

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper addresses the issue of scoring in the Hydropower Sustainability Assessment Protocol. There are a number of questions which it explores:

1. Why are we scoring at all?
2. Why not continue with the present scoring approach used in the IHA Sustainability Assessment Protocol (2006)?
3. At what 'levels' do we assign scores, e.g. individual attributes, attribute groups, or process/performance attributes?
4. How should the aspect pages of the Protocol be formatted to reflect and make clear the scoring approach?
5. What are the scoring instructions to determine the score for the level at which it is being assigned, and for aggregating up to the aspect or the project level?

To assist the consideration of these issues for Forum members, the following sets out a range of relevant issues and ideas for each topic, identifies key questions, and based on this analysis makes proposals as to how best to address the issue.

2. RATIONALE FOR SCORING

The IHA Sustainability Assessment Protocol (2006) is an aspect-by-aspect scoring tool, scoring each aspect on a scale of zero to five based on attributes defined for each scoring level.

The graded scoring is in some ways a signature approach for the Protocol and is seen to be a source of many advantages. Advantages of the Protocol being a scoring tool have been identified as:

- Shows the gradation of practice on each issue so that projects can see where they stand, what would be expected of a top performer, and how they could move forward up the gradation of practice.
- Enables strengths and weaknesses to be clearly seen, and areas of improvement identified both for the industry to identify its work programs and objectives and targets, and for those investing in a project to see where their support might best be invested.
- Enables benchmarking, comparison of performance over time, and comparison between projects.
- Measurement is an approach that is comfortable to owners and operators.
- If in the future a certification scheme is developed, or the Protocol is used as a basis for access to finance, regulatory approval or admission to markets, scoring provides a basis for thresholds to be set appropriate to the application for which it is being used.

On the converse side, there are many high value applications of the Protocol that do not involve assigning a score. These include but are not limited to the Protocol providing a comprehensive checklist of issues to be addressed, as a basis for risk assessment and due diligence assessments, as a basis for corporate continuous improvement programs and external sustainability reporting, and as a basis for dialogue amongst all sectors over expectations and performance. Additionally, scoring may be intimidating to some

owners/operators who do not believe they would get a high score, and result in development of a tool that is only utilised by the top performers.

Key Question: Should the Protocol be tailored to more specific uses, or designed to be very broadly applied?

Proposal: To ensure that all advantages can be realised, the Forum works towards development of a scoring tool, but provides instruction on how it can be applied without scoring to obtain the additional advantages it can bring to lifting sustainability performance in the hydropower sector. More tailored uses can be developed post-2009.

3. IDENTIFIED ISSUES WITH THE PRESENT SCORING APPROACH

A number of issues have been identified with the scoring system set out in the existing Protocol. These include:

- A high degree of subjectivity. As high a degree of objectivity as possible is required, with the idea that different assessors should get the same results on the same project.
- Insufficient specificity in assigning scores. This is closely linked to the above, and can be addressed by providing greater detail in the attributes, and by providing accompanying technical guidance notes.
- Weighting of attributes and aspects. Issues set out in the existing Protocol are all given equal weight, whereas some stakeholders have communicated that they see certain issues of being of much greater importance to overall sustainability than others.
- Too high an influence of some attributes. The existing Protocol instructs that if there is a low score on any attribute, this dictates the overall score for the aspect. Consequently, for example, if there is pristine water quality (performance score of 5) but there is seen to be an average water quality monitoring program perhaps because water quality is not a big issue and does not need close attention for the project (process score of 3), the overall score for the water quality aspect will be a 3 and not a 5.
- No instruction on how to form a view on overall project sustainability. There is no instruction in the existing Protocol on how to go from determination of aspect scores to determination of an overall score for the project. The existing Protocol is an aspect assessment tool and not targeted at assigning an overall score for project sustainability. Stakeholders appear to want this ability and want some instruction on how to approach this consistently.
- Masking of areas of poor performance. In the absence of any instruction on this matter, those who are seeking an overall score have either totalled all of the aspects scores to get a total score, or taken an average of all scores. There are concerns that in doing so, projects can have a complete absence of performance on certain aspects but still come up with a reasonable overall score because of high performance on other aspects.
- Inability to scale to different types and sizes of projects. There is no instruction in the existing Protocol on how to apply the Protocol to projects of differing sizes or types.

For example, if there is no resettlement or no cultural heritage values, how is the assessment adjusted and the overall score determined?

- Uncertainty as to how to assign a score in the absence of information. The instruction in the existing Protocol is that the assessor needs to see objective evidence in order to assign a score. If there is no evidence for an aspect, does the project get a zero on that aspect?

Key Question: To what degree does the Forum want to tackle “new frontiers” in designing an improved scoring approach?

Proposal: The Forum recognises the importance of not losing the value that is seen in the present scoring approach, but commits to re-visit the present scoring approach to see if some of the issues that have been raised can be better addressed.

4. LEVELS AT WHICH SCORES ARE ASSIGNED

Scores in the IHA Sustainability Assessment Protocol (2006) are assigned at the level of **process and performance attributes**. Two columns are provided, and a score determined for the process attributes (left hand column) and the performance attributes (right hand column).

The Forum has been working on identifying the aspects that are important to include in the Protocol, and the list of process and performance attributes important for each aspect. In the Draft Hydropower Sustainability Assessment Protocol Key Components Document (January 2009), the Forum outlined an aspect description, policy objective, process and performance attributes, and examples of evidence for each aspect it proposes to include in Sections I and II of the Protocol.

An option to ensure greater detail and objectivity for the assessor would be to assign scores at the **individual attribute** level. In the Key Components Document, attributes can be very broad e.g. quality of the management planning or very specific e.g. quality of the setting of objectives and targets in the management plan. Greater specificity of attributes enables better understanding by the assessor and the assessed of the important sustainability considerations for each aspect, and reduces the room for subjectivity and variability in assessment approaches. Scoring at the individual attribute level would result in a very detailed assessment and very detailed feedback information. However greater specificity of attributes makes it more challenging to develop an approach to aggregate scores up to the aspect level.

An alternative approach could be to assign scores by **attribute type**. Individual attributes can be grouped by type of attribute, with these types replicated frequently across different attributes. This is demonstrated in the HSAF Mtg6 Paper 5 showing Section I and II Key Components with an attribute type indicated for each attribute. Two examples have been provided as attachments to this paper, using the Section I Cultural Heritage aspect (Attachment 1a) which has defined attributes very broadly, and the Section II Resettlement aspect (Attachment 1b) which has defined a larger number of more specific attributes. Proposals for these attribute groups, based on those that seem relevant in the attached examples, include:

- *Process attribute types* – Aspect Assessment, Aspect Management Plan, Consultation
- *Performance attribute types* – Stakeholder Support, Aspect-Specific Indicators, Compliance

A focus on attribute types as the level at which scores are assigned would mean fewer scores were assigned under each aspect, aggregating up from attribute type scores to an overall aspect score may not be as complicated, and more consistent guidance on the scoring gradations could be defined through guidance notes.

Key Question: Are there other approaches that could be considered that are not listed here, or other advantages/disadvantages that should be considered?

Proposal: The Forum considers the advantages of and potential for using common attribute types as the level at which scores are assigned in the Protocol.

5. FORMATTING OF THE ASPECT SHEETS

Some formatting objectives might include:

- to provide the greatest amount of specificity for the assessor and the assessed;
- to make it clear how scores are assigned in an objective manner;
- to be pleasant to look at and easy to understand; and
- to not require too much reference to external documents, but the ability to refer to further information if necessary.

The format of the sheets will be influenced by the level at which one assigns scores. Some options are provided here for consideration, utilising the Section II Cultural Heritage aspect (with a small number of generally-expressed attributes) and the Section II Resettlement aspect (with a larger number of more specific attributes) from the Key Components Document to illustrate some different approaches. It should be noted that as little change as possible was made to the key components but there is potential to present these more efficiently, and also the graded levels are assigned for illustrative purposes only.

Attachments 2a and 2b illustrate the format used in the IHA Sustainability Assessment Protocol (2006). There are some difficulties in defining the gradations between scores, and the necessity to use poorly defined words (e.g. almost, mostly, some gaps, etc). A significant problem with this format is that it becomes cumbersome if there is greater detail provided of the attributes, as shown in Attachment 2b for the Section II Resettlement aspect.

Attachments 3a and 3b illustrate an approach using scoring at the individual attribute level. There are similar difficulties as with Attachments 2a and 2b with how to succinctly define gradations for each attribute so that they provide enough information but do not bulk out the assessment sheet.

Attachments 4a and 4b illustrate the approach using attribute type scoring. This provides scoring at a higher level, and with an approach that might be more easily replicated across aspects. A decision would need to be made on what attribute type groups are used; those shown in these attachments are for illustrative purposes. There are options with format that are not presented here:

- to define in words the content for each scoring level;
- to only define particular levels (e.g. level 5 and/or level 3) and let the assessor choose the relative degree of departure from this;
- to just refer to an attribute type scoring guidance note for each attribute type; or

- a combination of these options, e.g. define what would be a five score and direct the user to an attribute type scoring guidance note to determine the score if less than 5.

Key Questions: Which of these formatting approaches should be focussed on for further development? What variations are there on these approaches, that clearly address some of the issues that have been raised (Section 3 of this paper) that should be also considered?

Proposal: The Forum focuses on the format approach proposes using attribute types (Attachments 4a and 4b), and considers the most optimal variation on this.

6. SCORING INSTRUCTIONS

6.1. Assignment of Scores

The approach used for assigning scores in the existing Protocol (Attachments 2a and 2b) is that if a column has more than one point (i.e. attribute), all criteria must be met for a score to be awarded. This is fairly simple if there are not a lot of attributes, but becomes an issue for debate if there are a large number of attributes (e.g. the Resettlement aspect) and all but one of them are met.

The approach using individual attributes as the level at which scores are assigned is completely straightforward. The only problems are in determining the method by which to aggregate these individual scores up to the aspect score (Section 6.2).

The approach using attribute types as the level at which scores are assigned has some variations as were flagged in Section 5. There is the potential to define an approach that gives the clearest instruction on assigning scores. Attribute type guidance notes would ensure consistency in approach, e.g. for assigning a level for quality of the assessment process, the management planning process, the consultative process, the level of stakeholder support, and the level of compliance. Aspect-specific guidance notes could be provided for scoring instruction on aspect-specific indicators, in the case of the examples provided, for level of protection of cultural heritage, for degree of change in living standard for directly affected stakeholders, for degree of cohesiveness of resettled communities. Alternatively, the gradations in scoring can be spelled out directly in the columns, or some variation/combination. As with the existing Protocol, if there is a list with several points included, the instruction could be that all criteria must be met for a score to be awarded.

Another important consideration in assigning scores is the range of scores. At present it is a six-point range from 0 to 5. The level of difference and significance in departure at the low end of the graded scale can be difficult to assign. There are advantages and disadvantages in having a shorter scoring range. The history of application of the Protocol has led to the conclusion that defining the levels 1-5 were helpful, but there may be a case for dropping the 0 score. However, the implications of changing the six-point spread would need to be carefully considered in terms of their influence when aggregating up to the aspect or project level score.

Key Questions: Do we continue with the approach that if there is a list with several points included, all criteria must be met for a score to be awarded? Do we continue with a six-point scoring spread (0-5)?

Proposal: The Forum continues with the approach that all criteria must be met for a score to be awarded. The Forum considers dropping the 0 score and having a score range from 1 to 5.

6.2. Aggregating up to the Aspect Level

The approach used for determining aspect scores in the existing Protocol (Attachments 2a and 2b) is that the aspect score is the lower of the process score (left hand column) and the performance score (right hand column).

If scores are assessed at the individual attribute level (Attachments 3a and 3b), there is a lot more detail on the “scoring worksheet” and the approach where the lowest attribute score dictates the overall aspect score might be overly harsh, particular for the Resettlement example where there are many detailed attributes. Alternatives are:

- Drop the lowest (and highest?) individual attribute scores – this has the problem of risking masking areas of non-performance that are considered important;
- Average the individual attribute scores – this has the problem of risking masking areas of non-performance that are considered important;
- “Weight” attributes so that some have a higher percentage influence on the overall aspect score than others. This takes a lot of detailed consideration and evaluation in setting up the assessment sheet for each aspect, and requires many value judgements that could just open up too much debate.

If scores are assessed at the attribute type level (Attachments 4a and 4b), it would not seem overly harsh for the lowest attribute type score to dictate the overall aspect score, since each attribute type would be considered of equal importance. Assignment of scores for each attribute type would be specified by the scoring instructions.

As flagged above, the implications of any change in the scoring range at which scores are assigned when scores are aggregated up to the aspect level will need to be considered.

Key Question: Do we continue with the present approach used in the Protocol of taking the lowest level score that is assigned and using this for the aspect score?

Proposal: This approach is recommended, and is seen as the main case to move from scoring at individual attribute types to attribute groups. The issue of balance and weight should be factored into the decision about developing the attribute groups, i.e. maybe level of transparency should not be its own attribute group but incorporated into quality of the consultative process. Trialling will demonstrate where refinements might be needed.

6.3. Aggregating up to the Project Level

To go from the aspect level scores to determine an overall project level score, there are a number of options, some of which are:

- Total the aspect scores and determine a percentage total score (out of 100%) based on the number of aspects. This has the risk of masking areas of non-performance that are considered important.
- Take an average score of all aspects. This has the risk of masking areas of non-performance that are considered important.
- Weight the aspects with respect to their percentage contribution to the overall score. This needs some careful thought. There is already deliberate replication amongst aspects to ensure that some important issues are addressed in multiple ways (e.g.

Biodiversity is captured within its own aspect, and will also be a consideration in the Catchment Management, Environmental Impact Assessment, and Downstream Flows aspects).

- Do not present a single number as a total score, but rather performance bands with minimum scores required for particular aspects to be considered for particular bands.
- Do not present a single number as a total score, but rather have a template summary figure such as a histogram or 'webgram' to represent the outcomes of the assessment.

Aggregating up to the project level score does have some bearing on how many aspects are included in the assessment tool. It is important to think about how an overall summary will appear, and how it highlights the areas considered most critical to the overall sustainability performance of the project rather than losing these amongst a mass of too much summary information.

An important consideration in determining an overall score or a presentation of overall results is how the scoping step works. We want to allow the assessor to undertake a project scoping step to determine how the Protocol is best applied (e.g. for small versus large projects, tributary versus mainstem river, single versus multi-purpose hydro, resettlement involved versus not involved, life cycle stage etc), and further to this how with scoping applied is the overall project score determined.

The scoping step would involve the assessor systematically determining the degree of magnitude of importance of each of the Protocol aspects to the project under assessment. This could be a simple four-grade evaluation resulting in High Importance, Medium Importance, Low Importance, Not Relevant. It would be that these ratings form the basis for weighting the importance of this aspect in the overall project score. Not Relevant would not be assessed. High Importance might have a 3-fold weighting, Medium Importance a 2-fold weighting, and Low Importance a 1-fold weighting. A formula for determination of the overall score would need to be provided. A Scoping Guidance Note would be critical for this.

If no overall score is awarded, and a standard presentation format of results is used to illustrate aspect scores, there are some options with this format that could illustrate level of importance as determined by the scoping step. For example, if a histogram or 'webgram' are used, Not Relevant aspects would not be included, and the remaining aspects could be grouped together according to their importance rating and colour coded to make the High Importance ones stand out. This is an important tool to assist in ensuring the Protocol can be widely applicable.

Key Questions: How important is it at this stage in the Forum process to determine a mechanism to award an overall project score? How important at this stage is it to define a scoping instruction?

Proposal: At this stage it is proposed not to determine an overall numeric score. The Draft Hydropower Sustainability Assessment Protocol will be trialled to assess its practicability as an assessment tool, and it would be sufficient to present the results in a histogram. It is considered important at this stage to provide a scoping instruction, and it is proposed to utilise the proposal above with colour coding the level of importance for the purposes of s for trialling.

Attachment 1a: Key Components Document information showing Attribute Types - Section II Cultural Heritage Aspect

KEY COMPONENTS DOCUMENT – SECTION II - Cultural Heritage

DESCRIPTION: This aspect addresses the level of impact and planning for protection and conservation of tangible and intangible forms cultural heritage.

This aspect is important because cultural heritage artefacts can be damaged or lost through the physical landscape changes brought about by hydropower project construction and operation, as well as through associated infrastructure impacts (e.g. new roads, transmission lines). Furthermore, non-physical cultural heritage such as traditions, festivals and rituals can also be impacted through hydropower project impacts to local communities.

POLICY OBJECTIVE: The objective is to ensure that cultural heritage is identified, recognised and conserved.

PROCESS ATTRIBUTES:

- Comprehensiveness of the identified list of cultural heritage (Attribute type: **ASPECT ASSESSMENT**)
- Quality of the cultural heritage management plans (Attribute type: **ASPECT MANAGEMENT PLAN**)
- Degree to which local knowledge and expertise is utilised in assessment and development of management plans (Attribute types: **ASPECT ASSESSMENT, ASPECT MANAGEMENT PLAN**)
- Quality of the consultative process (Attribute type: **CONSULTATION**)

PERFORMANCE ATTRIBUTES:

- Level of stakeholder support/community acceptance (Attribute type: **STAKEHOLDER SUPPORT**)
- Level of regulator support (Attribute type: **STAKEHOLDER SUPPORT**)
- Level of protection of cultural heritage (Attribute type: **ASPECT SPECIFIC INDICATOR**)

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE:

- Heritage impact statements
- Conservation plans
- Heritage plans and agreements

Attachment 1b: Key Components Document information showing Attribute Types - Section II Resettlement Aspect

Section II Aspect - Resettlement

DESCRIPTION: This aspect addresses voluntary and involuntary resettlement relating to the hydropower development.

This aspect is important because poor management of involuntary resettlement has been one of the most high profile issues creating controversy with hydropower projects, in cases resulting in disenfranchisement and negative impacts on living standard and quality of life, especially for the rural poor. It needs to be managed well.

POLICY OBJECTIVE: The objective is to ensure that project resettlement is dealt with in a fair and equitable manner, that displaced groups are at a minimum re-established at no disadvantage, and ideally that standards of living are improved for both displaced and host communities.

PROCESS ATTRIBUTES:

- Quality of the resettlement baseline survey (Attribute type: **ASPECT ASSESSMENT**)
- Quality of the options assessment (Attribute type: **ASPECT ASSESSMENT**)
- Quality, funding and management structure of resettlement plan (Attribute type: **ASPECT MANAGEMENT PLAN**)
- Quality of the monitoring, evaluation and review process (Attribute type: **ASPECT MANAGEMENT PLAN**)
- Quality of the stakeholder identification process (Attribute type: **CONSULTATION**)
- Level of disclosure of information relating to resettlement (Attribute type: **CONSULTATION**)
- Level of informed participation of affected peoples (Attribute type: **CONSULTATION**)
- Quality of the consultation and negotiation process (Attribute type: **CONSULTATION**)
- Quality of the communications and engagement planning (Attribute type: **CONSULTATION**)

PERFORMANCE ATTRIBUTES:

- Level of stakeholder / regulator support for resettlement plan (Attribute type: **STAKEHOLDER SUPPORT**)
- Degree of resettlement impact avoidance, minimisation, mitigation (Attribute type: **ASPECT SPECIFIC INDICATOR**)
- Appropriateness of timing of resettlement (Attribute type: **ASPECT SPECIFIC INDICATOR**)
- Degree of change in living standard of directly affected stakeholders (Attribute type: **ASPECT SPECIFIC INDICATOR**)
- Degree of cohesiveness of resettled communities (Attribute type: **ASPECT SPECIFIC INDICATOR**)
- Level of compliance with resettlement legislation and standards requirements (Attribute type: **COMPLIANCE**)
- Level of compliance with resettlement plan targets and commitments (Attribute type: **COMPLIANCE**)

EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE:

- Documented compensation agreements
- Resettlement plan
- Minutes from meetings

Attachment 2a: Scoring as per Existing Protocol - Section II Cultural Heritage Aspect

Section II Aspect: Cultural Heritage

DESCRIPTION: This aspect addresses the level of impact and planning for protection and conservation of tangible and intangible forms cultural heritage.

This aspect is important because cultural heritage artefacts can be damaged or lost through the physical landscape changes brought about by hydropower project construction and operation, as well as through associated infrastructure impacts (e.g. new roads, transmission lines). Furthermore, non-physical cultural heritage such as traditions, festivals and rituals can also be impacted through hydropower project impacts to local communities.

POLICY OBJECTIVE: The objective is to ensure that cultural heritage is identified, recognised and conserved.

Sustainability Scoring: Assess both columns. If a column has more than one point, all criteria must be met for a score to be awarded. The aspect score is the lower of the two column assessments.

Score	Process	Performance
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confident that all cultural heritage assets identified. • Comprehensive cultural heritage management plans. • High level of utilisation of local knowledge and expertise. • Highly consultative and participative identification and planning process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong agreement on program with regulators and other stakeholders. • Full protection of high value heritage assets.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confident that most cultural heritage assets identified. • Well developed cultural heritage management plans. • Good utilisation of local knowledge and expertise. • Good level of consultation and participation in the identification and planning process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good agreement on program with regulators and other stakeholders. • High degree of protection of high value heritage assets.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Probable that most cultural heritage assets identified. • Basic cultural heritage management plans developed. • Some utilisation of local knowledge and expertise. • Consultative process in the identification and planning process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variable level of agreement on program with regulators and other stakeholders and/or some minor opposition. • Variable degree of protection of high value heritage assets.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some but not all cultural heritage assets identified. • Cultural heritage management plans partially developed. • Low level of utilisation of local knowledge and expertise. • Low level of consultation and participation in the identification and planning process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low level of agreement on program with regulators and other stakeholders and/or significant opposition. • Low level of protection of high value heritage assets.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low level of confidence that cultural heritage assets identified. • Poorly developed cultural heritage management plans. • No utilisation of local knowledge and expertise. • No consultation or participation in the identification and planning process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited agreement on program with regulators and other stakeholders and/or major opposition. • No protection of high value heritage assets.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No confidence that cultural heritage assets identified. • Absence of cultural heritage management plans. • No utilisation of local knowledge and expertise. • No consultation or participation in the identification and planning process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No agreement on program with regulators and other stakeholders and/or major opposition. • No protection of high value heritage assets.

Section II Aspect: Resettlement

DESCRIPTION: This aspect addresses voluntary and involuntary resettlement relating to the hydropower development.

This aspect is important because poor management of involuntary resettlement has been one of the most high profile issues creating controversy with hydropower projects, in cases resulting in disenfranchisement and negative impacts on living standard and quality of life, especially for the rural poor. It needs to be managed well.

POLICY OBJECTIVE: The objective is to ensure that project resettlement is dealt with in a fair and equitable manner, that displaced groups are at a minimum re-established at no disadvantage, and ideally that standards of living are improved for both displaced and host communities.

Attachment 2b: Scoring as per Existing Protocol - Section II Resettlement Aspect

Sustainability Scoring: Assess both columns. If a column has more than one point, all criteria must be met for a score to be awarded. The aspect score is the lower of the two column assessments.

Score	Process	Performance
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully comprehensive resettlement baseline survey Fully comprehensive resettlement options assessment High quality, fully funded and appropriately structured resettlement plan High quality monitoring, evaluation and review process Fully comprehensive stakeholder identification process Full disclosure of information relating to resettlement Fully informed participation of affected peoples Fully consultative and negotiation process Fully comprehensive communications and engagement planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full stakeholder / regulator support for resettlement plan Resettlement impact fully avoided, minimised, or mitigated Timing of resettlement appropriately planned Improvement in living standard of directly affected stakeholders Cohesiveness of resettled communities fully retained Full compliance with resettlement legislation and standards requirements Full compliance with resettlement plan targets and commitments.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quite comprehensive resettlement baseline survey Quite comprehensive resettlement options assessment Well funded and structured resettlement plan Quite comprehensive monitoring, evaluation and review process Quite comprehensive stakeholder identification process Quite transparent disclosure of information relating to resettlement Well informed participation of affected peoples Highly consultative process with negotiation Quite comprehensive communications and engagement planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High level of stakeholder / regulator support for resettlement plan Resettlement impact avoided, minimised, or mitigated Timing of resettlement appropriately planned Improvement in living standard for most directly affected stakeholders Cohesiveness of resettled communities well retained Almost full compliance with resettlement legislation and standards requirements Almost full compliance with resettlement plan targets and commitments.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive resettlement baseline survey Comprehensive resettlement options assessment Funded and structured resettlement plan Comprehensive monitoring, evaluation and review process Comprehensive stakeholder identification process Transparent disclosure of information relating to resettlement Informed participation of affected peoples Consultation and negotiation process in place Communications and engagement planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Variable level of stakeholder / regulator support for resettlement plan Resettlement impact mostly avoided, minimised, or mitigated Timing of resettlement appropriately planned Living standard maintained for all directly affected stakeholders Cohesiveness of resettled communities fully retained Generally compliant with resettlement legislation and standards requirements Generally compliant with resettlement plan targets and commitments.

Attachment 2b: Scoring as per Existing Protocol - Section II Resettlement Aspect

<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good resettlement baseline survey with some gaps • Good resettlement options assessment with some gaps • Resettlement plan partially funded and structured • Good monitoring, evaluation and review process with some gaps • Good stakeholder identification process with some gaps • Good disclosure of information relating to resettlement with some gaps • Good informed participation of affected peoples but with some gaps • Some consultation and negotiation with some gaps • Some communications and engagement planning with gaps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low level of stakeholder / regulator support for resettlement plan • Resettlement impact avoided, minimised, or mitigated to some degree • Some issues with timing of resettlement • Living standard maintained for most directly affected stakeholders • Cohesiveness of resettled communities fully retained • Some gaps in compliance with resettlement legislation and standards requirements • Some gaps in compliance with resettlement plan targets and commitments.
<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited resettlement baseline survey • Limited resettlement options assessment • Resettlement plan poorly funded and structured • Limited monitoring, evaluation and review process • Limited stakeholder identification process • Limited disclosure of information relating to resettlement • Limited informed participation of affected peoples • Limited consultation and negotiation process • Limited communications and engagement planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited stakeholder / regulator support for resettlement plan • Limited avoidance, minimisation or mitigation of resettlement impact • Many issues with timing of resettlement • Living standard of directly affected stakeholders not maintained • Cohesiveness of resettled communities fully retained • Significant gaps in compliance with resettlement legislation and standards requirements • Significant gaps in compliance with resettlement plan targets and commitments.
<p style="text-align: center;">0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No resettlement baseline survey • No resettlement options assessment • Resettlement plan not funded or structured • No monitoring, evaluation and review process • No stakeholder identification process • No disclosure of information relating to resettlement • No informed participation of affected peoples • No consultation and negotiation process • No communications and engagement planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No stakeholder / regulator support for resettlement plan • Resettlement impact not avoided, minimised, or mitigated • Many issues with timing of resettlement • Living standard of directly affected stakeholders diminished • Cohesiveness of resettled communities not retained • No compliance with resettlement legislation and standards requirements • No compliance with resettlement plan targets and commitments.

Attachment 3a: Individual Attribute Scoring - Section II Cultural Heritage Aspect

Section II Aspect: CULTURAL HERITAGE

DESCRIPTION: This aspect addresses the level of impact and planning for protection and conservation of tangible and intangible forms cultural heritage.

This aspect is important because cultural heritage artefacts can be damaged or lost through the physical landscape changes brought about by hydropower project construction and operation, as well as through associated infrastructure impacts (e.g. new roads, transmission lines). Furthermore, non-physical cultural heritage such as traditions, festivals and rituals can also be impacted through hydropower project impacts to local communities.

POLICY OBJECTIVE: The objective is to ensure that cultural heritage is identified, recognised and conserved.

Auditor's Comment on Relevance of this Aspect to Project being Assessed:

<i>Process Attributes</i>	5	4	3	2	1	0
Comprehensiveness of the identified list of cultural heritage	Confident that all identified	Confident that most identified	Probable that most identified	Some but not all identified	Low confidence that assets identified	No confidence that assets identified
Quality of the cultural heritage management plans	Comprehensive	Well-developed	Basic plans developed	Partially developed	Poorly developed	Not developed
Degree to which local knowledge and expertise is utilised in assessment and development of management plans	High level of utilisation	Good utilisation	Some utilisation	Low utilisation	No utilisation	No utilisation
Quality of the consultative process	High degree of consultation and participation	Good degree of consultation and participation	Consultative process followed	Low level of consultation or participation	No consultation or participation	No consultation or participation
<i>Performance Attributes</i>	5	4	3	2	1	0
Level of stakeholder support/community acceptance	Strong support	Good support	Variable level of support	Low level of support	Limited support	No support
Level of regulator support	Strong support	Good support	Variable level of support	Low level of support	Limited support	No support
Level of protection of cultural heritage	Fully protected	Highly protected	Variable level of protection	Low level of protection	No protection	No protection

Attachment 3b: Individual Attribute Scoring - Section II Resettlement Aspect

Section II Aspect: RESETTLEMENT

DESCRIPTION: This aspect addresses voluntary and involuntary resettlement relating to the hydropower development.

This aspect is important because poor management of involuntary resettlement has been one of the most high profile issues creating controversy with hydropower projects, in cases resulting in disenfranchisement and negative impacts on living standard and quality of life, especially for the rural poor. It needs to be managed well.

POLICY OBJECTIVE: The objective is to ensure that project resettlement is dealt with in a fair and equitable manner, that displaced groups are at a minimum re-established at no disadvantage, and ideally that standards of living are improved for both displaced and host communities.

Auditor's Comment on Relevance of this Aspect to Project being Assessed:

<i>Process Attributes</i>	5	4	3	2	1	0
Quality of the resettlement baseline survey	Fully comprehensive	Quite comprehensive	Comprehensive	Good but with some gaps	Limited	No survey conducted
Quality of the options assessment	Fully comprehensive	Quite comprehensive	Comprehensive	Good but with some gaps	Limited	No options assessment conducted
Quality, funding and management structure of resettlement plan	Fully funded and structured	Well funded and structured	Funded and structured	Partially funded and structured	Poorly funded and structured	Not funded or structured
Quality of the monitoring, evaluation and review process	Fully comprehensive	Quite comprehensive	Comprehensive	Good but with some gaps	Limited	No monitoring, evaluation or review
Quality of the stakeholder identification process	Fully comprehensive	Quite comprehensive	Comprehensive	Good but with some gaps	Limited	Not undertaken
Level of disclosure of information relating to resettlement	Fully transparent	Quite transparent	Transparent	Good but with some gaps	Limited disclosure	No disclosure
Level of informed participation of affected peoples	Fully informed participation	Well informed participation	Informed participation	Good but with some gaps	Limited information and participation	No information or participation

Attachment 3b: Individual Attribute Scoring - Section II Resettlement Aspect

Quality of the consultation and negotiation process	Fully consultative with negotiation	Highly consultative with negotiation	Consultative with negotiation	Some consultation and negotiation with gaps	Limited consultation and negotiation	No consultation or negotiation
Quality of the communications and engagement planning	Fully comprehensive	Quite comprehensive	Comprehensive	Some	Limited	None
<i>Performance Attributes</i>	5	4	3	2	1	0
Level of stakeholder / regulator support for resettlement plan	Strong support	Good support	Variable level of support	Low level of support	Limited support	No support
Degree of resettlement impact avoidance, minimisation, mitigation	Fully avoided, minimised or mitigated	High level of avoidance, minimisation or mitigation	Mostly avoided, minimised or mitigated	Some avoidance, minimisation or mitigation	Limited avoidance, minimisation or mitigation	Impact not avoided, minimised or mitigated
Appropriateness of timing of resettlement	Fully appropriate	Almost fully appropriate	Appropriate	Some issues with timing	Many issues with timing	Timing a major issue
Degree of change in living standard of directly affected stakeholders	Living standards improved for all	Living standards improved for most	Living standards maintained for all	Living standards maintained for most	Living standards not maintained	Living standards diminished
Degree of cohesiveness of resettled communities	Cohesiveness fully retained	Cohesiveness well retained	Cohesiveness generally retained	Cohesiveness mostly retained with some gaps	Cohesiveness not maintained	Cohesiveness not maintained
Level of compliance with resettlement legislation and standards requirements	Fully met (or likely to be)	Almost fully met (or likely to be)	Generally met (or likely to be)	Some gaps	Significant gaps	Does not meet
Level of compliance with resettlement plan targets and commitments	Fully met (or likely to be)	Almost fully met (or likely to be)	Generally met (or likely to be)	Some gaps	Significant gaps	Does not meet

Attachment 4a: Attribute Type Scoring - Section II Cultural Heritage Aspect

Section II Aspect: CULTURAL HERITAGE

DESCRIPTION: This aspect addresses the level of impact and planning for protection and conservation of tangible and intangible forms cultural heritage.

This aspect is important because cultural heritage artefacts can be damaged or lost through the physical landscape changes brought about by hydropower project construction and operation, as well as through associated infrastructure impacts (e.g. new roads, transmission lines). Furthermore, non-physical cultural heritage such as traditions, festivals and rituals can also be impacted through hydropower project impacts to local communities.

POLICY OBJECTIVE: The objective is to ensure that cultural heritage is identified, recognised and conserved.

Auditor’s Comment on Relevance of this Aspect to Project being Assessed:

<i>Process Attributes</i>	5	4	3	2	1	0
Quality of the cultural heritage assessment process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All cultural heritage items have been accounted for - Value of cultural heritage items has been assessed - Full geographic area under consideration assessed - Local knowledge extensively utilised - Appropriate expertise fully utilised 					
Quality of the cultural heritage management plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Full geographic scope - Fully addresses relevant international, national and regional standards, legislation, policies and plans - Objectives and targets set - Resources scoped and allocated - Monitoring and evaluation included 					
Quality of the consultative process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholders appropriately identified - Rights and risks of stakeholders identified - Stakeholders fully included - Fully transparent process - Process allows for negotiation - Materials available in appropriate languages and forms - Support provided to ensure all can participate fairly 					

Attachment 4a: Attribute Type Scoring - Section II Cultural Heritage Aspect

<i>Performance Attributes</i>	5	4	3	2	1	0
Level of stakeholder support/community acceptance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholders fully supportive of the cultural heritage assessment process - Full community acceptance of the cultural heritage management plan 					
Level of regulator support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regulator fully supportive of the cultural heritage assessment process - Full regulator acceptance of the cultural heritage management plan 					
Level of protection of cultural heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All cultural heritage items are protected in accordance with the objectives and targets set out in the management plan 					

Attachment 4b: Attribute Type Scoring - Section II Resettlement Aspect

Section II Aspect: RESETTLEMENT

DESCRIPTION: This aspect addresses voluntary and involuntary resettlement relating to the hydropower development.

This aspect is important because poor management of involuntary resettlement has been one of the most high profile issues creating controversy with hydropower projects, in cases resulting in disenfranchisement and negative impacts on living standard and quality of life, especially for the rural poor. It needs to be managed well.

POLICY OBJECTIVE: The objective is to ensure that project resettlement is dealt with in a fair and equitable manner, that displaced groups are at a minimum re-established at no disadvantage, and ideally that standards of living are improved for both displaced and host communities.

Auditor’s Comment on Relevance of this Aspect to Project being Assessed:

<i>Process Attributes</i>	5	4	3	2	1	0
Quality of the resettlement assessment process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fully comprehensive resettlement baseline survey - Rights and risks of all stakeholders assessed - All options fully considered - Appropriate expertise fully utilised - Local knowledge and input fully utilised 					
Quality of the resettlement management plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate expertise fully utilised - Local knowledge and input fully utilised - Fully addresses relevant international, national and regional standards, legislation, policies and plans - Objectives and targets set - Resources scoped and allocated - Monitoring and evaluation included - Grievance, complaints and dispute resolution mechanisms - Review process 					
Quality of the consultative process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comprehensive stakeholder identification process - Full disclosure of information relating to resettlement - Fully informed participation of all affected peoples - Fully consultative process - Process of negotiation allowed for - Communications and engagement well planned 					

Attachment 4b: Attribute Type Scoring - Section II Resettlement Aspect

<i>Performance Attributes</i>	5	4	3	2	1	0
Level of support for resettlement plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholders fully supportive of the resettlement assessment process - Full stakeholder acceptance of the resettlement management plan - Regulator fully supportive of the resettlement assessment process - Full regulator acceptance of the resettlement management plan 					
Level of resettlement performance indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resettlement impact fully avoided, minimised or mitigated. - Timing of resettlement appropriately planned. - Living standards of all directly affected stakeholders improved - Cohesiveness of resettled communities fully retained 					
Level of compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Full compliance with relevant international requirements - Full compliance with relevant national requirements - Full compliance with relevant standards - Full compliance with relevant regional policies and plans - Fully meets, or likelihood of fully meeting, objectives and targets in the resettlement management plan 					