



**Review and Update of the World Bank's Environmental and Social Safeguard Policies
Phase 2
Draft Feedback Summary**

Date: November 23, 2014

Location: Johannesburg, South Africa

Audience: Representatives of Civil Society Organizations

Overview and Key Issues Discussed: On November 23, 2014, the World Bank held a Consultation Meeting during the CIVICUS International Civil Society Week (ICSW). The meeting took place in the context of the World Bank's multi-phased process to review and update its environmental and social safeguard policies. The purpose of the meeting was to obtain views and insights on the Bank's draft Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) from representatives of Civil Society Organizations (CSO), and to hear their assessment of the of the Bank's safeguards policies' effectiveness and efficiency. The meeting was open to all CSOs that attended the CIVICUS ICSW.

Specific Feedback from Stakeholders

1. General Comments

Comments:

- Participants mentioned that it is important for CSOs to have copies of the Social and Environmental Assessments of projects.
- Some participants suggested that the World Bank partner with Civil Society Organizations to help raise awareness of its draft Environmental and Social Framework.
- Participants mentioned that the inclusion of stipulations for monitoring and evaluating finished projects was a major improvement to the policy. However, they mentioned that they would remain skeptical until they saw how monitoring and evaluation was undertaken.

Clarifications:

- Participants were interested in knowing if the draft Environmental and Social Framework included a grievance redress mechanism for projects financed in the past that may have had different safeguards standards.
- Participants inquired if World Bank financed projects are implemented in UN protected areas.
- Participants asked if the Bank financed projects in locations where there was government repression towards the population.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants were interested in knowing what happens when the World Bank and borrower have different safeguards standards. • Participants expressed interest in knowing if the World Bank is in contact with other development institutions, especially the African Development Bank.
<p>2. <i>Environmental and Social Standard 1 (ESS1): Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts</i></p>
<p>3. <i>Environmental and Social Standard 2 (ESS2): Labor and Working Conditions</i></p>
<p><i>Recommendations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants stated that the Bank should include more references to human rights in its safeguards policies.
<p>4. <i>Environmental and Social Standard 3 (ESS3): Resource Efficiency and Pollution Prevention</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants expressed that pollution was a long-term, cumulative consequence of some projects, and were interested in knowing what was being done to prevent long-term consequences.
<p>5. <i>Environmental and Social Standard 4 (ESS4): Community Health and Safety</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants manifested disappointment that the ESF did not have any mention of the World Commission on Dams’ report titled “Dams and Development: a new framework for decision-making”.
<p>6. <i>Environmental and Social Standard 7 (ESS7): Indigenous Peoples</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants questioned the future success of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), and mentioned that their perception was that the Bank is hierarchical institution and that decisions were often made at the top.