

Proposal 1: Alternative Approach to Measurement

The basic idea regarding the measurement and assessment of the different aspects in the SAF is to break them down and evaluate every single facet of the aspects separately in order to not have to lump different assessments under one score. This would allow to include even more facets under each aspect if necessary, to increase specificity as well as help to identify the gaps and areas for improvement for the future.

One could formulate best case scenario statements, which would be the expectation on an optimal situation for a score of 5 ("fully met") and then differentiate between different levels of deviation for 4 ("largely met") to 0 ("not at all met"). Repetition would be avoided and space be used for technical information and details.

Below/attached you find the translation of one aspect (B 19) from the original format into how a revised format could, as an example in order to demonstrate or visualize the ideas mentioned above.

The question, if one wants to include a summary of the aspects under the comments, is open. I have put it in as an example.

This approach however does not solve the problem of indicators yet, that would support a more objective assessment of the various aspects: where exactly to draw the line between a score of 5 and 4 or 4 and 3 etc.? But this will have to be discussed separately in one of the next meetings.

Proposal 1: Alternative Approach to Measurement

B19 Aspect: Sedimentation and erosion

Understanding the risks associated with reservoir and downstream sedimentation and erosion. Measures the likely effectiveness of programs to manage these risks. These programs could include, for example, specific operational rules, capital works, and catchment management programs.

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

Score	Performance	Process
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive understanding of likely reservoir and downstream sedimentation and erosion issues and risks, or suitable and adequate plans to gain that understanding. Likelihood of maximum, practicable, participation in catchment management planning and implementation. Strong likelihood that the scheme will meet or exceed regulatory requirements and stakeholder expectations. 	Strong likelihood that best practice sedimentation and erosion management strategies will be in place during construction and operation of the scheme.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good understanding of likely reservoir and downstream sedimentation and erosion issues and risks, or suitable and adequate plans to gain that understanding. Likelihood of high level, practicable, participation in catchment management planning and implementation. Likelihood that the scheme will meet regulatory requirements and stakeholder expectations. 	Likelihood that good sedimentation and erosion management strategies will be in place during construction and operation of the scheme.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory understanding of likely reservoir and downstream sedimentation and erosion issues and risks, or suitable and adequate plans to gain that understanding. Likelihood of adequate level, practicable, participation in catchment management planning and implementation. Likelihood that the scheme will largely meet regulatory requirements and stakeholder expectations. 	Likelihood that satisfactory sedimentation and erosion management strategies will be in place during construction and operation of the scheme.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gaps (actual or probable) in understanding of likely reservoir and downstream sedimentation and erosion issues and risks. Likelihood of low level, practicable, participation in catchment management planning and implementation. Likelihood that the scheme will fail to meet some regulatory requirements and face a moderate degree of ongoing stakeholder opposition. 	Likelihood of gaps in sedimentation and erosion management strategies during construction and operation of the scheme.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major gaps (actual or probable) in understanding of likely reservoir and downstream sedimentation and erosion issues and risks. Likelihood of very limited, practicable, participation in catchment management planning and implementation. Likelihood that the scheme will fail to meet most regulatory requirements and face a significant degree of ongoing stakeholder opposition. 	Likelihood of major gaps in sedimentation and erosion management strategies during construction and operation of the scheme.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No understanding of likely reservoir and downstream sedimentation and erosion issues and risks. Likelihood of no practicable participation in catchment management planning and implementation. Likelihood that the scheme will not meet regulatory requirements and face major ongoing stakeholder opposition. 	Likelihood of no sedimentation and erosion management strategies during construction and operation of the scheme.

Comments

Auditing Guidance Notes	Examples of Evidence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Sedimentation and erosion risk management planning. Investigations into sedimentation and erosion issues in the reservoir and downstream. Stakeholder surveys and agreements. Regulatory license requirements. Interviews with stakeholders and regulators.
--------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

Proposal 1: Alternative Approach to Measurement

B19 Aspect: Sedimentation and erosion						
Understanding the risks associated with reservoir and downstream sedimentation and erosion. Measures the likely effectiveness of programs to manage these risks. These programs could include, for example, specific operational rules, capital works, and catchment management programs.						
Sustainability Scoring: Assess both columns. If a column has more than one point, all criteria must be met for a score to be awarded. The aspect score is the lower of the two column assessments.						
	5	4	3	2	1	0
Expectation	fully reached / exceeded	largely reached / good	satisfactory	rectifiable gaps	major gaps	not at all met
Performance						
Comprehensive understanding of likely reservoir and downstream sedimentation and erosion issues and risks, or suitable and adequate plans to gain that understanding.		X				
Likelihood of maximum, practicable participation in catchment management planning and implementation.			X			
Likelihood that the scheme will meet or exceed regulatory requirements.		X				
Stakeholder expectations met .				X		
Process						
Strong likelihood that best practice sedimentation and erosion management strategies will be in place during construction and operation of the scheme.			X			
Comments / Summary (attach additional pages if more space is required)						
Good scientific analysis of the physical situation including downstream impacts, which meet regulatory requirements, but so far insufficient stakeholder involvement in the catchment management planning, which results in a lower score for the sedimentation and erosion management strategy. At this point of time, this can still be rectified, which will result in a higher overall scoring.						

Auditing Guidance Notes / Examples of Evidence available

Sedimentation and erosion risk management planning.	+
Investigations into sedimentation and erosion issues in the reservoir and downstream.	+
Stakeholder surveys and agreements.	-
Regulatory license requirements.	+
Interviews with regulators.	+
Interviews with stakeholders.	-
<i>Others:</i>	
specific operational rules	+
catchment management program	+

