



The World Bank
Review and Update of the World Bank's Environmental and Social Safeguard Policies

**Consultation Meeting with Civil Society and Academia
at the World Bank Paris Office**

The consultation meeting held on December 3, 2012 was chaired by Julia Nielson, World Bank Acting Director for Europe. Participants were primarily from French and international development CSOs, and French research institutions (see Annex).

SUMMARY:

- Unclear why Development Policy Lending (DPL) is not covered by the Safeguards review and update.
- There is interest among French researchers, who have strong operational experience in Africa and other regions, in participating in the Focus Group meetings. How can they be involved? How can their expertise (e.g., reviews of experience, analyses) be applied? Can they nominate experts for the panels of experts on the emerging issues?
- How will the Focus Groups for affected communities be chosen? Will the Bank consult only those who have been affected by Bank projects or who are already involved in formal consultative groups/processes, or is there scope for involving other Indigenous Peoples' voices?
- Inclusive Development International and others are troubled that the Safeguards review and update has been launched, when there has been no comprehensive study on the impacts of Involuntary Resettlement since 1994. On what aggregated data will the review of the Involuntary Resettlement policy be based? Will the Bank's internal review be completed and disclosed in time to inform the Safeguards review and update process?
- Inclusive Development International is working on case studies on involuntary resettlement (including in Cambodia) that should be taken into account. Inclusive Development International and Oxfam International will submit a specific proposal for a Safeguard Policy on land tenure, as well as a detailed submission with policy recommendations, together with International Accountability Project, Bank Information Center and Housing and Land Rights Network.
- Will the Focus Group meetings be conducted as consultations on the full range of questions, or will they center on specific issues? Will global expertise inform these Focus Group meetings and how? Why aren't there expert meetings on the existing policies, e.g., Involuntary Resettlement?
- The International Disability Alliance is concerned about the Safeguards review and update leading to expanded use of country systems as many countries (including OECD members) do not have disability standards.
- Special measures must be taken to include disabled groups at the local level in the consultation process, because they generally have no access to their Ministries of Finance and other relevant Bank counterparts, and are often neither inclined nor organized to participate actively in consultations.
- It is not enough for the Bank to include disability groups in the consultations, or to respond to demands for disability certification, which currently accounts for the bulk of the Bank's work on disability. If the Bank sees disability as an "emerging issue"—i.e., an issue where there should be significant improvement

in the next 10 years, then the Bank needs to raise its ambition to expanding access to countries' transport systems, resettlement and other social programs, etc.

- The resulting integrated framework should have fairly specific (if not lengthy) elements on disability and other areas of compliance.
- The International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) is pleased that the Safeguards review and update process is putting labor standards and occupational safety on the table; the ITUC would like to see a stand-alone Safeguard Policy on these issues, similar to the IFC Performance Standard 2 (on labor and working conditions).
- The ILO and labor unions should be involved throughout the consultation process.
- Beyond respecting core labor standards, the Safeguard Policies should promote this agenda. This means the Bank should not rely on expanded use of country systems, since many countries do not have the regulations and/or capacity to enforce core labor standards.
- While the IFC's expanded coverage of issues was a step in the right direction, CSOs disagree that the implementation mechanisms were an improvement; there is too much self-reporting. CSOs prefer the architecture of the Asian Development Bank's Safeguards Policy Statement to the IFC Performance Standards, because there is an overarching policy with key principles and specific safeguard requirements on, for example, Involuntary Resettlement in the appendix, with a decent level of detail/explanation about step-by-step requirements for each phase of the resettlement process. These steps need to be binding policy requirements. Too many important points in the IFC model are in non-binding guidance notes. The CSOs attending reject the IFC model of self-reporting ('fox guarding the chicken coop') as they see very poor implementation of the Performance Standards from IFC clients, exemplified by the high number of complaints to the CAO. Compliance should come first, problem-solving later.
- CSOs support a compliance-based approach over a risk-management approach, partly because the Bank has yet to demonstrate that it is doing well or well enough on risk assessment. IDI pointed to the Ethiopia PBS project, currently being considered by the Inspection Panel, as an example.
- While it is true that third-party monitoring/inspection has not proved to be a more effective model for ensuring compliance, there should be acknowledgement that no single specific mechanism or model—e.g., an exclusively self-reporting model or risk-management approach—will resolve the issue. It will take a combination of things, and third-party monitoring should not be excluded.
- For ensuring compliance on labor standards, the ILO should be involved in Monitoring and Evaluation (not only the Bank and companies).
- The Bank should develop an enforceable right to remedy as part of the Safeguards review and update; otherwise, what is the point of having an Inspection Panel or even Safeguard Policies? When governments are non-cooperative, the Bank should be able to lean on them to address grievances and implement remedies, or there should be ways for the Bank to compensate the aggrieved unilaterally.
- Even if there are no clear proposals yet on how to develop meaningful compensation for aggrieved parties, the *right* to remedy should be clearly stipulated in the new framework. This is a question of the Bank's accountability.

Annex



The World Bank

Review and Update of the World Bank's Environmental and Social Safeguard Policies

Consultation Meeting – Participant List

Date: December 3, 2012

Venue: World Bank Paris Office (Civil society and academic stakeholders meeting)

Total Number of Participants: 6

No.	Participant Name	Organization/Institution Represented	Organization Type	Country
1	Dominique Guillaud	Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD)	Academic research institute	France
2	Reiko Hasegawa	Institut du Développement durable et des Relations internationales (IDDRI)	Academic research institute	France
3	Edina Ifticene	WWF France	NGO	France
4	Alexandre Côte	International Disability Alliance (Secretariat)	NGO	France
5	Carolin Vollmann	International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)	Trade union confederation	Belgium
6	David Pred	Inclusive Development International	NGO	US/Cambodia