

**COMBINED PROJECT INFORMATION DOCUMENTS / INTEGRATED
SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET (PID/ISDS)**

Appraisal Stage

Report No.: PIDISDSA19770

Date Prepared/Updated: 08-Nov-2017

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country:	India	Project ID:	P157836
		Parent Project ID (if any):	
Project Name:	Meghalaya Community-led Landscapes Management Project (P157836)		
Region:	SOUTH ASIA		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	18-Sep-2017	Estimated Board Date:	28-Dec-2017
Practice Area (Lead):	Environment & Natural Resources	Financing Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Borrower(s)	Republic of India		
Implementing Agency	Government of Meghalaya		
Financing (in USD Million)			
Financing Source			Amount
Borrower			12.00
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development			48.00
Financing Gap			0.00
Total Project Cost			60.00
Environmental Category:	B-Partial Assessment		
Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):	The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate		
Other Decision:			
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

India's growth continues to be impressive but sustainability depends on judicious management of the country's natural resources. Despite a modest slowdown in fiscal year 2017, economic activity is

expected to accelerate and the GDP expected to grow at 7.2 percent in fiscal year 2018. The country still faces development challenges with the largest number of poor in the world . The primary sector (agriculture, fisheries and forestry) contributes only 13.9 percent to the GDP but for nearly 50 percent of the population it is the principal source of livelihood . About 29 percent of India's land is undergoing degradation mainly due to erosion, loss of topsoil and loss of vegetation . Addressing degradation of land and water resources is essential to raise agricultural productivity and incomes.

Emphasis on growth in the Northeastern States is likely to benefit Meghalaya. The economy of the northeastern region of India is dependent on its rich natural resources but sustainably harnessing them for economic growth remains a challenge. The landlocked state of Meghalaya is endowed with abundant mineral wealth and favourable agro-climatic conditions but continues to lag on several development indicators.. The per capita income of Meghalaya was historically 15 percent above the national average, but came down to 8 percent below national average by 2000-01, and remains there. As part of the Government of India's vision for the Northeast and to integrate better with East Asian economies, there is a renewed focus on the growth and development of infrastructure and connectivity of this region. Meghalaya is rich in natural resources: a potential for 3,000MW hydro-power (only 185 MW is operational) and rich deposits of coal, limestone, and uranium and has high potential for development of these sectors. The state also has high potential for tourism owing to its rich forest cover and biodiversity, scenic landscapes and unique cultural heritage.

However, degradation of land and water resources in the state are proving to be huge impediments, and need to be addressed to sustain the benefits of natural resource based growth. In 2011-12, about 22 percent of the state's geographical area was under degradation caused primarily by loss of vegetation cover (19.4 percent) and erosion (2.37 percent). Given the hilly terrain, impact of land degradation is higher, as the nearby valleys supporting agriculture become unsuitable for cultivation and increased seasonal floods exacerbate soil erosion. Despite receiving highest rainfall in the world, most places in Meghalaya are now face water shortage. Of the 60,000 natural springs, which provide drinking water for 80 percent of the population, more than 54 percent have dried up or their water discharge has reduced by more than half. Greening of rural development is already on the government's agenda; however, the departmental schemes are target driven and implemented in silos. It will require an integrated and landscape approach of conservation of natural resources to address the issues arising out of degradation of land and water.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

Meghalaya has a unique community natural resource management system. Distinct from the rest of India where state forest departments are responsible for the protection and management of forests, nearly 90 percent of the forests in Meghalaya are managed under customary law by the Khasi, the Garo and the Jaintia tribes. Their elaborate system of use-based classification of their lands, with a high level of protection for forests designated as sacred groves has been in practice for centuries. The national and the state forest laws do not formally recognize this form of community management. These forests are designated as 'unclassified forests' in the state records and for the most part do not receive technical or financial support from state institutions. There are no specific water-related institutions nor legal framework for water management in the state. Waterbodies, rivers and springs are considered common properties like forests, and are managed by traditional tribal institutions.

State institutions have not been able to support Meghalaya's community management of natural resources. Autonomous District Councils (ADCs) were established under the Constitution of India to facilitate tribal societies' way of life and serve as a link between the 'formal' state structures and traditional tribal institutions. The distinction between the role of the state and that of ADCs with respect to management of natural resources has been obliterated over the years. ADCs do not have the

financial or other resources for management forests or waterbodies. Communities and clans have ownership rights but little else. Together, these lacunae leave nearly 90 percent of Meghalaya's forests without any finances or technical assistance for conservation or sustainable use. The absence of appropriate incentives, resources or recognition for long-term management by communities is resulting in preference for short-term returns through poorly managed - coal mining and timber extraction. While joint forest management has been the dominant model to involve communities in forest management in most of India, it has little relevance for Meghalaya where communities already have rights on forests and traditional management systems. A fresh approach tailored to the unique context in the state and one that resonates with the community's own traditions will be required to reverse this negative trend.

The Government recognizes the importance of natural resource sustainability for economic development. The Government of Meghalaya through Meghalaya Basin Development Authority (MBDA) leads an ambitious program - the "Integrated Basin Development & Livelihood Promotion Program (IBDLP)" which focuses on poverty alleviation, employment generation and livelihood promotion. It has nine focal areas in agriculture, water and natural resource management to bring new knowledge and skills which empower communities to make the best use of natural resources through the value chain. Funds from the Integrated Watershed Management Program (IWMP) and the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MNREGS) are delivered through the Soil and Water Conservation Department and the Community and Rural Development Department. Each of these programs use their own program design and cost norms. In recent years, the Government of Meghalaya has started shifting emphasis of these programs towards community-led natural resources management. The Government is also emphasizing integrated community-level planning and approval at village level (to be aggregated at district level for the different state/central schemes to converge). Now, with MBDA-steered IBDLP, an actual opportunity exists to transform the way the state and the communities manage natural resources.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Development Objective(s)

The project development objective is to strengthen community-led landscapes management in selected landscapes in the state of Meghalaya.

Key Results

PDO Indicator 1 Land area under sustainable landscape management practices

PDO Indicator 2: Village Councils (or "Dorbar") functioning with adequate fiduciary capacities, and capable of monitoring eco-system changes in the larger sub-watershed.

PDO Indicator 3: Village-level NRM Plans accepted in-toto (without change) by DCs and State for implementation of programs under SS and CSS

PDO Indicator 4: Share of target beneficiaries with rating 'Satisfied' or above on process and impact of project interventions (disaggregated by sex)

D. Project Description

The Project will support and inform the Government of Meghalaya's (GoM) state-wide Integrated Basin Development Programme (IBDLP). The IBDLP has two pillars: (i) Market Access, and (ii) Landscape Management for Sustainable Natural Resource Management. The CLLMP aligns with the latter by strengthening communities and traditional institutions to manage their natural resources such as soil, springs and other water sources, forests and biodiversity, through a landscape approach. The

project will prioritise about 400 villages located in ‘very critical’ and ‘critical’ (degraded) landscapes over a period of five years for the planning and treatment of these landscapes.

Landscape planning and investments will be preceded by extensive training for communities and project management staff at the field level. The project will extend such training to communities beyond the targeted 400 villages to expand the reach of MCLLMP approach through knowledge and training to a wider cohort of villages which would take up landscape based planning and management of natural resources with funds from other government programs.

Participation and leadership of communities in the project design and implementation will be central to the project. A community would lead the preparation of its own landscape/NRM plan to promote improved NRM from the very early stages of project planning, including resource mapping, data collection, land use and management planning, project design and monitoring. A village will be the unit of landscape planning and development under the project. From an administrative point of view, each landscape will contain one or multiple settlements under a village council or dorbar but will typically be found within a single village council. This approach will also facilitate planning for funds from other government programs for the purpose of convergence of development programs at village level. Thus, the village will be the unit for preparation and approval of Community Natural Resource Management (CNRM) Plans, and its implementation.

D. Project Description

The Project will support and inform the Government of Meghalaya’s (GoM) state-wide Integrated Basin Development Programme (IBDLP). The IBDLP has two pillars: (i) Market Access, and (ii) Landscape Management for Sustainable Natural Resource Management. The CLLMP aligns with the latter by strengthening communities and traditional institutions to manage their natural resources such as soil, springs and other water sources, forests and biodiversity, through a landscape approach. The project will prioritise about 400 villages located in ‘very critical’ and ‘critical’ (degraded) landscapes over a period of five years for the planning and treatment of these landscapes.

Landscape planning and investments will be preceded by extensive training for communities and project management staff at the field level. The project will extend such training to communities beyond the targeted 400 villages to expand the reach of MCLLMP approach through knowledge and training to a wider cohort of villages which would take up landscape based planning and management of natural resources with funds from other government programs.

Participation and leadership of communities in the project design and implementation will be central to the project. A community would lead the preparation of its own landscape/NRM plan to promote improved NRM from the very early stages of project planning, including resource mapping, data collection, land use and management planning, project design and monitoring. A village will be the unit of landscape planning and development under the project. From an administrative point of view, each landscape will contain one or multiple settlements under a village council or dorbar but will typically be found within a single village council. This approach will also facilitate planning for funds from other government programs for the purpose of convergence of development programs at village level. Thus, the village will be the unit for preparation and approval of Community Natural Resource Management (CNRM) Plans, and its implementation.

Project Components

Component 1: Strengthening Knowledge and Capacity for Natural Resource Management (NRM)

(IBRD Financing USD 13.00 million): The objective of this component is to enable the development, assimilation, analysis and dissemination of knowledge and skills related to landscape management within the state. This component will comprise of the following sub-components:

Sub-Component 1A (IBRD Financing USD 5.22 million): Promotion of traditional knowledge, grass-root innovations and communication will support (i) state and regional level workshops on sharing of unique and traditional NRM practices, learnings from other NRM projects (ii) development of a knowledge management strategy and web platform for sharing of NRM related knowledge with the community under CLLMP and development of knowledge networks (iii) development of website for CLLM-Programme (iv) innovation grants to promote and pilot new approaches to sustainable NRM products and services, (v) Catalytic Activities to encourage community NRM in new villages. DPMUs will encourage communities for adoption of CLLMP approach that complete the initial training to initiate small activities to demonstrate interest of the village to take up larger activities.

Sub-Component 1B (IBRD Financing USD 5.30 million): Training and capacity building will finance (i) training and capacity building activities for all stakeholders and beneficiaries on community leadership and management of natural resources and the approaches promoted by the project; (ii) development of C-NRM plans (iii) development of training infrastructure at block level Bharat Nirman Rajiv Gandhi Seva Kendra (BNRGSK)/ Enterprise Facilitation Centres; and (iv) national and international exposure visits for project stakeholders. These training activities will be implemented in coordination with the Meghalaya Institute of Natural Resource Management, Institute of Governance, Department of Science and Technology, State Institute of Rural Development (SIRD), Forest Training Institute (FTI – Tura) and Conservation Training Institute of the Soil and Water Conservation Department (CTI). It was agreed during the mission that procurement of these agencies will be completed prior to negotiations.

Sub-Component 1C (IBRD Financing USD 0.28 million): Preparation of strategies, research and development will support consultancy services to develop plans and strategies on the following areas: (i) Preparation of strategy and action plan for development of a Agency of Excellence in knowledge management, innovation and communications; (ii) Institutional development study for Integrated Basin Development and Livelihood Promotion Program (IBDLP); (iii) Preparation of Training Plan for the project; (iv) Baseline Study for the project; (v) Study on drivers of deforestation and natural resource degradation; and (vi) Study on Rehabilitation of population displaced due to mines.

Sub-Component 1D (IBRD Financing USD 0.35 million): Monitoring learning and reporting will support an MIS system to cover the entire state for tracking performance and implementation progress of the CLLM-Project. MBMA will design and establish MIS infrastructure for CLLMP that can be scaled up to cater to other requirements of the IBDLP..

Component 2 (IBRD Financing USD 30.00 million): Community-led landscape planning and implementation. This component will support both planning and implementation of the landscape plans by communities in the selected very high/high priority areas.

Sub-component 2A (IBRD Financing USD 0.49 million): Preparation of Community landscape plans. Communities, with the help of project facilitating teams (subject matter specialists) at block level and village level service providers, will prepare plans which will allow communities to (i) optimize synergies between programs and funding streams; (ii) plan holistically rather than be program/ scheme-driven to meet targets; and, (iii) take a leadership role for the management of natural resources

under their stewardship. A Community Operations Manual (COM) will outline processes of community consultation and development of Community-led Natural Resource Management (CNRM) Plans. The COM will specifically define “bottom-up” participatory planning and implementation processes.

Sub-component 2B (IBRD Financing USD 29.51 million): Implementation of community landscape plans and implementation support: Communities will implement CNRM plans in a phased manner, agreed through a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Village NRM Committee and respective District Project Management Units (DPMU). Communities will first implement agreed first phase activities in their plan and graduate to the next phase of financing if implementation meets agreed criteria. This approach is meant to incentivize performance based access to funds by the communities. Actual interventions needed will be decided by the community in their respective CNRM Plans but will relate to soil and water conservation measures; soil health improvement and productivity enhancement measures; spring-shed development and water management plans; nursery, agro forestry and community forestry; optimization of shifting cultivation; rehabilitation of areas affected by mining etc. Criteria for assessing successful implementation will be agreed in the MoU. The implementation will be supported through GIS and geospatial equipment involving and monitoring & evaluation.

Component 3 (IBRD Financing USD 5.00 million) : Project management and governance: This component will support the strengthening of the institutional capacity and knowledge management of the project implementing entity MBMA for the implementation and management of the project including, inter alia, (i) establishment of the state project management unit (SPMU) within MBMA, support to seven district project management units, including technical staff and consultants (ii) the incremental costs associated with implementation; (iii) administrative support to 20 block development offices (iv) technical fiduciary and safeguards oversight and supervision of project activities in the field.

Component Name:

Component 1: Strengthening Knowledge and Capacity for management of Natural Resources

Comments (optional)

Component Name:

Component 2: Community-led landscape planning and implementation

Comments (optional)

Component Name:

Component 3 : Project management and governance:

Comments (optional)

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

The state of Meghalaya has 42 percent of its land as forest area. Within this, 88 % as of forest area is unclassified forest, 10.6 % is classified as reserve forest, 0.13% as protected forest and. Community forests are categorized as unclassified forests, while forests under State Forest Department stewardship are reserved forests and protected areas. The unclassified forest area is either private or clan/ community owned and is under the management of the Autonomous District Councils set up under the provisions of the Sixth Schedule to the Constitution of India.

It is proposed that sensitization and awareness on CLLMP approaches will be implemented across all villages in the state under Component 1 activities. Village community members from across the state will benefit from the training and capacity building and knowledge sharing activities of the project. The project will utilize GoM, North East Space Application Centre (NESAC) classification of degraded and highly degraded landscapes of Meghalaya and target NRM management activities in about 400 villages, under Component 2 of the project. Specific activities (location, type, extent) of project interventions will be selected during project implementation by the community.

A comprehensive Social Management Framework cum Indigenous People's Development Plan has been prepared as 86% of the state's population belong to the indigenous tribes i.e. Khasi, Jaintia and Garos.

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Mridula Singh, Social Safeguards Specialist

Sharlene Jehanbux Chichgar, Environmental Safeguards Specialist

II. IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation of the project will be managed by Meghalaya Basin Management Agency (MBMA) – a section 8 company (erstwhile Section 25 company) which has the primary responsibility of implementing Externally Aided Projects, including the Meghalaya Community Led Landscape Management Project (MCLLMP). The CLLM-Project will be governed and managed under the overall umbrella of the CLLM-Programme governance and management structure at the state, district and block level. At the village level, both the Programme and the World Bank assisted CCLM Project will follow the same model to encourage synergy and mutual learning between the Project and the Programme.

Safeguards management capacity has been instituted at the State (SPMU) and District (DPMU) level. Village facilitators will also be trained in environment and social management to support villages in preparation of CNRM plans.

III. SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	<p>The project activities are expected enhance natural resource management in targeted landscapes, and are expected to be beneficial and sustainable from an environmental perspective. Although the project would be implemented within environmentally and socially sensitive areas, none of the planned project investments or activities are expected to generate significant adverse environmental impacts.</p> <p>OP4.01 is triggered as this is a forest landscape project that will involve (i) Soil and water conservation measures; (ii) forest nurseries and composting units (iii) community water management, development</p>

	<p>and implementation spring shed management plans to reduce losses through run-off; (iv) afforestation and regeneration of natural forests; and, (v) rehabilitation of lands affected by shifting cultivation and mining. Though the typology and scale of the proposed interventions is manageable, the expected impacts and the measures to mitigate them are known; some environmentally sensitive hot spots although raise the level of risk of the project. Minor small scale impacts could arise with the selection of incompatible exotic species for afforestation, increase water availability could undermine any budgeting and create additional pipelines for drinking water, diversion channels for increasing area under irrigation. There is also a risk of contamination of the surface water if the spring area is not adequately protected from wastewater flows from domestic uses or discharges from commercial markets. Poorly designed and constructed catchment treatment schemes could lead to slope stability issues, localized water logging, and siltation in local streams. The risk of firewood/timber extraction from the afforestation plots raised through project interventions, poor survival of young plantations and forest fires are the major issues affecting success of the project interventions. Largely, the project its impacts are nonetheless expected to be overwhelmingly positive, and these impacts can be managed with standard mitigation and monitoring mechanisms.</p> <p>In compliance with OP 4.01, GoM has prepared an Environmental Management Framework (EMF) for managing and mitigating the environmental risk related to the project activities, so that project activities are environmentally sound and sustainable. Specific to the project activities the EMF includes (i) criteria and procedures for screening of project investments on the basis of their potential environmental impacts and benefits; (ii) a list of ineligible activities for the proposed project, and ecologically sensitive areas/critical natural habitats where project investments should not be implemented; (iii) screening against regulatory compliances, if required, and (iii)</p>
--	--

		mitigation measures and environmental guidelines for environmental risks/concerns for each of the major typology of project investments that may be identified through screening and (v) proposed institutional and implementation arrangements for training, supervision, monitoring, and consultation for the implementation of the EMF provisions.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	The project will affect natural habitats and associated ecosystems in a positive manner. The project is designed to reduce ongoing patterns of deforestation, soil erosion, forest degradation, habitat fragmentation and biodiversity loss by implementing measures to restore vegetative cover of native indigenous species, and introduce sustainable management of community forests, revive springs, and water bodies to prevent further degradation of these areas. There will be no major, long term change in land or water use or significant conversion or loss of these critical habitats. the project will not work in protected areas.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	The project is intended to bring about positive changes in the management, and sustainable utilization of forests. The current scenario indicates there is degradation of forest areas due to reduction in the fallow period of shifting cultivation activities, extensive forest fires, uncontrolled logging and fuel wood extraction. This has caused soil erosion, increased run off rate, and loss of productivity especially in shifting cultivation forest lands. The project would address these issues through investments in afforestation, soil and water conservation, and improved planning of forest landscapes and their resources to meet the requirements (fuel wood, building material, food) of the community. The positive impacts associated with the project are the conservation and restoration of degraded forest areas with native vegetative cover, their ecosystem functions and the protection of spring sheds.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	This policy is not applicable as the project will not finance any significant procurement of pesticides. Activities which will involve the use of pesticides and chemicals will not be supported under the project.

Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	The State of Meghalaya contains ASI protected structures in the Jaintia Hills and East Khasi hills. There are also state protected sites such as excavated temples, Buddhist Stupa and a Fortress in Garo areas. The EMF ensures that project supported activities will not intervene within the regulated area (200m) from the monuments/structures. The policy is triggered as a preventative measure as selected villages may be located within the proximity of sacred forest groves (These groves have a high cultural and religious significance and are protected by traditional communities) or protected structures/ monuments. The EMF provides criteria and procedures to ensure the appropriate treatment of physical cultural resources, and if archaeological or other culturally relevant items are found or exist near a selected village during project implementation. The EMF also includes a procedure for handling chance finds detailing the plan of action in the event of such an encounter.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	The policy is triggered, accordingly a Tribal Development Framework has been prepared to address impact. It will also include an action plan to ensure that equal opportunities are provided to access benefits.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	No	Land will not be required for the project. SMF of the project clearly identifies the procedure in this respect.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The Project will not fund any dams as defined in OP 4.37 as small or large dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The policy for Projects on International Waterways is not triggered as the proposed activities will not potentially impact any shared international waterway.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The Bank policy on Projects in Disputed Areas is not triggered by the project, as it is not located in any disputed territory of the country.

IV. 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:

Possible social impacts may include changes in land-use pattern in the project area. The

project's interventions in terms of legal documentation of ownership patterns, institution strengthening, awareness and capacity building is expected to mitigate this risk to a great extent. The project may also lead to conflicts between traditional institutions, ADCs and government departments over jurisdiction. The project includes an extensive redressal mechanism and social accountability measures for conflict resolution. Other social implications could be exclusion of women in decision-making and preparation of CNRM plans. The project aims at building women's capacity, providing equal opportunities and overall, enhancing their participation in collective decision making in natural resource management. Overall, SMF cum IPDP includes mitigation strategies and procedures addressing plausible negative impacts associated with the project.

Although, the project is expected overall to be environmentally positive, there is the potential for project works or activities to cause unintended negative impacts, albeit, minor/small scale unless carefully designed and implemented. The main safeguards-related risks associated with the project's site-specific investments within this context include (i) the need to ensure survival of plantations as the current scenario indicates that survival rate is low (ii) careful selection of tree species to ensure there is no replacement of the natural forests with incompatible exotic or invasive species (iii) adequate protection around the spring shed areas to ensure that the pristine water quality of the landscapes is maintained and no untreated wastewater, improper sanitation or changing land use leads to degradation of water bodies (iv) avoiding any improper siting of soil and water conservation works may cause drainage and erosion problems resulting soil particles being transported to drainage networks, affecting the quality of natural water systems; (vi) temporary adverse impacts may also be caused due to inferior construction methods or other practices leading to long-term slope instability, siltation in water bodies. There could also be impacts on sensitive habitats through increased noise and disturbance, improper waste disposal or accidental forest fires. Mitigation measures for each of these anticipated impacts have been listed for the design and implementation phase, and these will be applied as needed by the community.

There may also be environmental impacts of several inter-related interventions, such the incremental increase in water availability may change land use/agriculture patterns. Following restoration in the quality of landscapes, and increased soil productivity, induced impacts could be (i) increase in unplanned eco-tourism activities in natural and cultural heritage sites and pristine landscapes (ii) impacts on downstream communities if there is propagation in small scale irrigation schemes from the restored water sources. Measures for addressing these concerns have been are specified in the EMF.

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

There are no long-term adverse impacts to the project. The project's long-term environmental impacts are expected to be highly positive overall, with reduced deforestation and forest degradation; improvement in surface water quality and availability, and increased benefits-sharing from forest resources. This means no significant and/or irreversible adverse environmental impacts are anticipated from the investments to be financed under the project.

The project will have long term benefits on the beneficiaries of the project. Promotion of

NRM would add to households' productivity, which may lead to increase in sustainable livelihood opportunities and better nutritional standards of women and children. The project will also lead to greater participation of women in decision making processes.

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

The EMF has been designed to integrate and mainstream environment management into the community NRM plans right from the planning stage and would be linked to the various stages of the plan preparation and implementation. The report also contains environmental good practice guidelines that can be applied in the site identification, design and implementation of project activities so that it serves to minimize any adverse environmental impacts that may arise.

4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.

The MBDA has prepared an SMF cum IPDP based on the Social Assessment and Free Prior Informed Consultations, in accordance with OP 4.10 of Indigenous Peoples. As for institutional arrangements, social management staff has been designated at the SPMU level on a full-term basis. An Assistant Manager- Social at the DPMU will be staffed for supporting the implementation and monitoring of social development related activities at the district level. The facilitators at the village level will facilitate the preparation of the Community NRM Plans. Furthermore, the MBDA will prepare a Community Operations Manual (COM) to guide the community and project authorities on the project implementation.

GoM has also developed an EMF in accordance with OP 4.01 Category B project requirements, in consultation with communities, relevant state departments and technical experts to provide practical recommendations and guidance on minimizing and mitigating any potential environmental impacts of project-related interventions, and measures for enhancement and improvement of environmental conditions in the project area. The EMF includes guidelines for ensuring sustainability of the selected interventions, incorporating them into the planning process, maximizing the intended environmental benefits of the project, as a whole, and providing information and procedures for monitoring and evaluating the implementation of environmental actions and their impacts. The guidelines and mitigations will also included as part of the community operations manual.

The EMF also provides the appropriate institutional mechanisms and specific training /capacity building needs along with the requirements and processes for supervising and monitoring the environmental screening and mitigation measures during project implementation. It is agreed that GoM will recruit an Environmental Manager at the SPMU who will be supported, as required, by a project associate. In addition, an assistant manager, Environment in the DPMU will be made responsible for facilitating and reviewing the CNRM plan screenings and application of environmental guidelines till completion of the activities. At the village level, a facilitator/service provider will be trained in the overall aspects of environmental management, they will be identified by the Village NRM committee, and their services will be utilized based on the need of additional support on environmental safeguards. The block development offices may also provide additional experts for technical support to the environment facilitator.

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

The key stakeholders at the state level comprise of Meghalaya Basin Management Agency (MBMA), Meghalaya Basin Development Authority (MBDA), Soil and Water Conservation Department (SWCD), State Forest Department, Water Resources Department and other line departments. In addition to state departments, the stakeholders include Autonomous District Council (Khasi Hills, Jaintia Hills and Garo Hills), Traditional Institutions, Self Help Groups and CSOs/NGOs and community members.

During the initial phases of the EMF development, stakeholder consultation meetings were conducted in villages in Khasi, Jaintia, and Garo Hills representing landscapes facing different environmental challenges such as forest degradation, contamination of soil and water through coal mining and unsustainable shifting cultivation activities. Participants included the village council, elders, farmers, women and youth and officers from Block Development Units. These meetings were aimed at discussing with the communities the purpose of the project as well as managing community expectations towards restoration of degraded landscapes.

Focus group discussions were held with State level government officers from Soil and water conservation, forest, water resources, fishery and tourism departments. Technical inputs and success stories were also provided by University (NEHU), NGOs, research organizations, media, civil society organizations. MBDA also consulted targeted groups of communities including traditional leaders and youth, to discuss environmental implications of the project, and institutional mechanisms. Further, three regional workshops in each of the targeted forest landscapes were conducted during project preparation (March 17-23, 2017) to seek further inputs on the advanced draft of the project safeguard documents. The meetings targeted officials from government departments at the district, and block level for forests, soil and water conservation and water resources, farmers, forest dependent communities, traditional chiefs, and other relevant stakeholders.

In accordance with the World Bank's operational policies, stakeholder consultations were conducted across the three regions of Meghalaya, namely the Khasi Hills, Garo Hills and the Jaintia Hills. Additionally, three regional level consultations were held from 28th to 30th March, 2017 to discuss all aspects of the project, and seek inputs on the advanced draft of the project safeguard documents, prior to the appraisal. These consultations form part of the Free, Prior Informed Consultation requirement as per the OP 4.10 of the World Bank. The feedback from the consultations have been duly incorporated in the SMF cum IPDP. The SMF has been disclosed in-country on (date of disclosure) at the MBDA website and through the Bank's Info-shop

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	17-Aug-2017
Date of submission to InfoShop	17-Aug-2017
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	

"In country" Disclosure	
India	17-Aug-2017
<i>Comments:</i>	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	17-Aug-2017
Date of submission to InfoShop	17-Aug-2017
"In country" Disclosure	
India	17-Aug-2017
<i>Comments:</i>	
If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.	
If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why::	

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment						
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input 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 Practice 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 Practice Manager?	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>

been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?

V. Contact point

World Bank

Contact:Pyush Dogra
Title:Senior Environmental Specialis

Contact:Madhavi M. Pillai
Title:Sr Natural Resources Mgmt. Spe

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name:Republic of India
Contact:Lekhan Thakkar
Title:Director (MI)
Email:lekhan.t@nic.in

Implementing Agencies

Name:Government of Meghalaya
Contact:R.M. Mishra
Title:Principal Secretary, Planning
Email:rm.mishra@nic.in

VI. For more information contact:

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

VII. Approval

Task Team Leader(s):	Name:Pyush Dogra, Madhavi M. Pillai	
<i>Approved By:</i>		
Practice Manager:	Name: Hocine Chalal (PMGR)	Date: 05-Nov-2017
Country Director:	Name: Hisham A. Abdo Kahin (CD)	Date: 10-Nov-2017