

**Webinar 4 Meeting Date and Times**

- Wednesday 31 March 5 am – Boulder, USA (David Harrison)  
Wednesday 31 March 6 am – Chicago, USA (Refaat Abdel-Malek)  
Wednesday 31 March 7 am – Washington DC & New York, USA (Daryl Fields, Donal O’Leary, Courtney Lowrance)  
Wednesday 31 March 12 noon – UK (André Abadie, Kristin Schumann, Richard Taylor), Iceland (Gudni Johanneson)  
Wednesday 31 March 1 pm – Norway (Geir Hermansen), Germany (Joerg Hartmann, Kirsten Nyman), Zambia (Israel Phiri)  
Wednesday 31 March 7 pm – China (Zhou Shichun, Yu Xuezhong)  
Wednesday 31 March 10 pm – Hobart & Melbourne, Australia (Andrew Scanlon, Michael Simon, Helen Locher)

**Webinar 4 Agenda (based on UK times)**

Connections 11:45 – 12:00

- |         |               |   |
|---------|---------------|---|
| Item 1  | 12:00 – 12:05 | Confirmation of connections, on-line meeting procedures, & agenda |
| Item 2  | 12:05 – 12:20 | General and high level issues                                     |
| Item 3  | 12:20 – 12:40 | Protocol Introduction   |
| Item 4  | 12:40 – 12:55 | Section II specific issues  |
| Item 5  | 12:55 – 13:05 | Section III specific issues                                       |
| Item 6  | 13:05 – 13:15 | Section IV specific issues  |
| Item 7  | 13:15 – 13:25 | Section I specific issues   |
| Item 8  | 13:25 – 13:30 | Educational Supplement  |
| Item 9  | 13:30 – 13:40 | Steps leading up to Forum Meeting 9                               |
| Item 10 | 13:40 – 13:55 | Follow up to Forum Meeting 9                                      |
| Item 11 | 13:55 – 14:00 | Any other issues, and closing                                     |

**AGENDA ITEM 1 – OPENING**

**Present:** Forum Members/Alternates - Refaat Abdel-Malek (IHA), David Harrison (TNC), Joerg Hartmann (WWF), Kirsten Nyman (Germany), Donal O’Leary (Transparency International), Israel Phiri (Zambia) – part meeting, Andrew Scanlon (Hydro Tasmania), Cathleen Seeger (Germany, will be attending Forum Meeting 9), Michael Simon (Oxfam) – part meeting, Richard Taylor (IHA) – part meeting.

Meeting Chair - André Abadie

Coordination Team – Helen Locher (Forum Coordinator), Kristin Schumann (IHA)

**Apologies:** Forum Members – Daryl Fields (World Bank), Geir Hermansen (Norway), Gudni Johanneson (Iceland), Courtney Lowrance (Equator Banks), Zhou Shichun (China), Yu Xuezhong (China)

The Forum members noted that a number of Forum members were absent, and others were only able to partially participate in the webinar meeting. Consequently these minutes are a record of discussions and do not represent consensus views or agreements of the Forum.

**AGENDA ITEM 2 – GENERAL AND HIGH LEVEL ISSUES**

The Forum members discussed the very fast pace of document revision that was presently being experienced, and the problems that this was posing for Forum members and their reference groups. Of particular concern was the need to track what comments were being provided on these documents, and then what was or was not being responded to in the next revision. Specifically,

the Forum members had provided comments on the Section II Outline Document 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2010, but were not sure what had or had not been responded to in the next draft Section II Expanded Outline Document 15<sup>th</sup> March 2010. Forum members noted that many comments were quite detailed in nature, and it would not be possible to track what was dealt with comment-by-comment. However it was felt that in the next revision it should be possible to note at a higher level what issues were raised on each topic and what was addressed and was not addressed, so that Forum members could see where the comments are oriented and what might need to be discussed and resolved at Forum Meeting 9.

**Webinar 4 Action 1:** *The Forum Coordinator will provide information on issues raised in the Protocol documents that will be presented at Forum Meeting 9.*

The Forum members discussed what would be considered a “consensus” document, given that the comments received on the Section II Outline Document reflect a diversity of individual and organisational viewpoints, positions and preferred approaches on different issues. Of particular focus was how does the Forum achieve closure, noting that there are considerable time pressures.

There was a general view that the Forum has moved a long way, has achieved convergence on many issues, and that it is important to keep the remaining focus on the big issues. It was posed that many of the changes we are talking about now are not substantive content changes, but rather are improving ease of use. However, one Forum member raised that some of the changes made in response to consultation and trialling issues were seen as problematic, curtailing the Forum’s momentum, and moving things into another realm; particular mention was made of Section I moving to a project focus, the shift in approach with some social topics, and with moving information on high profile issues and auditing guidance notes into an Educational Supplement that is not used in the assessment process.

No agreement or actions were decided on these differing opinions.

The Forum members noted the need to learn from the experience of the World Commission on Dams, in which closure was perhaps too rushed, and reference groups could have better been engaged in the closure process. It was raised that perhaps Forum Meeting 9 is too ambitious in trying to achieve closure on all issues, and that a 10<sup>th</sup> Forum Meeting may considerably alleviate pressure. Whilst there was a general view that this suggestion is worthy of serious consideration, the Forum members also noted that they don’t want to take too much pressure off because it is essential that the process is contained and closed. The funding implications of a 10<sup>th</sup> meeting were recognised, and outreach to donors would be required. It was felt that Forum Meeting 9 should be aiming for closure, and an additional meeting retained as a back-up strategy if it appears evident at Forum Meeting 9 that it is required.

**Webinar 4 Agreement 1:** *The Forum will aim for closure at Forum Meeting 9, but may need to consider an additional meeting if the need emerges at Forum Meeting 9.*

A further high level issue that was discussed was that IHA has been advised that it would be impossible for IHA members from a particular country to adopt the Protocol if it contained “**Transboundary Issues**” as a topic, since transboundary agreements in this country are negotiated at the national level and a project cannot presume to take a lead on this. The IHA Reference group expressed a need for guidance from the Forum on how to handle this challenge. The Forum discussed the implications of this situation, and agreed to work with the IHA on a strategy to better understand and find solutions to this issue.

**Webinar 4 Action 2:** *David Harrison to liaise with Refaat Abdel-Malek and Richard Taylor on the strategy to address concerns with the Transboundary Issues topic. Any other Forum members who can assist in this area should get in touch with these individuals.*

### **AGENDA ITEM 3 – PROTOCOL INTRODUCTION**

The Forum discussed a number of proposals that arose from the IHA Reference Group meeting in Montreal on 22-24 March 2010. These are summarised in Webinar 4 Meeting Paper 1.

Specifically, the Forum discussed 1) a new approach to topic formatting; 2) removing definitions from the topic page that are found in the glossary; 3) removing the intent statement from the topic page; 4) removing the high profile and cross-cutting issues from the topic page; and 5) moving to a 6 level scoring system.

### **1. New approach to topic formatting**

The IHA Reference Group proposed a more consolidated approach to the presentation of each topic, involving linking the scoring levels more clearly with Table 2 in the Introduction, as described in Meeting Paper 1. The Forum members generally felt comfortable with trying this approach, as long as it was clear content was not being lost. The only reservation was about not seeing the details of the 5 scores on the topic page. It was agreed for the Protocol documents for Forum Meeting 9 to use the proposed formatting approach, but with the variation that both the 3 and the 5 levels would be spelled out on the topic page. This format will then be reviewed at Forum Meeting 9.

**Webinar 4 Action 3:** *For the Protocol documents that will be presented at Forum Meeting 9, the Forum Coordinator will re-format the Protocol in the manner recommended by the IHA Reference Group, with the addition of spelling out the Level 5 scoring statements.*

### **2. Removing definitions from the topic page that are found in the glossary**

There was general support for the proposal to remove any definitions on the topic page that are found in the glossary.

**Webinar 4 Action 4:** *For the Protocol documents that will be presented at Forum Meeting 9, the Forum Coordinator will remove definitions from the topic pages that appear in the Glossary.*

### **3. Removing the intent statement from the topic page**

There was quite a bit of discussion about the suggestion to remove the intent statement from the topic page. The recommendation was made because the statements are presently confusing – some seem to link to scoring levels and some do not. If the scoring levels are more readily apparent on the topic page, the IHA Reference Group thought the intent would be clear from the scoring levels in which case the intent statement at the top of the page might be redundant. Forum members discussed the evolution of these introductory sentences on each topic page, which at varying stages including a scoping/descriptive statement, a statement of why the topic is important, and a policy statement which evolved into an intent statement. The intent statement was seen as important in the Draft Protocol to link clearly with the Effectiveness measure for that topic. The Forum members thought that for the papers to be presented at Forum Meeting 9 it would be worth keeping the intent statements on the topic page. The purpose was felt to be that they help orient the reader about the topic, and they should be reviewed to ensure they are not linked to a particular scoring level. These statements will then be reviewed at Forum Meeting 9, including whether they are retained on each topic page and/or in the summary at the front of the section.

**Webinar 4 Action 5:** *For the Protocol documents that will be presented at Forum Meeting 9, the Forum Coordinator will keep the intent statements on each topic page, but review to ensure they are helping to orient the reader and user and are not linked to a particular scoring level.*

### **4. Removing the high profile and cross-cutting issues from the topic page**

There was quite a bit of discussion about the suggestion to remove the high profile and cross-cutting issues references on the topic page. These were not present on the aspect pages in the Draft Protocol, and the IHA Reference Group was questioning what purpose they were meant to serve on the topic page given they are not informing the scoring. The Forum discussed that the original intention was to provide in the Protocol Introduction a “map” of how these issues were addressed in the Protocol, because it was not immediately obvious from topic names. Putting

them on the topic page was not necessarily intended to be a permanent feature, but was thought to be of assistance in the drafting process (much like putting the relevant content of the IHA Sustainability Guidelines on the topic pages during the re-drafting, later to be removed). One experience from the trials however was that cross-cutting issues tend to be hidden and get lost in the introduction. Some Forum members have nominated additions to the high profile and cross-cutting issues on topic pages even if they don't appear in the text on that page but may have some relevance on the topic. These appear under "Assessment Guidance", but with no explanation to the assessor and project proponent on how to use this information in the assessment and scoring process.

Options discussed by Forum members are to 1) remove the high profile and cross-cutting issues references from the topic page; 2) keep in a limited manner to identify only those that are directly cited in the topic text; or 3) include in the more expansive way that some Forum members have proposed in their comments. Because all Forum members were not able to discuss these options, they will be retained in the Forum Meeting 9 papers and this decision will be taken at Forum Meeting 9.

**Webinar 4 Agreement 2:** *For the Protocol documents that will be presented at Forum Meeting 9, the high profile and cross-cutting issues will be retained on each topic page, and a decision made at Meeting 9.*

## **5. Moving to a six level scoring system**

In Meeting Paper 1, the proposed reformatting shows a six level scoring system (0-5). This is not a proposal of the IHA Reference Group, but the large jump between scoring levels 2 and 3 was raised a number of times in the consultation and trialling on the Draft Protocol and the IHA Reference Group was asked their opinion about another scoring level. Whilst not strongly advocating six levels, the IHA Reference Group could see the merit in responding to the consultation and trialling issue and was willing to see how it might work. Forum members expressed a diversity of views, and some were strongly against it, but it was agreed that there was little harm in seeing what it looks like because it could easily be taken back to five levels. It was agreed that for the papers for Forum Meeting 9 six scoring levels should be included and a decision will be taken at this meeting.

**Webinar 4 Action 6:** *For the Protocol documents that will be presented at Forum Meeting 9, the Forum Coordinator will present the six scoring levels.*

## **AGENDA ITEMS 4-7 – HSAP SECTIONS II, III, IV AND I**

The Forum members did not have time to specifically discuss any issues relating to the sections. It was noted that although comments have been received from the IHA Reference Group and one of the Forum members on the documents distributed the week of 15<sup>th</sup> March 2010, a number of Forum members have yet to submit comments. It was agreed that comments should be submitted as soon as possible, and no later than 16<sup>th</sup> April 2010, and issues will be recorded in the Meeting 9 papers.

**Webinar 4 Action 7:** *All Forum members to provide comments as soon as possible on the Protocol documents circulated the week of the 15<sup>th</sup> of March. Comments should be submitted no later than Friday the 16<sup>th</sup> of April, and should go to the Forum Coordinator with all Forum members copied in.*

## **AGENDA ITEM 8 – EDUCATIONAL SUPPLEMENT**

There was a general view that the Preliminary Draft Educational Supplement 19<sup>th</sup> March 2010 circulated for Forum member consideration is worthy of retaining, even if it is only a first pass and does not get further developed. There were doubts about the name, with others posed for

consideration including Technical Supplement or Additional Information. The general view was that the clear priority is on the Protocol itself, but Forum members like the supplement and some felt that it is essential. It was noted that the IHA Reference Group is supportive but wants it clear that is not integral to scoring in the Protocol, and believes it could be a focus of a follow up activity to the Forum rather than part of the documents put forward for adoption and endorsement.

The Forum members welcomed the opportunity to add to this Preliminary Draft, to see if it could be further developed prior to Forum Meeting 9.

**Webinar 4 Action 8:** *All Forum members to review and add to the Preliminary Draft Educational Supplement over the next three weeks. Additions or edits to content must be received by no later than Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> April 2010, so that an update can be presented with the Forum Meeting 9 papers.*

### **AGENDA ITEM 9 – STEPS LEADING UP TO FORUM MEETING 9**

There are less than four weeks until Forum Meeting 9 papers are to be distributed. The IHA Reference Group was interested in seeing any re-drafts of the outline documents in the week of the 12<sup>th</sup> of April, so that they could provide feedback that might be considered in the drafting of the Forum Meeting 9 papers. It was noted that a driver for this IHA Reference Group interest was so that they could express confidence to the IHA Board (which meets immediately after Forum Meeting 9) on the direction of the Protocol and that it is close to something IHA might adopt.

Forum members were conscious of the workload demands implicit in this scenario, and felt it was the call of the Forum Coordinator on how much could realistically be circulated by the 12<sup>th</sup> of April. It was discussed that maybe at a minimum this could be the Introduction and Section II.

**Webinar 4 Action 9:** *The Forum Coordinator will circulate interim Protocol documents on Monday the 12<sup>th</sup> of April, utilising the updated formatting approach, so that feedback can be provided on this. At a minimum these documents would comprise the Introduction and Section II, with any additional sections welcome.*

### **AGENDA ITEM 10 – FOLLOW UP TO FORUM MEETING 9**

The Forum noted the proposed steps outlined in Meeting Paper 1, in which the IHA Reference Group has scheduled a four-day meeting to review the outcomes of Forum Meeting 9. The earlier discussions about a possible need for a 10<sup>th</sup> Forum meeting are relevant here, but there was no further discussion on this.

### **AGENDA ITEM 11 – CLOSING**

Webinar 4 closed at 2:30 pm UK time.

## **SUMMARY OF AGREEMENTS**

**Webinar 4 Agreement 1:** *The Forum will aim for closure at Forum Meeting 9, but may need to consider an additional meeting if the need emerges at Forum Meeting 9.*

**Webinar 4 Agreement 2:** *For the Protocol documents that will be presented at Forum Meeting 9, the high profile and cross-cutting issues will be retained on each topic page, and a decision made at Meeting 9.*

## **SUMMARY OF ACTIONS**

**Webinar 4 Action 1:** *The Forum Coordinator will provide information on issues raised in the Protocol documents that will be presented at Forum Meeting 9.*

**Webinar 4 Action 2:** *David Harrison to liaise with Refaat Abdel-Malek and Richard Taylor on the strategy to address concerns with the Transboundary Issues topic. Any other Forum members who can assist in this area should get in touch with these individuals.*

**Webinar 4 Action 3:** *For the Protocol documents that will be presented at Forum Meeting 9, the Forum Coordinator will re-format the Protocol in the manner recommended by the IHA Reference Group, with the addition of spelling out the Level 5 scoring statements.*

**Webinar 4 Action 4:** *For the Protocol documents that will be presented at Forum Meeting 9, the Forum Coordinator will remove definitions from the topic pages that appear in the Glossary.*

**Webinar 4 Action 5:** *For the Protocol documents that will be presented at Forum Meeting 9, the Forum Coordinator will keep the intent statements on each topic page, but review to ensure they are helping to orient the reader and user and are not linked to a particular scoring level.*

**Webinar 4 Action 6:** *For the Protocol documents that will be presented at Forum Meeting 9, the Forum Coordinator will present the six scoring levels.*

**Webinar 4 Action 7:** *All Forum members to provide comments as soon as possible on the Protocol documents circulated the week of the 15<sup>th</sup> of March. Comments should be submitted no later than Friday the 16<sup>th</sup> of April, and should go to the Forum Coordinator with all Forum members copied in.*

**Webinar 4 Action 8:** *All Forum members to review and add to the Preliminary Draft Educational Supplement over the next three weeks. Additions or edits to content must be received by no later than Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> April 2010, so that an update can be presented with the Forum Meeting 9 papers.*

**Webinar 4 Action 9:** *The Forum Coordinator will circulate interim Protocol documents on Monday the 12<sup>th</sup> of April, utilising the updated formatting approach, so that feedback can be provided on this. At a minimum these documents would comprise the Introduction and Section II, with any additional sections welcome.*