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**Date:** February 2, 2015

**Location (City, Country):** Cusco, Peru

**Audience (Government, Civil Society, etc.):** Government

|  |
| --- |
| **Specific participant comments** |
| 1. **General Comments** |
| *Comments and Recommendations*   * There is concern about the **availability of the necessary resources to implement the new Environmental and Social Framework**, in the World Bank as well as in the borrowing countries. * The World Bank should **emphasize policy enforcement** as issues are not in regulations’ design or language but rather in their enforcement. * Bank financed projects should help build **governments’ institutional capacities**, including environmental education. |
| 1. ***A Vision for Sustainable Development*** |
| *N/A* |
| 1. ***World Bank Environmental and Social Policy*** |
| *N/A* |
| 1. ***Environmental and Social Standard (ESS1): Evaluation and management of environmental and social risks and impacts*** |
| *Comments and Recommendations*   * World Bank funded projects should take into consideration **non physical disabilities, such as sensory or psycho social disability, among others.** * The Bank should promote **universal access to education for people with disabilities**. * It is important to **promote the use of appropriate terms to designate people with disabilities**. Offensive words such as the disabled, handicapped, etc. must not be used |
| 1. ***Environmental and Social Standard 2 (ESS2): Labor and working conditions*** |
| *N/A* |
| 1. ***Environmental and Social Standard 3 (ESS 3): Effectiveness in resources and pollution prevention*** |
| *Comments and Recommendations*   * **Environmental auditing** should be included as a mechanism to prevent environmental pollution. * Water based projects should take account of potential **upstream impacts**. * Regulations should consider the impacts of Bank investments on climate change, especially regarding **greenhouse gas emissions. Norms concerning climate change should cut across all Bank’s environmental guidelines.** |
| 1. ***Environmental and Social Standard 4 (ESS 4): Community and Health Security*** |
| *Comments and Recommendations*   * The **use and sale of agrochemicals should be carefully regulated**, especially highly toxic pesticides that can have negative impacts on people’s health. |
| 1. ***Environmental and Social Standard 5 (ESS 5): Land purchases, restriction to land use and involuntary resettlement*** |
| *N/A* |
| 1. ***Environmental and Social Standard 6 (ESS 6): Biodiversity conservation and sustainable management of live natural resources*** |
| *Comments and Recommendations*   * ESS 6 should **forbid the use of genetically modified organisms** in World Bank financed projects because of their impact on biodiversity. * Environmental assessments should consider post-project environmental effects, in particular the effect of **irrigation infrastructure on water resources** typically poorly managed in Peru. |
| 1. ***Environmental and Social Standard 7 (ESS 7): Indigenous peoples*** |
| *Comments and Recommendations*   * Some rural communities call themselves indigenous but government does not consider them as such. Care should be put to take into account the **communities’ self-identification**, especially when government does not consider them indigenous. |
| 1. ***Environmental and Social Standard 8 (ESS 8): Cultural Heritage*** |
| *Comments and Recommendations*   * The Framework should take both **cultural and natural heritage into account.** In Peru, they go together. |
| 1. ***Environmental and Social Standard 9 (ESS 9): Financial intermediaries*** |
| *N/A* |
| 1. ***Environmental and Social Standard 10 (ESS 10): Dissemination of information and participation of stakeholders*** |
| *Comments and Recommendations*   * **Civil society must be involved in monitoring of projects during implementation**. In Peru, there have been instances in which environmental management plan requirements have not been met.   *Questions*   * How would ESS 10 apply when communities in a project’s **direct impact zones agree to a project opposed by people living in indirect impact zones**? Some projects in Peru were frustrated because of the local communities’ opposition. This created social and environmental impacts. How can the Framework help address these issues? |