

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

PROPOSED REVISION OF THE WATER POLICY OF THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

December 2004

PROPOSED REVISION OF THE WATER POLICY OF THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Board of Directors of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) approved the policy on water—*Water for All: The Water Policy of the Asian Development Bank*—on 16 January 2001. The water policy stipulated that an in-house review of policy implementation be undertaken in the third year, and the review be reported to the Board in an information paper. The interim review has been undertaken by ADB's Water Sector Committee to assess how the water policy has been integrated into ADB operations, to take stock of achievements, and to stimulate improvements in project design and implementation. During the review and formulation of operational guidelines for ADB's Operations Manual, the Office of the General Counsel recommended to update the policy's provisions for large water resource projects.

2. The policy states (para. 32): "ADB will adopt a cautious approach to large water resource projects—particularly those involving dams and storage—given the record of environmental and social hazards associated with such projects. All such projects will need to be justified in the public interest, and **all government and nongovernment stakeholders in the country must agree on the justification.** [emphasis added] Where the risks are acceptable and ADB's involvement necessary, ADB will ensure that its environmental and social impact assessment procedures are rigorously applied. Any adverse environmental effects will be properly mitigated, the number of affected people in the project area will be minimized, and those adversely affected will be adequately compensated in accordance with ADB's policy on involuntary resettlement. In line with its energy sector policy, ADB will continue to extend its support for technically and economically feasible hydropower projects that form part of a country's least-cost energy development plan, provided their environmental (including impact on fisheries) and social effects can be satisfactorily managed in accordance with ADB policies."

3. During the interim policy review, the Water Sector Committee noted that while ADB should continue to pursue a cautious approach to projects involving dams, the adoption of ADB's new accountability mechanism should cause a revision of this policy provision, specifically the text in boldface, to reflect what is practically possible in terms of achieving agreement of all stakeholders for large water resources projects. The review therefore recommended that ADB Board approval be sought for a revision to the impractical requirement for all stakeholders to agree on the justification of large water resources projects.

4. This paper provides the proposed text for this revision, taking into account the comments made by ADB staff, clients, and stakeholders on an earlier draft posted on ADB's website.

II. CONSULTATION

5. Following extensive discussion among staff, draft text to replace the text in boldface in para. 32 of the original water policy (quoted in para. 2) was prepared: "and stakeholders must be provided the opportunity to comment regarding the justification with their views considered. The ADB will promote the participation of government, civil society, and other stakeholders in the country towards this end". This revised text was posted on ADB's web site for comments for 60 days ending 30 June 2004, and disseminated with the assistance of regional departments and Office of External Relations to obtain comments from developing member country clients

and development partners. Nineteen comments were received from a wide range of organizations, including eight from developing member country clients (energy agencies and government ministries responsible for water resources, infrastructure, agriculture, and finance), five from nongovernment organizations, three from private sector companies, and three from individuals. A letter received from the International Rivers Network (IRN) was endorsed by 33 nongovernment organizations. All those commenting, except one individual respondent farmer, supported the need to revise the concerned provision of the policy. Most supported the text of the proposed revision, while others made suggestions for modifications or additions. A matrix with comments of clients and stakeholders is shown in Appendix. All comments were carefully reviewed by staff and discussed in an interdepartmental meeting.

6. Analysis of the comments along with proposed alternative text reveals three main areas of concern: (i) transparency and effectiveness of the participation process involving stakeholders, (ii) scope and impact of large water resources projects referred to in para. 32 of the policy paper, and (iii) linkage with recommendations of the World Commission on Dams.

7. ADB is committed to promoting transparency and stakeholder participation in its operations under its governance policy, and staff recognizes the challenges involved in doing so in large water resources projects. To underline ADB's commitment, the addition of the following bold-faced words is recommended to state that "ADB will promote the informed participation of government, civil society, and other stakeholders in the country **in an open and inclusive manner** towards this end." A respondent from Nepal made this recommendation.

8. Several respondents recommended introducing additional detail and subject matter into the proposed revision, e.g., regarding what type of large water resources structures are to be considered, the importance of health impacts, and transboundary impacts. Staff consider these additions are not needed as they are already addressed by other provisions of the water policy, and by other ADB policies.

9. IRN advocated that ADB incorporate the World Commission on Dams' recommendations into the water policy and also suggested modifications to the proposed revision for para. 32 of the policy. Staff found that IRN's proposed text revisions containing phrases of "all groups of people" and "demonstrable public acceptance," are too broad and therefore impractical to assess under ADB's accountability mechanism. The proposed text modification in para. 7 of this paper will help to address the issues raised by IRN in a manner that does not introduce impractical requirements that cannot be ascertained in ADB's operational work. IRN also recommended introducing the concept of "free, prior, and informed consent" into ADB's water policy. Staff noted that this concept is still being debated internationally and no agreement has been reached for its adoption in ADB's water policy.

III. RECOMMENDATION

10. Taking into consideration all the inputs received from the consultation process, it is recommended that the Board approves the replacement of the text in boldface in para. 32 of ADB's Water Policy quoted in para. 2 of this paper with the following text: "and stakeholders must be provided with the opportunity to comment on the justification with their views considered. The ADB will promote the informed participation of government, civil society, and other stakeholders in the country in an open and inclusive manner towards this end."

MARTIX OF COMMENTS FROM CLIENTS AND STAKEHOLDERS
Proposed Water Policy Revision Para. 32

Name	Position	Media	Comments	Remarks/Actions
Developing Member Country Agencies				
Janak Lal Karmacharya, janak@mos.com.np 23/05/04	Managing Director, Nepal Electricity Authority, Nepal	Web	<p>Summary Supported the need to revise as well as the proposed text; suggest adding the text indicated in bold:</p> <p>Full Text of Comments (verbatim) Universal acceptance of any decision is an utopia and therefore to insist on this would tantamount to stop construction of water resources projects, which are so important for food, health and energy security for many countries. Hence, ADB has taken right step to rectify this impracticable requirement for justification of large water resources projects. In general I agree with the proposed text, however, would suggest inclusion of few words. The proposed text should read: "All such projects will need to be justified in the public interest and stakeholders must be provided the opportunity to comment regarding the justification with their views considered. The ADB will promote the participation of government, civil society and other stakeholders in the country (in an open and inclusive manner) towards this end.</p>	The inclusion of the phrase "in an open and inclusive manner" can be considered in the revision.
Nasima Begum, 17/06/04 Manzurul Islam, manzurul_bd@yahoo.co.in	Senior Assistant Secretary, Ministry of Water Resources, Bangladesh Assistant Chief, Economic Relations Division, Ministry of Water Resources, Bangladesh	Letter Web	<p>Summary Supported the need to revise but suggested inclusion of some text, as indicated in bold, regarding dialogue and cooperation of countries sharing water resources.</p> <p>Full Text of Comments (verbatim) The recommendation of the interim review by the ADB's Water Sector Committee on the policy provision for large water resources projects involving dams and storage under paragraph 32 rightly acknowledged the "impracticability to expect all stakeholders to agree on justification" to such projects. Therefore, in case of large water resources projects, recommendation of ADB's Water Sector Committee to replace the text, "and all government and nongovernment stakeholders in the country must agree on the justification" with "and stakeholders must be provided the opportunity to comment regarding the justification with their views considered. The ADB will promote the participation of government, civil society and other stakeholders in the society towards this end" appears acceptable to this Ministry. However, it would be more acceptable if the proposed revision is rephrased as follows:All such projects will need to be justified in the public interest "and all stakeholders must be provided the opportunity to comment regarding the justification with their views considered. The ADB will encourage and promote the participation of government, nongovernment, civil society and other stakeholders in the country towards this end. When such projects are proposed to be prepared on rivers flowing through more than one country, views of co-riparian countries will have to be taken into</p>	<p>The inclusion of the word "all" can be considered to emphasize the coverage of the consultation process.</p> <p>The inclusion of the word "encourage" is not necessary since it is synonymous with promote.</p> <p>"Nongovernment" is already subsumed in civil society and other stakeholders.</p> <p>The issue of shared water resources is covered in paras. 50 and 51 of the Water Policy.</p>

MARTIX OF COMMENTS FROM CLIENTS AND STAKEHOLDERS
Proposed Water Policy Revision Para. 32

			consideration. The ADB will encourage and promote dialogue on regional cooperation towards this end.	
Nongovernment Organizations				
Olivia la O' Castillo, olcastil@info.com.ph 18/05/04	Chair and President, Asia Pacific Roundtable for Cleaner Production	Web	<p>Summary Supported the need to revise and suggested additional words indicated in bold letters:</p> <p>Full Text of Comments (verbatim) All such projects will need to be justified in the public interest and all stakeholders must be provided the opportunity to comment/react regarding the justification with their views considered. The ADB will promote the participation of government, civil society and other stakeholders in the country towards this end.</p>	No need to change. The word "all" is already included while the word "react" is already addressed by the phrase "must be provided the opportunity to comment."
Aviva Imhof aviva@irn.org 34 nongovernment organizations (NGOs) from 18 countries 02/06/2004	Director, Southeast Asia Program, International Rivers Network (IRN)	Letter/web	<p>Summary The NGOs emphasized that any changes in the Water Policy should be done under the ambit of the World Commission on Dams (WCD) recommendations and suggested a revision of the text as shown in bold letters:</p> <p>Full Text of Comments (verbatim) We, representatives of 34 NGOs from 18 countries, are writing to express our concern with the proposed revision to ADB's Water Policy regarding Large Water Resources Projects and to encourage you to push for modifications to the text that would bring the policy in line with World Commission on Dams (WCD) recommendations. The proposed new text significantly waters down the spirit and intention of the original policy prescription and undermines the ADB's commitment to the recommendations of the World Commission on Dams (WCD). The revision would contradict the international trend towards recognition of a rights-based approach to development, and the principle of free, prior, and informed consent.</p>	Needs interdepartmental discussion

¹ In a letter from Mr. Tadao Chino, President of the ADB, to the Mr. Kadar Asmal, Chair of the WCD, dated 22 December 2000, Mr. Chino stated that "ADB will re-examine its own procedures, including our environment and social development policies, and determine the extent to which the report's recommendations may necessitate changes in these procedures."

² The principle of free, prior and informed consent for indigenous peoples has been recognized by many legal instruments and development institutions, including ILO Convention 169, UNDP's policy on indigenous peoples, and IDB's resettlement policy, OP 710. The report of the Extractive Industries Review (EIR) that was commissioned by the World Bank recommended the adoption of the FPIC principle for indigenous people and for any other communities affected by Bank projects. Since the EIR report came out, the principle has been supported by World Bank President James D. Wolfensohn and by several member governments of the World Bank.

MARTIX OF COMMENTS FROM CLIENTS AND STAKEHOLDERS
Proposed Water Policy Revision Para. 32

		<p>In a letter from Mr. A. Seki, former director general of the Bank's Regional and Sustainable Development, to IRN dated 9 July 2002, Mr. Seki stated the following:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“We are still benefiting from the recommendations of the WCD when developing or revising our relevant policies and practices. An earlier example was the Water Policy... Please note that actions to implement the Water Policy are being taken, supported by the Water Fund. ADB will consider the specific concerns of IRN in the implementation of the Water Policy with regard to specific projects. When the Water Policy implementation is reviewed in 2005, ADB will consider the generic concerns of IRN in any update.”</p> <p>Given the Bank's commitment to consider the WCD recommendations in any update to the Water Policy, we were surprised and disappointed to see a proposed change to the Water Policy that actually weakens the policy's stipulations in relation to gaining public acceptance and brings it substantially out of line with WCD recommendations. In addition, we were surprised to see that the interim review of ADB's Water Policy implementation fails to mention the WCD even once.</p> <p>Therefore, we would like to recommend, in line with ADB's previous commitments to incorporate WCD recommendations into its safeguard policies,¹ that the proposed paragraph be modified as follows to bring it in compliance with World Commission on Dams guidelines. In addition, we expect that the 2005 revision of the Bank's Water Policy will look at ways of incorporating other WCD strategic priorities into the Water Policy, as promised by Mr. Seki. We suggest the following language modification to the disputed paragraph:</p> <p>“ADB will adopt a cautious approach to large water resources projects—particularly those involving dams and storage—given the record of environmental and social hazards associated with such projects. All such projects will need to be justified in the public interest, and decision-making process and mechanisms should be used that enable informed participation by all groups of people, and result in the demonstrable public acceptance of key decisions. Where projects affect indigenous and tribal peoples, such processes are guided by their free, prior, and informed consent.”</p> <p>This proposed language comes directly from the WCD's Strategic Priority 1 on Gaining Public Acceptance. In recent years, there has been a growing recognition by the international community that free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) and other forms of public acceptance are important principles of development policy.² Evidence demonstrates that only such a rights-based approach will allow affected communities to negotiate satisfactory outcomes of development projects.</p>	<p>The proposed policy revision focuses on a specific phrase of one paragraph to replace the impractical requirement for all stakeholders to agree on the justification and to ensure it will be operationally feasible under ADB's new accountability mechanism.</p> <p>The suggested modification based on the WCD recommendations expands the scope of the particular paragraph.</p> <p>The WCD recommendations will be one of the inputs during the comprehensive review of the Water</p>
--	--	--	---

MARTIX OF COMMENTS FROM CLIENTS AND STAKEHOLDERS
Proposed Water Policy Revision Para. 32

			<p>For your reference, we enclose Mr. Seki's letter to International Rivers Network of 9 July 2002, as well as IRN's original letter to President Chino analyzing the ADB's response to the WCD and suggesting changes to ADB policies to bring them in line with WCD recommendations.</p> <p>We hope you will push for this proposed revision when the policy comes to the Board in July, and we hope you will ensure that the 2005 Water Policy revision will look at ways of further incorporating WCD guidelines into the policy.</p>	<p>Policy in 2005.</p> <p>Furthermore some of the wording of suggested modification is based on very broad principles; and others, like free, prior, and informed consent, are still being debated internationally and no agreement has been reached on its adoption.</p>
<p>Syed Shafique Ahmed, rssa@bdcom.com 07/06/2004</p>	<p>General Secretary, Citizens Forum on Water and Sanitation Initiatives in Bangladesh</p>	<p>Web</p>	<p>Summary Supported the need to revise and the proposed text revision, but suggested adding text as shown in bold:</p> <p>Full Text of Comments (verbatim) I fully agree to the proposed revision on the stated grounds of impracticability. However, I would suggest that the sentence "particularly those involving dams and storage" should be rewritten as "particularly those involving embankments, dams, and storage. Reason: In Bangladesh, flood control embankments (we have 9462 kilometers of embankments as against one major dam and 1 barrage) at times face local people's wrath for water-logging and even flash flooding who resort to forceful cutting of embankments at several points rendering those ineffective. Consultation with local people and the civil society with detailed design and implementation plan and ensuring their involvement in monitoring and maintenance of the embankments can help avert later confrontations.</p>	<p>The phrases prior to this "large water resources projects" already encompass embankments, thus no need to specify embankments.</p>
<p>G. N. Kathpalia, alternatives@vsnl.net</p>	<p>Chairperson, Alternative Futures— Development Research and Communication Group</p>	<p>Web</p>	<p>Summary Supported the need to revise and the proposed text revision and provided the information requirements and analytical context for a meaningful interaction with the public. No suggestion on text content.</p> <p>Full Text of Comments (verbatim) The revision as proposed is practical and is supported. But in order to provide the realistic opportunity to the stakeholders and civil society the following action is also necessary. An integrated plan for the river basin considering all sources of water including rain water harvesting, small tanks, ground water, and large dams as proposed along with rainfall data has to be provided and the role to be played by the larger dam/storage. The existing use of water and the livelihood dependent on it, besides the requirement of maintaining</p>	<p>Noted. Information requirements mentioned are generally part of ADB procedure for water projects.</p>

MARTIX OF COMMENTS FROM CLIENTS AND STAKEHOLDERS
Proposed Water Policy Revision Para. 32

			the environment should be fully provided before deciding/diverting on the water to be used for new purposes/land. At the present moment normally there is no provision for downstream water flows after the construction of large/medium dams. It is only when such information is provided that useful comments could be given by the public.	
Private Sector				
Peter Furu pf@bilharziasis.dk 24/06/04	Senior Adviser, environmental health, Danish Bilharziasis Laboratory	Web	<p>Summary Supported the need to revise and the proposed text revision and suggested some focus on riparian countries' transboundary water issues and health impacts.</p> <p>Full Text of Comments (verbatim) The proposed revision may take into account stakeholders in riparian countries, as there may be important transboundary issues to consider.</p> <p>When revising paragraph 32 the Bank may consider to emphasize the health impacts of the large water resource development projects (parallel to environment and social impacts). In fact ADB has specific guidelines for Health Impact Assessment (1992) which should be adhered to.</p>	Noted but no need to specify transboundary issues and health impacts as these are covered in other ADB policies.
Pramod Kumar, pramod@smeciindia.com 24/06/04	Principal Environmental Specialist, SMEC (India) Pvt. Ltd.	Web	<p>Summary Supported the need to revise and the proposed text revision. Indicated the process required a strong government commitment to accountability and capacity building to ensure meaningful participation.</p> <p>Full Text of Comments (verbatim) This is a desirable practical and holistic approach to environmentally sustainable, economically viable, and socially responsible development that will ensure the DMcs to realize the Millennium Development Goal of Poverty alleviation. However, in order to ensure a meaningful, timely, and effective stakeholder consultation and public participation during the decision-making process, the policy should emphasize on Government's commitment to environmental and social accountability and capacity building of the Project Implementing Agencies.</p>	Noted and will be considered when discussing the process.
Individuals				
Subbu M. Hegde, subbuhegde@yahoo.com 05/05/2004	Individual Farmer India	Web	<p>Summary Did not support the need for a revision, moreover proposed a stricter policy to safeguard the interest of the poor.</p> <p>Full Text of Comments (verbatim) I strongly object to the change. Even with the current policy, there are cases where</p>	Disagreement noted. No need to focus on addressing the needs of the poor because the Water Policy has specific provisions addressing the poor (paras. 59 to 66 of the Water Policy).

MARTIX OF COMMENTS FROM CLIENTS AND STAKEHOLDERS
Proposed Water Policy Revision Para. 32

			<p>people are badly affected by the water project but the implementing agencies are ignoring the protests. The case in point is the 37 crore rupee project for drinking water supply to Sirsi town in North Kanara district in Karnataka. The project, when completed, will deprive water to thousands of families along the "Balagar" stream (not a river) and thousand more will be submerged. Even though a few affected farmers have taken the matter to the court, I will not be surprised if they are bulldozed in to submission by the local officials.</p> <p>In view of this, ADB should drop the planned change. On the contrary, a stricter policy to safeguard the interests of the poor is suggested.</p>	
Charles Aaron Bautista, Charles_Bautista@abs.pinoycentral.com	Writer ABS-CBN Global 14/05/04	Web	<p>Summary Commented on the decision-making process particularly in developing consensus.</p> <p>Full Text of Comments (verbatim) Is the decision making equally divided among the government, the civil society, and other stakeholders or a huge percentage will come from a particular sector? What percent will come from ADB and will ADB's decision affect the overall outcome of the referendum?</p>	Noted. This will be considered when developing the consultation process.

MARTIX OF COMMENTS FROM CLIENTS AND STAKEHOLDERS
Proposed Water Policy Revision Para. 32

Agree with the Proposed Policy Change				
Name	Position	Media	Comments	Remarks/Actions
Multilateral Development Banks				
Alessandro Palmieri, apalmieri@worldbank.org	Lead Dams Specialist, World Bank	E-mail/ web	<p>I noticed that ADB has put its draft revised Water policy on the web for comments (www.adb.org/Water/Policy/proposed_revision.asp).</p> <p>I have gone quickly through the main statements and I would like to bring to your attention the large difference between the following sentences:</p> <p>[a] stakeholders must be provided the opportunity to comment regarding the justification with their views considered. The ADB will promote the participation of government, civil society, and other stakeholders in the country towards this end.</p> <p>[b]... government and nongovernment stakeholders in the country must agree on the justification (Paragraph 32 of ADB's Water Policy)</p> <p>While sentence [a] is not only acceptable, but absolutely necessary, sentence [b] is a recipe for stopping any project (dam or not dam). I do not know of any large infrastructure project, especially a dam, in which all stakeholders agreed on justification. You just need a few (even one, if vocal enough) to stop any initiative that may be badly needed by the largest majority of stakeholders.</p> <p>I would refer you to the section on the 3Rs (Rights, Risks, and Responsibilities) in the SIOAP Sourcebook that I shared with you time ago. The need to reach a decision requires a responsible attitude by the stakeholder forum, and the acceptance of the role of government as the ultimate arbiter among (necessarily and inevitably) diverse positions</p> <p>Hope this helps in finalizing the revision of ADB Water Policy</p> <p>Congratulation for the initiative and best wishes</p>	Suggestion noted
Developing Member Country Agencies				
Iulai Lavea, treasury@samoa.ws 14/05/2004	Acting Chief Executive Officer, Ministry of Finance, Government of Samoa	Fax letter	I advise that we agree with the alternative wording to replace the bolded reference on page 32. The new wording allows more flexibility for government; yet still satisfy the good governance principle.	
Zhou Jianfang, 21/05/04	General Manager, Hebei Zhanghewan	Fax/ letter	After reading the water policy and the review report on the website, we found that we had no comments on the policy and report.	

MARTIX OF COMMENTS FROM CLIENTS AND STAKEHOLDERS
Proposed Water Policy Revision Para. 32

	Pumped Storage Co. Ltd, People's Republic of China			
Bountheuang Mounlasy, 02/06/04	Director General Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Lao People's Democratic Republic	Fax/letter	With reference to your letter dated May 17, 2004, concerning the above-mentioned subject, I would like to inform you that we upon agree in principle the Water Policy of the Asian Development Bank.	
B. Jigjid, 30/06/04	Minister, Ministry of Infrastructure, Mongolia	Fax	Thank you very much for your fax dated May 14, 2004, regarding on the Water Policy Revision Regarding Large Water Resources Projects of ADB. We are of course very applauded with your emphasized Para 32 on the captioned policy and website information and are pleased to inform you that we have no major comments for the proposed revision. In the future, we need to formulate and implement integrated, cross-sector approaches to water management and development, including delivery of water services and management of water resources. These policies will be based on the country water action agenda and will be guided by ADB's country operational strategies and programs.	
Aitzhanov, 11/06/04	Vice-Minister Ministry of Agriculture Kazakhstan	Fax	Having considered the letter of the Asian Development Bank of 13 May 2004 regarding the Water Policy of ADB, Ministry of Agriculture agrees with the proposed revisions and has no further comments. (Cover letter from Country Director, Kazakhstan Resident Mission) We are enclosing a letter dated 11 June 2004 from Mr. Aitzhanov, Vice-Minister of Agriculture in response to ECOD letter of 13 May 2004 requesting Government views on suggested revisions to the above policy. The letter confirms Government concurrence to the suggested revisions. As requested, the Government has attempted to reply to the website. This, however, did not work. Hence, the Government has requested to submit the letter as a hardcopy. We would appreciate ECRD assistance in putting the Government response in the website, should it is required. Signed Kazuhiko Higuchi.)	

MARTIX OF COMMENTS FROM CLIENTS AND STAKEHOLDERS
Proposed Water Policy Revision Para. 32

N. Gazikebov, 23/06/04	First Deputy Chairman, Amelior-ation and Water Farm Committee, Azerbaijan	Fax	<p>Amelioration and Water Farm Committee has already reviewed the information on the provision in ADB's water policy: Water for All—regarding large water resources projects which was approved by Board of Directors of Asian Development Bank on 16 January 2001.</p> <p>We appreciate the importance of cautious approach to large water resource projects, particularly those involving dams and storage to be justified in public interest, and their environmental and social impact assessment procedures and such other changes in the paragraph 32 of the policy as a desirable case in efficient use of existing storages and we do support ADB's suggestions.</p> <p>Thus, establishment of large storages is the requirement of every estate, including the states located in the intercountry watershed basins and it poses strategic significance, so it will be worthwhile to prioritize government interest and consider the importance of strict measures to minimize environmental and social impact of the storage if necessary.</p>	
Nongovernment Organizations				
Sultan Barq, sbarq@yahoo. com 15/05/04	President, Friends of Earth and Trees	Web	<p>We must teach the governments and people about water conservation. It would be extremely critical to save a drop of water instead of rendering it unretrievable.</p>	
Private Sector				
Bryan Dwyer, bryan.dwyer@ memcor.com. au 17/05/04	Intellectual Property Manager, Memcor Australia P/L	Web	<p>The amendment to the policy is such as to encourage more debate about the project and that can only be a good thing for projects which are being evaluated for implementation. My company is involved in water filtration and we welcome debate about the best approach to a project.</p>	

ADB = Asian Development Bank, DMC = developing member countries, ECRD = East and Central Asia Department, ECOD, Office of the Director General, ECRD, EIR = Extractive Industries Review, FPIC = free, prior and informed consent, IDB = Inter-American Development Bank, ILO = International Labour Organization, UNDP = United Nations Development Programme,