

Stakeholder Engagement Plan

Resilience, Early Action, and Disaster Readiness for Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (READY-KP)

Irrigation Department of The Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (GOKP) & The Relief,
Rehabilitation & Settlement Department Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
(P512715)

January, 2026

Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)

Table of Content

1. Introduction/Project Description	2
2. Objective/Description of SEP	3
3. Stakeholder identification and analysis per project component	5
3.1 Methodology	5
3.2 AFFECTED PARTIES.....	5
3.3 OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES	6
3.4 DISADVANTAGED / VULNERABLE INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS	7
4. Stakeholder Engagement Program.....	9
4.1. Summary of stakeholder engagement done during project preparation.....	9
4.2. Summary of project stakeholder needs and methods, tools and techniques for stakeholder engagement.....	17
4.3 Proposed strategy to incorporate the views of vulnerable groups	22
5. Resources and Responsibilities for implementing stakeholder engagement	23
5.1 Implementation Arrangements and Resources.....	23
6. Grievance Mechanism afterwards.....	25
6.1 Description of Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)	25
6.2 GRM Implementation Structure	25
6.3 Grievance Uptake Channels	26
6.4 Process Flow & Structure	27
7. Monitoring and Reporting.....	29
7.1 Summary of How SEP will be Monitored and Reported Upon	29
7.2 Reporting back to Stakeholder Groups	29
Annex 1. READY-KP – Preparation Stage SEP Consultation Checklist	32

1. Project Description

Pakistan's high vulnerability to climate change is a major risk multiplier, placing it among the top 10 most affected countries globally and among the top 4 exposed to recurring extreme events over the past 30 years. Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) is particularly vulnerable to riverine floods, flash floods, and GLOFs due to climate change, deforestation, land degradation, and dense settlements in hazard-prone areas. Major flood events in 2010, 2016, 2022, and 2025 caused extensive loss of life and damage to infrastructure and livelihoods, with damages exceeding US\$1.5 billion in 2022 and 484 fatalities reported during the 2025 monsoon floods. KP's mountainous geography and concentration of communities along the Kabul, Swat, and Indus river systems increase exposure to floods, landslides, and GLOFs. Over 3,000 glacial lakes have formed due to rapid glacial melt, and 25 of the province's 35 districts face high or medium flood risk. Despite strong policy commitments, disaster risk management capacities remain limited due to institutional resource and coordination constraints, disproportionately affecting vulnerable groups. The project aims to strengthen flood and disaster resilience through targeted infrastructure investments, early warning systems, and institutional capacity building, reducing flood risks, improving catchment management, and enhancing preparedness and response.

Project Development Objective: To improve flood resilience in selected areas of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

Project Components: The proposed Project has five components¹; the brief description of each component is given below:

Component 1 - Improving Infrastructure and Planning for Resilience: This component will support the design and construction of priority infrastructure investments aimed at reducing the province's exposure to climate change-exacerbated floods including riverine floods; increased flash flooding due to changing monsoon patterns; and GLOFs from accelerated glacial melt. The component includes both grey and green solutions for flood protection and will be implemented by the KP Irrigation Department, with technical support provided through a dedicated TA subcomponent. Technical assistance will also pave the way for future engagements and investments.

Component 2 – Establish Flood Early Warning System: This component will support the establishment and operationalization of an integrated Flood Early Warning System (FEWS) for KP, managed through collaboration between KP PDMA and the KP Irrigation Department. The FEWS will link hydromet observations, forecasting and modeling, decision support systems, and standardized alert dissemination to enable timely and coordinated preparedness and response to climate-exacerbated flood events.

Component 3 – Strengthening Institutional and Community Preparedness: This component will enhance the capacity of provincial institutions and local communities in KP to prepare for and

¹ *Project Appraisal Document, October, 2025*

respond to climate-induced multi-hazard disasters, with a particular focus on floods. It will strengthen the operational outreach and institutional capabilities of the Provincial Disaster Management Authority (PDMA) and Rescue 1122, improving the application of risk information in development planning and building community-level resilience. The component complements the infrastructure-focused and FEWS investments under Components 1 and 2 and is designed to ensure that both institutional systems and social preparedness mechanisms are adequately equipped to manage and mitigate disaster risks.

Component 4 – Project Management: This component will support the Project Implementing Units and operations of the KP ID and KP RRSD. It will cover project management, procurement, contract management, financial management, M&E (including project reporting, baseline studies, and financial, technical, environmental, and social audits), as well as oversight of social, environmental, and inclusion standards.

Component 5 – Contingent Emergency Response: This component will provide immediate response to an Eligible Crisis or Emergency, as needed. Following an adverse natural event that causes a major disaster or emergency, the government may request the Bank to re-allocate project funds to support response and reconstruction. Resources will be allocated to this component as needed during implementation.

Project Beneficiaries

The direct beneficiaries of flood protection infrastructure investments are estimated to be approximately 2.5 million people in selected districts vulnerable to riverine, flash, and glacial outburst flooding. The project components on telemetry and flood forecasting and emergency preparedness and response will indirectly benefit the province through the improved disaster risk management capacities of the GoKP. Communities will also benefit from better last-mile delivery of early warnings and improved rescue services.

Project Location

The project interventions are planned in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) province of Pakistan, covering both rural and peri-urban areas, however the exact districts and location of interventions will be finalized following Project appraisal.

The Resilience, Early Action, and Disaster Readiness for Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (READY-KP) Project is being prepared under the World Bank's Environment and Social Framework (ESF).

2. Objective/Description of SEP

READY-KP has been prepared under the World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework (ESF). Through the Environmental and Social Standard 10 (Stakeholder Engagement and Information Disclosure), the ESF requires the timely, relevant, understandable, and accessible disclosure of project information in a way that is free of manipulation, interference, coercion, discrimination, and intimidation.

ESS10 recognizes the importance of open and transparent engagement between the Borrower and project stakeholders as an essential element of good international practice. Effective

stakeholder engagement can improve the environmental and social sustainability of projects, enhance project acceptance, and make a significant contribution to successful project design and implementation.

Stakeholder engagement is an inclusive process conducted throughout the project lifecycle. When properly designed and implemented, it supports the development of strong, constructive, and responsive relationships that are important for successful management of a project's environmental and social risks.

This Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) aims to provide guidance on stakeholder engagement by defining approaches for public consultation and information disclosure through the project lifecycle. It outlines the ways in which the project team will communicate with stakeholders, and includes a mechanism by which stakeholders can raise concerns, provide feedback, and make grievances related to project activities. The SEP specifically emphasizes methods to engage groups considered most vulnerable and that are at risk of being left out of project benefits. It does this by:

- Establishing a systematic approach to stakeholder engagement that will help Borrowers identify stakeholders and build a constructive relationship with them, particularly with project affected parties (APs).
- Assessing the level of stakeholder interest and support for the project, and to enable stakeholder views to be taken into account in project design and environment and social performance.
- Promoting and providing means for effective, inclusive engagement with project APs throughout the project lifecycle.
- Ensuring that appropriate project information on environmental and social risks and impacts is disclosed to stakeholders in a timely, understandable, accessible, and appropriate manner.

The environment risk rating of the project is substantial and social risk rating is assessed as substantial, giving an overall project E&S risk classification of Substantial. The environmental risks are mainly associated with the construction of flood mitigation and resilience building infrastructure, such as check dams, reinforcing flood embankments, and repairing floodwater drains. Risks include pollution and nuisance (dust, noise, visual degradation of landscapes, debris), solid waste generation, and potential ground/surface water contamination where interventions are close to water streams, alongside Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) risks particularly due to mountainous and riverine terrain. Social risks are mainly associated with land acquisition for flood protection interventions which may lead to potential physical or economic displacement, impacting livelihoods and potentially creating social tensions. Additional risks include the potential inequitable distribution of benefits due to intra-district disparities, social exclusion of vulnerable groups (such as women and religious minorities) from disaster preparedness and early warning systems, and Community Health and Safety (CHS) risks associated with construction activities.

3. Stakeholder identification and analysis per project component

3.1 Methodology

The following stakeholders have been identified and analyzed per project component. These stakeholders include affected parties (as defined in section 3.2), other interested parties (as defined in section 3.3) and disadvantaged/vulnerable individuals or groups (as defined in section 3.4).

3.2 Affected Parties (APs)

Groups, individuals, and entities directly affected by the Project’s activities, especially flood protection infrastructure (embankments, spurs, gabions, check dams), afforestation, early warning systems, and community-based disaster preparedness.

Table 1: List of Affected Parties

Sector	Stakeholders	Project Component
Government / Institutional	KP Irrigation Department	Component 1, 2, 4
	Relief, Rehabilitation & Settlement Department (RRSD)	Components 2, 3, 4
	Provincial Disaster Management Authority (PDMA)	Component 2, 3
	Rescue 1122 (Provincial & District Stations)	Component 2, 3
	KP Climate Change, Forestry, Environment & Wildlife Department	Component 1
	Planning & Development Department (P&DD)	Components 1, 4
	Communication & Works (C&W) Department	Component 1
	Board of Revenue (BoR)	Component 1
	Department of Agriculture (Extension & Research)	Component 1
	Livestock & Dairy Development Department	Component 1
	Public Health Engineering Department	Component 1
	Local Government & Rural Development Department (LGRD)	Component 2, 3
	District Disaster Management Authorities (DDMAs)	Component 2, 3
	KP Rural Investment and Institutional Support Project (KP-RIISP)	Component 1
	Emergency Flood Assistance Project – Khyber Pakhtunkhwa	Component 1
Regional Meteorological Center (RMC) Peshawar	Component 1	

	Pakistan Council of Research in Water Resources (PCRWR)	Component 1
Community Stakeholders	Riverbank & Orchard Farmers	All components
	Tenant and Sharecropper Farmers	All components
	Livestock Keepers	All components
	Fisherfolk	All components
	Nursery Owners / Forest Cooperatives	All components
	Women's Groups / Rural Cooperatives	All components
	Village Jirgas & Elders and decision makers	All components
	Community-based Disaster Risk Management Groups	Component 2, 3
	Local Laborers (Skilled/Unskilled)	Component 1
	Teachers / Students / Health Workers	All components
	Religious Leaders / Mosque Committees	Component 2, 3
	Local Traders / Shopkeepers / Vendors	All components
Private Sector	Local Contractors / Material Suppliers	Component 1
	Telecom Operators (Jazz, Zong, Ufone, PTCL)	Component 2, 3
	Transporters & Goods Carriers	Component 1
	Media Outlets (FM, Local TV, Print)	Components 2, 3
	Microfinance Institutions (SRSP, NRSP, Akhuwat)	Component 2, 3
	Timber & Forestry Cooperatives	Component 1
	ICT & Data Firms	Component 1

3.3. Other Interested Parties (OIPs)

Groups or institutions not directly affected but having regulatory, policy, financial, or advocacy roles that can influence the project's design or success.

Table 2: List of Other Interested Parties

Sector	Stakeholders	Project Component
	National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA)	All components

Government / Institutional	Ministry of Climate Change & Environmental Coordination (MoCC)	All components
	KP Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	All components
	KP Provincial Assembly Committees on Environment, Planning	All components
	Deputy Commissioners / District Administration	All components
	KP Police / Frontier Corps / Civil Defence	All components
	Information & Public Relations Department	Components 2, 3
	Forest Department and Forest Development Corporation	Component 1
	Pakistan Forest Institute	Component 1
	Academia(Public): University of Peshawar, IMSciences, UET Peshawar	Component 1
	Directorate of Archaeology and Museums (KP)	Component 1
Civil Society & Development Partners	SRSP, HANDS, PRCS, RSPN, NRSP	Components 2, 3
	Mercy Corps, CARE, UNDP, UNICEF	Components 2, 3
	Research Institutes: SUPARCO, PMD, GLOF-II Program	Component 2, 3
	Faith-Based Organizations: Auqaf Dept, Wafa ul Madaris	All components
	Donors: World Bank, ADB, GIZ, FAO	All components
	WWF-Pakistan and IUCN Pakistan	Component 1
Private Sector	Engineering and Environmental Consulting Firms	Component 1
	Contractors' Associations (KP Builders Forum)	Component 1
	Banks & Financial Institutions (ZTBL, BoK, NRSP)	Components 2, 3
	Crop and flood insurance providers	Components 2, 3
	Media Houses & Chambers of Commerce	Components 2, 3
	Contractors Implementing Flood Protection and NbS Works	Component 1

4.1. Disadvantaged / Vulnerable Individuals and Groups

Disadvantaged or vulnerable individuals or groups are those who may be disproportionately impacted or further disadvantaged by the project due to their vulnerable status and often lack the voice to express their concerns. Their vulnerability may stem from gender, age, disability, economic deficiency, or dependence on natural resources. Engagement with these groups requires specific measures to ensure their equal representation in decision-making and full understanding of project activities.

Within the proposed Project, the vulnerable or disadvantaged groups may include, but are not limited to, the following:

Table 3 List of Disadvantaged/Vulnerable Individuals and Groups

Sector	Stakeholders / Groups	Project Component
Community-Based Groups	Women & Female-Headed Households	All components
	Persons with Disabilities	All components
	Poor & Landless Households	All components
	Indigenous Communities (Kalash – Chitral)	All components
	Religious Minorities (Christian, Hindu, Sikh)	All components
	Elderly & Widows	All components
	Youth (Unemployed, Students)	All components
	Children (Students in Flood Zones)	All components
	Illiterate Populations	All components
	IDPs / Migrants	All components
Livelihood-Based Groups	Tenant / Sharecropper Farmers	All components
	Daily Wage Laborers	Component 1
	Home-Based Women Workers	All components
	Small Fisherfolk	All components
	Women Nursery Workers	All components
	Informal Vendors / Hawkers	All components

Disadvantaged and vulnerable groups in READY-KP may face barriers such as such as exclusion from receiving project benefits due to elite capture, particularly where local power dynamics influence relief distribution and decision-making, exclusion from disaster preparedness mechanisms, limited access to rescue infrastructure, and communication gaps hindering their

ability to receive early warnings. Women, often confined to household roles due to cultural norms (*Purdah*), may experience poor mobility, restricting their participation in external engagements and access to male-dominated grievance channels. Consultations revealed that women are disproportionately affected by the loss of household assets (e.g., dowry items) and face severe psychosocial stress during floods.

Similarly, the elderly and Persons with Disabilities (PWDs) are often left behind or stranded on rooftops during rapid onset floods due to a lack of specialized rescue equipment. Furthermore, prevalent illiteracy can impede the comprehension of SMS-based early warnings, necessitating alternative communication methods like voice notes or loudspeakers. These challenges necessitate tailored approaches to stakeholder engagement and information dissemination.

Engagement with IPs requires a tailored approach that goes beyond standard public consultation to respect their unique cultural identities, governance structures, and customary land rights. Key issues to be addressed include potential language barriers, culturally appropriate communication, and the protection of traditional decision making processes. To ensure meaningful participation, the project will implement a Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) process for activities implemented in areas where IPs reside.

Vulnerable groups within the communities affected by the project will be further confirmed and consulted through dedicated means, as appropriate. Description of the methods of engagement that will be undertaken by the project is provided in the following sections.

4. Stakeholder Engagement Program

4.1. Summary of stakeholder engagement done during project preparation

During the preparation phase, the project team conducted extensive Institutional and Community Consultations across three high-risk districts: Peshawar, Nowshera, and Charsadda. Visits to 9 specific flood-prone villages/locations involved Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with approximately 300 residents, including 97 women, specifically to validate technical designs, assess ground-level vulnerabilities, and understand historical local response mechanisms. Vulnerable and disadvantaged groups were prioritized, including households living on riverbanks, residents near overflowing drains, women, economically disadvantaged, people with disability and families displaced by the 2010 and 2022 floods.

Institutional consultations involved various government authorities such as the Provincial Disaster Management Authority (PDMA), Irrigation Department (PIU, XENS, SDOs), Communication and Works (C&W) Department, Public Health Engineering Department, Rescue 1122 and Civil societies. The team also engaged with District Administrations, Tehsil Municipal Administrations (TMAs), the Social Welfare Department, and the Police Department to assess emergency response capacities.

Table 4: Summary of Stakeholder Engagement During Project Preparation: Institutional Consultations

District	Date	Audience / Participants
Peshawar	December 12, 2025	District Level: Representatives from PDMA, Irrigation Department, C&W Department, Agriculture Department, Rescue 1122, Irrigation Department, WWF , Local government, PTA, PCRWR, Planning and Development Department, TMA, Code for Pakistan
Nowshera	December 10, 2025	District Level: Irrigation department, agriculture extension, Rural development, Social Welfare Department, Mines and Minerals, C&W, Soil and water, SRSP, Labour Department, ADC, On Farm water management.
Charsadda	December 9, 2025	District Level: Irrigation Department, Agriculture extension district, Rescue1122, Deputy Commissioner Office, district administration, Revenue Department, C&W Department

Table 5: Summary of Stakeholder Engagement during Project Preparation: Community Consultations

District	Date	Venue / Village	FGDs (Male/Female)	Participants (F)	Participants (M)
Charsadda	Nov 11, 2025	Shakoor Village (Tehsil Tangi)	2	14	16
Charsadda	Nov 11, 2025	Haji Abad Village (Tehsil Umerzai)	2	10	30
Charsadda	Nov 11, 2025	Kashmir Khan Village (Tehsil Nisata)	2	7	32
Peshawar	Dec 3, 2025	Pyari Payian (Tehsil Mathra)	2	22	10
Nowshera	Dec 3, 2025	Camp Korono (Tehsil Pabbi)	2	12	18
Nowshera	Dec 4, 2025	Banda Sheikh Ismail (Tehsil Pabbi)	2	12	32
Nowshera	Dec 4, 2025	Pashtoon Gharai (Rahim Abad)	2	9	29
Nowshera	Dec 4, 2025	Azakheil Bala (Tehsil Nowshera)	2	6	12

Nowshera	Dec 4, 2025	Gujar Basti, Amangar (Tehsil Nowshera)	2	5	20
-----------------	----------------	--	---	---	----

4.1.1. Key Findings from Institutional Consultations

C. Consultation Session: Peshawar (Provincial Level):

The consultation in Peshawar was a strategic dialogue involving different government departments. Participants reviewed historical disaster patterns, noting that the floods of 2010, 2022, and 2025 caused massive devastation to the Peshawar Valley’s agriculture and infrastructure. While the immediate response has often been community-led (self-help), government agencies like PDMA and Rescue 1122 utilized boats and helicopters for evacuations. However, significant operational weaknesses were flagged, including the non-functionality of dewatering pumps during emergencies, a lack of weather radars and river gauge stations, and the absence of backup satellite communication when cellular networks fail.

- I. **Institutional Coordination and Data Systems:** Stakeholders highlighted that current coordination often relies on informal WhatsApp groups, leading to confusion when multiple agencies respond simultaneously. There was a strong consensus on the need for a Centralized Decision Support System. Participants recommended developing a unified digital dashboard at PDMA that integrates real-time hydrological data (Irrigation Dept), weather forecasts (Met Dept), and Safe City camera feeds to monitor flood levels. It was also proposed that Incident Command Centers be established to formalize inter-departmental workflows.
- II. **Digital Preparedness and Early Warning Systems (EWS):** Current EWS relies heavily on mosque announcements, which has limited reach in remote mountainous areas. Stakeholders proposed modernizing this by developing mobile apps in local languages, installing digital sirens, and using animated awareness videos. It was emphasized that PDMA should digitize its control rooms and introduce toll-free numbers, while addressing connectivity blind spots in the northern districts. Representatives from PTA recommended collaborating with the Universal Service Fund (USF) to install resilient USF cell towers in flood-affected zones, ensuring that connectivity remains accessible for emergency communications even when private sector signals fail.
- III. **Community Engagement and Social Inclusion:** The forum stressed that communities are the first responders but lack structure. Recommendations included notifying Village Disaster Management Committees (VDMCs) and integrating disaster preparedness into school curricula. It was strongly recommended that Early Warning and Rescue trainings be extended to local Police (Thana level), Religious Leaders (Molvis), and School Teachers, as they are often the most relevant and accessible first responders during the critical initial hours of a disaster. A critical discussion point was Gender and Vulnerability; participants noted that cultural norms often prevent women from accessing relief. The project was urged to involve female activists and

social mobilizers to reach women in *Purdah* and ensuring that evacuation centers have separate, private spaces for women and children.

- IV. **Capacity Building and Sustainability:** There is a need for advanced equipment, specifically drones for surveillance, boats, life jackets, and first aid kits. Stakeholders also raised the issue of Build-Neglect-Rebuild, pointing out that donor-funded infrastructure often fails due to a lack of maintenance funds. The project was advised to include a dedicated Operations & Maintenance (O&M) component or endowment fund. Additionally, strictly enforcing the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa River Protection Ordinance 2002 to remove encroachments and encouraging afforestation along riverbanks were identified as key sustainability measures. Capacity building for government officials and volunteers, with emphasis on technical skills and disaster management knowledge were highly suggested by government representatives.
- V. **Citizen Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM):** For handling complaints, the consultation revealed a community preference for Khuli Kachehris (Open Courts) and direct access via toll-free numbers (specifically the 1700 Helpline). It was recommended that the GRM must ensure anonymity to protect complainants and should be widely publicized through banners and social media. The role of the Media was also highlighted, with suggestions to train journalists on responsible disaster reporting to prevent panic.

D. Consultation Session: Nowshera (District Level):

The institutional consultation in Nowshera served as a critical multi-stakeholder forum attended by several government departments and community Representatives. The discussion focused on Nowshera's critical vulnerability due to the backwater effects of the Indus River slowing down the Kabul River, and the increasing unpredictability of seasons due to climate change.

- I. **Historical Context and Response Evolution:** Stakeholders drew sharp comparisons between the 2010 super flood and recent events to highlight the evolution of local response. It was noted that in 2010, lack of preparedness led to the destruction of critical infrastructure, including wheat stocks at Pirpai and Azakhel. Conversely, in 2022 and 2023, timely mobilization by the District Administration reduced human casualties. However, participants emphasized that the current response remains reactive, with evacuation efforts often becoming chaotic due to the lack of pre-designated safe zones for livestock and assets.
- II. **Early Warning Systems and Digital Innovation:** Participants engaged in a detailed discussion on making early warning mechanisms more accessible to ensure alerts effectively reach the grassroots level. There was a strong consensus on establishing hierarchical WhatsApp communities, connecting the District Administration directly with Union Councils and Village Elders to ensure official alerts are disseminated instantly without distortion. A major challenge identified was the proliferation of fake news on social media causing panic; to counter this, it was agreed that all digital alerts must be authenticated by the Deputy Commissioner's office or should be through dedicated mobile application by the government. Recognizing digital limitations,

stakeholders mandated the installation of physical sirens and hooters in high-risk zones for immediate mass evacuation, reinforcing the traditional use of mosque loudspeakers.

- III. **River Morphology and Infrastructure Needs:** Technical discussions revealed that the Kabul River's carrying capacity has been drastically reduced due to heavy siltation. The Irrigation Department and community issued a unanimous demand for extensive dredging and de-silting alongside the construction of reinforced concrete or gabion walls, noting that simple earthen embankments have repeatedly failed. Simultaneously, the TMA highlighted urban flooding risks where internal sewerage lines suffer from backflow when river levels rise. To address this, the project was requested to provide heavy-duty de-watering pumps and non-return valves, while considering upper catchment interventions like small ponds to attenuate flood peaks.
- IV. **Operational Challenges and Evacuation:** Rescue 1122 highlighted a critical resource gap, specifically the shortage of boats, diving suits, and oxygen cylinders, which compromises rescue operations. A recurring behavioral challenge is the refusal of families to evacuate without their livestock. The consultation recommended designating large Assembly Areas capable of housing animals to encourage timely evacuation. Furthermore, to address the fear of theft in evacuated neighborhoods, the Police Department was requested to deploy patrols to protect assets, thereby encouraging residents to move to safety sooner.
- V. **Community Engagement and Gender Inclusion:** To overcome cultural barriers preventing women from accessing disaster training, the forum proposed engaging Lady Health Workers (LHWs) and female polio workers to conduct preparedness sessions inside homes, while using girls' schools and colleges as culturally acceptable venues. Recognizing economic pressures, stakeholders advised providing incentives for daily wage earners to attend these trainings. It was also noted that traditional door-to-door awareness is insufficient, necessitating structured school-based evacuation drills.
- VI. **Sustainability and Institutional Coordination:** Regarding long-term sustainability, the District Administration advocated for a soft approach to encroachment removal through dialogue and compensation rather than forced evictions. The session concluded with a recommendation to break institutional silos by establishing a Central Control Room at the district level and forming Village Disaster Risk Management (VDRM) Committees at tehsil level to monitor the maintenance of flood protection infrastructure post-completion.

E. Consultation Session: Charsadda (District Level):

The consultation in Charsadda was a strategic dialogue involving a diverse range of stakeholders. The discussion was heavily influenced by Charsadda's unique geographic position at the confluence of the Swat and Kabul Rivers (Jindai Point), making it highly susceptible to complex flooding dynamics involving backwater effects and flash floods. Participants reviewed historical disaster patterns, noting that while the 2010 flood caused widespread devastation due to a lack of preparedness, the response in 2022 was

significantly better due to timely alerts and organized evacuations. However, significant operational weaknesses were flagged, including a shortage of heavy machinery (boats, de-watering pumps) and the challenge of convincing communities to evacuate their homes and livestock in time.

- I. **Critical Risk Zones and Infrastructure Needs:** Stakeholders identified the Jindai Point (the junction of Swat and Kabul rivers) as the most critical high-risk zone. The backwater effect, where the Indus slows the Kabul, and the Kabul slows the Swat causes water to pile up, inundating surrounding villages. There was a strong consensus on the need for specialized engineering interventions here, specifically raising flood protection walls at the Munda Headworks and constructing reinforced embankments along the Swat River.
- II. **Digital Preparedness and Early Warning (EWS):** Current EWS relies on a mix of modern and traditional methods. The Irrigation Department and District Administration successfully utilized WhatsApp groups and official social media pages in 2022 to disseminate alerts, supplemented by mosque loudspeakers for last-mile connectivity. However, a major challenge identified was misinformation on social media, which creates confusion and skepticism among the public. Stakeholders proposed that all digital alerts must be authenticated by the District Administration to maintain credibility. Additionally, despite warnings, many residents delay evacuation; thus, more aggressive forceful evacuation protocols and designated safe assembly areas for livestock were suggested.
- III. **Community Engagement and Social Inclusion:** The forum stressed that while communities are the first responders, their capacity is limited by poverty and a lack of resources. A critical discussion point was Gender and Vulnerability; cultural constraints in Charsadda often prevent women from participating in public disaster trainings. To address this, stakeholders recommended engaging Lady Health Workers (LHWs) and female teachers to conduct digital preparedness sessions inside homes or at girls' schools or through animated videos and digital tools. It was also noted that community volunteers (especially youth) are active but lack incentives; the project was urged to provide safety equipment, transport, and refreshments to sustain volunteer motivation.
- IV. **Capacity Building and Sustainability:** There is an acute need for institutionalizing resilience. Stakeholders raised the issue of sustainability, noting that local bodies and community committees must take ownership of flood protection infrastructure to ensure its maintenance. The Soil Conservation Officer emphasized that without community-led maintenance, infrastructure degrades quickly. The consultation recommended forming Village Disaster Management Committees (VDMCs) to act as the custodians of these assets. Furthermore, capacity building for Rescue 1122 was requested, specifically regarding the procurement of advanced rescue equipment like amphibious boats to navigate the complex river currents of the district and the IT skills for digital early warning systems.
- V. **Citizen Feedback and Grievance Redress (GRM):** For handling complaints, the consultation revealed that communities currently use platforms like the Ikhtiyar

Awam portal and Open Kachehris (Open Courts). However, stakeholders recommended establishing a project-specific grievance mechanism that is integrated with these existing systems. It was suggested that the Irrigation Department should share regular progress updates on social media and use WhatsApp-based feedback loops to allow communities to report quality issues or grievances in real-time. Transparency initiatives such as Social Audits were also proposed to ensure accountability at the local level.

4.1.2. Key Findings from Community Consultations

The following findings summarize the feedback received directly from flood-affected communities. Special emphasis has been placed on the Female Consultations to highlight the disproportionate impact of floods on women and children.

A. District Charsadda

- I. **Infrastructure Failure and Technical Gaps:** Consultations in Charsadda focused on communities living along major drains and the Kabul River confluence. In the villages of Kashmir Khan (Nisata) and Shakoor (Tangi), the primary concerns revolved around infrastructure failure and public health. Residents identified the Hisara Drain as a critical hazard, due to backflow from the Kabul River, the drain frequently overflows, submerging an area with a population of over 100,000. Communities explicitly demanded the concrete lining and deepening of the drain, alongside a protection wall along the Kabul River from the Motorway Bridge to Pashton Gharai.
- II. **Abazai Canal Seepage:** Farmers reported that the unlined Abazai Canal causes severe seepage, damaging the foundations of adjacent houses and waterlogging agricultural land. They requested canal lining and the construction of patrol roads to improve market access.
- III. **Lack of Early Warning:** While alerts exist for major rivers, communities noted a complete lack of warning for flash floods in the drains (Hisara/Shobla), leaving them vulnerable to sudden inundation.
- IV. **Psychosocial Distress:** Women expressed deep emotional trauma, stating they do not enjoy Eid or festivals because their lives are consumed by the fear of rain floods. The uncertainty of the next flood has created a state of permanent anxiety.
- V. **Economic Loss (Dowry):** A specific economic shock raised by women was the loss of Sanduqs (Trunks) containing dowry items collected for their daughters' marriages. These assets take years to accumulate and are often the first to be destroyed by floodwaters, pushing families into severe economic regression.
- VI. **Evacuation Barriers:** Women reported being stuck on rooftops (*Chat*) for days during floods due to a lack of boats or transport. Cultural restrictions often delay their evacuation until the situation becomes life-threatening.

- VII. **Health and Hygiene:** Due to the lack of clean water, women are forced to use polluted drain water for washing clothes. This has resulted in high incidences of Hepatitis C and Dengue among women and children.
- VIII. **Digital Exclusion and GRM:** Women reported significant digital barriers, noting they are not allowed to complain to government systems and lack internet access.

B. District Nowshera

- I. **Urban flooding:** In Gujar Basti, the community reported that the Nalla is clogged with dense sediment and animal waste. When the Kabul River rises, water backflows into the Nalla, flooding the village. They proposed installing a gate at the outfall and constructing a paved road along the banks.
- II. **Economic Loss (Crop Destruction):** Residents in Camp Korono stated that floods from June to August destroy their standing crops every year. Although their land is fertile for fruits and vegetables, the recurring floods from the Ghari Momin drain and Bara River make cultivation risky. They also highlighted that floods frequently disrupt electricity, plunging the village into darkness during emergencies.
- III. **Encroachment on Drains:** A critical finding in the Labour Colony Drain area was that the entire drain is heavily encroached upon. The community acknowledged this but requested a sensitive approach to rehabilitation that avoids rendering them homeless.
- IV. **Public Health:** Women highlighted that after floods, the stagnation of water leads to immediate outbreaks of allergies, flu, UTIs and Hepatitis among children and young girls. They requested that the project include health camps or sanitation kits as part of the response.
- V. **Trainings and Preparedness:** Women expressed a desire to participate in disaster preparedness trainings but noted that cultural norms (*Purdah*) prevent them from attending sessions led by men. They specifically requested that Lady Health Workers (LHWs) or female teachers be used to conduct training inside villages or at girls' schools.
- VI. **Priority Evacuation:** Women noted that while they try to evacuate children and the disabled first, they are often hindered by the need to secure livestock, which is a primary source of household income/nutrition.

C. District Peshawar

The community in Pyari Payian (Tehsil Mathra) presented unique challenges related to the Naguman River system and emergency response.

- I. **Water Management:** The community presented a dual challenge. During winter, there is zero water flow in the civil canals (*Kattas*), making it impossible to irrigate wheat crops. Conversely, during the monsoon, the Naguman and Adizai Rivers overflow, causing destruction. The community proposed a balanced engineering solution like constructing a

feeder canal to ensure winter irrigation and gabion walls to protect against summer floods. They also requested the installation of gates on the Naguman River side to regulate flow.

- II. **Emergency Response:** While Rescue 1122 is responsive, communities noted that the nearest rescue focal point is quiet away from their villages. They requested the establishment of a Rescue 1122 point at the center of the five villages to ensure quicker response times.
- III. **Gender Equity and Safety:** Women raised concerns regarding equity in relief distribution, noting that male household heads typically collect supplies, often overlooking women's specific needs (hygiene kits, medicines). They also urged strict monitoring of contractors, noting that construction debris and open pits near homes pose a severe safety risk to children playing in the area.
- IV. **Digital Access and Grievances:** Digital Access and Grievance Redress (GRM): Women reported a complete lack of awareness regarding any grievance mechanisms. They emphasized that due to strict cultural mobility restrictions (*Purdah*), they are unable to visit government offices to file complaints physically. Furthermore, they stated they would only be willing to utilize a system if anonymity is strictly guaranteed. To address these barriers, they recommended identifying female community activists as focal points to collect grievances directly from households or establishing accessible digital/phone-based channels that allow them to lodge complaints safely from home.

4.2. Summary of project stakeholder needs and methods, tools and techniques for stakeholder engagement.

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan below outlines the engagement process, methods, including sequencing, topics of consultations and target stakeholders. The World Bank and the Borrower do not tolerate reprisals and retaliation against project stakeholders who share their views about Bank-financed projects.

Table: 6 Summary of Stakeholder Needs, Methods, and Techniques for Engagement:
Preparation Stage

Project stage	Target stakeholders	Topic of consultation / message	Method used	Responsibilities	Frequency/Timeline
Preparation stage	Irrigation Department, RRSD, PDMA, Rescue 1122 and other government APs and OIPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project overview and design, - Identify vulnerable groups, - Identify institutional capacity gaps in disaster response, - Validate technical designs for flood protection, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One-on-one group discussions, - Consultative workshops, - Formal meetings, - One-on-one interviews 	Irrigation Dept (PIU), Relief, Rehabilitation & Settlement Department (RRSD)	During project preparation

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inter-agency coordination protocols (e.g., data sharing), - Potential social and environmental impacts, - Women's access to relief and participation barriers, - Feedback on planned activities, - Collect information on existing GRM 		Project Preparation Team	
Preparation Stage	Local Community members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project overview - Potential impacts of READY-KP - Feedback on planned activities - Existing flood protection practices - Collect information on existing GRM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community meeting - Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) - Site visits 	Irrigation Department (PIU), Relief, Rehabilitation & Settlement Department (RRSD) Project Preparation Team	As necessary during preparation stage prior to implementation
Preparation Stage	Women and vulnerable groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project overview - Potential impacts of READY-KP - Identification of vulnerable groups, - Current role of women in disaster preparedness and response - Cultural barriers to evacuation and shelter access - Impact of floods on household assets, 	Gender segregated FGDs One-on-one interviews Site visits	Irrigation Dept (PIU), Relief, Rehabilitation & Settlement Department (RRSD) Project Preparation Team	As necessary during preparation stage prior to implementation

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Status of women's representation in decision making - Privacy concerns regarding construction crews - Collect information on existing GRM 			
Preparation Stage	NGOs/CSOs working on floods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project overview - Potential impacts of READY-KP - Feedback on planned activities - Identification and characterization of vulnerable groups - Alignment with existing NGO resilience programs 	<p>Consultative workshops</p> <p>One-on-one discussions</p> <p>Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)</p> <p>Correspondence</p>	<p>Irrigation Dept (PIU)</p> <p>Relief, Rehabilitation & Settlement Department (RRSD)</p> <p>Project Preparation Team</p>	As necessary during preparation stage prior to implementation
Preparation Stage	Private sector service Providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project overview - Feedback on planned activities - Potential collaboration opportunities 	<p>-One-on-one discussions</p> <p>- Consultative workshops</p> <p>Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)</p>	<p>Irrigation Dept (PIU)</p> <p>Relief, Rehabilitation & Settlement Department (RRSD)</p> <p>Project Preparation Team</p>	As necessary during preparation stage prior to implementation
Preparation Stage	Research universities and institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project overview - Potential impacts of READY-KP - Feedback on planned activities - Technology transfer and innovation 	<p>- Consultative workshops</p> <p>- One-on-one discussions</p> <p>-Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)</p>	<p>Irrigation Dept (PIU)</p> <p>Relief, Rehabilitation & Settlement Department (RRSD)</p>	As necessary during preparation stage prior to implementation

				Project Preparation Team	
Preparation Stage	Local Flood volunteer teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project overview - Existing response mechanisms - Feedback on planned activities - Capacity building needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) <p>Consultative workshops</p>	<p>Irrigation Dept (PIU),</p> <p>Relief, Rehabilitation & Settlement Department (RRSD)</p> <p>Project Preparation Team</p>	As necessary during preparation stage prior to implementation

Table: 7 Summary of Stakeholder Needs, Methods, and Techniques for Engagement: Implementation Stage

Project stage	Target stakeholders	Topic of consultation / message	Method used	Responsibilities	Frequency/ Timeline
Implementation phase	District officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progress updates - Implementation of ESMF and other E&S documents - E&S issues identified during project implementation. - LMP and OHS plans. - Feedback on project implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Workshops - Formal meetings 	PIU Social and Environmental Specialists	Bi-annually throughout project implementation
Implementation Phase	Provincial government departments outside of the Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness of project design and implementation - Disclosure of ESMF and related E&S documents - Progress updates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One-on-one and group discussions - Workshops 	PIU Social and Environmental Specialists	Annually during project implementation

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feedback on project implementation 			
Implementation Phase	Contractors / workers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Working condition - Disclosure of ESMF and related E&S documents - Familiarization with GRM procedure - OHS plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Toolbox talks - Trainings - Feedback surveys 	PIU Social and Environmental Specialists Contractors	Continuously throughout project via toolbox talks; Monthly trainings
Implementation phase	Local communities (VC, UC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness raising of project benefits - Guidance on how to participate in project - Feedback on project implementation - Disclosure of ESMF and related E&S documents - Grievance redress procedure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community meetings (<i>Jirgas</i>) - Mass media / Social media - Feedback surveys - Workshops 	PIU Social and Environmental Specialists	Awareness raising campaigns continuously; Consultations at beginning and end of each activity
Implementation phase	Water association groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness raising of project benefits - Guidance on how to participate in project - Feedback on project implementation - Operation and Maintenance (O&M) - Disclosure of ESMF and related E&S documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) - Workshops - Feedback surveys 	PIU Social and Environmental Specialists	Workshops and FGDs to be conducted twice annually for each subproject
Implementation phase	Farmer groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness raising of project benefits - Guidance on how to participate in project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) - Workshops - Feedback surveys 	PIU Social and Environmental Specialists	Workshops and FGDs to be conducted twice annually for each subproject

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feedback on project implementation - Training opportunities provided by the project - Disclosure of ESMF and related E&S documents 			
Implementation Phase	Women's organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness raising of project benefits - Guidance on how to participate in the project - Feedback on project implementation - Guidance on utilizing the project GRM (GBV/SEA/SH) - Disclosure of ESMF and related E&S documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gender-segregated FGDs - Feedback surveys 	PIU Social and Environmental Specialists	Workshops and FGDs to be conducted twice annually for each subproject
Implementation Phase	Ethnic, religious minority communities, and other vulnerable groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness raising about project benefits - Disclosure of ESMF and related E&S documents - Guidance on participating in the project - Guidance on utilizing the project GRM - Feedback on project implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In-community focus group discussions - Targeted outreach 	PIU Social and Environmental Specialists	Targeted outreach to be carried out prior to initiating each subproject
Implementation Phase	Media / NGOs working on floods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness of project design and implementation - E&S issues identified during project implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One-on-one group discussions - Workshops - Correspondence 	PIU Social and Environmental Specialists	Quarterly throughout implementation

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project updates - Feedback on project activities 			
Implementation Phase	Research universities and institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness of project design and implementation - Progress updates - Feedback on implemented activities - Actual and potential E&S risks and mitigation measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One-on-one group discussions - Workshops 	PIU Social and Environmental Specialists	Quarterly throughout implementation

4.3. Proposed strategy to incorporate the views of vulnerable groups

The project will actively seek the views of vulnerable groups, specifically small-scale farmers, *Purdah*-observing women, female-headed households, the elderly, persons with disabilities (PWDs), and families living in encroachment zones. Engagement will be conducted through culturally appropriate meetings, gender-segregated focus groups, and household surveys. To ensure full participation, materials will be provided in Pashto and Urdu and in formats accessible to the illiterate. A safe space will be created for open dialogue, leveraging partnerships with local Elders (*Mashars*) to reach marginalized segments.

The project will engage these groups through the following methods:

- **Community Meetings (*Hujras/Jirgas*):** Organizing meetings in local guest houses to facilitate direct interaction with male elders and farmers.
- **Gender-Segregated FGDs:** Conducting separate sessions for women in private venues to discuss sensitive issues like sanitation and privacy.
- **Mosque Announcements:** Utilizing mosque loudspeakers for rapid dissemination of updates, identified as a trusted channel during consultations.
- **Digital Engagement:** Leveraging tiered WhatsApp communities and dedicated local voice-enabled chatbots to share audio and pictorial updates, ensuring outreach to youth, women, and stakeholders with low literacy
- **Household Interviews:** Engaging in one-on-one interviews for PWDs, the elderly, or encroachment-affected families fearing social stigma or eviction.
- **Collaboration with LHWs:** Partnering with Lady Health Workers and female polio workers to disseminate information to women inside households.

- II. The following measures will be taken to remove obstacles to full participation and access to information:

- **Local Languages:** Translating all engagement materials (GRM brochures, PIDs) into Pashto and Urdu.
- **Accessible Formats:** Using pictorial guides and audio messages delivered through local voice-enabled chatbots and WhatsApp for stakeholders with low literacy; displaying helpline numbers and other supporting information on clear, visible signage.
- **Culturally Appropriate Venues:** Holding women’s consultations in private spaces (homes/girls schools) and mens in Hujras or Mosques.
- **Female Staffing:** Mandating the presence of Female Social Mobilizers to lead all engagements with female stakeholders.
- **Flexible Timing:** Scheduling sessions to avoid prayer times and peak agricultural activity.
- **Transportation Support:** Facilitating transport for PWDs or remote communities to central meeting points.
- **Feedback Loops:** Utilizing the Ikhtiyar Awam Portal, Open *Kachehris* (Public Courts), and complaint boxes and Project GRM for continuous two-way communication.

5. Resources and Responsibilities for implementing stakeholder engagement

5.1. Implementation Arrangements and Resources

The project’s stakeholder engagement will be managed through the Project Implementation Units (PIUs) of the two main implementing departments:

1. **Irrigation Department (Components 1 & 2):** The Social Specialist within the Irrigation Department PIU will lead engagement related to flood infrastructure under Component 1, as well as engagement related to Flood Early Warning Systems (FEWS) in Component 2 which will be jointly implemented by both PIUs.
2. **Relief, Rehabilitation and Settlement Department (RRSD) (Components 2 & 3):** The Social Specialist within the RRSD PIU will lead engagement related to disaster preparedness and response junder Component 3. They will coordinate directly with **PDMA** and **Rescue 1122** (the executing agencies) to ensure that community training, early warning dissemination, and emergency response consultations are effectively carried out. The Specialist will also work with the KP-ID Social Specialist to conduct stakeholder engagement related to Component 2 activities.

Coordination & Oversight:

These specialists will coordinate with District Administration and District Disaster Management Authorities (DDMAs) for local-level engagements. The Project Directors of both PIUs (Irrigation and RRSD) will oversee the overall implementation of the SEP, ensuring integration with the project’s environmental and social management strategies. Stakeholder feedback and engagement outcomes will be systematically documented and reviewed to inform project adjustments and decision-making.

The stakeholder engagement activities will be documented through:

- Detailed records of all engagement activities, including minutes of meetings, attendance lists, and feedback received.
- Regular reports summarizing the stakeholder feedback, concerns, and suggestions.
- Documentation of how stakeholder input has been incorporated into project planning and decision-making.
- Ongoing updates in project reports and communications to ensure transparency and accountability.

Resources

The implementation budget of the SEP will be assessed later as the SEP will be updated within 60 days of project effectiveness with PIU-wise allocation. This includes all costs related to ongoing engagement with stakeholders, information disclosure, grievance redress, and other activities described in the SEP. The budgetary estimates will be assessed for the following items:

Table:8 SEP Budget

Item	Estimated Cost (USD)	Comments
Stakeholder engagement events (workshops, meetings, etc.)	75,000	Covers all organized events for mass stakeholder engagement, and includes location costs, technical services, catering, materials, etc.
Community consultations	50,000	All stakeholder engagement carried out with communities in the field
Mass communications campaigns	100,000	Covers activities for Early Warning System (EWS) dissemination and departmental helplines awareness.
SEP training activities	75,000	Related to training provided to stakeholders including first responders, BCC, benefit sharing, etc)
Procurement of equipment	100,000	Including ICT equipment for SEP implementation, subscriptions to services, software packages, digital platforms etc.
Travel costs	50,000	For frequent traveling of social teams to field sites in Peshawar, Nowshera, and Charsadda for monitoring and consultations.
GRM implementation & Equipment	45,000	Costs for upgrading the departmental helplines for integration with digital tools, installing complaint boxes at construction sites, and IT equipment for grievance tracking.
TOTAL	495,000	Estimated Total Budget

6.3. Grievance Mechanism afterwards

6.1 Description of Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)

A Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) is a system that allows not only grievances but also queries, suggestions, positive feedback, and concerns of project-affected parties related to the environmental and social performance of a project to be submitted and responded to in a timely manner.

READY-KP will establish a detailed GRM at project effectiveness to receive, address, and monitor complaints and community feedback. The GRM will operate at Tehsil, District, and Provincial levels, with clear reporting lines to the Project Implementation Units (PIUs) under the Irrigation Department and RRSD. All complaints will be routed to the Social Specialist of the respective PIU, who will act as the Grievance Redress Officer (GRO).

6.2. GRM Implementation Structure

- A. **Provincial Level:** Project Implementation Unit (PIU) GRC, A Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) will be formed at the Provincial PIU level to handle high-priority cases and oversee the entire system.

I. **Composition of PIU GRC:**

- Project Director (Chair)
- Social Specialist (Grievance Redress Officer - GRO)
- Gender Specialist
- One representative from each implementing partner (Irrigation & RRSD)

- B. **District Level:** Each district will have a Grievance Focal Person (GFP) nominated by the Irrigation Department and linked to the PIU. GFPs will collect complaints and forward them to the PIU Social Specialist. A District GRC will also be notified in each target district to handle medium-priority issues. The GRC will convene hearings for complaints that cannot be resolved at the field level (e.g., crop compensation disputes, significant construction nuisances).

I. **Composition of District GRC:**

- Executive Engineer (XEN) Irrigation / District Emergency Officer (Rescue 1122) (Chair)
- District Grievance Focal Person (GFP)
- Sub-Engineer / Field Officer

- C. **Tehsil/ Field Level:** Local GFPs will be designated by respective PDs from each implementing partner that is irrigation department and Relief, Rehabilitation and Settlement Department (RRSD) at Tehsil level to receive complaints in person and through community meetings. They will maintain grievance registers and coordinate with district GFPs. A Tehsil-level committee called Tehsil GRC will also be established to resolve minor operational issues directly at the site.

I. Composition of Tehsil GRC:

- Sub-Divisional Officer (SDO) / Tehsil Lead (Chair)
- Local Grievance Focal Person (GFP)
- Community Elder / VC Representative

6.3. Grievance Uptake Channels

Grievances can be submitted via the following channels, integrating existing provincial systems as requested during consultations:

1. **Provincial Helpline:** PDMA Helpline 1700 (Toll-free, 24/7).
2. **Online Portal:** *Ikhtiyar Awam* / Pakistan Citizen Portal (Project Category).
3. **WhatsApp:** Dedicated Project WhatsApp Number (to be established).
4. **In-Person:** Through Open *Kachehris* (Public Courts), SDO/XEN Offices, and Grievance Focal Persons (GFPs) at all levels.
5. **Complaint Boxes:** Located in communities near construction sites, Tehsil offices, and DC offices.
6. **Postal/Email:** Dedicated complaints email address monitored by the PIU Social Specialist.
7. **Website Forms:** Online forms available on the relevant project pages of the Irrigation Department and Relief, Rehabilitation and Settlement Department (RRSD) websites.

6.4. Process Flow and Timeframe

Table 9: GRM Process Flow

Step	Description of Process	Timeframe	Responsibility
7. Receipt & Central Logging	Grievances received via any channel are forwarded immediately to the PIU. The Social Specialist logs the complaint into the centralized Grievance Management System (GMS) and assigns a unique Tracking ID.	Immediate (Within 24 Hours)	PIU Social Specialist (GRO)
7. Acknowledgement	The complainant receives a formal acknowledgement containing the Tracking ID and expected date of resolution. This is sent via SMS/WhatsApp/Letter, or provided verbally/in-person	Within 5 Days	PIU Social Specialist / Local GFP

	by the Local GFP for illiterate complainants.		
7. Sorting & Categorization	<p>The PIU Social Specialist screens the complaint and assigns a priority level</p> <p>Low Priority: Minor issues (e.g., dust, noise). Referred to Tehsil Level GRC.</p> <p>Medium Priority: Serious but not critical (e.g., compensation delays). Referred to District Level GRC.</p> <p>High Priority: Critical issues (e.g., corruption, GBV, legal violations). Handled by Provincial PIU GRC.</p>	Upon Receipt	PIU Social Specialist
7. Verification & Investigation	<p>Low Priority (Tehsil): The Local GFP/SDO conducts a site visit and resolves it locally.</p> <p>Medium Priority (District): The District GRC convenes a hearing with the complainant and contractor.</p> <p>High Priority (Provincial): The PIU GRC convenes a special session, potentially involving site audits or legal consultation.</p>	<p>Low/Med: Within 10 Working Days</p> <p>High: Within 21 Days</p>	Relevant GRC (Tehsil / District / Provincial)
7. Resolution & Closure	A formal Resolution Letter/Notification is drafted. The PIU reviews the decision for ESS compliance. The resolution is communicated to the complainant.	Post-Resolution	PIU Social Specialist / District GFP
7. Feedback & Satisfaction	Within one week of conveying the resolution, the GFP contacts the complainant (via phone or visit) to verify if they are satisfied with the	Within 7 Days of Resolution	District / Local GFP

	outcome. If satisfied, the case is marked Closed .		
7. Monitoring & Reporting	The PIU compiles data from the GMS to analyze trends. Quarterly reports are submitted to the World Bank detailing open, closed, and pending grievances.	Quarterly	PIU Social Specialist
7. Appeals	If the complainant rejects the resolution, they may lodge an appeal to the Project Director . If still unsatisfied, they may seek legal recourse through the judicial system.	Within 5 days of appeal	Project Director / PIU GRC

6.5. Handling GBV/SEA/SH Grievance

To address any complaints related to GBV/SEA/SH, the project will ensure that such grievances are treated with the highest confidentiality and referred to relevant GBV service providers. Dedicated trained female staff (e.g., Gender Specialist) will be appointed to receive and process GBV-related complaints. Special considerations will be taken to ensure that the complainant's identity is treated as privileged information, and the option to lodge the complaint anonymously will be provided. Detailed protocols for receiving, managing, and addressing complaints related to GBV/SEA/SH will be developed in the GBV/SEA/SH Action Plan.

7. Monitoring and Reporting

7.1. Summary of How SEP will be Monitored and Reported Upon

The SEP will be monitored based on both qualitative reporting (based on progress reports) and quantitative reporting linked to results indicators on stakeholder engagement and grievance performance.

SEP reporting will include the following:

- **(i)** Quarterly progress reporting on the ESS10-Stakeholder Engagement commitments under the Environmental and Social Commitment Plan (ESCP).
- **(ii)** Annual cumulative qualitative reporting on the feedback received during SEP activities, in particular:
 - a. Issues that have been raised that can be addressed through changes in project scope and design, and reflected in the basic documentation such as the Project Appraisal Document, Environmental and Social Assessment, Resettlement Plan, or GBV/SEA/SH Action Plan, if needed;

- b. Issues that have been raised and can be addressed during project implementation.
 - c. Issues that have been raised that are beyond the scope of the project and are better addressed through alternative projects, programs, or initiatives; and
 - d. Issues that cannot be addressed by the project due to technical, jurisdictional, or excessive cost-associated reasons. Minutes of meetings summarizing the views of the attendees can also be annexed to the monitoring reports.
- **(iii)** Quarterly quantitative reporting based on the indicators included in the SEP. A set of indicators for monitoring and reporting is included in **Annex 2**.

7.2. Reporting back to Stakeholder Groups

The SEP will be revised and updated as necessary during project implementation. Quarterly summaries and internal reports on public grievances, enquiries, and related incidents, together with the status of implementation of associated corrective/preventative actions, will be collated by responsible staff (Social Specialists at PIUs) and referred to the Project Directors.

Specific mechanisms to report back to the stakeholders include:

- **Regular Community Consultations:** Held in *Hujras* and community centers, particularly with beneficiary communities in flood-prone zones.
- **Open Kachehris (Public Courts):** Conducted by District Administration to provide public updates and receive direct feedback.
- **Digital Updates:** Updates posted on the project's official pages on the **Irrigation Department and RRSD websites**, as well as through **WhatsApp groups** established for community coordination.
- **Mosque Announcements:** Utilized for rapid dissemination of critical updates or meeting schedules.

Annexes

Annex 1. READY-KP – Preparation Stage SEP Consultation Checklist

Category	Consultation Question	
Institutional (30 Min)	What major floods or disasters have affected your area of influence in recent years, and how did people respond at the local level?	
	How did the community organize itself during those times — who took the lead, and what support helped recovery?	
	What weaknesses did you face — lack of information, resources, or coordination — and how can the project help overcome them?	
	Given that communities are the first responders, how should they be engaged in risk identification, preparedness, and response planning?	
	How can local awareness, capacity, and linkages with departments like PDMA or DDMA be strengthened to improve resilience?	
	The project defines resilience as both physical and institutional strength. Do you agree with this definition? What else would make communities truly resilient?	
	What trainings or awareness programs have been offered for vulnerable groups? Who provides them, and how can they be improved?	
	How are people informed or invited to these committees or trainings, and what barriers stop them from joining?	
	What actions could encourage more participation by these groups — flexible	

	timings, transport, community outreach, or female trainers?	
	How are communities currently involved in disaster planning or coordination with government departments?	
	What challenges do communities face when trying to join these activities — is it time, distance, information, or resources?	
	How can these challenges be reduced so more people can participate?	
	How can community preparedness and participation be institutionalized so that activities continue after the project ends?	
	What problems arise in evacuating people, livestock, or valuables during floods?	
	What local systems or volunteers exist for emergency support — boats, vehicles, committees — and how do they coordinate?	
	What training or equipment do first responders or volunteers need to act faster and safer?	
	How can Rescue 1122 and community volunteers work better together during emergencies?	
	What steps can communities take each year to stay prepared, even without external funding?	
Digital Preparedness & Early Warning Institutional (20 Min)		
	How quickly do messages reach you in your capacity and communities, and are they easy to understand?	
	What difficulties do women, elders, or people with limited literacy face in understanding early warnings?	

	How can the digital systems apps be improved so they're more useful and trusted by rural communities?	
	For institutions: how should PDMA, DDMA, and Irrigation Dept. share data for timely warnings?	
Institutional Coordination (15 Min)	How do PDMA, DDMA, Irrigation Dept., and Rescue 1122 currently coordinate during flood response?	
	What challenges occur when several departments respond at the same time?	
	What regular meetings or SOPs exist between departments and how can they be improved?	
	What capacity-building, training, or budget support do institutions need to perform better?	
	How can community-level disaster committees report directly to district and provincial agencies?	
Citizen Engagement & Feedback (Institutional) (15 Min)	What's the most convenient way for communities to share complaints or feedback about this project?	
	What kind of project information would you like to receive regularly — progress, activities, risks, results?	
	How should the project respond when communities share feedback — what follow-up do you expect?	
	How can grievance channels (hotline, local office, WhatsApp) be made easier to use for everyone?	
	How can communities help contractors keep areas safe and clean during works?	
	What local bodies or committees can help keep flood protection systems active after project completion?	

	What's the best way to keep citizens informed about project progress and results?	
--	---	--

Annex 2: Monitoring and Reporting on the SEP

Key evaluation questions	Specific Evaluation questions	Potential Indicators	Data Collection Methods
<p>GRM Performance. To what extent have project-affected parties been provided with accessible and inclusive means to raise issues and grievances? Has the implementing agency responded to and managed such grievances?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are project affected parties raising issues and grievances? • How quickly/effectively are the grievances resolved? • Usage of GRM and/or feedback mechanisms • Requests for information from relevant agencies. • Use of complaint boxes placed in the villages/project communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of grievances raised by stakeholders, including uptake channel, resolution status. • Number of Sexual Exploitation, and Abuse/Sexual Harassment (SEA/SH) cases reported in the project areas, which were referred for health, social, legal and security support according to the referral process in place. (if applicable) • Number of grievances that have been (i) opened, (ii) opened for more than 30 days, (iii) resolved, (iv) closed, and (v) number of responses that satisfied the complainants, during the reporting period disaggregated by category of grievance, gender, age, and location of complainant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Records from the implementing agency and other relevant agencies • Grievance Logs

<p>Stakeholder engagement impact on project design and implementation.</p> <p>How have engagement activities made a difference in project design and implementation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was there interest and support for the project? • Were there any adjustments made during project design and implementation based on the feedback received? • Was priority information disclosed to relevant parties throughout the project cycle? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active participation of stakeholders in activities. • Number of actions taken in a timely manner in response to feedback received during consultation sessions with project affected parties. • Number of consultation meetings and public discussions where the feedback and recommendation received is reflected in project design and implementation. • Number of disaggregated engagement sessions held, focused on at-risk groups in the project (e.g., women, elderly, vulnerable farmers). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder Consultation Attendance Sheets/Minutes • Evaluation forms • Structured surveys • Social media/traditional media entries on the project results
<p>Implementation effectiveness.</p> <p>Were stakeholder engagement activities effective in implementation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the activities implemented as planned? Why or why not? • Was the stakeholder engagement approach inclusive of disaggregated groups? Why or why not? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of SEP activities implemented. • Key barriers to participation identified with stakeholder representatives. • Number of adjustments made in the stakeholder engagement approach to improve projects' outreach, inclusion and effectiveness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication Strategy (Consultation Schedule) • Periodic Focus Group Discussions • Face-to-face meetings and/or Focus Group discussions with Vulnerable Groups or

			their representat ives
--	--	--	------------------------------