



Combined Project Information Documents / Integrated Safeguards Datasheet (PID/ISDS)

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 03-Sep-2018 | Report No: PIDISDSA22656



BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country India	Project ID P160463	Project Name AP Integrated Irrigation & Agriculture Transformation Project	Parent Project ID (if any)
Region SOUTH ASIA	Estimated Appraisal Date 27-Jul-2018	Estimated Board Date 23-Oct-2018	Practice Area (Lead) Agriculture
Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing	Borrower(s) Department of Economic Affairs	Implementing Agency Government of Andhra Pradesh	

Proposed Development Objective(s)

The Project Development Objective is to enhance agricultural productivity, profitability and climate resilience of smallholder farmers in selected districts of Andhra Pradesh.

Components

- Component A: Improving Irrigated Agriculture Efficiency
- Component B: Promoting Climate Smart Agriculture Practices
- Component C: Post-harvest Management, Market and Agribusiness Promotion
- Component D: Project Management and Capacity Building

PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US\$, Millions)

SUMMARY

Total Project Cost	245.90
Total Financing	245.90
of which IBRD/IDA	172.20
Financing Gap	0.00

DETAILS

World Bank Group Financing



International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)	172.20
--	--------

Non-World Bank Group Financing

Counterpart Funding	73.70
Borrower	73.70

Environmental Assessment Category

B-Partial Assessment

Decision

The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

- India continues to be one of the world’s fastest growing economies and has experienced a substantial decline in poverty.** From 2012–13 to 2015–16 growth rose from 5.5 to 8.2 percent, supported by robust private consumption, a resilient services sector, and a revival of industrial activity. More recently, however, temporary disruptions from demonetization and uncertainty about the goods and service tax have slowed growth generally, and growth in real gross domestic product (GDP) declined to 7.1 percent in 2016–17 and 6.6 percent in 2017–18
- Since the 2000s, India has made notable progress in reducing absolute poverty.** Between 2004 and 2011, poverty declined steeply from 38.9 to 21.6 percent. High economic growth, a rapid rise in rural wages, greater rural-urban integration, and increased nonfarm activity, especially in construction, were the main drivers of poverty reduction. Since 2011, economic growth may also have been a factor, but if so current trends in the construction sector and rural wages suggest that the pace of poverty reduction may moderate.
- India is now confronted by serious structural barriers to more inclusive growth and sustainable development.** It is still home to 263 million poor people—80 percent of whom reside in rural areas—who live on less than US\$1.90 a day. Expansion of the economy has not generated jobs fast enough to absorb labor in rural areas, exacerbating rural-urban income disparities. In recent years the Government of India (GoI) has therefore directed its attention to accelerating rural growth and poverty reduction, creating jobs, and improving environmental management. In the Union Budget 2017–18, the GoI articulated its goal of doubling farmer incomes in five years, setting an annual growth target of 4 percent for agriculture and allied sectors.
- Agricultural growth is central to India achieving its development goals.** More than two-thirds of the country’s poor live in rural areas, and their chances of climbing out of poverty depend directly on how well agriculture and allied sectors perform. Today, agriculture represents 14 percent of national GDP and provides livelihoods for more than 50 percent of the population. But it must deal with decelerating



productivity growth,¹ due mostly to inefficient use of resources, especially soil and water, and to unsustainable production practices. Among factors driving inefficiency are incentives that promote dependence on rice, wheat, and other food grains rather than forwarding crop diversification; overuse of chemical inputs and water; failure to adopt modern agricultural techniques; insufficient investment in irrigation systems; and poorly integrated value chains.

5. **Climate change is expected to negatively affect agriculture.** Its adverse effects are expected to aggravate resource constraints and disproportionately affect the poor, and it may roll back the progress made so far in poverty reduction and food security. Climate change models, such as those of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, predict that temperatures in India are likely to rise by 3°C–4°C by the end of the 21st century. Unless farmers adapt their practices and there are policy changes (current policies, for instance, promote wasteful use of irrigation water), farm incomes will undoubtedly drop. Rain-fed areas will be most affected, with potential losses of up to 18 percent of annual revenue.²

6. **Strategic shifts will be necessary to transform India's agriculture into a modern and resilient food system by moving it away from a traditional food security orientation.** It must transit (a) from food grain production to diversified high-value horticulture and livestock products; (b) from a focus purely on physical productivity (yields) to agricultural resilience and stability to deal with the effects of climate change and short-term weather anomalies; (c) from a simplistic focus on what farms produce to adding value post-harvest; (d) from a calorie-focused production structure to nutrition-sensitive agriculture; and (e) from merely supplying more irrigation water to making water use more efficient.

7. The proposed project is designed to support such strategic shifts by building up the resilience of agriculture to climate change in districts of Andhra Pradesh (AP) that are already affected by weather variability and the threats it poses to agriculture, food security, and the livelihoods of farming communities.

Sectoral and Institutional Context

8. **Agriculture in AP is characterized by low productivity and high vulnerability to weather shocks.** The total cultivated area of 6.35 million ha is spread over a variety of agro-ecologies that produce a wide range of crops (primarily rice but also maize, ragi, small millets, pulses, castor, cotton, etc.). More than three-fourths of the producers are marginal and small-scale farmers with landholdings of less than 2 ha. Because over 55 percent of farms are rain-fed, AP's agriculture is extremely vulnerable to rainfall variability. Along with the adverse effects of climate change, deterioration in the quality of natural resources is also a significant threat to the sustainability of AP agricultural production and farm incomes. Policy makers are coming to recognize that previous strategies for agricultural growth must be readjusted to fully exploit agriculture's potential for inclusive and sustainable rural growth.

9. **Although steps have been taken to make AP agriculture more productive, water-stressed conditions and high input costs, among other problems, have triggered widespread agrarian distress.** Compared to neighboring states, for instance, yield gaps can be significant; for instance, average rice yield

¹ In the 1990s and 2000s, agriculture grew at about 3–3.5 percent annually but in 2013–15 its growth rate fell below 2 percent a year during 2013–2015.

²Climate, Climate Change, and Agriculture - Economic Survey 2017–18. <http://mofapp.nic.in:8080/economicsurvey/pdf/>.



in AP is 20 percent lower than in Tamil Nadu and Karnataka.³ Among factors dragging on agricultural productivity are (a) variable rainfall and inadequate management of soil health; (b) lack of knowledge of or interest in climate-resilient technologies and practices; (c) limited use of irrigation; (d) little crop diversification in the rabi season⁴ in rain-fed areas; (e) lack of adequate storage and processing facilities; and (f) inefficient links to markets and unprofitable prices. A baseline survey for this project suggests that farmers are forced to be distress sellers; most farmers sold produce at the farm gate—only 10 percent carried it to nearby Agricultural Products Marketing Committee *Mandis* (official places for farmers to sell their commodities). Thus, rain-fed agriculture in AP is increasingly risky and economically nonviable; there is an urgent need for a thoughtful mix of supportive policies and investments to promote sustainable solutions to the current decline.

10. **If its potential is to be harvested, agriculture in AP must become both climate-resilient and profitable.** AP authorities recognize that climate change and rainfall variability is the new normal. It calls for an approach to sustainable growth of agriculture that is based on long-term adaptive interventions to ensure food security and build the resilience of farms to climate change. As part of Swarnandhra Vision 2029, the Government of AP (GoAP) has therefore devised a strategy to transform and ensure the sustainability of agriculture by working toward the following objectives: (a) increase productivity and promote sustainable crop intensification⁵; (b) use water conservation and micro-irrigation to mitigate the impact of droughts; (c) improve post-harvest management to reduce wastage; and (d) support processing, value addition, and supply chain management. With this strategy, the GoAP intends to increase the contribution of agriculture to GSDP from INR 319,610 million in 2015–16 to INR 600,000 million by 2021–22, and to raise food grain yields from 2,641 to 4,409 kg per ha.

11. **More efficient production and more crop diversification are needed if small and marginal farmers are to meet GoAP productivity targets.** Paddy rice is the predominant AP cereal crop, grown in 89 percent of the cultivated area during the kharif season.⁶ To meet the GoAP's ambitious productivity targets, improving paddy productivity and sowing non-paddy crops in a wider area are critical. In addition, expanding the area being cultivated during the rabi season from the present 38 percent, together with intensification, will enhance productivity through diversification to pulses and other high-value crops, such as vegetables. Taking these steps will require broadening the area under assured irrigation; adopting Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) to restore soil health and conserve natural resources; promoting appropriate and competitive agricultural diversification; and putting in place an inclusive market-oriented development strategy to benefit smallholder farmers through public-private partnerships (PPPs). These interventions are aligned with the Gol's commitment to doubling farmer incomes by 2022.

12. **Supporting production and diversification in the rabi season is essential to make farming more profitable.** Farmers are increasingly realizing that cultivating food grains exclusively is not profitable. The state is promoting horticulture as a way to avert risk and increase profitability, thereby providing farm households with much-needed stability. Moreover, recent studies suggest that the retail market for

³ The productivity of farm animals is also extremely low, e.g., cows produce only 3.15–4.55 liters of milk per animal per day (AP Economic Survey 2017).

⁴ Rabi crops are those sown in winter and harvested in the spring in South Asia. It starts from October continues till March followed by Kharif season that start from April and continues till September.

⁵ Crop intensification: More variety of crops per year in given agriculture land (It is calculated as – gross crop area / net crop area X 100).

⁶ The kharif cropping season is from April to September during the southwest monsoon.



agricultural commodities is relatively better in AP than in other states: currently AP procures 45 percent of its daily vegetable consumption from West Bengal, Karnataka, and other states. The same is true for floriculture, due to demand from many religious centers in the state. In other words, demand in AP for agricultural products is vibrant. With 55 percent of agricultural land in AP being rain-fed, the supply side is the main GoAP concern. The kharif season is predominantly used for cultivating paddy for self-consumption. During the rabi season—the main season for high-value crop production—two-thirds of AP cultivable land is left fallow. Therefore, a major GoAP policy thrust for improving agricultural performance is therefore to stabilize supply-side management by emphasizing production and diversification in the rabi season. This necessitates assured irrigation, which can be achieved by rehabilitating small-scale community-based irrigation (SSCBI)⁷ systems and improving their management.

13. **Revitalizing SSCBI systems is a priority for the GoAP to increase the area under assured irrigation and enhance farmers' resilience to climate change.** For most of small and marginal farmers, improving water storage and management in SSCBI systems holds the promise for improving crop productivity and enhancing crop diversification. As conventional irrigation cannot be extended to the entire arable area in AP due to water scarcity, environmental concerns, and high investment costs, rehabilitating existing tanks offers the most cost-effective option for enhanced agriculture performance. Existing assessments suggest that the area irrigated by SSCBI systems can be extended to more than 1 million ha (out of the 3.2 million ha rain-fed agriculture land). Reviving this irrigation scheme, which focus on developing local water resources in a defined catchment (or cascade) to maximize benefits and promote equitable access to water, aligns with the priority policies of both the Central and the State Governments. This project focuses on such low-resource areas with an aim to support the accelerated development of more productive, resilient, diversified, and sustainable agriculture.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

14. The PDO is to enhance agricultural productivity, profitability and climate resilience of smallholder farmers in selected districts of Andhra Pradesh.

D. Project Description

Project Components

15. The proposed project complements current GoAP agriculture policies and programs in rain-fed areas and reflects lessons learned from the WBG agriculture portfolio in India and elsewhere. The Project consists of the following parts:

16. **Component A: Improving Irrigated Agriculture Efficiency.** The intent of this component is to enhance the water security of individual farms so as to reduce the risks associated with climate variability. Within a defined cascade, this component will finance the following interrelated interventions: (a) Institutional strengthening and capacity building of WUAs for better operation and maintenance of tank systems and better water management, through training, technical assistance, support from private operator, and establishment of service feedback mechanism and user satisfaction surveys; (b) Modernization of irrigation infrastructure of tank systems located in select cascades; and (c) Improving water productivity and efficiency by, *inter alia*: (i) establishing cascade monitoring and decision support

⁷ SSCBI systems consist of small tanks, ponds, and other water bodies within a defined catchment area.



systems; (ii) installing sensor-based measuring devices to monitor water discharge to farms; (iii) broadening stakeholder participation in planning for and managing water resources; and (vi) promotion of community-led management to improve groundwater conditions.

17. **Component B: Promoting Climate-Smart Agricultural Practices.** The goal of this component is to increase on-farm productivity and strengthen farm resilience to climate change in order to increase agricultural production and farmer incomes. This will be achieved by: (a) Promoting climate-smart crop production and diversification, including support for technology dissemination and transfer for sustainable and climate-resilient crop intensification; mobilization and organization of targeted farmers into farmer producer organizations for cooperative production and produce marketing; market demand assessments for crops that farmers can profitably diversify into; demonstration of new crops and their production technologies; rejuvenation of old orchards; strengthening of access to seeds and other critical inputs for new crops; and support for mechanization of farm activities, including establishment of farm machinery centers to provide on lease machinery and other equipment; and (b) Support to climate-smart aquaculture with a focus on improvement of aquaculture production and profitability, including through: support for aquaculture management approaches; improved access to good quality fish seed and feed; production of high value species; improved production technology dissemination; strengthening of extension-farmer linkages; biosafety and disease surveillance; improvement and management of fish marketing infrastructure; value addition; and support for compliance with food safety standards.

18. **Component C: Post-harvest management, market and agribusiness promotion.** This component will contribute to enhancing farmers' profitability by improving their access to markets and their capacity to add value to their produce, including through: easing market infrastructure constraints on the processing, storage, handling and marketing of farm produce; and facilitating linkage of farmer producer organizations and value chain operators to local, national and international markets.

19. **Component D: Project management and capacity building.** Support for Project implementation, monitoring and reporting.

E. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

20. The institutional and implementation arrangements for the project are fully integrated with the structures of participating state, district, and SSCBI line departments and agencies. Four such entities will undertake interventions and activities. The administrative lead is the WRD Principal Secretary. Associated GoAP agencies are the Departments of Agriculture, Horticulture, and Fisheries.

21. The project is organized around the following functions: (a) oversight and orientation by a Project Steering Committee (PSC); (b) management of project financial resources by an Empowered Finance Committee (EFC); (c) coordination of project activities and partners by a Project Management Unit (PMU); and (d) technical execution of project activities by specified government entities.

22. The main responsibilities of the PSC are to (a) advise the project on strategic directions and supporting activities; (b) approve the Annual Work Plan and Budget; (c) ensure that all stakeholders collaborate effectively; and (d) review the PMU's Implementation Progress Reports, ensure that activities are effective, and advise on any adjustments needed to the Annual Work Plan. The PSC, chaired by the



Chief Secretary, will comprise the Principal Secretaries or Secretaries for Finance, Water Resources, Agriculture, Horticulture, and Fisheries. An EFC chaired by the Secretary, WRD, will manage project financial resources and oversee allocation and reallocation of project funds.

23. Day-to-day management and operation of the project is the responsibility of the PMU headed by the GoAP-appointed State Project Director (SPD). The PMU will provide operational management and coordination and will be represented at the district level through the DPMUs. It must ensure that (a) all project activities are planned, financed, and conducted according to the Annual Work Plan and Budget; (b) project activities conform to PIP operational guidelines; (c) procurement and financial management (FM) activities conform to the World Bank *Procurement for IPF Borrowers* (2016), project fiduciary manuals, and the Procurement Plan; and (d) the project fully complies with all applicable social and environmental safeguards. The PMU is also responsible for monitoring project activities, preparing quarterly and annual progress reports, and ensuring that all reports, financial and other, are submitted to the World Bank on schedule. It will represent all disciplines needed by the project and may include external specialists and other technical personnel deputed from line departments and agencies. Additional specialists in environment and social safeguards, media and communications, market intelligence, geographic information systems (GIS), and other areas will be recruited as needed.

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

Andhra Pradesh is located on the east coast in peninsular India facing the Bay of Bengal. The State has three physiographic zones, the hilly region (having Nallamalai, Erramalai hills and the Eastern Ghats having an altitude of 500 to 1400 m); the plateau (having an altitude of 100 m to 1000 m) and the deltas of rivers (between the Eastern Ghats and the Sea Coast). The state is drained by three major perennial rivers viz. Godavari, Krishna and Pennar, and several other medium and small rivers. In all some 40 rivers drain into the sea. Rainfall varies from 560 mm in the Rayalaseema region to about 1200 mm in the northeastern coastal part of the state. The State receives about 66 percent of rainfall from south-west monsoon (June-September) and about 25 percent from north-east monsoon (October-December). The project activities will involve investing on repair and rehabilitation of about 1000 tanks spread across the state. The interventions will include: improving water assets, modernizing irrigation infrastructure, improving water productivity, promoting adaptive sustainable agricultural practices, enhancing fisheries production and climate friendly agri-business promotion.

G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Suryanarayana Satish, Social Safeguards Specialist
Gopaldaswamy Srihari, Social Safeguards Specialist
Anupam Joshi, Environmental Safeguards Specialist



SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The physical investments under the project are largely on rehabilitation of existing water assets where improper construction could result in adverse impacts. The investments under productivity enhancement through sustainable agriculture practices could result in positive impacts with effective planning and implementation. An Environmental and Social Assessment has been undertaken and a Social and Environmental Management Framework has been developed for managing risks and maximizing the environmental and social opportunities. These take into account experiences and learnings from the previous project.
Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03	No	No impact is expected due to the project interventions.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	The rehabilitation of tanks may impact natural habitats including wetlands, for which a natural habitat management plan has been prepared as part of the ESMP.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	The project interventions are not expected to have an impact on the forest areas.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	The project will not directly finance pesticides use, but improved irrigation and crop diversification may result in increased use of pesticides. The project will work in synergy with the State Primary Sector Mission and focus on climate smart agriculture production system which will promote non-chemical package of practices.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	No significant adverse impacts on cultural property is expected, but this issue has been examined during the ESA, and appropriate measures have been put in place to deal with any findings emerging thereof.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	AP state has a tribal population of 2.7 million amounting to 5.5 percent of the total population. A few pockets in three districts are predominantly inhabited by tribals and are covered under the Fifth Schedule of the Indian Constitution. So, project areas are likely to have tribal population. As investment plans are currently not known, such situations will be addressed through a Tribal Peoples



		Planning Framework (TPPF) when the project gets taken up in the tribal areas.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	No	The project will not and need not resort to involuntary acquisition of land as the project would cover only the existing irrigation tanks with a focus on repair and rehabilitation only. Towards ensuring this, a caveat will find a place in the legal documents.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	Yes	Some of the tanks could be large with high embankments above 10 m. This policy is triggered during the previous phase and arrangements are put in place. Three region-wise Dam Safety Panels (DSPs) were constituted by the Government to function with technical guidance from the Chief Engineer, Central Designs Organization. The project will seek better coordination with the Dam Safety Panel. The project will also support safety enhancement of tank systems as part of tank rehabilitation.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The project does not fall on any international waterways.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The project is not in any disputed areas.

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:

There are no major significant and/ or irreversible impacts expected as a result of the project. Safeguard issues revolve around augmenting and/or re-engineering the existing minor irrigation tanks along with water conveyance system, and other associated activities related to enhancing production, productivity and incomes in the spheres of agriculture and fisheries. The key interventions relate to bridging the gaps between designed and actual irrigable areas with participation of the local water using communities. Major challenge lies in mobilizing the tank-based community toward group action, and establishing linkages with other public and private sector institutions. This has been addressed successfully under the first project (APCBTMP) with the help of an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF). The proposed project is built upon it with due recognition of latest legislative developments and expanded scope of interventions, into agriculture and fisheries. Adoption of ESMF will ensure addressing the impacts as appropriate.

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

Given the nature of interventions proposed, impacts are likely to be positive. Human and Institutional development measures are designed such to ensure that positive impacts/ benefits remain sustainable. No negative impacts are



envisaged either in the short or long term. ESMF will serve as an effective instrument for avoiding, minimizing and mitigating negative impacts.

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

All alternative options were discussed and assessed prior to finalizing the interventions outlined in the PAD.

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.

Borrower had undertaken an in depth social and environmental assessments which has led to not only updating the previous project’s ESMF, but also, social and environmental management plans (SMP and EMP). SMP comprises a.o., Tribal People Planning Framework (TPPF) (to ensure inclusion and equity for tribals/ indigenous peoples) and Gender Impact Assessment/ Management Plans. EMP comprises action plans to address dam safety, nutrient management, pest management, cultural property and natural habitat. To ensure effective implementation, project has dedicated social and environment specialists in the Management Unit who have spearheaded the preparation of ESMF. The framework and plans have been prepared adopting fully participatory processes involving all the relevant stakeholders. All the relevant documents have been disclosed both internally and externally.

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

A detailed and extensive mapping of the stakeholders has been done which enabled identifying direct and indirect stakeholders at different levels – national, state, district and village. Efforts have also been made to distinctly delineate and reach out to the poor and vulnerable sections such as scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, marginal/ landless laborers, and women. A number of consultations have been held with relevant stakeholders across all levels. A district level disclosure workshop was held at Araku Valley (a tribal/scheduled area) on 28th November 2017 to share and evince feedback on the draft ESMF. A state level workshop was held at Vijayawada on 21st December 2017 to share the final draft ESMF report with the public at large, and stakeholders in particular. Apart from these, three other regional disclosure workshops have also been held.

Key issues identified during consultations and addressed thus far include dominance by economically and socially better-off groups, high levels of vulnerability of scheduled tribes, inadequate representation of and participation by women, skewed composition and inadequate functioning and limited financial capacity, and inadequate capacity building of WUAs and their committees.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure	For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors
16-Mar-2018	18-Dec-2017	

"In country" Disclosure



India
16-Mar-2018

Comments

Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework

Date of receipt by the Bank

Date of submission for disclosure

28-Mar-2018

04-Apr-2018

"In country" Disclosure

India
28-Mar-2018

Comments

Pest Management Plan

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?

Date of receipt by the Bank

Date of submission for disclosure

Yes

28-Mar-2018

04-Apr-2018

"In country" Disclosure

India
28-Mar-2018

Comments

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 (to be filled in when the ISDS is finalized by the project decision meeting)

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?

No

If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?

No

OP 4.09 - Pest Management

Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?

Yes

Is a separate PMP required?

No

If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?

NA

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?

Yes

OP/BP 4.37 - Safety of Dams

Have dam safety plans been prepared?

Yes

Have the TORs as well as composition for the independent Panel of Experts (POE) been reviewed and approved by the Bank?

Yes



Has an Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) been prepared and arrangements been made for public awareness and training?

Yes

The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information

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

Yes

Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?

Yes

All Safeguard Policies

Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?

Yes

Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?

Yes

Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?

Yes

Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?

Yes

CONTACT POINT

World Bank

Ranjan Samantaray
Sr Agricultural Spec.

Kazuhiro Yoshida
Senior Irrigation and Drainage Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Department of Economic Affairs
Ms. Bandana Preyashi
Director



bandana.preyashi@gov.in

Implementing Agencies

Government of Andhra Pradesh
Mr. Shashi Bhushan Kumar
Secretary, Department of Water Resources
cs@ap.gov.in

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

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

APPROVAL

Task Team Leader(s):	Ranjan Samantaray Kazuhiro Yoshida
----------------------	---------------------------------------

Approved By

Safeguards Advisor:		
Practice Manager/Manager:	Chakib Jenane	03-Sep-2018
Country Director:	Hisham A. Abdo Kahin	10-Sep-2018