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**INPUT SUMMARY**

Representatives from Civil Society Organizations and other stakeholders participated in this consultation meeting, which was held as a side event of the Land and Poverty Conference. Members of the safeguard review team included Motoko Aizawa (Sustainable Development Network), Yves Prevost (Sustainable Development Network), and Charles di Leva (Environmental and International Law). In addition, Jonathan Mills Lindsey (Legal Environment) and Hanneke van Tilburg (Africa Core Operations Services Department: Safeguards) also attended the meeting. The Bank team acknowledged receipt of several NGO/CSO written contributions.

Comments from participants included the following:

* It was noted that the World Bank President talked about the need for land tenure security in his opening remarks at the Land and Poverty Conference. The voluntary guidelines (for responsible governance of land tenure) should be a benchmark or minimum standard for Bank-funded projects.
* Even though the safeguard policies are proposed to be reoriented “away from ‘do no harm’ to ‘doing good,’” the Bank still needs to avoid, mitigate and remedy harm that occurs. There is a role for safeguards in the doing good agenda.
* An increased focus on sustainability is welcome, provided that risks, including human rights risks, are effectively and appropriately managed. A move toward principles and results-based performance standards should be accompanied by a strong evaluation framework for safeguard results as well as an accountability framework for the Bank.
* It was suggested that the Bank should examine staff behavioral interactions around the application and perception of safeguards, in addition to revising the text of the safeguard policies.
* It was recommended that the Bank rethink its approach to land given the current land rights crisis. The Bank’s safeguards should play a role in shifting the Bank’s approach toward a broader strategy on land.
* There should be a review of Bank-financed land administration projects to see if they indeed consider land tenure as part of a human rights continuum; examples from Cambodia and Guatemala suggest this is not the case.
* It was suggested that the safeguard review team consider the issue of land use restrictions. A clear definition of the term “land,” should be provided, along with clarification on how restrictions on land use and regulatory issues are considered in cases where land is not actually taken.
* The Bank should the expand scope and coverage of the involuntary resettlement policy.
* Issues such as gender, water, or disability, among others, could either be addressed as a strategy or a standalone safeguard, or be incorporated into an existing safeguard. The Bank needs to decide which approach would be more effective for Bank-financed projects in the long run.
* The Bank should look at the commitment of the European Investment Bank (EIB) and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) to human rights and how social assessments are used as a human rights assessment or a human rights impact analysis in these institutions. The Bank’s safeguard policies should recognize that the Bank is bound by the UN Charter and that member states have their own legal obligations regarding human rights.