

12th Steering Committee Meeting, Nairobi, Kenya, 22 and 24 November 2006

Draft Summary Record of the Meeting

The twelfth meeting of the Steering Committee was held on 22 and 24 November 2006 at UNEP Head Quarters in Gigiri, Kenya and Nairobi Safari Club Hotel, Kenya respectively.

Steering Committee Members:

Mr. Willie Croucamp, DWAF, South Africa (GACG, Africa)
Mr. Øivind Johansen, Ministry of Petroleum and Energy, Norway (GACG, Europe and NA)
Mr. Janak Lal Karmacharya, Nepal Electricity Authority
Mr. Manfred Konukiewitz, BMZ
Ms. Joji Carino, Tebtebba Foundation
Mr. Mathew McCartney, IWMI
Mr. Patrick McCully, IRN
Mr. Alessandro Palmieri, World Bank
Mr. Gopal Siwakoti (CHITAN), WAFED
Ms. Richard Taylor, IHA
Mr. Tim Kasten, UNEP (DEPI Acting OiC)

Alternates

Mr. Jean-Michel Devernay, EDF International-Electricité de France
Ms. Michael Fink, GTZ
Ms Dipti Bhatnagar, Narmada Bachao Andolan, India
Mr. Shripad Dharmadhikary, Manthan Adhyayan Kendra

Observer

Ms Zodwa Dhlamini, LHC, South Africa
Mr Peter Chola, Ministry of Energy and Water Development, Zambia
Ms. Daniela Kussberger, GTZ

Absent with Apologies

Mr. Felipe Arreguin Cortes, CNA, Mexico (GACG, LAC)
Mr. Veliparampil Kamalanathan Jyothi, Central Water Commission, India (GACG, Asia)
Mr. Refaat Abdel-Malek, Montgomery Watson Harza
Mr. Ger Berkamp, IUCN
Mr. Stephen Karekezi, AFREPREN/FWD
Mr. Peter Bosshard, IRN

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.

FIRST SESSION – Wednesday 22 November 2006

Agenda Item 1: Welcoming Remarks

Mr Donald Kaniaru welcomed the participants to the 12th meeting of the Steering Committee for the Dams and Development Project. He invited Mr Alberto Calcagno to introduce the agenda of the meeting as well as the supporting briefing documentation of the meeting.

Mr Calcagno welcomed the participants to the 12th Steering Committee meeting, the last meeting within the context of DDP. He presented the briefing notes for the meeting and explained that it was envisaged that the first segment of the meeting on 22 November would be devoted to finalizing the planning for the 5th Dams and Development Forum including reviewing the draft Forum Programme, assessing the progress made on the Compendium, agreeing on recommendations of the Steering Committee to the Forum on the post DDP era as well as allocating tasks to be undertaken during the Forum amongst its membership. The second segment of the meeting on 24 November would review the outcome of the Forum meeting, make recommendations on finalizing the outputs of DDP as well as for the future beyond DDP.

Agenda Item 2: Minutes of Eleventh Steering Committee meeting

1. The minutes of the last Steering Committee meeting were adopted subject to the changes in paragraphs under Agenda Item 3: Structure and Outline of the Compendium. IRN raised the issue on whether there was consensus at the 11th SC Meeting to publish the Compendium as reflected in the draft minutes as its representative who attended the meeting understood it differently. It was suggested to reflect the diversity of views on the subject of publishing the Compendium as follows: some like IRN 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. The DDP Secretariat further clarified that in fact the document tabled at the time of the meeting were the final reports of the consultants and not the Compendium. The first draft of the Compendium was circulated to the SC in early November and would be considered at the Forum meeting.
2. It was also remarked that the numbering of paragraphs was to be rectified, as it followed a wrong numbering due to a computer error.

Agenda Item 3: Draft Compendium on Relevant Practices – Report of the Secretariat

3. The Coordinator introduced the Compendium to the Steering Committee. The DDP Secretariat distributed the key messages explaining the main features of the Compendium (Annex 1). He informed the Committee that the draft Compendium had been circulated to the SC, GACG and DDF members. A series of comments had already been received by the Secretariat and further comments could be submitted for consideration up to the end of the current year.
4. Some members of the Committee representing civil society raised a serious concern on the Compendium. They noted that some broad and opinionated statements are made in the document like the statement in Introduction paragraph 1: *'While a range of alternatives to provide water and energy services are available, the types of services that dams provide cannot often be substituted but rather complemented by other alternatives'*. They affirmed that such statements made the issue of options assessment redundant and set back the progress made in whole dams and development debate in the last six years back. It was further remarked that the language was very complex and incomprehensible to a layperson.

5. The representatives of civil society further questioned the appropriateness of the process of compiling the Compendium due mainly to the fact that affected people had not been adequately consulted. The document therefore had not done justice to the views of the affected communities. Further, it was noted that the national dialogue processes had not made input to the Compendium. The document therefore did not capture the spirit of a multistakeholder process in which diverse views were put across. They remarked that the result of this work was very different from the initial idea, and such document should be widely accepted before its publication.
6. In addition, the representatives of civil society noted that the current draft of the Compendium did not build on the existing knowledge base. It did not add any value to the WCD Report. They observed that should UNEP decide to publish the document despite these different views of some stakeholders, clear disclaimers should be incorporated into the document and the diversity of opinions among the Forum members should be highlighted.
7. A representative of GACG at SC read the statement from GACG concerning its perspective on the way forward with the Compendium:
 - GACG members appreciated all the work done by the Secretariat from the last GACG and SC meetings in August 2006 up to now.
 - They suggested improvements to the structure of the document. An Executive Summary containing the conclusions and recommendations needed to be included. The recommendations and conclusions of each chapter were to be highlighted at the beginning of the chapter. Duplication should be avoided which will reduce the length of the document.
 - They recommended that a red thread around sustainable development be introduced throughout the document as its main nexus. It should include in the Introduction of the Compendium a discussion on upstream and downstream impacts, IWRM, affected people etc.
 - They recommended changes to the title of the Compendium and suggested the following formulation: 'The Compendium of relevant practices for improved decision making throughout the lifecycle of dams'.
 - The presentation of the case studies be synchronized and standardized to include such project characteristics as the size of the project, transboundary nature, multipurpose etc.
 - The members recommended the standardization of the language as well the verification of facts to which they undertook to actively.
8. The GACG representative also stated that the governments were responsible for the achievement of MDGs, and were therefore looking at the development of more dams in a sustainable way. These developments will be done within the context of IWRM and should take into account social and environmental consequences as well as other aspects like disaster management and climate change. Governments will thus need a lot of information to inform the various stakeholders including regulators, financiers and practitioners. The Compendium postdates the WCD Report and provides recent information about practices influenced by the WCD framework. It contains more recent information than what was available six years ago. It is dealing with dynamic issues and the document will need to be updated regularly. Its publication should therefore immediate and not be delayed beyond DDP. It was suggested that it should be published under UNEP's banner for a greater impact.
9. A representative from utilities remarked that people had not reviewed the document properly. Time will be required to comment on the document in depth. The Compendium should provide information on what has been done but not on what should be done. In some instances, authors have put their philosophies across. The Compendium should be brief and succinct.
10. The Secretariat welcomed the comments and was looking forward to further comments before the end of December 2006 for them to be considered in the final publication before the closure of the Project in April 2007.

Agenda Item 4: DDP legacy. Recommendations to the 5th DD Forum on future actions beyond DDP

11. Matthew McCartney presented to the Steering Committee the following three scenarios for the future of activities and output from DDP based on inputs obtained from consultations undertaken:
 - a) No requirement for a central body to coordinate activities such as DDP. The national dialogues continue out on their own, and the global forum meetings to be coordinated by institutions such as IHA or IRN.
 - b) UNEP convenes the Forum meetings every year or two, preferably back to back with other major events. No other activities to be pursued.
 - c) UNEP convenes the Forum, facilitates national dialogues, and upgrades and updates the Compendium.
12. The representative of IRN explained that IRN did not have the capacity to organize the Forum Meetings and suggested that UNEP is better placed to undertake this with the support of an advisory body. Further, the support of UNEP to country processes is important. Linkages to UNDP at country level would be useful.
13. The representative of IHA expressed the willingness of the institution to contribute to the organization of the Forum meetings but not to host the meetings. A neutral platform would be required. There was general endorsement by the members of the suggestion that UNEP continues to host the Forum meetings. The meeting could potentially be convened every year. The issue of better defining the goal of the meetings was raised and it was agreed that this would be the task of the advisory body envisaged. It was recommended to retain the current structure of the Steering Committee. It would be in charge of defining what will be discussed at the Forum meeting and other related aspects.
14. Mr. Tim Kasten, Acting Officer in Charge of DEPI, presented the UNEP Water Policy and Strategy which is a product of wide consultation with the governments and is scheduled to be submitted for adoption at the next Governing Council Meeting in February 2007. He mentioned major areas of WPS that concerned the water and energy infrastructure. He also noted that UNEP had interest in infrastructure and environmental sustainability issues and therefore would pay special attention to the outcomes of DDP as well as the publication of the Compendium.
15. At this point, Mr. Achim Steiner, the Executive Director of UNEP, invited all SC members to his office for coffee. He welcomed the members of the Steering Committee and shared some his views on the Compendium and the value of DDP's work with the context of the future activities of UNEP in the field of environmental sustainability in water and energy infrastructure.

Agenda Item 5: The 5th DD Forum Meeting Agenda

16. The Coordinator introduced the Forum Programme. The participants discussed the arrangement for the 5th Dams and Development Forum meeting particularly the delivery of opening and closing remarks as well as the facilitation of the breakout groups' discussions. Mr. Konukiewitz and Mr. Croucamp agreed to deliver brief opening remarks in Session 1, while Mr. McCully and Mr. Taylor would deliver closing remarks in Session 7. Mr Devernay, Ms. Bhatnagar and Mr. Janak accepted to chair the working groups in Session 4.

Agenda Item 6: Next steps and closure of the DDP – Report of the Secretariat

17. The DDP Secretariat referred the participants to the progress report and activity plan for the closure of the project in April 2007 included as documents D and E of the Briefing Document. No comments were made on them.
18. There were no issues raised under Agenda item 7: Any Other Business in the first session of the Steering Committee.

SECOND SESSION – Friday 24 November 2006

Agenda Item 8: Assessment of the proceedings of the 5th Dams and Development Forum meeting/Agenda Item 9: Next steps and closure of the DDP - Recommendations

19. It was unanimously agreed that the 5th Dams and Development meeting was constructive and provided a wealth of information. The presentation on the Columbia Case Study was very well received resulting in the recommendation that future Forum meetings should focus on specific examples and ensure more in-depth discussions around the different case studies and processes happening in the world. It was further suggested that the Forum should retain its current membership structure.
20. The discussion on the role and composition of an advisory group ensued. It was recollected that due to its sensitivity, the issue of representation was a subject of lengthy discussion at the onset of the DDP process, and therefore had to be avoided. In case of the need for such a body therefore, it should retain the current composition of the Steering Committee while different persons could be chosen to sit on it. Since the Steering Committee did not play any role in the national dialogues, its future function could therefore be restricted to suggesting the themes for and organizing the forum meetings. It was also noted that for broader activities beyond the convening of the Forum meetings, UNEP might not need any input from an advisory group.
21. The participants were then reminded about the intention of the Acting Officer in Charge of DEPI to prepare a concept note outlining recommendations on the way forward beyond the DDP activities. A suggestion was therefore put forward to the Steering Committee to form a group to work out some recommendations on the post-DDP era by mid-December 2006 for consultation with other SC members before submitting it to UNEP at the end of January 2007 for consideration as the Concept Note is compiled. Mr McCartney (IWMI), Mr Taylor (IHA), Mr McCully (IRN) and Mr Croupcamp (Government of RSA) accepted to work on the recommendations for the concept note.
22. Mr. McCartney was requested to circulate the presentation to other SC members.

Agenda Item 8: Finalizing the Compendium on Relevant practices

23. The DDP Secretariat explained in more detail the proposed way forward to finalize the Compendium submitted to the Forum meeting. The Secretariat suggested several options on finalizing the Compendium. After some discussion it was recommended that the Secretariat compiles the comments from the stakeholders together and undertakes the preliminary revision of the current draft Compendium incorporating these comments by the end of 2006. The Secretariat would then submit this documentation to a professional editor for review and editing. The output from the professional editor would be submitted to an editorial group composed of selected Steering Committee members. The editorial group would liaise with other stakeholders in reviewing the edited document and provide comments to the Secretariat that would finalize the Compendium with the assistance of the professional editor.
24. The Secretariat will also seek the advice of the editorial group on the way of presenting the statements of different stakeholders in the text as well as in compiling a foreword. Depending on the outcome of this consultation, there will be two options of dealing with the foreword: either a common statement in the foreword from the Steering Committee or separate statements from the different stakeholder groups.
25. It was recommended that the professional editor should be brought on board as soon as possible. The Secretariat was requested to circulate the Terms of Reference for the editorial assignment to the members of the editorial group for their input. They should contain clear instructions to the professional editor i.e. reviewing the style, presenting diverse views, incorporating thoroughly comments received, using impartial language, remaining factual and avoiding judgments,

remaining technical and avoiding political statements, bringing out clearly the nature of the compendium. It was noted that incorporating diverging views into the document would enrich it. It was also recommended that the editor should be provided with all original comments on the first draft of the Compendium.

26. A word of caution was raised concerning drawing clear distinctions of the roles of the Secretariat, the Editorial Group and the editor. It was noted that the editor could not deal with the issues of substance discussed in the Compendium, therefore the Secretariat should do so in addition to managing the process while the editor focuses on issues of editing the language and the presentation of issues to improve readability of the document.
27. It was also suggested that the introduction of the Compendium should be revised and consideration should be given to drawing from the key messages presented by the Secretariat under Agenda Item 2.
28. One SC member proposed to revisit the title of the Compendium as in his view two words in it contained a sense of judgement 'relevant' and 'improved'. As an alternative, he suggested to consider 'Compilation of recent practices related to decision-making on dams and their alternatives'.
29. It was agreed that the editorial group for the Compendium would comprise of the Steering Committee members selected to prepare recommendations for the Concept Note under Agenda Item 7 para 21.
30. Concerning the statements of the stakeholder groups, it was suggested that this should be decided later depending on the final draft of the Compendium and the final opinion of each group on it. These divergent views should be reflected distinctly and transparently. The editorial group will manage this aspect.

Agenda Item 11: DDP legacy. Recommendations on future actions

31. The DDP Secretariat briefed the Steering Committee on the planned activities for the closure of the project including the external evaluation that would start in January 2007. All activities will be finalized by the end of April 2007 when the DDP staff will be disbanded.
32. It was recommended that the external evaluation of the project should focus on assessing whether the results were met and the risks and opportunities for the sustainability of the outcomes of the DDP.

Agenda Item 12: Any other business

33. Mr. Janak Karmacharya informed the Steering Committee that since he did not work any longer for the Nepal Electricity Authority, he will not be in the capacity to represent utilities in Steering Committee in future. He thanked everyone for the cooperation.
34. The issue of communicating the project outcome was raised. In response, the Secretariat advised that the last issue of the Confluence newsletter would communicate the closure of the Project. The Compendium will be distributed to all Forum members and key organisations in the field as well as libraries. A distribution contractor of UNEP will disseminate the rest of the copies on request.
35. It was suggested that, depending on the availability of funds, the Project donates something into one of UN programmes and funds such as UNICEF or the like to mark a symbolic closure of the Project.
36. In his closing remarks, the Coordinator on behalf of the Secretariat and the Facilitator thanked the Steering Committee for the invaluable support throughout the project life. DDP was a huge experiment that charted new waters on dealing with controversial issues.
37. In adjourning the meeting, the Facilitator thanked the Steering Committee and everyone else who made his work easy and wished all success in following up the outputs of the Project. He however

noted that the Steering Committee would still exist up to the end of April 2007 discharging the tasks that have been agreed upon at this meeting.