



ISSUE

05

April  
2012

# The Update

Inspection Panel Newsletter

## The Inspection Panel

The Inspection Panel was established by identical Resolutions of the Boards of Executive Directors of IBRD and IDA in 1993 as an independent accountability and recourse mechanism of the World Bank. In response to complaints from project affected persons, the Panel investigates Bank-financed projects to determine whether the Bank has complied with its own policies and procedures (including social and environmental safeguards), and to address related issues of harm to people or the environment.

## Filing a Request

For a detailed guide on how to file a request and a request template, click [here](#).

## Frequently Asked Questions

Unsure about how the Panel works or whether a project qualifies for inspection?

Find out [here](#).

## Contact us:

1818 H Street NW  
Washington DC, 20433 USA

Tel: ++202-458-5200  
Fax: ++202-522-0916  
e-mail: [ipanel@worldbank.org](mailto:ipanel@worldbank.org)  
or  
P.O. Box 27566  
Washington, DC 20038 USA

[www.inspectionpanel.org](http://www.inspectionpanel.org)



## In This Issue

Message from the Inspection Panel Chair

Latest Cases Reviewed by the Inspection Panel

Outreach Activities

Update of Panel Operating Procedures

Rio+20 UN Conference

Announcements

## Message from the Inspection Panel Chair



### Participation and citizen-driven accountability 20 years after Rio

At the "Earth" Summit in Rio back in 1992, over 180 countries affirmed the importance of civil society engagement and called for strengthening its participation in development. In the wake of the Rio summit and in response to widespread concerns about impacts of projects financed by the World Bank, the Inspection Panel was created in 1993.

The Panel represents a pioneering approach of "citizen-driven accountability". It provides a channel for citizens affected by projects to raise concerns to the highest levels of decision making in the Bank about social and environmental harm linked to Bank-financed operations. All the major International Financial Institutions (IFI) have since established their own independent accountability mechanisms (IAM).

Twenty years on, the Panel and the other IAMs have

made substantial contributions to the evolution of the IFI's social and environmental performance. Their work has stimulated participation in development. The concerns of affected citizens have been heard and acted upon by IFI management, local and national decision makers, and public and private sector operators. The design of development projects have been improved by giving affected communities a voice.

Through the Panel and the other IAMs, affected communities have sent a clear message about the critical importance of consultation, participation, disclosure of information and close supervision in ensuring the success of development projects.

This year's Rio+20 Conference seeks to reaffirm and reinforce international commitment to sustainable development under the banner of "green economy". While there is an urgent need to improve food security and management of land, water and energy, global development is not without risks for poor and vulnerable communities. The call for strong citizen involvement that resonated in Rio

twenty years ago, enshrined in Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration, has the same validity today.

Moving forward, the role and responsibilities of IFIs will change. New and innovative financial instruments to fund sustainable development will emerge. The international aid architecture is evolving towards greater emphasis on country ownership, balanced with results orientation and mutual accountability. The issue of ensuring accountability and people's access to recourse mechanisms becomes even more relevant in this context.

As a contribution to the Rio+20 agenda, the IAMs are taking stock of their collective experiences. What types of social and environmental concerns have been raised? What are the trends evidenced in complaints from affected communities? Rio+20 will hopefully provide an opportunity to discuss how citizen-driven accountability can be strengthened as a part of improving governance at the international, regional, national and local levels.

## New Chairperson at the Inspection Panel

The Inspection Panel is pleased to announce that Panel Member Alf Jerve has assumed the responsibility of Chairperson of the Inspection Panel on February 1, 2012. Being a Panel Member since 2008, Mr. Jerve has close to three decades of work experience in the field of development. As a social anthropologist by training, he has been engaged in a wide range of development activities, including extensive field research in Africa and Asia. Mr. Jerve succeeds Roberto Lenton, whose term as a Chairperson concluded on January 31. Mr. Lenton will remain a Panel Member until his term ends on August 31, 2012. Please check Page 8 of this newsletter for a related Inspection Panel Member vacancy announcement.

The Panel consists of three members appointed by the World Bank Board of Executive Directors for a five-year non-renewable term. Panel Members are required to select a Chairperson annually. To find out more about the Panel Members, go [here](#).

## Latest Requests for Inspection

Since the last Panel newsletter in July 2011, the Panel has handled 10 Requests for Inspection from communities and affected people. These Requests relate to the following projects:

- Papua New Guinea: Smallholder Agriculture Development Project
- South Africa: Eskom Investment Support Project
- DRC: Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project
- Chile: Quilleco Hydropower Project
- Lebanon: Greater Beirut Water Supply Project
- Argentina: Santa Fe Infrastructure Project and Provincial Road Infrastructure
- Argentina: Second Norte Grande Water Infrastructure Project
- India: Madhya Pradesh Water Sector Restructuring Project
- Red Sea-Dead Sea Water Conveyance Study Program
- Kazakhstan South-West Roads: Western Europe-Western China International Transit Corridor

## Completed Investigations

### Papua New Guinea: Smallholder Agriculture Development Project



The Panel received a Request for Inspection on December 8, 2009 related to the *Papua New Guinea Smallholder Agriculture Development Project* from the Center for Environmental Law and Community Rights (CELCOR), a local NGO which was acting on behalf of the Ahora/Kakandetta Pressure Group, affected customary land owners from the Oro Province and other affected smallholders within the Project areas. The Project intends to increase local development by increasing oil palm revenue through the participation of smallholders. The Requesters claimed that the Bank has failed to comply with several of its Operational Policies and Procedures which may cause adverse impacts. They stated that decades of oil palm production had not reduced poverty nor improved their living standards. The Requesters were further concerned about inadequate consultation with community members, lack of disclosure

of documents in local languages, and fear that smallholders would have to pay an extra levy to support the Road Maintenance Trust Fund, leading to a further reduction in their income. Taking into consideration these claims and the Management Response, the Panel recommended an investigation, which was approved by the Board on March 25, 2010.

In its Investigation Report issued on September 19, 2011, the Panel found that the consultation process fell short of policy requirements because Management failed to provide relevant information prior to consultation in a culturally appropriate manner, form, and language to achieve broad community support for the Project. The Panel found that while the Project aims to increase the income of smallholders, in compliance with Bank Policy on Poverty Reduction, it was not in full compliance with the Indigenous Peoples Policy and did not include critical means of improving smallholder livelihoods. While the Panel agreed with Management's view that a system for the regular maintenance of the road network is critical for smallholders and the industry, it was concerned that the burden of risk fell entirely on smallholders. In terms of alleged environmental harm, the Panel found the Project to be mainly in com-

pliance with the Bank's Policy on Environmental Assessment, except for the issue of mill effluents. Management submitted its Response to the Panel's Investigation Report on October 31, 2011.

In its Response, Management noted that it will continue to take actions to address the concerns of affected communities, such as ensuring proper documentation of consultations and translation of relevant documents into Tok Pisin, and will support and monitor the implementation of the Effluent Action Plan. Management also expressed its commitment to maximize benefits for the smallholders from the Project.

On December 13, 2011, the World Bank Board of Executive Directors discussed the findings of the Inspection Panel investigation report on the Smallholder Agriculture Development Project (SADP). The Board approved the Management's Action Plan in response to the Panel's findings and welcomed actions set forth in Annex 1 to the Management Report and Recommendation. Management will report to the Board on the implementation of the actions presented in the Action Plan and Annex 1 of the Management Report during Project implementation. All reports related to this case are available [here](#).



## South Africa: Eskom Investment Support Project



On April 6, 2010, the Inspection Panel received a Request for Inspection related to the US\$ 3.75 billion *Eskom Investment Support Project*, the components of which include the 4,800 MW coal-fired Medupi Power Plant located near Lephalale in Waterberg District, associated infrastructure and investments, as well as a component for the development of renewable energy generation sources. The Request was submitted by representatives of the community living in the Project area.

The Requesters raised 13 claims, which they believed were linked to the Project and could cause harm if the Bank's operational policies and procedures were not complied with. The alleged harm related to increased health problems, decreased water

availability, exacerbation of the effects of climate change, and cultural and livelihoods changes. According to the Request, these will arise from emission of particulates and greenhouse gases, increased water use, expanded mining operations, land development and influx of labor, as well as strains on the national economy. In addition, the Request claimed that the application of the Bank's policy on Borrower/Country Systems is not warranted in the context of the Project, and that there has been inadequate attention to key issues of cumulative impacts and Project alternatives.

Management submitted its Response to the Request on May 27, 2010, in which it asserted that compliance with Bank guidelines, policies, and procedures has been assured. Management believes that extensive due diligence has been carried out during the Project preparation process and that, through such due diligence, the requirements of Bank policies and procedures, including those applicable to the matters raised in the Request, have been met. Moreover, Management believes that the Requesters' rights or interests have not been, nor

will they be, directly and adversely affected.

The Panel submitted its Eligibility Report to the Board on June 28, 2010 in which it recommended that an investigation be conducted into claims that related to allegations of violations of World Bank operational policies. The Board approved this recommendation and the Panel submitted its Investigation Report to the Board on November 21, 2011. The full text of the Panel's Investigation Report and Management's Report and Recommendation will be made publicly available after the Board meets to consider these reports. In the meantime, all previous reports related to this case are available [here](#).



## Other Cases Reviewed

### Democratic Republic of Congo: Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project

In March 2009, the Panel had received two Requests related to the retrenchment operation in Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC): *Private Sector Development and Competitiveness Project*. On December 15, 2009, the Panel received a third Request for Inspection related to the same Project. The Request was submitted by representatives of three State-owned banks. All three Requests, which raise similar issues of non-compliance and harm, were registered by the Panel.

The Requesters claimed that severance packages did not comply with provisions of the Congolese Labor code and relevant Bank policy, and that the attempted reintegration measures did not succeed. All three Requests were processed simultaneously.

On April 19, 2010, the World Bank Board of Executive Directors approved the Panel's Recommendation to provide additional time for the Bank Man-

agement to implement a proposed Action Plan and strategy to address concerns of affected people raised in these Requests. This Action Plan includes the establishment of a conflict resolution mechanism, a certification of the social debt per enterprise per employee, and reform of the national pension scheme. Since then, Management has submitted a Progress Report on May 5, 2011, in which it recognized that persons affected by retrenchment operations need to be properly informed and consulted. Management also provided evidence of concrete efforts that promise to yield positive benefits to the Requesters, including access to education and health benefits, and access to the national pension system.

In its final Eligibility Report relating to this case, the Panel noted Management's acknowledgment that the Bank's supervision and support to the implementation of retrenchment operations could have been better. The



Panel welcomed Management's concern for the Requesters' claims and its further commitment to a time-bound plan combined with a robust supervision. On September 21, 2011, the World Bank Board of Executive Directors approved the Panel's recommendation not to investigate whether the Bank has complied with its policies and procedures with respect to the allegations contained in the three Requests for Inspection. Reports and further information on this case are available [here](#).

## Chile: Quilleco Hydropower Project

On April 21, 2010 the Inspection Panel received a Request for Inspection from residents of Tucapel, Santa Bárbara, Ralco Lepoy, and Concepción in the Biobío region of Chile. The Requesters stated, among other things, their concern over negative impacts of the *Quilleco Hydropower Project*, which is supported in part by the Bank through a Carbon Emissions Reduction Purchase Agreement with the private sector company Colbun.

Management submitted its Response on July 20, 2010 with a proposed plan of actions, which included two separate independent studies about possible project's social and environmental impacts and required remedial actions, if warranted. The Panel submitted its Eligibility Report on August 23, 2010.

The Panel recommended deferring the decision on whether to recommend an investigation until further time has elapsed to determine if the concerns

raised by the Request can be addressed by the proposed actions and the ensuing dialogue among the affected and interested parties.

On April 12, 2011, Management submitted to the Board its Progress Report on the Implementation of the Management Actions. The Progress Report described the ongoing communication and engagement with the affected community, compliance with the Bank's Policy on Safety of Dams, and the results of studies related to hydrology and hydrogeology, as well as the level of impact on livelihoods in the affected area.

On August 31, 2011, the Panel submitted its Final Report and Recommendation, in which it addressed the issue of whether Management's actions were adequate enough to ensure compliance with applicable operational policies and procedures. The Panel noted the progress that Management had made in



enhancing the capacity of Colbun to communicate and interact with the affected community, as noted in the Management Progress Report. The Panel also noted that the dialogue had not yet yielded concrete results, and more time and effort was needed to fully address the concerns expressed. In light of these factors and Management's representations about continued active participation in addressing the requesters' concerns, the Panel did not recommend an investigation. Reports and further information are available [here](#).

## Lebanon: Greater Beirut Water Supply Project



On November 4, 2010 the Inspection Panel received a Request for Inspection from residents of the Greater Beirut area, who question the adequacy of the Environmental Assessment (EA) under the *Greater Beirut Water Supply Project*, in particular the analysis of alternatives and the consultation process of the project, which seeks to increase potable water supply for Greater Beirut.

In its Report and Recommendation, issued on January 20, 2011, the Panel recommended that the Board authorize the Panel to carry out an investigation of some of the matters raised in the Request for Inspection. Specifically, the Panel recommended that its investigation would focus on issues of compliance and potential harm related to water quality, costs and water availability. Following a Board discussion and the commissioning by Management of specific studies on these issues, the Panel was called by the Board to review these studies and to determine whether subsequent investigation was still warranted. In the ensuing Panel Report issued on July 29, 2011, the Panel noted that important issues of direct relevance to the allegations of potential

harm raised in the Request remained and warranted further consideration, and that Management had issued a Note that included a summary of the identified risks and risk management measures and a proposed action plan to address these risks.

In light of the proposed actions by the Bank Management and its commitment to report back to the Board on the implementation of these actions in 18 months (i.e., by January 2013), the Panel determined to await further developments and to report to the Board by early 2013 on whether subsequent investigation was warranted. Reports and further information are available [here](#).

## Argentina: Santa Fe Infrastructure Project and Provincial Road Infrastructure Project

On September 6, 2011, The Panel received a Request for Inspection from residents of Zona Rural (Paraje la Vigilancia) residing along the National Road 19 in Provincia de Santa Fe, Argentina. The Request related to the *Santa Fe Infrastructure Project and Provincial Road Infrastructure Project*.

The Requesters claimed that the new

path of Road 19, at Km 44, is dangerously too close to a school, a chapel and a commercial establishment, thus jeopardizing the lives of the students and patrons. They added that this situation creates difficulties of accessing and parking near these establishments, and as a consequence, is also a danger to vehicles transiting in the road at high speed.

Following its Resolution, the Panel did not register the Request because at the time the Request was submitted to the Panel, the disbursements of the loan financing for the project exceeded 95%.

Reports and further information are available [here](#).



## Argentina: Second Norte Grande Water Infrastructure Project



On May 4, 2011, the Inspection Panel received a Request for Inspection from residents of the Comunidad Los Flores in the city of Santiago del Estero, Argentina, raising concerns related to the *Argentina Second Norte Grande Water Infrastructure Project*, and specifically, on one of the sub-projects expected to be financed under the Project: the Santiago del Estero Sanitation and Wastewater System. The Requesters asked that the Panel keeps their

names confidential.

The Requesters stated that they will suffer harm as a result of the Bank's failures and omissions in the design and preparation of the Project, because these alleged failures of the Bank will, in turn, adversely affect the design of the then proposed sewerage system and water treatment plant for the city of Santiago del Estero. The Requesters also complained that there was no information on public hearing mechanisms ensuring that potentially affected people would be consulted.

Management submitted its response on July 28, 2011, and the Panel issued its Eligibility Report on August 26, 2011. In its Report, the Panel noted

that the Management unambiguously stated that it would not finance the proposed subproject subject of the Request as it was designed. In light of this, the Panel stated that it could not recommend an investigation related to a subproject that the Bank had declared ineligible for financing. The Panel also noted that this conclusion would not preclude the Requesters from submitting a Request for Inspection if the Bank were to consider financing a subproject that in their view would be in violation of Bank policies and would result in harm to the potential requesters. Reports and further information are available [here](#).

## India: Madhya Pradesh Water Sector Restructuring Project

On June 2, 2010, the Inspection Panel received the first of several communications from a resident of Gwalior city, India, regarding the Water Quality Enhancement Project of Swarn Rekha River, a Bank-funded sub-Project under the *India Madhya Pradesh Water Sector Restructuring Project (MPWSRP)*. On August 31, 2010 the Panel received a formal Request for Inspection from several residents of Gwalior city regarding the MPWSRP.

As the complainants had still not raised concerns with Management at that time, the Panel responded by informing the Requesters of the need to make prior contact with Bank management. The Request claimed, among other things, that raw sewage in the Swarn Rekha River is accumulating near their homes located on the banks of the river, posing a health hazard to them.

On May 17, 2011, the Inspection Panel submitted a Memorandum to the Board of Executive Directors in which it informed about Management's ongoing efforts to address the concerns raised, and the Requesters' willingness to engage with the Management. The Inspection Panel, as stated in this Memorandum, decided not to register the Request at that time in order to await further developments. On July 6, 2011, the Panel received the Second Request for Inspection filed by the same affected persons regarding the same sub-Project.

Management submitted its Response on September 21, 2011, and the Panel issued its Eligibility Report on October 25, 2011, in which it did not recommend an investigation.

In its Report, the Panel noted that the sewage problem appears not to have



been identified by the Bank until the complaint was received by the Panel, and that subsequently, the supervision by Management has been robust. The Panel also noted that Management has been proactive in its efforts to assist in resolving the problem since the matter was brought to its attention in late 2010. Reports and further information are available [here](#).

## Red Sea Dead Sea Water Conveyance Study Program

On August 10, 2011, the Panel received a Request for Inspection submitted by two Palestinian civil society organizations: Stop the Wall Campaign and the Palestinian Farmers Union; and an international human rights non-governmental organization 'The Global Initiative for Economic, Social and Cultural Rights'. The two Palestinian organizations represented many Palestinian residents and farmers of the West Bank. Their Request for Inspection stated a number of claims relating to policy non-compliance and potential harm resulting from the design of the *Red Sea Dead sea Water Conveyance Study Program* and resulting from the potential implementation of a RSDS Project prepared under this Study Program. The Panel registered the

Request on October 20, 2011.

Management submitted its Response on November 15, 2011. The Panel carefully reviewed the Request for Inspection and the Management Response, and considered that the Requesters are raising legitimate concerns, such as potential adverse environmental effects on the Dead Sea and potential adverse effects on sources of water for the population in the West Bank, and concerns regarding legitimizing the current off-take of water in the Jordan River Basin and from the Dead Sea. The Panel, however, did not recommend an investigation of whether the Bank has complied with its operational policies and procedures related to the Study Program because of certain unique and special circumstances

and uncertainties at this stage. The Panel considered that key issues pertaining to the proposed RSDS Project are still under scrutiny and noted that the remaining phases of the Study Program involve negotiations and reaching an agreement among the Beneficiary Parties followed by disclosure and a period for public hearings. The Panel acknowledged that the Study Program is a politically complex process that is still ongoing. The Panel also noted that its recommendation does not preclude the possibility of a future claim, relating to compliance and harm, in the event that the Bank decides to support the proposed RSDS Project or a related alternative. Reports and further information are available [here](#).

## Kazakhstan South-West Roads: Western Europe-Western China International Transit Corridor



Between February 16, 2011, and April 19, 2011, the Inspection Panel received several complaints expressing different concerns related to impacts of the *Kazakhstan—South-West Roads: Western Europe-Western China International Transit Corridor Project*.

On June 15, 2011, the Panel received a formal Request for Inspection. This was the second Request the Panel received relating to the same Project.

The Request was submitted by Mr. Bauyrzhan Isaliev, a representative of the non-governmental organization 'National Analytical Information Resource' on his own behalf and on behalf of NAIR and 24 project-affected people. Issues raised in the Request related to loss, or potential loss, of assets and livelihood from land acquisition for the Project and potential adverse environmental impacts with regard to works on different sections of the road in Turkestan, Sairam, Yntymak and Temirlanovka.

Management submitted its Response on September 16, 2011. In its Response, Management stated that the Bank has undertaken diligent efforts to apply its policies and procedures in the context of the planning for, and implementation of, this Project.

The Panel submitted to the Board of Executive Directors its Eligibility Report on October 18, 2011. The Panel noted that Management in its Response acknowledged the Requesters' concerns relating to the four road sections mentioned above. In the Panel's view, Management demonstrated that actions were being taken to resolve these concerns. The Panel also noted that during its field visit, the Requesters highlighted that the engagement of the Panel brought more attention to their grievances, and that they were satisfied with the fact that their concerns were either resolved or in the process of being resolved. In light of the above, the Panel did not recommend an investigation of whether the Bank has complied with its operational policies and procedures.

Reports and further information are available [here](#).

## Outreach Activities

### Annual Report summarizing activities held in 2010-2011

Since the last newsletter, the Panel has produced its [Annual Report for 2010-2011](#). The Annual Report summarizes in detail the cases the Panel handled during the last fiscal year. It also contains a summary of systemic issues identified by the Panel.

To get a hard copy of the Panel's Annual Report, please email us at [ipanel@worldbank.org](mailto:ipanel@worldbank.org).

The Inspection Panel encourages the use and dissemination of its work. Please acknowledge the Inspection Panel as the source of information. You may contact us if you have any questions regarding use and distribution of the Panel's reports.

Electronic version of all of the Inspection Panel's publications can be found [here](#).



### Nordic Outreach Tour — March 26-30, 2012

During March 26 – 30 2012, Mr. Alf Jerve, the Inspection Panel Chairperson, Panel Member Ms. Eimi Watanabe, and Mr. Peter Lallas, the Panel Executive Secretary visited Geneva, Copenhagen, Stockholm, and Oslo.

They met with the Aarhus Convention Secretariat, as well as with the repre-

sentatives of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) based in Geneva.

During the tour, they also met with several NGO representatives, and relevant government ministries in Oslo, Copenhagen, and Stockholm. The

purpose of the trip was to inform these stakeholders about the Inspection Panel's work, its contribution to the upcoming Rio+20 Conference, and to discuss issues related to citizen-driven accountability.

### Inspection Panel awareness raising among students and academia

The Panel Secretariat staff met on different occasions with students of Columbia University Human Rights Program, American University Human Rights and Undergraduate Programs, and of Germany's Justus Liebig University Giessen to introduce the Inspection Panel and its work and discuss the Panel's role in the human rights debate, within the international law sphere and vis-à-vis civil society. These meetings generated discussions on the Panel and its mission, requests for inspections, policies and procedures raised in requests and other aspects related to the Panel's function.



## Update of Operating Procedures

The Inspection Panel is continuing a review and update of its Operating Procedures, which specify the Panel's operations and practice within the ambit of its mandate. The current Procedures date back to the establishment of the Panel in 1994, and need to be updated to reflect, among other things, two sets of Clarifications to the Panel Resolution (in 1996 and 1999) and practice and experience over time.

The Panel has embarked on a targeted consultation process to create opportunities for dialogue with stakeholders who are interested in the Panel's work and issues of public accountability of international financial institutions. This process includes the Board and Management at the World Bank, and various external stakeholders such as former requesters, civil society organizations, representatives of other international accountability mechanisms, members of the academic community, former Panel members, and technical experts who have worked on Panel investigations.

The objective of this consultation process is to identify areas where the Panel has the opportunity to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of its operational work in the years to come, within its existing mandate. One important goal is to help make the Panel process simpler, more user-friendly and accessible, and readily understandable to all. While the ongoing targeted discussions and consultations have already provided many valuable comments on the Panel process in general, it is important to note that this is only an update by the Panel of its Operating Procedures and not a total review of its process.

To facilitate and assist in these discussions, the Panel hired two consultants with expertise in the field of accountability: one to receive ideas and feedback from external stakeholders; and the other from Bank Management/Staff. The Panel itself is carrying out dialogue with Board members. The Panel also circulated, in its [June 2011 Newsletter](#), an invitation for views and recommendations on the initial topics noted above and any other aspects of the Inspection Panel process.

Over the past several months, these consultants, [Ms. Lori Udall and Ms. Jean Aden](#), have engaged in extensive meetings and discussions with the respective stakeholders and provided opportunities for dialogue and input about opportunities to enhance and improve the Panel process and procedures. These discussions have considered, among other topics, the following:

- Improving public awareness of the Panel's availability as an accountability and recourse mechanism
- Supporting due diligence at the registration phase of the Panel process
- Supporting clarity of information in the eligibility phase of the process
- Fostering opportunities for problem solving by Management and Requesters during the early stages of the Panel process
- Speeding up investigations
- Promoting appropriate and effective interactions with the Board, Governments, Requesters and Management throughout the Panel process
- Fact-finding in follow-up to the process (if requested by the Board)
- Promoting corporate learning as a result of Panel investigations and work

Both Panel consultants have reported to the Panel on the full range of comments, ideas and inputs received. The Panel will soon post additional information on these inputs on its website at [www.inspectionpanel.org](http://www.inspectionpanel.org).

Building on these efforts to date, the Panel is now in the process of developing a revised draft set of its new Operating Procedures, taking into account inputs from the targeted discussions. The draft will be made public on the Inspection Panel's website in the near future to allow stakeholders to comment within a period of 45 to 60 days. The Panel's lead contact person for the update of Operating Procedures is Mr. Serge Selwan who can be reached at [sselwan@worldbank.org](mailto:sselwan@worldbank.org).



## Inspection Panel and other Independent Accountability Mechanisms at the Rio+20 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development June 2012

As indicated in the message from the Chair, the upcoming United Nations Summit on Sustainable Development (Rio+20 Conference) presents an important occasion to foster dialogue and attention to the crucial role of civil society and public participation in the development process, in support of sustainable development. To this end, a group of Independent Accountability Mechanisms, including the Inspection Panel, are planning to organize a session on **Citizen-Driven Accountability in the Context of Sustainable Development** as a part of the Rio+20 Conference. It is expected that this event will be hosted on June 18, 2012 by the Brazilian Academy of Sciences in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

The purpose of this event is to contribute to the agenda of the Rio+20 Conference and its objectives by generating discussion and dialogue about citizen-driven accountability, in support of more equitable and sustainable development. The discussion will highlight the role of civil society in the work of the IAMs and the contribution of IAMs in development operations, and note the important role of science and technical expertise in the process. The event will also be an opportunity for the IAMs to present their rich experience in dealing with a multitude of issues raised by affected people. The IAMs will present an analytical paper that summarizes the evolution of the IAMs and highlights current trends and outcomes by addressing questions such as: *What is the record of the IAMs over nearly two decades? How do they work as international fact-finding bodies? What kind of issues do they address, and what are their findings? Are solution-seeking/redress mechanisms complementary or substitutes for accountability? What can be done to protect and strengthen the rights of people to voice their concerns and obtain redress? What can be done to strengthen accountability in operations of the IFIs?*

The Rio+20 Conference will mark the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development, as well as the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg. To find out more about the Conference and its objectives, please visit the [Rio+20 official website](#).

### Inspection Panel Member Vacancy Announcement Deadline April 13, 2012

The Inspection Panel has announced a vacancy for the position of Inspection Panel Member. A link to the vacancy announcement and information on how to apply can be found [here](#). In May 2003, the Board of Executive Directors of the World Bank established [the procedures for the selection of a new Panel Member](#). In February 2012, the Board appointed members of the Selection Committee for a new Inspection Panel Member. The composition of the Selection Committee can be found [here](#).

Applications or suggestions for candidates should be sent to Mr. Derek Wilkinson of the Boyden Executive Search at [WBGIInspectionPanel@boyden.com](mailto:WBGIInspectionPanel@boyden.com).



## The Panel in Facts and Figures

### The Panel's Case record

- Formal Requests Received	77
- Requests Registered	66
- Recommendations Approved	58
- Concerns Addressed during Eligibility Phase	15
- Investigations Recommended	31
- Investigations Approved*	27

\* The number of investigations is 27, however, the number of Requests leading to investigations is 30 because three investigations related to projects subject to more than one Request.

### Percentage of Requests by region

- Middle East & North Africa	3%
- East Asia & Pacific	8.5%
- Europe & Central Asia	10%
- South Asia	19.5%
- Latin America & Caribbean	30%
- Sub-Saharan Africa	31%

### 10 Bank Policies most often raised in Requests

1. Project Supervision
2. Environmental Assessment
3. Involuntary Resettlement
4. Indigenous Peoples
5. Disclosure of Information
6. Poverty Reduction
7. Natural Habitats
8. Economic Evaluation
9. Cultural Resources
10. Forestry

### Contact us:

1818 H Street NW  
Washington DC, 20433 USA

Tel: ++202-458-5200  
Fax: ++202-522-0916  
e-mail: [ipanel@worldbank.org](mailto:ipanel@worldbank.org)  
or  
P.O. Box 27566  
Washington, DC 20038

[www.inspectionpanel.org](http://www.inspectionpanel.org)