



OFFICE OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT (OPERATIONS 1)

28 April 2004

To : Mr. Stephen Sedgwick
Chair, Board Inspection Committee

From : Vice-President (Operations 1)

Subject : **Chashma Right Bank Irrigation Project (Stage III)**
– Response to Questions on the Final Report on Progress of the Grievance Redress Process

1. This refers to your memo dated 22 April 2004, through which you requested Management's responses to four questions on the Final Report on Progress of the Grievance Redress Process (the Final Report). Responses to each of these are provided below.

A. Question 1: Timeframe to Complete the Actions Agreed by the Government (described in paras. 21-30 of the Final Report).

2. ADB has and will continue to closely monitor the progress of these actions with the agencies concerned. ADB has been holding regular meetings with the Federal Government to follow up on the actions, including GRSC's recommendations. Such meetings were held on 9 February, 4 March, and 16/17 April 2004. The Government recently advised ADB that its target to complete compensation payments for land acquisition (paras. 21 and 22) is June 2004. In early April 2004, the Environment Management Unit under WAPDA's national Drainage Programme submitted a revised Environment Management Plan (EMP, paras. 24 and 25 of the Final Report) for internal approval in WAPDA, upon which implementation will follow. The EMP includes the irrigation management programme (paras. 26 and 27 of the Final Report) as one of the primary mitigatory measures. WAPDA also informed ADB that (i) the three cross drainage structures on the Indus Highway (para. 28 of the Final report) were completed in March 2004; (ii) a contract for extension of one of two incomplete flood carrier channels (para. 29 of the Final Report) was awarded recently and the other will be awarded in due course; and (iii) WAPDA's Central Design Office has conducted surveys and consultations with concerned villages in February-March 2004, and is finalizing the design for works to strengthen flood protection measures (para. 30 of the Final Report), as well as additional livelihood support facilities to be provided for the eight protected villages located to the west of the main canal. As discussed below, the Hill Torrent Management Plan (para. 23 of the Final Report) would be completed by mid-2006.

B. Question 2: Delayed Commencement of the Updated Feasibility Study on the Hill Torrent Management Plan

3. The Irrigation and Power Department of the Punjab Government (IPD-Punjab) has informed us as follows of the background:

- (i) Following approval of the PC-2 document in June 2003, IPD-Punjab started selection of consultants;
- (ii) IPD-Punjab proposed to recruit the consulting firm that worked on the original master plan and feasibility studies through the direct selection procedure;
- (iii) This arrangement required approval of the Chief Minister of the Province, which was obtained in September 2003;
- (iv) Contract negotiations with the firm continued until early February 2004, due to disagreement on the duration of the study - the consultant insisted that 10-month inputs are needed for the study as against the five-month period provided in the TOR; and
- (v) IPD-Punjab and the consultants finally agreed on the study period of eight months, to conclude by end-September 2004.

4. As mentioned in the Final Report, the updated feasibility study will be delivered in September 2004, and subsequently IPD-Punjab will start to prepare the PC-1 document to obtain Government approval for implementation of the plan. Upon receipt of the updated feasibility study report, ADB will field a mission to assess whether the plan can be financed from the project's loan savings. Preparation of a PC-1 and its approval within the Government usually require substantial time, at least three to four months. While an implementation plan is yet to be prepared under the study, it is tentatively estimated that the implementation period would be about one year, excluding time needed for setting up the project office and approval of procurement. Therefore, from completion of the updated feasibility study to completion of the work would take at least one and a half years.

C. Question 3: Comments on Mr. Gadi's E-mail of 22 March 2004

5. The description in our report is based entirely on what the Mission observed and discussed with concerned persons in the field. Prior to fielding the Mission, we received a fax from WAPDA, which explained the flood situation as follows:

“The maximum flood was observed during midnight on 20 and 21.08.03. The intensity of the flood was very high, however, it passed away safely along protection bund without causing any damage to built up property and crops. Since protection bund is an earthen one, its erosion on the inner face is a natural phenomena. In fact, local Govt. had constructed a road culvert on the Western side of Sokkan village (*sic*, should read “Sokkar”) which could not dispose off the flood water, resulting in leakage through protection bund. The local population attended the problem, subsequently rectification work was done by WAPDA machinery satisfactory”

6. The Mission visited the location on 12 October 2003, and noted that the eroded section of the bund, which had been repaired, could easily be identified and distinguished from other parts of the embankment that were not damaged (see Attachment 1). However, it was also clear that the bund in the village side had no sign of breakage. Therefore, we specifically stated “the protection bund was eroded (but not breached).” There is actually no substantial contradiction between our report and the grievance submitted by the Nazim of Sokkar Union Council, as

translated by Mr. Gadi.¹ The only difference lies in the use of the word “breach.” We reported that “the protection bund was eroded (but not breached)” in order to clarify that the dike was not cut or broken through. The word “breach” literally means “a broken, ruptured, or torn condition or area,” and would suggest that the embankment was cut by the flood. As WAPDA reported, there seemed to be leakage or overflow of water, which the Nazim expressed as “breach.” The key point of our argument was that there was no damage in Sokkar village due to the flood on 21 August 2003. The Nazim did not claim that there was damage to the village. We trust that the Inspection Panel was able to confirm this during its field visit.

7. One of the GRSC members has reported to us that: (i) the Nazim’s claim was received by fax on the night of 21 August 2003; (ii) immediately upon receipt of the fax, two GRSC members visited Sokkar village on 22 August 2003 (the Final Report inadvertently reported this date as 23 August), where they encountered WAPDA officials who were investigating the embankment; (iii) they all proceeded to the Nazim’s house and discussed the measures; and (iv) in addition to repair of the embankment, it was agreed that the narrow bridge of the district road should be expanded so that the embankment can work properly (see footnote 22 of the Final Report). It is worth mentioning that the hill torrent flood on 21 August 2003 was totally unrelated to the Project, and would have hit the village regardless of the existence of the Project. If there had been no Project (and hence, no protection bund), the village would have been damaged by the flood. The repaired embankment successfully protected the village during another flood on 27 August 2003. It may also be noted that the Nazim of Sokkar Union Council became a member of GRSC in September 2003, and ADB staff had an opportunity to discuss this matter with him on 11 October 2003, when a GRSC meeting was held.

D. Question 4: Comments on Mr. Gadi’s E-mail of 9 March 2004

8. We sent the consultant’s explanation about this claim to the Sr. Inspection Specialist, OSEC on 23 March 2004, for transmittal to the Board Inspection Committee (BIC) and the Inspection Panel (Attachment 2), as Mr. Gadi’s e-mail was also addressed to Chair, BIC and Panel members. The same explanation was also sent on 24 March 2004 to Mr. Gadi and other addressees of his e-mail. Mr. Zaidi, the consultant, assured that he did not in any way force or coerce villagers to accept any specific opinions or measures. Only at the request of the villagers, who could not themselves write in Urdu, did Mr. Zaidi agree to write a memorandum to record their opinions. With the information provided in Attachment 2, we consider that Mr. Gadi’s claim does not reflect the facts about Mr. Zaidi’s method of consultation with Katehra villagers.

9. We hope the above responses adequately answer your questions.

cc: Members, Board Inspection Committee
 Director General, SARD
 Deputy Director General, SARD
 Director, SAAE
 H. Wej; T. Matsuo

¹ We note that we have not seen the complaint filed by the Sokkar Nazim. This complaint was submitted to GRSC in Urdu. However, for the purpose of this response, we will accept the translation provided by Mr. Gadi.