

## ANNEXE 1

### Schedule of response to comments from reviewers and stakeholders

#### The AfDB

Comment	Response
<p><b>1.5.1.3</b> Water (Surface and Groundwater Resources) Isiolo River is extensively used and is the main water source for Isiolo = <b>the contractor must under no circumstances use this river for construction purposes. they must drill their own boreholes which should be left for use by the community after construction and this can be recorded as complimentary initiatives for the project</b></p>	<p>Works at the Suswa substation will require borehole since there is no permanent water in the vicinity. It may not be economical to sink boreholes for construction of tower foundations all along the alignment because the water demand for each tower is low and the supply can be easily be sub-contracted to local contractors.</p>
<p><b>Executive summary conclusion:</b> Further, during consultations with the Client and Financiers, it was discovered that the scaling of the maps included in the reports gave erroneous impression that Option A/C route traversed Matthew’s Range and Losai protected areas. By increasing the scale of the map adequately it is shown that the route traverses well outside the two protected areas. Thus Option A/C route was able to regain the credit it earlier apparently lost = <b>this is well noted and the distance to the said areas should be mentioned.</b></p>	<p>Corrected</p>
<p><b>8.2.3</b> Estimates of livestock and wildlife populations are notoriously inaccurate in the project region. However, regular ground counts and aerial surveys indicate long-term population changes = <b>how was the inaccuracy established? The accurate results should then be given. It will be crucial for the changes to be graphically shown as this will also allow analysis of whether the project (especially construction stage) will have any noticeable impact on fauna in the area.</b></p>	<p>This paragraph has been reworded to clarify that the Table indicates data from last known census (2008) for Laikipia and Samburu. The paragraph has been reworded to indicate that accurate data from the rest of the area especially north of Samburu are not available.</p>
<p><b>8.2.3 last paragraph</b> ....The following species are listed in the 2004 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, and can be found within the various districts traversed by the project. Population and distribution of species in the project affected districts could not be obtained = <b>but there is no list following this paragraph. Furthermore, if there are no estimated figures and the distribution how will the impacts if any of the project on the species be done? Hopefully there will be a detailed monitoring that can then form a baseline. This should be included in the ESMP.</b></p>	<p>Statement deleted since it is no longer applicable because the paragraph referred to Kajiado which is now outside the project area.</p>
<p><b>8.2.4</b> The proposed transmission line route include various protected areas e.g. national parks and game reserves, both protected under Wildlife Conservation and Management Act, Cap 376, and forest reserves which are protected under Forest Act No. 7 of 2005 and Forest Act, Cap 387. Though the routing was planned close to existing roads, it is in some sections in the vicinity or even crossing the following</p>	<p>A new Table (Table 5) has been introduced clarifying the alignment in relation to the protected areas. New maps (Figures 22, 25 and 36) have also been inserted clarifying this information</p>

protected areas in Kenya (listed from North to South): IBA Dida Galgalu Desert	
<b>8.2.4</b> Marsabit National Reserve Losai National Reserve Matthews Range Forest Reserve Aberdare National Park and neighboring Forest Reserves IBA Lake Ol Bolossat IBA Lake Naivasha Longonot National Park = <b>this paragraph is contradicting point 6 of the conclusion of the executive summary. Please clarify.</b>	Clarified
<b>8.2.4.1.1.1</b> Marsabit National Reserve and Marsabit Forest Reserve = <b>there should be a map (to scale) showing the T-line in relation to this facility. The same for the other two IUCN areas. This is because the given map is covering a wider area and is not clear. Also the numbering of these subparagraphs should be corrected.</b>	The relation of TL in relation to protected areas clarified. Done, see Figures 22, 25 and 36 The entire report has been reformatted.
<b>8.3.1</b> The Laikipia – Samburu Ecosystem The Laikipia-Samburu ecosystem spans approximately 25,000 square kilometers and is defined by the Ewaso Ng'iro river watershed. The proposed transmission line crosses this ecosystem from around Rumuruti to around Logologo. = <b>Show on a map or explain in detail the extent</b>	Map has been inserted (Figure 23)
<b>8.3.1.2</b> Fauna Laikipia – Samburu ecosystem, although ..... Below is a summary of the 2008 population estimates for some of the species that are counted regularly using sample survey techniques by the Department of Resource Surveys and Remote Sensing (DRSRS) in partnership with Mpala Research Centre (Kinnaird and Ojwang 2008). <b>This shows that paragraph 8.2.3 is not correct. The ESIA study could have updated the 2008 scenario instead of using Kinnard &amp; Ojwang results. Updated information should be obtained.</b>	Corrected
<b>8.3.1 figure 15</b> - <b>should show the T-line and the legend must be updated to show what the dotted thicker arrows are for.</b>	A better map showing animal distribution has been inserted (Figure 21 also see 37)
<b>9.1.1</b> Soil The sites most vulnerable to ..... adequate mitigation measures will be taken to ensure least damage to the soil and to rehabilitate sites disturbed during construction. <b>Other sections following this one have clear mitigation (the How). This mitigation is not enough</b>	The mitigation actions are now elaborated
<b>9.1.8</b> Protected Areas The alignment has carefully avoided the The Marsabit National Park, Samburu and Buffalo Springs National Park and The Aberdares national Park. It however traverses through several conservancies and the Losai Game reserve. Adequate distance has been maintained between the proposed RoW and most sensitive parts of the protected areas. No impacts are expected on Marsabit Forest Reserve, Aberdare National Park and the neighboring Forest Reserve, IBA/Ramsar site Lake Naivasha and Longonot National Park. It is assessed that the project's impact will be low to medium for the traversed IBA Dida Galgalu Desert, Marsabit National Reserve, Losai National Reserve, because the construction of such a large infrastructure project poses the risk of lowering their importance and decreasing their scenic landscape value	This has been reassessed and appropriately corrected. Bird collisions during construction are not as critical and therefore only during operation does it pose some danger, although still low in our assessment.

<p>to tourism. The project’s impact on IBA Lake OI Bolossat is assessed as low since the lake is about 4 km away and the risk of bird collisions during construction is very low. Risk allocation is confusing here. If the development is permanently decreasing the importance and tourism value why is it given low to medium? This must be accompanied by further justification. Secondly, the statement about bird collision during construction should also bear in mind that the structures are permanent. More details here are required.</p>	
<p><b>Figure 26 below:</b> The red line depicts the section (7.5 km) to be fitted with overhead ‘aviation’ balls near Lake OI Bolosat to enhance the visibility of overhead conductors for birds. This should be included in the ESMP to ensure that it is included in the costing and implemented.</p>	<p>Included and costed in the ESMP</p>
<p>There should be an annex of the consultation process, including all the meetings undertaken, people/stakeholders met, and the issues raised and how they were addressed.</p>	<p>Annexe of consultation process included as appendix 5</p>
<p>By and large, there is clarity needed on where the line passes with regard to areas of environmental significance.</p>	<p>This has been corrected and clarified all through the report</p>
<p>They have also not mentioned where construction waste will be taken to. Merely stating that it will be appropriately disposed of is not adequate because if there are no appropriate landfills around, it would mean transporting it over long distance and this would be costly and should therefore be included in the ESMP so that money can be allocated to the activity.</p>	<p>It is not possible to be precise at this stage. In the ESMP, the contractor is expected to develop a waste management plan before commencement of work. Construction water is normally contained in the contract quotes by the Contractor. However, only Suswa substation will require large quantities of water</p>
<p>They have not stated where water will be transported from since most of the construction is preferably going to be done during the dry periods.</p>	
<p>By and large the project lacks benefits in terms of complimentary initiatives and direct benefits to the communities. Therefore the section on ICT could have been elaborated further clarifying how communities or municipalities will gain and how they will be notified of this benefit and assisted to make use of it.... Some capacity building or information sessions that must then be included in the ESMP.</p>	<p>A new chapter on Positive Impacts has been introduced.</p>

## The AFD

Comment	Response
<p>The ESIA is inspired by the Fichther Report. New chapters have been included: Private and communal ranches, information on the avifauna in IBA...</p> <p>The change of line routing out of Matthews Range appears in Figure 1 but some chapters which describe the route still mention “crossing Matthews range”. It appears that the report has not been properly re-read as Losai reserve is described twice... etc..</p> <p>No explanation for the reader why the route has changed to avoid Matthews Range (it is mentioned in a sentence in the RAP)</p>	<p>The Report has been revised to avoid repetitions e.g. of Losai Reserve, etc.</p> <p>The new preferred alignment is now described fully.</p>
<p>No information on construction / How many workers / working site etc... - No assessment on the impact of the construction works on the population and Marginalised group (how many jobs etc.. need for services...)</p>	<p>This is not possible at this stage. All this will depend on the contractors’ approach, e.g. a contractor may opt to subcontract some works, etc. However, the general aspects of jobs, business opportunities, etc are contained in the new Chapter on positive impacts, and a section on how the positive impacts can be enhanced.</p>
<p>No information is provided on impacted conservancies (and to which extent), their status, the consultations held with them etc.</p>	<p>This is now elaborated in the Baseline conditions. List of affected conservancies are now included plus more information on them.</p> <p>The extent on the impact on conservancies must be read under the Potential Impacts on Fauna and Flora and Tourism in general</p>
<p>No analysis of the impact on tourism.</p>	<p>This is now elaborated in the section 10.2.1, under Aesthetics</p>
<p>The ESMP is not sufficiently developed and its follow up will be difficult as it is not precise enough.</p> <p><i>For example: During construction</i>  <i>Instruction of the employees not to disturb the animals, especially birds, hunting/ poaching shall be prohibited in general.</i></p> <p>The ESMP should give more detailed information of what are the best practices otherwise anything</p>	<p>The ESMP is now revamped. The EMP mentions the need for the Contractors’ employees to be bound by a code of conduct that, among others prohibit poaching, bush meat, etc.</p> <p>Further the ESMP spells out that the Contractor should inform the employees of the</p>

	<p>Wildlife Act that prohibits killing game for whatever reason without a permit from KWS.</p> <p>Being too specific may be risky as it runs the risk of excluding unforeseen issues. However a monitoring plan has been presented in a new chapter that will address the unforeseen issues.</p>
<p>No mention on how Ketraco will supervise 3 contractors at the same time. AFD has received from Ketraco its safety, health and environment Policy and its Environmental and Social Management Framework. AFD will send some comments to Ketraco if necessary.</p>	<p>Addressed in the new Institutional Analysis Chapter 15.</p>
<p><u>Specific comments</u> p.29: (6.1.3) Why the EP are mentioned specially under the title “AfDB Environmental Social Impact Assessment Guidelines, 2004 ?</p>	<p>Corrected</p>
<p>p.31: List of Stakeholders : a large number of ranchers and interested individuals (see annexe). I did not find this annex. Idem for the consultations and § 7.2 (iii) community consultations.</p>	<p>Annex attached</p>
<p>p.20: <i>The proposed 500 kV HVDC transmission line is on conventional lattice self supported steel towers of approximate height 45 m.</i> p.33: <i>The proposed 500 kV HVDC transmission line is supported on conventional lattice self supported steel towers of approximate height 38 m.</i></p>	<p>Corrected, 45 m retained.</p>
<p>p. 35: <i>the transmission line routes were then compared with selected parameters as shown below.</i> No parameters below.</p>	<p>Paragraph revised with more clarity</p>
<p>p.42 : <i>In order to exhaust all comments of all stakeholders of the project, comparison of all possible routes- from technical, ecological, and economic points of view were undertaken to come to a final decision on the route preferred to project implementation. Discussion with the client gave emphasis on the need of long distance road construction work in option D. Construction of the road is not in immediate domains of mandate of EEPCo and KETRACO and such work has potential to delay the project even more. Further, during consultations with the Client and Financiers, it was discovered that the scaling of the maps included in the reports gave erroneous impression that Option A/C route traversed Matthew “ s Range and Losai protected areas. By increasing the scale of the map adequately it is shown that the route traverses well outside the two protected areas. Thus Option A/C route was able to regain the credit it earlier apparently lost.</i> I do not understand this paragraph. Was it written before or after the change of route ?</p>	<p>Corrected</p>
<p>p. 47 : Lake paradise : Isn’t it dry?</p>	<p>No, not dry</p>
<p>p.49 : <i>It continues southwards along the main road at a distance of up to 8 km from the road to Merille where it diverts westwards through a pass in the Wamba Mountains or Matthews Range respectively.</i> This sentence is a copy and paste from Fichtner 2009. I</p>	<p>Corrected</p>

<p>thought that it was agreed that the new routing did not go through Matthews Range.</p> <p>p. 54 : Map with the line routing crossing Matthews Range. Then Matthews Range has disappeared from the text but with no explanation.</p>	
<p>p.56 :On Reserve or National parks : no mention on the management of the protected areas. Please add this information.</p>	Information added
<p>p. 52 : Wildlife : only marsabit with no figures and then in p. 59 under Laikipia Ecosystem, there is a fauna paragraph. Why not a comprehensive chapter on Wildlife/Fauna ?</p>	Fauna now integrated in one section
<p>Why Losai National Reserve is in § 9.2.4 and again in p. 68 (§9.3.4)</p>	Corrected
<p>p. 83 : § 10.1.5. Noise : . <i>In total, about 433 households, consisting of slightly over 2000 persons that are within the 65 m wayleave can potentially be affected. However, considering only those with the vicinity of the towers will be affected, the actual number of people is substantially lower.</i> I do not understand. The people within the way leave should not be resettled?</p>	Re-worded for clarity
<p>p.84 : <i>Woodlands of Laikipia and Samburu</i>  <i>.. The impact on this type of vegetation could be through two processes, all of them during construction:</i>  <i>1. Construction of access roads to the alignment RoW for construction of towers and stringing</i>  <i>2. Clearing the alignment to allow stringing</i>  <i>Typically, construction access roads will require roads of between 7 and 10 m width to deliver construction materials. Considering that the alignment is some distance to existing roads in over 60% of the case across this ecosystem, accesses will be required to access tower sites and to deliver materials. It is not possible to accurately indicate the extent of vegetation lost but rough indications are that if a total of about 100 km of new access roads will be required across this ecosystem, then about 100 ha of woodlands will be cleared.</i>  <i>Considering that this loss is not along a continuous line but several small accesses spread across the vast ecosystem, the impact is considered low and transient. <u>Mitigation Measures</u> To mitigate this impact, it suggested that the road be thoroughly scarified to allow vegetation to re-establish naturally. The area being semi-arid, it is not practical to artificially plant trees on these decommissioned roads as the seedlings may not establish. Left to naturally re-generate, it estimated that the impact can be fully mitigated after about 10 years if the abandoned roads are scarified. Where trees of value are to be cleared within individual holdings, such individuals will be compensated to enable them replace lost trees away from the RoW.</i>  Why no offsetting is proposed as mitigation measures?</p>	Revised and improved
<p>The EMP seems to be the compilation of two documents.  p. 99 § 11.4 Mitigation plan. Next paragraph 3.1.3 sub plans and Tasks  (i) Construction and workers camp management plan  In the summary of the EMP, the Construction and workers camp</p>	The entire ESMP is revamped and all these issues clarified. New chapter on Monitoring is introduced.

<p>management plan is not mentioned. There is a need to improve the chapter.</p> <p>Summary of the EMP : why is it less developed and comprehensive than the report from Fichtner? (no paragraph on waste)</p> <p>The Construction and workers camp management plan and the monitoring plan are supposed to be produced later . They should be done with an independent consulting firm. Is it budgeted ? Who shall pay contractor ? Ketraco ?</p>	
No grievance mechanisms in the EIA	Now included under 13.5 Construction phase environmental management Plan

## The World Bank

Comment	Response
<p>The organization of the draft is extremely unclear. Several sections shown in the Table of Contents are not in the draft. The Executive Summary does not appear to be present, although Section 2 is called Executive Summary in the TOC and the text in Section 1 looks as if it started out to be an Executive Summary but then became something different. The Executive Summary should in any case be a section that precedes Section 1 of the main text and that can stand alone, since a copy of it has to be sent to the Bank's Board of Executive Directors.</p>	<p>The whole report has been revised ensuring better flow. The Exec summary was presented as a separate file, that is why you may have missed it. Now included in the same document.</p>
<p>Although the consultants responded to earlier comments by Noreen Beg, the draft only partially reflects changes based on those comments. There are, for example, still figures that show the t-line passing through protected areas, but there are also figures that show it avoiding some of them. The picture is not consistent.</p>	<p>Corrected throughout the document</p>
<p>OP 4.04 restrictions may not have been met – e.g., while line does not pass through Marsabit National Park, it does pass through Marsabit National Reserve, which is also critical by 4.04 definition. There is nothing in the text to demonstrate that doing so will not degrade critical natural habitat.</p>	<p>Clarified and the TL does not cross Marsabit National Park.</p>
<p>1. The draft fails to fulfill the required content of OP 4.01. It is missing the following sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An executive summary</li> <li>• Assessment of institutional capacities of KETRACO, NEMA, Ministry of Energy and county and local government to manage and monitor environmental and social impacts, and specific recommendations to strengthen capacity where needed.</li> <li>• An analysis of the “without project” or “no action”</li> </ul>	<p>Exec summary now in same doc. A new chapter on institutional analysis (Chapter 15) More details added to the Analysis of alternatives chapter A new chapter on monitoring is introduced</p>

<p>alternative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A monitoring plan.</li> </ul>	
<p>The ESMP in Section 9 as summarized in 9.5.10 is not comprehensive. It does not present mitigation measures for all identified impacts, and it omits key recommendations from the ESIA, such as scheduling construction so that it does not disrupt animal migrations, and installing devices near important bird areas to reduce risk of collisions</p>	<p>The ESMP is revamped and all concerns captured</p>
<p>Analysis of alternatives is not complete. Section 6 covers route options, and the text in various other places has a material on adjustments of the alignment to avoid sensitive and protected areas. However, there is no analysis of the “no action” alternative, which is a requirement of OP 4.01, nor is there analysis of alternatives to the project.</p>	<p>Done</p>
<p>There should be a section on cumulative impacts. If there are none, this section should still be included to explain why not and to show that the question was considered.</p>	<p>A new chapter on cumulative impacts has been introduced (Chapter 11).</p>
<p>There is a whole collection of social issues that are not addressed. Examples: positive impacts of employment of local workers in ROW clearing and other unskilled work; HIV/AIDs and other STDs that may be brought to the area by workforce; positive and negative impacts of small businesses that may spring up around sites and worker camps (service providers, prostitution, bush meat sellers).</p>	<p>A new chapter on Positive Impacts is introduced (Chapter 9). Other social issues have also been captured, others enhanced</p>
<p>There are some very important recommendations that need follow-up by the Bank, the most important of which is to schedule construction so that it does not coincide with animal migrations. Mentioned twice in the text, it has already gotten lost by the time the ESMP summary table in Section 9 was prepared. It needs to be a clause in all construction contracts</p>	<p>This, and others, now captured in the ESMP</p>
<p><b>Specific Comments</b></p> <p>See edits and marginal comments in the copy of the draft that accompanies these notes.</p>	<p>These have been dealt with throughout the document</p>

Comments from other stakeholders’

Comment	Response
<p><b>Joseph Mbugua- Lake Olbolossat conservation network.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lake olbolossat should not be referred to as a small lake/swamp since it is the the only lake in central province and the tourism driver in Nyandarua</li> <li>• How will the rare and endangered and rare birds around lake olbolossat be protected since they are not documented in the report.</li> <li>• What are the long and short term benefits to the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lake Ol Bolossat is never referred to as a swamp anywhere in the document</li> <li>• Protection of birds will be done through warning reflective spheres – already</li> </ul>

<p>affected communities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will there be a forestation initiatives supported by the project?</li> </ul>	<p>mentioned as a mitigation measure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The other issues of benefits are for KETRACO to include in their CSR policy</li> </ul>
<p><b>Engineer Kariuki- compliance and enforcement department (NEMA)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public participation not clear in the report</li> <li>• Separate impacts at construction, operation and commissioning.</li> <li>• Justify why health and safety issues have been assessed as insignificant.</li> <li>• The E.M.P being a predictive tool should be finalised before construction (not as a frame work)</li> <li>• Discuss the specific issues for compliance under legal frameworks picked, pick impacts and discuss mitigation</li> <li>• General safety measures proposed not conclusive</li> <li>• When will the environmental management plan/action plan be developed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public participation records now attached as annex</li> <li>• The ESMP is in the report</li> <li>• Other concerns are addressed throughout the document</li> </ul>
<p><b>Bernard –NEMA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender disaggregated consultation and community participation not clear in the report</li> <li>• Need for specific valuation of endangered and rare bird species around lake olbolossat</li> <li>• Impact ratings on lake olbolossat should not be low</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Species of L. Ol Bolossat are listed</li> <li>• Impacts on L. Ol Bolossat is low and justification is contained in the text</li> <li>• More data on PAPs presented including gender disaggregated data e.g. Tables 7 - 11</li> </ul>
<p><b>Mildred- KETRACO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly indicate how line A/C was chosen out a range of lines A,B,C and D</li> <li>• How will data on avi-fauna be collected and who will do it?-Need for analysis of available secondary data on avi-fauna collisions by such projects</li> <li>• How did the consultant arrive at 3.7 Km away from lake Olbolossat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue of preferred TL alignment is discussed</li> <li>• Bird collision data unavailable in Kenya, a monitoring system is proposed for future data collection</li> </ul>
<p><b>World bank</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a clear frame work for the mitigation of impacts on cultural properties</li> <li>• Can anything be done to avoid criss-crossing lines i.e. main transmission lines verses distribution lines</li> <li>• Vigorous public sensitisation should be done to people on and along the line</li> <li>• Other comments by world bank on ESIA have been sent to the consultant</li> <li>• The cured and complete report should be approved by</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These comments are addressed as appropriate throughout the report</li> </ul>

word bank committee by the 10 <sup>th</sup> of January 2012	
<p><b>AFD</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough explanations for rerouting</li> <li>• Compensations and effects on conservancies should be properly compiled</li> <li>• Short and long term impacts especially on tourism not clear</li> <li>• Monitoring and evaluation procedures should be properly documented</li> <li>• Grievance address measures or criteria not shown in the report</li> <li>• Need for a map showing the line and its effects on roads and other key features</li> </ul> <p>(AFD report and or comments to be sent to the consultant by latest 9<sup>th</sup> Dec 2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new route is now the subject of this ESIA</li> <li>• Explaining the reason for this alignment is done in several sections of the report</li> </ul>
<p><b>Ogada- Tourism and aesthetics</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elaborately compile effects of visual intrusion ad add more information on tourism in laikipia in page 23 of the report</li> <li>• There is difficulty in text interpretation e.g the use of left and right ffor direction instead of east or west</li> <li>• Follow up on laikipia conservation principals and try to technically separate biodiversity per county</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More info on tourism added</li> <li>• Biodiversity does not recognize county boundaries. The Laikipia - Samburu ecosystem is discussed in details in the report because of its importance</li> <li>• Description of the preferred route has been revised to avoid ambiguity.</li> </ul>