

11th Steering Committee Meeting, the Hague, Netherlands, 29 and 30 August 2006

Draft Summary Record of the Meeting

The eleventh meeting of the Steering Committee was held on 29-30 August 2006 in the offices of the UNEP Global Programme for Action, in The Hague, The Netherlands

Steering Committee Members:

Mr. Refaat Abdel-Malek, Montgomery Watson Harza
Mr. Ger Berkamp, IUCN
Mr. Peter Bosshard, IRN
Mr. Willie Croucamp, DWAF, South Africa (GACG, Africa)
Mr. Ulrich Hangsberg, National Water Commission, (GACG, LAC)
Mr. Øivind Johansen, Ministry of Petroleum and Energy, Norway (GACG, Europe and NA)
Mr. Veliparampil Kamalanathan Jyothi, Central Water Commission, India (GACG, Asia)
Mr. Manfred Konukiewitz, BMZ
Mr. Mathew McCartney, IWMIa
Mr. Alessandro Palmieri, World Bank
Ms. Richard Taylor, IHA
Ms. Veerle Vanderweerd, UNEP (DEPI OiC)

Alternates

Mr. Jean-Michel Deverney, EDF International-Electricité de France
Ms. Michael Fink, GTZ
Mr. Teodoro Sanchez Campos, PA (former ITDG)
Mr. Hans Peter Schiffer, HEA

Absent with Apologies

Mr. Felipe Arreguin Cortes, CNA, Mexico (GACG, LAC)
Ms. Joji Carino, Tebtebba Foundation
Mr. Janak Lal Karmacharya, Nepal Electricity Authority
Mr. Stephen Karekezi, AFREPREN/FWD
Mr. Gopal Siwakoti (CHITAN), WAFED

Consultants

Ms. Claudia Baldwin	Stakeholder Participation
Dr. Kai Schmidt-Soltau	Addressing Outstanding Social Issues
Dr. Dieter Heinson	Social Impact Assessment
Mr. Vincent Roquet	Compensation Policy
Mr. Dominique Egré	Benefit Sharing
Mr. Carl Brunch	Compliance
Prof. Victor Pochat	International Policy for Shared River Basins
Mr. Tinashe Darlington Nhete	Identification of options
Mr. James Ramsey	Environmental Management Plan

Facilitator

Mr. Donald Kaniaru, UNEP

DDP Secretariat

Mr. Alberto Calcagno, DDP Co-ordinator
Mr. Thomas Chiramba, Senior Project Officer
Ms. Wanjiku Kaniaru, Associate Expert
Ms. Liazzat Rabbiosi, Associate Project Officer

This record of the meeting reflects the decisions taken and the action points for further follow up arising from the deliberations under each agenda item, without detailing the arguments during the discussions.

Tuesday 29 August 2006

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Opening Remarks

1. Mr. Donald Kaniaru opened the 11th Steering Committee meeting and invited Ms. Veerle Vanderweerd, (OIC) DEPI/UNEP to deliver opening remarks. She welcomed the participants to the meeting and briefly explained that the main purpose of the meeting was to review the reports prepared by the consultants as well as to discuss the Exit strategy for the project. She mentioned that the Government Advisory Consultative Group was also meeting at the same time the SC was meeting. The meeting of GACG however had started the previous day. She therefore apologised for not being able to attend the first day of the SC meeting as she had to chair the second day of the GACG meeting.
2. The Coordinator made a presentation setting the scene for the discussions anticipated to take place during the meeting. He explained the step by step process followed to elaborate the Compendium, the methodological approach adopted, the background reports produced by the consultants and the purpose of the meeting. The purpose of the meeting was for UNEP to obtain the guidance and recommendations of the Steering Committee on what and how the information contained in the reports of the consultants would be compiled into the Compendium. He presented and explained the proposed programme of work to organise the discussions. At the end, the Coordinator stressed the fact that the main goal of the whole exercise was to produce a user-friendly and informative publication that provides insights and information about current practices in dealing with a set of key priority issues without being prescriptive.
3. Following the brief presentation, the Facilitator opened the floor to the participants. The need to create an opportunity for the two advisory bodies to interact was tabled. It was agreed that the outcomes of the GACG meeting would be made available to the SC members. The joint dinner scheduled at the end of the day was as an important opportunity for further interaction.

Agenda Item 2: Reporting of the elaborations of the consultants on the priority key issues

4. The consultants introduced themselves and the priority issue they dealt with in their respective studies. The Chair invited the consultants to make brief presentations outlining the overall content of their findings as per the terms of reference including definitions, methodology, case studies identified and discussed, conclusions and recommendations. Annex I captures the main observations made by the participants on the different presentations.
5. At the end of the first day meeting, a briefing note with recommendations adopted by the GACG concerning finalizing the reports of the Consultants and criteria for compiling the Compendium, the draft outline of the Compendium prepared by DDP and a revised version of this draft outline emerging from the GACG deliberations were distributed to the SC members with the view of discussing them the next day.

Wednesday 30 August 2006

Agenda Item 8: Review and adoption of the record of the tenth SC meeting

6. The record of the 10th SC meeting was adopted with the following two minor changes:

- Matthew McCarney has relocated to Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- Item 40: replace “set of recommendations with “relevant examples”

Agenda Item 6: DD Forum renewal

7. The DDP Secretariat introduced the developments in membership of the Dams and Development Forum and sought the advice of the SC members on how to deal with some the requests for membership (Document D). The SC agreed on the following recommendations and actions to be pursued:

- Mr. Willie Croucamp confirmed that Lesotho Highlands Water Commission, in the category of Government (Project/Basins) was considering to attend the 5th DDF meeting. He also committed to follow up the invitation to Water Research Commission, Research Organizations.
- Richard Taylor offered to follow up on the invitation to Atkins Environmental (UK)
- Columbia Power Corporation to be formally invited to join the DD Forum in the Utilities category
- Mr. Veliparampil Kamalanathan Jyothi committed to follow up with the Planning Commission of India regarding the nomination of their representative to the DDF.
- African Rivers Network to be formally invited to join the DD Forum in the International NGOs category.
- JVE was deemed to fall under the advocacy NGO category. It was also noted that it was a member of ARN. Therefore it could not be accepted to be a DDF member under the category of International NGOs.

8. DDP Secretariat was requested to circulate information about vacant slots in DDF in each category for the SC members to make proposals.

Agenda Item 5: 5th DD Forum Meeting

9. The Secretariat presented the draft agenda of the 5th DD Forum meeting scheduled for 23-24 of November (Document C) for consideration by the SC members. The following observations and recommendations were made during this discussion.

- To provide space for participants to present their experiences in handling environmental and social issues, especially those from countries involved in extensive development work on dams and such as China and India. They could highlight the value that DDP has added to their work.
- To provide space to discuss the recent developments and experiences on dealing with environmental and social issues. This may include presentations on other guidelines or approaches being used besides the WCD such as: the IHA Sustainability Guidelines, OECD common approaches that refer to IHA guidelines and WCD, IFC performance standards based on the World Bank or private sector safeguards such as HSBC that refer to WCD. The discussions at the Forum should focus on case studies illustrating the experience with these guidelines. This creates the basis for the nature of the future discussions in the Forum that will serve as a platform to exchange experiences.

- Use the forum to illustrate the use of the Compendium as a resource for project proponents or any other group of stakeholders. In this regard, it was suggested to break the participants into groups to get the views of the groups on the use of the Compendium.

10. Regarding the presentation of experiences, it was suggested that the participation of the governments of China and India was important. Whilst they at times abstain from participating actively in discussions they were good at listening and thus they will have an opportunity of taking some lessons and show the way forward. Based on the same reasons, it was suggested to also invite representatives of the civil society, NGOs, from these countries to present different perspectives. It was suggested that UNEP could facilitate the participation of China as Ms. Veerle Vanderweerd was going to visit China in October 2006. A suggestion was also made to extend an invitation to Iceland.

11. DDP Secretariat to revisit the draft programme taking into account comments from the SC meeting and circulate an improved version of the programme. The Secretariat was also invited to consult with the SC members when identifying relevant persons to contribute at the 5th Forum meeting.

Agenda Item 3: Structure and Outline of the Compendium

12. Discussions used as a starting point the recommendations and the draft outline of the Compendium produced by the GACG. A wide range of issues was addressed and diverse opinions were shared during the deliberations. Their main outcomes with general consensus can be summarized as follows:

Regarding the Reports of the Consultants

13. Overall consensus was reached that the reports of the consultants contained interesting and extremely valuable information not to be lost. Some of the participants however observed that a number of case studies were not well referenced and that some conclusions were not well justified. Others raised the issue that the case studies should be referenced only to well-documented published literature relevant for the issue. On the same issue, other participants observed that referencing was less critical /significant for products of surveys of this nature that are not thorough research. The lack of time and resources for additional research was noted. The recommendation was then made to explore the possibility of putting the data/reports under the name of the consultants on the website or other medium for broad accessibility.

14. The various stakeholder groups expressed various views with the regards to the way forward with the publication. Civil Society were of the opinion that the Compendium should not be published by UNEP due to a flawed methodology (inadequate consultation with affected people) and gaps in the detailed reports used as resource materials. Others like those from utilities noted that substantive work was still required to compile the summaries from the nine reports to constitute the Compendium and this would require extensive time going well beyond the DDP timeframe while others, particularly those from governments and the industry considered that a document comprising of extended executive summaries from improved reports from the nine consultants could be published.

15. It was recommended to enhance the access to full reports by placing them on publicly accessible website for comments/peer-review process incorporating a search engine to facilitate the search of data with some tips on the use of these data. The need for making the reports also available to the public on a CD without leaving out anything due to the value of the information contained was underlined.

16. It was also recommended that UNEP should screen out the case studies with the governments involved as well as to consult, where possible, with the affected people whose voices had not been heard. The IHA representative offered to share the contacts of those affected communities for further verification, with regards to those case studies that were winners of IHA Blue Planet Award.

17. It was further recommended to highlight the cases where information was not available thus encouraging and enabling people who could help to come forward and send the missing information.

It was also noted all information on Case Studies is unlikely to be available because of the nature of the issues and their evolving character.

Regarding the Compendium

18. The issue of publishing the Compendium was discussed and in particular the implications of having the Compendium published as a UNEP publication. The meeting made several suggestions that are captured in the following:

19. It was recommended to retain the structure proposed by GACG. The term of ‘good examples of relevant practices’ should be retained. The access to the information should be increased using the reports as working documents.

20. After extensive discussions of the different views of the stakeholders regarding what is to be done with the reports of the consultants and the scope of issues to be incorporated into the Compendium, it was agreed that the chapters dealing with the specific issues according to the outline proposed by GACG, be made up of expanded executive summaries of 5 – 10 pages to be prepared with the assistance of the respective consultants for each issue. In order to ensure consistency in the issues to be covered and presented in the expanded executive summaries it was recommended that the DDP Secretariat provides a template to the consultants. The consultants could also be used to peer review the draft compendium. The DDP Secretariat should focus on elaborating the front part of the Compendium. Regarding UNEP’s responsibilities, it was suggested incorporating appropriate disclaimers.

21. The meeting highlighted the importance of properly articulating the history of DDP in the introduction of the Compendium. This should cover the reasons for its creation and in particular the concerns of the governments and the need through DDP processes of bringing them back into the dialogue. It should be stressed that the compendium is an informative learning tool for stakeholders involved. The Compendium is intended to enhance the consideration of economic, environmental and social aspects. The introduction section should therefore address the sustainability issues as well as economic factors. Sustainable development should go through the entire publication as the red line. The issues should be addressed within the context of the strong interest of governments in development, poverty reduction and meeting the MDGs. The message should be put across clearly that focus is on innovative mechanisms in dealing with these priority environmental and social issues and not projects per se. It should be emphasized that the work was a survey of what is happening in the field but not a comprehensive all inclusive research. It was also suggested to explain in the introduction that the Compendium is one of the learning tools produced by the project thus raising the importance of other outputs of the projects such as national dialogues

22. For each chapter on the priority issues, a table similar to the one used in SIA report could be produced thus providing the reader with an easy reference to the information. Further, the examples should be compiled into a matrix providing basic statistical data and referenced to the elements of the issues illustrated by the case study. The examples should be cross-referenced and linked with the reports.

23. Some participants noted the challenge presented by the overlap of some issues. They therefore recommended treating some of them together and, where possible, to form teams between consultants working on related issues.

24. It was also emphasized that the compendium should include cross-referencing between issues and case studies demonstrating the linkages.

25. It was recommended worked out in detail the conclusions and recommendations of the Compendium at the 5th DD Forum meeting.

26. The representative of India stressed that his country was confronted with the issues addressed by the Compendium. The Compendium would therefore provide useful lessons based on examples on how some of these issues could be tackled. Therefore, the reference to case studies in the Compendium was deemed very important. It was also pointed out that the compendium should be published now otherwise it might lose its value.

27. It was recommended that the first draft of Compendium should preferably be ready by the 1st of November for circulation among the SC and GACG members.

Agenda Item 9: Exit Strategy

28. The secretariat presented the results of the survey carried out among GACG, SC and DDF members to determine possible activities to be undertaken beyond DDP. The questionnaires were sent early in July listing the major activities that might be kept alive after the end of the project. As noted, the response rate was only around 12-15%. In response to questions from some SC members regarding the relevancy of the survey, the DDP Secretariat explained that the decision to conduct the survey was made at the 10th SC meeting and captured in its record of the meeting.

29. It was suggested that UNEP might take forward some of the activities such as national dialogues and the annual DD Forum meetings perhaps with less frequency as well as sponsor the attendance of some of the participants. It was observed that the construction of dams is likely to continue in a contentious way, and the DD Forum was a useful platform to discuss these issues in a constructive way. Other possible options were also suggested such as IHA or IRN to sustain the dialogue. It was also suggested that monitoring of continuous improvement in the field should also be kept on as a follow-up activity. In response, it was noted that UNEP was a result-oriented organization, therefore it should be clear about the end results before making any commitment. The meeting was informed that the decision about any UNEP follow-up to the project would be taken at the GC.

30. Consensus was reached on that the last Forum meeting should be used as an opportunity for coming up with practical arrangements for follow-up activities.

Agenda Item 10: Any Other Business

31. The IHA representative shared information with the SC about the upcoming 7th IHA Congress to be held in Turkey in 2007. Training workshops on the IHA Sustainability Guidelines will be provided. He invited the participation of the SC members.

Closing remarks

99. Ms. Veerle Vanderweerd, (OIC) DEPI/UNEP thanked all participants for their active participation and constructive input. In response, the SC members thanked UNEP for hosting the meeting and welcomed Mr. Achim Steiner as a new Executive Director and looked forward to meeting him, as many of the members knew him from his previous work with the World Commission on Dams.

Annex 1

Reporting on the Elaborations of the Consultants on the Priority Key Issues

Stakeholder participation (mechanisms) [SP1] (presented by Ms. Claudia Baldwin, IAP2)

1. It was observed that none of the legislation defined the stakeholders to be involved in public participation and the question was put if that was covered in the report. In response, the consultant informed that this would be addressed in the revised version of the report.
2. It was noted that the criteria for good public participation defined in the report were based on the core values of IAP2. One participant noted that the World Commission on Dams report had a different approach to stakeholder participation founded on risks and rights and gaining public acceptance. The stakeholder participation issue as addressed in the consultant's report did not equate stakeholder participation with public acceptance. The conceptual conflict between two approaches was pointed out. It was also emphasized that no examples in the consultant's report covered gaining public acceptance process. Regarding the survey carried out by the consultants for the study, an observation was made that no inputs from NGOs or affected communities had been included. The consultant responded to the last comment by reassuring the participants that attempts had been made to consult the affected people but little feedback was received. Responses from DDP stakeholders were considered, e.g. WAFED in Nepal suggested Andhikhola, which was eventually used in the report.
3. It was further noted that the report offered a wide variety of approaches and was not prescriptive. A question was raised about the level of acceptance of the IAP2 standards. It was explained that IAP2 was an international organization with a large membership especially in North America, Australia and Africa. The core values had been developed by professionals in the field.
4. It was further requested if a crosscheck analysis of the core values against the case studies had been made. The consultant responded that such attempt had been made to a certain degree but it would be worthwhile to present it in a matrix format.
5. To the questions if any of the case studies complied with all the IAP2 core values and principles and if such cases led to a higher degree of public acceptance, it was explained that many projects did but applies mainly to those from developed countries. With regards to the second point, the media was the only source of information on public acceptance. Although it was impossible to get direct feedback, there was a feeling that collaborative processes moved forward more smoothly and resulted in more acceptable solutions. Most of the evaluations had been carried out by developing agencies. Thus their objectivity was in question. An independent evaluation would help to understand the degree of acceptance facilitated by public participation process.
6. A question was raised regarding the observation of the consultant why developers were more comfortable to engage in the process once the decision had been taken. It was further requested if it was due to a wider range of stakeholders at planning stage, thus more difficult to manage. The question also raised issues concerning barriers to stakeholder participation as observed from the study and the ways to overcome them. In response, it was explained that a well-designed stakeholder participation process helped to come to the best option/decision. If there was no stakeholder participation earlier in the process, then it was more difficult to overcome the cynicism of the public later on. The importance of convincing people that the project was in best public interest was noted. This ultimately involved the questions of who the stakeholders were: the width and coverage by the term. It was pointed out that resources were a major impediment to undertaking extensive public participation processes. Resource should be allocated from the earliest stages.
7. The issue of collecting baseline data from affected people was also discussed as a part of the stakeholder participation process. It was defined as a way of establishing the value brought to the

population by the project. The consultant confirmed that the baseline data collected in some cases had been very useful as in the case of Andhikhola in Nepal.

Addressing Outstanding Social Issues [SP3] (presented by Mr. Kai Schmidt-Soltau)

8. An observation was made that due to limited time available the knowledge base of the report was not strong enough. The conclusions suffered from selectiveness of information and projects. Several projects chosen for the study had indeed extensive outstanding social issues (OSI). It was therefore suggested to elaborate the conclusions in light of the information available. The consultant explained that the reports from civil society had been reviewed. Although they covered extensively OSI, they did not provide any evidence or information of the mechanisms for addressing OSI, which was the focus of the study. They were nevertheless included in the reference list and referred to in the section dealing with the perception of stakeholders.
9. The scope of the study was also discussed stressing the need to make it clearer in the report the point that it was not possible to solve all outstanding issues, but that there were mechanisms that tried to solve them to a certain extent. In the same vein, it was emphasized that the objective of the studies were to learn and identify mechanisms and instances where they had been applied thus demonstrating a possible approach.
10. The importance of the including mechanisms to address outstanding social issues also in new projects was noted, as OSI would accrue even in the best projects. It was further suggested that the report should make clearer which OSI had been solved. It was further recommended that no further studies would be required but refinement of the case studies identified with the view to demonstrate the way to develop the methodology of dealing with social issues in the long run after the project construction.
11. A question was put if any other mechanisms apart from monetary had been used to address outstanding social issues such as change in modes of operation e.g. restoring water flows etc. The consultant explained that in the example of Pak Mun the opening of the gates during the fish migration period was used to address the reduced fish stock thus resolving one of the key outstanding social issues. However, there was no documented information supporting the fact that this had been done to address outstanding social issues, as the official position was explained by the regular revision of management plans of the dam. To use Pak Mun or other examples in which a revision of the management plans had relieved outstanding social issues would need more research. The consultant shared the view that often there was reluctance to accept such measures as addressing OSI, which would mean the recognition of their existence in the first place.
12. It was further observed that this issue was too difficult to be addressed through a case-study approach.. Notwithstanding, it should highlight frameworks and mechanisms for new projects to address OSI that each project should have a provision for OSI as well as the need for ongoing monitoring and evaluation which is an important element to tackle this successfully.

Social Impact Assessments [SP5] (presented by Mr. R. Dieter Heinsohn)

13. The issues of conclusions in the report was raised stating that if there was no sufficient or only one-sided information, it would make more sense admitting this and not to make any conclusions.
14. A suggestion was made to expand the geographical coverage as 3 examples in Africa out of 5 were from RSA. This was explained by the existence of language barriers as information in French was not covered by the consultant.
15. The need to address the distinction between SIA for a dam and broader impact from something else that would have occurred anyway was pointed out. The consultant explained that an iterative monitoring was an element to address to certain extent cumulative/downstream impacts as well as common sense of being aware and knowledgeable.

16. A question was made if there were any examples of positive changes induced by the development captured in a SIA. It was suggested to make this explicit in the report as well highlighting the positive impacts of dams. This could be mentioned in the introductory part, for instance. On the same note, it was further emphasized that dams were for development and brought positive economic impact, which should be also covered in the report. In response, it was shared that in the example of James Bay in Canada, SIA on indigenous community demonstrated that the negative impacts were more significant for the community than the positive ones.
17. Another question referred to how to do a SIA for a non-dam alternative and compare between project and non-project options. The need to explain about other alternatives was stressed.
18. It was further suggested to balance between benefits and negatives of dams (at the project level). The draft SIA report seemed to be one-sided as there was little information about positive impacts. Benefits (e.g. training, employment), i.e. that can be applied for a long time on a project and thereafter, on other projects or in private business were discussed in the report but these need to be brought out more prominently in the case studies. In terms of broader benefits to society at provincial, state, national and international level, it was explained that a project-specific SIA did not cover generally these issues but regional and macro economic assessments (as a different module within the planning framework) did.
19. It was pointed that level of public awareness between downstream and upstream communities is often different. Also some strong economic and sound interests are able to lobby for projects in spite of impacts. Therefore, the study should not try to overarch cost-benefit analysis but focus on assessment and mitigation on people while articulating the benefits to local community.
20. It was suggested that the table presented by the consultant illustrating the elements of the issues and the case study that best illustrate implementation should be used in all other reports.
21. It was reiterated that a balanced approach to impacts and benefits of dams in the examples should be covered in the introduction and conclusions. The discrepancy between the title and reality was pointed out. It was therefore recommended to change the title of the report to “SIA of Affected People” to reflect the report’s scope. In this regard, the report should focus on assessing and mitigating social impacts on affected people.

Compensation policy and benefit sharing (mechanisms) [SP5] (presented by Vincent Roquet and Dominique Egre)

22. It was brought to the attention of the meeting that most of the information in the benefit sharing report came from the World Bank commissioned report, the preparation of WB reports normally involved stakeholder consultations.
23. The need to include the broader dimension of benefit sharing in the introduction, as in the case of the social impact assessment priority issue was pointed out. For instance, they could include the benefits to society as a whole related to watershed protection (ex: Nam Theun-2 dam project in Cambodia).
24. A question was raised how monetary benefit sharing would work for non-hydropower projects such as irrigation or flood control projects. In a number of multipurpose projects, the hydropower component paid for the remaining components such as navigation (ex: the Rhine Canal in Germany). There could be other intangible benefits related to the sharing of water resources. This was suggested for further discussion in the report. The consultant explained that there were examples of benefit sharing mechanisms (including intangible benefits) in other fields such as those involving access to genetic resources. Such mechanisms could include alternative ownership schemes (for instance with a local indigenous community) or in the field of community resource management.

25. It was further emphasized that in some examples selected by the Consultant, there would be a need for input from independent consultants to assess the outcomes of resettlement programs. This would apply in particular to the Saguling and Cirata dams in Indonesia, to the Chamera and Uri dams in India and to the Ghazi Barotha dam in Pakistan.
26. The need for monitoring of the distribution and use of funds available through benefit sharing mechanisms was stressed in order to avoid potential corruption.
27. The incentives for developers to share benefits with local communities in a competitive market framework were recommended for further discussion in the report. In the context of competitive bidding, developers who introduced benefit-sharing mechanisms in the past should be granted a special credit in recognition of their performance. This could apply in particular to a competitive bidding process for development of a specific dam site in a river basin where a cascade of dams had already been built. In response, the consultant pointed out that a developer would be more likely willing to share project benefits derived from the economic rent if it were based on a partnership, where local communities were willing to share upfront the project costs and the long-term benefits of a project. In the case of the Chimara dam project in Nepal, employees had become shareholders by using their pension funds as contribution to the project's equity.

Compliance (policy and mechanisms) [SP6] (presented by Mr. Carl Bruch)

28. The meeting was informed that the International Hydropower Association was working on the issue of certification for green power. The question of flexibility in terms of retaining reward and penalty approaches in both developing and developed countries was raised.
29. The idea of including sectoral comparison between different mechanisms of compliance was suggested for further discussion in the report.
30. A question was made whether there was any link between compliance and social corporate responsibility policy and what motivated companies to comply. The consultant responded by describing the three basic categories of placing persons in terms of complying: (a) law-obedient, (b) depending on sanctions, and (c) non-compliance in all cases. He suggested tailoring the compliance mechanisms to the context with the view of putting in place mechanisms that increase those that comply.
31. The issue of practical linkages between 'those that enforced and what was enforced' was raised. Many mechanisms in the report were noted as of proactive nature thus bringing the issue of who enforced/ensured the compliance. The request was made to simplify the analysis of mechanisms through, for instance, a matrix format indicating those who enforced and possible suitable tools for them. In response, it was explained that who and the tools would depend on context: country, department, and level of supervision.
32. It was confirmed that there were monitoring reports of at least two World Bank projects by independent panel of experts.

International Policy concerning Shared Rivers [SP7] (presented by Mr. Victor Pochat)

33. It was observed that the focus of observations/conclusions was on conflict resolution while the study often went beyond and covered mutual benefit approaches thus demonstrating the opportunity. It was also noted this approach was not new and its potential for regional cooperation should be further stressed.
34. Further, the criteria for selection of the examples were questioned based on the understanding that the existence of the agreement between the countries was not a demonstration of good practice. It

was noted in response that the focus was on evolution of the work as many cases started from the conflict but moved on to make a real effort for cooperation.

35. The issue of water treaties signed in Africa by colonial governments was raised. A request was made to mention what the experience was with them after these countries became independent. The consultant explained that the situation was varied, and there was initiative, for instance, from Nile Basin Commission to deal with such agreements.
36. It was explained that the fact that two countries concluded an agreement was in itself a good practice. The issue was raised on how they were being implemented in the countries, i.e. the factors that affected the outcomes of the agreements, needed to be described in more in the report.
37. Before the presentations of the next two issues, the SC members were advised that these were work in progress as these assignments had been commission later than the first ones. The results of the progress up to the moment would be therefore presented to seek the feedback from the committee for the finalization of the reports.

Identification of Options [SP2] (presented by Mr. Tinashe Nhete)

38. The question was raised regarding the narrow focus on identification of options instead of looking at comprehensive options assessment process. In response, it was explained that such approach had been selected through a consultation process at the 4th Dams and Development Forum where a list of issues based on a checklist were prioritized. The possibility to include the other issues at a later stage was mentioned.
39. It was noted that the least cost planning as one of the state of the art frameworks described by the consultant did not present a new approach and has always been a criteria for project funding in the past. The approach was based on the least cost option. The consultant argued that e.g Bujagali in Uganda did present the least cost option, and only later the option assessment had become a strong upfront requirement. It was also observed that the problem was that locally affected populations did not want any options that affect them.
40. It was further suggested to include examples that demonstrate the effectiveness of a non-dam option, i.e. the construction of a dam was avoided due to its cost.
41. The observation was made that options assessment could not be avoided and was important. The issue of optimization should be further stressed in the report. The examples presented focused mostly on electricity and power whereas water services should also be covered including the multipurpose dams to demonstrate the balance between various purposes of dams.

Environmental Management Plans [SP4] (presented by Mr. James Ramsay)

42. In response to the question on the possibility of using the unpublished World Bank reports, it was confirmed that it was possible.
43. It was noted that health and safety issues were not included in the presentation. The consultant explained that public health issues downstream could be included and are generally covered in the mitigation measures.
44. The broad scope of the issue under consideration and its conceptual overlap with other issues was pointed out. SIA was normally integrated into EMP while resettlements plans were part of EMP too. The need to identify the scope of this assignment was put forward to the DDP Secretariat with the recommendation to cover the issues not dealt with in other reports. It was further suggested to describe the evolution of the EMP in the over-arching Sustainability Assessment framework while concentrating the study on traditional issues, i.e. environmental issues.
45. The idea of focusing on the examples that demonstrate the follow-up on the issues identified through other processes such EIA/SIA, option assessment was also put forward.

46. The need to mention in the state of the art the evolution of WCD and other relevant guidelines such as IHA Sustainability Guidelines was noted. The consultant explained that many of the guidelines were included in annexes and referenced to.