

**** These are not official minutes of the IHA Reference Group meeting. These are notes from the Sustainability Forum Coordinator to the Forum, and they have been cross-checked with the minute takers at the IHA Reference Group meeting to ensure that there are no inconsistencies.*

The IHA Reference Group met for 3 days in Montreal, 22-24 March 2010. There were 24 participants from companies in North and South America, Europe, Asia and Australia. The focus of the meeting was review of revisions of the Draft Protocol circulated the week of the 15th of March – Section II Expanded Outline Document (which included the Protocol Introduction); outline documents for Sections I, III and IV; and a preliminary draft Educational Supplement.

A very significant problem for IHA is that one of its members has advised that it would be impossible for them to adopt the Protocol if it contained “**Transboundary Issues**” as a topic, since transboundary agreements are negotiated at the national level and a project cannot presume to take a lead on this. The IHA Reference group has expressed a need for guidance from the Forum on how to handle this challenge.

The following summarises some of the main recommendations of the IHA Reference Group back to the Forum.

Introduction:

A few additions and wording refinements were recommended, particularly in the first section on Protocol users and purpose. These were to bring closer to the front of the Introduction the idea that scoring is scaled around basic good practice as a central score, and that there are multiple players with responsibilities influencing project sustainability. One of the ideas was to introduce early the idea that the assessment produces a “Sustainability Profile” for a project.

Table 1 was not found to be necessarily helpful but possibly a source of confusion. An alternative approach could be to have a figure that shows the essential building blocks (economic/financial, social, environmental, technical, integrated), and then a matrix indicating the topics for each section.

The IHA Reference Group discussed **High Profile and Cross-Cutting Issues**. They felt that these had served a purpose in the drafting process, but questioned what on-going purpose they are serving. Because they are not critical to guidance on assigning a score, the IHA Reference Group did not feel that they needed to be on the topic page. The IHA Reference Group supported including a table or section of the Introduction identifying where and how in the Protocol Sections that these high profile and cross-cutting issues are incorporated, and more information on these issues in any future Educational Supplement.

Many recommendations arose out of discussions around Section II content, and ways that the content could be presented to **improve ease of use**. If the Forum supports this recommended approach, then the Introduction will need to be re-drafted to reflect this.

Particular questions that were being raised, and that the recommendations were seeking to address, included:

- What was the relationship of Table 2 to the Protocol topic scoring instructions, particularly with respect to the 1, 2 and 4 scores? It was noted that both the table and topic page scoring instructions referred to gaps, which was the source of some confusion. On the topic page these gaps refer to the components of the scoring statements for 3 or 5, whereas in Table 2 these gaps refer to something else.
- Was it necessary to have such long sentence strings with multiple clauses in the 3 and 5 scores and so much repetition of phrases throughout the Protocol?
- How would the scores be presented at the end of the assessment – all topics and all criteria, or was there some sort of aggregation of criteria scores into topic scores, and if so what was the basis for this?

The core elements of the proposal from the IHA Reference Group is to (1) not break topics down into criteria in the sense that they are used in the present documents, but instead consolidate the Level 3 statements (presently under different criteria) into a set of bullet points under that topic; and (2) have Table 2 be the core guide to the Protocol assessment and scoring. On the topic page it would be only necessary to identify the basic good practice scores – Level 3 – as this set of bullet points, and if they are labelled with the appropriate column header from Table 2 then the assessor could go to Table 2 to see how to scale up or down to get the other scores. Where there are particular milestones for a Level 5 that are not clear in Table 2, these would be provided as “In addition” statements on the topic page (for example consent for the resettlement plan under Stakeholder Support).

An example of the proposal is found in the attachments. Using the example of Topic II-19 Public Health, on page 7 is the content from the Section II Expanded Outline Document 15 March 2010, and on page 9 is the proposed adjustment.

An advantage of this approach is that there is clearly one score for each topic. All of the bullet points under a Level 3 score would need to be met for a score of 3 to be assigned.

To utilise this approach, the Forum will need to be highly confident in **Table 2**. The IHA Reference Group spent some time revisiting Table 2, and made some proposals for refinements to accommodate this more central role that it would play. On page 10 is the Table 2 found in the Section II Expanded Outline Document 15 March 2010, and on page 11 is the proposal from the IHA Reference Group. It is anticipated that further refinements may need to be made to Table 2 as this approach is tested on different topics.

A further proposal arising from the IHA Reference Group is to consider having **6 levels of scoring** in the Protocol. This would be to acknowledge and address the large gap between the 2 and 3 scores that was called to the Forum’s attention many times in the trialling and consultation on the Draft Protocol. The proposed revision for Table 2 on page 11 shows six scoring levels.

The IHA Reference Group discussed that better guidance could be given on the case where scores could not be assigned, and instead the topic would be designated as either **Not Relevant** or **Not Assessed**. Not assessed was considered to be appropriate where objective evidence was unable to

be produced in the Protocol assessment process either due to an interviewee not being available or access to the evidence not provided at the time.

The IHA Reference Group discussed the text in the Introduction about **Objective Evidence**. It was felt that there was not enough emphasis on documentary evidence as being of highest value. The concern was to avoid the Protocol becoming used as an opinion polling mechanism by over-reliance on interviews.

The IHA Reference Group discussed the broadened listing of **potential interviewees** for each topic. It was recommended to include in the Introduction a message that would make it clear that the Protocol assessment process is not an opinion poll of a variety of stakeholders, but rather the proponent and the assessor agree on the stakeholders who will have the most insights into assessment and ensure its credibility.

The IHA Reference Group discussed the text in the Introduction that referred to an **Educational Supplement**, but did not have time to review and discuss the draft Educational Supplement included in the Protocol documents circulated the week of the 15th of March. It was suggested that this name might need to be revisited. The IHA Reference Group raised questions about process of development, review and closure for the Educational Supplement, and about the relationship and level of dependency of the supplement with the Sections. The IHA Reference Group supported the text in the Introduction that the Protocol scoring is not tied to the Educational Supplement, and that all information required for an assessment is found in the core Protocol documents (Introduction plus Sections). The general feeling was that there is not enough time to produce the Educational Supplement alongside the Sections, and this would be a good candidate for follow up activities.

The IHA Reference Group felt that the **glossary** of terms needed to have a high level of prominence in the Protocol, and that definitions that are found in the glossary do not need to be on the topic page. A careful review of the glossary was felt to be required, and some definitions were identified as being a bit unusual (e.g. those for “maximised” and “minimised”).

The IHA Reference Group recommended that the **Introduction be a stand-alone document**, and that the scoring table and glossary are included with each Protocol Section.

The IHA Reference Group discussed the need for **definitions of Basic Good Practice for Assessment, Management and Stakeholder Engagement** to be in the Protocol Introduction and provided with the scoring table and glossary for each section. It was expected that these would be derived from the previous guidance notes that were in the Draft Protocol Introduction, which had now been moved to the Educational Supplement. For example, it would state that a management plan should include objectives and target dates, allocation of responsibilities and resources, monitoring, review and reporting, etc. It was not felt that this was necessary for other columns in Table 2, but just these essential process considerations.

The IHA Reference Group felt that the **statements of intent** at the top of each Topic were a bit confusing as to whether they are linked to a scoring level – in some cases they seem to be and in other cases not. It was felt that they had served a purpose in the Protocol development process but may no longer be required. A suggestion was to remove them from the Topic pages (the set of Level

3 bullet points would clearly identify intent, particularly the statement about Outcomes), but in the summary to the Section to include in the consolidated list of topics a statement of intent for each that is tied to the Level 3 scores.

Section 2: The IHA Reference Group mostly focussed on Section II, but only on a selection of topics. Some of the points raised, many of which extend to other topics, include:

II-1 Communications & Consultation. “Grievance mechanism” was felt to not exactly capture what was sought here, which is some mechanism to invite, hear and respond to stakeholder issues (which may or may not be grievances). It was questioned what project ever maps stakeholders based on “rights”; mapping on risks and responsibilities was felt to be much more practical and realistic. “Needs” in this topic should be made clear it is communications and consultation needs.

II-3 Siting & Design. Discussion that for many projects there are not options around the siting, and this needs to be reflected in the topic text. With references to stakeholder engagement, the IHA Reference Group would like this worded or some guidance provided that ensures this is interpreted reasonably; i.e. they cannot be talking interactively to everyone in the world who identifies themselves as a stakeholder at every point in their project development process. In the first assessment guidance note, it was proposed to replace “minimise the area flooded per unit of energy (GWh) produced” with “avoid exceptional greenhouse gas emissions”.

II-4 Hydrological Resource. References to review by an independent expert were often felt not to be necessary for a 5, as the project may have utilised the most competent expertise available to undertake the work. It was recommended that the Expertise column be removed from Table 2 and only included in the Protocol if it is considered essential to a topic.

II-10 Transboundary Rivers. Recommended to rename back to its previous name Transboundary Issues. It was identified that inclusion of this topic presents a major problem for one of the IHA members.

II-14 Project Affected Communities. References to “sustained livelihoods” could be better described something along the lines of saying “help to rebuild livelihoods and living standards that may be impacted by the project”. References to respecting human rights are still difficult to accept as inclusions in scoring statements in the Protocol with no guidance on how these are assessed.

II-19 Public Health. Discussion of use of references to standards, which is done for the Public Health, Cultural Heritage and Labour and Working Conditions topics. It was felt that there are no obvious and recognisable public health or cultural heritage standards, but there are for Labour and Working Conditions and it might make sense to limit such a reference only to that topic. Also discussion of references to “management systems”; the scoring table should paint a picture of an increasingly systematic approach to management as you move up the scoring gradation, and it was felt only the Environmental & Social Issues topic should refer to a formal management system (ISO 14001 certification) as a 5.

II-20 Project Catchment and Lands Management. Recommend using the singular for Land. Need to define or better word “based on a consultative process” in this and other topics.

Section 3: The main focus of interest was how much of the project preparation content should be carried into this section, however there was not enough time for the IHA Reference Group to talk about this section properly.

Section 4: There was not enough time for the IHA Reference Group to talk about this section properly. It was generally felt that the present version is much more workable than the previous version. It was recommended to include more content on outcomes (e.g. water quality consistent with national standards), however with the text worded so that it recognised and did not penalise situations where an adverse situation (e.g. poor water quality) was not caused by and was beyond the control of the project. Considerable attention was paid to topic relevance, with guidance requested on how to address varying circumstances that might be encountered. There is a need for much more dedicated discussion about this section.

Section 1: Some members of the IHA Reference Group had significant concerns about having such a section in the Protocol. Concerns were to test whether it is going to result in inhibiting projects proceeding in developing countries with poor institutional capacities, and that despite the wording in the text there would be an expectation for companies to make such assessments public. It was noted that unlike the other 3 sections this section was not assessing sustainability of a project, but rather the activities of the proponent. It was noted that the scoring followed a different logic that assessed the activities of the proponent, and consequently Table 2 would not provide a guide. A recommendation was to take away the scoring but follow a similar presentational approach to the other Sections. This could be achieved by only presenting the set of bullet points for basic good practice, and then a few sentences on what further measures a proponent could undertake to go beyond basic good practice. The recommended approach would have assessment guidance notes and definitions still included.

Review up to Forum Meeting 9: The IHA Reference Group appreciates that these are a number of changes that it is proposing to the Forum. It hopes that the Forum at Webinar 4 can understand that this is an important process step for IHA to more fully understand and “own” the Protocol (and hence be more likely to apply it widely). If the Forum is welcoming of these suggestions, the IHA Reference Group would appreciate the opportunity to see and be able to discuss a re-formulation of the Protocol documents before they are presented as meeting papers at Forum Meeting 9.

The most opportune time to do this appears to be the week of April 12th. If the Protocol Introduction and 4 sections can be circulated during this week as ready, the IHA Reference Group could aim to provide written comments by Monday 19th April and then discuss by teleconference on Tuesday 20th April.

Post-Forum Meeting 9: One of the biggest messages from the IHA Reference Group back to the Forum was that they are generally very positive about the direction the Protocol is going, and can see the pathway towards closure and adoption by IHA. However, it is very important to IHA to have time built into the Forum closure process to ensure that IHA members fully understand what is in the Protocol and are able to talk amongst themselves about good and best practice on these topics. A proposed scenario that would enable this was discussed and is described here. This is working on the assumption that IHA adoption is essential, as this is the organisation that will own the Protocol and

widely promote application within its membership. Adoption by IHA requires a Special Resolution to be passed by the Board, and then a period of 8 weeks for IHA members to indicate any objections. If more than 50% of members object, the resolution does not pass. The IHA Board will not want to put forward any Special Resolution that it feels may not be passed, and so will be strongly guided by the recommendations of the IHA Reference Group.

- 26th April 2010 – Draft1 Final Protocol is circulated to the Forum members (and on to Reference Groups) as the meeting papers for Forum Meeting 9. This Draft1 Final is discussed by the Forum members during Forum Meeting 9, and any proposed edits are incorporated into a Draft2 Final. There is a possibility that Draft2 Final can be agreed within the Forum meeting itself, in which case it can be circulated right away.
- 3rd to 6th May 2010 – Forum Meeting 9. Draft minutes of Forum Meeting 9 will be circulated to the meeting participants by 14th May 2010.
- 21st May 2010 – Target date for Draft2 Final to be agreed by the Forum members as reflecting the outputs of their discussions at Forum Meeting 9, and circulated to reference groups.
- 12th – 15th June 2010 – 4-day meeting of the IHA Reference Group to review the Draft2 Final. If any changes are proposed, these would be provided as a Draft3 Final, ideally agreed within the IHA Reference Group meeting itself. The outcome of the review may be no recommended changes, and recommendation to the IHA Board that the Special Resolution for adoption of the Protocol by IHA members be initiated based on the Draft2 Final.
- Week 21st June 2010 (or soon after) – If necessary, Forum Webinar 5 to discuss Draft3 Final. The outcome of this webinar would be the Forum recommendation on the Final Protocol, which would then be put to IHA members to consider adoption.
- Forum members would be considering their endorsement of the Final Protocol alongside IHA's Special Resolution. It is hoped that by or soon after September 2010, a Final Protocol that is adopted and widely endorsed by Forum members can be launched.

II-19: Public Health (Section II Expanded Outline Document 15/3/10)

This aspect addresses public health risks and opportunities associated with the hydropower project. The intent is that public health risks are avoided, and enhancement opportunities are identified and implemented where practicable.

II-19.1 Public Health Assessment and Planning

1 - No elements of basic good practice have been undertaken or are evident, or there are many critical gaps in the requirements for basic good practice, or there are issues of very poor quality in the efforts that have been made.

2 - A number of elements of basic good practice have been undertaken, but there are one or more critical gaps, or issues of poor quality.

3 – In consultation with local health officials and project affected communities, public health risks, issues and opportunities have been assessed including public health system capacities, access to health services, and use of and access to traditional medicines; the assessment has considered health needs, issues and risks for different community groups including gender and ethnicity; and public health management measures have been incorporated into plans to minimise and manage negative public health impacts arising from the project.

4 - All elements of basic good practice have been undertaken and in one or more cases exceeded, but there are one or more gaps in the requirements for proven best practice.

5 – In addition, a highly collaborative approach with the affected communities has been taken to the public health assessment and planning; the assessment has been comprehensive; and plans avoid or comprehensively mitigate negative public health impacts, contribute to addressing issues beyond those impacts caused by the project, are embedded in a management system that is independently reviewed, and are publicly available in a timely and easily accessible manner.

II-19.2 Likely Public Health Outcomes

1 - No elements of basic good practice have been undertaken or are evident, or there are many critical gaps in the requirements for basic good practice, or there are issues of very poor quality in the efforts that have been made.

2 - A number of elements of basic good practice have been undertaken, but there are one or more critical gaps, or issues of poor quality.

3 – The project is likely to minimise and manage negative impacts on public health, and the level of protection represented by the public health management plan is consistent with national standards.

4 - All elements of basic good practice have been undertaken and in one or more cases exceeded, but there are one or more gaps in the requirements for proven best practice.

5 – The project is highly likely to avoid or comprehensively mitigate negative impacts, contribute to addressing public health issues beyond those impacts caused by the project; and the level of protection represented by the public health management plan is consistent with international standards.

Assessment Guidance:

Topic relevance: This topic will always be relevant, because even in a region with no individuals or communities living in the project affected area, there will be residents in the area due to the new project and issues, risks and opportunities should be identified and planned for

Public health risks examples include: disease introduced by construction workforce (e.g. HIV, Aids); vector borne diseases (e.g. malaria, schistosomiasis); communicable and non-communicable diseases, malnutrition, psychological disorders, social well-being; loss or contamination of traditional resources; mercury or heavy metal bio-accumulation; etc.

Public health opportunities examples include: improved access to electricity, clean water and sanitation; development or upgrading of public health facilities; provision of equipment, training, health education, immunisations, etc.

Public health management measures examples include: measures to reduce mosquito-borne disease risks; storing of medical supplies and immunisations; educational, awareness and disease prevention training; water quality testing; etc.

Potential interviewees: project social issues manager, independent public health expert, representative from government health department, project affected community representatives

Examples of evidence: public health issues and opportunities assessment; public health management plans; national and international standards

High profile & cross-cutting issues: communication, gender, transparency

II-19: Public Health (Proposal from IHA Ref Grp 24/3/10)

This aspect addresses public health risks and opportunities associated with the hydropower project.

0 - No relevant elements of basic good practice have been undertaken or are evident, or there are many critical gaps in the requirements for basic good practice, or there are issues of very poor quality in the efforts that have been made.

1 - A number of relevant elements of basic good practice have been undertaken, but there are several critical gaps, or issues of poor quality.

2 - A number of relevant elements of basic good practice have been undertaken, but there is a critical gap.

3 – Assessment: Public health risks, issues and opportunities have been assessed including public health system capacities and access to health services; and the assessment has considered health needs, issues and risks for different community groups.

- **Management:** Measures have been incorporated into long-term plans that guide project implementation and operation.

- **Stakeholder Engagement:** Assessment and planning has been undertaken in consultation with health officials and project affected communities.

- **Outcomes:** Plans minimise and mitigate negative public health impacts.

4 - All relevant elements of basic good practice have been undertaken and in one or more cases exceeded, but there are one or more gaps in the requirements for proven best practice.

5 - All relevant elements of proven best practice have been undertaken.

Assessment Guidance:

Topic relevance: This topic will always be relevant, because even in a region with no individuals or communities living in the project affected area, there will be residents in the area due to the new project and issues, risks and opportunities should be identified and planned for

Public health risks examples include: disease introduced by construction workforce (e.g. HIV, Aids); vector borne diseases (e.g. malaria, schistosomiasis); communicable and non-communicable diseases, malnutrition, psychological disorders, social well-being; loss or contamination of traditional resources; mercury or heavy metal bio-accumulation; etc.

Public health opportunities examples include: improved access to electricity, clean water and sanitation; development or upgrading of public health facilities; provision of equipment, training, health education, immunisations, etc.

Health needs, issues and risks for different community groups would be with respect to, for example: gender, age, ethnicity, use of and access to traditional medicines, etc.

Public health management measures examples include: measures to reduce mosquito-borne disease risks; storing of medical supplies and immunisations; educational, awareness and disease prevention training; water quality testing; etc.

Potential interviewees: project social issues manager, independent public health expert, representative from government health department, project affected community representatives

Examples of evidence: public health issues and opportunities assessment; public health management plans; any relevant legislation, policies or standards

Table 2 - Scoring Levels and Indications of Characteristics (From Section II Expanded Outline Document 15 March 2010)

Level	Assessments	Management Processes	Stakeholder Engagement	Stakeholder Support	Outcomes	Compliance	Disclosure	Expertise
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate and effective assessment processes with no gaps; • Regional view / perspective; • Very high level of integration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate and effective management processes with no gaps; • Pro-active and adaptive management; • Processes are closely monitored, frequently reviewed, and promptly improved as issues arise, and where necessary includes an iterative process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate and effective management processes with no gaps; • Frequent and two-way engagement with stakeholders; • In cases stakeholder involvement in decision-making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support of nearly all directly affected stakeholder groups; • In cases formal agreements or consent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoidance or comprehensive mitigation of negative impacts, and enhanced outcomes; • Contribution to addressing issues beyond those impacts caused by the developer / owner / operator; • Leverages opportunities; • Contributes to internal and external capacity building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No non-compliances or non-conformances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive disclosure of information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent or third-party verification or review
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate and effective assessment processes with very few non-critical gaps; • High level of integration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate and effective management processes with very few non-critical gaps; • Somewhat pro-active and adaptive management; • Processes are regularly reviewed, and improved as necessary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate and effective consultation processes with very few non-critical gaps; • Regular and two-way engagement with stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support of a large majority of directly affected stakeholder groups, and/or only very low opposition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoidance or mitigation of negative impacts; • Capacity building but limited to project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very few minor non-compliances and non-conformances that can be readily remedied 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only minor gaps in disclosure of information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of external expertise where needed
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate, and effective assessment, management and consultation processes with a number of non-critical gaps; • Includes key components required of an assessment; • Project-focused view / perspective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate, and effective management processes with a number of non-critical gaps; • Reactive, but appropriate management with presence of corrective action process; • Processes are periodically reviewed and improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate, and effective consultation processes with a number of non-critical gaps; • Regular engagement with stakeholders, often two-way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support of a majority of directly affected stakeholder groups, and/or low opposition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimisation and management of negative impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of minor non-compliances and non-conformances that can be readily remedied 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets key recommended instances needed for disclosure of information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some use of external expertise
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of critical gaps in assessment processes resulting in these processes being less than suitable, adequate and effective; • Project-focused perspective with gaps on social and environmental issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of critical gaps in management processes resulting in these processes being less than suitable, adequate and effective; • Reactive, corrective action sometimes insufficient; • Critical gaps in the review and improvement of processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of critical gaps in consultation processes resulting in these processes being less than suitable, adequate and effective; • Some engagement with stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low support amongst directly affected stakeholder groups, and/or a majority oppose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deterioration in baseline condition with some delay or difficulties in addressing negative impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major non-compliances and non-conformances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited disclosure of information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited use of external expertise
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large number of critical gaps in assessment processes; • Narrow perspective on technical aspects and physical infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large number of critical gaps in management processes; • Poor management not reacting to problems / concerning developments; • No review or improvement of processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large number of critical gaps in consultation processes; • No engagement with stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very low support amongst directly affected stakeholder groups, and/or a large majority oppose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant and potentially long-term deterioration in baseline condition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement with stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No disclosure of information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No use of external expertise

Table 2 - Scoring Levels and Indications of Characteristics - proposals from IHA Ref Grp 24 March 2010

Level	Assessment	Management	Stakeholder Engagement	Stakeholder Support	Outcomes	Conformance / Compliance	Disclosure
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate and effective assessment processes with no gaps; • Regional view / perspective; • Very high level of integration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate and effective management processes with no gaps; • Pro-active and adaptive management; • Processes are closely monitored, frequently reviewed, and promptly improved as issues arise, and where necessary includes an iterative process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate and effective consultation processes with no gaps; • Frequent and two-way engagement with stakeholders; • In cases stakeholder involvement in decision-making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support of nearly all stakeholder groups directly affected by that topic for the relevant measures; • In cases formal agreements or consent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition: • demonstrated avoidance and full compensation of negative impacts; plans provide for enhancements to pre-project conditions and/or contribute to addressing issues beyond those impacts caused by the developer / owner / operator; • Leverages opportunities; • Contributes to internal and external capacity building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No non-compliances or non-conformances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive disclosure of information to stakeholders
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate and effective assessment processes with very few non-critical gaps; • High level of integration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate and effective management processes with very few non-critical gaps; • Somewhat pro-active and adaptive management; • Processes are regularly reviewed, and improved as necessary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate and effective consultation processes with very few non-critical gaps; • Regular and two-way engagement with stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support of a large majority of stakeholder groups directly affected by that topic for the relevant measures, and/or only very low opposition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full compensation of negative impacts; • Capacity building but limited to project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very few minor non-compliances and non-conformances that can be readily remedied 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only minor gaps in disclosure of information to stakeholders
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate, and effective assessment processes with a number of non-critical gaps; • Includes key components required of an assessment; • Project-focused view / perspective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate, and effective management processes with a number of non-critical gaps; • Reactive, but appropriate management with presence of corrective action process; • Processes are periodically reviewed and improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable, adequate, and effective consultation processes with a number of non-critical gaps; • Regular engagement with stakeholders, often two-way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support of a majority of stakeholder groups directly affected by that topic for the relevant measures, and/or low opposition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimisation and mitigation of negative impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No major non-compliances and non-conformances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets key recommended instances needed for disclosure of information to stakeholders
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A critical gap in assessment processes results in these processes being less than suitable, adequate and effective; • Project-focused perspective with a critical gap on social and environmental issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A critical gap in management processes resulting in these processes being less than suitable, adequate and effective; • Reactive, corrective action sometimes insufficient; • A critical gap in the review and improvement of processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A critical gap in consultation processes resulting in these processes being less than suitable, adequate and effective; • Regular engagement with stakeholders sometimes two-way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support of some stakeholder groups directly affected by that topic for the relevant measures, with some opposition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some deterioration in baseline condition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A major non-compliances and non-conformances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited disclosure of information to stakeholders
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of critical gaps in assessment processes resulting in these processes being less than suitable, adequate and effective; • Project-focused perspective with gaps on social and environmental issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of critical gaps in management processes resulting in these processes being less than suitable, adequate and effective; • Reactive, corrective action but often insufficient; • Critical gaps in the review and improvement of processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of critical gaps in consultation processes resulting in these processes being less than suitable, adequate and effective; • Some engagement with stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low support amongst stakeholder groups directly affected by that topic for the relevant measures, and/or a majority oppose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deterioration in baseline condition with some delay or difficulties in addressing negative impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of major non-compliances and non-conformances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very limited disclosure of information to stakeholders
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large number of critical gaps in assessment processes; • Narrow perspective on technical aspects and physical infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large number of critical gaps in management processes; • Poor management not reacting to problems / concerning developments; • No review or improvement of processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A large number of critical gaps in consultation processes; • No engagement with stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very low support amongst stakeholder groups directly affected by that topic for the relevant measures, and/or a large majority oppose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant and potentially long-term deterioration in baseline condition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No engagement with stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No disclosure of information to stakeholders