

SR3

Safeguards Diagnostic Review

for

**Piloting the Use of Romanian Systems to Address
Environmental and Social Safeguard Issues in the
Proposed World Bank-Assisted**

Romania

**Municipal Services Project
and
Transport Sector Support Project**

Equivalence and Acceptability Assessment Report

May, 2006

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	IV
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	V
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	VI
<i>Introduction</i>	vi
<i>Equivalence and Acceptability Assessment: Principal Observations</i>	vi
<i>Principal Observations – Dam Safety</i>	x
<i>Principal Observations – Other Issues</i>	x
<i>Conclusions</i>	x
PILOTING THE USE OF ROMANIAN SYSTEMS TO ADDRESS ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARD ISSUES IN THE PROPOSED WORLD-BANK ASSISTED MUNICIPAL SERVICES PROJECT AND TRANSPORT SECTOR SUPPORT PROJECT 1	
SAFEGUARDS DIAGNOSTIC REVIEW.....	1
1.0 BACKGROUND	1
2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS	2
2.1 <i>Romania Municipal Services Project (MSP)</i>	2
2.2 <i>Romania Transport Sector Support Project (TSSP)</i>	2
2.3 <i>Rationale for choosing the MSP and TSSP for Piloting</i>	3
2.4 <i>Summary of Public Consultation and Disclosure</i>	3
3.0 EQUIVALENCE ANALYSIS	4
3.1 <i>Bank’s Safeguard Policy Areas Applicable to the Proposed Pilot Projects</i>	4
3.1.1 Romania Municipal Services Project	4
3.1.2 Romania Transport Sector Support Project.....	5
3.2 <i>Methodology Used for Determining Equivalence</i>	5
3.3.1 Romanian Laws and Regulations Applicable to the Projects	5
3.3.3 Current and Proposed Measures to Improve the System.....	8
3.3.2 Analysis of Gaps.....	8
3.3.3 Proposed Measures to Address the Gaps of the Romanian EA System	8
3.4 <i>Equivalence Analysis – Cultural Property</i>	9
3.4.1 Romanian Laws and Regulations Applicable to the Projects	9
3.4.2 Analysis of Gaps.....	11
3.4.3 Current and Proposed Measures to Achieve the Equivalence	11
3.5 <i>Equivalence Analysis – Dam Safety</i>	11
3.5.1 Romanian Laws and Procedures	11
3.5.2 Analysis of Gaps.....	12
3.5.3 Current and Proposed Measures to Achieve the Equivalence.....	12
3.6 <i>Equivalence Analysis - Involuntary Resettlement</i>	12
3.6.1 Romanian Laws and Procedures	12
3.6.2 Equivalence and Analysis of Gaps and Differences.....	14
3.6.3 Current and Proposed Measures to Address Gaps	20
4.0 ACCEPTABILITY ASSESSMENT	21
4.1 <i>Purpose and Scope of the Acceptability Assessment</i>	21
4.2 <i>Methodology Used to Determine Acceptability</i>	21
4.3 <i>Acceptability Assessment – Environment Assessment</i>	21
4.3.1 Implementation Practices and Institutional Capacity	21
4.3.2 Analysis of Gaps.....	22
4.3.3 <i>Current and Proposed Measures to Maintain Acceptability</i>	23
4.4 <i>Acceptability Analysis – Cultural Property</i>	23
4.4.1 Implementation Practice and Institutional Capacity.....	23
4.4.2 Analysis of Gaps.....	24
4.4.3 Current and Proposed Measures to Maintain the Acceptability	24
4.5. <i>Acceptability Assessment - Dam Safety</i>	24
4.6 <i>Acceptability Assessment - Involuntary Resettlement</i>	25
4.6.1 Implementation Practice and Institutional Capacity	25
4.6.2 Analysis of Gaps.....	26
4.6.3 Current and Proposed Measures to Increase the Acceptability	26
Suggested Gap-Filling Measures for Involuntary Resettlement	27
ANNEX I - LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK.....	28
<i>Annex I A - Relevant legal texts</i>	28
International Law	28
European Union’s “acquis communautaire”	28
Romanian Law	30

<i>Annex I B – Romanian Licensing and Permitting Procedures</i>	33
Introduction.....	33
Procedures for Receiving an Environmental License to Construct (OR the Environmental Agreement).....	33
Procedures for Obtaining an Environmental Permit to Operate	36
Monitoring Capacity during the Constructions Period and After the Issuance of the Environmental Permit to Operate.....	36
<i>Annex I C - Romania’s Current and Proposed Measures that would Improve and Sustain Acceptability</i>	37
Introduction.....	37
Transposition of the EU Legislation and Its Enforcement.....	37
Institutional Consolidation	37
Personnel Training	39
Financing and Other Activities.....	39
ANNEX II – SUMMARY MATRICES FOR ANALYSIS OF EQUIVALENCE	41
<i>Annex II A - Environmental Assessment</i>	41
<i>Annex II B - Cultural Property</i>	46
<i>Annex II C – Dam Safety</i>	50
<i>Annex II D - Involuntary Resettlement (Expropriation for Public Use)</i>	52
ANNEX III – LIST OF PERSONS MET	59
ANNEX IV - CONSULTATION AND DISCLOSURE.....	63
<i>IV A – Summary Minutes of December 12, 2005 Public Consultation</i>	63
Background	63
Introduction/Opening Section	63
Background Presentation on the Use of New World Bank Policy on Country Systems.....	64
Overview of Romanian EA systems.....	64
Progress on EU Accession	64
Overview of World Bank Romania Municipal Services Project	64
Questions and Answers Section	64
Closing Remarks	65
<i>IV B – Response and Disclosure Following Public Consultation</i>	65
<i>IV C – List of Participants at Public Consultation</i>	65

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Draft and final reports were prepared by a World Bank team led by Ron Hoffer, Lead Environmental Specialist and Regional Safeguards Coordinator (ECSSD). Team members included Hanneke van Tilburg (Senior Counsel, LEGEN), Ruxandra Floroiu (Environmental Engineer, ECSSD), Panneer Selvam (Senior Environmental Specialist, ESDQC/QACU), Stan Peabody (Lead Social Scientist, ECSSD), Miroslav Ruzica (Senior Social Scientist; PA9SS/ECSSD), and Alexander Rowland (Communications Officer, ECCBK). Critical support on mission logistics and outreach within Romania from George Moldoveanu (Team Assistant, ECCRO) and Alexandra Caracoti (External Affairs Officer, ECCRO) was invaluable. Technical input was also provided by Gabriel Ionita (Senior Agricultural Specialist, ECSSD) and Peter Dewees (Lead Environmental Specialist, ECSSD). Peer review and management insight from other Bank staff, including Maninder Gill, Arlene Fleming, Doina Visa, Stephen Lintner, Charles di Leva, Laura Tuck and Benoit Blarel, as well as Task Team Leaders Sudipto Sarkar and Henry Kerali, is very much appreciated. Finally, the team would like to thank ECSSD, QACU, ECCU5, and OPCS, who generously assisted in the financing of staff and travel resources over and above project budgets to carry out this work.

The report was reviewed by a working group in the Ministry of Environment and Water Management of Romania, to ensure that the results of the study are accurate and reflect national priorities and support. The working group is lead by Mr. Silviu Stoica, Director of the Environment Department (MEWM), and includes the following specialists: Ms. Adriana Baz (Director, Department of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity, and Biosecurity, MEWM); Ms. Elena Dumitru (Director, Department of Solid and Hazardous Waste Management, MEWM); Ms. Angela Filipas (General Director, Department of Impact Assessment, Control Pollution and Risk Management, MEWM); Ms. Camelia Calatan (Department of Authorization and Horizontal Legislation, NEPA); and Ms. Doina Cioaca (Department of Nature Conservation, Biodiversity and Land). The working group also coordinated input from other Ministries; their input is also appreciated.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

EA	Environmental Assessment
EAAR	Equivalence and Acceptability Assessment Report
EGO	Emergency Government Ordinance
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Study
EMF	Environmental Management Framework
EMP	Environmental Management Plan
EMAS	Eco Management and Audit Scheme
GD	Government Decision
GOR	Government of Romania
FI	Financial Intermediary
ICIM	National Research Development Institute for Environmental Protection
IPTANA	Roads Design Institute
ISPCF	Railway Design Institute
HRMEP	Hazard Risk Mitigation and Emergency Preparedness Project
LEPA	Local Environmental Protection Agency
MCRA	Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs
MEWM	Ministry of Environment and Water Management
MO	Ministerial Ordinance
M.Of	Official Gazette of Romania
MPF	Ministry of Public Finance
MSP	Municipal Services Project
MTCT	Ministry of Transport, Construction and Tourism
NCA	National Commission for Archaeology
NCHM	National Commission for Historical Monuments
NCMNR	National Company for Motorways and National Roads
NEAP	National Environmental Action Plan
NEG	National Environmental Guard
NEPA	National Environmental Protection Agency
PCR	Physical and Cultural Resources
POE	Panel of Experts
REPA	Regional Environmental Protection Agency
SNCFR	National Railway Company CFR SA
TSSP	Transport Sector Support Project

CURRENCY EQUIVALENTS

(Exchange Rate Effective March 5, 2006)

Currency Unit	=	Romanian New Leu (RON)
2.89 RON	=	US\$1

Vice President:	Shigeo Katsu
Country Manager/Director:	Owaise Saadat/Anand Seth
Sector Director:	Peter D. Thomson
Sector Manager:	Motoo Konishi (Transport) Sumter Lee Travers (Municipal Services)
Team Leaders:	Henry Kerali (Transport) Sudipto Sarkar (Municipal Services)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

1. **Background.** Following extensive global notification and consultations, in March 2005 the World Bank Board approved a pilot program to test the use of borrower or “country” systems to meet the objectives of World Bank environmental and social safeguard policies. This led to the issuance of World Bank Operational Policy 4.00¹ (OP 4.00) which lays out specific criteria for advancing pilot projects. It was recognized in the background paper for Board consideration that sector-specific Bank operations in new member states and candidates for European Union (EU) accession hold particular promise as pilots.

2. **Project Descriptions.** Two operations proposed for Romania for piloting OP 4.00, are the subject of review in this report: the Municipal Services Project (MSP) and the Transport Sector Support Project (TSSP). The Municipal Services Project will support the rehabilitation and improvement of wastewater, stormwater and drinking water systems to reduce pollution, improve public health, and assist Romania in meeting environmental requirements for European Union accession. The Transport Sector Support Project will provide funds to rehabilitate, maintain and improve national road and rail systems.

3. **Methodology.** In cooperation with Romanian officials, and with the support of European Commission staff, the World Bank has compared the Romanian systems (including those which stem from EU directives) against the objectives and operational principles laid out in OP 4.00-Table A1 for safeguards that would normally apply to these two Bank-assisted projects. This assessment included a legal and technical review; both on paper and through field interviews and site visits.

4. **Scope of the Pilot.** The equivalence and acceptability assessment addresses environmental and social safeguard issues which are triggered (or were once considered as possibly triggered during preparation) by the projects in the following areas: (a) Environmental Assessment; (b) Involuntary Resettlement; (c) Cultural Property, and (d) Dam Safety. As per Bank’s policy on Environmental Assessment, both projects are categorized as an environmental category B. The Bank’s policy area on Involuntary Resettlement will apply only to the TSSP, as it may require small scale land acquisition (albeit without physical relocation of households or businesses). Based on current project information, neither project is expected to any affect known physical cultural resources, but the MSP may be active in historic areas so the cultural property safeguard is triggered.

5. **Public Consultation and Disclosure.** Report conclusions were discussed at a public meeting in Bucharest on December 12, 2005, following disclosure in Romania of a draft Executive Summary. A full draft report was disclosed in English in the World Bank InfoShop and in Romanian on the MEWM web site January 25, 2006. The comment period in Romania closed on March 10, 2006; no comments were received from the public. This revised version reflects: (i) clarification of information and supporting analyses from the draft, and (ii) a decision to not pilot Involuntary Resettlement.

Equivalence and Acceptability Assessment: Principal Observations

6. **Environmental Assessment (EA).** The World Bank examined the equivalence and acceptability of Romania’s EA system along two lines: EA approval procedures, and compliance monitoring during construction and operation. The Bank is pleased to note that there is a well defined process in place for screening, review, public consultation, disclosure, and approval of EA documents. Regarding screening (i.e. determination of the appropriate EA category), projects falling on

1

<http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/Institutional/Manuals/OpManual.nsf/tocall/E49CED1645FB433885256FCD00776B19?OpenDocument>

Romania's Annex I list² would typically fall within the World Bank's EA Category A. Mandatory full EAs required under Romania's system provide an equivalent level of attention to assessing risk, alternatives and mitigation/monitoring (i.e. scoping) as compared to World Bank requirements for Category A projects. Both the Municipal Services and Transport Sector Support projects are, however, Category B for Environmental Assessment under the World Bank system. Most sub-projects correspond to the comparable Romania Annex II, sub-project categories being considered under the Municipal Services and Transport Sector Support projects will likely, therefore, be subject under the Romanian system to at least an equivalent approach to EA screening, scoping and analysis as set forth in World Bank OP 4.00.

7. While the EA documents are prepared by project proponents, an independent Technical Committee is established by government to review each project. The committee include representatives of local and regional environmental agencies, other local officials, representatives of the Health Services, the National Environmental Guard (inspection service), the Romanian Water Company ("*Apele Romane*"), research institutes, and others as deemed necessary. Public participation during the EA process includes at least one public consultation, and as many as three public announcements in local newspapers or on the local environment agency website. This approach should achieve comparable outcomes as envisaged by the Bank under OP 4.00. Environmental sections of standard bidding documents for roads and rail projects were examined and found comparable to the core mitigation and monitoring aspects of stand-alone Environmental Management Plans normally included as a requirement of World Bank safeguard policies.

8. Regarding implementation, a successful project application results in the issuance of two documents which contain mitigation and monitoring measures comparable in aim to the Environmental Management Plan required for Bank projects. Following the acceptance of the EA, an *Environmental License to Construct* (called the "environmental agreement") is issued by municipal authorities for all projects with civil works. After construction, the project proponent is required by law to apply for the *Environmental Permit to Operate* (sometimes called "environmental authorization"), which is issued only after a review by local or regional environmental authorities. The *Environmental License* sets the measures/conditions to mitigate adverse impacts during construction and is issued by the competent environmental authority based on the information obtained during the environmental assessment process. The *Environmental Permit to Operate* (issued by environmental authorities) verifies that mitigation and monitoring measures are in place.

9. The permitting process includes setting wastewater discharge limits (by *Apele Romane*). Discharge standards and wastewater management programs (e.g. receiving water quality) set by Romanian authorities are aligning with comparable EU directives on wastewater and watershed management (as transposed into Romanian law), and are quite consistent with the Bank's narrative descriptions of good water quality management programs in the Pollution Prevention and Abatement Handbook (Part II).

10. This review included meetings and site reviews in cooperation with environmental officials at the local and regional levels. In Romania all key environmental responsibilities fall under the Ministry of Environment and Water Management (MEWM). Preparation for EU accession has led, and will likely continue to lead, to considerable increases in staff at both the policy and field levels. A core group of environmental specialists are also on staff in key regional offices responsible for rails and roads; a very important element in practical implementation of environmental requirements.

11. Regarding compliance monitoring, an independent agency under the MEWM – the National Environment Guard (NEG) – is tasked to carry out this responsibility. The NEG is being staffed up and responsibilities strengthened through passing bylaws and establishing good working procedures. An ambitious training program is also being implemented. If violations in licenses or permits are found, the NEG has a range of administrative orders and penalties to issue at its disposal. There seems

² Annex I to GD 918/2002; projects subject to mandatory EA; based on EU Directive 85/337/EEC as amended

to be serious commitment at the senior management level to improve the overall compliance level. The trend is positive, with reportedly increased fines for violations, more transparency, and reduced ambiguity in setting the fines (thereby helping reduce corruption). It should be noted, however, that a fully staffed NEG will not be in place for about a year, so effectiveness cannot yet be fully documented.

12. In the area of Environmental Assessment, the safeguard diagnostic review concludes that there are no gaps regarding the equivalence of Romanian systems that would inhibit piloting.

13. With respect to EA implementation practices (the core of the “acceptability analyses”), the Bank finds the current approach and direction of Romanian institutions in carrying out sub-sector laws and policies (including compliance and enforcement) to conform to OP 4.00. While several areas would benefit from strengthening (as part of the country’s overall improvement in environmental management and implementation of sectoral policies), these are not significant enough to hinder the Municipal Services or Transport Sector Support projects from being approved as pilots. Capacity-building under European Union programs, as well as the proposed World Bank Environmental Management Loan, while not required for piloting under OP4.00, will be very supportive to further enhance Romania’s system in this area.

14. **Cultural Property.** Regarding cultural property, the Bank believes that Romanian systems are equivalent and acceptable for application to both operations. If either operation would require construction or rehabilitation near to historic buildings or other physical cultural resources, or if “chance finds” are encountered, Romanian systems are at least as effective as those outlined in OP/BP 4.00 on such points. Inventories of buildings and sites of cultural significance are available, and are consulted to assess whether proposed investment projects might cause impact. Local experts on archeology, architecture and other relevant fields are brought in for assessments before construction decisions are made and after, if “chance finds” are encountered during construction. While there have been reported instances where construction has taken place in areas of cultural importance without the full engagement and approval of experts, this does not appear to be a systemic issue which would hamper the acceptability of piloting in this area. The Bank will work with Romanian implementing authorities to closely monitor this aspect.

15. **Involuntary Resettlement.** No Involuntary Resettlement is envisaged under the MSP. The Transport Sector Support Project may involve small-scale land acquisition, but is not expected to cause actual physical relocation of households or businesses³. Accordingly, the assessment focuses on the principles of OP 4.00 that are applicable to expropriation and land acquisition. The Bank commissioned a thorough legal analysis of expropriation and related legislation, met with officials in national and local governments who deal with expropriation, property assessors, and people whose land had been expropriated. As will be noted below, gap-filling measures would have been needed if the decision were taken to pilot this safeguard area. The extent and timing of gap-filling was considered by the Romanian partners, but it was finally decided to not include Involuntary Resettlement in the pilot for use of country systems. Consequently, Bank guidelines on Involuntary Resettlement as embodied in OP/BP 4.12 will apply to the TSSP. Nevertheless, major conclusions from the review are noted below.

16. Unlike the case of Environmental Assessment, the EU does not have community-wide policies or directives regarding the expropriation of land by government, or the subsequent resettlement of people or loss of income. Each member state has its own laws and procedures on these matters.

17. Expropriation in Romania is governed by Law 33/1994 which establishes principles and the framework for expropriating private land for public use. This law is supplemented by Government

³ During preparation it was also expected that the Municipal Services Project might trigger this safeguard, but following further analysis in Bucharest and Arad, this policy area is not expected to apply.

Resolution 583/1994, which specifies procedures for investigations required to establish “Public Use”. The law and procedures apply to expropriation carried out by all levels of government—national county and local.⁴ Little expropriation was carried out for many years following the fall of the Ceausescu regime, as there was little infrastructure development or rehabilitation activity. More recently, however, significant investments in highway construction on the national level, and rehabilitation and expansion of infrastructure on the local level, have increased the incidence of expropriation in the country.

18. The review found equivalence between Romania’s system on land acquisition, and several of the operational principles on involuntary resettlement of Table A1 of OP/BP 4.00, including: emphasizing alternatives that do not require expropriation; applying similar standards and procedures at all governmental levels and for all aspects of an investment; establishing baseline ownership conditions; including consultations, public participation and systematic disclosure of decisions and designs; using market value as the compensation standard, with the possibility of additional compensation for damages and lost benefits; requiring prompt payment; providing compensation for the loss of assets by third parties and persons without formal rights.

19. The safeguard diagnostic review also found several areas in which Romanian expropriation laws and procedures are not equivalent to principles in OP/BP 4.00. Neither Romanian laws nor practices explicitly: (i) require a baseline socio-economic survey for expropriation; (ii) call for follow-up monitoring and assessment; (iii) notify affected persons of their rights; (iv) grant special consideration to the poor, vulnerable or other special groups; or (v) give preference to a land-based strategy. Three of these differences would not significantly affect achieving the objectives of OP/BP 4.00 in the pilot projects. The lack of a socio-economic survey would not materially affect outcomes, as the combination of compensation for loss of assets and “prejudice,” (damages and lost benefits) should be adequate to enable affected persons to maintain their socio-economic status. Similarly, the law is applied uniformly regardless of the physical or economic status of affected persons, although the provision of prejudice may be invoked to compensate for damages. Finally, affected persons have access to an open land market which enables them to purchase alternative lands, if they wish, without requiring an administered land replacement system.

20. Two differences are significant however, and pertinent to the projects. First, as compensation is assumed to be adequate, there is no monitoring or assessment of the impacts of expropriation. Second, Romanian authorities do not systematically inform affected people of their rights, as required in OP/BP 4.00. The safeguard diagnostic review concludes that these differences could be mitigated through gap-filling measures if piloting was to be carried out.

21. The acceptability assessment concluded that the expropriation process in Romania is implemented according to the law and is markedly consistent with OP/BP 4.00. Some key strengths in the expropriation process are: legislation and procedures apply uniformly to all administrative levels; the systematic involvement of a wide range of institutional stakeholders in the preparation and review of expropriation decisions; the use of market value as the compensation standard with the provision of additional compensation for damages; judicial review of all purchase agreements and resolution of disputes; clear payment requirements; and the requirement that all expropriation must be completed before a Construction License is issued.

22. The acceptability assessment also found some areas of weakness that were largely related to lack of transparency in the valuation and negotiation process, and little track record with regards to dealing with more complicated issues such as impacts on livelihoods and illegal occupation. Gap-filling measures to address these areas were discussed with Romania, although a conventional

⁴ For highway construction, Law 198/2004 was adopted, which applies only to highways and national roads. It was supplemented by Methodological Rules of June 10, 2004. In addition to existing provisions of Law 33/1994, Law 198/2004 prescribes the use of escrow accounts to enable the expropriator to pay compensation in cases where ownership is unclear or contested, thereby speeding up the expropriation process. The 2004 law does not apply to the pilot projects.

approach through the application of OP 4.12 was selected for the TSSP. Following the final stages of preparation the MSP was deemed not to require expropriation and the policy is not triggered.

Principal Observations – Dam Safety

23. During the preparation of the Municipal Services Project (i.e. before the selection of Bucharest and Arad for the bulk of investments), it was possible that candidate sub-projects might have included rehabilitation or extension of drinking water systems where supply is obtained from dams or other control structures. New dams would not have been financed by the project, nor would dams have been rehabilitated under the project, but the capability of Romanian authorities to ensure dam safety was considered important should water supplies under the project be associated with control structures. Good alignment was found between Romanian requirements and those of the Bank for dam safety. Experience by the World Bank in ongoing projects in Romania also suggests that the country's system for ensuring the safety of existing dams that are utilized for water supply is adequate for piloting. The project as appraised, however, does not include investments reasonably associated with any control structures so the dam safety safeguard is not triggered. The information gathered during this assessment is left in this report, however, for general information and possible relevance to future projects.

Principal Observations – Other Issues

24. The Bank's Policy on International Waterways (OP/BP 7.50) may be triggered by some sub-projects in the Municipal Services project, and procedures under OP/BP 7.50 do apply. As per OP 4.00, this policy cannot be piloted for the use of borrower systems.

25. There is no information to indicate that other safeguard policy areas are applicable to the proposed projects.

Conclusions

26. The results of this diagnostic review indicate that the operational principles of EA as stated in Table A1 of OP4.00 and the Romanian system of laws, regulations and procedures in the sub-sectors to be supported by the proposed Municipal Services and Transport Sector Support projects have many common features and that there are no gaps that are relevant to these projects. With respect to the acceptability, it was also found that Romania's current approach to EIA conforms to OP 4.00. Regarding Cultural Property, Romanian systems are considered equivalent and acceptable. While there have been reported instances where construction has taken place in areas of cultural importance without full engagement or approval of experts, this does not seem to be a systemic issue and the Bank will work with the Romanian implementing agencies to closely monitor this aspect. Gap-filling would be needed for piloting Involuntary Resettlement, but it was finally decided to adopt a conventional approach and to not include this policy area in the pilot. Consequently, Bank guidelines on Involuntary Resettlement as embodied in OP/BP 4.12 will apply to the TSSP

27. Regarding monitoring and reporting. Romanian entities will prepare bi-annual monitoring reports to monitor the implementation status of the EAAR, and identify issues or problems which need to be resolved.

28. Safeguard-related matters will be supervised regularly by the World Bank throughout the implementation of the two proposed projects.

**PILOTING THE USE OF ROMANIAN SYSTEMS TO ADDRESS ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL
SAFEGUARD ISSUES IN THE PROPOSED WORLD-BANK ASSISTED MUNICIPAL SERVICES PROJECT
AND TRANSPORT SECTOR SUPPORT PROJECT**

SAFEGUARDS DIAGNOSTIC REVIEW

1.0 BACKGROUND

1. Starting in 2005, and extending over a two year period, the Bank will be supporting a limited number of pilot projects in which lending operations will be prepared using the borrowing country's systems⁵ for environmental assessment and other environmental and social safeguards, rather than the Bank's operational policies and procedures on safeguards. The rationale for using country systems is to scale up development impact, increase country ownership, build institutional capacity, facilitate harmonization and increase cost effectiveness. These pilot operations are governed by a new operational policy⁶ (OP 4.00) on "Piloting the Use of Borrower Systems to Address Environmental and Social Safeguard Issues in Bank-Supported Projects." This policy sets forth the methodology, enumerates the criteria for assessing country systems, and specifies documentation and disclosure requirements and respective roles of the client country and the Bank.

2. The Bank considers a borrower's environmental and social safeguard system to be equivalent to the Bank's if the borrower's system is designed to achieve the objectives and adhere to the applicable operational principles set out in Table A1 of OP 4.00. Since equivalence is determined on a policy-by-policy basis in accordance with Table A1, the Bank may conclude that the borrower's system is equivalent to the Bank's in specific environmental or social safeguard areas in particular pilot projects, and not in other areas.⁷ Before deciding on the use of borrower systems, the Bank also assesses the acceptability of the Borrower's implementation practices, track record, and institutional capacity. The above approach and criteria for assessment were developed with inputs from external stakeholders such as representatives of governments, bilateral and multilateral development institutions, civil society organizations, and the private sector and are consistent with commitments made by the development community in the March 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

3. Romania is one of the few countries that are being considered for piloting the use of country systems, specifically in the proposed Bank-assisted Municipal Services Project (MSP) and Transport Sector Support Project (TSSP). The following sections describe the scope methodology and findings of the equivalence and acceptability assessments carried out by Bank staff in co-operation with Romanian officials, European Commission officials, and consultants and local specialists. The proposed pilot is expected to bring the added benefit of moving towards harmonization of environmental and social safeguards requirements among the Government, the World Bank and other development partners such as the European Union, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, European Investment Bank, and other financial institutions and donors who support similar projects in Romania.

⁵ Country systems is defined as the country's legal and institutional framework, consisting of its national, sub-national, or sectoral implementing institutions and relevant laws, regulations, rules, and procedures that are applicable to the proposed pilot project.

⁶ OP 4.00 can be viewed at this web-site:
<http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/Institutional/Manuals/OpManual.nsf/tocall/E49CED1645FB433885256FCD00776B19?OpenDocument>

⁷ The Bank's environmental and social safeguard policies will apply to the areas which the Bank has determined not to be equivalent to its applicable policy framework and will continue to apply to all projects that are not part of the pilot program.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

2.1 Romania Municipal Services Project (MSP)

4. The proposed Romania MSP will be implemented by three implementing entities, namely: the Municipality of Bucharest, the Municipality of Arad, and the Ministry of Environment and Water Management (MEWM). The project is rated as Category B for Environmental Assessment⁸, and has the following three components: (i) urban services in Arad Municipality; (ii) urban services in Bucharest Municipality, and (iii) a technical assistance component.

5. Components (i) and (ii) entail **investment**, for improving urban services in Bucharest and Arad through:

- ③ Rehabilitation of existing drinking water networks;
- ③ Rehabilitation of existing sewerage lines;
- ③ Rehabilitation of existing storm water drainage lines;
- ③ Rehabilitation and upgrading of existing drinking water treatment plants;⁹
- ③ Rehabilitation and upgrading of existing waste water treatment plants;
- ③ Construction of new drinking water networks;
- ③ Construction of new sewerage lines;
- ③ Construction of new storm water drainage lines;
- ③ Paving of roads where the above works have been carried out.

6. The technical assistance component (component iii) consists primarily of:

- ③ Consulting services to prepare water and wastewater feasibility studies for projects in 11 counties

2.2 Romania Transport Sector Support Project (TSSP)

7. The proposed Romania Transport Sector Support project is categorized as a Category B project for Environmental Assessment and will be structured as a specific investment loan. The project will be implemented by the Romania National Company for Motorways and National Roads (NCMNR) and Romania National Railway Company (SNCFR) for the national roads and railways, respectively; for the county roads (see below) a new management entity will be established. The project will consist of the following components:

- ③ A roads component comprising:
 - Periodic maintenance of selected key sections of the national road network, in line with the Governments on-going program;

⁸ Earlier versions of the Bank's Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet (ISDS) noted a proposed FI category with possible A and B sub-projects in several cities. The project as now envisaged does not include landfills or wastewater treatment plants, nor is it currently slated to provide co-funding for cities beyond Bucharest and Arad. With a focus on rehabilitation and minor systems expansion, the latest ISDS notes the more appropriate Category B rating.

⁹ As of April 2006, rehabilitation and upgrading of drinking water and wastewater treatment plants may not be financed, but since the analyses have been carried out, the results are included in this document.

- Technical assistance to improve the capacity within NCMNR to effectively manage road maintenance and rehabilitation. This comprises studies and consulting services aimed at: (a) preparing and implementing a pilot output-based area-wide multi-year maintenance contracts, with the objective of gradually expanding the coverage to the entire country within four years; (b) hiring a Technical Adviser to improve management and technical capacity within the RNCMNR; and (c) the design of maintenance and rehabilitation works.
 - Technical assistance for county road management to develop the operating procedures and competitive selection procedures for Rural Roads Maintenance Consultancies
- ③ A **railway component** consisting of:
- Periodic maintenance, repair and overhaul of main lines; this sub-component is designed to fund three types of maintenance works: (a) overhaul of public infrastructure - tracks, bridges, tunnels, embankments, interlocking and signaling electrification systems; (b) repair and maintenance of tracks, bridges, tunnels, and embankments; and (c) repair and maintenance of interlocking, signaling, and electrification systems at border stations;
 - Technical assistance to SNCFR for the implementation of railway infrastructure maintenance management systems.

2.3 Rationale for choosing the MSP and TSSP for Piloting

8. Joining the European Union is one of the central development objectives of Romania with the recently signed Accession Treaty committing the government to EU membership in 2007. EU accession will require wide ranging reforms of the Romanian economy in order to prepare for competition, and to improve the physical infrastructure. The rationale for choosing the MSP and TSSP lending operations as pilots for the OP/BP 4.00 is in accordance with the country's reform efforts linked to the EU accession process. The proposed pilots will support priority investments in transport and municipal services infrastructure sectors determined by Romania, and thereby assist the country to fulfill its pledges with regard to EU accession and with the absorption of EU grant funds. Specifically, the Transport Sector Support Project will provide financial support to ensure full implementation of the GOR's program for rehabilitation and maintenance of the existing road and rail networks. The MSP project will provide new urban services for water supply, sewerage, drainage and road surfacing in priority neighborhoods of Bucharest and Arad municipalities. This equivalence and acceptability assessment helps to identify opportunities for strengthening existing capacity that is needed for the country to meet accession requirements for the EU environmental directives (Chapter 22, "Environmental Protection"), and to establish or strengthen existing institutions and their environmental and social systems to absorb post-accession EU funds and contribute to a smooth integration process. Consequently, the MSP and TSSP pilots offer an opportunity to strengthen the Government of Romania's (GOR) institutional capacity to promote harmonization of environmental safeguard requirements among the GOR, the World Bank and other development partners.

2.4 Summary of Public Consultation and Disclosure

9. A public consultation workshop was organized to discuss the Executive Summary of this report in Bucharest on December 13, 2005. In preparation for this workshop, the document and invitations were placed on MEWM's website, and invitations were sent to potentially interested stakeholders. Participants expressed overall support for the pilot. No major issues were raised or objections were made. Annex IV provides a summary of the meeting and the list of participants.

10. A full draft report was disclosed in English in the World Bank InfoShop and in Romanian on the MEWM web site January 25, 2006. The comment period in Romania closed on March 10, 2006;

no comments were received from the public. This revised version reflects clarification of information and supporting analyses but no change in overall conclusions with regard to equivalence and acceptability.

3.0 EQUIVALENCE ANALYSIS

3.1 Bank's Safeguard Policy Areas Applicable to the Proposed Pilot Projects

3.1.1 Romania Municipal Services Project

11. **Environmental Assessment.** The proposed MSP will assist Romania in its efforts to meet the cost of water, wastewater, and storm sewerage investments, to comply with wastewater discharge, and water quality standards set by EU directives.¹⁰ Though these are environment friendly investments aimed to reduce the current pollution load, they could result in adverse environmental impacts if inappropriate design, construction and operational practices are followed. In order to address these potential adverse impacts, the Bank policy area on EA is applicable to the proposed MSP.¹¹ The project has been categorized as an environmental category B since the investments will be related to small civil works without significant impact to the environment.

12. **Involuntary Resettlement.** During project preparation, the possibility that the Bank's policy area on Involuntary Resettlement might apply was raised since the project might require small scale land acquisition, for example to extend sewerage networks (although physical relocation of households or businesses was not expected.) Most of the pipes will be buried under streets, for which the local government will issue concessions for the right-of-way. During the final stages of project preparation, where more specific information on investments in Arad and Bucharest were obtained, the possibility of land acquisition was excluded from the project¹².

13. **Cultural Property.** Based on current project information, the project is not expected to affect any known physical cultural resources. However the policy area on Cultural Property is also considered in this assessment, to address any chance finds during construction and unexpected impacts that may occur during realignment or expansion of services when investments may take place in historic districts, potentially affect historic structures, or influence other physical-cultural resources.

14. **Other Safeguards.** The Bank policy on International Waterways (OP 7.50) is triggered by the MSP, but given that that safeguard policy area does not fall within the scope of OP 4.00 it is not included in this equivalence and acceptability assessment. Instead, procedures under OP 7.50 (notification of riparians) was carried out.

15. There is no information to indicate that other safeguard policy areas are applicable to the proposed MSP. During the preparation of the Municipal Services Project (i.e. before the selection of

¹⁰ A list of relevant EU directives can be found in Annex I

¹¹ Under the Bank's OP/BP 4.01 the MSP would be classified as environmental "B." Earlier versions of the Bank's Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet noted a proposed FI category with possible A and B sub-projects. The project as now envisaged does not include new landfills or wastewater treatment plants, nor is it currently slated to provide co-funding for other cities. With a focus on rehabilitation and minor systems expansion in Arad and Bucharest, the Category B rating is more appropriate.

¹² At negotiations, the Project Implementing Entities confirmed that the Project will be carried out on public lands and that it will not trigger the Bank's policy on Involuntary Resettlement that includes land acquisition. As a result, there would be no land acquisition costs – which were to be fully financed by the Project Implementing Entities - related to the Project as originally anticipated. It was further agreed that the gap filling measures related to Bank's piloting of its policy on Involuntary Resettlement under OP 4.00 (including associated effectiveness conditions of the Loan) will not be included in the Project. A definition consistent with the Bank's resettlement policy was retained in the Appendix to the Loan Agreement and undertakings were entered into by the two Municipalities to ensure that the carrying out of the Project would not cause, or result in, resettlement.

Bucharest and Arad for the bulk of investments), it was possible that candidate sub-projects might have included rehabilitation or extension of drinking water systems where supply is obtained from dams or other control structures. New dams would not have been financed by the project, nor would dams have been rehabilitated under the project, but the capability of Romanian authorities to ensure dam safety was considered important should water supplies under the project be associated with control structures. Such sub-projects are not, however, currently included in the project but the resultant “equivalence and acceptability” assessment is left included in this report for possible reference use in future projects.

3.1.2 Romania Transport Sector Support Project

16. **Environmental Assessment.** As described above, the proposed Transport Sector Support Project will assist Romania in its efforts to maintain, rehabilitate and modernize national and country roads and railways. Rehabilitation and maintenance activities under the proposed project could result in some adverse environmental impacts, unless appropriate design, construction and operational practices are followed. Potential adverse environmental impacts are expected to be local, and occur during implementation/construction only, and the project has been categorized as “B”.

17. **Involuntary Resettlement.** Under the current scope of the project, investments (such as resurfacing of roads, improvement of signaling, and maintenance of rail) are largely expected to incur within the existing right of way. The road rehabilitation component is not expected to require the acquisition of land. With regard to the railway component it cannot be excluded that acquisition of small amounts of land may be needed, for example to maintain yards or sub-stations or realign tracks, and the Bank’s policy on Involuntary Resettlement is therefore also considered applicable to the proposed TSSP. Physical relocation of households or businesses is not expected to take place.

18. **Other Safeguards.** There is no information to indicate that other environmental and social safeguard policies of the Bank are applicable to the proposed TSSP.

3.2 Methodology Used for Determining Equivalence

19. This equivalence analysis was carried out by Bank staff in co-operation with Romanian and EU officials, consultants and legal and environmental counsel.¹³ The methodology included a desk review of current in-force Romanian legislation; Romania’s treaty of accession to the EU; relevant European Union Directives and International Conventions; discussion with Romanian officials and EU Commission staff; and a review of EU and Bank reports and studies.

20. The equivalence analysis matrix (Annex II to this report) provides a comparison between EA, Involuntary Resettlement and Cultural Property policy objectives and operational principles, as stated in Table A1 of OP 4.00, with the requirements under the applicable Romanian laws, regulations, rules, and procedures. Information of the area of Dam Safety is left included in the matrix, despite the fact that has now become evident that that area is not triggered by the MSP.

3.3 Equivalence Analysis - Environmental Assessment

3.3.1 Romanian Laws and Regulations Applicable to the Projects

21. Annex I to this report contains a list of laws, regulations, rules and procedures that govern EIA categorization in Romania. In addition, it lists relevant EU directives and international treaties to which Romania is party. Matrices comparing Romanian systems to the requirements of OP 4.00 for Environmental Assessment are included as Annex IIA to this report.

¹³ Key officials met during the major September 2005 study mission are mentioned in Annex III; the input of other staff during previous and follow-on meetings and discussions is gratefully acknowledged.

22. Joining the European Union is one of the central development objectives of Romania with the recently signed Accession Treaty, and the Government is committed to obtaining EU membership in 2007. Article 148 (2) of Romania's Constitution (titled "on Integration into the European Union") provides that, as a result of accession, the provisions of the constituent treaties of the European Union as well as the other binding community regulations *shall take precedence* over conflicting provisions of the national law, in compliance with the provisions of the accession act.

23. European Union law on environmental protection comprises over 200 legal acts covering horizontal legislation, water and air pollution, management of waste and chemicals, biotechnology, nature protection, industrial pollution and risk management, noise and radiation protection. If it finds that an EU member state is not applying EU law, and therefore not meeting its legal obligations, the European Commission takes steps to put the situation right, though a process called the 'infringement procedure.' If this procedure fails to correct matters, the Commission must then refer the matter to the European Court of Justice, which has the power to impose penalties. The Court's judgments are binding on EU member states and institutions.

24. Preparation for EU accession has required wide ranging reforms of the Romanian administration and legal system in order to prepare for acceptance of the so-called *acquis communautaire*, and to improve physical infrastructure. The general framework Law 294/2003 approving the Emergency Government Ordinance 91/2002 which amended Law 137/1995 was adopted, introducing a compulsory procedure for EIA for certain projects, including those with transboundary effects. Government Decision 918/2002 (transposing the EIA Directives) and four Ministerial Ordinances¹⁴ were adopted establishing the competencies, procedural stages and instructions including on public participation and preparation in the EIA procedure (screening of projects, scoping of EIS, and review).¹⁵ Screening of projects, to determine whether significant environmental impacts are likely to occur, and a full EIA has to be carried out, is based on quantitative and qualitative criteria. Competent authorities are MEWM (for certain important projects) and National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA) at national level, Regional EPAs, and LEPAs (county level), depending of the type and anticipated impact of a proposed project. Annex I.1 and I.2 of MO 860/2002, as amended by MO 210/2004 and MO 1037/2005, determines which competent authority is responsible with regards to which type of project. A Technical Review Committee comprised of several representatives of ministries and representatives of civil protection and the fire brigade, and which may be enlarged with experts as needed, participates in all stages, notably, screening, scoping, and quality review of the EIS. The EIS may only be developed by certified specialists.

25. New projects, and any change, extension, or dismantling of projects that may have significant environmental impacts, related to activities listed in GD 918/2002 (environmental impact assessment framework) and EGO 152/2005 (on integrated pollution prevention, mitigation and control) require an environmental license to construct,¹⁶ and in many instances an integrated multi-media permit.¹⁷ A full EIA is required for projects of the types listed in Annex I of GD 918/2002, and for the types listed in Annex II of that same Government Decision, when the competent authorities have so determined on a case by case basis (screening). A detailed description of the Romanian Licensing and Permitting Procedures is presented in Annex IB of this document. The following table aims to provide an overview of EIA procedures applicable to the proposed sub-projects. Investment projects not subject

¹⁴ The regulatory instruments in Romania include Laws, Decisions and Ministerial Ordinances. Decisions are issued to organize the application of laws. Ordinances are issued within the limits and conformity with the provisions of enabling laws. Laws are passed by the Parliament. Decisions and Ordinances are signed by the prime Minister and countersigned by the Minister(s) who carry-out their execution.

¹⁵ For detailed references see legislation listed in Annex IA

¹⁶ Romanian law uses the term "environmental agreement" in this context.

¹⁷ MO 860/2002, Art 5 (1)

to EIA are subject to simplified environmental licensing procedures in view of issuing the Unique Agreement.¹⁸

Table 1. Subproject investments and relevant EIA categories under Romanian Law

Proposed Sub-project Investments	Investments for which EIA is mandatory under Romanian Law (annex 1 GD 918/2002 and Annex I.1 of MO 860/2002	Investments for which need for EIA is determined on case by case basis (annex 2 GD 918/2002 and Annex I.2 of MO 860/2002	List of investments for which Unique Agreement is required, but not subject to full EIA
Municipal Services Project¹⁹			
1. Rehabilitation of existing drinking water networks	None	Any change or extension of investments listed at point 10, b) Urban development	Based on 860/2002
2. Rehabilitation of existing sewerage lines	None	Any change or extension of investments listed at point 10, b) Urban development	Based on 860/2002
3. Rehabilitation of existing storm water drainage lines	None	Any change or extension of investments listed at point 10, b) Urban development	Based on 860/2002
4. Rehabilitation and upgrading of existing drinking water treatment plants ²⁰	None	Any change or extension of investments listed at point 10, b) Urban development	Based on 860/2002
5. Rehabilitation and upgrading of existing waste water treatment plants	None	Any change or extension of investments listed in Annex 1 or 2 [i.e. waste water treatment plants with a capacity exceeding 150,000 population equivalent] which may have significant effects on the environment (annex 2 cat 13a)	Based on 860/2002
6. Construction of new drinking water networks	None	Installations of long-distance aqueducts (annex I.2 cat. 10(j))	Based on 860/2002
7. Construction of new sewerage lines	None	Investments listed at point 10, b), Urban development	Based on 860/2002
8. Construction of new storm water drainage lines	None	Investments listed at point 10, b), Urban development	Based on 860/2002
9. Road paving	Same as below	Same as below	
Transport Sector Support Project			
9. Maintenance and primary rehabilitation of selected key sections of the national road network	- Construction of motorways and express roads (annex 1 cat 8.3) - Construction of a new road of four or more lanes or realignment and/or widening of an existent road, of two lanes or less so as to provide four or more lanes, where such new road or realigned and/or widened section of road would be 10 km or more in a continuous length (annex 1 cat 8.4)	Construction of roads (not included in Annex I.2) Any change or extension of investments listed in Annex 1 or 2 which may have significant effects on the environment (Annex 2 cat 13a)	
10. Maintenance of existing infrastructure (e.g. railway track, bridges and tunnels)	Construction of lines for long distance railway traffic (annex 1, cat. 8.1)	Construction of railways (projects not included in Annex 1) Any change or extension of investments listed in Annex 1 or 2 [i.e. lines for long distance railway traffic] which may have significant effects on the environment (Annex 2 cat 13a)	
11. Modernization of signaling, power supply, and inter-modal equipment	Construction of overhead electrical power lines with a voltage of 220 kV or more and a length of more than 15 km (annex 1.1,	Transmission of electrical energy by overhead cable	

¹⁸ MO 860/2002, Art 5(3) – the Unique Agreement is given for those investments that are subject to environmental procedure *without* an environmental agreement (license to construct) and therefore for which it is not necessary to develop an EIA.

¹⁹ At the time this report is being prepared, investments in solid waste management and wastewater treatment are not envisaged for financing.

²⁰ As of April 2006, rehabilitation and upgrading of drinking water and wastewater treatment plants may not be financed, but since the analyses have been carried out, the results are included in this document.

Proposed Sub-project Investments	Investments for which EIA is mandatory under Romanian Law (annex 1 GD 918/2002 and Annex I.1 of MO 860/2002	Investments for which need for EIA is determined on case by case basis (annex 2 GD 918/2002 and Annex I.2 of MO 860/2002	List of investments for which Unique Agreement is required, but not subject to full EIA
at border stations	cat 3.9)	Construction of intermodal terminals Manufacture of railway equipment Any change of extension of overhead electrical power lines with a voltage of 220 kV or more and a length of more than 15 km [i.e. projects listed in Annex 1 or 2] which may have significant effects on the environment (annex 2, cat 13a)	

3.3.3 Current and Proposed Measures to Improve the System

26. Romania is committed to improve the EA system as part of the EU accession process through the transposition and implementation of Directive 2003/35/EC which amends the EIA Directive. Improvement will bolster overall environmental sustainability of national programs, but is not necessary to meet OP 4.00 requirements for the Municipal Services and Transport Sector Support projects. It should also be noted that the Bank's proposed Environmental Management Loan (slated for delivery in FY07) will provide considerable capacity building which will directly and positively improve Romanian systems at both the policy and field levels.

3.3.2 Analysis of Gaps

27. As can be seen from the equivalence analysis matrix in Annex IIA, the Bank's EA policy and the Romanian EIA system have many common features and principles and are considered compatible in most aspects. Both the Romanian EIA system and the Bank's policy on EA classify projects and activities into categories. The positive list of projects and activities subject to full environmental assessment or a more limited environmental analysis under the Romanian legislation is by nature similar to the classification (respectively) in Category A and Category B projects under the Bank's policy.

28. Overall, the Romanian system screening process is comprehensive and provides adequate procedural details (including checklists for the competent authorities). The differences between the Romanian EIA process and the principles stated in the Bank's OP/BP 4.00 relate to (a) continuing consultation throughout implementation of high-risk projects and (b) use of independent advisory panels during the implementation of such projects. However, these differences are not pertinent to the proposed TSSP and MSP.

3.3.3 Proposed Measures to Address the Gaps of the Romanian EA System

29. With regard to EA, no gap-filling measures are required for the MSP and TSSP, to achieve equivalence between Romania's system and the objective and principles as stated in Table A1 to OP.400.

30. Romania is committed to improve the EA system as part of the EU accession process through the transposition and implementation of Directive 2003/35/EC which amends the EIA Directive. Improvement will bolster overall environmental sustainability of national programs, but is not necessary to meet OP 4.00 requirements for the Municipal Services and Transport Sector Support projects.

3.4 Equivalence Analysis – Cultural Property

31. The EU has limited legislation in the area of cultural property, primarily addressing standards for the export of cultural goods/national treasures as well as measures to return illegally traded cultural property. Each member state has its own laws and procedures for protecting physical cultural resources (PCR), that go well beyond those of the EU in terms of comparability in scope to that of the World Bank safeguard policies.

3.4.1 Romanian Laws and Regulations Applicable to the Projects

32. The comparison of Romanian systems for PCR with the objective and operational principles as stated in Table A1 of OP/BP 4.00 is included as Annex IIB.

33. PCR protection in Romania is comprehensively governed by several pieces of legislation, the most pertinent being: Law 422/2001 on protection of historic monuments and Government Ordinance 43/2000 (GO 43/2000) on Archaeological Heritage Protection and Declaring of Certain Archaeological Sites as Areas of National Interest (modified text following the Law 378/2000 and the Law 462/2003).

34. Law 422/2001 establishes the principle of classification of historic monuments: Group A being historic monuments of national and universal interest, and Group B being historic monuments representative of the local cultural heritage. Classification for both groups is performed under an Order of the Minister of Culture and Religious Affairs (MCRA), at the proposal of the National Commission for Historic Monuments (NCHM).²¹ Owners and the public as well as the NCHM, the National Commission for Archaeology (NCA), the local mayor, and local or county councils are entitled to participate in the listing process, as they can make proposals for listing; proposals that have to be taken into account by the county services of the Ministry of Culture. Any order of classification must be communicated to the owner of the property and the local public administration within 30 days of the decision being taken. On the other hand, the owner of a building proposed to be listed or rejected for listing is entitled to appeal against the decision at the MCRA within 30 days of receiving the communication.

35. Law 422/2001 also contains provisions entitling the owner to receive scientific, technical, material and financial support for the conservation and restoration of his/her monument. This mechanism helps to bring the public effectively into the process of both listing and preserving historic monuments. There are approximately 29,000 listed monuments in Romania.²²

36. For each monument, an area of protection is created by the local public administration (with the engagement of qualified staff), and the protected area must be demarcated within the General Urban Plan of the municipality. Until a protection area has been established for a historical monument, it is considered to have a protection radius area of 100 meters in towns, 200 meters in villages, and 500 meters in the countryside. Newly listed buildings must be included in the General Urban Plan within 12 months of being listed, and the plan must be communicated to the MCRA every five years, along with all up-to-date information concerning historic monuments.

37. Without exception, there can be no intervention upon listed buildings without the prior consultation and authorization of the MCRA. This means that the building permission request must be seen by the local representative of the MCRA, who will provide advice and recommendations on the construction works in the form of an administrative document. Only after receiving this document can

²¹ The NCHM is a 21 member body which meets once a month to advise the MCRA on classifications (particularly Group A), national strategies and methodologies for PCR protection, general urban plans, and criteria for selecting specialists and experts in PCR protection. Its membership comprises representatives from: the Romanian Academy, Ministry of Education and Research, Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Housing, NGOs, and the MCRA.

²² The list, which includes UNESCO World Heritage Sites can be consulted on-line at <http://www.cultura.ro/Documents.aspx?ID=89>

a County Council, following the qualified advice of the MCRA and the NCHM, grant or refuse a construction request affecting a listed building / site. If the works are approved, they must involve design supervisor engineers and/or architects who have specific qualifications in the field of historical buildings, certified by MCRA.

38. The same principles apply to located archaeological sites (the National Archaeological Repertory), which is maintained by the MCRA and includes some 5,600 locations.²³ GO 43/2000 on Archaeological Heritage Protection set up a comprehensive system of preservation for Romania's archaeological heritage from areas of archaeological potential and from urban development areas, following on the provisions of the Council of Europe Convention of La Valetta (1992). The law makes it mandatory for an infrastructure project proponent to carry out field surveys at the feasibility study stage of the project, using qualified specialists. The project proponent must also pay for archaeological surveillance over the entire period of the works to protect the archaeology and chance finds. Research carried out in this manner is known as 'preventive archaeological research' and aims to find the most likely archaeological remains, to study them and to protect them in a specialized institution before the investment project could affect them. In certain cases, especially when there are structures with great historic, cultural or scientific importance that cannot be moved, the archaeological team can recommend the preservation of the remains by changing the initial plans. Planned building works on located archaeological sites cannot go ahead without the MCRA issuing a certification that all archaeological patrimony has been revealed and fully examined (the so-called "Archaeological Burden Discharge Certificate").²⁴ If archaeological remains are discovered during any archaeological research, the location can be added by the MCRA to the National Archaeological Repertory and the National Office for Cadastre, Survey and Mapping must include these areas of located heritage on cadastre plans and topographical maps.

39. Under the terms of GO 43/2000, 'chance' archaeological finds discovered during building works, or any human activity, must be reported to the town mayor within 72 hours of discovery. Following the discovery, and until an Archaeological Discharge Certificate is issued, the building permit is suspended or the town Mayor can order the interruption of all activity. Scientific, management and technical measures must then be adopted to preserve the vestiges uncovered by chance until the assets are classified or until the conclusion of the archaeological research. Law enforcement officials must also be notified to guard the area.

40. Environmental Protection Law 137/1995 also stipulates measures for cultural heritage protection within the context of the Environmental Impact Assessment procedure (detailed in Government Ordinance 860/2002). In particular, affirmation that projects pose insignificant environmental impact, can only be issued after the project site location has been checked against its relative position to, *inter alia*, protected areas, and natural or archaeological monuments. The EIA must specify effects on material assets and cultural heritage at each stage of the process (screening, scoping and review) and, as necessary, experts from entities responsible for archaeological sites and historical monuments may participate in the Technical Review Committee for EIA. In addition, public consultation is foreseen at publication of the assessment study, before which the public may forward justified proposals concerning the EA.

41. Romania became a member of the Council of Europe in 1993, which binds it to a number of conventions, which they have ratified, relating to the protection of physical cultural resources, including the European Cultural Convention, the Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe, and the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage.

42. To summarize, Romanian law specifies that inventories of buildings and sites of cultural significance are consulted to assess whether proposed investment projects might cause impact. Local

²³ This list may be consulted on-line at: <http://www.cimec.ro/scripts/ARH/RAR-Index/cauta.asp>

²⁴ The certificate may be issued by the local offices of the MCRA, in the case of researches made necessary for the construction of private homes.

experts on archeology, architecture and other relevant fields are brought in for assessments before construction decisions are made, and after if “chance finds” are encountered during construction. Only when the finds have been fully analyzed are investment projects allowed to proceed.

3.4.2 Analysis of Gaps

43. As can be seen from the equivalence analysis matrix in Annex II to this report, there are no gaps between Romanian laws, regulations and procedures on PCR and the objective and operational principles as stated in Table A1 of OP 4.00. Owners of property (archeology and/or monuments) that is to be classified are notified of the process and made aware of the obligations of having their property listed and can contest the decision. Public consultation does occur during the EIA process (which includes consideration of physical cultural resources issues), and hence this is considered equivalent to OP/BP 4.00.

3.4.3 Current and Proposed Measures to Achieve the Equivalence

44. With regard to Cultural Property no gap-filling measures are required for the MSP and TSSP, to achieve equivalence between Romania’s system and the objective and principles as stated in Table A1 to OP.400.

3.5 Equivalence Analysis – Dam Safety

3.5.1 Romanian Laws and Procedures

45. During the preparation of the Municipal Services Project (i.e. before the selection of Bucharest and Arad for the bulk of investments), it was anticipated that candidate sub-projects might have included rehabilitation or extension of drinking water systems where supply is obtained from dams or other control structures. New dams would not have been financed by the project, nor would dams have been rehabilitated under the project, but the capability of Romanian authorities to ensure dam safety was considered important should water supplies under the project be associated with control structures. Such sub-projects are not, however, currently included in the MSP. Nevertheless, the information gathered as part of the equivalence analysis in this area is left included here, for possible future reference.

46. Romanian legislation (Water Law 107/1996 modified by Law 310/2004, and Government Ordinance 244/2000) and regulations (Ministerial Ordinance 128/2005) for dam safety are sufficiently broad and include coverage for water retention structures. Both categories were considered under the Bank-financed Hazard Risk Mitigation and Emergency Preparedness Project (HRMEP), currently under implementation. Good alignment was found between Romanian requirements and those of the Bank. Experience by the World Bank in ongoing projects in Romania also suggests that the country’s system for ensuring the safety of existing dams that are utilized for water supply is sufficiently equivalent to applicable aspects of the Municipal Services project. Depending on risk, key aspects of this system includes, for example, the assurance that:

- ③ For each of the control structure associated with the project, emergency preparedness plans (EPP) would be in place and periodically updated.
- ③ That operations and maintenance plans are in place for each dam or control structure.
- ③ For higher risk control structures, a Panel of Experts (POE) including certified independent experts would be tasked to undertake reviews of designs and technical specifications for works; the POE will further advise on construction quality.

Dam safety issues do not arise in Transport Sector Support Project.

3.5.2 Analysis of Gaps

47. When limited application of dam safety provisions arose as a possibility in the Municipal Services project (now no longer deemed applicable), no significant gaps were found between Romanian law on dam safety and the operational principles as stated in Table A1 of OP 4.00.

3.5.3 Current and Proposed Measures to Achieve the Equivalence

48. The policy is not triggered and no gap-filling measures are required.

3.6 Equivalence Analysis - Involuntary Resettlement

49. The equivalence analysis for Involuntary Resettlement focuses on expropriation and land acquisition as the Transport Sector Support Project is not expected to cause physical relocation of households or businesses. It should be noted, however, that Romania has selected a conventional approach to due diligence for this safeguard policy area, and OP 4.12 will apply rather than OP 4.00. Nevertheless, the results of the equivalence review are presented for general information and possible use in future pilots. Involuntary Resettlement is not triggered for the Municipal Services Project.

50. The EU does not have a common policy or standards regarding resettlement or expropriation. Each member state has its own laws and procedures in this area.

3.6.1 Romanian Laws and Procedures

51. In Romania, expropriation at all levels is governed by a general framework Expropriation Law 33/1994, the implementation of which is guided by Government Resolution 583/1994²⁵. The basic principles are straightforward: expropriation must be justified and minimized; compensation is in cash based on market value and damages; contracts are subject to judicial review and ratification; failed negotiations regarding compensation are settled by the courts, informed by an expert valuation assessment; and civil works can start only after the transfer of the title is ordered by the courts and full compensation is paid²⁶

52. The Romanian Constitution (Art. 44, para. 3.6) protects the ownership of private property and provides that “nobody may be expropriated unless for a cause of public use, established according to the law, subject to a fair and prior compensation.” Implementation of this clause is the subject of the Expropriation Law (33/1994) regarding the Process of Land Acquisition for Reasons of Public Use, referred to as the “Expropriation Law.” Procedures for establishing public use are articulated in Government Resolution 583/1994 on “Regulation regarding the procedure of the commissions for performing a prior investigation to declare a public use for national or local interest works”.

53. The Expropriation Law specifies conditions under which different governmental authorities (national, country and local) can expropriate private land and outlines procedures for doing so. Government Resolution 583/1994, a companion to Law 33/1994, sets procedures and the functioning and membership of review commissions involved in making the Expropriation Decision. These procedures apply to all levels of government. The process consists of three stages that are described in Law 33/1994. The following titles were assigned to these stages for clarification:

- ③ *Declaration of Public Use*—based on a feasibility study and economic analysis, in the

²⁵ Another law, No. 198/2004, accompanied by Methodological Rules of June 10, 2004, for the application of Law 198/2004, simplifies expropriation for highways and national roads by establishing provisions to use escrow accounts to deposit funds for complicated cases involving disputes, absentee owners or uncertain owners. This law does not apply to the pilot projects, although there is an attempt underway to pass similar legislation for the railroads.

²⁶ These Romanian laws and procedures apply to the expropriation of private land for public use. A specific Act of Parliament would be required for the relocation of a village, presumably because the cost of such an undertaking would be considerably higher than simple expropriation, but this is not relevant for the projects at hand.

expropriation request the expropriator must demonstrate public need (“Public Use”); document that the investment is included in the urban or regional plan; and include a preliminary assessment of land acquisition and cost. Documentation is reviewed by a commission (county, local), which obtains inputs from utilities, agencies and interested parties. People who feel they may be affected can inquire and raise objections at this time. The commission either accepts the proposal and issues a Location Permit, or returns it to the expropriator. Minutes of the decision meeting are posted and distributed to affected parties. The Location Permit is posted in the County or Local Council and published in a local newspaper.

- ③ *Administration*—based on the Technical Design, which specifies ownership of affected parcels (approved by the Cadastre office) and compensation levels set by authorized assessors, the expropriator can acquire land or rights-of-way. The design and proposed aggregate compensation is posted in the County or Local Council and published in a local newspaper, and owners are notified of the intent to acquire land or right of way. Interested parties can challenge the Technical Design by writing to the mayor, who appoints a commission to review and respond to all inputs. The minutes of the deliberation of the commission are posted and the commission either endorses the design or instructs the expropriator to modify it. Owners must provide documentation of ownership to negotiate. By law, the expropriator cannot offer an amount less than the assessed value of the property (Law 33/1994, Chapter IV, Art. 27). If the expropriator and owner agree on the compensation amount, a purchase contract is prepared and signed. The agreement becomes effective when it is ratified by the court and compensation is paid. If the two parties do not agree on a compensation amount, the expropriator or owner can submit the case for court adjudication.
- ③ *Adjudication*—all agreements are reviewed by the court to determine whether or they followed proper procedures fulfilling legal requirements; if so, they are ratified and the transfer is immediate upon payment. In case of a dispute over compensation, the court commissions an expert valuation and sets the level of compensation. Ownership is deemed transferred when the transaction is registered in the cadastre and compensation is paid. The court also has the authority to sanction expropriation if owners cannot be located or ownership is disputed.

54. Land acquisition must be completed before a Construction License is issued, after which civil works can start.

55. The process can be time consuming, particularly if ownership is unclear or disputed, if owners cannot provide documentation of ownership or if owners cannot be located. Compensation for disputed lands is decided by the court and the expropriator deposits funds that are distributed once the dispute is settled. In cases where documentation is incomplete, the expropriator helps legitimate claimants acquire documents. If owners are not located, the expropriator follows a prescribed notification procedure. The law does not clearly limit the time required to complete expropriation or provide adequate guidance on how to conclude the process for complicated cases.²⁷ Consequently, the expropriation process can be protracted.

56. Once the court ratifies the arrangement, and money is deposited in a bank account, the transfer can take place. The owners of the land that was expropriated have three years to challenge the compensation amount, but cannot reverse the court decision to transfer ownership.

²⁷ Law 198/2004 was enacted to simplify procedures for the construction of highways and national roads. Methodological Rules were issued to guide application of the law (June 10, 2004). The new law differs from Law 33/1994 in one principal respect—the introduction of escrow accounts to deposit compensation when ownership is unclear or disputed or owners cannot be located. This law is not applicable in the pilot projects.

57. Disputes over ownership are resolved through a separate process outside the scope of the Expropriation Law. The process involves the cadastre office as well as courts, which make the final determination of the validity of conflicting claims and the distribution of assets.

3.6.2 Equivalence and Analysis of Gaps and Differences

58. The expropriation system in Romania is broadly consistent with the objectives and many of the operational principles of OP/BP 4.00. However a number of the operational principles listed in Table A1 of OP 4.00 do not have specific corresponding requirements in Romania. The similarities and differences between principles in OP/BP 4.00 and Romanian legal requirements and practices are highlighted below. The text is structured following the objective and principles listed in table A1 to OP/BP 4.00 (see also summary matrix as Annex IID to this report).

Objective: *To avoid or minimize involuntary resettlement and, where this is not feasible, to assist displaced persons in improving or at least restoring their livelihoods and standards of living in real terms relative to pre-displacement levels or to levels prevailing prior to the beginning of project implementation, whichever is higher.*

59. The Romanian Constitution protects private property and provides that “*nobody may be expropriated unless for a cause of public use, established according to law, subject to a fair and prior compensation*” (Art. 44, para.3.6). These provisions were further elaborated in the Expropriation Law (Law 33/1994) and Government Resolution 583/1994, which establish a standard that applies to all levels of government. Each act of expropriation is based on a request for an expropriation decision, which must justify “*the national or local interest, the economical-social, environmental or any other kind of advantages that justify the necessary character of works and could not be carried out except by means of expropriation*” (Art. 10 Expropriation Law).

60. The Expropriation Law is based on the assumption that compensation at market value and “prejudice” (real value of the premises and the prejudice caused to the owner or other entitled persons (Art. 26, Expropriation Law) should be adequate to enable the affected people to maintain the value of their assets and, if relevant, to re-establish themselves under similar circumstances. Article 26 of the Expropriation Law loosely characterizes prejudice as “*damages caused to the owner or, if the case may be, to other entitled persons, also considering the justification submitted by them.*” The Civil Code defines prejudice as “*damage effectively suffered and unrealized benefits.*” Expropriation cancels tenancy agreements and the tenants are “*entitled to compensation*” (Art. 28, Expropriation Law). It appears that prejudice thus covers impacts on income and livelihoods beyond the cost of affected assets, including impacts on third parties.

Operational Principle 1. *Assess all viable alternative project designs to avoid, where feasible, or minimize involuntary resettlement.*

61. Article 10 of the Expropriation Law requires a project proponent/expropriator to justify the need for expropriation and to demonstrate that the investment cannot occur without expropriation. A commission (at national, county or local level) is set up to review each proposal, obtain technical inputs from government agencies and inputs from interest parties, and recommend an expropriation decision or return the proposal to the project proponent. Various agencies and ministries also append specific requirements that must be fulfilled in the Technical Design. The process is essentially repeated when the Technical Design is completed and affected persons are identified.

Operational Principle 2. *Through census and socio-economic surveys of the affected population, identify, assess, and address the potential economic and social impacts of the project that are caused by involuntary taking of land (e.g. relocation or loss of shelter, loss of assets or access to assets, loss of income sources or means of livelihood, whether or not the affected person must move to another location) or involuntary restriction of access to legally designated parks and protected areas.*

62. The Expropriation Law does not require a baseline census or socio-economic survey. The expropriation request must identify economic and social benefits of the investment, however, and the Technical Design includes detailed information about land ownership and use (confirmed by the Cadastre Office) and estimated value of the land to be expropriated (Art. 12, Expropriation Law). This constitutes a de facto household census. Cases involving physical relocation and loss of access to assets are identified through the process of collecting information for the Technical Design. The loss of income sources or means of livelihood and transition costs can be included in calculations of compensation for “prejudice,” but they must be claimed by the owner or other affected person.

63. No socio-economic surveys are required for expropriation.

Operational Principle 3. *Identify and address impacts also if they result from other activities that are (a) directly and significantly related to the proposed project, (b) necessary to achieve its objectives, and (c) carried out or planned to be carried out contemporaneously with the project.*

64. Legal expropriation standards and procedures and compensation standards apply equally to all aspects of an investment.

Operational Principle 4. *Consult project-affected persons, host communities and local nongovernmental organizations, as appropriate. Provide them opportunities to participate in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of the resettlement program, especially in the process of developing and implementing the procedures for determining eligibility for compensation benefits and development assistance (as documented in a resettlement plan), and for establishing appropriate and accessible grievance mechanisms. Pay particular attention to the needs of vulnerable groups among those displaced, especially those below the poverty line, the landless, the elderly, women and children, Indigenous Peoples, ethnic minorities, or other displaced persons who may not be protected through national land compensation legislation.*

65. Investments must be embedded in urban or regional spatial plans, which are adopted and revised through open meetings. Documentation related to justifying an investment and implementing it, to obtain a Location Permit and then Construction License, must be posted in County and Local Councils, offices of the expropriator, the official gazette and local newspapers. The documentation constitutes both expropriation and construction plans, owners and proposed compensation. The documentation prepared to request an expropriation decision and to obtain a Location Permit, is reviewed by officials from different agencies. The process is relatively open, although no public meetings are required. Affected persons are not specifically contacted at this point, but they and all other interested parties have access to officials to discuss various aspects directly or submit written questions or objections, which are considered in making the decision.

66. Once the Location Permit is issued, the Technical Design is completed and posted in the country or local government offices, as well as the office of the expropriator. Interested parties who have questions or objections can express their reservations in writing to the mayor or head of the county, who establishes a commission to review and address each petition and consult with interested parties. These consultations can lead to revisions of the Technical Design. For example, input from local people, through the mayor, prompted the re-location of a bypass (Transport Restructuring Project) away from the city to give more room for urban development. Although there are no resettlement plans, as such, the documentation for the expropriation decision and the Technical Design can be seen as a reasonable proxy for a land acquisition or resettlement plan, especially since

the system is almost exclusively based on paying cash compensation to affected persons for lost assets and opportunities.

67. Grievance mechanisms exist at successive stages in preparation and design of the investment. Prior to the issue of the Location Permit and completion of the Technical Design, interested parties can address their concerns regarding location, alignments and the scope of expropriation to agencies involved in the decision-making process, the mayor, and negotiation representatives of the expropriator (Art. 12-19 Expropriation Law). Expropriation must be concluded before the Construction License is issued. Once that occurs, affected persons can challenge the level of compensation in the courts, but cannot reverse the expropriation process.

68. There are no regular mechanisms for public participation in monitoring the implementation of the investment and the impact of expropriation, although controversial projects are generally actively scrutinized by the press.

69. Eligibility for compensation is consistent and straightforward, including owners, tenants and other individuals who occupy land to be expropriated (Art. 28 Expropriation Law). Tenants are compensated for damages and illegal occupiers can claim compensation for the loss of above ground assets (Art. 29 Expropriation Law) (“value-added”).

70. There are no special provisions for the vulnerable, minorities or others and, with the exception of squatters, there appear to be no displaced persons or minorities who are not protected through national land compensation legislation.

Operational Principle 5. *Inform displaced persons of their rights, consult them on options, and provide them with technically and economically feasible resettlement alternatives and needed assistance, including (a) prompt compensation at full replacement cost for loss of assets attributable to the project; (b) if there is relocation, assistance during relocation, and residual housing, or housing sites, or agricultural sites of equivalent potential, as required; (c) transitional support and development assistance, such as land preparation, credit facilities, training or job opportunities as required, in addition to compensation measures; (d) cash compensation for land when the impact of land acquisition on livelihoods is minor; and (e) provision of civic infrastructure and community services as required.*

71. Owners are notified by letter of the intent to expropriate, which includes a copy of the minutes of the expropriation decision. Since compensation is in cash, affected people are not given different options; rather, it is assumed that they can use the compensation to choose their own options.

- (a) Land acquisition must be completed—compensation must be paid and titles transferred—before a Construction License is issued for the investment. Compensation must be paid within 30 days of court judgments. Compensation is at market value, plus prejudice, which is considered sufficient to replace assets and restore incomes, and therefore equivalent to replacement cost. Occupants without legal titles to affected land can be compensated for their lost above-ground assets, expressed as “value added.” Affected persons and third parties who seek compensation for prejudice must present their cases to negotiators or the court. Crop loss is the only form of damage that is explicitly stated in the law; claims for other losses must be documented by affected persons on a case-by-case basis. They must claim compensation as “prejudice.”
- (b) Residences are rarely affected. If they are, the residents of expropriated properties move to housing arranged by themselves, following negotiation, compensation and the transfer of titles. If they ultimately need to be evicted, the expropriator must provide another “*dwelling space, in conformity with the law*” (Art. 29 Expropriation Law). Tenants and illegal occupants of expropriated residences, even more rare, will

be provided with acceptable alternative housing to which to move (Art. 29 Expropriation Law).

- (c) Relocation costs will be included in compensation for “prejudice.” Owners and others who have cause must make the claim for damages during the negotiation process or, in court, if their claim is not resolved to their satisfaction. The court renders final decisions on compensation levels that are under question. In the absence of strict guidelines, “prejudice” can cover a range of impacts, but it is up to the claimant to make the case.
- (d) Cash compensation is the norm. If most of a parcel is subject to expropriation, and the remainder is not viable or without value, the owner can appeal to have the whole parcel expropriated (Art. 24 Expropriation Law).
- (e) No community-wide involuntary physical relocation that would require the development of new urban infrastructure and services is envisioned under the pilot projects. The expropriation law will apply to all expropriation related to project investments. In the unlikely event that an investment entails the relocation of individual households, people would move to residences with appropriate infrastructure and community services, rather than to greenfield sites.

Operational Principle 6. Give preference to land-based resettlement strategies for displaced persons whose livelihoods are land-based.

72. Expropriation laws and procedures are based on cash compensation at market rate, which is assumed to enable owners to purchase land to replace the expropriated land. Land replacement is not prohibited by the law, but it is not expected and it would be impractical in the Romanian context to make administered land substitution a standard policy, given limited amounts of state land and the prevalence of ownership issues related to re-privatization and restitution of previously nationalized lands.

73. Land can be bought and sold freely in urban and rural areas. The rural land market is open, but it is not really active, as sales are very limited. All informants claim that owners are generally amenable to sell land and buyers can find land easily. Reportedly, those who lose land to expropriation can readily purchase alternative land from others who would like to sell. Consequently, as the land market is open and active on the supply side, affected persons use the market for land and housing, if needed, and there is sufficient supply of land and housing, a land-based expropriation strategy is not necessary.

74. Municipalities and local self-government authorities may own land that can be sold and/or exchanged to owners of expropriated land on a case-by case basis. When this occurs, if the alternative plot is either more valuable or less valuable than the expropriated land, the difference is settled in cash. For example, Arad has implemented such arrangements, as it has both urban and rural land available.

Operational Principle 7. For those without formal legal rights to lands or claims to such land that could be recognized under the laws of the country, provide resettlement assistance in lieu of compensation for land to help improve or at least restore their livelihoods.

75. The expropriator/project developer advises owners about the registration process for unregistered lands. This is a mutual interest, as lands have to be registered to be purchased. People who have been using state land for 30 years can apply for ownership and registration (governed by the Civil and Civil Procedure Codes). Households living on or using land they do not own are only compensated for their “value added” contributions (lost above-ground assets) (Art. 26 and 28

Expropriation Law). There is no specific provision for resettlement assistance in lieu of compensation for land, except as it would be claimed and included under “prejudice.”

Operational Principle 8. *Disclose draft resettlement plans, including documentation of the consultation process, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in an accessible place and in a form and language that are understandable to key stakeholders.*

76. Proposals for expropriation and Location Permits and Technical Designs are prepared in the local language and made available in the respective county or local council office and the expropriator’s office and are posted in the official gazette and local newspapers before expropriation is initiated. Interested parties, including actual or potential affected persons, can register their concerns verbally or in writing when the expropriation decision is under consideration and later, after the Technical Design is completed. No formal resettlement or land acquisition plans are issued in addition to the documentation required to justify expropriation and the Technical Design, but these documents are essentially equivalent to the plans specified in the principle. Documentation of the consultation process includes the minutes of the expropriation decision and the findings of the commission established by the mayor respond to complaints and objections.

Operational Principle 9. *Apply the principles described in the involuntary resettlement section of this Table, as applicable and relevant, to subprojects requiring land acquisition.*

77. The principles apply to all aspects of an investment involving expropriation, at each level of government, including all subprojects.

Operational Principle 10. *Design, document, and disclose before appraisal of projects involving involuntary restriction of access to legally designated parks and protected areas, a participatory process for: (a) preparing and implementing project components; (b) establishing eligibility criteria; (c) agreeing on mitigation measures that help improve or restore livelihoods in a manner that maintains the sustainability of the park or protected area; (d) resolving conflicts; and (e) monitoring implementation.*

78. This issue is not relevant to the pilot projects.

Operational Principle 11. *Implement all relevant resettlement plans before project completion and provide resettlement entitlements before displacement or restriction of access. For projects involving restriction of access, impose the restrictions in accordance with the timetable in the plan of actions.*

79. Expropriation must be completed before a Construction License is issued, which enables the project proponent/expropriator to start civil works.

80. There are no restrictions on access that require mitigation.

Operational Principle 12. *Assess whether the objectives of the resettlement instrument have been achieved, upon completion of the project, taking account of the baseline conditions and the results of resettlement monitoring.*

81. No ongoing monitoring of the expropriation process is required. Similarly, no follow-up assessments are undertaken, as compensation is assumed to be adequate unless it is revised by a court decision in response to a challenge.

Analysis of Gaps

82. There are no salient differences between Romanian expropriation laws and Table A1 of OP 4.00 in the objectives and principles 1, 3, 8, 9 and 11. Principle 10 is not relevant for the pilot projects.

83. The principles in which there are differences are discussed below, with abbreviated titles of the respective principles.

84. ***Operational Principle 2. Census and Survey.*** The expropriation documents and Technical Design include information on household land ownership, which constitutes a proxy for a household census. This operational principle also requires a baseline household socio-economic survey to be carried out. However, Romanian expropriation laws and procedures do not require a survey. The pilot projects primarily involve land acquisition, not physical relocation, and would not require affected persons to change occupations, for which a socio-economic survey might have some value. Therefore, this difference does not compromise the objectives or outcome of the process and this is not a significant gap that would need to be filled in order for the projects to be piloted under OP 4.00

85. ***Operational Principle 4. Consultation, Entitlements and Special Groups.*** The consultation and disclosure process is adequate, although a specific resettlement document is not required. The documents prepared for the Expropriation Decision and the Technical Design can be considered reasonable proxies for the plan specified in the principle.

86. Eligibility for compensation is based on documentation of ownership or claims for damages. Within 15 days of the completion of the Technical Design, which identifies affected persons specifically, these are notified by letter of the intent to expropriate, along with a copy of the minutes of the Expropriation Decision. Negotiation for compensation can be complicated if the land is not titled and ownership is contested, however. The estimated cost of expropriation is included in the expropriation request and refined in the Technical Design, which includes estimates of the value of each parcel. Affected persons must request compensation for “prejudice,” during negotiation or in the court, if they are not satisfied with the outcome of negotiations.

87. The process does not give special consideration to the vulnerable or excluded groups, but that difference is not considered to be significant if (a) assessed valuation is adequate and consistent and (b) people are informed of their rights and entitlements. Informants indicated little experience with the issue of illegal occupation and squatters, and this needs to be monitored closely during implementation.

88. ***Operational Principle 5. Inform People of Rights, Compensate and Support Transition.*** There are no provisions that require the expropriator to inform people of their rights. If information is provided, however, it is cursory and appears to be inadequate. This is a salient divergence from the principle which could have significant impact if it results in compensation below market value and people are unaware of opportunities to contest the amount. This gap will have to be filled.

89. Prompt payment of compensation is required, and consistent with the principle, but violations of this principle in major highway construction have been reported, thus the issue will need to be monitored closely during implementation.

90. Property values are assessed by certified assessors. Informants indicated some discrepancies in the extent to which specific assessment reports are prepared and whether they are prepared before or after negotiations. If the reports are prepared before negotiations, they are not necessarily shared with owners, thus potentially disadvantaging them in negotiations. This is a salient divergence which will be mitigated by standardizing the timing of assessments as well as requiring them to be shared with owners at the start of negotiations.

91. The quality and consistency of assessors appears to be subject to dispute, which undermines public confidence in the valuation process and could result in under-valuation, which would violate the principle. This divergence in practice will be mitigated.

92. If people are adequately informed about their rights, a combination of compensation for assets and prejudice should be adequate for households to restore their assets, livelihoods and, if relevant, transition to another location. Improving the dissemination of information will help reduce the likelihood that compensation is inadequate, making the process and practice equivalent to the principle. To address the divergence in practice related to information dissemination, the letter that announces the intent to expropriate will be accompanied by a brochure that clearly describes the expropriation process and the rights of owners in the process, including the scope of prejudice.

93. If affected persons are compensated adequately for their losses, there is land is available for owners to make their own adjustments, thus the divergence from the principle of a land based strategy is not considered to be material. Special cases involving major land losses and the loss of businesses and residences would need to be managed on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the Bank.

94. **Operational Principle 6. Preference for a Land Based Strategy.** The use of cash compensation for expropriation in Romania differs from the principle that compensation of people displaced from land-based livelihoods and expropriation should be land based. Given the complex landholding situation in Romania and the lack of availability of State land that could be traded, and given the availability of private land for purchase and open access to the land market, the current arrangement is adequate to enable affected households to pursue a land based solution on their own, if they so desire. This difference from the principle is therefore not considered to be significant.

95. **Operational Principle 7. Provide Resettlement Assistance to those Without Formal Legal Rights to Land.** Informants indicated little experience expropriating land used by people who are without use or ownership rights. Romanian law does not make specific provision to compensate people without legal rights to land, although they may be eligible to claim damages (prejudice). It is not expected that the pilot projects will encounter such situations, and Bank and Romanian authorities will establish a mechanism to address this issue in the unlikely event that people without legal title to land are affected by the pilot projects. Each case should subsequently be monitored.

96. **8. Follow-up Monitoring and Assessment.** Romanian law and practices do not require monitoring or assessment of the impact of expropriation. This is a divergence that will be addressed through independent monitoring and regular Bank supervision.

3.6.3 Current and Proposed Measures to Address Gaps

97. Two salient gap-filling measures were explored as a means to achieve equivalence. They are as follows:

98. **Notify Owners of Rights and Procedures.** An information brochure acceptable to the Bank could be prepared for each government level (national, county and local) that outlines steps in the expropriation process; discusses the valuation and negotiation processes; describes the steps in obtaining compensation for damages (prejudice), including relocation costs and assistance to address impact on livelihoods, if relevant; provides information on the rights of owners at each step of the process and avenues of recourse at each step; and advises on how owners can obtain legal assistance, if needed. The brochure could then be distributed with each letter, notifying an owner of the intent to expropriate. The practice should be specified in any guidance documents and manuals of the respective agencies.

99. **Monitor.** A local independent monitor could report on expropriation activities and their impacts. The Bank will then monitor the promptness and adequacy of compensation, including prejudice, and the impacts of expropriation during regular supervision missions and recommend steps

to resolve significant problems that emerge during implementation as identified by project officials and independent monitors.

4.0 ACCEPTABILITY ASSESSMENT

4.1 Purpose and Scope of the Acceptability Assessment

100. The previous sections on “equivalence” examined the Romanian system of laws, regulations, rules and procedures relative to the Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Table A1 of OP/BP 4.00. The purpose of this acceptability assessment is to confirm that the implementation practices, track record and institutional capacity of relevant Romanian institutions in addressing environmental and social issues in the proposed MSP and TSSP are acceptable and meet the requirements stated in Bank Policy OP 4.00. It should be noted that the Bank will continue to supervise pilot projects during implementation; in fact with no diminution of attention. Ensuring a good “track record” in advance of project implementation should solidify lessons gained from piloting, however.

4.2 Methodology Used to Determine Acceptability

101. To complete this assessment of “acceptability” several key factors were considered: (i) existing formal or informal processes in place to implement the laws, by-laws and procedures; (ii) capability in the field, as judged through selected field interviews, site visits and desk reviews of Bank-supported projects; (iii) evidence of progress towards meeting EU targets on transposition of legislation, staffing and budgets where these apply; (iv) informal consultations with specialist and stakeholders; and (v) the track record of Romania compared to other Bank middle-income countries in these regards.

102. Regarding the field reviews, World Bank specialists visited ongoing, proposed and completed projects (Bank, Romania and EU-financed) in representative key cities slated for the Municipal Services and Transport Sector Support projects, including Bucharest, Brasov, Tirgu Mures, Arad, and Calarasi. Selected bidding documents and environmental reports were reviewed, as were government procedural manuals, compliance checklists and other information sources.

103. Interviews with EU officials responsible for peer reviews of Romanian environmental systems, and for determining progress with accession requirements were also helpful. The World Bank files for the Railway Rehabilitation project (closed in September 2003) and ongoing Roads 2 and Transport Restructuring projects, showing satisfactory progress on safeguards, were also reviewed.

4.3 Acceptability Assessment – Environment Assessment

4.3.1 Implementation Practices and Institutional Capacity

104. Romania is committed to making enormous investments in environmental protection and management as part of its EU accession process. This commitment includes: (i) completing the transposition of the comprehensive EU environmental *aquis*; (ii) strengthening the institutional capacity in the environmental sector at local, regional and central level; (iii) investing in pollution control to meet media-specific directives; (iv) building enforcement and control capacity.

105. Environmental protection investments in infrastructure are increasing dramatically; for example about Euro 347.8 million were spent during the period of January-July, 2005 on technology alone; largely in water and air pollution control by industry. An additional amount of Euro 1,200 million has been allocated to Romania under the EU’s ISPA program (through 2006) for critical investments in water and transport infrastructure; supported by environmental capacity-building at the local level.

106. Capabilities on the institutional front are also getting stronger and are considered sufficient to support piloting of Environmental Assessment. The establishment of an over-arching Ministry of Environment and Water Management (MEWM) with specialized Departments and Directions is considered by European Commission officials to be a very positive step. MEWM has eight Regional Agencies (REPA) and 42 County Agencies (LEPA). Staff is organized to carry out oversight (in parallel with routine World Bank supervision) on the types of investments planned to be supported by the Municipal Services and Transport Sector Support projects. Staffing in the MEWM has been increasing with approximately 949 specialists being added recently in the environmental sector at central, regional and local levels. Overall, the MEWM has developed a strategy to increase environment personnel by 1,660 persons/civil servants by 2006; driven again by meeting expectations of the EU regards with regards to capacity needs. The MEWM, its entities and supporting administrative structures implement relevant EA laws, by-laws, and established procedures through a practice which is embodied in the application, review and approval (or denial) of various licenses (to construct) and permits (to operate). As presented in more detail in Annex IB, these are effective analogies to World Bank procedures for the review of proposed projects under relevant safeguard policies.

107. The importance of training and public awareness components have been recognized in the move towards EU accession. A total of twelve (12) training seminars for experts in the MEWM and their subordinate structures took place during 2005. About ten EU-twinning projects totaling Euro 13.5 million are developed and/or scheduled to be launched during the period of 2005-2006 with a focus on training and technical assistance of government personnel. Public education and awareness programs are aimed at business operators, public officials and local stakeholders.

108. In addition, environmental inspection, compliance and control is on track for significant improvement through the consolidation and growth of the National Environmental Guard (NEG), the national institution under the MEWM that is in charge with: (i) the inspection and enforcement activities for environment protection; and (ii) the issuance of penalties for exceeding discharges and emission limits. Control and monitoring actions have strengthened during the last year. For example, during the period of July 1-August 15, 2005, the representatives of NEG performed inspections at 958 sites; a significant increase over previous periods. The process of assigning fees and fines has also evolved to reduce the potential for corruption, as contrasted to more favorable investments in pollution control technology.

109. The NEG works closely with other institutions on monitoring; for example the National Water Agency, "*Apele Romane*," which is responsible for ambient water flow and quality and. On the transport side, we also found capability for setting and tracking environmental requirements in such institutions as: (i) National Railway Company (SNCFR), (ii) Roads Design Institute (IPTANA) and (iii) Railway Design Institute (ISPCF). These entities help set performance or technical standards in bid documents for maintenance projects that are comparable to the Bank's Environmental Management Plans for such relatively lower risk investments.

110. The National Environmental Protection Agency is an entity with growing responsibilities and influence. It plays a key advisory role in policy and strategy formulation and implementation. Key Directorates include one for nature conservation, biodiversity and soil protection, and another for monitoring and data coordination and synthesis. Additional institutional information is provided in Annex IC.

4.3.2 Analysis of Gaps

111. In system design and general implementation, there are no gaps regarding the acceptability of Romanian systems that would inhibit piloting for Environmental Assessment. It is recognized, however, that some regional and local arms of the MEWM (including the NEG) are still staffing up, and that experience is only now being gained on new monitoring, inspection and compliance programs. Therefore the only weakness identified here is a limited "track record" of improved

performance under a strengthening structure. As noted below, however, this will be addressed through mutually-beneficial pilot project implementation.

4.3.3 Current and Proposed Measures to Maintain Acceptability

112. There are no gaps in application of the Romanian system which require modification to increase acceptability. Nevertheless, to avoid any significant differences in the environmental protection outcome of the EA process, and maintain acceptability during the pilot program, the Bank and Romania have agreed on an approach to initially review and clear sub-project EAs jointly, as follows:

- ③ the first three environmental impact assessment reports and the first three environmental permits/licenses that maybe required under Romanian Law for the carrying out of the Project, shall be submitted to the Bank for its prior review; and
- ③ As an integrated part of the normal procurement practice (with commensurate *ex-ante* and *ex-post* provisions), review of relevant annexes of bid documents describing environmental mitigation and monitoring procedures to be carried out by works contractors, supervisory contractors, etc..

113. To reinforce the importance of good compliance, monitoring and enforcement, the Bank will receive regular updates of sub-project compliance with Romanian environmental laws. To the extent practical, the Bank will coordinate supervision visits with local environmental officials.

114. Strengthening of the EA system is underway as part of the EU accession process and would be helpful more broadly for environmental performance improvement, but it is not necessary to meet the due diligence requirements for the Municipal Services and Transport Sector Support projects. It should also be noted that the Bank's proposed Environmental Management Loan (slated for delivery in FY07) will provide considerable capacity building which will directly and positively improve Romanian systems at both the policy and field levels. A strong and well equipped administration is needed for the application of the EU acquis.²⁸

4.4 Acceptability Analysis – Cultural Property

4.4.1 Implementation Practice and Institutional Capacity

115. As noted earlier, the Romanian system of laws and procedures on cultural property is quite comprehensive. Bank staff reviewed Romanian implementation practices, track record, and capacity in this regard in connection with the implementation of Bank projects, and more broadly in discussions with officials in Bucharest, Arad, Brasov and other cities.

116. In practice, the wide applicability and comprehensiveness of the Romanian legal system in this area can mean a backlog on processing applications by relevant bodies, with the potential for some applications not getting full review. This is not unexpected given the rapidity of investment growth in the country. In addition, the level of public awareness of the law on protection of PCR is fairly limited and, if known, often seen as being of secondary importance to new investments and development (especially in historic town centers which often have older road, energy, telecommunications, and water infrastructure). Although the MCRA has carried out awareness raising campaigns of the law in national newspapers, local museums do not always have a particularly interactive dialogue with the public, seeing themselves more as research institutes. The lack of awareness is aided by the fact that not all historic monuments are marked with a clearly identifiable sign, as mandated in Law 422/2001.

²⁸ http://europa.eu.int/enlargement_negotiations/chapters/chap22/index.htm. Capacity-building support through the EU IMPEL/ECENA networks is particularly relevant.

117. The MCRA has a decentralized staff, with one representative in each of the 42 Counties of Romania. Most municipalities, however, do not have services for PCR analysis and support, so this work is typically carried out by local museums (according to a list of experts maintained by the MCRA). In addition, the MCRA notes that in only three counties do they have an archaeologist working at local level for the MCRA.

118. Public consultation is provided under EIA procedures, whereby PCR must be identified during the screening, scoping and review phases. This can help to supplement the traditional lists of classified monuments and sites by taking into account, through studies and consultation, the entire project impact area. MCRA, the NCHM and NCA together do work out programs for training specialists, as well as plans of teaching and specialization in the field of protecting PCR.

4.4.2 Analysis of Gaps

119. In practice, the principles and procedures outlined in section 3.4.1 are satisfactorily implemented but, as noted, there are instances when applications for building permission do not get fully reviewed, and occasions when the local representatives of the MCRA are not consulted prior to applications being granted. In addition, not all General Urban Plans are being systematically communicated to the MCRA and reviewed by the NCHM.

120. The Romanian system has exhibited good practices including: (i) inventories of buildings and sites of cultural significance, (ii) inventories being supplemented by in-field surveys where inventories are insufficient, (iii) use of local experts on archeology, architecture and other relevant fields for assessments before construction decisions are made, and after if “chance finds” are encountered during construction, and (iv) full approvals by relevant local bodies before construction and operation takes place. Nevertheless, there have been reported situations of gaps in diligence.

4.4.3 Current and Proposed Measures to Maintain the Acceptability

121. In light of the assessment above, to maintain acceptability the Bank will supervise the project to ensure cooperation between environmental and cultural property specialists. Example good practices include:

- ③ More routine representation of the MCRA staff or suggested experts on EIA Technical Review Committee/s;
- ③ PCR experts, as identified by the MCRA, are used to help draft the PCR aspects of the EIA study, and
- ③ Where appropriate, provisions for safeguarding PCR, including those for ‘chance finds should monitored under individual licensing procedures.

122. With such measures taken to maintain acceptability, we do find the system appropriate for piloting.

4.5. Acceptability Assessment - Dam Safety

123. OP 4.00 allows piloting of borrower dam safety requirements as they apply to three types of projects: (i) construction of new dams, (ii) rehabilitation of existing dams, and (iii) carrying out activities that may be affected by an existing dam.

124. The World Bank has financed projects covering points (ii) and (iii) and, regarding acceptability, has found good progress to date. Dam safety safeguards requirements are implemented by the Borrower (through the Ministry of Environment and Water Management).

125. During the preparation of the Municipal Services Project (i.e. before the selection of Bucharest and Arad for the bulk of investments), it was possible that candidate sub-projects might have included rehabilitation or extension of drinking water systems where supply is obtained from dams or other control structures. New dams would not have been financed by the project, nor would dams have been rehabilitated under the project, but the capability of Romanian authorities to ensure dam safety was considered important should water supplies under the project be associated with control structures. Such sub-projects are not, however, currently included in the project but the resultant “equivalence and acceptability” assessment is left included in this report for possible future reference.

126. In Romania the implementation of the dam safety policy is achieved through ten consulting firms experienced in dam safety design. The MEWM has five specialists, who work closely with CONSIB (two of them being also members) while the National Agency “Apele Romane” has ten specialists including two in the headquarter office and eight in the regional branches (one for each river basin department). The CONSIB experts are in charge with the review of the dam safety designs as well as with periodic inspections and reviews of dam safety operations.

127. Training options on dam safety were scarce. Recently, the World Bank HRMEP project currently under implementation in Romania offered the opportunity of a USBR training course on dam safety and plans to continue to enhance the technical capacity of Romanian engineers in the field. Contacts with international experts are held periodically through participation in seminars and workshops, but the participation is limited to a small number of experts.

128. Satisfactory progress was made since:

- ③ A Panel of Experts (POE) including independent experts certified by MEWM and members of CONSIB was selected by the implementing agency to undertake reviews of designs and technical specifications for works;
- ③ The POE advises on construction quality;
- ③ For each of the dams included in the project, emergency preparedness plans (EPP) are in place and periodically updated;
- ③ During the floods which occurred this year no dam was compromised and the functionality of Emergency Preparedness Plans was assessed, and
- ③ Operation and Maintenance plans are in place for each dam, and the dams subject to rehabilitation are operated under restrictions which were fully observed during recent floods.

129. The Bank has noted good implementation practices on dam safety since implementation of HRMEP, and, should the policy have been triggered under the Municipal Services project (in the limited manner examined during preparation), Romanian procedures would have been acceptable for piloting under OP 4.00.

4.6 Acceptability Assessment - Involuntary Resettlement

4.6.1 Implementation Practice and Institutional Capacity

130. Implementing agencies and local governments have adequate staff with appropriate skills to undertake any land acquisition satisfactorily. In turn, they have access to qualified assessors, although some informants raised questions about the quality and consistency of assessments.

131. The investigations for the acceptability analysis revealed that agencies at all levels consistently and systematically adhere to the standards and procedures specified in the Expropriation

Law and related regulations. Responsible officials are fully versed in the law and knowledgeable about both required practices and shortcomings. The official process required to justify expropriation, and practical consideration of the problems associated with establishing ownership and conducting negotiations are an effective deterrent to frivolous use of the expropriation process. Moreover, expropriating residences and businesses is even more difficult thus, in practice, alternative designs are considered and designs are revised to eliminate the need to abolish structures and relocate households. For example, the alignments of bypasses to be constructed under the Transport Restructuring Project deliberately avoided residences.

4.6.2 Analysis of Gaps

132. The equivalence analysis discussed above identified two areas which would have required gap-filling had this policy area been selected for piloting under OP 4.00: notification of affected persons of the expropriation process and their rights and opportunities for redress; and monitoring of the impact of expropriation. Details on these measures for addressing these issues are discussed in the next section, though Romania has not selected this policy for piloting, and a conventional approach under OP 4.12 has been selected for the one project (TSSP) where this policy area is triggered.

133. The expropriation process is clear and consistently executed, but there are three areas of weakness. First, the law requires that property valuation be carried out by certified experts, but the process is not fully transparent. Presumably, the purpose of the requirement is to protect the interests of both the government and private parties. The valuation assessments will serve both parties, not just the expropriator, thus they will be shared with owners, as well, in order to level the playing field. Second, compensation must be no lower than assessed valuation, but the lack of transparency in the valuation and negotiation processes makes it difficult for owners to be confident that they have received a fair price for their assets. Third, little documentation was received regarding some of the more complicated issues that the Bank's policies are designed to address, such as compensation for loss of livelihoods, illegal occupation, and direct and indirect impacts on businesses. It was concluded that the limited experience in dealing with these issues offers an opportunity for an ongoing dialogue between the Bank and expropriators, if such exceptional cases occur, to give both parties the assurance that best practices are followed.

134. Gap-filling measures regarding how to address these three issues are discussed in the following section.

4.6.3 Current and Proposed Measures to Increase the Acceptability

135. The several areas in which Romanian expropriation laws and practices diverge significantly from the principles in Annex A, OP 4.0, and areas in which experience is too limited to determine whether practices ultimately achieve the principles, have been discussed above. These divergences are discussed below, together with suggested actions which could be taken to comply fully with the Bank's responsibilities had this policy area been selected for piloting.

136. **Share Assessments carried out by Qualified Assessors.** To meet the requirements of OP 4.00, the Bank and the Client would have agreed on the timing of valuation assessments and the qualifications of assessors, such as the requirement that they be certified and trained in market-based assessments. In addition, the Client would require field staff to share assessment reports with owners at the start of negotiations, and incorporate the requirement in operational guidelines and manuals.

137. **Pay Compensation at the Assessed Value of land and Damages.** Expropriators could be expected to document the fact that they did not pay too much for land, but not that the compensation at least equals the assessed value of land and other assets. Negotiators could be instructed to ensure that they pay assessed value at a minimum and that they document this in each expropriation file.

138. **Inform of Exceptional Cases.** The expropriation of residences and businesses appears to be rare, and there is little follow-up, thus there is some uncertainty about the final status of owners who lose more than land due to expropriation. Consequently, should this policy area been selected for piloting, the Bank would have needed assurances that unusual cases are handled appropriately. Specific arrangements would have been needed to address such cases. The Bank would then be informed promptly of cases such as those listed below and apprised of the proposed remedial approach, based on agreed arrangements, before proceeding. The following circumstances will require notification: acquisition of residences; acquisition of parts of an agricultural holding where the remainder is not adequate to allow people to sustain their livelihoods, compelling affected people to change their occupations; acquisition of commercial structures or businesses; and expropriation of land used by people without claim to legal title.

Some gap filling measures were presented to Romania to achieve and sustain equivalence and acceptability in the area of Involuntary Resettlement, but in the end a conventional approach for due diligence in this policy area was selected. Consequently, Bank guidelines on Involuntary Resettlement as embodied in OP/BP 4.12 will apply to the TSSP project.

139. Gap-filling measures which had been suggested are noted below are included for information purposes only.

Suggested Gap-Filling Measures for Involuntary Resettlement

Suggested Actions to be Taken	Responsibility	Implementation Date
To Achieve Equivalence		
1. Adopt information brochure acceptable to the Bank to notify affected persons of their rights and relevant procedures, and agree to distribute in a timely manner	Expropriation office of NCMNR, SNCFR and Municipalities of Arad and Bucharest will adapt	No later than Effectiveness
2. Adopt TORs acceptable to the Bank for independent monitors to monitor the promptness and adequacy of compensation, including prejudice, and the impacts of expropriation, and agree to retain these monitors when needed	same	No later than Effectiveness
To Achieve and Sustain Acceptability		
1. Share valuation assessments carried out by qualified assessors with affected persons, before the start of negotiations under the expropriation procedures	NCMNR, SNCFR, Municipalities of Arad and Bucharest	Ongoing after effectiveness
2. Document and pay compensation at the assessed value of land, structures and damages, or higher	same	Ongoing after effectiveness
3. Notify the Bank of the following cases for joint resolution: intended acquisition of residences; agricultural holdings; commercial structures and businesses; and/or land used by people without claim to legal title.	same	Ongoing after effectiveness

Had these gap filling measures been agreed to, Romania's system would have been considered equivalent and acceptable for piloting the TSSP project under OP 4.00.

ANNEX I - LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

Annex I A - Relevant legal texts

International Law

140. Article 11(2) of Romania's Constitution (as revised by Law No. 429/2003) provides that treaties ratified by Parliament according to the law are part of national law.

141. The following treaties to which Romania is party relate to the *protection of natural habitats*:

- ③ Ramsar Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, 1971), ratified by Romania on 21/9/91.
- ③ The Danube Delta and Small Island of Braila have been designated as Ramsar Sites.
- ③ Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species (Bonn, 1979), ratified by Romania on 1/7/98.
- ③ Convention on Biological Diversity (Rio de Janeiro, 1992), ratified by Romania on 17/8/94.
- ③ Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Berne, 1979). Accession by Romania on 18/5/93.
- ③ Convention concerning the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (Paris, 1972). Accession by Romania on 16/5/90. Several areas, including the Danube Delta are designated as UNESCO World Heritage Site.
- ③ Danube River Protection Convention signed in 1994.

142. On *environmental assessment*, relevant treaties ratified by Romania include:

- ③ UN/ECE Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus, 1998), ratified by Romania on July 11, 2000.
- ③ Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (Espoo, 1991), ratified by Romania on March 29, 2001.

143. The following treaties ratified by Romania relate to *physical cultural resources*:

- ③ European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (revised) (Valetta, 1992), ratified by Romania 20/11/97.²⁹
- ③ Convention concerning the protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (Paris, 1972). Accession by Romania on 16/5/90. Several areas, including the Danube Delta are designated as UNESCO World Heritage Site.

European Union's "acquis communautaire"

144. Relevant legal texts include:

²⁹ This convention makes the conservation and enhancement of the archaeological heritage one of the goals of urban and regional planning policies. It is concerned in particular with arrangements to be made for co-operation among archeologists and town and regional planners in order to ensure optimum conservation of archaeological heritage

- ③ Treaty concerning the Accession of the Republic of Bulgaria and Romania to the European Union, signed by the EU Member States and Bulgaria and Romania in Luxembourg on 25 April 2005.
- ③ Protocol concerning the conditions and arrangements for admission of the Republic of Bulgaria and Romania to the European Union (Annex VII; list referred to in Article 20 of the protocol; transitional measures, Romania; Section 9 on environment).

Environmental Assessment

- ③ Council Directive 85/337/EEC of 27 June 1985 (as amended by Directives 97/11/EC and 2003/35/EC), on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment.
- ③ Directive 2001/42/EC on Strategic Environmental Assessment.

Pollution Prevention and Control; Integrated Permitting

- ③ Council Directive 96/61/EC of 24 September 1996 concerning integrated pollution prevention and control (as amended by Directive 2003/35/EC of 26 May 2003).

*Waste Management*³⁰

- ③ Council Directive 1999/31/EC of 26 April 1999, on the landfill of waste.
- ③ Council Regulation EEC/259/93 of 1 February 1993, on the supervision and control of shipments of waste within, into and out of the European Community.
- ③ Council Directive 75/442/EEC of 15 July 1975, on waste (as amended by Council Directive 91/156/EEC, Commission Decision 94/3/EC, Commission Decision 96/350/EC and Commission Decision 2000/532/EC).
- ③ Council Directive 86/278/EEC of 12 June 1986, on the protection of the environment, and in particular the soil, when sewage sludge is used in agriculture (as amended by Directive 91/692/EEC).
- ③ Council Directive 91/689/EEC of 12 December 1991, on hazardous waste (as amended by Council Directive 94/31/EC, Council Decision 94/904/EC and Commission Decision 2000/532/EC and implemented by Commission Decision 96/302/EC).
- ③ Council Directive 94/62/EC of 20N December 1994 on packaging and packaging of waste (as implemented by Commission Decisions 97/129/EC and 97/138/EC and amended by Directive 2004/12).

Water and Waste Water

- ③ Council Directive 91/271/EEC of 21 May 1991 concerning urban waste water treatment, as amended by Commission Directive 98/15/EC.
- ③ Council Directive 98/83/EC of 3 November 1998 on the quality of water intended for human consumption.
- ③ Council Directive 75/440/EEC of 16 June 1975 concerning the quality required of surface

³⁰ This information is included for illustrative purposes only; no new waste disposal sites are now currently envisaged for financing under the MEP.

water intended for the abstraction of drinking water in the Member States (as amended by Council Directives 79/869/EEC and 91/692/EEC).

- ③ Council Directive 76/464/EEC of 4 May 1976 on pollution caused by certain dangerous substances discharged into the aquatic environment of the Community (as amended by Council Directive 91/692/EEC).
- ③ Council Directive 79/869/EEC of 9 October 1979 concerning the methods of and measurements and frequencies of sampling and analysis of surface water intended for the abstraction of drinking water in the Member States (as amended by Council Directive 91/692/EEC).
- ③ Council Directive 80/68/EEC of 17 December 1979 on the protection of groundwater against pollution caused by certain dangerous substances (as amended by Council Directive 91/692/EEC).

*Nature Protection*³¹

- ③ Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild flora and fauna.

Air Quality

- ③ Council Directive 96/62/EC of 27 September 1996 on ambient air quality assessment and management.
- ③ Council Directive 1999/30/EC of 22 April 1999 relating to limit values for sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and oxides of nitrogen, particulate matter and lead in ambient air (amended by Commission Decision 2001/744/EC of 17 October 2001).

Romanian Law

145. Relevant Romanian law includes the following:

Environmental Assessment

- ③ Law 137/1995 (amended by EGO 91/2002, published in M.Of no. 465 of 06/28/2002, approved by Law 294/2003, published in M.Of no. 505, of 07/14/2003). Framework Law on Protection of the Environment.
- ③ GD 918/2002 (published in M.Of no. 686 of 09/17/2002) (as modified by GD 1705/2005 M.Of no. 970 of 10/22/2004). Framework procedure for environmental impact assessment, and approval of list of public and private projects subject to this procedure.
- ③ MO 860/2002 (published in M.Of no. 52 of 01/30/2003) (as modified by MO 210/2004, published in M.OJ no. 309 of 04/07/2004) as amended by MO 1037/2005, published in M.Of no. 985 of 11/07/2005). Procedures for approval of the EIA and the issuance of environmental agreement.
- ③ MO 863/2002 (published in M.Of. no. 52 of 01/30/2003)
- ③ Guidelines on EIA methodology (screening, scoping, and review of study)

³¹ This information is included for illustrative purposes only; the Natural Habits safeguard is not triggered under either project.

- ③ MO 864/2002 (published in M.Of. no. 397 of 06/09/2003) on procedures and public consultation in case of transboundary impacts.
- ③ MO 171/2005 (published in M.Of. no.236 of 03/22/2005) setting up Technical review Committee at central level.
- ③ MO 210/2004 (published in MO 309 on 04/07/04) Methodology of reviewing the EIA and approving the environmental license to construct
- ③ MO 1037/2005, published in M.Of. no.985 of 11/07/2005
- ③ MO 978/2003 (published in MO 3 on 01/05/04) Rule that attests physical and juridical persons that develop the EIA
- ③ MO 97/2004, published in M.Of. no.504 of 06/04/2005
- ③ MO 876/2004 (published in MO 31 on 01/1/05) Methodology for the approval of the Environmental Permit for activities with significant impact on the environment

Strategic Environmental Assessment

- ③ GD 1076/2004 (published in M. Of nr. 707 of 05.08.2004) on procedures for environmental assessment of plans and programs.

Dam Safety

- ③ Law 107/1996, modified by Law 310/2004 – Water Law
- ③ EGO 244/2000, approved with amendments by Law 466/2001 - on safety of dams
- ③ MEWM Ordinance 128/2005 – regulations regarding responsibilities and organization of the National Commission on Safety of Dams (CONSIB)

*Nature Protection*³²

- ③ EO 236/2000 regarding the management of protected natural areas and the conservation of natural habitats, wild flora and fauna
- ③ Law 462/2001, regarding the management of protected areas and the conservation of natural habitats, wild flora and fauna
- ③ GD 230/2003
- ③ MO 552/2003
- ③ MO 850/2003

Waste, Waste Water, Air and Noise Pollution

- ③ MO 1141/2002 for the approval procedure and competencies for issuing water management permits and authorizations
- ③ Water Law 310/2004 for the amendment and completion of Water Law 107/1996

³² This information is included for illustrative purposes only; the Natural Habits safeguard is not triggered under either project.

- ③ Law 456/2002 regarding drinking water quality, modified by law 311/2004
- ③ GD 974/2004 on inspection and monitoring of drinking water
- ③ GD 168/2005 on inspection of monitoring systems
- ③ GD 162/2002 regarding management of solid waste, amended by GD 349/2005
- ③ GD 188/2002 for the approval of certain norms concerning the conditions of discharging waste water into the aquatic environment
- ③ GD 662/2002 regarding management of oil waste
- ③ GD 349/2002 regarding management of collection and storage of solid waste
- ③ GD 856/2002 regarding records of disposal and collection of solid waste and approval of list including hazardous waste
- ③ Law 426/2001 approval of EGO 78/2000 regarding classification of solid waste
- ③ GD 1159/2003 Modification of GD 662/2001 regarding disposal of oily waste published in O.M. 715/October 14, 2003
- ③ Law 294/2003 Approval of UGO 91/2002 regarding modification and completion of Environmental Protection Law 137/1992
- ③ MO 592/2002 Norms regarding minimum permissible values and evaluation methods for SO₂, NO_x and NO₂, suspended solids (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), Pb, CO, O₃, and benzene in the air.
- ③ Law 655/2001 Law for approval of UGD 243/2000 regarding environmental protection
- ③ GD 1470/2004 (MO 954/2004) regarding approval of National strategy for solid waste management and National Plan for solid waste management

Physical Cultural Resources

- ③ Law 422/2001 on protection of historic monuments
- ③ Law 43/2000 on protection of the archaeological heritage (as amended by Law 462/2003)
- ③ Law 150/1997 ratification of the European Convention on the Protection of Archeological Heritage (Valetta, 1996)

Annex I B – Romanian Licensing and Permitting Procedures

Introduction

146. In conformity with the Law of Environmental Protection No.137/1995 including the respective updates - the Emergency Ordinance No.152/2005, the Governmental Decision No. 918/2002, and the Ordinance of the Ministry of Environment and Water Management No. 860/2002 and 863/2002, the decision making process of the EIA regarding the issuance of the Environmental License to construct and the Environmental Permit to operate is well developed. The Environmental Protection Law sets out the EIA requirements and principles; the GD 918/2002 sets out the procedures, while the OM 860/2002 and 863/2002 present in detail the procedures for EIA and for issuing the environmental license.

147. Based on Romanian Law, any development of a new facility or modification of an existing one listed in Annex I of GD 918/2002 requires the approval of an EIA before the environmental license (environmental agreement) and permit to operate (environmental authorization) is approved by LEPAs. For any activities not covered in the list of mandatory EIA (Annex II of the GD no.918/2002), the LEPAs or REPAs use selection criteria to determine whether such activities could have a significant environmental impact. Existing facilities require an environmental permit from the LEPAs, which includes assessment of compliance with the environmental standards (e.g., conditions related to air, water, and soil reflecting existing standards).

148. The GD 918/2002 presents the steps of the procedure, the requirements that the physical or legal certified persons to prepare the impact studies, and the list of activities which are subject to the EIA procedure. Overall, the EIA procedure includes a screening stage, a scoping stage, and a validation stage.

Procedures for Receiving an Environmental License to Construct (OR the Environmental Agreement)

149. The procedure for issuing the environmental license to construct is described in detail in the following steps and briefly presented in the flow chart.

Step 1. The initial screening of the new project/investment

This is determined by the local EPA responsible for the location (commune, city) where the investment will develop. When requesting the ***Environmental License to Construct, the Beneficiary/the Project Proponent*** (e.g., ***National Railways Company SCNCF “CFR” SA; the City Hall***) is responsible to present to the local/regional EPA or MEWM a *Technical File* including the following documentation:

- ③ *Request Form* of the EA in conformity with the MO No. 860/2002; this request is attention to the local or regional EPA or to the MEWM depending on the geographical location of the project;
- ③ *Urban Planning Certificate* and the corresponding licenses and permits (obtained at the level of Feasibility Study) based on the corresponding law;
- ③ *Contracts* with the local solid waste company for collection of the solid wastes and with “Apele Romane” for water supply and sewage discharges (other authorizations from local utilities may be required based on necessity);
- ③ *Technical Memorandum* (standard form) in conformity with Annex II.2 of the MO No. 860/2002 (prepared by the Consultant/Firm that developed the Feasibility Study);

- ③ *Technical Note* (standard technical form) in conformity with the OMEWM No. 1943/2001 (prepared by the Consultant/Firm that developed the Feasibility Study);
- ③ *Fee* (differs depending on the stage of the EA process);
- ③ *Public announcement* regarding the request to obtain the Environmental Permit in conformity with Annex II.4 of the MO No. 860/2002.

Within the EPA, a Technical Review Committee (TRC) is formed based on the Ordinance of Prefect, which includes members of the local/regional EPA, the National Environmental Guard (NAG), the National Water Company “Apele Romane,” Sanitary and Urban Institutes and those authorities responsible for environmental permits authorizations. The TRC members analyze the documentation presented within the Technical File and issue one of the following three classifications of the project investments: (i) activities are of insignificant environmental impact and therefore the project is NOT subject to environmental procedure;³³ (ii) activities are of low environmental impact and the *simplified licensing procedure* will apply;³⁴ and (iii) activities are of significant environmental impact and the *full environmental permitting procedure* will apply.³⁵ Furthermore, (for cases (ii) and (iii)) the EPA authorities together with the members of TRC and the Beneficiary are visiting the site of the future investment to: (i) verify its location as presented in the Technical File; and (ii) complete the *List of Control* developed according to the OMEWM No. 863/2002.

Step 2. EIA Report Preparation

The EPA reviews and approves the *List of Control* which includes the conclusion presented by the TRC, based on which documents it announces the Beneficiary of his obligation to develop the EIA study (the impact study).

The Beneficiary is obliged to:

- ③ *Prepare the EIA report* in conformity with the OMEWM No. 863/2002. The EIA report should be developed only by physical persons or consulting firms independent³⁶ of the Beneficiary and the person who developed the Feasibility Study, that are accredited for developing such technical studies for Infrastructure Projects/Investments (as defined in the Annex 4 of the OM No. 978/2003) including the legal conditions stipulated in the OM No. 978/2003 and 97/2004;
- ③ *Hire* based on contract and competition through expression of interest/invitation to submit proposals process the firm/physical person who will develop the EA report;
- ③ *Prepare and sponsor the public announcement* of the definition of the project (this is the 2nd public information in the EIA process approval);

Step 3. The review of the EIA Report

At this stage, ***the EPA*** is charged with the following steps: (i) completing the *List of Control* for the EIA Report analysis process; (ii) preparing the *Public Consultation*;³⁷ and (iii) communicating the results to the Beneficiary.

³³ Stamp “A” will be placed on the technical file by the environmental authority.

³⁴ Stamp “B” will be placed on the technical file and the project is subject to environmental procedure WITHOUT an environmental agreement

³⁵ Stamp “B” will be placed on the technical file and the project is subject to environmental procedure WITH an environmental agreement

³⁶ The EA report could be developed by foreign firms/persons if they possess an accreditation issued by an EU country and approved by the Romanian National Accreditation Institute

³⁷ The Public Consultation preparation activities are financed by the Beneficiary

The Beneficiary is obliged to:

- ③ *Present* to the local EPA the EIA report, with the help of the consulting firm that developed the EIA;
- ③ *Prepare and launch* the public consultation in the presence of those affected, NGOs, or interested persons including presentation of the project and the EIA Report during of a public debate;
- ③ *Evaluate* the discussions and conclusions received during the public consultation;
- ③ *Reply* to the public comments and requests with a valid technical solution.

Step 4. Decision and Approval of the Environmental License to construct

The EPA issues the Environmental License to start construction of the investment within 30 days after the final decision.

The Beneficiary is obliged to:

- ③ *Announce the public*³⁸ about the approval of the Environmental License;
- ③ Request of Environmental Permit to Operate

Additional points:

- ③ The EIA report is prepared at the level of the project's Feasibility Study, in conformity with GD No. 918/2002;
- ③ The minimum information presented by the Beneficiary during the request to obtain the Environmental License should be also completed based on conditions recommended by the foreign donors (EBRD, WB, EIB) and/or as required by the EU legislation and the Romanian legislation in force;
- ③ For those investments obtained through ISPA or SAPARD funds, the conditions during the project operation established through the Environmental Permit will take in consideration the limits of the pollutants' discharges required by the EU and Romanian legislation. However, the national limits will prevail if they are more restrictive than those imposed by the EU legislation.
- ③ The Environmental License is valid during the entire period of the project construction, but will expire if the investment works will not start in maximum 2 years from its approval. During the period of investment constructions, the local environmental protection authorities will monitor those conditions imposed by the Environmental License (please note detailed information on the monitoring process in the next section);
- ③ The Beneficiary is obliged by law to inform the environmental protection authorities in writing any time when there is a significant modification of the initial conditions of the project based on which the current Environmental License was issued.

³⁸ During the EIA approval process there are three public information sessions [(i) when the Beneficiary submits the technical file to the EPA; (ii) at the end of screening phase; (iii) the public debate; and (iv) when the Environmental Approval is issued by the local EPA].

Procedures for Obtaining an Environmental Permit to Operate³⁹

150. The Environmental Permit to Operate investments with *significant* impact on the environment is issued by the EPA in conformity with OMEWM No. 876/2004. The local EPA together with the local National Environmental Guard as well as representatives of National Agency “Apele Romane” is inspecting the site after construction and issue a technical note with observations at the site (e.g., Environmental Audit).

151. The Environmental Audit of existing facilities is carried out only by certified persons paid by the Project Proponent and includes: (i) a checklist including characteristic elements of the investment; (ii) an environmental study including data collection and technical review of all environmental aspects, before taking a decision on the scale of potential or existing environmental impacts from the site; and (iii) site investigations to quantify the potential scale of contamination of the site. Compliance programs are usually required based on the result of the environmental audit.

152. ***The Beneficiary*** is charged with:

- ③ Requesting the Environmental Permit from the local EPA;
- ③ Preparing a *Technical File* as in the previous case;
- ③ Announcing the public about the request to start operations;
- ③ Seeking annual renewal of the permit once it is issued (it is valid for 5 years).

153. Standards (ambient and emission limits) are usually followed to comply with the environmental protection as requested by EU. Currently there are ambient standards for air, noise, waste and discharges of certain substances in the water.⁴⁰

Monitoring Capacity during the Constructions Period and After the Issuance of the Environmental Permit to Operate

154. During constructions, LEPAs together with the NGA and “Apele Romane” are in charge with visiting the site of the project and inspecting the environmental compliances stipulated in the Environmental License and Environmental Permit. Also, within the technical Department of SNCFR, one permanently evaluates the impact of the railway activity regarding water, air, soil and noise pollution. This monitoring is achieved by analyses and measurements of environmental factors concentrations performed in the environmental protection laboratories network of SNCFR (there are 8 regional laboratories). These laboratories are certified by the European RENAR.

155. The NGA inspectors may accompany the LEPAs’ inspectors for site visits according to an inspection program. Following the site visit and checking the compliance, the inspectors prepare a report based on which they may advise the operators on how to meet standards and permit conditions. If a facility/project does not comply with relevant standards, it will first receive a warning from the inspector followed by a certain amount of time necessary to take care of the steps that comply with the permit. If these steps are not performed, an administrative fine will be imposed (the size of the fine varies as presented in the legislation). Finally, non-compliance will result in court action.

³⁹ Issued for existing activities or when a new investment starts its operation

⁴⁰ Standards required by Law are listed in Annex I A

Annex I C - Romania's *Current* and *Proposed* Measures that would Improve and Sustain Acceptability

Introduction

156. The costs that Romania needs to adjust to the EU environmental requirements by 2018 -the final year of the longest transition period obtained by Romania to comply with the EU environmental requirements - totals Euro 29.3 billion, out of which about 20% will be covered from the State and local budgets, 34% from the EC funds, 26 % by the business operators, and the rest of about 20% from other sources (credits, loans, bilateral agreements). The environmental protection investments totaled about Euro 347.8 million during the period of January-July, 2005, representing mainly the business operators' contribution in the industrial pollution control and air quality. The water sector requires the highest costs of the total needed expenses, specifically 65% (or Euro 19 billion) are estimated to account for wastewater treatment while about Euro 6.5 billion will be needed for the drinking water quality sector.

157. The commitment undertaken by Romania during the Chapter 22 Environment negotiations refers to the following actions: (i) finalization of the environmental aquis transposition by the end of 2006; (ii) strengthening the institutional capacity in the environmental sector at local, regional and central level; and (iii) enforcement and control of the relevant legislation.

158. In order to strengthen the administrative and institutional capacity for implementation of the environmental legislation at national, regional and local level and for the country preparation for EU accession, the Government of Romania undertook a number of steps during 2004 and 2005 which are outlined in the following sections.

Transposition of the EU Legislation and Its Enforcement

159. By the third quarter of Calendar Year 2005, 95% of the EU environmental aquis is transposed, specifically the water quality sector, nature protection, noise and nuclear safety and radio-protection. In sectors such as air quality or industrial pollution control, chemicals and waste management, transposition rates are about 90%; all institutional capacity of structural and cohesion funds absorption have been built and enhanced; all technical implementation measurements currently scheduled for 2005 have been completed.

160. In the **water sector** the main legal acts are the Environmental protection Law and the Water Law 107/1996, recently amended in order to amend the Water Framework Directive. In order to improve the quality of waters, the 2004 National Report including management plans for the development of hydrographic basins in Romania was developed. Moreover, the maximum limits of certain dangerous chemical substances discharged into the surface waters were established. Also, the activity of reviewing and transposing the permit conditions of wastewater treatment plants discharges in surface waters has been launched.

161. In the **transport sector**, the air quality problem is approached by imposing the use of less pollutant fuels and by rehabilitating the trans-European roads (GD 343/2002). In addition, regulations were adopted on certification of vehicle equipment, spare parts and materials (Law 671/2002), on periodical inspection of the vehicle technical quality to ensure safety on roads and environment protection (Law 167/2003), and on gas and particle emission limitation from internal combustion engines used for mobile equipment that are not vehicles (GD 743/2002).

Institutional Consolidation

162. Institutional consolidation through establishment of specific institutions for an adequate enforcement of the environment aquis and through approval of supplemental staff positions in the main institutions responsible for environmental protection to increase the efficiency of environmental

activity (Table xx). There are currently institutions with very clear responsibility in the implementation and control of the environment legislation enforcement as following:

- ③ the MEWM, by its specialized Departments and Directions (e.g., EU Integration; Environment; and Water), is in charge only with the development and supervision of application of the environment protection policy and strategy, programs and plans and concentrates on the coordination, elaboration, and promotion of norms that entirely transpose the EU legislation into the Romanian legislation. The MEWM has in its subordinate the NEPA, together with its eight Regional Agencies (REPA) and 42 County Agencies (LEPA);
- ③ the NEPA is the national institution that: (i) ensures the technical support of the MEWM; (ii) coordinates REPAs and LEPAs; and (iii) implements and monitors the environmental action plans at national, regional and county level;
- ③ the REPAs (8) are in charge with the environmental management at regional level and coordination of the LEPAs;
- ③ the LEPAs (42) are in charge with the coordination, implementation and monitoring of the environmental action plans at county level;
- ③ The NGA, which is directly subordinated to the MEWM, is the national authority for control and complying with the environmental protection legislation. The NGA is in charge with: (i) the inspection and enforcement activities for environment protection; and (ii) the issuance of penalties for exceeding discharges and emission limits;
- ③ The National Agency “Apele Romane” is the governmental authority responsible for the management of water quality and quantity of the Romanian hydrographical basins. Together with MEWM is the institution in charge with water as physical resources.
- ③ The MTCT is in charge with development of policies and activities in the transport sector, being the main regulation authority for vehicle emissions. Responsible also for activities concerning land use planning and tourism.
- ③ The Environmental Fund identifies environmental priorities and totals about Euro 50 million in 2005 mainly from environmental taxes.

Other institutions involved:

- ③ ICIM – operates under the MEWM authority and carries out complex research studies concerning surface and underground water quality, air quality, pollution sources, environmental radioactivity, technical assistance and environmental expertise, training courses for the personnel in the environmental and water field. Although plays an important role in the overall functioning of the MEWP (including harmonization process, environmental monitoring and coordination of data provided by local EPAs, reference body for the Danube river areas conservation), ICIM has no regular yearly income secured from the State budget and about 85% of its funding is based on contracts with economic agents and private sector (e.g., EIA studies, environmental audits);
- ③ Institute of Meteorology, Hydrology and Water Management – operates under the National Agency “Apele Romane” authority and monitors, forecasts, and carries out research on meteorology, hydrology and water resource management as well as information on the ozone layer and wind speed;
- ③ SNCFR – implements the environmental implementation programs of an ecological railway transport in the country

- ③ ISPCF – designs the railway infrastructure
- ③ IPTANA – designs the roads infrastructure

163. Approximately 949 additional experts have been employed in the environmental sector at central, regional and local level. Overall, the MEWM has developed a strategy regarding the environment personnel increase by 1,660 persons/civil servants until 2006, as noted in the following table:

164. Approved positions for additional staff in state institutions

Institution	Supplemental Staff approved in 2004	Staff positions filled-in as of September 2005 (of total # approved for 2005)
MEWM	50 (in the General Direction for Management of Structural Funds)	23 (of 96)
NEPA	100	33 (of 95)
REPA (8)	88	36 (of 70)
LEPA (42)	498	55 (of 222)
NARW		63
ARBDD		8 (of 15)

165. The Control and Monitoring Activities process including the prevention, observation and penalty application for avoiding the law regarding environmental protection strengthen during the last year. For example, during the period of July 1st-August 15, 2005, the representatives of NEG performed inspections at 958 economic agents concluding the following: (i) about 47% of the required environmental measures were adopted totaling 121,170 RON; and (ii) about 53% of other environmental protection investment measures proposed for 2005 were already developed totaling about 70,760 RON. Moreover, the NEG will perform a regular inspection together with representatives of MEWM (e.g., “Apele Romane”) and LEPA/NEPA in conformity with a program approved by the MEWM and LEPA/NEPA.

Personnel Training

166. A total of twelve (12) training seminars for experts in the MEWM and their subordinate structures took place during 2005. About ten (10) twinning projects totaling Euro 13.5 million are developed (and/or scheduled to be launched) during the period of 2005-2006 involving the daily training of REPA personnel as well as regular technical assistance for the personnel of NEPA and of the General Direction in charge with managing the Structural Funds within the MEWM. In 2004, the SNCFR achieved the training of 4 employees in Management integrated systems for quality (ISO 9001), environment (ISO 14001), and health and work security (OHSAS 18001). Also, 7 SNCFR employees participated at ISO 1400 training while other 2 employees participated at the environmental auditors testing laboratories (ISO/EC 17025).

Financing and Other Activities

167. Financing and facilitating access to viable environmental technologies through strengthening the Environment Fund capacity: the number of applications and concrete projects using allocation of appropriate amounts from the EF has increased considerably. The amount of Euro 1,200 million allocated to Romania under the ISPA program until 2006 for the improvement of the environmental infrastructure has been covered through the projects submitted so far to Brussels. A new portfolio of projects able to absorb the future funds that Romania will benefit from in the future is in process to be established.

168. Supporting public education and awareness through specific programs related to environmental issues: numerous actions and awareness raising campaigns regarding the possibility of business operators, public administration, and all stakeholders in the environment protection have been carried-out.




Figure. Procedures for issuing the environmental license to start-up investments of a new facility

ANNEX II – SUMMARY MATRICES FOR ANALYSIS OF EQUIVALENCE

Annex II A - Environmental Assessment

Bank Policy (OP 4.00) Requirements (Objective and Operational Principles)	Government of Romania’s Equivalent Requirements		Significant differences between OP 4.00 and Romania’s requirements.	System improvements that would be undertaken by the Government of Romania before implementation of the project activities
	Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Romania’s corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.	Romania’s corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.		
<p>Objective: To help ensure the environmental and social soundness and sustainability of investment projects. To support integration of environmental and social aspects of projects into the decision-making process.</p>	<p>protection of the environment and leading to sustainable development of society</p> <p>EIA aims at stating the measures of reduction or avoidance of the negative impact of the project on the factors mentioned enumerated in paragraph (1) and determines the decision of achieving or not achieving the project on the chosen site. Factors enumerated in paragraph (1) are: (a) human beings, fauna, flora, (b) soil, water, air, climate and the landscape, (c) material assets and cultural heritage, and (d) the interaction between (a), (b), (c).</p>	<p>Art 1 Law 137/1995</p> <p>Art 3(2) GD 918/2002</p> <p>More generally, environmental assessment is governed by the following Romanian legislation: Law 137/1995 GD 918/2002 MO 860/2002 MO. 863/2002 MO 864/2002.</p>	<p><i>No significant gaps.</i></p>	<p><i>None required</i></p>
<p>Operational Principles:</p> <p>1. Use a screening process for each proposed project, as early as possible, to determine the appropriate extent and type of environmental assessment (EA) so that appropriate studies are undertaken proportional to potential risks and to direct, and, as relevant, indirect, cumulative, and associated impacts. Use sectoral or regional environmental assessment when appropriate.</p>	<p>A screening process is in place and consists of three categories: (a) projects that require the preparation of a full EIA, either mandatory or after screening by the competent authorities (Category A); (b) projects that are subject to an “unique agreement” and require only a summary description of the project, its impacts and appropriate mitigation measures (Category B); (c) projects that do not require an EA (Category C).</p> <p>Competent environmental authorities review all category A and B projects for their potential impacts and determine the scope of the EIA, or a limited environmental analysis</p>	<p><u>On Category A</u> GD 918/2002, Art 3(4) EIA is achieved in 3 stages as follows: (i) the environment impact assessment screening stage; (ii) the environmental impact assessment scoping stage and (iii) the review of the environmental impact statement stage.</p> <p>Art 6(2): EIA is mandatory for projects of Annex 1 of GD 918/2002. Art 6(3), (4), (5): screening is mandatory for projects of Annex 2, using criteria of annex 3, to determine need for full EIA.</p> <p>Art 8: Competent authority provides guidance to developer on type and extent of issues to be addressed in impact study. Minimum information to be provided by the project developer at the screening stage is listed in Annex 4 of the same GD 918/2002, and includes direct, indirect, secondary, cumulative, positive and negative impacts.</p> <p>Details of the screening and scoping procedures are given in MO 860/2002 and MO 863/2002, which include checklists for both the screening and</p>	<p><i>No significant gaps.</i></p>	<p><i>None required</i></p>

⁴¹ Romanian law uses the term “environmental agreement” in this context.

Bank Policy (OP 4.00) Requirements (Objective and Operational Principles)	Government of Romania's Equivalent Requirements		Significant differences between OP 4.00 and Romania's requirements.	System improvements that would be undertaken by the Government of Romania before implementation of the project activities
	Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.	Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.		
		<p>scoping stages.</p> <p><u>On Category B</u></p> <p><u>GD 860/2202</u> Art 5(1') New projects, and any change, extension, or dismantling of projects that may have significant environmental impacts, related to activities listed in GD 918/2002 (environmental impact assessment framework) and EO 152/2005 (on integrated pollution prevention, mitigation and control) require a license to construct⁴¹, and in some instances (such as sanitary landfills) an integrated [permit to operate], including a summary description of the project, its impacts and appropriate mitigation measures</p> <p>MO 860/2002 Art 7, 10 (standard application form), 11, 13(a), Art 33 (model and minimum content of environment agreement).</p>		
2. Assess potential impacts of the proposed project on physical, biological, socio-economic and physical cultural resources, including transboundary and global concerns, and potential impacts on human health and safety.	EIA shall identify, describe and assess in an appropriate manner in the light of each individual case the direct and indirect effects of a project on (a) human beings, flora and fauna; (b) soil, water, air, climate and the landscape; (c) material assets and the cultural heritage; (d) interaction between factors mentioned under (a), (b) and (c).	<p>GD 918/2002 Art 3(1)</p> <p>Furthermore, MO 863/202 provides detailed guidance to competent authorities on factors to be both screening and scoping. Assessment of global concerns not explicitly mentioned but addressed in the content MO 863/2002 (climate change, ozone depletion, pollution of international waters, biodiversity)</p> <p>Art 13 of GD 918/2002 and MO 864/2002 provide detailed procedures for environmental assessment of projects likely to have transboundary effects. Law 22/2001 ratifies the ESPOO Convention on transboundary environmental impact assessment.</p>	<i>No significant gaps.</i>	<i>None required</i>
3. Assess the adequacy of the applicable legal and institutional framework, including applicable international environmental agreements, and confirm that they provide that the cooperating government does not finance project activities that would contravene	Romania is committed to EU membership in 2007 and adoption of the EU's environmental acquis (including several international conventions). Upon EU accession, non-compliance would result in an infringement procedure. Also, as mentioned in Annex I, Romania is signatory to several international conventions related to Natural Habitat and Physical Cultural Resources and Convention on EIA in a transboundary context (Espoo, 1991).	There are no explicit provisions under Romanian law; but provisions in the Constitution (Article 11) however recognize that international treaties once ratified are part of national law. Article 148 of the Constitution provides that binding EU regulations take precedence over contrary national laws.	<i>No significant gaps</i>	<i>None required</i>
4. Provide for assessment of feasible	The "no project" alternative must be considered under the	GD 918/2002, Annex 4 and Art 10 require that EIA includes at least (i)	<i>No significant gaps.</i>	<i>None required</i>

Bank Policy (OP 4.00) Requirements (Objective and Operational Principles)	Government of Romania's Equivalent Requirements		Significant differences between OP 4.00 and Romania's requirements.	System improvements that would be undertaken by the Government of Romania before implementation of the project activities
	Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.	Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.		
investment, technical, and siting alternatives, including the "no action" alternative, potential impacts, feasibility of mitigating these impacts, their capital and recurrent costs, their suitability under local conditions, and their institutional, training and monitoring requirements associated with them.	EIA for categories "A" projects. The other points listed under principle 4 are referred to in varying degrees of detail.	<p>description of measures taken into account in order to avoid, reduce, and if possible remedy negative effects on the environment; (ii) description of environmental aspects potentially affected; (iii) general presentation of main alternatives studies by developer with indication of reasons for his choice.</p> <p>MO 863/2002, Annex 2, Part I, point 2.1 and table 1 list a range of alternatives, (including siting and technology), to be considered by the competent authorities during scoping. The zero alternative must be considered.</p> <p>MO 863/2002, Annex 2, Part I, points 3.1 and 3.2 and table 2 (scoping checklist) provide a list of potential impacts to be considered during scoping.</p> <p>MO863/2002 Annex 2, Part II, Annex 3 (guidelines on review of EIA report) includes review by competent authorities of whether the responsibilities and funding for implementation of mitigation are clearly defined.</p>		
5. Where applicable to the type of project being supported, normally apply the Pollution Prevention and Abatement Handbook (PPAH). Justify deviations when alternatives to measures set forth in the PPAH are selected.	No reference to PPAH guidelines in Romanian Law	<p>Emissions, waste management, water, wastewater discharge, and air pollution standards are set in various pieces of Romanian legislation.</p> <p>MO 860/2002. Art 33(3) and Annex III.1 provide a model and minimum content of the environmental agreement that include allowed levels of emissions.</p> <p>MO 860/2002 Art 34. For investment projects that are and to be financed from (EU) community funds the installation parameters and operating conditions established by the environmental agreement shall consider pollutant emission discharge conditions set by EU legislation. National limits shall apply when more restrictive.</p>	<i>No significant gaps, since Romanian standards are more comprehensive and equally/more stringent</i>	<i>None required</i>
6. Prevent and, where not possible to prevent, at least minimize, or compensate for adverse project impacts and enhance positive impacts through environmental management and planning that includes the proposed mitigation	<p>The EIA emphasizes both positive and negative impacts with major focus on the mitigating measures for addressing negative impact.</p> <p>However, no specific requirements are given for EMP</p>	<p>MO 860/2002 Art 49] The environmental agreement shall be issued only if the project provides the removal of the negative consequences on the environment in relation to the applicable provisions of the technical norms and regulations in force.</p> <p>MO 860/2002 Annex No III.1 regards Contents of Environmental Agreement (Model)</p>	<i>No significant gap</i>	<i>None required</i>

Bank Policy (OP 4.00) Requirements (Objective and Operational Principles)	Government of Romania's Equivalent Requirements		Significant differences between OP 4.00 and Romania's requirements.	System improvements that would be undertaken by the Government of Romania before implementation of the project activities
	Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.	Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.		
measures, monitoring, institutional capacity development and training measures, an implementation schedule, and cost estimates.		<p>MO 860/2002 Annex II.2 on standard contents for the technical memorandum for <u>integrated</u> environmental agreement; point V provisions on environmental monitoring.</p> <p>MO 860/2002 Art 50, the environmental agreement shall be revised if new elements become known. Project proponent must inform competent authorities of substantial change of data that formed basis of issuance of environmental agreement.</p> <p>MO 8676/2004</p> <p>Standard bidding documents are used in all projects that include requirements for onsite mitigation measures during construction</p>		
7. Involve stakeholders, including project-affected groups and local nongovernmental organizations, as early as possible, in the preparation process and ensure that their views and concerns are made known to decision makers and taken into account. Continue consultations throughout project implementation as necessary to address EA-related issues that affect them.	<p>Public involvement foreseen at screening, EIA review, and decision stage.</p> <p>No provision for continuing consultation throughout project implementation of high risk projects.</p>	<p>Requirements for public participation (information and consultation) are in Art 12, 14, and 15 of GD 918/2002</p> <p>Detailed arrangements (including timeframes, model public announcements, forms for recording and for evaluating comments) are provided in chapter III (public information and consultation) of MO 860/2002. Procedure includes information to be made available, public debate, and consideration of written comments</p>	<i>Gap with respect to continuing consultation throughout project implementation of high risk projects such as large new landfills.</i>	<i>None required since high risk will not be financed by either project.</i>
8. Use independent expertise in the preparation of EA where appropriate. Use independent advisory panels during preparation and implementation of projects that are highly risky or contentious or that involve serious and multi-dimensional environmental and/or social concerns.	<p>Certified expertise required for EIA study</p> <p>Review of EIA by TRC</p>	<p>Art 11(1) of GD 918/2002: EIA study is achieved on the basis of guidance foreseen in Art 8 (i.e. scoping by competent authority) through specialized units, independent of the developer and certified by law.</p> <p>GD 918/2002 – Technical Review Committee at central and local level comprised at central of representatives of certain public central and/or local authorities. It may be enlarged with experts as the specific conditions of the project will impose. MO 863/2002 makes checklists compulsory for every stage of the EIA procedure (screening, scoping, review of EIA report) and to be reviewed by TRC with aim to ensure quality.</p> <p>Independent Panel of Experts during implementation for</p>	<i>Gap with respect to use of independent advisory panels during implementation of high risk projects</i>	<i>None required since high risk will not be financed by either project.</i>

Bank Policy (OP 4.00) Requirements (Objective and Operational Principles)	Government of Romania's Equivalent Requirements		Significant differences between OP 4.00 and Romania's requirements.	System improvements that would be undertaken by the Government of Romania before implementation of the project activities
	Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.	Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.		
		risky/contentious/multi-dimensional projects not envisioned.		
9. Provide measures to link the environmental assessment process and findings with studies of economic, financial, institutional, social and technical analyses of a proposed project.	There is no specific requirement However, composition of TRC allows for input from the various parts of the administration and for integrated decision making	MO 171/2005	<i>No significant gaps</i>	<i>None required</i>
10. Provide for application of the principles in this Table to subprojects under investment and financial intermediary activities.	Concept of subproject not mentioned in Romanian legislation, [but all investment types are covered]	Under Law 137/1995, GD 918/2002 and its executive regulations, the competent authorities are required to screen and review all investment projects for their potential impacts. GD 860/2002 Art 5(1) provides that applying for an environmental agreement is mandatory for all new investment projects and any change or extension that may have significant effects on the environment, including for dismantling projects, related to activities as established by GD 918/2002 on the environmental impact assessment framework procedure and the Emergency ordinance 152/2005 on integrated pollution prevention and control. GD 860/2002 Art 5(2), (3) For investment projects related to activities not subject to an EIA, public authorities for environmental protection shall apply simplified environmental licensing procedures (...) only an environmental permit shall be issued.	<i>No significant gaps.</i>	<i>None required</i>
11. Disclose draft EA in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in an accessible place and in a form and language understandable to key stakeholders.	Romanian law has comprehensive disclosure and consultation requirements – the national/regional or local EPA is responsible for organizing public consultation/debate on draft EIA and publishes its decisions, including those of Technical Review Committee, in local newspapers and their websites.	MO No. 860/2002	<i>No significant gap.</i>	<i>None required</i>

Annex II B - Cultural Property

Bank Policy (OP 4.00) Requirements	Government of Romania's Equivalent Requirements		Significant differences between OP 4.00 and Romania's requirements.	System improvements that would be undertaken by the Government of Romania before implementation of the project activities
(Objective and Operational Principles)	Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.	Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.		
<p>Objective: To assist in preserving physical cultural resources (PCR) and avoiding their destruction or damage. PCR includes archaeological, paleontological, historical, and sacred sites, including graveyards, burial sites, and unique natural values.</p>	<p>Protection of historic monuments is in the public interest.</p> <p>Aim is to protect archaeological heritage and to certify certain archaeological sites as areas of national interest (including structures, constructions, groups of buildings, developed sites, moveable objects, monuments of other kinds as well as their context, whether situated on land or under water, war memorials and graveyards).</p>	<p>Law 422 / 2001</p> <p>Government Ordinance 43 /2000 (as amended by Law 378/2000 and Law 462 / 2003)</p>	<p><i>No significant gaps</i></p>	<p><i>None required</i></p>
<p>Operational Principles:</p> <p>1. Analyze feasible project alternatives to prevent or minimize or compensate for adverse impacts and enhance positive impacts on PCR, through site selection and design.</p>	<p>In the case of infrastructure projects in areas with located archaeology, project proponents are obliged to finance any modifications to the project necessary to protect archaeological discoveries. In some cases, if there are structures with great historic, cultural or scientific importance that cannot be moved (such as churches, temples, monumental tombs, fortified settlements), the archaeological team can recommend the preservation of the remains by changing the initial plans.</p> <p>For projects likely to have insignificant environmental effects such determination can only be made after checking the application, the site location within the urban development plan and in relation to its relative position with regards to protected areas or buffer zones, natural or archaeological monuments, restricted development zones.</p>	<p>Government Ordinance 43/2000 Article 6</p> <p>Government Ordinance 860/2002</p>	<p><i>No significant gaps</i></p>	<p><i>None required</i></p>
<p>2. If possible, avoid financing projects that significantly damage PCR. As appropriate, conduct field based surveys</p>	<p>Any intervention on a listed monument or archaeological site must be authorized by the Ministry</p>	<p>Law 422 / 2001, Article 22, 28 (f,g), 55 Government Ordinance 43 / 2000, Article 5 (9)</p>	<p><i>No significant gaps</i></p>	<p><i>None required</i></p>

Bank Policy (OP 4.00) Requirements	Government of Romania's Equivalent Requirements		Significant differences between OP 4.00 and Romania's requirements.	System improvements that would be undertaken by the Government of Romania before implementation of the project activities
(Objective and Operational Principles)	Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.	Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.		
using qualified specialists to evaluate PCR.	<p>of Culture and Religious Affairs.</p> <p>In the case of any infrastructure project, project proponents are obliged in the feasibility study to carry out field surveys using qualified specialists. They must also pay for archaeological surveillance over the entire period of the works to protect the archaeology and chance finds.</p> <p>Qualified specialists are specified on a Register of Archaeologists, maintained by the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs.</p>	<p>Government Ordinance 43/30 Article 6</p> <p>Government Ordinance 43/ 2000 Article 10 (h)</p>		
3. Consult local people in documenting the presence and significance of PCR, assessing the nature and extent of potential impacts on these resources, and designing and implementing mitigation plans.	<p>Owners whose building is subject to a protection classification procedure must be informed of this by the County department for culture, religious and national public patrimony. They are entitled to challenge the procedure at the Ministry of Culture and Religious affairs within 30 days of being notified.</p> <p>Local public administration authorities are responsible for modifying general urban plans in order to protect archaeological patrimony. They must also define the limits of the priority archaeological interest area, and inform the public of the special regime of protection for that area.</p> <p>PCR protection is covered in Environmental Impact Assessment procedures and public involvement foreseen at screening, EIA review, and decision stage.</p> <p>Under the detailed arrangements for public information and participation in the EIA process, the public has the right to present proposals. Procedure includes information to be made available, public debate,</p>	<p>Law 422 (2001), Article 13, Article 60 (2)</p> <p>Government Ordinance 43 (2000), Article 20 (c)</p> <p>Government Decision 918 / 2002, Articles 12, 14, and 15</p> <p>Government Ordinance 860 / 2002, Chapter III, Articles 13 to 17</p>	<p><i>No significant gap</i></p> <p>For infrastructure projects affecting historic monuments and sites, public consultation is not enshrined in Law 422 or GO 43. This is only foreseen in EIA procedures, which require inclusion of PCR experts 'as needed.'</p>	<p><i>None required</i></p>

Bank Policy (OP 4.00) Requirements (Objective and Operational Principles)	Government of Romania's Equivalent Requirements		Significant differences between OP 4.00 and Romania's requirements.	System improvements that would be undertaken by the Government of Romania before implementation of the project activities
	Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.	Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.		
	and consideration of written comments			
4. Provide for the use of "chance find" procedures that include a pre-approved management and conservation approach for materials that may be discovered during project implementation.	<p>Mandatory reporting to authorities within 72 hours of a find.</p> <p>The Town Mayor can order the interruption of all activity / revoke the building permit, following authorization from the decentralized services of the Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs.</p> <p>Scientific, managing and technical measures should be adopted to preserve the vestiges uncovered by chance until the classification of those assets or until conclusion of the archaeological research.</p> <p>The area of archaeological patrimony accidentally revealed must be delimited, as suitable, either as: the entire area of the building authorization / a radius of 50 meters from the place of discovery / the entire area affected by the action of a natural event that revealed the find.</p> <p>Police must be notified to guard the area. Only when the discovery has been fully analyzed by qualified experts can the MCRA authorize an "Archaeological Discharge Certificate."</p>	<p>Government Ordinance 43 (2000) Article 4 (3)</p> <p>Government Ordinance 43 (2000) Article 5 (10)</p> <p>Law 422 /2000 Article 48 (d)</p> <p>Government Ordinance 43 (2000) Article 5 (1)</p> <p>Government Ordinance 43 (2000) Article 2 (j)</p> <p>Government Ordinance 43 (2000) Article 11 (e)</p> <p>Government Ordinance 43 (2000) Articles 5 (1,2, & 3)</p>	<i>No significant gaps</i>	<i>None required</i>
5. Define and undertake measures for strengthening institutional capacity to implement mitigation plans and to deal with impacts on PCR identified prior to and/or discovered during project implementation.	<p>During the feasibility study for a project, the project proponent is obliged to establish the measures and necessary funds for the protection of PCR.</p> <p>The MCRA is responsible for establishing the methodology of planning, execution and control regarding preventive archaeological research.</p> <p>MCRA and the NCHM are responsible for elaborating and organizing a national system for education,</p>	<p>Government Ordinance 43 (2000) Article 6</p> <p>Government Ordinance 43 (2000) Article 10 (f1)</p> <p>Law 422/2001 Article 28 (r), Article (p)</p>	<p><i>No significant gaps.</i></p> <p>The law says little about measures to strengthen 'institutional capacity' to deal with impacts on PCR discovered during project implementation.</p>	<i>None required.</i>

Bank Policy (OP 4.00) Requirements	Government of Romania's Equivalent Requirements		Significant differences between OP 4.00 and Romania's requirements.	System improvements that would be undertaken by the Government of Romania before implementation of the project activities
	Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.	Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.		
	training and improvement for specialists in protection of PCR			
6. Disclose draft mitigation plans, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in an accessible place and in a form and language that are understandable to key stakeholders.	Under the detailed arrangements for public information and participation in the EIA process, the public has the right to present proposals. Procedure includes information to be made available, public debate, and consideration of written comments.	Government Ordinance 860 / 2002, Chapter III, Articles 13 to 17	<i>No significant gaps</i>	<i>None required</i>

Annex II C – Dam Safety⁴²

Bank Policy (OP 4.00) Requirements (Objective and Operational Principles)	Government of Romania's Equivalent Requirements		Significant differences between OP 4.00 and Romania's requirements.	System improvements that would be undertaken by the Government of Romania before implementation of the project activities
	Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.	Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.		
To assure quality and safety in the design and construction of new dams and the rehabilitation of existing dams, and in carrying out activities that may be affected by an existing dam.	To provide a framework for quality assurance of design and construction of new dams or rehabilitation of existing dams, and for their safety operation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Law 107/1996, modified by Law 310/2004 • Gov. Ordinance 244/2000 • MEWM Ordinance 128/2005 	<i>No significant gaps</i>	<i>None required</i>
1. Identify existing dams and dams under construction that can influence the performance of the project and implement necessary safety measures/remedial works	In case a new project would need to be linked to an existing dam or a dam under construction, this project must fully comply with the dam safety regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Law 107/1996, modified by Law 310/2004 	<i>No significant gaps</i>	<i>None required</i>
2. Use experienced and competent professionals to design and supervise the construction, operation and maintenance of dams and associated works.	Design of dams can be undertaken only by firms specialized and certified by MEWM. Construction supervision can only be undertaken by site supervisors certified in this field.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Law 107/1996 modified by Law 310/2004 • Gov. Ordinance 244/2000 	<i>No significant gaps</i>	<i>None required</i>
3. Develop detailed plans, including for construction supervision, instrumentation, operation and maintenance and emergency preparedness.	It is mandatory that, for all dams, the owners have detailed plans for instrumentation, operation and maintenance, and emergency preparedness. During construction phase, the supervision programs are prepared by the designer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Law 107/1996 modified by Law 310/2004 • Gov. Ordinance 244/2000 	<i>No significant gaps</i>	<i>None required</i>
4. Use independent advice on the verification of design, construction, and operational procedures and appoint independent panels of experts for large or high hazard dams.	All engineering designs must be verified by certified, independent, verifiers. Also, the operational plans need to be reviewed and accepted by an independent panel of experts members of CONSIB (the National Commission on Dam Safety)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Law 107/1996, modified by Law 310/2004 • Gov. Ordinance 244/2000 • MEWM Ordinance 128/2005 	<i>No significant gaps</i>	<i>None required</i>
5. Use contractors that are qualified and experienced to undertake planned construction activities.	For large and medium size dams, the works can be contracted only with qualified and experienced contractors. For small dams, of local importance, other contractors can be considered, under close supervision of the designer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Law 107/1996, modified by Law 310/2004 	<i>No significant gaps</i>	<i>None required</i>
6. Carry out periodic safety inspections of new/rehabilitated dams after	Annual safety inspections are mandatory for all dams, conducted under	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Law 107/1996, modified by Law 310/2004 	<i>No significant gaps</i>	<i>None required</i>

⁴² Included for general information; this policy is not triggered in the current configuration of either of the two projects.

Bank Policy (OP 4.00) Requirements	Government of Romania's Equivalent Requirements		Significant differences between OP 4.00 and Romania's requirements.	System improvements that would be undertaken by the Government of Romania before implementation of the project activities
	Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.	Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sectoral guidelines.		
completion of construction/rehabilitation, review/monitor implementation of detailed plans and take appropriate action as needed.	the supervision of independent experts. Annual reports are evaluated periodically as part of the process of renewing the license for dam operation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gov. Ordinance 244/2000 • MEWM Ordinance 128/2005 		

Annex II D - Involuntary Resettlement (Expropriation for Public Use)

Bank Policy (OP 4.00) Requirements	Romania's Equivalent Requirements		Differences between OP 4.00 and Romania's requirements.	Differences that are significant and material to the Pilot Projects and would need to be addressed	System improvements that would have been undertaken by the Government of Romania before implementation of the project activities under OP 4.00
	Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sector guidelines.	Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sector guidelines.			
(Objective and Operational Principles)					
<p>Objective: To avoid or minimize involuntary resettlement and, where this is not feasible, to assist displaced persons in improving or at least restoring their livelihoods and standards of living in real terms relative to pre-displacement levels or to levels prevailing prior to the beginning of project implementation, whichever is higher.</p>	<p>a) Expropriation can occur only after the need for "public use" is demonstrated in a legal process and compensation is made. Therefore, the need to minimize involuntary resettlement is implicit.</p> <p>b) Compensation is paid at market value and "prejudice" (damages actually suffered and lost benefits, such as loss of income, relocation costs, etc). Assumed to enable affected people to maintain the value of their assets and restore their livelihoods and standards of living.</p>	<p>a) Constitution, Art. 44, para. 3, 6 "nobody may be expropriated unless for a cause of public use, established according to the law, subject to a fair and prior compensation." Law No. 33/1994 (referred to as the Expropriation Law)</p> <p>a) Expropriation Law, Art. 1, 10.</p> <p>b) Expropriation Law, Art 26. Pecuniary damages consist of the real value of the premises and the prejudice caused to the owner or other entitled persons. Expropriation Law Art. 28 "The usage, the usufruct, superficies, as well as any other real rights and concession and award into possession will be extinguished as a result of expropriation, the holders being entitled to receive pecuniary damages.</p>	<p>The principles are not explicitly stated, but are embedded in legal requirements and procedural requirements.</p> <p>The Romanian law does not establish a standard for mitigating social impacts; rather, it assumes that compensation is adequate mitigation.</p>	<p>"Prejudice" which captures impacts on incomes and livelihoods, needs to be claimed by the affected persons as part of negotiations and is not an automatic entitlement.</p>	<p>Need to inform affected people about compensation standards and prejudice and procedures to claim prejudice.</p>

Bank Policy (OP 4.00) Requirements (Objective and Operational Principles)	Romania's Equivalent Requirements		Differences between OP 4.00 and Romania's requirements.	Differences that are significant and material to the Pilot Projects and would need to be addressed	System improvements that would have been undertaken by the Government of Romania before implementation of the project activities under OP 4.00
	Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sector guidelines.	Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sector guidelines.			
Operational Principles: 1. Assess all viable alternative project designs to avoid, where feasible, or minimize involuntary resettlement.	An Expropriation Decision is issued by a relevant authority (national, county, or local depending on the level of the authority that is investing), based on a "Prior Investigation File" that justifies the works requiring expropriation and demonstrates that they cannot be carried out without the specific expropriation requested. The need to minimize involuntary resettlement is implicit in this requirement.	Expropriation Law, Art. 7, 8, 10,	No significant difference in practice, as expropriation must be justified and residences are assiduously avoided in designs.(is there any reference to this in the regulations)	None	None required
2. Through census and socio-economic surveys of the affected population, identify, assess, and address the potential economic and social impacts of the project that are caused by involuntary taking of land (e.g. relocation or loss of shelter, loss of assets or access to assets, loss of income sources or means of livelihood, whether or not the affected person must move to another location) or involuntary restriction of access to legally designated parks and protected areas.	a) The Prior (Preliminary) Investigation File identifies the "economic-social, environmental or any other kind of benefits" of the work as well provides data "to describe expropriation, economic, social environmental or any other kind of inconveniences. b) Once public interest is established, a Technical Design is completed, which includes details regarding alignment, specific parcels affected, ownership details from cadastre, and other assets affected and compensation standards and total cost.	a) Government Decree No. 583/1994, On Working Procedures of the Commissions in Charge of Conducting Preliminary Investigations in Order to Establish Public Usefulness for National or Local Interest Works, Annex 1, b) Expropriation Law Art. 3	The expropriation documents and technical Design include household land ownership, which constitutes a proxy for a household census. No household socio-economic surveys are carried out, as stipulated in Principle 2, as compensation standards and prejudice are assumed to be adequate to offset losses.	None This deficiency does not compromise the objectives or outcome of the process and this is not a significant issue that would prevent the application of OP 4.00 especially since the pilots involve only land acquisition and cash compensation without any need to change occupations.	None required
3. Identify and address impacts also if they result from other activities that are (a) directly and significantly related to the proposed project, (b) necessary to achieve its objectives, and (c) carried out or planned to be carried out contemporaneously with the project.	Legal expropriation and compensation requirements apply to all aspects of an investment.		No significant difference.	None	None required
4. Consult project-affected persons, host communities and local nongovernmental organizations, as appropriate. Provide them opportunities to participate in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of the resettlement program, especially in the process of developing and implementing the procedures for determining eligibility	a) Works must be entered into Urban and regional spatial plans (a public process) before an expropriation request can be made are revised to include new investments and changes in land use through public meetings. b) Documents related to the declaration of public use (the Expropriation	a) Expropriation Law, Art. 8, 10. Law No. 71/1996 regarding approval of the National Territory Planning – Section I – Means of Communication b) Expropriation Law,	The consultation, disclosure and appeals processes are consistent with the principle and adequate. Although a specific resettlement document is	While affected people are not involved in implementation and monitoring, they are carried out on the basis of established laws and guidelines. Similarly, since eligibility is	None required

Bank Policy (OP 4.00) Requirements (Objective and Operational Principles)	Romania's Equivalent Requirements		Differences between OP 4.00 and Romania's requirements.	Differences that are significant and material to the Pilot Projects and would need to be addressed	System improvements that would have been undertaken by the Government of Romania before implementation of the project activities under OP 4.00
	Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sector guidelines.	Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sector guidelines.			
	Municipality Court to resolve disputes and set compensation, based on the findings of an expertise. The claims of "other entitled persons" are also resolved in the court. j) The expropriator must pay compensation within 30 days, after which the title is considered transferred and work can begin. Owners can still contest compensation levels or demonstrate ownership and eligibility for compensation after payment		be among the "other entitled persons" (Art. 26 of the Expropriation Law) or other "holders being entitled to receive pecuniary damages (Art. 28 of the, Expropriation Law). The process does not give special consideration to the vulnerable or excluded groups	was unable to determine how or if they are compensated in practice. The lack of special attention to vulnerable groups is not considered to be significant if assessed valuation is adequate and consistent and people are informed of their rights and entitlements.	expropriation involving squatters and illegal occupants. Independent monitors will monitor and the Bank will supervise.
5. Inform displaced persons of their rights, consult them on options, and provide them with technically and economically feasible resettlement alternatives and needed assistance, including (a) prompt compensation at full replacement cost for loss of assets attributable to the project; (b) if there is relocation, assistance during relocation, and residual housing, or housing sites, or agricultural sites of equivalent potential, as required; (c) transitional support and development assistance, such as land preparation, credit facilities, training or job opportunities as required, in addition to compensation measures; (d) cash compensation for land when the impact of land acquisition on livelihoods is minor; and (e) provision of civic infrastructure and community services as required.	Owners are notified that their land is to be expropriated and given a copy of the minutes of the Expropriation Decision. Although they have 45 days to contest, the law does not require the expropriator to notify them of their rights a) Land acquisition must be completed—compensation must be paid and ownership transferred—before a construction license is issued for the investment. b) If relocation is required, the expropriator must ensure an alternative dwelling, in conformity with the law, is made available. c) Relocation costs, transitional support and development assistance, as needed, would be included in compensation for "prejudice." d) Cash compensation is the norm. e) No community-wide involuntary relocation is envisioned in the pilot	Expropriation Law, Art 13, 14 a) Constitution, Art. 44, para. 3, 6; Expropriation Law, Art. 31. b) Expropriation Law, Art. 29. c) Expropriation Law, Art. 26, 28. d) Expropriation Law, Art. 26 e) Expropriation Law, Art. 7. Expropriation of entire urban or rural localities requires a special law; Art. 29.	The law does not require provision of information on rights or options, as required by the principle. . This is a salient divergence from the principle. . a) Prompt payment of compensation is required, and consistent with the principle b) No significant difference c) No damage payments are automatic, except for standing crops. Affected persons must claim prejudice. d) Property values are to be assessed by certified	Notification of rights is unreliable not systematic or adequate and could have significant impact if it results in compensation below market value and people are unaware of opportunities to contest the amount. This should be mitigated c) As above, due to inadequate information, affected persons may not claim prejudice.	Prepare information to be given to owners before negotiation to inform of rights, including provisions for prejudice. Independent monitoring of payments. Monitor during Bank supervision. Obtain agreement on timing of assessments and assurance that assessors are certified. (EU and USAID are training assessors for capacity building). Obtain agreement to share assessments with owners prior to negotiation. Introduce instructions in guidance documents. Independent monitoring of compensation to ensure that it is not lower than value determined by assessors. Manage special cases involving major land losses and the loss of businesses and residences on a case-by-case basis in

Bank Policy (OP 4.00) Requirements (Objective and Operational Principles)	Romania's Equivalent Requirements		Differences between OP 4.00 and Romania's requirements.	Differences that are significant and material to the Pilot Projects and would need to be addressed	System improvements that would have been undertaken by the Government of Romania before implementation of the project activities under OP 4.00
	Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sector guidelines.	Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sector guidelines.			
	projects. In the event of relocation of individual households, it would be to sites with appropriate infrastructure and community services.		assessors. e) No significant difference.		consultation with the Bank until there are adequate assurances that the system works. The following circumstances would require notification: acquisition of residences; acquisition of parts of an agricultural holding where the remainder is not adequate to allow people to sustain their livelihoods, compelling affected people to change their occupations; acquisition of commercial structures or businesses; and expropriation of land used by people without claim to legal title.
6. Give preference to land-based resettlement strategies for displaced persons whose livelihoods are land-based.	Expropriation laws and procedures are based on cash compensation at market rate.	Expropriation Law, Art. 1, 26.	The use of cash compensation in Romania differs from the principle that resettlement of people displaced from land-based livelihoods and expropriation should be land based. Given the complex landholding situation and the inability to be confident that substitute land under State control is available, and given the availability of land for purchase, the current arrangement is appropriate, as it would enable households to pursue a land based solution on their own. This divergence from the principle is therefore not considered to be significant.	None	None required
7. For those without formal legal rights to lands or claims to such land that could be recognized under the laws of the country, provide resettlement assistance in lieu of	A person who occupies state land for 30 years or more can obtain ownership. Other residents without formal legal title to affected land can be compensated for	Expropriation Law, Art 26, 28	The law does not clearly address the entitlements of people without land ownership,	The lack of recognition of the status of landless is a gap between Romanian law and	The Bank should be appraised in a timely manner if there are any situations in which affected persons have no tenancy arrangements or rights to title and informed

Bank Policy (OP 4.00) Requirements (Objective and Operational Principles)	Romania's Equivalent Requirements		Differences between OP 4.00 and Romania's requirements.	Differences that are significant and material to the Pilot Projects and would need to be addressed	System improvements that would have been undertaken by the Government of Romania before implementation of the project activities under OP 4.00
	Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sector guidelines.	Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sector guidelines.			
provide resettlement assistance in lieu of compensation for land to help improve or at least restore their livelihoods.	lost assets (value added) and relocation assistance as prejudice.			principle 7. It is not likely to be an issue in the proposed pilot projects, and therefore the gap is not significant.	of proposed actions to be taken. Each case should subsequently be monitored by independent monitors.
8. Disclose draft resettlement plans, including documentation of the consultation process, in a timely manner, before appraisal formally begins, in an accessible place and in a form and language that are understandable to key stakeholders.	Proposals for expropriation and Location Permits and Technical Designs are prepared in the local language and made available in the respective county or local council office and the expropriator's office and are posted in the official gazette and local newspapers. The minutes of the Expropriation Decision and minutes of the Commission established to review and assess objections are also disclosed in administrative offices.	Resettlement Law, Art. 11, 12, 18.	Romanian laws do not require the preparation of resettlement plans or their disclosure, but the Preliminary Investigation File for expropriation and the Technical Design constitute a reasonable proxy for a resettlement plan. Disclosure of each is adequate and consistent with principle 8.	None.	None required
9. Apply the principles described in the involuntary resettlement section of this Table, as applicable and relevant, to subprojects requiring land acquisition.	The laws and procedures apply equally to all expropriation required for an investment.		No difference	None	None required
10. Design, document, and disclose before appraisal of projects involving involuntary restriction of access to legally designated parks and protected areas, a participatory process for: (a) preparing and implementing project components; (b) establishing eligibility criteria; (c) agreeing on mitigation measures that help improve or restore livelihoods in a manner that maintains the sustainability of the park or protected area; (d) resolving conflicts; and (e) monitoring implementation.	This issue is irrelevant to the pilot projects.		Irrelevant	None	None required
11. Implement all relevant resettlement plans before project completion and provide resettlement entitlements before displacement or restriction of access. For projects involving restriction of access,	Expropriation must be completed before a Construction License is issued to begin civil works.) Constitution, Art. 44, para. 3, 6; Expropriation Law, Art. 1, 31.	No differences	None	None required

Bank Policy (OP 4.00) Requirements	Romania's Equivalent Requirements		Differences between OP 4.00 and Romania's requirements.	Differences that are significant and material to the Pilot Projects and would need to be addressed	System improvements that would have been undertaken by the Government of Romania before implementation of the project activities under OP 4.00
	Objectives and Operational Principles as stated in Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sector guidelines.	Romania's corresponding laws, rules, regulations, procedures, and sector guidelines.			
impose the restrictions in accordance with the timetable in the plan of actions.					
12. Assess whether the objectives of the resettlement instrument have been achieved, upon completion of the project, taking account of the baseline conditions and the results of resettlement monitoring.	No follow-up assessment required beyond financial audit.		Romanian law and practices do not require monitoring or assessment of the impact of expropriation. This is a significant difference .t	If compensation is at market value and claims and payments for prejudice are adequate, it is assumed that expropriation impacts will be negligible. The assumption has not been tested, however.	Fund independent monitors to report periodically on expropriation activities and their impacts. Bank should supervise regularly and recommend steps to resolve problems that emerge. Carry out an assessment at completion.

ANNEX III – LIST OF PERSONS MET

September 2005 Study Mission

Ministry of Environment and Water Management (MEWM)

Mr. Constantin Popescu	Secretary of State, Environment Department
Ms. Lucia Ana Varga	Secretary of State, Water Resources Department
Mr. Attila Korodi	Secretary of State, European Integration Department
Mr. Silviu Stoica	General Director, Environment Department
Mr. Gheorghe Constantin	Director, Water Resources Department
Ms. Adriana Baz	Director, Natural Habitat, Biodiversity and Biosecurity Division, Environment Department
Ms. Liliana Chirila	Director, SOP Environment, Structural Instruments Management Department
Ms. Angela Filipas	Director,
Ms. Maria Theodorescu	Counselor, Environment Department
Ms. Daniela Pineta	Counselor, Environment Department

National Administration “Apele Romane” (“Romanian Waters”)

Mr. Petru Serban	Director, Department of Management and Operation of Hydrographic Basins
------------------	--

National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA)

Mr. Ioan Gherhes	President
------------------	-----------

Bucharest Regional Environmental Protection Agency (REPA)

Ms. Simona Catrina	Executive Director
Ms. Ana Maria Nistorescu	Manager, Environmental Policies Implementation Department
Ms. Roxana Costache	Manager, IPCC Implementation Department

Bucharest Local Environmental Protection Agency (LEPA)

Ms. Sanda Petrisor	Director, EU Implementation
--------------------	-----------------------------

National Environmental Guard

Mr. Silvian Ionescu	General Director (Comisar)
Mr. Ion Vasilescu	Regional Director Sibiu
Mr. Dan Sachelarescu	Director, Justice Department

Environmental Protection National Research and Development Institute (ICIM)

Ms. Mariana Ghineraru	General Director
Ms. Violeta Visan	Senior Researcher, EIA Department

Ministry of Transport, National Railway Company “CFR” S.A

Mr. Traian Preoteasa	General Director
Mr. Orlando Craciun	Deputy General Director, Department of EU Integration
Mr. Vlad Manu	Director, Foreign Financing Department
Mr. Tiberiu Angelescu	Director, Foreign Financing Department
Ms. Aurora Smarandescu	Manager, Technical/Environmental Department
Ms. Irian Axenie	Manager, Foreign Financing Department

Railway Study and Design Institute (ISPCF - S.A.)

Mr. Stefan Bucioaca General Manager, Technical Department
Ms. Nina Mihailescu Manager, Environment Department
Mr. Radu Constantin Engineer Technical Control, Environment Department
Ms. Daniela Stancu Engineer, Environmental Department

Design Institute for Roads, Maritime and Air Transport (IPTANA – S.A.)

Ms. Liliana Bara Director, Environment Department
Mr. Marian Constantinescu Deputy General Director, Roads and Maritime Department

Ministry of European Integration

Mr. Adrian Ciocanea Secretary of State

Ministry of Culture

Mr. Virgil Nitulescu Secretary of State
Mr. Adrian Craciunescu Advisor

European Union, Delegation of the European Commission in Romania

Ms. Jeni Ionita ISPA Team Leader
Ms. Adriana Micu Task Manager Environment

Bucharest City Hall

Mr. Calin-Radu Ancuta Manager, European Integration Department
Mr. Mircea Alexandrescu Executive Director, Environment Department
Mr. Valeriu Ilie Deputy Executive Director, Transport, Roads and Traffic Management Department
Mr. Stefan Agache Prefect
Mr. Stefan Horia Stupcanu Urbanization Department, Bucharest Municipality

Brasov City Hall

Ms. Gabriela Plopeanu Manager Environment Program, EU Integration Department

Brasov County Council

Mr. Mihai Sarbu Architect
Mr. Virgil Mihailescu Manager, Cultural Department

Brasov Regional Roads and Bridges Department

Mr. Mircea Olariu Technical Director

Targu Mures City Hall

Mr. Dorin Florea Mayor

Targu Mures Local Environmental Protection Agency (LEPA)

Mr. Dan Stefanescu Director
Ms. Gabriela Boca Manager, Monitoring Department

Targu Mures Local Water Administration “Apele Romane”

Ms. Monica Gheorghe Counselor

Targu Mures Roads Department

Mr. Gheorghe Ispas Director

Arad City Hall

Mr. Razvan Popa Executive Director, Technical Department
Mr. Tamas Petru Director, Economic Department
Ms. Magda Matzeil Counselor, Economic Department

Arad Water Company

Mr. Marius Toma Technical Director
Ms. Lia Botezatu ISPA Team Leader

Timisoara Regional Environmental Protection Agency (REPA)

Ms. Francisca Schultz Manager, Authorizations and Controls Department

Arad Local Environmental Protection Agency (LEPA)

Ms. Dana Danoiu Executive Director
Ms. Gabriela Vesa Manager, Authorizations and Controls Department
Ms. Orasan Adina Counselor, Authorizations and Controls Department
Ms. Marina Ilisie Manager, Monitoring Department

Other Government

Mr. Stefan Daniel Dragulin Vice President, Calarashi County Council
Mr. Corneliu Ion Totoian Property Assessor

Additional Experts

Mr. Ionut Apostol Executive Director, *TERRA Mileniul III*
Ms. Serena Adler General Director, *AWMS* Independent Environmental Services
Mr. Cristian Popa-Dumitru Senior Consultant, RomAir Consulting Ltd.
Mr. Mihnea Crihan Technical Consultant, RomAir Consulting Ltd.
Ms. Adina Luta Financial Consultant, RomAir Consulting Ltd.
Mr. Frits Jakma Consultant, Jakma Water Consulting

November 2005 Study Mission on Cultural Property**Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs (MCRA)**

Mr. Mircea Victor Angelescu Counselor

Ministry of Environment and Water Management (MEWM)

Ms. Angela Filipas Director,
Ms. Maria Theodorescu Counselor, Environment Department
Ms. Daniela Pineta Counselor, Environment Department

National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA)

Ms. Mihaela Petcu Director General

National Office of Historic Monuments

Ms. Anca Bogdan Director

Pro Patrimonio Foundation (NGO)

Ms. Maria Berza Executive Vice-President for Romania
Ms. Mioara Lujanschi Director

Brasov City Hall

Ms. Gabriela Plopeanu

Manager Environment Program, EU Integration Department

Brasov County Council

Mr. Mihai Sarbu

Architect

Ms. Dana Jenei

Art Historian, Direction of Cultural Heritage, Department for Historical Monuments

UNESCO National Commission of Romania

Mr. Alexandru Mironov

General Secretary

Mr. Srban Ursu

Science Program Specialist

ANNEX IV - CONSULTATION AND DISCLOSURE

IV A – Summary Minutes of December 12, 2005 Public Consultation

169. A half-day public discussion on the proposal to pilot the use of Romanian systems to address environmental and social safeguard issues in two proposed World Bank supported projects (under Bank Operational Policy 4.00), was organized by the Romanian Ministry of Environment and Water Management (MEWM) and the World Bank (WB) on December 12, 2005. The meeting attracted about 35 specialists including municipal government representatives, environmental authorities (MEWM, National Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), regional and local EPAs), the local design institutes for roads and railways, as well as NGO groups, private sector consultants, and other members interested in the subject. The meeting was held in Bucharest at the council hall of the MEWM headquarter. The invitation, the proposed agenda and the list of participants are attached.

Background

170. The meeting was an important step in consultation with stakeholders as required by the World Bank OP/BP for piloting country systems. The informative and informal meeting discussed the primary conclusions of the noted draft report for which an Executive Summary had been sent to the attendees in advance and posted on the MEWM web site. The full draft report (comprising the detailed technical and policy analyses which supported the conclusions of the Executive Summary) were then under review by a Working Group organized by the MEWM to ensure factual representation and the Government view on the proposed study. Their comments will be incorporated and a revised draft will be available for public review in early January 2006. This disclosure date will be in advance of formal World Bank project appraisal, thereby meeting the World Bank's policy on this point.

Introduction/Opening Section

171. Opening remarks for the MEWM were given by Mr. Attila Korodi, Secretary of State for EU Integration; touching on the overall goals of two WB proposed project investments for piloting, the situation of the country's needs in the water and transport sector (expansion and rehabilitation of sewerage networks, railway and secondary roads rehabilitation), and the proposed funds to cover these needs. It was underlined the necessity of increasing the country's capacity on implementing systems related to the assessment of the impact on environment, physical cultural resources and safety of dams. The role of the National Environmental Guard (GNM) as an independent agency within the MEWM, with the respect to project compliance was also highlighted.

172. Opening Remarks for the World Bank were presented by Mr. Ron Hoffer, ECA Regional Safeguard Coordinator, who recognized the tremendous amount of work that is underway in Romania on all fronts to transpose and adopt EU systems. It was underlined that Romania is making great strides in strengthening environmental and social protection to meet the requirements of both the EU environmental acquis, as well as the interest of citizens and business. He emphasized that the discussed pilot program will not lead to a lowering of standards or the WB's supervision of project implementation, but allows Romania to substitute the Bank's process on some areas of environmental and social safeguards to achieve comparable positive end points. It was underlined that international best practices will continue to be followed but in a way that supports the good direction that Romania is going. Furthermore, the agenda was presented and the main presentations were announced while the public was invited to listen and comment on any discussed aspects. The introduction section closed with an invitation to the members of the public to introduce themselves.

Background Presentation on the Use of New World Bank Policy on Country Systems

173. Presentations on (i) background on Bank's policy piloting the use of Romanian System to address Safeguards and (ii) comparison of systems, approach to equivalence and to assess adequacy were made by Mr. Ron Hoffer before the participants articulated their own perspectives. The principal observations related to the potential safeguards policies triggered by the two proposed pilot projects - Environmental Assessment, Involuntary Resettlement, Cultural Property and Safety of Dams – were presented and conclusions related to the overall study goal were listed.

Overview of Romanian EA systems

174. Ms. Angela Filipas, Director of the EIA Division in the MEWM, highlighted the new key developments in the Romanian legislation, almost entirely transposed to the EU, related to the application of the EIA in the country.

Progress on EU Accession

175. Mr. Attila Korodi briefed on the progress of the country to the EU accession, highlighting in particular the legislation update related to the solid waste management and IPPC.

Overview of World Bank Romania Municipal Services Project

176. The consulting firm (Romair Ltd.) that developed the feasibility studies for the proposed investments under the Municipal Services Project briefly presented the main objective of the project, the envisaged investments and affiliated costs as well as the benefits achieved by the affected population.

Questions and Answers Section

177. Following the presentations, Mr. Hoffer invited questions and comments from members of the public. The following issues were raised:

- ③ A representative of the REPA asked where the storm waters are envisaged to be discharged. The reply included explanation based on the feasibility study findings.
- ③ A representative of the MEWM (Biodiversity Conservation Department) asked for explanation on the two types of natural habitats defined by the World Bank in the new operational policy OP/BP 4.00-Table A1. A follow-up question requested information on the classification of those sites that are not included in the Natura 2000 network. Information on these points was provided by the World Bank.
- ③ A question was raised on the status of highway bypasses with World Bank financing in the Targu Mures area. It was clarified that these are supported by a different World Bank project and progress on technical and safeguards aspects was satisfactory.
- ③ A comment was made on the new approval of Romanian Order 60 (GD 918) related to shorten the period of certain documents during the approval of the EA process. It was confirmed that these are not related to the public consultation schedule but rather to the timing allowed to read and send comments on the main documentation. It was also underlined that according to the Romanian law each environmental project and its impact will be evaluated differently based on the site characteristics.

Closing Remarks

178. Mr. Ron Hoffer (WB) and Director Silviu Stoica (MEWM) thanked everybody for participating and contributing to the meeting.

IV B – Response and Disclosure Following Public Consultation

179. All comments received from the meeting and comment period on the Executive Summary, as well as input from the MEWM Working Group and other Ministries were incorporated in the revised full report. Comments from the public on the Executive Summary of the draft study were accepted by the MEWM until December 22, 2005. On January 25, 2006, the draft Final Report was disclosed in Romania (listed on the MEWM website) and in the World Bank’s Infoshop achieving the Bank’s public disclosure requirements. The revised Final Report will be similarly disclosed before Board presentation.

IV C – List of Participants at Public Consultation

No.	Name	Institution/Organization
1	Atila Korodi	MEWM, Secretary of State
2	Constantin Popescu	MEWM, Secretary of State
3	Marian Constantinescu	IPTANA, Bucharest
4	Ana-Maria Nistorescu	REPA, Bucharest
5	Vasilica Daescu	ICIM Bucharest
6	Mariana Badea	ICIM Bucharest
7	Carmen Calatan	NEPA Bucharest
8	Doina Cioaca	NEPA Bucharest
9	Daniela Stancu	ISPCF Bucharest
10	Danut Stefanescu	REPA, Targu Mures
11	Narcis Jeler	MEWM
12	Gabriela Pietrareanu	ICIM Bucharest
13	Octavian Ciobota	Ecological Foundation Romania
14	Ioan Ignat	City Hall Arad
15	Gheorghe Ghiocel	RomAir Consulting
16	Daniela Radulescu	National Agency “Apele Romane”
17	Fritz Schweiger	Posch&Partners
18	Cristian Popa	RomAir Consulting
19	Marius Nistor	EPTISA Romania
20	Nina-Maria Rahailescu	ISPCF Bucharest
21	Adela Tanasoiu	NCMNR
22	Mihaela Balan	NCMNR
23	Cristina Rucareanu	EPTISA Romania
24	Adrian Chesaru	MEWM
25	Lacramioara Cristogel	Brasov City Hall
26	Luminita Mlenajek	ICIM Bucharest
27	Aurora Smarandescu	SNCFR Bucharest
28	Luminita Danciu	MEWM
29	Fritz Jakma	EPTISA
30	Iordan Catalina	MEWM
31	Adriana Baz	MEWM
32	Angela Filipas	MEWM
33	Serena Adler	Director, AWMS

World Bank

34	Ron Hoffer	ECSSD, Washington
35	Stan Peabody	ECSSD, Washington
36	Sudipto Sarkar	ECSIE, Washington
37	George Moldovean	ECCRO
38	Alexandra Caracoti	ECCRO
39	Ruxandra Floroiu	ECSSD, Washington