

**THE WORLD BANK GROUP ARCHIVES**

**PUBLIC DISCLOSURE AUTHORIZED**

**Folder Title:** Indigenous People - Concept Notes, Issue Papers and Cover Notes - Gloria Davis - Subject Files

**Folder ID:** 30098644

**Series:** Subject files

**Dates:** 05/18/2000 – 02/13/2001

**Fonds:** Personal papers of Gloria Davis

**ISAD Reference Code:** WB IBRD/IDA DAVIS-15

**Digitized:** 11/03/2023

To cite materials from this archival folder, please follow the following format:  
[Descriptive name of item], [Folder Title], Folder ID [Folder ID], ISAD(G) Reference Code [Reference Code], [Each Level Label as applicable], World Bank Group Archives, Washington, D.C., United States.

The records in this folder were created or received by The World Bank in the course of its business.

The records that were created by the staff of The World Bank are subject to the Bank's copyright.

Please refer to <http://www.worldbank.org/terms-of-use-earchives> for full copyright terms of use and disclaimers.



THE WORLD BANK

Washington, D.C.

© International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / International Development Association or

The World Bank

1818 H Street NW

Washington DC 20433

Telephone: 202-473-1000

Internet: [www.worldbank.org](http://www.worldbank.org)

**PUBLIC DISCLOSURE AUTHORIZED**

Indigenous People - Concept Notes  
Issue Papers, Cover Notes

2000-2002

**DECLASSIFIED  
WITH RESTRICTIONS**  
WBG Archives



**30098644**

A2011-001 Other #: Box # 358861B

Indigenous People - Concept Notes, Issue Papers and Cover Notes - Gloria  
Davis - Subject Files



## Indigenous Peoples Policy – Key issues

### Policy Requirements.

The 1994 Operational Directive (OD 4.20) introduced an important principle, namely that there is no one correct approach to indigenous peoples, but rather indigenous people need the opportunity to speak for themselves on matters that affect them. Recent consultation have also made it clear that indigenous people want more than “minimizing and mitigating” they want to benefit from development in ways that are culturally appropriate. We have kept these points in mind in defining policy requirements. We have also tried to be clear about what is required and what is desirable and worthy of consideration.

Specifically, the policy now requires identification of affected indigenous groups and consultation with them early in the project cycle, and where projects affect indigenous peoples it requires mechanisms incorporated into the project to permit ongoing participation, minimize or mitigate adverse impacts, and ensure that benefits intended for indigenous people are culturally appropriate. At the same time it sets out a menu of options which could be considered by the Borrower and the Bank, including but not limited to freestanding operations for specific indigenous groups.

correspond  
to their  
wishes

### Who Does the Policy Apply to?

This has been one of the most difficult areas to reach agreement. After much discussion we have recognized that there are many indigenous people with common characteristics (paragraph 5) found in rural and urban areas and in all stations of life, but we have concluded that the policy should cover only those who are vulnerable because of potential disruption or disintegration of their customary institutions (para 6). Where people have moved into cities or migrated for wage labor, and in so doing have substantially changed their modes of production and ways of life, they are not normally covered by the policy. This recognizes that there are both equity issues and practical problems in singling out for attention indigenous groups in mixed communities, but that there may be some cases where it is appropriate to do so. The draft policy makes it clear that country knowledge and technical judgement are required in determining who the policy applies to. Some stakeholders will no doubt want to see coverage extended to all indigenous people regardless of where or how they live.

### What Documentation is Required?

2  
0

but  
should  
not  
be in  
policy

## **OP/BP 4.10 – Indigenous Peoples Revision Process and Key Issues (10/24)**

### **A. Background**

1. The World Bank was the first multilateral financial institution to introduce a special policy for the treatment of indigenous or tribal peoples in development projects. As far back as 1982, the Bank issued Operational Manual Statement (OMS) 2.34 on “Tribal People in Bank-financed Projects,” the purpose of which was to protect the interests of relatively isolated and culturally distinct, indigenous groups in Bank-financed development interventions.

2. In 1991, based upon its experience with OMS 2.34, and in an environment where the rights and problems confronting indigenous people were highlighted in internal for and in the United Nations (Decade of Indigenous Peoples), the Bank issued a revised policy (OD 4.20, Indigenous Peoples). While maintaining the protective measures of the earlier policy, the OD emphasized the need for indigenous peoples to participate in and benefit from Bank-financed development projects. It also outlined special procedures for incorporating indigenous peoples’ concerns into Bank-financed investments through the design of Indigenous Peoples Development Plans (IPDPs).

3. In 1998, in preparation for conversion to the OP/BP format, an approach paper was sent to OPC [and ?CODE] which set out a framework for revising OD 4.20. This framework was subsequently discussed with indigenous groups, other key stakeholders including international organization (ILO, UNCHR), and within the Bank in different regions and networks.. Specifically, the Approach Paper recommended:

- a) adherence to the current policy objectives of OD 4.20, but more clarification of those minimum standards needed to ensure that indigenous peoples would not experience adverse effects from Bank-financed development interventions;
- b) a process for identifying the populations covered by the Operational Policy that draws upon previous definitional criteria, but gives greater attention to national and international legal definitions and to consultations with governments, regional and national indigenous organizations, NGOs and academic experts;
- c) clarification in three areas: what is expected in terms of social analysis, participation and consultation; what is meant by land and natural resource protection; and, when indigenous peoples action plans are required; and,
- d) specification of ways in which the Bank Group can go beyond protective measures and promote indigenous peoples development, especially within the broader framework of poverty reduction and private sector investments.

This note describes the ways in which these elements, and others which have emerged from external and internal discussions, have been handled in the proposed OP/BP 4.10.

### **B. Policy Objectives and Minimum Standards**

4. The 1991 Directive states that the “Bank’s broad objective towards indigenous people, as for all people in its member countries, is to ensure that the development process fosters full



2  
0

respect for their dignity, human rights, and cultural uniqueness.” It goes on to state, that the intention is to ensure that indigenous peoples do not suffer adverse effects, particularly from Bank-financed projects, and that they receive culturally compatible social and economic benefits” [para. 6, OD 4.20]. The revised policy maintains these policy objectives [para. 1, OP 4.10].

5. To safeguard indigenous peoples and their cultures and prevent adverse effects from Bank-financed development interventions, the Approach Paper also recommended a clear statement in the revised policy of those conditions in which the Bank would *not* be prepared to finance projects. Specifically, it recommended that the Bank *not* appraise any project affecting indigenous peoples unless *meaningful consultation* (including disclosure of relevant information) has taken place and suitable mitigation measures are developed by the Borrower and are acceptable to the Bank [para. 9, OD 4.20]. These recommendations have been incorporated into the revised policy [see op4.10, paras 3, 19 & 20].

6. The Approach Paper also recommended that the revised policy clarify that the Bank would not assist any development interventions that:

- a) knowingly involve encroachment on the traditional lands or territories being used or occupied by indigenous peoples, unless adequate safeguard measures are provided [para. 5, OMS 2.34 and paras. 15 (a) and (c), OD 4.20; and OP 4.10, para.8?];
- b) remove indigenous peoples from their traditional lands or territories, unless such resettlement is demonstrated to be unavoidable, provides the affected population with culturally-compatible alternative lands and livelihoods, [OP 4.10 paras 9 & 24]; or
- c) support the commercial exploitation of the natural, mineral, hydro-carbon and/or cultural resources contained in the areas traditionally used or occupied by indigenous peoples unless they participate in the benefits of such activities and receive fair compensation for any harm or damage that might result from such activities.[OP 4.10 para 11].

7. These points have been included in the revised OP (as noted above) although the wording has been adapted to conform to the more affirmative policy language. The general safeguard clause and points (a) and (b) above do not go beyond the current OD. The inclusion of point (c) results from the growing trend toward the commercial utilization of the natural, mineral, hydro-carbon and/or cultural resources contained on lands occupied or used by indigenous peoples, and the need to clarify the minimum conditions which would need to exist for the Bank Group to support such activities. The wording in the revised policy has been agreed with staff of the Bank’s hydrocarbon group.

## **B. Identification of Indigenous Peoples**

8. One of the difficulties encountered in implementing OD 4.20 has been the identification and definition of “indigenous peoples” covered by the Bank’s policy. Rather than seek a single universal definition for “indigenous peoples,” for purposes of the proposed policy, indigenous people are defined by functional criteria [para. 5] which are similar to those in OD 4.20 [para. 5]. However, the draft policy clarifies that not all people who may be considered indigenous are covered, but rather “those who may be vulnerable if there is disruption to, or the destruction of, the distinctive social, cultural or economic institutions on which they depend. The policy does not apply in situations where indigenous people have moved into cities or migrated for wage labor, and in so doing have significantly changed their modes of production and ways of life.”



[OP 4.10 para 6]. This is consistent with current Bank practice. In recognition of the complexity in which indigenous groups live, the policy also clearly indicates that country knowledge and technical judgement are required in determining whether the provisions of the policy apply.

9. The Approach Paper also proposed a legal and consensus-based process between the Bank and the Borrower for getting agreement on indigenous populations. This process included:

- a) review national constitutions, laws, and other relevant legislation in regard to specific definitions and legal frameworks;
- b) where appropriate, use ILO Conventions 107 and 169 Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries, where the Borrower Country has ratified either or both of these Conventions;
- c) and consultations with the government, regional and national indigenous organizations, NGOs, and academic experts who know the ethnic composition of the particular country.

These provisions have been largely retained (OP 4.10, paras 7 and 17) although for practical reasons the present policy draft does not assume that this process is a prerequisite for a specific operation, as this would be impractical in countries with small lending programs; and in cases where public opinion is divided and consensus building would be difficult and time consuming, such discussions could potentially delay projects which would benefit indigenous groups, among others.

## **D. Processing Requirements**

10.. The Approach Paper recommended more detailed guidance on ways to a) more systematically incorporate social and cultural aspects into project design; b) ensure that borrowers incorporate meaningful consultation and informed participation with affected indigenous populations into all phases of the project cycle; and c) provide relevant documentation, especially for projects that have adverse impacts on indigenous groups. These measures have been incorporated into the draft policy in the following ways.

### **Procedures for Addressing Social and Cultural Aspects,**

11. The revised policy requires a social assessment for all operations which may affect indigenous peoples in order to a) identify affected indigenous groups, b) provide the framework for consultation and participation, c) identify potentially adverse impacts, d) determine opportunities, and e) ascertain other pertinent social issues which may affect project design and implementation [para 18]. Initially there was some concern about whether such analysis should be required in all cases involving indigenous peoples. However, recent experience has demonstrated that adequate planning cannot be done without the steps enumerated above, and both the need for technical judgment in determining affected indigenous groups, and the complexity of determining appropriate mechanisms for consultation and ongoing participation, requires some form of social assessment.

### **Consultation and Participation**

12. A fundamental principle of both the OD and the draft OP is that indigenous people should have a voice in the design and implementation of development operations that affect them. For



this reason, the Approach Paper recommended that strategies for addressing issues pertaining to indigenous peoples be based upon their *informed participation*. This is affirmed in the draft OP [paras 3 & 11] and measures to achieve this are described [OP 4.10, paras 18-20 and BP 4.10 paras 5, 6 & 8]. Additional guidance on best practice will be made available in a forthcoming sourcebook. The emphasis in the Approach Paper on consultations with government agencies, local NGOs, and national and local indigenous organizations that are working for the welfare of indigenous peoples are included [para 19] but direct consultation is given more emphasis, given the strong preference expressed by indigenous peoples to be allowed to speak for themselves.

### **Indigenous Peoples Action Plans**

13.. Finally, where there could be potentially adverse effects on indigenous peoples, the Approach Paper recommended that Borrower or project sponsors should prepare an Indigenous Peoples Action Plan (IPAP) which is consistent with current Bank policy. However, following discussion with LEG, a decision was taken that some form of documentation is needed for all projects that affect indigenous groups, in order to demonstrate what the issues are and how they have been handled. For this reason, the draft policy requires an IPAP for all projects, including freestanding projects designed for indigenous peoples, although it recognizes that the content and level of detail of the IPAP will vary according to specific project circumstances and the nature of benefits or impacts to be addressed [OP 4.10, para 20].

WHY?

14. In contrast to current policy, which calls for a single format for such plans, the Approach Paper recommended that the revised policy accept that these action plans could be prepared as stand-alone documents, be folded into broader Community Action Plans, form part of the Social Mitigation Plans, or be incorporated as targeting strategies or components in the project design. Such design flexibility, it notes, is needed to accommodate different project circumstances. This provision has been retained. [OP 4.10, para ??]

## **E. Promoting Indigenous Peoples Development**

### **Strategies for Including Indigenous Peoples in Development**

15. The Approach Paper recognized that in certain country contexts, pro-active approaches may be needed to redress historical patterns of exclusion of indigenous peoples and to create the conditions for their sustainable development. It also recognized that in many cases benefits intended for indigenous peoples could be enhanced if they were more culturally appropriate. It also acknowledged the increasing role of the private sector in development and indicated the important role which private companies can play in directly assisting indigenous communities or supporting governments in the provision of such assistance.

17. Recognizing that proactive measures can be recommended but not required – unless consistent with Borrower interest and country strategy – the draft policy:

a) encourages Borrowers, as part of their poverty reduction strategies to consider freestanding projects and other initiatives to identify the development needs and priorities of indigenous peoples and to strengthen the policy frameworks and institutions needed to achieve them (para 3)

b) provides for the possibility of assistance to establish legal recognition of traditional rights, when requested by the Borrower [para.10];

c) recognizes the importance of cultural knowledge and proposes measures to enhance and protect it; [para. 11];

d) promotes measures to improve access to beneficial projects in education and health and to tailor the benefits of such projects to the needs of indigenous peoples [para 13];

e) provides for freestanding projects, project components and other initiatives aimed at supporting the development priorities of indigenous groups.[para 14];

f) specifies other forms of support which the Bank may provide relating to legal frameworks and other forms of technical assistance. [para 15]; and

g) encourages the involvement of the private sector and expansion of opportunities in the private sector for indigenous groups [para 16]]

## **Conclusion**

18. To be added

October 24, 2000



Patricia M. Humphreys 02/13/2001 01:17 PM

---

Extn: 30947 HRSLO  
Subject: RE: Grip Reports

Dear Colleagues,

In preparation for an overview report of GRIP experiences, we've been reviewing our files and it appears that we do not have your GRIP Report. If this is an oversight on our part please forward a copy. If you have already submitted it to Mr. Wolfensohn's office but not to us please forward a copy. If you have not yet submitted your report to Mr. Wolfensohn, please do so at your earliest convenience. The original should go to the President's office and a copy to us.

You will recall that Mr. Wolfensohn's expectations are:

Post-Immersion  
WOLFENSOHN BRIEFING

Prepare a description of your immersion experience, in fewer than four pages, that responds to the following three questions:

1. Where did you go and what did you see?
2. How has this experience affected you and what was its impact on you?
3. How can you use this experience to strengthen your work in the Bank?

We would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible so we can complete our review of the Grass Roots Immersion Program.

Many thanks.

Regards,  
Pat Humphreys  
HRSLO, Leadership and Organization Effectiveness  
phumphreys@worldbank.org  
ext. 30947

---

To: Nisha Agrawal  
Nurul Alam  
Angeline Attena  
Mahmood A. Ayub  
Mark Baird  
Therese Ballard  
Mohamed N. Benali  
Constance A. Bernard  
Wolfgang Bertelsmeier/Fo/Ifc@Ifc  
Jbhagwati@Worldbank.Org  
Patricia A. Bliss-Guest  
James P. Bond  
Barbara Bruns  
Nicholas R. Burnett  
Mae Chu Chang  
Meera Chatterjee  
Barun Prasad Chatterjee  
Roberto Chavez  
Victoria C. Choy/Hq/Ifc@Ifc  
Dclarke@Ifc.Org  
Cynthia C. Cook  
Veronique N. Danforth  
Patricia Davies  
Gloria Davis  
Oscar De Bruyn Kops  
David De Ferranti  
E. Hazel Denton  
Mamadou Dia  
Enrique Domenge/Hq/Ifc@Ifc  
Alfred M. Duda  
Zafer Ecevit  
Victoria M. Elliott  
Lisa Fonick Haworth  
Ana Flavia Fonseca  
Helen Louise Frick  
Morallina Fanwar George  
Robin Glantz/Hq/Ifc@Ifc  
Cynthia Haddock  
Nagy K. Hanna  
Doris A. Herrera-Pol  
Dale M. Hill  
Assaad Jabre/Hq/Ifc@Ifc  
Babu John  
Orsalia Kalantzopoulos  
Birgitta Kantola/Hq/Ifc@Ifc  
Homi Kharas  
Martin Kimmig/Hq/Ifc@Ifc  
Kenneth King  
Deborah Ann Knight  
Doris Koehn  
Manga Kuoh  
Dominique M. Lallement  
Carol F. Lee/Hq/Ifc@Ifc  
Natalie G. Lichtenstein  
Andres Liebenthal  
Jacques Loubert  
Jonathan B. Lyttle  
William B. Marke  
Daniel Morrow  
Deepa Narayan  
Ohene Owusu Nyanin  
Judy M. O'connor  
Jaime G. Olazo



# **World Development Report 2002 "Sustainable Development with a Dynamic Economy"; Staff Director: Zmarak Shalizi**

## **World Development Report 2002**

### **Sustainable Development with a Dynamic Economy: *Growth, Poverty, Social Cohesion, and the Environment***

Growth in material well-being is a central element in advancing human welfare and reducing poverty. Growth requires investment in productive physical capital. And a development strategy focused narrowly on physical investment and growth can be successful for a period. However, if policies to increase aggregate wealth waste natural resources, inflict unnecessary damage on critical environmental processes, undermine social cohesion, or fail to rapidly reduce poverty, they can generate serious problems. These problems can be ignored for a while, but not indefinitely. Unattended, these social and environmental problems can fester to the point where they gradually or abruptly undermine the scope for improvements in human welfare. Sustaining growth over the long term therefore requires that such problems be addressed integrally in current growth strategies and investment programs. It is better to address these problems well before they become crises, since the lead times can be long.

Examples of such problems are: (a) *Socio-economic inequalities*. When communities are relatively isolated, they may be able to sustain very different degrees of total wealth and income inequality for long periods. As globalization removes barriers to the mobility of people, ideas and information, individuals grow more aware of opportunities and living standards elsewhere, and of the nature of many of the obstacles they face. Much milder combinations of inequality and rising expectations than those seen today within and among countries have often fueled social tension and upheaval in the past. (b) *Demographic stresses*. Even though there is evidence that developing countries are undergoing a demographic transition from high to low population growth rates, the transition is far from complete. This has a number of consequences. Already, the bulk of the population in many developing countries is young. Even with a moderately low population growth over the next 30 years, there will be an additional 2 billion people to accommodate in developing countries. Improving livelihoods and quality of life for this growing population will require substantial investments in education to create a more literate and skilled labor force, in productive job creation to employ the growing labor force, and in infrastructure and housing to accommodate the service and amenity needs of the new firms and households (many of which will be in urban areas). If large proportions of the population remain outside the mainstream of development they will have no alternative but to eke out an existence from marginal lands or activities, with consequent pressures on both fragile ecosystems and inherited social institutions. The demographic transition varies across countries. Its impact is complicated by the incidence of diseases, including HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis which will have profound effects on demographic processes and expenditure patterns in some countries. (c) *Natural resource rents*. Valuable natural resources (minerals, forests, etc.) are major sources of revenue in many poor and middle-income countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Since the presence of



these resources is not the result of human effort, their exploitation can generate large returns at low cost. The struggle for control of these resources is a leading cause of social conflict, indeed of civil wars in many countries. Even in the absence of violence, concentrations of natural resource revenues can contribute to widespread corruption and sustain significant inequalities of income, thereby undermining social cohesion and sustainable development. Strategies for the responsible use of natural resource rents are key to sustainable development.

(d) *Environmental degradation*. Self-regulating and self-repairing natural processes provide many essential, environmental services at local, regional, and global levels that are taken for granted. However, the scale of human activity is now so great that it interferes with many of these self-regulating and self-repairing natural functions at all levels. Inappropriate management of our interaction with the environment can have costly, unanticipated (and sometimes irreversible) effects on the physical base on which we and other species depend--as for example in the case of the dust bowl in the U.S. in the 1930s, or flooding in China in the 1990s. Most environmental degradation hits poor people particularly hard, with problems of water supply, clean cooking and heating being of special importance.

Our understanding of these problems and their consequences continues to evolve. Human ingenuity can mitigate some of these problems through improved knowledge and technology. Overall, though, the greater challenge for the future is to modify social institutions and behavioral incentives so individuals and communities can better manage *human, social, physical, and natural assets* over longer time periods. People change society and the environment because they have incentives to do so. Social and environmental problems arise, however, when people are either unaware of the consequences, or are aware, but unconcerned because the burdens fall on others. We have a challenge of social action. In looking at social and environmental issues, the needs of the most vulnerable groups require special attention. The poor (globally and within countries) are least able to protect themselves from the adverse effects of prolonged neglect of environmental and social consequences, or from well-meaning programs to protect the environment and society which do not address the needs of the poor.

As part of the Bank's continuing commitment to understanding the key drivers of development and appropriate development policy--especially over the medium and long term--, WDR 2002 will address the *interaction between growth, poverty reduction, social cohesion, and the environment*. From a similar perspective, WDR 2000 *Attacking Poverty* and the upcoming WDR 2001 *Institutions for Markets* have specifically addressed the institutional structures needed to facilitate markets and growth, and to spread the benefits of this growth to all segments of society, most particularly the poor--with poverty being defined more broadly than just income. This WDR will be timed in relation to the Rio+10 activities of 2002 and will provide an understanding of sustainable development which goes beyond the narrow focus on a few selected aspects of environmental degradation.

This topic has been selected because it is at the center of much of the Bank's work and research in recent years and focuses on crucial aspects of development and poverty reduction going forward. As in the past, WDR 2002 will be integrated into the work programs of the Bank, and DEC in particular. The WDR team will also work closely with ESSD on both the environmental and social challenges to sustainable development. In addition a consultative



network of 'Friends of the WDR' from throughout the Bank will be established. ESSD and DEC will work together on external consultations.

The report will be prepared under the general direction of Nicholas Stern, Chief Economist and Senior Vice President, Development Economics. I am pleased to announce the appointment of Mr. **Zmarak Shalizi** as Staff Director for the WDR 2002/2003. Mr. Shalizi is currently a Research Manager in DEC. He has extensive experience in the Bank having worked in Operations, Networks and DEC. He was chosen for his intellectual leadership in a number of fields, his demonstrated ability to lead productive teams, and to manage fruitful consultations with partners.

The topic of the WDR is a challenging one, and I am sure I can count on your fullest cooperation to make it a success. I hope that the very process of preparing the WDR itself will help enhance our commitment to an understanding of these issues, which are so much at the center of our development efforts.

James D. Wolfensohn

## **OED COMMENTS ON RECASTING OF THE IP POLICY**

OED proposes to launch a review of the implementation of the Indigenous Peoples (IP) policy with a view to informing ESSD's good practice source book on the subject expected to be issued in June 2002. An approach paper for the evaluation is under preparation. The evaluation should not however hold up the recasting process which has been going on for more than 4 years, with an Approach Paper for Consultation on Revision of Indigenous Peoples cleared with the Operational Policy Committee in June 1998. Clearly, the time has come to put this exercise to bed.

Recasting is designed to provide clarifications of existing policies and clearer delineations of mandatory vs. best effort provisions. It is not designed to change policy.

The proposed OP/BP does furnish useful clarifications. The recast policy should greatly facilitate its implementation and reduce the attendant transaction costs. For example, the proposed OP clarifies that the policy is not applicable to IPs who have left their communities of origin, moved to urban areas or migrated to obtain wage labor. It defines informed participation as establishing an appropriate framework for dialogue with provision of relevant information in a timely and culturally appropriate manner, consideration of the views and preferences of IPs and Bank reviews of project proposals to ensure consistency with the policy. It does not require consent from IPs (as implied by WDC guidelines) although such consent could be viewed as a best practice or stretch goal in some circumstances

On the other hand, the draft does not offer any clarification with respect to the inclusion of "human rights" in the objectives set forth in the policy. We understand that guidance will be provided to staff in the proposed source book as to what this objective actually means in terms of Bank accountability, taking into account the Bank's articles and its comparative advantage. Nor does the draft OP tackle conclusively the question of classification of social groups as IPs. This question is by far the most divisive in terms of country relations and equity of implementation of the policy across countries and Regions. We also understand that the source book will provide guidance to staff in this area. It would be very useful if the Source Book is published as soon as possible after the new policy is issued.

The draft OP distinguishes between adverse impact on IPs and cases where IPs are beneficiaries. The former triggers a mandatory provision for borrowers to prepare an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) where adverse impacts are visualized. The latter does not, although the draft OP does require borrowers to incorporate special measures as needed in the project design. Clarification of this requirement in the source book is required to ensure that the Bank's operational emphasis on participation is implemented with respect to IPs wherever practicable.

Finally, with respect to gender, OED suggests that "both men and women" should be the language used in 7c (bullet points 2), and 9c. Equally, the OP should clarify that selected performance indicators ought to capture the impact of project actions on men and women from different generations (13a of the draft BP).

We trust that these comments will be explicitly taken into account before the draft OP/BP is issued for formal outside consultations.



### **Section III. Risk Management - Management and Reviewers Only**

#### **A. Safeguard Risks. What are the key risks associated with the project?**

##### **1. Procedural Compliance.**

[Does the project require any policy exceptions or involve precedent setting safeguard policy decisions? Is the task team unable to meet any specific procedural requirements of safeguards policies?]

##### **2. Analytical quality.**

[On what basis is the proposed/actual quality of analytical work judged for this project (e.g., TOR; specified previous precedent; independent peer review; experience and qualifications of preparation team; stakeholder feedback process; comparison with good practice guidelines; recognized international practice;]

##### **3. Potential for divergent stakeholder views**

[What aspects of the project could generate strong divergence in stakeholder views? What aspects of the project, sectoral, national or international context are known to be sensitive or controversial? Describe the nature of existing or potential concerns which could be raised in relation to this project.]

##### **4. Effectiveness of Stakeholder Consultation / Participation**

[What are the practical barriers to effective stakeholder consultation and participation presented by this project or its social and political context? (Barriers could include overall governance, client track record, political context, project scope, security)

##### **5. Client Capacity to Implement Safeguards Management Plans.**

[Describe the basis on which the adequacy of client capacity to implement proposed management plans was judged? (e.g., clarity and relevance of proposed management plans; source of budget resources; clarity of implementation schedules; implementation responsibilities; client previous track record with projects of similar scope and complexity. What aspects of the safeguards management plans present the greatest risk if not-implemented properly?]

#### **B. Risk Management .**

Describe the specific measures proposed to reduce and manage safeguard risks.

**Direct Quotes from the OED Report/Documents**  
**Implementation of Operational Directive 4.20 on Indigenous Peoples:**  
**An Independent Desk Review (2002)**

***OED Fast Track Brief***

*Page 1:* “The evaluation concluded that the OD objectives are consistent with the Bank’s poverty reduction mandate. It found that the implementation of the OD has positively influenced the outcome of Bank-supported projects, in terms of their overall objectives and their poverty reduction impact. One contributor to these results is that projects that applied OD had higher levels of stakeholder participation in design and implementation.”

*Page 2:* “The evaluation found notable improvement in the degree and quality of application of the OD in recent years, especially in open projects which were approved after FY 98. This improvement is likely due to the institutional and strategic changes since 1996.”

***Memorandum to the Executive Directors and the President***

*Page 2:* “It [OED] found that there has been significant progress in the implementation of the OD [4.20 on indigenous peoples] in recent years – the OD has been applied in over 60 percent of these projects and in 90 percent of those projects that could have an adverse impact on IP. On a regional basis, there is considerable improvement in the LAC and East Asia regions, with the OD being applied in more than 85 percent of the projects that affected IP. In the projects where OD has not been applied, IP are mainly beneficiaries. This improvement is likely due to the institutional and strategic changes since 1996.”

***Main Report***

*Page 9:* “...some of the more recent CASs prepared in the countries with good analytical work reflect integration of relevant issues. CASs in countries with large indigenous populations (Bolivia, Ecuador, Guatemala, and Peru) explicitly integrate issues relating to IP, particularly in terms of inequitable access to development benefits. In the other countries with smaller populations, the treatment is mixed. The Nicaragua CAS (2000) addresses the issue of indigenous groups’ rights to land and natural resources, starting with the demarcation of indigenous land. CASs for Brazil and Venezuela, with only a small minority of IP, have not been explicit but they have targeted vulnerable groups that need special attention. The Vietnam CASs are notable in their treatment of the issue: a previous CAS focused on analysis, and the later CAS reported on the analysis and the subsequent strategy. Overall, the evaluation concludes that the OD’s requirement for analytical work on different levels was highly appropriate and relevant.”

*Page 9:* “While the OD is silent on the issues [of Collaboration with Other Partners], there have been a number of partnership efforts at the regional and policy levels.”



*Page 14-15:* “Out of the 89 projects that affected IP, the evaluation concluded that activities were likely to have an adverse impact on IP in 25, while in the remainder the IP were potential beneficiaries. Only 11 of the 25 projects, however had IPDPs or elements thereof. ...In the other 14, there were inadequate measures to mitigate the adverse impact of the project activities. However, this does not mean that the evaluation can conclude that the project in fact adversely affected IP or that IP did not benefit from the project.”

*Page 15:* “The review of more recent open projects indicates that there has been improvement in the quality of coverage in projects approved after FY 98.... Institutional arrangements for monitoring OD implementation changed after FY96, when Technical Departments and subsequently the Regional networks, were charged to ensure proper implementation. The Strategic Compact in FY 97 also provided resources marked for social scientists that play an important role in implementing this policy. .... The review of these projects indicates that the application of OD 4.20 has remained at the same level, but found that more than 95 percent of the projects that were likely to have an adverse impact on IP included IPDPs or elements, thereof. On a regional basis, there is considerable improvement in the LAC and East Asia regions, with OD being applied in more than 85 percent of projects that affected IP. In the projects where OD has not been applied, IP are mainly beneficiaries.”



# Record Removal Notice

<b>File Title</b> Indigenous People - Concept Notes, Issues Papers and Cover Notes - Gloria Davis - Subject Files		<b>Barcode No.</b>  30098644		
<b>Document Date</b> May 18, 2000	<b>Document Type</b> Email hard copy			
<b>Correspondents / Participants</b> From: Gloria Davis, SDV To: Colin Bruce				
<b>Subject / Title</b> Resource Requirements for Social Policy Development [Budget]				
<b>Exception(s)</b> Corporate Administrative Matters				
<b>Additional Comments</b>		<p>The item(s) identified above has/have been removed in accordance with The World Bank Policy on Access to Information or other disclosure policies of the World Bank Group.</p> <table border="1"><tr><td><b>Withdrawn by</b> Kim Brenner-Delp</td><td><b>Date</b> Sept. 20, 2023</td></tr></table>	<b>Withdrawn by</b> Kim Brenner-Delp	<b>Date</b> Sept. 20, 2023
<b>Withdrawn by</b> Kim Brenner-Delp	<b>Date</b> Sept. 20, 2023			