

Forum Meeting 7 commenced at 10:30 am on Thursday 18 June 09 and closed at 17:00 on Sunday 21 June 09. Not all agenda items were addressed in the order presented in the meeting agenda, and some agenda items were partially covered one day and completed the next. To avoid any confusion, these minutes record the meeting by agenda item in the order presented in the meeting agenda.

Agenda Item 1 – Opening

Present: Forum Members - Refaat Abdel-Malek (IHA), Marcelo Battisti (Equator Banks), David Harrison (TNC), Joerg Hartmann (WWF), Gudni Johannesson (Iceland), Kirsten Nyman (Germany), Donal O’Leary (Transparency International), Israel Phiri (Zambia), Andrew Scanlon (Hydro Tasmania), Michael Simon (Oxfam), David Wright (Norway), Yu Xuezhong (China)
Meeting Chair - André Abadie
Coordination Team – Helen Locher (Forum Coordinator), Michael Fink (IHA)

Apologies: Forum Members – Daryl Fields (World Bank), Zhou Shichun (China)

The Forum members reviewed and agreed on the meeting agenda provided as Meeting Paper 1. The highest meeting priorities were to review and make agreements on the content of the Draft Hydropower Sustainability Assessment Protocol; and to agree on forward work plan (trailing, consultation Phase 2, consultant input, meetings 8 and 9).

Agenda Item 2 – Actions from Previous Meeting

The minutes from Meeting 6 were provided as Meeting Paper 2a but were not discussed, as they had already been accepted as final by agreement of Forum members out of session.

The status of actions from previous Forum meetings, summarised in Meeting Paper 2b, was reviewed. A number of the actions were self-explanatory from the status report or were on the Meeting 7 agenda so were not discussed at this point. The following actions were listed as “in train” or for a verbal report, and received discussion in this meeting:

T4 – “The Forum Coordinator will ensure follow up with UNEP to better understand the assistance they are offering the Forum”. The action arose as a recommendation from the Phase 1 Consultation Outcomes Report. The Forum Coordinator reported that she had several email exchanges and a long phone call with Thomas Chiramba and UNEP, and there is good alignment between programmes, particularly on the consultation side. This was further considered later in the meeting under Agenda Item 12, planning for Phase 2 Consultation.

T5 – “The Forum Coordinator will ensure a meeting is set up with the Equator Banks and the International Finance Corporation to better understand the relationship and the potential issues and opportunities between the Protocol and the IFC Performance Standards, and to learn from IFC about how they have designed their standards to be applicable on a global scale”. Marcelo Battisti advised that the Equator Banks Forum representatives had a meeting with IFC about the Protocol at their annual meeting in Washington DC in May 2009, followed up by a teleconference with Alex Indorff from IFC, who is responsible for the IFC Performance Standards. The different approaches between the Protocol and the IFC Performance Standards were discussed. It was noted that Alex Indorff would be at the IHA Congress in Reykjavik, and there would be the opportunity for Forum members and the Coordinator to further discuss these issues with him.

Mtg 7 Action 1: *The Forum Coordinator will ensure follow up with the IFC to continue to build an understanding of commonalities between the Protocol and the IFC Performance Standards.*

T6 – “The Forum Coordinator will liaise with the Equator Banks to see if they can provide recommendations to the Forum on how the Key Components Document could incorporate the

IFC Performance Standards”. Marcelo Battisti advised that the Protocol is generally covering all of the same issues as the IFC Performance Standards and that there are no outstanding gaps that need to be addressed.

T7 – “The Forum Coordinator will ensure that the Forum receives input from appropriate sources on how to ensure relevance of the Protocol to small and medium sized hydropower”. The Forum Coordinator advised that she had written to the European Small Hydropower Association (ESHA), CELAPEH in Columbia, and the International Network on Small Hydropower in China asking for their review and advice on the Key Components Document and how it relates or could better relate to small hydropower. ESHA responded with advice on which aspects were and were not relevant, and which were relevant if scaled back, and this was circulated to Forum members. The Forum Coordinator reported that this advice was taken into account when drafting the Protocol content. CELAPEH had offered to assist with arranging trials of the Draft Protocol on small hydropower projects in South America as well as consultation, which was discussed under Agenda Items 11 (Trialling) and 12 (Phase 2 Consultation).

T15 – “The Forum members will draft the Section I content trying to address the specific issues raised in the consultation, and reconsider when looking at this draft whether it adequately addresses the concerns raised”. The Forum Coordinator advised that this was an open action to be considered under Agenda Item 8, when the Forum members reviewed the proposed Section I content for the Draft Protocol.

T21 – “The Forum Coordinator to investigate the cost and timing requirements and the in-kind support opportunities around getting documents translated for the Phase 2 Consultation, with particular focus on Spanish, Portuguese, French and Mandarin Chinese”. The Forum Coordinator advised that several IHA members had previously provided translation of the IHA Sustainability Guidelines (2004) and IHA Sustainability Assessment Protocol (2006) into these languages, and the plan was to follow up in person with these members during the IHA Congress in Reykjavik to see if they could provide this service for the Draft Protocol.

Mtg 7 Action 2: *The Forum Coordinator will ensure follow up with IHA members about translations of the Draft Protocol into Spanish, Portuguese, French and Mandarin Chinese.*

T22 – “Gudni Johanneson to develop a strategy to ensure good government engagement in the Phase 2 Consultation, and to liaise with the Forum Coordinator on the implementation”. Gudni Johanneson advised that the strategy was to get the World Energy Council (WEC) to write to national energy ministers requesting their engagement with the Forum process, particularly during the Phase 2 Consultation and trialling. Efforts to liaise with the WEC between Forum meetings 6 and 7 were not fruitful because the WEC had a change in Secretary-General during this time. The new WEC Secretary-General, Christoph Frei, would be in Reykjavik at the IHA Congress and Gudni Johanneson advised that he had a meeting set up at which this issue could be directly discussed. Alternative strategies to engage governments were only briefly mentioned by the Forum members: Ideas included going through the World Bank, through the IHA membership in the various countries, through IRENA, and through UNEP.

Mtg 7 Agreement 1: *The primary strategy for engagement with governments at this point in time will be through the World Energy Council.*

Mtg 7 Action 3: *Gudni Johanneson will take the lead on discussions with WEC about contacting all national energy ministers about the Draft Protocol and their engagement in the consultation and trialling process.*

Mtg 7 Action 4: *The Forum Coordinator will ensure delivery on the strategy to engage governments during Consultation Phase 2, either through the WEC approach or alternative approaches if necessary.*

Agenda Item 3 – Review of Activities Post Mtg 6 – the Protocol Drafting Process

The purpose of this agenda item was for all Forum members to catch up and express their views on the process of developing the Draft Protocol content between Forum Meetings 6 and 7.

At Forum Meeting 6, several workshops were proposed to be held during this time to provide input into the drafting process. These included 3 workshops with thematic specialists sponsored by and held at the World Bank in April 2009, and a drafting workshop in London in mid-May 2009 for Forum members and alternates who were able to travel. There was some concerns about these workshops, particularly in relation to Forum members not being available to attend these, and decisions being made on Draft Protocol content outside of Forum meetings based on engagements with non-Forum members. Some Forum members were able to attend some workshops, and the Forum Coordinator tried as far as possible to keep Forum members abreast of developments in draft content, but it was recognised that this was a source of some anxiety.

A significant issue that arose during this period was that the template for aspects agreed at Forum Meeting 6 proved very difficult to work with, and it was a process of trial and error before an alternative and more workable template was developed. There were also efforts, as agreed by the Forum, to simplify, streamline and ensure consistency of approach with Protocol content during the drafting process, which resulted in some changes to aspect names and some merging of aspects. This was very difficult for Forum members and reference groups who were trying to follow and have input into the drafting process, as things changed often and quickly. The Forum Coordinator spoke to two papers, Meeting Paper 3a Evolution of the Protocol and Meeting Paper 3b Evolution of Aspects, to talk through the templates that were developed during this period, the issues with them, and the variations that then arose. The risk of reference group burn-out during this process was discussed.

It was recognised that the period between Forum meetings 6 and 7 was a unique and highly challenging period of the Forum process, and once the Draft Protocol was publicly released in July 2009 the content would remain static until the Final Protocol was released in early 2010.

Agenda Item 4 – Review of Draft Protocol Introduction

Forum members reviewed Mtg7 Paper 4 Draft Protocol Introduction in plenary. Discussion points included:

- the way in which attribute guidance notes are introduced and explained;
- how the introduction section could be cut back;
- how cross-cutting issues are presented;
- translation of scores into quality statements like “basic good practice” = 3, which imply acceptability;
- overlap in timing between Sections (e.g. several turbines commissioned while construction still proceeding);
- use of adjectives such as excellent, very good, good, poor, very poor, and the need for consistency and clear definitions; and
- aspect names and groupings.

The following agreements and actions in relation to the content of the Introduction arose from this review.

Mtg 7 Agreement 2: *For the Draft Protocol the aspects provided in the Meeting 7 papers will be used, subject to some minor naming clarifications; there will be no further merging or splitting of aspects at this point in time.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 3: *Average attribute scores were agreed to be not very meaningful from a sustainability perspective, and the performance attribute Level of Effectiveness perhaps most significant.*

Mtg 7 Action 5: *In Meeting 7 Paper 4 Figure 6, the Forum Coordinator will change the asterisks to indicate the score for the Level of Effectiveness attribute rather than the average attribute score.*

Mtg 7 Action 6: *The Forum Coordinator will replace Meeting 7 Paper 4 Table 6 with the table providing definitions for each of the 5 scores (5 – Excellent; 4 – Very Good; 3 – Good; 2 – Poor; 1 – Very Poor) that is provided as Attachment 1 to the Forum Meeting 7 minutes.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 4: *The Introduction will make it clear that the Protocol is intended to be regularly updated.*

Agenda Item 5 – Review of Draft Protocol Section II Content

Forum members reviewed Mtg7 Paper5 Draft Protocol Section II content both in plenary focussing on over-arching issues, and in small groups looking at each aspect and making recommendations back to the plenary. Areas of focus included:

- the aspect relevance guide;
- simplification of aspect scoring;
- considerations relevant to project context and scale;
- considerations about the scoring gradations relevant to developed and developing country contexts;
- phrasing around an attribute being not relevant versus generally not relevant;
- a document on a “rights-based” approach and what that means;
- ensuring appropriate references in relevant aspects (e.g. river basins) to situations where the developer is in control, where it can influence, and where it has no influence;
- how particular issues are addressed in the Section II draft content including communications, human rights, project-affected community, stakeholder support, free prior and informed consent, indigenous peoples, resettlement, benefit sharing, landscaping, site architecture, environmental flows, and river basins; and
- where the document would benefit from more auditing guidance notes (with a particular focus on communications, gender and human rights).

The following agreements and actions in relation to the content of Section II arose from this review.

Mtg 7 Agreement 5: *The Aspect Relevance Guides will make clear the process for which an aspect is determined not relevant. This will be on a project-by-project basis. The auditee will make a case for an aspect to be not relevant and present evidence to support this. The auditor will review the evidence and draw a conclusion, documenting the evidence cited, the quality of the evidence, and the basis for this conclusion. The Aspect Relevance Guide will not be presented as a table, but rather as examples.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 6: *Within the aspects there are many dot points, and in cases there are redundancies and opportunities to simplify. It was agreed that these redundancies will be removed in the cases where it is clearly evident.*

Mtg 7 Action 7: *The Forum Coordinator will remove obvious redundancies in the aspect scoring.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 7: *Under the Quality of the Assessment Process attribute, expressions beginning “Understanding of...” will be replaced with “Quality of the process leading to an understanding of...”.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 8: All attribute references to “Not relevant” will be replaced with “Generally not relevant”. Instructions will be provided in the Protocol Introduction for the auditor to go to the Auditing Guidance Note for that attribute if it is determined that the attribute is relevant.

Mtg 7 Agreement 9: The following definitions will be used in the Protocol in relation to stakeholders, communities, and project-affected area:

- **Stakeholder:** One who is interested in, involved in or affected by the hydropower project and associated activities.
- **Stakeholder Group:** A group of stakeholders with common characteristics or interests.
- **Directly Affected Stakeholder:** Those stakeholders with substantial rights, risks and responsibilities in relation to the issue.
- **Project Affected Communities:** The interacting populations of various kinds of individuals living in the region that are directly affected by the hydropower project preparation, implementation and/or operation. These may be within the catchment, reservoir area, downstream, or in the periphery where project-associated activities occur.
- **Community Groups:** Groups of people with common characteristics or interests living together within the larger society. There are many different ways to view these groups, and these will need to be defined in meaningful ways for the project. These may include, by way of example, urban dwellers, rural dwellers, indigenous peoples, ethnic minorities, people of a common profession or religion, disabled, elderly, illiterate, women, men, children, etc.
- **Project-Affected Area:** The catchment, reservoir, and downstream of the project site and associated dams; the area affected by any associated infrastructure developments (e.g. roads, transmissions lines, quarries, construction villages, etc); and any area to which project affected people might be relocated.

Mtg 7 Action 8: Joerg Hartmann will provide a diagram for the Protocol Introduction to help clarify definitions relating to stakeholders and communities.

Mtg 7 Agreement 10: Wording capturing the intent of “free, prior and informed” will be found in relation to Quality of the Consultation Process attribute. The word “consent” is seen as a performance attribute, and will be found in a score of 5 for the Stakeholder Support attribute in the Indigenous Peoples and the Resettlement aspects. Consent will be defined as “Signed agreements with community leaders or representative bodies who have been authorised by the affected communities which they represent, through an independent and self-determined decision-making process undertaken with sufficient time and in accordance with cultural traditions, customs and practices”.

Mtg 7 Action 9: Forum members will endeavour to collect and circulate examples both within and outside of the hydropower sector where consent of indigenous peoples or where consent of affected peoples on the resettlement plan has been achieved for a project.

Mtg 7 Agreement 11: References in the Draft Protocol to external agreements or standards will be provided in full with the reference source and date.

Mtg 7 Agreement 12: In addition to significant issues addressed in other meeting agreements, it was broadly agreed to utilise the Section II approach, format and content for the Draft Protocol provided in the Meeting 7 Paper 5, subject to minor edits brought to the attention of the Forum Coordinator by the Forum Meeting 7 Section II small working groups.

Agenda Item 6 – Protocol Overview Analyses

This agenda item was focused on three separate considerations:

1. The analysis of the Draft Protocol content provided in the meeting 7 papers with the World Commission on Dams strategic priorities, provided in Mtg7 Paper 6 WCD Content Analysis;

2. How cross-cutting issues are addressed in the Draft Protocol content; and
3. Protocol information notes that are envisaged to be in an Appendix.

Mtg 7 Agreement 13: *The analysis of the relationship between the Draft Protocol content and the World Commission on Dams Strategic Priorities will be presented in the same two-column format as Mtg7 Paper 6, updated to reflect outcomes of Forum Meeting 7. This analysis will not be within the Protocol documents, but will be provided on the Forum website at the same time as release of the Draft Protocol.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 14: *The importance of the cross-cutting issues was fully recognised, but little further work will be done on these for the Draft Protocol. At this point in time, cross-cutting issues will be addressed as presently in the Meeting 7 papers, with the addition of better guidance notes for gender, communications and human rights.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 15: *An Appendix will not be included with the Draft or the Final Protocol, given difficulties in managing the process of Appendix development alongside managing trialling, consultation and final agreements on the core Protocol content. An Appendix is envisaged to be part of a follow-on stage.*

Agenda Item 7 – Section III and IV content

Forum members reviewed Mtg7 Papers 7a and 7b, Draft Protocol Section III and IV content, in small groups looking at each aspect and then making recommendations on any significant issues back to the plenary.

Mtg 7 Agreement 16: *It was agreed to utilise the Section III and IV approach, format and content for the Draft Protocol provided in the Meeting 7 Papers 7a and 7b, subject to the same changes agreed for the Section II content, and minor edits brought to the attention of the Forum Coordinator by the Forum Meeting 7 Sections III and IV small working groups.*

Agenda Item 8 – Review of Draft Protocol Section I Content

Forum members reviewed Mtg7 Paper 8, Draft Protocol Section I content, in small groups looking at each aspect and then making recommendations on any significant issues back to the plenary.

Main points of note with the draft Section I content were that there were four new aspects that were identified as relevant to developers (Technical Issues & Risks, Social Issues & Risks, Environmental Issues & Risks, and Economic & Financial Issues & Risks), and that distinctions were made for some of the attribute bullet points in the other five aspects between their relevance to governments versus developers. The Forum Coordinator advised that these amendments were made in the effort to address concerns raised during Consultation Phase 1 about relevance of Section I to developers.

Mtg 7 Agreement 17: *It was agreed to utilise the Section I approach, format and content for the Draft Protocol provided in the Meeting 7 Paper 8, subject to minor edits brought to the attention of the Forum Coordinator by the Forum Meeting 7 Section I small working group.*

Agenda Item 9 – Consolidation of Changes for Draft Protocol

Mtg 7 Agreement 18: *The Draft Protocol will be four separate documents, one for each section of the Protocol, with the same introduction section and with no appendix.*

Agenda Item 10 – Forward Work Plan

Forum members reviewed the forward work plan provided in Paper 10a Forum Work Plan, and the budget status provided in Paper 10b Forum Budget Overview. Forum members noted that

** Note that agreements reached at a meeting may be revisited and updated at a later meeting based on further information, discussion and analysis.*

there is sufficient funding available to hold Forum Meeting 8, to fund the Forum Coordinator until the end of December 2009, and for limited trialling and consultation. Forum members expressed appreciation for the US\$20,000 funding pledge from the World Bank, and for Michael Fink's extensive efforts in the fund-raising efforts.

Mtg 7 Action 10: *Forum members will continue to seek funding to support trialling, consultation, and the final two Forum meetings.*

Forum members discussed that Forum Meeting 8 would be a very intensive working meeting, and the venue should be one that is conducive to collaborative work and that presents no financial or logistical challenges for the Forum. The possibility was discussed of holding Forum Meeting 9 in New Delhi, India in March 2010 at the 3rd International Renewable Energy Conference.

Agenda Item 11 – Trialling

The Forum members reviewed the expressions of interest that had been received since circulation of the "Draft Protocol Trialling – Call for Expressions of Interest" document in mid-May 2009 (provided as Meeting 7 Paper 11).

At the time of Forum Meeting 7, interest in projects for trialling had been received for projects in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Ghana, India, Columbia, Australia. Further potential candidates for trialling were identified during the Forum meeting in Brazil, Chile, Bhutan, Kazakhstan, China, South Africa, Zambia, Egypt and Russia.

Mtg 7 Action 11: *All Forum members will pursue and encourage potential projects to participate in trialling, either as formal Forum assessments or as self-assessments.*

Mtg 7 Action 12: *The Forum Coordinator will keep an up-to-date list of projects for trialling on the Forum members' internal website.*

Agenda Item 12 – Consultation Phase 2 & Forum Communications

The Forum members reviewed potential activities that had been identified for Consultation Phase 2, in response to circulation of the Consultation Phase 2 Planning Document in mid-May 2009 (provided as Meeting 7 Paper 12), and raised a number of further options in the meeting including workshops, seminars, organizational meetings, conference events, and journal articles.

Mtg 7 Agreement 19: *GTZ will fund a consultation consultant to manage the consultation process, thereby ensuring a level of independence, and freeing the Forum Coordinator to be more directly involved in consultation and trialling activities. The consultation consultant will manage the internet survey process, undertake telephone consultations, manage and ensure delivery on regional workshops, and develop and deliver the consultation outcomes report by mid-November 2009.*

Mtg 7 Action 13: *The Forum Coordinator, Michael Fink and Kirsten Nyman will develop Terms of Reference for a consultation consultant, get quotes, and make a decision on appointment.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 20: *The Forum will aim to hold three regional meetings during Consultation Phase 2, in Africa, Latin America and southeast Asia.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 21: *The Forum will utilise the consultation Phase 2 questions proposed in Forum Meeting 7 Paper 12, modified to reflect that there will not be information notes in an Appendix.*

Mtg 7 Action 14: *The Forum Coordinator will submit an abstract about the Forum process, authored by all Forum members, in the journal Water Alternatives for its WCD+10*

edition, and draft and deliver this article based on review and input from all Forum members.

Agenda Item 13 – Analysis of Implementation Options

The Forum members discussed Meeting Paper 13, Implementation Options for the Hydropower Sustainability Assessment Protocol, undertaken by Stratos Ltd. Forum members found the analysis to be very useful to discussions about forward pathways. There was a strong interest amongst Forum members in defining a next stage that would move the Protocol process forward towards an international sector standard.

Agenda Item 14 – Process Review

Mtg 7 Action 15: *The Forum Coordinator will provide in the July 2009 Forum Status Report a summary of progress on identified performance indicators and major risks, for the review of Forum members. The draft July 2009 Forum Status Report will be circulated to Forum members before end July 2009.*

Agenda Item 15 – Wrap-up

Mtg 7 Action 16: *The Forum Coordinator will incorporate all outcomes of Forum Meeting 7 into the four Draft Protocol documents, and make public by no later than 13 July 2009.*

Mtg 7 Action 17: *The Forum Coordinator will develop a schedule of Forum member availability during the trialling and consultation period, and ability to travel to regions.*

The Forum meeting closed at 17:00 on 21 June 09. The next meeting of the Hydropower Sustainability Assessment Forum is Forum Meeting 8, 7-10 Dec 2009, location to be advised.

HSAF Meeting 7 Summary of Agreements

Mtg 7 Agreement 1: *The primary strategy for engagement with governments at this point in time will be through the World Energy Council.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 2: *For the Draft Protocol the aspects provided in the Meeting 7 papers will be used, subject to some minor naming clarifications; there will be no further merging or splitting of aspects at this point in time.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 3: *Average attribute scores were agreed to be not very meaningful from a sustainability perspective, and the performance attribute Level of Effectiveness perhaps most significant.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 4: *The Introduction will make it clear that the Protocol is intended to be regularly updated.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 5: *The Aspect Relevance Guides will make clear the process for which an aspect is determined not relevant. This will be on a project-by-project basis. The auditee will make a case for an aspect to be not relevant and present evidence to support this. The auditor will review the evidence and draw a conclusion, documenting the evidence cited, the quality of the evidence, and the basis for this conclusion. The Aspect Relevance Guide will not be presented as a table, but rather as examples.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 6: *Within the aspects there are many dot points, and in cases there are redundancies and opportunities to simplify. It was agreed that these redundancies will be removed in the cases where it is clearly evident.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 7: *Under the Quality of the Assessment Process attribute, expressions beginning “Understanding of...” will be replaced with “Quality of the process leading to an understanding of...”.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 8: *All attribute references to “Not relevant” will be replaced with “Generally not relevant”. Instructions will be provided in the Protocol Introduction for the auditor to go to the Auditing Guidance Note for that attribute if it is determined that the attribute is relevant.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 9: *The following definitions will be used in the Protocol in relation to stakeholders, communities, and project-affected area:*

- **Stakeholder:** *One who is interested in, involved in or affected by the hydropower project and associated activities.*
- **Stakeholder Group:** *A group of stakeholders with common characteristics or interests.*
- **Directly Affected Stakeholder:** *Those stakeholders with substantial rights, risks and responsibilities in relation to the issue.*
- **Project Affected Communities:** *The interacting populations of various kinds of individuals living in the region that are directly affected by the hydropower project preparation, implementation and/or operation. These may be within the catchment, reservoir area, downstream, or in the periphery where project-associated activities occur.*
- **Community Groups:** *Groups of people with common characteristics or interests living together within the larger society. There are many different ways to view these groups, and these will need to be defined in meaningful ways for the project. These may include, by way of example, urban dwellers, rural dwellers, indigenous peoples, ethnic minorities, people of a common profession or religion, disabled, elderly, illiterate, women, men, children, etc.*
- **Project-Affected Area:** *The catchment, reservoir, and downstream of the project site and associated dams; the area affected by any associated infrastructure developments (e.g. roads, transmissions lines, quarries, construction villages, etc); and any area to which project affected people might be relocated.*

Mtg 7 Agreement 10: *Wording capturing the intent of “free, prior and informed” will be found in relation to Quality of the Consultation Process attribute. The word “consent” is seen as a*

performance attribute, and will be found in a score of 5 for the Stakeholder Support attribute in the Indigenous Peoples and the Resettlement aspects. Consent will be defined as “Signed agreements with community leaders or representative bodies who have been authorised by the affected communities which they represent, through an independent and self-determined decision-making process undertaken with sufficient time and in accordance with cultural traditions, customs and practices”.

- Mtg 7 Agreement 11:** References in the Draft Protocol to external agreements or standards will be provided in full with the reference source and date.
- Mtg 7 Agreement 12:** In addition to significant issues addressed in other meeting agreements, it was broadly agreed to utilise the Section II approach, format and content provided in the Meeting 7 Paper 5, subject to minor edits brought to the attention of the Forum Coordinator by the Forum Meeting 7 Section II small working groups.
- Mtg 7 Agreement 13:** The analysis of the relationship between the Draft Protocol content and the World Commission on Dams Strategic Priorities will be presented in the same two-column format as Mtg7 Paper 6, updated to reflect outcomes of Forum Meeting 7. This analysis will not be within the Protocol documents, but will be provided on the Forum website at the same time as release of the Draft Protocol.
- Mtg 7 Agreement 14:** The importance of the cross-cutting issues was fully recognised, but little further work will be done on these for the Draft Protocol. At this point in time, cross-cutting issues will be addressed as presently in the Meeting 7 papers, with the addition of better guidance notes for gender, communications and human rights.
- Mtg 7 Agreement 15:** An Appendix will not be included with the Draft or the Final Protocol, given difficulties in managing the process of Appendix development alongside managing trialling, consultation and final agreements on the core Protocol content. An Appendix is envisaged to be part of a follow-on stage.
- Mtg 7 Agreement 16:** It was agreed to utilise the Section III and IV approach, format and content for the Draft Protocol provided in the Meeting 7 Papers 7a and 7b, subject to the same changes agreed for the Section II content, and minor edits brought to the attention of the Forum Coordinator by the Forum Meeting 7 Sections III and IV small working groups.
- Mtg 7 Agreement 17:** It was agreed to utilise the Section I approach, format and content for the Draft Protocol provided in the Meeting 7 Paper 8, subject to minor edits brought to the attention of the Forum Coordinator by the Forum Meeting 7 Section I small working group.
- Mtg 7 Agreement 18:** The Draft Protocol will be four separate documents, one for each section of the Protocol, with the same introduction section and with no appendix.
- Mtg 7 Agreement 19:** GTZ will fund a consultation consultant to manage the consultation process, thereby ensuring a level of independence, and freeing the Forum Coordinator to be more directly involved in consultation and trialling activities. The consultation consultant will manage the internet survey process, undertake telephone consultations, manage and ensure delivery on regional workshops, and develop and deliver the consultation outcomes report by end November 2009.
- Mtg 7 Agreement 20:** The Forum will aim to hold three regional meetings during Consultation Phase 2, in Africa, Latin America and southeast Asia.
- Mtg 7 Agreement 21:** The Forum will utilise the consultation Phase 2 questions proposed in Forum Meeting 7 Paper 12, modified to reflect that there will not be information notes in an Appendix.

HSAF Meeting 7 Summary of Actions

- Mtg 7 Action 1:** *The Forum Coordinator will ensure follow up with the IFC to continue to build an understanding of commonalities between the Protocol and the IFC Performance Standards.*
- Mtg 7 Action 2:** *The Forum Coordinator will ensure follow up with IHA members about translations of the Draft Protocol into Spanish, Portuguese, French and Mandarin Chinese.*
- Mtg 7 Action 3:** *Gudni Johannesson will take the lead on discussions with WEC about contacting all national energy ministers about the Draft Protocol and their engagement in the consultation and trialling process.*
- Mtg 7 Action 4:** *The Forum Coordinator will ensure delivery on the strategy to engage governments during Consultation Phase 2, either through the WEC approach or alternative approaches if necessary.*
- Mtg 7 Action 5:** *In Meeting 7 Paper 4 Figure 6, the Forum Coordinator will change the asterisks to indicate the score for the Level of Effectiveness attribute rather than the average attribute score.*
- Mtg 7 Action 6:** *The Forum Coordinator will replace Meeting 7 Paper 4 Table 6 with the table providing definitions for each of the 5 scores (5 – Excellent; 4 – Very Good; 3 – Good; 2 – Poor; 1 – Very Poor) that is provided as Attachment 1 to the Forum Meeting 7 minutes.*
- Mtg 7 Action 7:** *The Forum Coordinator will remove obvious redundancies in the aspect scoring.*
- Mtg 7 Action 8:** *Joerg Hartmann will provide a diagram for the Protocol Introduction to help clarify definitions relating to stakeholders and communities.*
- Mtg 7 Action 9:** *Forum members will endeavour to collect and circulate examples both within and outside of the hydropower sector where consent of indigenous peoples or where consent of affected peoples on the resettlement plan has been achieved for a project.*
- Mtg 7 Action 10:** *Forum members will continue to seek funding to support trialling, consultation, and the final two Forum meetings.*
- Mtg 7 Action 11:** *All Forum members will pursue and encourage potential projects to participate in trialling, either as formal Forum assessments or as self-assessments.*
- Mtg 7 Action 12:** *The Forum Coordinator will keep an up-to-date list of projects for trialling on the Forum members' internal website.*
- Mtg 7 Action 13:** *The Forum Coordinator, Michael Fink and Kirsten Nyman will develop Terms of Reference for a consultation consultant, get quotes, and make a decision on appointment.*
- Mtg 7 Action 14:** *The Forum Coordinator will submit an abstract about the Forum process, authored by all Forum members, in the journal Water Alternatives for its WCD+10 edition, and draft and deliver this article based on review and input from all Forum members.*
- Mtg 7 Action 15:** *The Forum Coordinator will provide in the July 2009 Forum Status Report a summary of progress on identified performance indicators and major risks, for the review of Forum members. The draft July 2009 Forum Status Report will be circulated to Forum members before end July 2009.*
- Mtg 7 Action 16:** *The Forum Coordinator will incorporate all outcomes of Forum Meeting 7 into the four Draft Protocol documents, and make public by no later than 13 July 2009.*
- Mtg 7 Action 17:** *The Forum Coordinator will develop a schedule of Forum member availability during the trialling and consultation period, and ability to travel to regions.*

** Note that agreements reached at a meeting may be revisited and updated at a later meeting based on further information, discussion and analysis.*

ATTACHMENT 1 – DEFINITIONS OF PROTOCOL SCORING GRADATIONS

SCORE	DEFINITIONS	CHARACTERISTICS THAT MAY BE EVIDENT
<p>5 Excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate, and effective assessment, management and consultation processes with no gaps. • Processes are closely monitored, frequently reviewed, and promptly improved as issues arise, and where necessary includes an iterative process. • Frequent and two-way engagement with stakeholders, and stakeholder involvement in decision-making. • Support of nearly all directly affected stakeholder groups. • No non-compliances or non-conformances. • Avoidance or comprehensive mitigation of negative impacts, and enhanced outcomes. • Contribution to addressing issues beyond those impacts caused by the developer / owner / operator. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pro-active and adaptive management, • Regional view / perspective, • Contributes to internal and external capacity building, • Long term funding for managing all key aspects, • Very high level of integration, • Leverages opportunities, • Meaningful stakeholder engagement and involvement in decision making process, • Independent or third-party verification or review, • Comprehensive disclosure of information.
<p>4 Very Good</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate, and effective assessment, management and consultation processes with very few non-critical gaps. • Processes are regularly reviewed, and improved as necessary. • Regular and two-way engagement with stakeholders. • Support of a large majority of directly affected stakeholder groups, and/or only very low opposition. • Very few minor non-compliances and non-conformances that can be readily remedied. • Avoidance or mitigation of negative impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Somewhat pro-active and adaptive management, • Capacity building but limited to project, • Long-term funding for managing most key aspects, • High level of integration, • Meaningful stakeholder engagement, • Use of external expertise where needed, • Only minor gaps in disclosure of information.
<p>3 Good</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate, and effective assessment, management and consultation processes with a number of non-critical gaps in components. • Processes are periodically reviewed and improved. • Regular engagement with stakeholders, often one-way (for project to inform). • Support of a majority of directly affected stakeholder groups, and/or low opposition. • A number of minor non-compliances and non-conformances that can be readily remedied. • Minimisation and management of negative impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reactive, but appropriate management with presence of corrective action process • Project-focused view / perspective, • Relies on project to manage all aspects, • Sufficient funding for the year, • Includes key components required of an assessment, • Manages key risks, • Some stakeholder engagement, • Some use of external expertise, • Meets key recommended instances needed for disclosure of information.
<p>2 Poor</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of critical gaps in assessment, management and consultation processes resulting in these processes being less than suitable, adequate and effective. • Critical gaps in the review and improvement of processes. • Some engagement with stakeholders • Low support amongst directly affected stakeholder groups, and/or a majority oppose. • Major non-compliances and non-conformances. • Deterioration in baseline condition with some delay or difficulties in addressing negative impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reactive, corrective action sometimes insufficient, • Project-focused perspective with gaps on social and environmental issues, • Limited funding, • Gaps in assessments, • Gaps in risk management, • Poor stakeholder engagement, • Limited use of external expertise, • Limited disclosure of information.
<p>1 Very Poor</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large number of critical gaps in assessment, management and consultation processes. • No review or improvement of processes. • No engagement with stakeholders. • Very low support amongst directly affected stakeholder groups, and/or a large majority oppose. • Major and persistent non-compliances and non-conformances. • Significant and potentially long-term deterioration in baseline condition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor management not reacting to problems / concerning developments, • Narrow perspective on technical aspects and physical infrastructure, • Insufficient funding, • Incomplete, superficial assessments, • Key risks insufficiently managed, • Absence of stakeholder engagement, • No use of external expertise, • No disclosure of information.

* Note that agreements reached at a meeting may be revisited and updated at a later meeting based on further information, discussion and analysis.