ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF BUSINESS PROJECTS AND THEIR RAMIFICATIONS ON PUBLIC, COUNTRY RISK WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO GLOBAL GOALS.

[1]**Ms. Milcah Elizabeth Shibu**, [2]**Mr. Vivek V Vijayan**, [3]**Ms. Linomina Mathew**

[1]Assistant Professor, [2]Assistant Professor, [3]Assistant Professor
[1]Post Graduate Department of Commerce,
[1]Kristu Jyothi College of Management and Technology, Kottayam, India

Abstract: In this present scenario, Innovation is considered a major component of every business. This paper seeks to analyze the changes brought by the New Environmental Impact Assessment policy on the public, environment, and country. The immediate growth of the business is a very common aspect nowadays. The government is liberalizing the policies and providing easy access to the industrialists for development through this policy. This study aims to assess the probable consequences which can be raised by this newly changed policy both from an industrial and public perspective. This paper opted for descriptive research by collecting information through a structured questionnaire from the general public. In the sampling survey, 150 samples have been taken for the study by using the probability sampling method. The data collected is analyzed with the help of a statistical package for social science. This paper finds that authorities are giving more importance to industrial development in comparison with environmental protection. it suggests that giving more importance to environmental protection will help in attaining sustainability and its goals. This paper fulfils an identified need to study the rising problem related to the new Environmental Impact Assessment policy.

Index Terms – **Environment, Health, Country, Public, Sustainability.**

I. INTRODUCTION

In this cutting-edge period, the Indian economy is blasting. The Industrial area has a significant function in the advancement of our economy. It advances the general flourishing of the nation. The various ventures incorporate assembling and synthetic businesses, iron and steel, and so on. The current state of our economy is far superior to the condition at the hour of autonomy, yet at an exceptionally weighty expense – at the expense of natural quality (**Tvaronavičienė, 2014**). As we venture into a time that guarantees higher monetary development, we ought to likewise remember that this previous advancement hurts our current circumstances. it calls attention to the significance of a maintainable turn of events.

Supportable improvement by contemplating, "Atmosphere Action" is an extremely compulsory necessity in this current situation **(Wood et al., 2018).** Here, maintainable advancement implies meeting human improvement objectives with no mischief to our current circumstances and lessening defilement. The recently actualized 2030 plan by the United Nations for economic advancement holds a profound guarantee for securing our current circumstances. In a prior time, the natural effect appraisal assumes a significant function in ensuring the climate.

What is EIA? (Environmental Impact Assessment)

The Environmental impact assessment was presented to recognize and assess the ecological outcomes of the advancement undertaking, strategy, or program by considering the natural, social, and stylish contemplations **(Van et al., 2020).** The reason for this appraisal is to guarantee that if the venture engineers thought about the natural effects. Before beginning an advancement venture, it a necessary to take endless clearances and 'No complaint authentication' from different government offices. An Environmental impact assessment is required before beginning any development venture to ensure that the undertaking doesn't make any harm to the climate. This draft has been proposed by the service of climate, woods, and environmental change. The Indian involvement in Environmental Impact Assessment started more than 20 years back. It began in 1976-77 when the Planning Commission requested the Department of Science and Technology to inspect the waterway valley ventures from a natural point.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Nowadays, EIA is a mandatory process for our country. Since then, many modifications and amendments have been made by the government to improve or sometimes dilute the EIA process. It is very difficult to balance environmental growth and economic development. To keep both the environmentalist and industrialists happy, the government has liberalized various policies. Thus, there is a need to determine how effective the public participation processes are in the state of Kerala. This study attempts to focus

on the role and impact of the EIA draft in achieving the united nation's sustainable development goal of climate Action. This study will be beneficial for various sections of society. This study will open the eyes of the government to realize the problems faced by the public due to liberalizing the policies of Environment impact Assessment.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The Environmental impact assessment was introduced to identify and evaluate the environmental consequences of the development project, policy, or program by taking into account the environmental, cultural, and aesthetic considerations. The environment is a very important factor that must be taken into consideration before developing a project. This research study raises the following questions:

1. What are the probable consequences of the amended public consultation of EIA draft 2020 on the public?
2. How does the EIA draft affect climate change?
3. What are the ramifications of the EIA draft on country risk?

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Planet earth is faced with the toughest times of global warming, with the atmospheric temperature increasing at an unprecedented rate. World over climatic conditions are changing day by day, and their impact is very loud and wide. Our natural resources to fuel our life and livelihood are also being affected by this phenomenon of global warming. There is an impending urgent requirement to unravel a new road map toward sustainable, clean, and renewable energy resources to rebuild our planet from the dreadful side effects and the after events of global warming. The simple scope emphasizes the futurology of the environment in consideration of the EIA draft, as there is an urgent need to analyze the impact in a distinct sense from the very beginning.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To analyze the Effects of Amended Public Consultation of EIA Draft on Public.
- To assess Probable consequences of the EIA Draft on Climate change.
- To analyze the Ramifications of EIA Draft on country risk.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Primary as well as secondary data were collected for acquiring facts. Primary data were collected with the help of a sample survey by using a convenient sampling method. Secondary data were collected from various publications of the Central, State, and Local governments, books, magazines, newspapers, public records, historical documents, and also referring to the website. In the sampling survey, 150 samples have been taken for the study by using the probability sampling method. The data collected is analyzed with the help of a statistical package for social science. The analyzed data is presented in the form of tables and figures.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

1. EIA Draft

EIA stands for Environment Impact Assessment Draft. It was developed to identify and evaluate the environmental consequences of the development project, policy, or program by taking into account the environmental, cultural, and aesthetic considerations.

2. Global Goals

Global goals mean the goals set up by a united nation to be achieved in 2030. In this study, we are giving importance to the sustainable development goal. i.e. Climate Action.

3. Sustainable Development

Sustainable Development means development that meets the need of the present without compromising the ability of the future to meet its requirement.

4. Amended Public Consultation:

The Response time frame for people in general to any notice of an undertaking in EIA 2006 was 30 days yet EIA 2020 Draft diminished the public reaction time to 20 days.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

(Awan, 2013) concludes that both developed and developing countries are responsible for various environmental hazards. He states that developed countries are using more resources for exporting and developing countries are exploiting the existing resources for their development. This understanding is very crucial, as he tried to show the importance of our environment in the light of development. His study, however, failed to explain the role of government policies in the environment. it may have been useful if it includes such a dimension also. (Morelli, 2011) investigates the studies of others to characterize the idea inside the setting of explicit disciplinary regions and presents a proposition for an essential comprehension of the expression "natural manageability" as a development of our normal impression of the idea of human movement to all the more obviously interface it with the biological idea of association and to fill in as an objective for ecological supervisors. (Arunee Kasayanond, 2019) This study attempts to discover the state of information in Malaysia on the green economy. The information has been gathered through essential and optional sources. This recommends the advancement towards the green economy in Malaysia is similarly affected by the perspective on its significance later on. The examination reveals that development in green economy mindfulness among the organizations will provoke an increase in the degree of ecological supportability, in this way improving the current state of the green economy in Malaysia. The coordinated survey checked the going with issues: Organization information, the idea of the business and the owner chiefs' longings for the green economy, etc. They gathered the data from the business people only and not from the general population so this investigation doesn't think about the function of the public in driving a green economy. This examination would be more useful to some different gatherings if they had considered the assessment of the public moreover.

(Sameer Kumar, 2013) This study deals with the role of Environment Impact Assessment of Thermal Power Plant for Sustainable Development. The thermal power plant impact affects land, soil, air, and different social effects the warm force plant is likewise said to transmit an enormous measure of mercury furthermore, produces an enormous amount of fly ash which pollutes the climate. These plants likewise burn through a lot of water. Due to these issues, they require proper Environmental assessment before the beginning of the project. On examining the entire warm force plant the researcher concludes that thermal power plant creates power however it is inconvenient for the climate so we need to give it with the strategy referenced in our

exploration for lessening its results. But their study is limited in its scope as it is only focussing on thermal power plants and their implications. The study would have been more useful findings if it increases its scope. **(Sousa et al., 2020)** studied ecosystem services in environmental impact assessment. Previously used methods have been used to analyze the role of ecosystem services. The ecosystem mainly includes various services and products it offers to the people. Their study states that improper environmental assessment will create serious problems for the people and will affect the services also. This study only analyses the first phase of EIA. Analysis of another part will increase the scope and importance of this study. This study also concludes that a good mechanism of environmental impact assessment will increase sustainable development. **(Li H et al., 2019)** in their study analyses the impact of EIA on transportation infrastructure facilities. Infrastructure will cause higher pollution in our society. Their study implies that using of steel material is the main cause of this pollution. Good use of environmental impact assessment will help the area to reduce its pollution to a great extent is the finding of their study. **(Rodríguez-Luna et al., 2021)** conducted a comparative analysis of environmental impact assessment. Chilean environmental impact assessment system was compared with different other countries' EIA systems. Their study analyses that the centralization of these policies is causing serious issues in the country. Proper improvement of these EIA policies will help in reducing problems and it will help them to give more importance to the environment. Their comparison is limited and increasing the number of countries will surely increase the scope of this study. **(Li S et al., 2020)** studied the role of the public in Environmental impact assessment of marine engineering. Marine engineering has a very high economic effect. Even though it creates a huge impact, the environment must be considered before making a decision. Their study analyzed and states that the involvement of the public is important before taking an industrial decision. They have considered marine engineering as the study area and considering another field of business may increase the scope of their study. **(Sandam et al., 2020)** analyses national parks in South Africa's environmental impact assessment report quality. They identified different advantages of the EIA Report as well as its limitations also. They found that more reliability in EIA Report will ensure sustainable development. They have considered the national parks of South Africa and they can increase the scope if they widen the research area. (**Enríquez-de-Salamanca, 2018**) their paper analyzed the manipulation made by stakeholders in EIA Process. They finally suggested that such manipulations must be reduced for an effective process of environmental assessment.

3. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

RELIABILITY STATISTICS

The study examines environmental impact assessment and its ramifications on global goals and country risk. The aspects considered include the concern levels of individuals in a public hearing, awareness about the new policies, opinion about the new policy, probable consequences of EIA Draft on climate change, and Ramifications of EIA Draft on country risk. To identify these aspects, the researchers conducted a thorough review of the literature and developed measurement scales that are appropriate for the study. The Alpha (Cronbach) values relating to these aspects are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Cronbach's Alpha for Measurement Scales used in the Study

Aspects	Cronbach's Alpha
Concern levels of Individuals in Public Hearing	0.709
Awareness of the new policy	0.855
Opinion about the new policy	0.709
Probable consequences of EIA Draft on Climate change	0.816
Ramifications of EIA Draft on Country Risk	0.771
Total	0.799

The coefficient of reliability is used as a measure of the internal consistency or reliability of a

psychometric test score. A value greater than .7 is widely considered a good score (Nunnally, 1978). Of the five constructs measured, all aspects have got a value beyond this threshold limit indicating higher reliability of the measurement scales adopted for the study.

Reference:

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2 nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

A. Concern level of stakeholders in the Public hearing of EIA Draft on Public.

Stakeholders include environmentalists, NGOs, residents of the nearby village, and other stakeholders. It analyses the concern level of these individuals in each stage.

The concern level of stakeholders in the Amended Public consultation of EIA Draft on Public was measured using a five-point scale with 4 variables. Table 3 shows the mean score of all the variables indicating the involvement in the public consultation of projects.

Table 3: Concern level of stakeholders in the public hearing of the project: Descriptive statistics

Concern level of the public in the involvement of the project	Mean	Std. Deviation
As Environmentalist	2.79	1.277
As NGO	2.90	1.253
As a Resident of the nearby village	2.87	1.181
As Other Stakeholders	3.05	1.157
Total	3	1.217

Source: Primary Data, N=150

Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics of the four variables which indicate the concern level of the public in the public hearing process. The variable with the high mean score is other stakeholders (mean=3.05, SD=1.157)'. Others are environmentalists with 2.79 mean and SD of 1.277, NGOs (2.90 mean and SD 1.253), and residents of the nearby village (Mean= 2.87, SD= 1.181). The average total score computed was 3 with a Standard Deviation of 1.217

B. Source of Awareness about the New policy.

Source of awareness shows the different origin from which the public receives information about the new policies of the EIA Draft.
The Source of awareness about the new policies of public participation was measured using a five-point scale with 4 variables. Table 4 shows the mean score of all the variables indicating the source of awareness about the new policies of public participation.

Table 4: Source of awareness about the new policies of public participation: Descriptive statistics

Awareness about the new policies of public participation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Programs Conducted by NGO	3.19	1.098
Newspapers	3.03	1.137
From Industrialists	3.01	1.137
Others	2.94	1.196
Total	3.0425	1.142

Source: Primary Data, N=150
Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics of the four variables which indicate the source of awareness about the new policies of public participation. The variable with the high mean score is the awareness program conducted by NGO (mean=3.19, SD=1.196)'. awareness from Newspapers (Mean = 3.03, SD= 1.137), and awareness from industrialists (Mean= 3.01, SD = 1.137) The average total score computed was 3.0425 with a Standard Deviation of 1.142.

C. Opinion about the Amended public consultation policy

Amended public consultation is creating a huge impact on the public. Different people have a different opinions about this new policy.
Opinion about the Amended public consultation policy was measured using a five-point scale with 3 variables. Table 5 shows the mean score of all the variables indicating opinion about the Amended public consultation policy.

Table 5: Opinion about the Amended public consultation policy: Descriptive Statistics

Opinion about the amended public consultation policy	Mean	Std. Deviation
Two-way communication is not a component of the new policy	3.05	1.134
Excessive political consideration is included	3.04	1.160
Setting up industries within 100 km of the international borders without public consultation is a good decision of the government.	3.02	1.226
Total	3.03	1.170

Source: Primary Data, N=150
Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics of the three variables which indicate opinions about the Amended public consultation policy. The variable with the high mean score is the opinion of the public about the two-way communication between people and authorities (mean=3.05, SD=1.134)'. other scores are excessive political consideration (Mean= 3.04, SD= 1.160), Setting up industries within 100 km of the international borders without public consultation is a good decision of the government (Mean = 3.002, SD= 1.226). The average total score computed was 3.03 with a Standard Deviation of 1.170.

D. Probable Consequences of EIA Draft.

New Environmental Impact Assessment policies can create different problems in the environment as well as for the people. Here, it analyzed the probable consequences of the EIA Draft on the environment and the Public.
Probable consequences of the EIA Draft were measured using a five-point scale with 4 variables. Table 6 shows the mean score of all the variables indicating probable consequences of the EIA Draft.

Table 6: Probable consequences of EIA Draft: Descriptive statistics

Probable consequences of EIA Draft	Mean	Std. Deviation
Environmental pollution	2.97	1.158
Recategorization of a large project will cause a bad impact on the environment	3.19	1.118
Increase the vulnerability of the regions to climate shifts	2.95	1.191
More intense floods, earthquakes, and landslides	2.93	1.170
Total	3.01	1.150

Source: Primary Data, N=150
Table 6 shows the descriptive statistics of the four variables which indicate the probable consequences of the EIA Draft. The variable with the high mean score is about the recategorization of a large project will cause a bad impact on the environment (mean=3.19, SD=1.118)'. other scores include Environmental pollution (Mean= 2.97, SD= 1.158), Increasing vulnerability of

regions to climate (Mean= 2.95, SD= 1.191), More intense floods, earthquakes and landslides (Mean = 2.93, SD= 1.170). The average total score computed was 3.03 with a Standard Deviation of 1.170.

E. Ramifications of EIA Draft on country Risk

Ramifications mean how the new issues affected the environment. This analysis shows how new policies affected the country using different variables.

Ramifications of the EIA Draft on country risk were measured using a five-point scale with 4 variables. Table 7 shows the mean score of all the variables indicating Ramifications of EIA Draft on country risk.

Table 7: Ramifications of EIA Draft on country Risk: Descriptive Statistics

Ramifications of EIA Draft on country risk	Mean	Std. Deviation
The government is not providing information	2.91	1.246
Authorities are not making efforts	2.91	1.164
The impact on Human settlement is very high	3.03	1.191
Bad impacts on community development	3.19	1.098
Total	3.01	1.1745

Source: Primary Data, N=150

Table 7 shows the descriptive statistics of the four variables which indicate the ramifications of the EIA Draft on country risk. The variable with the high mean score is the Bad impacts on community development (mean=3.19, SD=1.098). Other scores are Government is not providing information (Mean = 2.91, SD= 1.246), Authorities are not making efforts (Mean= 2.91, SD= 1.164), Impact on human settlement is very high (Mean = 3.03, SD= 1.191). The average total score computed was 3.01 with a Standard Deviation of 1.1745.

ONE WAY ANOVA

H_0: There is no significant difference among different Age groups regarding involvement in the Public Hearing of different projects.

H_1: There is a significant difference among different Age groups concerning involvement in the Public Hearing of different projects

A public hearing involves participating in the process when a new project takes place in a particular area. Here it analyses whether different age groups have any preference in a public hearing of projects.

Table 8: Age and Involvement in the public hearing of different projects.

Age Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Anova	Df	F	Sig
Less than 17	4	2.5625	0.23936	Between Groups	2	1.525	0.22
17-34	112	2.9464	0.65453	Within Groups	148		
More than 34	35	2.7786	0.57128	Total	150		
Total	151	2.8974	0.63263				

A one-way subject's ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of involvement in the public hearing of public, taking 3 age groups less than 17, 17 to 34, and above 34. Since, P>0.05, the null hypothesis was accepted. There is no significant difference between Age and Involvement in the public hearing of different projects.

H_0: There is no significant difference among different Age groups regarding Awareness of the new EIA policy

H_1: There is significant difference among different Age groups in Awareness of the new EIA policy

Table 9, analyses whether age has any role in getting awareness about new policies. Awareness can be gained through various sources and including newspapers, media, awareness programs, etc.

Table 9: Age and Awareness of New policy

Age Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Anova	Df	F	Sig
Less than 17	4	3	1.06066	Between Groups	2	1.5999	0.21
17-34	112	2.9911	0.62774	Within Groups	148		
More than 34	35	3.2071	0.56388	Total	150		

Total	151	3.0414	0.62811

A one-way subject's ANOVA was conducted to compare the awareness of new policy, taking 3 age groups less than 17, 17 to 34, and above 34. Since, P>0.05, the null hypothesis was accepted. There is no significant difference between Age and awareness of the new EIA policy.

H_0: There is no significant difference among different Age groups about Opinions about the Amended Public Consultation Policy
H_1: There is significant difference among different Age groups about Opinions about the Amended Public Consultation Policy

Table 10: Age and Opinion about the Amended Public Consultation Policy

Age Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Anova		Sig
					Df	F	
Less than 17	4	3.0833	0.99536	Between Groups	2	0.029	0.97
17-34	112	3.0298	0.70966	Within Groups	148		
More than 34	35	3.0571	0.62875	Total	150		
Total	151	3.0375	0.69447				

(Ulibarri et al., 2019) in their study states that people had given good opportunities in the public hearing of the project. Information was collected from them and used in the evaluation process. Here, a one-way subject's ANOVA was conducted to compare the Opinion about the Amended Public Consultation Policy, taking 3 age groups less than 17, 17 to 34, and above 34. Since, P>0.05, the null hypothesis was accepted. There is no significant difference between Age and Opinion about the Amended Public Consultation Policy.

H_0: There is no significant difference among different Age groups regarding Probable Consequences of the EIA Draft on Climate Change
H_1: There is significant difference among different Age groups regarding Probable Consequences of the EIA Draft on Climate Change

Table 11: Age and Probable Consequences of EIA Draft on Climate Change

Age Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Anova		Sig
					Df	F	
Less than 17	4	3.5	0.57735	Between Group	2	2.852	0.061
17-34	112	2.9442	0.60934	Within Group	147		
More than 34	34	3.1471	0.58749		149		
Total	150	3.005	0.61132				

A one-way between subject's ANOVA was conducted to compare Probable Consequences of EIA Draft on Climate Change, taking 3 age groups less than 17, 17 to 34, and above 34. Since, P>0.05, the null hypothesis was accepted. There is no significant difference between Age and Probable Consequences of the EIA Draft on Climate Change.

H_0: There is no significant difference among different Age groups regarding Ramifications of EIA Draft on Country Risk
H_1: There is significant difference among different Age groups regarding Ramifications of EIA Draft on Country Risk

Table 12: Age and Ramifications of EIA Draft on Country Risk

Age Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Anova		Sig
					Df	f	
Less than 17	4	3.25	0.95743	Between Groups	2	2.138	0.122
17-34	112	3.9851	0.80338	Within Groups	146		
More than 34	33	4.1212	0.78536		148		
Total	149	3.9955	0.80909				

A one-way between subject's ANOVA was conducted to compare the ramifications of EIA Draft on Country Risk, taking 3 age groups less than 17, 17 to 34, and above 34. Since, P>0.05, the null hypothesis was accepted. There is no significant difference between Age and ramifications of the EIA Draft on Country Risk.

Correlation

H_0: There is no significant relationship between Income and Awareness of the new policy of EIA.
H_1: There is a significant relationship between Income and Awareness of the new policy of EIA.

Table 13: Relationship between Income and Awareness of New policy.

	Mean	Std. Deviation	1	2
Income	14513.64	17459.207	0.017	
	3.0414	.62811		
Awareness of New Policy			0.017	1

A Pearson correlation was run to determine the relationship between Income and Awareness of New policy. From Table 13, it is clear that there is no significant relationship between Gender and Awareness of New policy (r = 0.017, N= 151, p=0.05) and which is statistically measured.

Paired Test

H_0: There is no significant difference between the mean score of the effectiveness of new policy in involvement in a public hearing before the amendment and after the recent amendment.

H_1: There is significant difference between the mean score of the effectiveness of new policy in involvement in a public hearing before the amendment and after the recent amendment.

Table 14: Effect of Involvement in a public hearing on the effectiveness of the new policy of EIA

Involvement in Public Hearing	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Df	P-value
Involvement before amendment	2.86	1.149			
Involvement after amendment	3.14	1.132	-2.113	150	0.036

Table 13 shows the result of the paired-samples t-test which was conducted to analyze the effect of involvement in the public hearing before and after the recent policies. As the P-value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant difference in the number of involvements before amendment (M=2.86, SD=1.149) and several involvements after amendment (M= 3.14, SD= 1.132). These results suggest that involvement in public hearings does have an impact on this new policy formulation. The involvement of the public in the project-related hearings will help the government in protecting the environment.

Independent sample t-test

H_0: There is no significant difference between concern level in the public hearing and Gender.

H_1: There is a significant difference between concern level in the public hearing and Gender.

Table 15: Concern level in the public hearing and Gender.

Concern Level in the Public hearing of the project	Mean	SD	Independent sample t-test				
			F	P value	t	Df	P value
Male	2.9518	.67451	3.320	.070	1.17	149	0.244
Female	2.8309	.57537					

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Concern levels in the public hearing of the project in Male and Female groups. There was a significant difference in the Male group (M= 2.9518, SD= 0.67451) and Female (M= 2.8309, SD= 0.57537), f= 3,320, P= 0.244. As P-value is greater than 0.05, it states that the Male and female group does not have any significant difference in the concern level of Public hearing. In other words, it means the concern level will not change with the Gender.

4. FINDINGS, SUGGESTIONS, AND CONCLUSION

OUR FINDINGS

To analyze the Effects of Amended Public Consultation of EIA Draft on Public.

- Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics of the four variables which indicate the concern level of the public in the public hearing process. The variable with the high mean score is other stakeholders (mean=3.05, SD=1.157)'. Others are environmentalists with 2.79 mean and SD of 1.277, NGOs (2.90 mean and SD 1.253), and residents of the nearby village (Mean= 2.87, SD= 1.181). The average total score computed was 3 with a Standard Deviation of 1.217.
- Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics of the four variables which indicate the source of awareness about the new policies of public participation. The variable with the high mean score is the awareness program conducted by NGO (mean=3.19, SD=1.196)'. awareness from Newspapers (Mean = 3.03, SD= 1.137), and awareness from industrialists (Mean= 3.01, SD = 1.137) The average total score computed was 3.0425 with a Standard Deviation of 1.142.
- Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics of the three variables which indicate opinions about the Amended public consultation policy. The variable with the high mean score is the opinion of the public about the two-way communication between people and authorities (mean=3.05, SD=1.134)'. other scores are excessive political consideration (Mean= 3.04, SD= 1.160), Setting up industries within 100 km of the international borders without public consultation is a good decision of the government (Mean = 3.002, SD= 1.226). The average total score computed was 3.03 with a Standard Deviation of 1.170.

- A one-way subject's ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of involvement in the public hearing of public, taking 3 age groups less than 17, 17 to 34, and above 34. Since, P>0.05, the null hypothesis was accepted. There is no significant difference between Age and Involvement in the public hearing of different projects.
- A one-way subject's ANOVA was conducted to compare the awareness of new policy, taking 3 age groups less than 17, 17 to 34, and above 34. Since, P>0.05, the null hypothesis was accepted. There is no significant difference between Age and awareness of the new EIA policy.
- A one-way subject's ANOVA was conducted to compare the Opinion about the Amended Public Consultation Policy, taking 3 age groups less than 17, 17 to 34, and above 34. Since, P>0.05, the null hypothesis was accepted. There is no significant difference between Age and Opinion about the Amended Public Consultation Policy.
- A Pearson correlation was run to determine the relationship between Income and Awareness of New policy. From Table 13, it is clear that there is no significant relationship between Gender and Awareness of New policy (r = 0.017, N= 151, p=0.05) and which is statistically measured.
- Table 13 shows the result of the paired-samples t-test which was conducted to analyze the effect of involvement in the public hearing before and after the recent policies. As the P-value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant difference in the number of involvements before amendment (M=2.86, SD=1.149) and several involvements after amendment (M= 3.14, SD= 1.132). These results suggest that involvement in public hearings does have an impact on this new policy formulation. The involvement of the public in the project-related hearings will help the government in protecting the environment.
- An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Concern levels in the public hearing of the project in Male and Female groups. There was a significant difference in the Male group (M= 2.9518, SD= 0.67451) and Female (M= 2.8309, SD= 0.57537), f= 3,320, P= 0.244. As P-value is greater than 0.05, it states that the Male and female group does not have any significant difference in the concern level of Public hearing. In other words, it means the concern level will not change with the Gender.

To assess Probable consequences of the EIA Draft on Climate change.
- Table 6 shows the descriptive statistics of the four variables which indicate the probable consequences of the EIA Draft. The variable with the high mean score is about the recategorization of a large project will cause a bad impact on the environment (mean=3.19, SD=1.118)'. other scores include Environmental pollution (Mean= 2.97, SD= 1.158), Increasing vulnerability of regions to climate (Mean= 2.95, SD= 1.191), More intense floods, earthquakes and landslides (Mean = 2.93, SD= 1.170). The average total score computed was 3.03 with a Standard Deviation of 1.170.
- A one-way between subject's ANOVA was conducted to compare Probable Consequences of EIA Draft on Climate Change, taking 3 age groups less than 17, 17 to 34, and above 34. Since, P>0.05, the null hypothesis was accepted. There is no significant difference between Age and Probable Consequences of the EIA Draft on Climate Change.

To analyze the Ramifications of EIA Draft on country risk.
- Table 7 shows the descriptive statistics of the four variables which indicate the ramifications of the EIA Draft on country risk. The variable with the high mean score is the Bad impacts on community development (mean=3.19, SD=1.098). Other scores are Government is not providing information (Mean = 2.91, SD= 1.246), Authorities are not making efforts (Mean= 2.91, SD= 1.164), Impact on human settlement is very high (Mean = 3.03, SD= 1.191). The average total score computed was 3.01 with a Standard Deviation of 1.1745.
- A one-way between subject's ANOVA was conducted to compare the ramifications of EIA Draft on Country Risk, taking 3 age groups less than 17, 17 to 34, and above 34. Since, P>0.05, the null hypothesis was accepted. There is no significant difference between Age and ramifications of the EIA Draft on Country Risk.

SUGGESTIONS
1. Environmentalists must be more concerned about public participation in projects.
2. Newspapers and other social media should give more attention to the problems arising from EIA's new policy.
3. The lack of two-way communication between the general public and government authorities must be reduced.
4. People with good experience in this field must be given priority in public participation.
5. The environment must be properly considered before beginning a project.
6. People must have more awareness regarding the environmental impact of the new EIA Policy,
7. Community residing near a new project development must be considered before its commencement.
8. Country risk arising with this new EIA policy must be reduced.

REFERENCES

[1] Awan, A. G. (2013). Relationship Between Environment and Sustainable Economic Development: a Theoretical Approach To Environmental Problems. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, *3*(3), 741–761.

[2] Enríquez-de-Salamanca, Á. (2018). Stakeholders' manipulation of Environmental Impact Assessment. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, *68*, 10–18.

[3] Jay, S., Jones, C., Slinn, P., & Wood, C. (2007). Environmental impact assessment: Retrospect and prospect. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, *27*(4), 287–300.

[4] Kasayanond, A., Umam, R., & Jermsittiparsert, K. (2019). Environmental sustainability and its growth in Malaysia by elaborating the green economy and environmental efficiency. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, *9*(5), 465–473.

[5] Kumar, S., Katoria, D., & Sehgal, D. (2013). *Environment Impact Assessment of Thermal Power Plant for Sustainable Development*. *International Journal of Environmental Engineering and Management* (Vol. 4, pp. 567–572). Retrieved from http://www.ripublication.com/ijeem.htm

[6] Li, H., Deng, Q., Zhang, J., Olanipekun, A. O., & Lyu, S. (2019). Environmental impact assessment of transportation infrastructure in the life cycle: A case study of a fast track transportation project in China. *Energies*, *12*(6). https://doi.org/10.3390/en12061015

[7] Li, S., Zhang, X., & Ding, Z. (2020). The Impact of Public Participation on the Environmental Impact Assessment of Marine Engineering. *Journal of Coastal Research*, *103*(sp1), 479–483.

[8] Morelli, J. (2011). Environmental Sustainability: A Definition for Environmental Professionals. *Journal of Environmental Sustainability*

[9] Rodríguez-Luna, D., Vela, N., Alcalá, F. J., & Encina-Montoya, F. (2021). The environmental impact assessment in Chile: Overview, improvements, and comparisons. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, *86*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2020.106502

[10] Sandham, L. A., Huysamen, C., Retief, F. P., Morrison-Saunders, A., Bond, A. J., Pope, J., & Alberts, R. C. (2020). Evaluating environmental impact assessment report quality in South African national parks. *Koedoe*, *62*(1), 1–9.

[11] Sousa, P., Gomes, D., & Formigo, N. (2020). Ecosystem services in environmental impact assessment. In *Energy Reports* (Vol. 6, pp. 466–471). Elsevier Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egyr.2019.09.009

[12] Tvaronavičienė, M. (2014). If industrial sector development is sustainable: Lithuania compared to the EU. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, *1*(3), 134–142.

[13] Ulibarri, N., Scott, T. A., & Perez-Figueroa, O. (2019). How does stakeholder involvement affect environmental impact assessment? *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, *79*.

[14] van Eldik, M. A., Vahdatikhaki, F., dos Santos, J. M. O., Visser, M., & Doree, A. (2020). BIM-based environmental impact assessment for infrastructure design projects. *Automation in Construction*, *120*.

[15] Wood, S. L. R., Jones, S. K., Johnson, J. A., Brauman, K. A., Chaplin-Kramer, R., Fremier, A., … DeClerck, F. A. (2018). Distilling the role of ecosystem services in the Sustainable Development Goals. *Ecosystem Services*, *29*, 70–82.

[16] Zeleňáková, M., & Zvijáková, L. (2017). Risk analysis within environmental impact assessment of proposed construction activity. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, *62*, 76–89.

[17] Zvijáková, L., Zeleňáková, M., & Purcz, P. (2014). Evaluation of environmental impact assessment effectiveness in Slovakia. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, *32*(2), 150–161.