

**ADB's Safeguard Policy Update (SPU)  
Multistakeholder Consultation  
ADB Headquarters, Manila, 19-20 November 2008**

**Multistakeholder Consultation Report**

This Report was prepared by a team of documenters contracted by ADB, through the Lead Facilitator, to capture the participants' written and verbal outputs. These were then reviewed by the Lead Facilitator for accuracy using best professional judgment to interpret any unclear comments and fairly highlight plenary discussions. The report should not be interpreted as an expression of a collective position or consensus since in some group reports, several or many participants may have agreed with a statement, while in others this may not have been the case.

The views expressed in this document do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) or its Board of Governors or the governments they represent.

**ADB's Safeguard Policy Update (SPU)  
Multistakeholder Consultation  
ADB Headquarters, Manila, 19-20 November 2008**

**Multistakeholder Consultation Report**

## **Contents**

I. PURPOSE OF THE CONSULTATION REPORT	4
II. PARTICIPATION	4
III. INTRODUCTION TO THE WORKSHOP	4
A. Welcome	4
B. Consultation Agenda	5
C. Overview: Safeguard Policy Update and Second Draft Safeguard Policy Statement	5
IV. OVERARCHING STATEMENT, OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, POLICY PRINCIPLES ON SAFEGUARDS	7
V. SAFEGUARD REQUIREMENTS FOR BORROWERS / CLIENTS (SR-1-4), ANNEXES: OUTLINE OF ASSESSMENTS OR PLANS AND PROHIBITED INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES LIST (PIL)	7
VI. POLICY DELIVERY PROCESS: KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXISTING POLICIES AND SECOND DRAFT	9
VII. POLICY DELIVERY PROCESS: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS - APPENDIX 1. ADB PROHIBITED INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES LIST	11
VIII. POLICY DELIVERY PROCESS: SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR FINANCING MODALITIES ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES, RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS, TRANSITION AND CONCLUSION	13
IX. STRENGTHENING AND USE OF COUNTRY SAFEGUARD SYSTEMS (CSS): APPENDIX 2. APPROACH FOR STRENGTHENING AND USE OF CSS TO ADDRESS ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARD ISSUES IN ADB OPERATIONS	13
X. GLOSSARY	14
XI. NEXT STEPS AND CLOSING REMARKS	14

## **Attachments**

- A List of Participants
- B Opening remarks by Dr. Ursula Schäfer-Preuss, Vice President, Knowledge Management and Sustainable Development, Asian Development Bank
- C Agenda
- D Safeguard Policy Update Multi-Stakeholder Consultation Presentation (Part I)
- E Overarching Statement, Objectives, Scope, Policy Principles on Safeguards (Multistakeholder Breakout Groups by Policy Area) – Breakout Group Outputs
- F Safeguard Requirements For Borrowers / Clients (Sr-1-4), Annexes: Outline Of Assessments or Plans and Prohibited Investment Activities List (PIL) (Multistakeholder Breakout Groups By Policy Area) – Breakout Group Outputs
- G Safeguard Policy Update Multi-Stakeholder Consultation Presentation (Part II)
- H General Requirements – Breakout Group Outputs
- I Special Requirements – Breakout Group Outputs
- J Country Safeguard Systems – Complete Outputs
- K Glossary

## I. PURPOSE OF THE CONSULTATION REPORT

1. As a core part of its Safeguard Policy Update (SPU) process, the ADB held a second set of multistakeholder consultation workshops 18 – 20 November 2008. This week included an Indigenous Peoples Consultation workshop on 18 November, with a pre-consultation meeting the afternoon of 17 November, and a Multistakeholder Consultation Workshop on 19 – 20 November followed by an optional Post-Consultation Dialogue held on the morning of 21 November. These workshops were conducted to provide ADB's various stakeholders in government, the private sector, academe and civil society, as well as other multilateral financial institutions and development agencies, an opportunity to share comments and recommendations on the Second Draft of the Safeguard Policy Statement as input to ADB's preparation of a Working Paper for discussion by its Board of Directors anticipated for First Quarter 2009. These workshops are only one forum for stakeholders to provide comments. ADB also received written submissions from its stakeholders and their organizations.

2. The purpose of this Consultation Report is to present the observations, recommendations, and highlights of discussion that occurred during the Multistakeholder Consultation Workshop without summary or editorial reductions. Thus, the data (particularly the attachments) are primarily for the use of the participants and ADB resource persons. Other readers may find portions difficult to interpret. This draft report was sent to stakeholder participants and participating ADB staff for corrections. This revised draft is being posted on ADB Safeguard Policy Update website <http://www.adb.org/Safeguards/about.asp>.

## II. PARTICIPATION

3. Seventy-three participants representing different stakeholders from the government, civil society organizations, specific indigenous peoples groups, academe, private sector and development agencies attended the Multistakeholder Consultation Workshop to consider ADB's Second Draft Safeguard Policy Statement. A list of participants follows (**Attachment A**).

## III. INTRODUCTION TO THE WORKSHOP

### A. Welcome

4. Ms. Ursula Schäfer-Preuss, Vice-President, Knowledge Management and Sustainable Development of the ADB, welcomed and thanked the participants for their participation in the Bank's Safeguard Policy Update consultation process. She emphasized the SPU is a corporate priority for ADB, as their objective is to improve the relevance and effectiveness of the three safeguard areas: environment, involuntary resettlement and indigenous peoples. Ms. Schäfer-Preuss mentioned although safeguards have always been important, they are now central to ADB's new long-term strategic framework, *Strategy 2020*. Protecting the environment and affected people are more important than ever to achieving inclusive growth, environmental sustainability and poverty reduction in the developing member countries.

5. According to Ms. Schäfer-Preuss, the SPU will enhance the effectiveness of safeguard policies and make sure they remain relevant to changing client needs and to new lending instruments. Moreover, it will result in a consolidated safeguard policy statement that brings the environment, involuntary resettlement and indigenous peoples safeguards under one umbrella. However, the new SPS will not compromise on the objectives and principles of ADB's current safeguard policies, but better articulate policy requirements, demarcate roles and responsi-

lities of ADB and borrowers, and strengthen delivery of safeguard results on the ground. She went on to give some examples of how the ADB, in preparing the second draft of the Safeguards Policy, has sought to address comments it received during consultations, two of which are mentioned here:

- (i) Indigenous peoples have highlighted the importance of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the principle of free prior and informed consent. The second draft recognizes this principle for project circumstances where indigenous peoples are particularly vulnerable.
- (ii) In the context of the Paris Declaration and the more recent Accra Agenda for Action there is strong recognition of the need for better alignment with country systems. Some stakeholders have expressed concern about the application of country safeguard systems (CSS). A phased, gradual approach for the application of CSS is proposed, where CSS will be considered only after rigorous assessments of equivalence and capacity. It has also been clarified that CSS assessments will be disclosed for public comment.

6. Through this consultation meeting, ADB seeks a review of the Second Draft to ensure the updated safeguard policies reflect international practices and are suitable to the context of our developing member countries in the Asia and Pacific Region. In closing, she asked the participants to take this opportunity to engage actively with other stakeholders and ADB staff. (The entire opening statement is attached as **Attachment B**).

## **B. Consultation Agenda**

7. Peter Malvicini, lead facilitator of the event, discussed (i) policy updates and articles posted on the website; (ii) two-day agenda of the multistakeholder consultation; and (iii) consultation norms and ground rules.

The lead facilitator reiterated the formal objective of the workshop, which was:

*To review a second draft of the safeguard policy statement in its entirety, with emphasis on ADB's response to stakeholder comments on the consultation draft.*

8. He presented basic ground rules for process to help the group reach the objective. He assured participants a team of independent documenters was capturing their comments, suggestions, and questions in this workshop. The participants were assured a forum for open and constructive discussion. Each was encouraged to use the opportunity to articulate issues and concerns regarding the Second Draft Safeguard Policy Statement. As a multistakeholder consultation, the facilitators emphasized the importance of drawing out diverse opinions. Groups were specifically instructed not to seek consensus as that was not the purpose, nor would time allow to develop agreement on points. The Agenda was then presented and confirmed by the participants (**Attachment C**).

## **C. Overview: Safeguard Policy Update and Second Draft Safeguard Policy Statement**

9. Ms. Xiaoying Ma, ADB SPU Task Manager, presented the Safeguard Policy Update and Second Draft Safeguard Policy Statement (**Attachment D**). In it, she discussed the following points:

- Proposed Safeguard Policy Structure (Current vis-a-vis Proposed)

- Proposed Principles and Requirements on Environmental Safeguards (What's new and key differences)
- Proposed Principles and Requirements on Involuntary Resettlement Safeguards (What's new and key differences on Policy and Scope)
- Proposed Principles and Requirements on Indigenous Peoples Safeguards (What's new and key differences especially on Free, Prior, and Informed Consent)
- Key Comments Received on the Consultation Draft of the Safeguard Policy Statement and ADB's Response

10. Questions and Clarifications: Highlights of the Plenary Discussion

CLARIFICATIONS/OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
Over the past 2 years, we've been hearing senior ADB officials, saying, on record, that safeguards policies will not be weakened. Policy principles are not well integrated in the safeguard policies. Would the ADB not consider these instances as a weakening of the policy?	
There is disparity of policy principles with principles on Environment, Involuntary Resettlement and Indigenous Peoples	
<p>On the issue on alternatives for long-term and short-term plans regarding livelihood restoration:</p> <p>Integration is far more important when we are conceiving the project. So, once the project is conceived, we need alternatives for long-term and short-term plans. It would be important to consider short-term requirements, long-term requirements. For example, in livelihood requirements, in the initial stages, we need to sustain a short-term plan. This has not been stated.</p> <p>When we talk of biodiversity, we don't just talk about management. Merely putting management in is not adequate; we also need protection.</p>	Water Resources Management should also be ADB's priority, not only biodiversity and conservation
We have continually raised our concern about workers protection as not part of the ADB safeguard policy.	
I see it's not just the consolidation of the SPU, but also the delivery of the country systems. Why is the ADB still considering the World Bank's approach as a good approach, since it failed?	
Currently the ADB has some standards that are higher than the World Bank's, though some have been diluted in the draft. Do you consider these dilutions?	
Are you expecting us to comment on all cross cutting issues?	
The safeguard policy in many areas has been strengthened. Indigenous Peoples (IP) issues are challenging to deal with in	Too much conditionality though will not make a good

China. The UN IP policy is different in terms of concept. Nationality issues are the root cause for conflict.	product. The country commitment should be strengthened. Clarify the definition and scope to which kinds of people "IPs" refers to in China.
We have to revisit the Bahasa translation of the draft. There were some miscommunications, for example, the term "sustainability" was translated as "harmonization". While there was a mention of the word "gender" in the second draft, there was no provision to protect affected women.	Review Bahasa translation. Include a specific provision for the protection of affected women.
In practical terms, when you talk of IP, this policy does not really apply in India. If the policy affects tribal people in India, the funding will really not be accepted. External Affairs says the "IP" term does not apply to us. The tribal people are located in very resource rich areas, and ADB has some projects planned in those areas owned by tribal peoples.	
The Operations Manual only has one paragraph for each policy, and since it is an operation's manual, it should contain more detail.	The Operations Manual should be more detailed.

#### IV. OVERARCHING STATEMENT, OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, POLICY PRINCIPLES ON SAFEGUARDS

11. Following the clarification session, participants were divided into multistakeholder break out groups. Facilitators sought feedback from participants on the proposed Safeguards Policy Structure and the Policy Objectives, Scope and Principles. A complete record of the outputs (comments and recommendations) of each of the breakout groups is attached (**Attachment E**).

12. Participants were divided into three safeguards policy areas: Environment (four groups), Involuntary Resettlement (three groups), and Indigenous Peoples (two groups). The facilitator then gave the processes and mechanics of the workshop. Each group was tasked to discuss these questions: *Do policy principles articulate international best practice? What's crucial, missing, needs strengthening?* A rapporteur from each breakout group narrated highlights of their discussion to the plenary group at the end of the day.

#### V. SAFEGUARD REQUIREMENTS FOR BORROWERS / CLIENTS (SR-1-4), ANNEXES: OUTLINE OF ASSESSMENTS OR PLANS AND PROHIBITED INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES LIST (PIL)

13. Participants were again divided into multistakeholder breakout groups for this session. Facilitators sought feedback from participants on the proposed Safeguard Requirements for Borrowers/Clients, Annexes: Outline of Assessments or Plans and Prohibited Investment Activities List (PIL). Each group tackled the questions: *"Are the safeguard requirements for borrowers/clients adequate? What's crucial, missing, needs strengthening?"* A complete record of the outputs (comments and recommendations) of each of the breakout groups is attached

**(Attachment F).** A rapporteur from each breakout group shared highlights of their discussion to the plenary group at the end of the day.

14. Questions and Clarifications: Highlights of the Plenary Discussion [IV - Overarching Statement, Objectives, Scope, Policy Principles on Safeguard and V - Safeguard Requirements for Borrowers / Clients (SR 1-4) were discussed together]

OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
Three safeguard policy areas are not integrated clearly. Although the intention is very clear, the operationalization is not.	When a project is started, the three policy areas should all be integrated.
	Document should use stronger language.
In the main policy statement, the reasons given for enforcing safeguards are solely to avoid negative effects of non-enforcement.	Include positive effects of enforcing safeguards (not just negative effects).
Country specific safeguards? - Is it a policy or a delivery mechanism?	
What are the conditions for construction contracts? Environmental Management Plans do not get reflected in the contracts; this is a major weakness.	
Language is vague in certain areas, in certain areas it seems deliberate; time frames are specific in some areas, in some, not.	Build in timeframes, number of consultations, when and how they will be held, into the policy.
Language tends to be apologetic or defensive; e.g., Involuntary resettlement (IR) safeguards, Policy Principle #3 includes the phrase "improve or at least restore" - there is a world of difference between the two.	Useful to carefully see if merely restoration is enough – if conditions are restored to a negative state, restoration should not be acceptable.
On livelihood – specific points do not relate to livelihood but only to compensation, except point 8.	
If some standards have been brought in for environmental safeguards, a similar effort should be brought in for IR and IP.	
US and other countries have not endorsed this UN declaration [on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP)]; do not know the implication.	Urge attention to specific language being used
Free prior and informed consent (FPIC), referring to both content and process, was used even before the UN declaration. Regarding the definition of Consent, the IP sector position is not to define it because it is an evolving international concept. In the Philippines, consent is the result or decision reached through the collective decision making process	

of the affected IP.	
World Bank: FPIC on IP – WB does not currently recognize FPIC for IPs. To recall, WB Operational Policy on Indigenous Peoples was endorsed by the Bank's Board two and half year prior to the adoption of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (which was voted against by Australia, Canada, New Zealand and USA; later Australia endorsed its adoption). Given the above, the WB Legal Department at the time of revision of the Indigenous Peoples policy ruled that FPIC is not part of international standard and should not be adopted by the Bank. Since the adoption of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, WB Legal Department is reviewing the implications of the UN Declaration for the WB. In the mean time, WB Sustainable Development Network has made a commitment to Indigenous Peoples leaders to revisit the Indigenous Peoples policy within this fiscal year (end June).	
ADB: Can FPIC be operationalized? It has been operationalized in the Philippines, Canada and the Congo Basin. Operationalizing is looking more feasible. Issue of rights, up to our owners, shareholders to make that political call. Staff can only advise but shareholders will decide.	
What are other models for land conversion? When government acquires land without eminent domain rights, e.g. community leases land for duration of project but holds property rights; private sector cannot use it but perhaps government can.	
Who will identify the advisory panel?	

**VI. POLICY DELIVERY PROCESS:  
KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXISTING POLICIES AND SECOND DRAFT**

15. Ms. Xiaoying Ma, ADB SPU Task Manager, presented Part II of the Safeguard Policy Update, focusing on the Policy Delivery Process (**Attachment G**). Her presentation highlighted what is new, and the key differences between existing policies and the second draft with regard to policy delivery procedure, including (i) general requirements and (ii) special requirements. She also emphasized key comments received on the Consultation Draft and ADB's response.

16. Questions and Clarifications: Highlights of the Plenary Discussion

<b>OBSERVATIONS</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
---------------------	------------------------

What is ADB's definition of "highly complex" projects? The definition "those deemed by ADB to be highly risky" seems circular. What criteria are used by ADB?	
On the definition of social and environmental risk, what criteria and definition is used?	
Although there seems to be continued commitment to due diligence, key elements are missing, e.g. indicative/estimate budget is missing; it is hard to determine how ADB will push with this. Bank staff doubt if they have the budget and staffing to carry this out effectively. OM is not comprehensive; are we being asked to simply trust the good intentions of the Bank [ADB]?	
	Paragraph 69 of accountability mechanisms – specify project affected people can submit documentation; use the first level grievance/redress mechanisms before elevating.
Paragraph 62 info disclosure, on classes of documents	Emphasize documents are cumulative. And perhaps a statement could be made to qualify that "in addition to the requirements mentioned to the PCP, these documents are added."
	Emphasize ADB's accountability mechanism and PCP at the overarching statement on page 16, para 55 in addition to the safeguards policy... "in order to deliver on its safeguards policy..."
How will ADB deal with cross boundary projects?	
Not all countries welcome CSOs, how will this be dealt with?	
Need policy principles that are highly aspirational, then work down to practical requirements and operational details	
How and who determines geographical area of (project) impact?	
Are all these safeguard costs, fully funded under the ADB loan, and are these fully specified in the loan and budgeted by item?	
On the use of word "exclusion", as it is used in highly sensitive and complex projects – what does this mean? Which projects will be excluded?	

How will ADB strike a balance between host country laws and ADB's safeguard requirements?	
Almost all laws in Indonesia are problematic, e.g. investment laws in Indonesia allow land use rights for foreigners for 90 yrs. Is this in line with ADB's commitment to reduce poverty in Asia?	

## VII. POLICY DELIVERY PROCESS: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS - APPENDIX 1. ADB PROHIBITED INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES LIST

17. Participants divided into breakout groups to discuss separate general requirements considering the questions: "Are the general requirements for policy delivery adequate? What's crucial, missing, needs strengthening?" They were free to move to different table to comment and discuss any general requirement that interested them. They used Appendix 1, ADB Prohibited Investment Activities List as references. A complete record of the outputs (comments and recommendations) of each of the breakout groups is attached (**Attachment H**).

18. Questions and Clarifications: Highlights of Plenary Discussion

<b>OBSERVATIONS &amp; RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<p><i>Environment Categorization:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholder participation in categorization; scope for revisiting categorization should be defined</li> <li>• Country's categorization vs. ADB's categorization must be looked into</li> <li>• Ask ADB to use World Bank Definitions for Categorizations</li> <li>• Examine specific parameters used in categorization</li> </ul>
<p><i>Involuntary Resettlement:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested abandonment of SPS signifies a return to old policy</li> <li>• There should no longer be involuntary resettlements as a result of projects.</li> <li>• More clarifications and improvements in the process: more consultation (client, borrower, community); better screening process; recommending all projects having IR component should automatically be classified as Category A; budgets, checklists, follow-ups; state-wide resettlements; financial intermediaries</li> </ul>
<p><i>Indigenous Peoples:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All IP projects should be considered highly complex and sensitive projects; ADB should be allowed to withdraw operations in the area.</li> <li>• Include IP systems, standards, etc.</li> <li>• IP plans should be approved by government ministry/department; advisory panel &amp; consultation including: IP organizations, government department, etc.</li> <li>• All projects impacting on IPs ought to be categorized as highly-sensitive</li> <li>• ADB CSS should not be applied to all countries.</li> <li>• Information disclosure, directly or indirectly to IPs affected, should be done not later than</li> </ul>

<p>120 days.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ADB should set aside an IP Trust Fund</li> </ul>
<p><i>Information Disclosure:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ADB should retain the 120 day public disclosure rule for all projects, public and private sector</li> <li>• ADB should work closely with borrowers so they fulfill requirements based on SR</li> <li>• Loan-agreements should be disclosed to affected people</li> <li>• How to disclose information and/or communicate to stakeholders should be specified</li> </ul>
<p><i>Consultation and Participation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to detail the consultation process more (ex. traditions &amp; cultures of AP)</li> <li>• Consultation should start from the beginning till the end</li> <li>• <i>Private Sector:</i> as needed, additional financial support should be provided to private sector</li> <li>• <i>Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC):</i></li> <li>• Remove reference to broad communities as part of the definition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ E.g. “Consent refers to a collective...”</li> <li>○ inclusion of health &amp; education projects</li> <li>○ broad community support vs. majority support</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><i>Due Diligence:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When there is a discrepancy between country and ADB standards, which is to be followed? Country-standards or ADB standards?</li> <li>• Needs to move from: oral to written form; definition not in glossary; methodology</li> <li>• More clarity in procedure</li> <li>• Independent advisory department which determines highly-sensitive projects</li> <li>• Highest standard should be applied</li> <li>• In terms of procedure, adopt a legitimate approach (with regards to due diligence)</li> </ul>
<p><i>Monitoring and Reporting:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process: needs to be extended beyond project period</li> <li>• Strong link between APs (representatives should be gender-positive)</li> <li>• Encourage disclosure of monitoring results</li> <li>• Look at instilling evaluative thinking on the borrowers on/from monitoring.</li> <li>• Integrate due diligence results; track results in assessing risks vs. success factors</li> <li>• Use independent third-party monitoring</li> </ul>
<p><i>Derogation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Majority agree on the deletion; not so transparent; wording is not enough; go back to former paragraph 55 &amp; 56 (existing ADB policy)</li> <li>• If the conditions of local/national conditions are similar to ADB policy, adhere to ADB policy</li> <li>• Have an approval process</li> </ul>
<p><i>Accountability mechanism:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This paragraph has 2 Parts: Project-Level Grievance (PLG) and ADB accountability</li> </ul>

- Separate into 2 paragraphs to avoid confusion
- Needs more guidance on what constitutes PLG mechanism; publish reports, etc.
- Clearer definition of PLG Mechanism for the public client

### **VIII. SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FOR DIFFERENT FINANCING MODALITIES, ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES, RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS, TRANSITION AND CONCLUSION**

19. Breakout groups worked on the question “*Are the safeguards adequately tailored to ADB’s lending modalities? Are the proposed outlines for safeguard plans and framework adequate?*” The roles and responsibilities and resource implications on Special Requirements for different financing modalities were discussed at table groups, and highlights were presented during the plenary. A complete record of the outputs (comments and recommendations) of each of the breakout groups is attached (**Attachment I**).

### **IX. STRENGTHENING AND USE OF COUNTRY SAFEGUARD SYSTEMS (CSS): APPENDIX 2. APPROACH FOR STRENGTHENING AND USE OF CSS TO ADDRESS ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARD ISSUES IN ADB OPERATIONS**

20. With regard to the strengthening and use of Country Safeguard Systems (CSS), participants were asked to submit their written comments and/or participate in the plenary discussion. **Attachment J** contains the written comments regarding the CSS. Following are the issues, questions and concerns raised by the participants during the plenary.

- (i) There should be no discrimination between the public and the private sector.
- (ii) What are the roles of the various ADB offices on safeguard policies?
- (iii) On financial return on investment, the question is who will have the final say as to who will choose the final lot price? This highlights the process issue of shared responsibility, and the assurance of implementing the safeguard policy.
- (iv) If safeguard requirements of the sectors of ADB are in conflict with the countries laws, the one with the higher standard should apply.
- (v) A participant questioned the implementation of the country safeguard system in countries where the government is oppressive, militaristic and corrupt.
- (vi) The whole issue of country system is basically about trust: on how people trust the government, how the government has trust, how the ADB trusts the local people, how the local people trust the ADB. These are all about trust. He said a sovereign nation has the right to decide what its people want; but not necessarily follow the existing ADB law or to respect the ADB law. Third party involvement is important as a development bank has the responsibility to make sure affected people do not suffer because of the use of its money.
- (vii) It is the right of the affected people to get information as early as possible regarding information disclosure. He added, ADB should require borrower/clients to proactively

deliver information to the people instead of just making information “available and accessible”. Moreover, he said, the ADB must elaborate on their policy statement to make it clearer and assure the people it is serious in improving the safeguard policy.

- (viii) Several countries do not have any particular legislation supporting or respecting the rights of IPs. He asked how the ADB would apply the country system approach on projects affecting IPs in such countries.
- (ix) A participant raised a question on the criteria for the use of CSS.
- (x) On assessments of adequacy or acceptability of the standards, if there’s a gap between the ADB standard and the country standard, the default principle should be the more stringent standard. But there are two risks in using it: one, the country may not like it, because they will consider it as a conditionality but probably civil society will see this as an opportunity to push for political will because political will; two, if a country resists, ADB may compromise its safeguard policies and use the country’s standards.
- (xi) ADB was the first to strengthen the implementation of Certificate of Ancestral Domain Titles [Philippines], particularly in the implementation of the Cordillera Highland Resource Management Project which ADB co-financed. Where country safeguards are weak, ADB must provide the necessary technical assistance to ensure these country safeguards systems will be efficiently complied with.
- (xii) Would ADB consider developing a platform for sharing of best practices / sharing of views, sharing of information?
- (xiii) Capacity building is important to implement safeguard policies. While we recognize ADB’s time and effort to conduct these consultations, ADB needs more effective partnership approaches with NGOs and other organizations.

## **X. GLOSSARY**

21. During the consultation, all terms from the Safeguard Policy Statement’s Glossary were posted together with their definitions. Over the course of the two days, participants recommended revisions to the proposed definitions and a list of additional words to consider for inclusion (**Attachment K**).

## **XI. NEXT STEPS AND CLOSING REMARKS**

22. Mr. Nessim Ahmad, Director, RSES, ADB, thanked the group for their active participation, knowledge of the SPS, and the lively discussions among stakeholders. In closing, he reminded participants of the next steps: to review the workshop reports and all formal comments received during this consultation period, and then prepare a Working Paper (W-paper) for discussion by ADB’s Board of Directors, First Quarter 2009. This paper will also be placed on ADB’s website. The final policy, or R-paper, will then be prepared based on guidance from the Board.

23. Mr. Bindu Lohani, Vice President, Finance and Administration, ADB, thanked the group for their dedication and hard work during the two days of the consultations. He promised the group ADB would seriously study the observations and recommendations put forward.