in some cases parcels with unauthorized occupants i.e. squatters using such lands for residential or livelihood purposes. Though acquisition of privately-owned land using formal acquisition process is very unlikely and will be the last resort in such community driven schemes, its probability, particularly in case of multi-village schemes cannot be ruled out. Hence, considering this possibility, it was decided that OP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement would be triggered under the Project. A Resettlement Policy Framework has been prepared separately for each of the project States, and are in the processed of being formally endorsed by the States, after which the Project will be restructured to trigger OP4.12. Each RPF lays down the processes and procedures applicable for land taking using each of these modes, besides mitigation measures including entitlements that are commensurate to the impacts identified. The framework will guide preparation of Abbreviated Resettlement Action Plan (ARAP), for each scheme, as required.

OP 4.10, on Indigenous Peoples policy is triggered as scheduled tribes are present in project areas in both Jharkhand and Assam. Four of the six project districts in Jharkhand are located in Fifth Schedule Areas and have predominantly tribal population. In Assam, though three of the project districts have tribals but the project locations do not lie in the Sixth Schedule Areas. However, as majority of the tribals are socially and economically weak, prone to vulnerability, and often excluded from development initiatives as part of project preparation, a Tribal Development Plan for Jharkhand had been prepared to enable them to access project on par with others. It aims at promoting inclusive, equitable and sustainable water supply and sanitation delivery through fostering and empowering grassroots tribal institutions in the tribal areas. Subsequent to the finalization of the TDP, and to provide more detail on its operationalization, the SPMU prepared a Tribal Development Implementation Plan (TDIP), involving several rounds of extensive consultations with tribal experts, academics and tribal representatives, besides consultations with tribal leaders, members of civil society and through workshops held at state level. The Plan, which was approved in August 2018, is at a state-wide level rather than scheme-specific and provides additional details and guidance on how schemes in tribal areas, including schemes involving both tribal and non-tribal communities, should be selected, designed and governed. Subsequently, during project implementation, in January 2016, a TDP for Assam was prepared by the Borrower. It was approved by the Bank and publicly disclosed on the state line department's website in 2016. It was developed for the state of Assam, to ensure that tribal populations are: i) adequately and fully consulted; (ii) enabled to participate in the project and derive full benefits; and (iii) that the project's institutional and implementation arrangements take due note of the existing governance in the tribal areas as specified under the Constitution of India and relevant legal provisions. preparation of a Tribal Development Implementation Plan (TDIP),

to complement the TDP with specific actions and processes to facilitate its implementation. The TDIP was prepared through several rounds of district-level consultations with tribal leaders, members of civil society and academicians, and through workshops held at state level. In accordance with the state level TDPs, scheme level plans will be prepared incorporating context specific suggestions arising from FPICs, suitable measures and actions, besides commensurate budget to execute these actions.

An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken individually for each constituent state in the project. The EIA comprised of:
(a) an assessment of the current status of rural water supply and sanitation in the state;
(b) status of the water resources availability (quantity and quality) for sourcing drinking water;
(c) documentation of an environmental baseline based on issues pertaining to rural water supply and sanitation in the respective states;
(d) assessment of institutional, legal/regulatory and policy provisions in the respective states;
(e) identification of expected environmental impacts of proposed project interventions;
(f) suggesting corresponding mitigation measures;
(g) preparation of an Environmental Management Framework (EMF) that enables respective project implementing agencies to address all environmental concerns in the project; and
(h) institutional arrangements for effective application of the EMF and its management.

The findings of the EA study indicate that while the proposed project interventions are expected to result in overall improvement in environmental and public health in each constituent state, potential adverse impacts are expected to be of low of intensity and localized nature. Most of them are likely to occur only on account of poor implementation practices such as inadequate adherence to proper siting norms, deficiencies in design/construction or lapses in operation and maintenance. Such impacts can be managed effectively by rigorously applying the EMF and by fostering a strong environment management regime in the implementation arms of the project.

Environmental Issues and Management.

(i) Water Availability: As per baseline data, the state of Assam has an annual replenish able groundwater resources of 27.23 BCM out of which 22% is being utilized annually. There are no zones classified as over exploited, critical or semi-critical in Assam. The Brahmaputra River has an average water discharge at the mouth with a flow of 19,830 cubic meters per second (cum/sec.), a maximum discharge of 72,794 cum/sec. at Guwahati and a minimum discharge of 1,757 cum/sec. Though surface water is available, risk from floods to intakes and other water supply infrastructure is an issue of sustainability. Floods may create water quality issues, like flood waters entering toilets resulting in contamination of surface and groundwater aquifers. Decreasing groundwater levels are observed in some districts.

The annual replenishable groundwater resources in Bihar are estimated to be 29.19 BCM out of which about 39% is being utilized. There are no zones classified as over exploited, critical or semi-critical in the state. The surface water resource in Bihar includes 69,000 ha of ponds and tanks, 9,000 ha of oxbow lakes, 7,200 ha of reservoirs, 3,200 km of rivers and 1 lakh ha of riverine and other flood plains. Due to the general lowering of groundwater table, during summer months hand pumps run dry. Floods in Bihar create water quality issues and spread of water related diseases after floods are recorded. The ground water table in some of the north Bihar district is high; this may create water quality problems due to rampant open defecation and solid waste disposal.

The annual replenishable ground water resources in Jharkhand are estimated to be 5.58 BCM out of which about 20% is being utilized. Major rivers/ streams of Jharkhand include Brahmanni, Subarnarekha, Damodar, Amanat, Anuranga,

Barakar Ajoy and Mayurakshi. Wetlands constitute an area of 170,000 ha. in the state. Groundwater availability is not an issue in most places.

The groundwater levels in Uttar Pradesh show a wide variation from less than 2 mbgl to more than 30 mbgl. The annual replenishable groundwater resources in UP are 76.35 BCM, out of which about 70% is being utilized. Of the rivers and canals in the country, Uttar Pradesh occupies the first place with the total length of rivers and canals as 31.2 thousand km. that is about 17 percent of the total length of rivers and canals in the country. The state of UP falls in Ganga Basin with the sub basins of Yamuna, Ramganga, Gomati and Ghaghra Rivers. The state is estimated to have 161.70 BCM (131.0 m.a.f.) of surface water. Frequent drying of groundwater sources and their contamination is an issue. To avoid flood related risks the HFL of the source and nearby rivers need to be taken into consideration during the design.

(ii) Water Quality: Increasing levels of water contamination due to anthropogenic activities is slowly becoming an area of concern. Open defecation, lack of means to dispose animal waste, and garbage are major contaminating factors in all the states.

The aquifers in many districts of Assam are affected with excess of Fluoride, Iron and Arsenic. The discharges of untreated domestic wastewater, industrial wastewater, run of from the agricultural fields and the urban sewage water is polluting the surface water in the state of Assam.

Ground water in Bihar is affected in many districts with excess Fluoride, Iron, Nitrate and Arsenic. Bacterial contamination is found in surface water in Bihar. Water quality of shallow hand pumps is considered poor by the villagers.

Groundwater in Jharkhand is affected in many districts with excess Fluoride, Nitrate and Arsenic. Bacterial contamination is found in surface water in many places in Jharkhand in addition to increase in turbidity levels due to mining activities. Mining of mineral resources affects the groundwater availability and quality while streams and water bodies get affected by to ore-waste, coal washeries etc.

The Shallow groundwater in certain locations in eastern districts of UP is found to be in high state of Arsenic, Fluoride, and Iron, leading to the concentrations that are often exceeding the drinking water standards. In order to ensure sustainability, groundwater is sourced from deep aquifers after scientific hydrogeological investigations.

(iii) Environmental Sanitation: In Assam, about 62% of the households have household latrines and out of these only around 66% use them. In Bihar, the present level of sanitation coverage in the rural areas is less than 25 % with usage percentage much lower. The status of sanitation in Jharkhand is very dismal, with only about 8% households having access to sanitation in the rural areas and the balance defecating in the open. There are no sanitation facilities in most of rural households in eastern Uttar Pradesh. Most villagers practice open defecation which is a source of contamination of shallow groundwater and spread of water related and contagious diseases. Poor or unfinished installations, lack of super structure and reluctance to change behaviour is leading to non-use of toilets.

(iv) Solid and Liquid Management: There is no drainage or sewerage system in villages of Bihar with most of the liquid waste is going to either agricultural land or to open ponds and open fields affecting the surface water quality. There is no drainage or sewerage system in villages of Jharkhand. In many of the Eastern UP districts solid and liquid waste management facilities are nearly non-existent. Major issues that arise of this situation in all states are that wastewater logging takes place near residences, thereby posing health problems and polluting groundwater sources. The solid

waste strewn around the village is posing a major public health problem in the villages in all states, apart from contaminating water sources.

(v) Capacity of Implementing Agencies: Significant emphasis on capacity enhancement had been laid as part of the original project design and capacity support was provided through many implementation support partners such as: District Project Management Consultants (DPMC), Support Organizations, Community Mobilizers/Organizers, Jal Shahiyas, besides implementation of IEC strategy through professional agencies, etc. Bank task teams too have provided extensive handholding to implementation agencies by conducting many periodic trainings, workshops as well as undertaking many technical and interim missions, supplementing regular supervision missions.

Most infrastructure creation activities proposed under this project are expected to take place in the vicinity of rural or peri-urban human habitations. Efforts were made in the project to manage potential negative impacts in all four states. However, in case of Jharkhand, which is a predominantly a tribal state, in two large Multi Village schemes grievances were received relating to shortcomings in implementing Bank Safeguards requirements of free, prior and informed consultations of potentially affected people, in particular with respect to the selection of sites with potential impacts on cultural resources and in following due process for the timely preparation of scheme EMPs. These grievances led to an investigation by the World Bank Inspection Panel. To address such shortcomings and ensure that proper measures are taken in sub-project where sites might impact monuments, places of cultural significance or sacred groves protected by communities through local traditions and cultural values located nearby, it was agreed to trigger OP4.11 on Physical Cultural Resources (PCR) for this Project. Accordingly, a PCR procedure and implementation guideline has been prepared as an Annexure to existing EMF to screen sub projects for PCR and address such impacts, if observed, through a management plan described in the EMF annex.

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

No indirect and/or long term impacts are expected as a result of the future activities in the project area. Most of the project components will have complementary positive impacts on the environment e.g. a combination of ground water recharge measures, greater ownership by communities and willingness to improve sustainability of local water sources e.g. activities selected under the tribal development plan could include renovation of existing water bodies in the project area. The selection of safe drinking water sources coupled with water quality monitoring programs and environmental sanitation and health hygiene education will contribute in sustainable water supply systems and in improving environmental conditions in villages.

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

Environment: Based on the implementation practices of the project in Batch-1 schemes, gaps were observed in the screening of schemes and developing self contained EMPs. Project teams understanding of environmental issues and challenges were strengthened using capacity building workshops exclusively on environmental safeguards. The project teams were guided to analyze sub projects for various alternatives available for the water availability for the particular sub project and bringing out clarity on the final selection of alternative supply of water to scheme. In various schemes source sustainability and water quality was explored at the field level in a more realistic way through screening and developing environmental management plans. Such as in MVS schemes some important considerations from environmental safeguards procedures were introduced such as , 9a) exploring debris disposal sites , 9b) appropriate management of sludge from WTPs , (c) reutilizing of debris and sludges for community use. In addition

bio-engineering techniques were also suggested wherever landslides prone areas / sites were seen within the project to minimize large scale erosion impacts e.g near Bagbera WTP. Also water yields of the sources included for any sub projects were also screened through the safeguard screening to help sustainability of the scheme.

Social: In schemes implemented thus far in Batch I and also those under preparation under Batch II, efforts have been made to avoid or minimize involuntary resettlement impacts by: i) using either land that belongs to implementing agency or to other government departments, without encroachments; Gram Panchayat land; private land taken on voluntary donation basis; direct purchase through negotiation (in UP); land taken on long term lease (in Bihar), etc.; ii) changing sites due to land related problems such as non-availability of land, encroachments, inadequate size of land plot, etc.; iii) using modified designs, re-routing of pipelines to address community concerns relating to impacts on assets including on culturally sensitive locations etc. E.g. in Jharkhand, the site originally selected for the WTP was changed to another location due to the opposition of local residents, who claimed that they used the hill as a place of worship. This led to identification of an alternative WTP site, wherein district authorities modified the footprint of the WTP site, to avoid disturbances to the identified places of significance. The contractor too adapted the WTP design to fit in the new site dimensions and made a U-shape in the boundary wall alignment to accommodate a sacred tree located within a meter of the plot boundary. Likewise, the land area taken for the ESR under another adjoining scheme represented less than 14 percent of the total area of the plot.

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.

Roles and responsibilities for ensuring implementation of the environment and social safeguards have been detailed out at state, district, Block and village/scheme levels. A State Project Management Unit (SPMU) at the state level and District Project Management Units (DPMUs) at the district, have been set up at time of project preparation and have been functional since, These include an Environment and Social Development Specialists given the overall responsibility of ensuring environmental and social compliance. Besides, in the case of Jharkhand there is a Tribal Development Specialist at the SPMU level.

Implementation experiences till date have brought to the fore issues pertaining to low skills levels, management capacities in implementation agency staffs, lack of dedicated project leadership and the national level and in most of the states, poor human resource (HR) practices e.g. prolonged gaps in staffing. Except for the state of Assam that has had relatively stable set ups at both SPMU and DPMU levels, staffing issues i.e. either absence or presence of staff with inadequate capacities for prolonged periods, have hampered adequate attention to E&S aspects. Specifically, UP and Jharkhand had no social specialist and tribal specialists respectively for a period of two years. Though UP currently has a Social Specialist in place, the position of Tribal Development Specialist in Jharkhand SPMU has fallen vacant yet again and so it the position of Social Specialist in the DPMU of the East Singhbhum district where the grievances originated. In Bihar too, the social specialist position in the SPMU has been vacant for nearly two years and the social specialist contracted through the Project Management Consultant firm to support the SPMU has also left. Further, in cases where E&S specialist are in place, they are burdened by absence of other staff positions of M&E, Contract Management, Procurement, etc. and hence unable to dedicate due attention to E&S aspect. Poor payment terms plus lack of annual increments have led to Bihar and Jharkhand being unable to attract or retain competent E&S professionals. The combination of these factors resulted not only in sub-optimal implementation quality and inordinate delays in output delivery but also most significantly inadequate integration of E&S aspects into scheme preparation and implementation. For instance, in Batch I, completed schemes suffer from many shortcomings as pointed out during multiple ISMs and field visits of Bank team members.

During implementation, two grievances were received by the Inspection Panel, in relation to two large Multi village schemes (MVS) in state of Jharkhand. Both grievances related to the selection of sites of major infrastructure for the MVS in the tribal dominated areas. In both cases, complainants alleged, amongst other aspects:
i) inappropriate consultation relating to the site selection of the Water Treatment Plant or Elevated Storage Reservoir (ESR);
ii) insufficient assessment of the site that the communities claimed to have been using for a number of community functions;
iii) environmental impacts of the construction and operation of the WTP & ESR have not been sufficiently and timely studied.
These complaints also pointed out shortcomings relating to weaknesses in design and supervision, insufficient free, prior and informed consultations and documentation thereof, lack of disclosure of key scheme-specific Safeguards documents, initiation of works without meeting the requirement for prior approval by the Bank of an Environmental Management Plan (EMP), and failure to identify concerns and apply the Bank's Operational Policy on Physical Cultural Resources (OP 4.11).

A comprehensive Safeguards compliance review was performed between October and February 2019, to assess compliance of Batch I schemes and document readiness of schemes proposed or ongoing under Batch II. This assessment identified the following shortcomings: i) weak environmental screening in absence of proper community consultation; ii) schemes tendered and contracted without proper environmental endorsement; iii) requisite environmental clearances or statutory permissions not obtained prior to commencement of works; iv) EMPs weak in content and not finalized and cleared before commencement of construction; v) multiple environmental non-compliances arising out of improper scheme design, construction or finishing; vi) schemes had to be dropped because on non-availability of land or; vii) lack of adequate community consultations to elicit community support while planning of schemes; viii) inadequate integration of E&S aspects into planning and implementation processes; ix) prolonged gaps in staffing of environmental and social and tribal specialists in SPMUs and DPMUs leading to poor monitoring and supervision of E&S aspects; x) inadequate monitoring of commissioned/handed over schemes; and xi) non-submission of E&S progress cum-monitoring reports.

To address these important gaps, the team is reviewing the environmental and social safeguards documents of all schemes, with the objective to have them brought in compliance with safeguards requirements, including on PCR, by the October 31, 2019. This is part of a comprehensive review of all project-funded schemes to ensure and document readiness of schemes in relation to:

a) assessment of E&S impacts through Environmental Data Sheets and notes on impacts on PCRs and associated community consultations;
b) for category 2 schemes, preparation of accurate and well-structured EMPs that capture and address all associated environmental issues and make use of latest techniques such as GIS and strip maps;
c) review and approval of all EMPs by the Bank;
d) public disclosure of all safeguards documents including EMF, SMF, EDS, EMP and ARAP, as the case may be, on the relevant State Government websites;
e) ensuring documentation of community consultations conducted at all levels – revenue village/habitation level, etc.;
f) obtaining "Agree-to-do" consents from communities, particularly Gram Sabha resolutions as per mandated quorums, where applicable;
g) obtaining requisite statutory clearances for schemes and environmental endorsement;
h) documenting land availability through no objection certificates and transfer of land parcels;
i) documentation of socio-economic profile of households that have, donated/will donate land, for NNP Schemes.

Monitoring of all of these aspects are being streamlined through a detailed checklist that enable DPMUs to undertake a thorough review of scheme level compliance related documentation with a view to ascertain compliance to due processes and requirements. SPMUs in each state to ensure adequate monitoring of the implementation of E&S related aspects. Likewise, DPRs & ARAPs for schemes comprising tribal areas and population and/or having involuntary resettlement impacts, will be reviewed by the Bank.

These aspects and the timely processing of each of these steps was clarified in the EMPs. In addition, the team has further increased capacity building activities to strengthen the implementing agencies' skills on process, monitoring and evaluation in the remainder implementation period of the project by organizing capacity building workshops, hand-on support for safeguards preparation and regular visits for on-the-job training on supervision of E&S aspects. Particular activities in this respect include:

i) Refresher safeguard trainings have been carried out in Bihar and Jharkhand, which focused on enabling implementation agencies to enhance effectiveness of their environmental & social screening of activities, improve quality of associated documents such as scheme level DPRs EDSs and EMPs under Batch II; Similar trainings are to be organized in the states of UP and Assam;

ii) Carrying out a separate screening for Physical and Cultural Resources (PCR) to identify any such sites that may be affected by the scheme construction. The screening will also be done from PCR perspective retroactively to all completed schemes. If any affected PCR is identified, appropriate mitigation strategy will be decided in accordance with applicable regulations/guidelines in consultation with the community; For all schemes, the community will be formally consulted (as per proper consultation procedure) on the issues listed in the EDS and PCR screening formats before they are finalized;

iii) efforts to strengthen Project and site-level GRMs and identify steps to strengthen them;

iv) Ensuring rigorous and continuous monitoring through the following actions: a) monitoring checklists on technical, environmental and social aspects for use by DPMU and SPMU level E&S specialists during field supervision visits;
b) Bank's review of state wise Environmental & Social Monitoring report that is to be submitted on a quarterly basis; and
c) disclosure of safeguard documents and Executive summaries on websites of MDWS, each SPMU and Bank's operations portal;

v) Additional interim mission and site visits will be undertaken by the Bank team to ensure compliance. Additionally, as an outcome of the IP cases, the following management actions have been undertaken and are being regularly monitored:
i. An anthropologist with local experience has been hired to better understand concerns of the complainants and identify/agree on possible compensatory measures;
ii. implementation stage consultations in all GPs covered by Bagbera and Chhotagovindpur MVSs to update community members on implementation progress, have been undertaken;
iii. follow up with the Project Management Units at the national, state and district level (NPMU/SPMU/DPMU) to ensure appropriate monitoring of EMP implementation, staffing, and application of safeguards instruments;
iv. review of the scope of works and training of the all Community Organizers that have been placed in all five districts of Jharkhand to give them a greater role in disseminating information about the Project, relaying community concerns, and environmental and social monitoring;

v. review and update existing Information, Education and Communication (IEC) materials (including basic information about the Project and its expected benefits as well as about water, sanitation and hygiene in general) to consider current community concerns, and its dissemination in the most widely spoken tribal languages in this area;
vi. review of the processes followed to document community "no objection" to the siting of significant infrastructure (WTPs, ESRs) associated with the two MVSs in Jharkhand;
vii. disclosure of executive summaries of safeguard documents in Hindi that are translated and disclosed in local languages predominantly used in the Project areas, namely Hindi and Assamese; and
viii. Preparation of safeguard documents for application of OP 4.11 to the Project.

The environmental screening procedure will continue to be strengthened during the remainder period of the Project, to ensure it covers all the following salient points in sufficient details:

- Schemes, which should have been screened based on the information of the Detailed Project Reports (DPRs), will be screened based on actual design or implemented schemes;
- Screening to use the Environmental Data Sheet (EDS) which records important project parameters of environmental significance and the PCR screening format.
- For all schemes, the community needs to be formally consulted (as per proper consultation procedure) on the issues listed in the EDS and PCR screening formats before they are finalized.
- The Bank will review and approve each EDS and PCR screening format for each scheme funded under the Project.
- If the value of any of the parameters listed on the EDS/PCR Format is indicative of an issue or issues of significance, the scheme will be flagged as Category-2 and a more focused environmental assessment leading to the preparation of a scheme specific Environment Management Plan (EMP) needs to be undertaken. In case an affected PCR is identified, the EMP will provide details on the agreed mitigation strategy arrived at in consultation with the community.
- All MVS are to be classified as Category-2 as they require a closer scrutiny to their large size and extent of coverage.
- EMPs pertaining to all Category-2 schemes will be reviewed and approved by the Bank before they can be finalized.
- Any variation / design change in the scheme will mandate corresponding revision of the EDS and EMP and its re-approval by the Bank.
- For both Categories, environmental endorsement will continue to be the culmination of the environment screening procedure. Category-1 schemes can be endorsed directly after completion of screening and uploading EDS on the web site for Bank's approval,Category-2 schemes will be endorsed only on finalization of the EMP and its subsequent approval by the Bank and EMP to be displayed n department's website.
- Approved EDS, PCR Formats and EMPs pertaining to all schemes be disclosed on relevant State Government website(s). If any EDS or EMP is revised during implementation as a consequence of variation in design or for any other reason, the re-approved version will also be disclosed.

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

During project preparation, key stakeholders were identified, and consultations held to seek their views and incorporate the same into the project design. Grassroots level stakeholders include: i) benefiting households (including women, poor, Scheduled Castes, and Scheduled Tribes); ii) Gram Panchayats (men and women elected representatives), iii) Junior Engineers of RWSSD, and (iv) other community-based organizations such as Support Organizations, Community Mobilizers/Organizers including Jal-Shahiyas (GP level water and sanitation workers) particularly in Jharkhand and Bihar, etc. Block/ district level stakeholders are: the respective Panchayat Raj Institutions; other concerned line departments such as health, rural department, power, irrigation; district/ block

administration; the RWSSD; and non-governmental organizations, contractors/ suppliers and consultants. Departments of Finance, Drinking Water Supply & Sanitation, Rural Development and Panchayat Raj, Irrigation, Tribal Welfare, political leaders, NGOs and consultants contracted for DPR preparation and Project Management (Bihar).

There have been consultations throughout the project preparation both by the Bank Missions as well as by the state governments. The environmental and social assessment studies were conducted with active participation of relevant stakeholders. Summary of all safeguard documents - Environment Management Framework, Social Management Framework and Tribal Development Plans (Jharkhand and Assam) have been translated into local language and disseminated throughout the state. Stakeholder consultation workshops were held at all levels grassroots, regional and state. During implementation stage, consultation meetings of VWSCs/MVWSC, meetings between implementing and VWSC and respective contractors have continued with use of Support organizations and Community Organizers/Mobilizers and Jal-Shahiya (Jharkhand and Bihar).

However, during the course of project implementation over the years, when the project leadership as well as SPMU/DPMU staffs changed several times, the disclosed documents got removed from website of Jharkhand for reasons such as maintenance of websites, updation of websites, change of hosting to different server, etc. The Bank is now working with the respective states to address the issue and ensure that all public documents are uploaded again and disclosed as earlier. In addition, As per the revised strategy, all EDSs, EMPs and ARAPs (when prepared) will also be disclosed on the respective state websites.

B. DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure
12-Mar-2013	05-Apr-2013

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

"In country" Disclosure

Country	Date of Disclosure
India	28-Feb-2013

Comments

Team required the republishing of all documents and executive summaries in local languages in State department websites and disclosing them locally.

Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure
22-Mar-2013	05-Apr-2013

"In country" Disclosure

Country	Date of Disclosure
India	25-Mar-2013

Comments

Team require republishing of all documents and executive summaries in local languages in State department websites, and local disclosure.

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
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes

OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats	
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes
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 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples

Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	Yes
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?	NA

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?	No

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

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader(s)	Xavier Chauvot De Beauchene Mariappa Kullappa

Approved By		
Safeguards Advisor	Charles Ankisiba	30-Sep-2019
Practice Manager/Manager	Michael Haney	30-Sep-2019

.

Note to Task Teams: End of system generated content