Reviewof DPRs

1. Navegaon to Pathkeda road

i. In section 1.3, there should a mention whether the road is located in a tribal habitation? If so, then as per the VF, where Scheduled Tribes represent over ten per cent of a participating village, the VF will require holding a free, prior and informed consultation with STs to seek their broad support for the project as required by OP 4.10.

ii. Section 2.1, "The project road is recently constructed as all-weather roads to gravel road standards under CMGSY after proper study / surveys of the alignment. No change in the alignment is required". **Kindly indicate when was this gravel road built?** Also since construction of the road was recently undertaken it should be possible to indicate how manyland owners donated the land, if any land was required in the first place.

iii. Section 2.3: Details on available ROW is confirmed by whom?

iv. **Screening format:** At least the screening report findings should be presented as per given format by World bank earlier, in February 2016

v. **Transect Walk Summary:**

- Section 2.1: Transect walk is fine, though any discussions with females (as shown in photo) could have been recorded as well.
- Overall number of participants (based on photos in main report and annexure) are quite low, though segregated figures are presented by gender and social group.
- **Were they given prior information about the meeting?**
- **Provide details on information about the project as informed to communities – format is provided in the ESMF (Annexure)**
- Did PIU officials also participate in the Transect Walk?
- Also give details on the type of information provided? Also was any permission sought for usage of other common resources, if required? If so, annex them.

vi. On provision of CD structures and field culverts, there is contradictory information. See

- Section 2.4 Page 7 &11;
- Section 2.1 (3), Page 20 and 25
- Section 10, 10.2, Page 54 (where tables are blank)
- Section 16.6, Page 67, --- here CD structures are provided

So are CD structures proposed or not proposed?

vii. Page 47, 8.15, Widening of pavement. Insert a clear statement that no additional land was required for improvement of curves if present ROW was found to be sufficient.

viii. Section 12

- 12.1 – This project is a new connectivity road – Is it earthen or existing CMGSY road?
- One clear statement is required on what is the existing land available or available ROW
- Table 12.1 – Remarks column not clear

ix. Page 71 talks of land availability certificate and details in table. But there is no table

x. Page 72 Summary of impacts table – also is blank. If there are no impacts, state as NIL

xi. Page 72, List of Trees – Are these trees identified along the road or are they impacted trees?

2. Jasraj to PipariyaRamwanroad

i. Which district is Satna or Sagar? It is possibly Sagar though different worksheets in the excel file indicate different names while there are two maps – Sagar and Guna.

ii. **Screening format:** At least the screening report findings should be presented as per given format by World bank earlier, in February 2016

iii. Details on available ROW is provided by whom or confirmed by whom?

iv. **Transect Walk Summary:**

- At present there is no description of transect walk and consultations in the report. An annexure is present that mentions issues, but it is not clear whether their acceptance of suggestion was conveyed back to the communities
- Transect Walk summary has to be included in the main report. Segregate the figure on number of participants (as given in the annexure) and present by gender and social group and present in the main section
- **Were they given prior information about the meeting? Provide details on information about the project as informed to communities – format is provided in the ESMF (Annexure)**
- Also give details on the type of information provided? Also was any permission sought for usage of other common resources, if required? If so, annex them.

v. On provision of CD structures and field culverts, there is contradictory information. While worksheet on Planning talks of provision of field channels, the same is not reflected in the transect walk and consultations annexure.

vi. Section 12
- It is not as per format provided by World Bank in February 2016
- One clear statement is required on what is the existing land available or available ROW

vii. FOLLOW OTHER ASPECTS AS PROVIDED IN THE FORMAT GIVEN BY WORLD BANK

3. Devri to Bicchiya road

i. In section 1.3, there should a mention whether the road is located in a tribal habitation? If so, then as per the VF, where Scheduled Tribes represent over ten per cent of a participating village, the VF will require holding a free, prior and informed consultation with STs to seek their broad support for the project as required by OP 4.10.

ii. Section 2.1, "The project road is recently constructed as all-weather roads to gravel road standards under CMGSY after proper study / surveys of the alignment. No change in the alignment is required". **Kindly indicate when was this gravel road built?** Also since construction of the road was recently undertaken it should be possible to indicate how many land owners donated the land, if any land was required in the first place.

iii. Section 2.3: Details on available ROW is provided by whom or confirmed by whom?

iv. **Screening format:** At least the screening report findings should be presented as per given format by World bank earlier, in February 2016

v. **Transect Walk Summary:**

- Section 2.1: Transect walk is fine, though any discussions with females (as shown in photo) could have been recorded as well.
- Overall number of participants (based on photos in main report and annexure) are quite low, though segregated figures are presented by gender and social group.
- **Were they given prior information about the meeting?**
- **Provide details on information about the project as informed to communities – format is provided in the ESMF (Annexure)**
- Did PIU officials also participate in the Transect Walk?
- Availability of ROW is different at different places in the report: 2.3 (Page 2) and in section 2.1 (2)
- Also give details on the type of information provided? Also was any permission sought for usage of other common resources, if required? If so, annex them.

vi. Checklist 2.3: Curve improvements if any should be included in this checklist

vii. On provision of CD structures and field culverts, there is contradictory information. See

- Section 2.7 Page 7;
- Section 2.1 (3), Page 20
- Section 10, 10.2, Page 50 (where tables are blank)
- Section 16.6, Page 67, --- here CD structures are provided

So are CD structures proposed or not proposed?

viii. Page 42, to minimize extra land arrangement gives the impression that some land is required to be taken. State clearly that **"extra land requirement has been avoided by ….."**

ix. Page 47, 8.15, Widening of pavement. Insert a clear statement that no additional land was required for improvement of curves as present ROW was found to be sufficient.

x. Section 12

- Again details on ROW varies. Consistency check required.
- 12.1 – This project is a new connectivity road – Is it earthen or existing CMGSY road?
- One clear statement is required on what is the existing land available or available ROW
- Table 12.1 – Remarks column not clear

xi. Page 68 talks of land availability certificate and details in table. But there is no table or certificate

xii. Page 69, List of Trees – Are these trees identified along the road or are they impacted trees?

4. AB Road to Sakonya

i. Which district is Guna or Sagar? Worksheets in the excel file indicate different names while there are two maps – Sagar and Guna, besides a write-up on Satna

ii. **Screening format:** At least the screening report findings should be presented as per given format by World bank earlier, in February 2016

iii. Details on available ROW is provided by whom or confirmed by whom?

iv. **Transect Walk Summary:Attached file seems to be a different road -- District Raisen (Chandoniganj to Bandoli road). Hence, not reviewed**

- Were they given prior information about the meeting?
- Provide details on information about the project as informed to communities – format is provided in the ESMF (Annexure)
- Did PIU officials also participate in the Transect Walk?
- Also give details on the type of information provided? Also was any permission sought for usage of other common resources, if required? If so, annex them.

v. Section 12
   - It is not as per format provided by World Bank in February 2016
   - One clear statement is required on
     - what is the existing land available or available ROW and
     - source of information through existing ROW

5. District Raisen (Chandoniganj to Bandoli road)

i. In section 1.3, there should a mention whether the road is located in a tribal habitation? If so, then as per the VF, where Scheduled Tribes represent over ten per cent of a participating village, the VF will require holding a free, prior and informed consultation with STs to seek their broad support for the project as required by OP 4.10.

ii. **Screening format:** At least the screening report findings should be presented as per given format by World bank earlier, in February 2016

iii. Details on available ROW is provided by whom or confirmed by whom?

iv. **Section 2.13:** site comments is blank

v. **Strip Plan is blank also**

vi. **Transect Walk Summary:**There is no detail of consultation and list of participants also is not provided. Same language

- Were they given prior information about the meeting?
- Provide details on information about the project as informed to communities – format is provided in the ESMF (Annexure)
- Did PIU officials also participate in the Transect Walk?
- Also give details on the type of information provided? Also was any permission sought for usage of other common resources, if required? If so, annex them

xiii. On provision of CD structures and field culverts, there is contradictory information. See

- Section 2.7 and section 10 on hydrological structures
- Section 16.6, Page 67, --- here CD structures are provided

So are CD structures proposed or not proposed? It is observed that the same statement is coming in every DPR but it is not clear either in the transect walk or in the mitigation or design measures.

vi. to minimize extra land arrangement gives the impression that some land is required to be taken. State clearly that **"extra land requirement has been avoided by ….."**

vii. Widening of pavement. Insert a clear statement that no additional land was required for improvement of curves as present ROW was found to be sufficient.

viii. Section 12 – is not provided at all. Please provide as per format given by World Bank in February 2016

6. Garoth- Bolya Road To Farnyakhedi

i. In section 1.3, there should a mention whether the road is located in a tribal habitation? If so, then as per the VF, where Scheduled Tribes represent over ten per cent of a participating village, the VF will require holding a free, prior and informed consultation with STs to seek their broad support for the project as required by OP 4.10.

ii. **Screening format:** At least the screening report findings should be presented as per given format by World bank earlier, in February 2016

iii. Details on available ROW is provided by whom or confirmed by whom? Indicate land availability clearly and if certificate was provided, then present the certificate in the annexure

iv. **Strip Plan is blank also**

v. **Transect Walk Summary:**Files on photos, minutes that are provided cannot be opened in present format. Please provide compatible format

- Were they given prior information about the meeting?
- Provide details on information about the project as informed to communities – format is provided in the ESMF (Annexure)
- Did PIU officials also participate in the Transect Walk?
- Also give details on the type of information provided? Also was any permission sought for usage of other common resources, if required? If so, annex them

xiv. On provision of CD structures and field culverts, there is contradictory information. See

- Section 2.7
- Section 16.6, here text says CD structures are provided but no figures are provided

So are CD structures proposed or not proposed? It is observed that the same statement is coming in every DPR but it is not clear whether any such requests have been accepted and provided for in design considerations.

ix. to minimize extra land arrangement gives the impression that some land is required to be taken. State clearly that **"extra land requirement has been avoided by ….."**

x. Widening of pavement. Insert a clear statement that **additional land was or was not required** for improvement of curves as present ROW was found to be sufficient/insufficient.

xi. Section 12 provided but not as per format given by World Bank in February 2016

7. Broada road to Sarpati Road

i. In section 1.3, there should a mention whether the road is located in a tribal habitation? If so, then as per the VF, where Scheduled Tribes represent over ten per cent of a participating village, the VF will require holding a free, prior and informed consultation with STs to seek their broad support for the project as required by OP 4.10.

ii. **Screening format:** At least the screening report findings should be presented as per given format by World bank earlier, in February 2016

iii. Details on available ROW is provided by whom or confirmed by whom? Indicate land availability clearly and if certificate was provided, then present the certificate in the annexure

iv. Strip plan or sketch indicating chainages is also provided

v. Transect Walk Summary: Files on photos and list of participants in transect walk are provided. No. of participants is also reasonably good. However, the minutes provided are not clear.
- Were they given prior information about the meeting?
- Provide details on information about the project as informed to communities – format is provided in the ESMF (Annexure)
- Did PIU officials also participate in the Transect Walk?
- Also give details on the type of information provided? Also was any permission sought for usage of other common resources, if required? If so, annex them

vi. Widening of pavement. Insert a clear statement that **additional land was or was not required** for improvement of curves as present ROW was found to be sufficient/insufficient.

vii. Section 12 provided but not as per format given by World Bank in February 2016

8. AshoknagarAmrahiKachar Road to Mudra

i. In section 1.3, there should a mention whether the road is located in a tribal habitation? If so, then as per the VF, where Scheduled Tribes represent over ten per cent of a participating village, the VF will require holding a free, prior and informed consultation with STs to seek their broad support for the project as required by OP 4.10.

ii. **Screening format:** At least the screening report findings should be presented as per given format by World bank earlier, in February 2016

iii. Details on available ROW is provided by whom or confirmed by whom? Indicate land availability clearly and if certificate was provided, then present the certificate in the annexure

iv. Strip plan or sketch indicating chainages isprovided

vi. Transect Walk Summary: Files on photos, minutes that are provided cannot be opened in present format. Please provide compatible format. Also

- Were they given prior information about the meeting?
- Provide details on information about the project as informed to communities – format is provided in the ESMF (Annexure)
- Did PIU officials also participate in the Transect Walk?
- Also give details on the type of information provided? Also was any permission sought for usage of other common resources, if required? If so, annex them

v. Widening of pavement. Insert a clear statement that **additional land was or was not required** for improvement of curves as present ROW was found to be sufficient/insufficient.

vi. Section 12 provided but not as per format given by World Bank in February 2016.