

Comments on World Bank draft Operational Policies O.P. 4.10 and Bank Procedures B.P. 4.10, concerning indigenous peoples.

Society for Applied Anthropology

[Submitted to the World Bank in November 2001]

Overview

The Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA) is an international professional association with over 2,300 members concerned with the application of the social sciences to the resolution of contemporary human problems. The SfAA is comprised of professionals from many occupations, including academia, business, law, health care, the non-profit sector, and government. Our members come from a variety of disciplines: anthropology, sociology, economics, planning, and other applied social and behavioral sciences. What unites us is a commitment to applying social knowledge for the public good, a commitment exemplified by the careers of our founding members, including Margaret Mead. The Society appreciates the opportunity to comment on O.P. 4.10 and B.P. 4.10.

O.P. 4.10 and B.P. 4.10 are proposed to replace O.D. 4.20, issued in 1991. The Society recognizes that The Bank aims to bring its indigenous peoples policy into line with its new format of separate documents on policy, procedures, and best practices. The changes from the 1991 document to the proposed 2001 documents represent significant alterations in language, however, with important practical consequences; the changes are not simple or routine. The Society strongly recommends that O.P. /B.P. 4.10 be strengthened in a number of areas before they are enshrined as Bank policy and procedure.

The Society compliments The Bank on many aspects of this draft. The new policy/procedures emphasize much more clearly the central informed decision-making role of indigenous peoples themselves. The proposed documents draw attention to the need for culturally and gender appropriate approaches, and address key areas of interaction between Bank projects and indigenous peoples, such as conservation areas, natural resource extraction projects, and commercialization of cultural resources. The Society notes that the new documents seek the necessary balance of economic and culture considerations in Bank lending policies, and applaud this effort. The Society's approach to The Bank's proposals is constructive, acknowledging the ever-present need for review and change. However, we strongly feel that the positive features of the proposed document do not justify its adoption by The Bank until and unless the major limitations of the drafts are addressed.

The general philosophy of the Society's comments is as follows: in keeping with The Bank's own phrasing "meaningful consultation" and "informed participation," indigenous peoples themselves should be core decision-makers on relevant project and afforded the right of prior, informed consent, a cornerstone of their rights as recognized by the International Labor Organization and the United Nations. The Society recognizes that The Bank is striving to provide more responsibility to non-bank actors, to borrowers and indigenous peoples alike. In situations where indigenous peoples hold a fair status in the borrowers' society, this requires open and reasonable procedures for project design and implementation. However, we are cognizant of the widespread situations where borrowers do not adequately represent the intentions or best interests of indigenous peoples. Where indigenous peoples face conditions of discrimination, vulnerability in the legal system, and unequal power (see O.P. 4.10 paragraphs 2, 4), The Bank should be unusually careful in reviewing the quality and results of the participatory process. Consultation from indigenous people to borrower and subsequently reported by the borrower to The Bank is too weak a standard, especially for high-risk projects. Such conditions demand from Bank policy a stricter standard, that both borrower and indigenous peoples give meaningful prior, informed consent in a process with demonstrated integrity. Cultural sensitivity of policy is necessary, but not sufficient; policy must

also promote and require effective exercise of rights and statement of interests. Inexplicably, the policy assigns the borrower, who may have little experience in indigenous development, responsibility for the indigenous development plan. The policy is out of step with indigenous development approaches that focus upon capacity building and empowerment of peoples as a development means and end. Throughout the recommendations, then, the Society advocates one fundamental theme: prior, informed consultation and consent by indigenous peoples must be realistic, meaningful, and unavoidable.

The changes suggested herein serve three important goals of the World Bank. First, experience has shown that projects that ensure conditions of lawfulness, non-discrimination, and meaningful participation and consent are more effective at poverty reduction. Poor project governance and merely symbolic versions of participation (cloaking top-down managerial approaches) are associated with project inefficiency and development ineffectiveness. Indigenous peoples are in particular danger of being impoverished by discriminatory and non-participatory projects. Thus strengthening O.P. 4.10/B.P. 4.10 serves the poverty reduction goals of The Bank. Second, such approaches offer a consent-based process, which addresses the need of all multilateral institutions for widening understanding and support in the court of world public opinion. Finally, empowering indigenous peoples to take active charge of their own futures in project design, screening and appraisal, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation serve fundamental ends of human capacity development and nation-building in open and democratic forms.

Paragraph by paragraph discussion

O.P. 4.1

Paragraph 1. We read the final sentence of this paragraph with a concern about inequitable agreements that might arise because of the legal and commercial weakness of many indigenous peoples. Apparent benefits could in fact prove to be symbolic, minimal, or maldistributed. The policy needs language that fits with The Bank's goal of poverty reduction, in this case among indigenous peoples. **Recommendation:** add the words "and equitable" to the end of the paragraph, so the final sentence reads "...and ensure that benefits intended for them are culturally appropriate and equitable."

Paragraph 2. In paragraph 2, O.D. 4.20 included strong language addressing situations where indigenous peoples are restricted in their capacity to assert their rights and interests. This language does not appear in O.P. 4.10. Yet O.P. 4.10/B.P. 4.10 aspire to greater active participation by indigenous peoples and borrowers, which makes even more important language justifying "special action" to enable effective exercise of interests and rights. A modified form of the passage from O.D. 4.20 should be included in O.P. 4.10 in order to justify and support specific policy statements in paragraphs 9-11 and 14-16. **Recommendation:** add this sentence to paragraph 2: "Special action is required where Bank investments affect indigenous peoples whose social and economic status restricts their capacity to assert their interests and rights in land, culture and other vital resources."

Paragraph 6. The Society strongly disagrees with the draft policy's exclusion of groups who have left their communities of origin, moved to urban areas, or migrated to obtain wage labor. Voluminous research has shown that in the contemporary world, indigenous peoples' survival strategies often include migratory labor, residence in cities, and so forth, and importantly that such movements do not preclude active involvement in traditional home communities and regions. Often, the most vital and creative leaders and organizations have external involvements during at least part of their lives. To remove them from indigenous status would undercut the "meaningful consultation" that The Bank seeks. **Recommendation:** eliminate all of paragraph 7. If there is concern that unrelated outsiders are abusing the process (and great caution should taken with this

assumption), the paragraph 6(a) provisions for close attachment and/or 6(c) self-identification and identification by others more than suffice to handle this contingency.

Paragraph 9. The Society supports The Bank's emphasis at the screening stage on evidence of consultation and participation by indigenous peoples in the borrower proposal. The language about cultural concerns in paragraph 9 is good, and we applaud The Bank for it. There remains a serious concern with unequal power situations inside borrower nations that sometimes render consultations less than fully meaningful. We note that this goes beyond simply being culture and gender appropriate (the thrust of proposed items 9(a) and (c)). Our concern is that borrower documents should demonstrate substantive as well as formal consultation, including evidence that indigenous peoples' representative organizations served as autonomous, equal, and effective negotiating bodies in the decision-making process. Three changes can help bring this about. **Recommendations:** First, add item 9(d) which reads "results in clear prior, informed consent by significantly affected indigenous peoples, achieved in an process with demonstrated integrity." Second, add the word "substantive" so that the last sentence reads "The Bank reviews the Borrower's project proposal to ensure its substantive consistency with this policy." Finally, the policy should provide for the project to finance independent, legal representation to indigenous people to equalize the unfair advantage that the policy assigns to the borrower over indigenous peoples.

After paragraph 9. Indigenous consultation and participation in the screening stage is not meaningful if it takes place in a coercive or highly risky context, situations often faced by indigenous peoples and it is not meaningful unless the indigenous people are fully informed, in a timely and culturally appropriate manner, of all project risks that may be associated with the project. It is the responsibility of borrowers and host governments to ensure adequate contexts for participation, and the responsibility of The Bank to review project proposals with this concern in mind. **Recommendation:** Insert a new paragraph after paragraph 9, here named paragraph 9.1. It should read "Project design, planning, and implementation cannot go forward if the borrower and/or the host nation cannot guarantee minimum conditions of lawfulness, openness, and non-coercion of indigenous peoples so that their participation is meaningful and effective. Initially, this should be documented as part of project screening, and then regularly monitored throughout the project life-cycle."

Paragraph 10, subsection a. This paragraph is the critical stage when The Bank reviews key borrower documents concerning major and often adverse impacts on indigenous peoples, including evidence from social assessment, the major planning document Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP), and within it, evidence of vital consultations with indigenous peoples over potentially very serious issues. However, we are deeply concerned that the language in this section exclusively emphasizes how the project will be made to proceed ("the measures required to avoid, minimize, or mitigate such impacts"). There are some situations where participation is seriously insufficient and/or where impacts are so large that they cannot be mitigated while maintaining the human and cultural integrity of a people. Given the disadvantages and biases faced by indigenous peoples, and given the major impacts this paragraph envisions, we see a particularly vital role for a legitimate consultation process and clear prior, informed consent by indigenous peoples when projects involve high levels of adverse impacts--participatory approaches entirely in keeping with The Bank's policy in this document. As professional social scientists, we know that prior, informed consent is technically feasible. **Recommendation:** add the following sentence to the end of 10(a). "In situations with substantial adverse impact, the borrower must demonstrate extensive consultation with and clear prior, informed consent by indigenous peoples to the IPP and all relevant project components, achieved in an process with demonstrated integrity; absent this, the project cannot proceed."

In regard to paragraph 10, we also introduce a smaller suggestion for The Bank's consideration. This paragraph dichotomizes Bank policy into two paths, one where there are anticipated adverse impacts and an IPP is required, and the other where there are benefits and cultural appropriateness

and consultation but an IPP is not required. However, anthropology has shown that apparent benefits may have significant social-cultural impacts, sometimes negative, on indigenous peoples. It seems advisable where substantial benefits are aimed at indigenous peoples, that planning be required take into account possible changes, side-effects, and transformations, and that indigenous people be deeply involved with the planning. What is and is not a benefit should be definitely agreed upon by the indigenous peoples, as well as the borrower and bank. **Recommendation:** an IPP be required in subsection (b) as well as subsection (a) where anticipated benefits are substantial relative to the size of the indigenous group. This also requires modification of B.P. 4.10 paragraph 5, to read “where a project may entail substantial impacts...” rather than “where a project may entail adverse impacts...” and again in paragraph 6, “where the social assessment confirms that a project has substantial impacts...” rather than “where the social assessment confirms that a project has adverse impacts...” Finally, we feel the policy should make it clear that indigenous peoples are informed and participate in the discover of potential hazards, risks and benefits associated with a propose project prior to consenting to any agreements.

After Paragraph 11. In keeping with the overview, which calls for indigenous “voice ... in implementation,” there are several areas for improvement in this section. One of them is continued indigenous participation in projects after screening and design, i.e., into the stages of implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. The other concerns conditions for meaningful participation in these later stages. In general, we see a need to extend O.P./B.P. 4.10’s participatory philosophy beyond initial planning to cover the full project cycle, including such important issues as monitoring disbursement of benefits and mitigation resources. We see a particular need for a voice for indigenous peoples in project evaluation, which should prove valuable information for future Bank decisions and policies. Our professional members have participated in or documented scores of cases in which indigenous groups ahve been active members or formed their own evaluation teams. Also, we see conditions of openness, lawfulness, and security as vital to this process. **Recommendations:** Insert a new paragraph after paragraph 11--here named paragraph 11.1. Paragraph 11.1 should read “A strategy for participation at all project stages should be part of the IPP; where appropriate, the IPP shall also include plans for sustainable post-project rights and participation for indigenous peoples. Meaningful consultation with indigenous peoples, as described in paragraph 9, shall be conducted at regular intervals during project implementation. Meaningful consultation on and participation in disbursement of benefits, mitigation measures, and compensation is essential. Indigenous people affected by projects are to participate meaningfully and substantially in project monitoring and post-project evaluation, and a record of their comments is to be kept by the borrower, the host government, and The Bank. Information and documentation needed for all aspects of project monitoring and evaluation shall be made available in a timely fashion, in a language understandable by indigenous peoples’ representatives, and supported with expertise so that indigenous peoples are enabled to address technical issues as much as possible. When substantial adverse impacts emerge in implementation and post-implementation stages, borrower plans must demonstrate extensive consultation with and clear prior, informed consent by indigenous peoples, achieved in an process with demonstrated integrity; absent this, further actions cannot proceed. Throughout the project, the borrower and host government are to maintain lawfulness, openness, and non-coercion of indigenous peoples so that their participation is meaningful and effective; inability to do this can result in reduction or cancellation of Bank loans.”

After Paragraph 11. Recent decades of activity by indigenous peoples and research by social scientists have shown that such people are capable of making effective use of expert knowledge when it is available to them but also that lack of access to expert knowledge (as compared to dominant society institutions) is a major cause of poverty, exclusion, and lack of power. The previous policy, O.D. 4.20, listed many specific kinds of expert information and required definite roles for external specialists on indigenous peoples. The current draft has essentially removed all the calls for specific knowledge and roles for expertise, undoubtedly for two reasons--to reduce overly specific operational detail and to temper the earlier document’s tendency to paternalism. The Society does not disagree with these goals. However, excising all aspects of expert knowledge

from policy mandates will have the negative side effect of not guaranteeing that indigenous people themselves can call on expert knowledge to empower their role in consultation and participation. The Society holds that there is an important role for anthropological and sociological expertise in the service of indigenous peoples' prior informed participation at all stages of the project process, as well as for The Bank, borrower, and host government. **Recommendation:** create a new paragraph 11.2 after paragraphs 11 and 11.1. It should read "In projects where there is a significant chance that indigenous people will be affected, indigenous development, anthropological, sociological, or other relevant expertise shall be part of project screening, design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Such expertise shall be made available in a timely and culturally and linguistically meaningful fashion to indigenous peoples as well as to borrowers, host governments, and The Bank. The substantive availability of such expertise shall be one of the criteria used by The Bank in screening IPPs and other borrower documents. Gathering information needed to render such expertise useful shall be part of the full project life cycle (see B.P. 4.10). The Bank may assist borrowers and indigenous peoples with such expertise and information collection as needed."

Paragraph 14 addresses commercial use of lands and resources. The Society applauds The Bank's recognition that such uses represent a particular problem area for indigenous peoples and the requirement that borrowers inform indigenous peoples about rights under statutory and customary law. However, the policy should go further than simply informing people, it should also make financial provisions to provide indigenous people with legal representation, independent of the borrower, government or bank. The Society also applauds the language about benefit-sharing. However, because land is often vital to the human and cultural survival of indigenous peoples (as recognized in O.P. 4.10), certain projects may present such substantial loss of or damage to use of lands as to extinguish or irreparably harm indigenous groups. Nevertheless, the final sentence speaks only of adverse impacts being avoided or minimized and culturally appropriate benefits shared. Certain projects may have impacts that cannot sufficiently be mitigated, minimized, or compensated as to make up for the kinds of harm suffered by indigenous people. If the welfare of indigenous peoples is the reason for this safety net policy, then provisions must be made for the possibility of canceling projects on such grounds. **Recommendation:** add as the final sentence in paragraph 14: "In situations where projects involve loss of or damage to use of lands that might extinguish or substantially harm indigenous groups, the borrower must demonstrate extensive consultation with and clear prior, informed consent by indigenous peoples, achieved in a process with demonstrated integrity; absent this, the project cannot proceed." We also suggest adding the word "equitable" to item (d), so that it reads "provides them with opportunities to derive equitable benefits from the project." The justification for this is discussed under paragraph 1, above.

Paragraph 15. This section also recognizes a critical and complex issue for indigenous peoples. We applaud The Bank for its recognition of both customary rights and sustainable ecosystem management. We also welcome the final sentence that offers preference for arrangements that allow sustainable use to enable indigenous peoples to maintain their way of life. However, we are concerned that proposed language makes the achievement of this preferred resolution more difficult. Extensive social science and human ecological research demonstrates that indigenous peoples are in a dynamic relationship with their environment, modifying it and using some of resource stocks and flows in ways that do alter the ecosystem without leading to irreversible declines. Thus such relationships, though involving some usage of stocks, can be sustained over very long periods of time. However, paragraph 15 envisions Bank projects in this area "ensur[ing] that natural resources are not depleted." Some depletion of resources is necessary for continued human use. Although not deliberate, we worry that unqualified use of the word depletion might justify projects whose notion of conservation is to exclude human activities, including those of existing indigenous occupants, even though the overall thrust of paragraph 14 is not to do this. We think the language should be better crafted to recognize the combined human and natural goals for such parks/areas. Furthermore, recent field research has shown that when indigenous peoples are involved in unsustainable uses of resources, this often comes from a combination of poverty, exclusion, exploitation, new needs, and limited ways for fulfilling them. We think that any

conservation policy that acknowledges customary rights to indigenous use must equip such peoples with capabilities such that they can avoid unsustainable depletion of resources.

Recommendations: change the phrase “ensure that natural resources are not depleted” to read “ensure that natural stocks and flows are managed and used in such a way as not to lead to irreversible decline and depletion.” To be consistent with other aspects of the policy where there are potential substantial adverse impacts (see paragraphs 10, 14 above), change the passage “to ensure informed participation of those indigenous peoples with customary rights of use” to read “to obtain prior, informed consent of those indigenous peoples with customary rights of use.” At the end, add the sentence, “To achieve these goals, furthermore, preference is given to projects that include a significant component that increases the economic, social, legal, and political capabilities of indigenous peoples such that they are less likely to use natural resources in unsustainable ways.”

Paragraph 16. This section on commercialization of cultural resources represents a real improvement to the policy. However, we read this paragraph with a concern about inequitable agreements that might arise because of the legal and commercial weakness of many indigenous peoples, as well as political pressures. Again, we stress the need to assure the weaker parties have proper legal representation. Without adequate representation, apparent benefits could in fact prove to be minimal or maldistributed. In reviewing planning and implementation, The Bank, borrowers, and host governments need to ensure that indigenous peoples receive compensation for the commercialization of their own cultural resources comparable to that obtained by outside parties.

Recommendation: add the word “equitable” so that the paragraph reads “Bank policy requires that such groups agree to and derive equitable benefits from the use of such resources.”

Paragraphs 17-22 (“Indigenous Peoples and Development” section). This section delineates a wide variety of possible initiatives that indigenous peoples, borrowers, and The Bank can take that would strengthen indigenous peoples initiatives and capabilities. The Society is supportive of these approaches. Each paragraph is phrased as actions that borrowers, Bank, etc. “may” rather than “shall” do. This is necessary, in that different initiatives may be appropriate in different situations, so flexibility is needed. However, it presents the risk that these paragraphs may have little effect on actual policy if few substantive projects are initiated, existing mainly as wish-lists on paper. We are certain that this is not The Bank’s intention. An appropriate solution is to monitor regularly The Bank’s, borrowers’ and host governments’ initiatives in these areas, to demonstrate where activities are taking place and where added initiatives are needed. Not least, this knowledge of existing kinds of projects and potential areas for new projects will constitute a resource for indigenous peoples’ organizations that will promote greater use of these approaches. **Recommendation:** add a new paragraph after paragraph 22 (tentatively numbered 22.1) that shall read: “As part of the Country Assistance Strategy, an annual report shall delineate all proposed and on-going projects in that nation falling under the preceding criteria (paragraphs 17-22), and summarize activities taken therein.” Also, to rectify the preceding paragraph (22) after the insertion of the new paragraph, drop the word “Finally” at its beginning.

Footnote 2. This footnote defines the range of Bank projects to which the policy shall apply, and extends its coverage to all components of the project, regardless of the source of financing. This is a constructive measure, and we applaud it. However, the next sentence specifically removes adjustment loans from the policy. Indigenous peoples are often profoundly affected by adjustment loan-based policies, including loss of lands to commercialization, weakening of specialized public services and agencies directed to them, and emergence of new market activities and opportunities. Hence, the final sentence creates a substantial loophole and threatens to undermine the constructive elements of Bank policy toward indigenous peoples. It needs to be replaced by a sentence explicitly including such loans as projects subject to this policy. **Recommendation:** delete the existing final sentence of footnote 2 (“The term ‘project’ does not include...”) and replace it with this sentence “The term ‘project’ includes programs supported under adjustment loans.”

Footnote 6. The text at paragraph 10 and elsewhere (recommended paragraph 11.1, and paragraphs 14-16) do not adequately address the situations where indigenous' peoples social-political organization makes it difficult to obtain meaningful consultation and consent, especially in situations with substantial adverse impacts. In all cases, the thrust of policy should be to increase the capacity of indigenous peoples to participate in decision-making. But there needs to be a special mechanism to handle this distinctive set of cases. We suggest that as soon as such indigenous groups are identified and there is an indication of any substantial impact, a special commission of nonpartisan experts be appointed to safeguard indigenous peoples' interests starting from the creation of the IPP. **Recommendation:** add this additional statement at the end of footnote 6: "In situations where indigenous' peoples social-political organization makes it difficult to obtain meaningful consultation and consent, and when there is an initial indication that a project will have a substantial impact on them, a special commission of nonpartisan and unaffiliated professionals shall be appointed, starting from the creation of the IPP, to safeguard indigenous peoples' interests and increase the capacity of the group. Members should be drawn from persons familiar with the locale and the culture of the impacted indigenous peoples. Membership should be interdisciplinary and should be drawn broadly from the fields of law, anthropology, sociology, environment/ecology, resource economics, and agriculture/forestry, where applicable. To obtain a nonpartisan commission, appropriate professional organizations will appoint members. The commission should have access to a broad range of indigenous groups, representatives, and leaders; likewise, the commission should be given adequate opportunity for field reconnaissance and access to all pertinent documents. The commission should attend and participate in hearings on the terms of loan agreements, and its testimony should become part of the record of proceedings. Later, commission representatives should participate in monitoring and evaluation of project implementation and disbursement of benefits and mitigation resources. The cost of the commission shall be borne by the borrower. In all cases, however, the thrust of commission activities should be to increase the capacity of indigenous peoples to participate in decision-making. The commission mentioned below should include representatives of the group and work to rid itself of a job as soon as the people are trained."

B.P. 4.10

Paragraph 5. We have two concerns about this paragraph. First, in this draft it does not indicate that the social assessment is shared consultatively with indigenous peoples. Second, the description of the content of an adequate social assessment should be strengthened, especially if this is a form of expertise to be shared with indigenous peoples (see comments on O.P. 4.10, suggested paragraph 11.2, above). O.P. 4.10/B.P. 4.10 are much less specific than O.D. 4.20 about kinds of information collected in situations with possible significant impacts on indigenous peoples.

Recommendation: add this passage to the end of paragraph 5: "Draft social assessments should be conducted with and shared with indigenous people's representatives and a record kept of these consultations, before being forwarded to The Bank. This forms part of the record of consultation and prior, informed consent needed to conform to O.P. 4.10. The borrowers' participatory social assessment should be written by qualified social and environmental scientists, and borrowers should also make independent experts available to indigenous peoples. An adequate social assessment will vary from project to project, but it shall include at least information on the legal and customary situations and rights of indigenous peoples, their lands and resources, delineation of institutional capacity (including climate of lawfulness) in the affected area, a baseline social and environmental study, key social, cultural, and environmental impacts on the population, strategies for eliciting and strengthening local participation, and politically and culturally appropriate mitigation and implementation strategies. Failing to share in a timely fashion the results of this assessment from the indigenous people shall terminate the project process."

Paragraphs 5 and 6. If an IPP is required for projects with substantial positive impacts as well as adverse impacts (as we recommend in the comments on O.P. 4.10 above), then small modifications in language are needed in these two paragraphs. **Recommendation:** modify B.P. 4.10 paragraph

5, to read “where a project may entail substantial impacts...” rather than “where a project may entail adverse impacts...” and paragraph 6 to read “where the social assessment confirms that a project has substantial impacts...” rather than “where the social assessment confirms that a project has adverse impacts...”

Paragraph 6. This paragraph does require that the IPP be developed in consultation with indigenous peoples. A record of this should be kept by the borrower and sent to The Bank for review for adequacy along with the IPP itself. Also, the consultation should be culturally and linguistically accessible to indigenous peoples and should be conducted in a timely fashion.

Recommendation: after the phrase "and the borrower shares it with the affected indigenous groups in a culturally and linguistically appropriate fashion, and in a timely manner required for prior, informed consent."

Paragraph 7. This addresses the final sharing of the IPP after approval. It mentions an original (presumptively national language) IPP and an English summary, but does not deal with cultural and linguistic barriers to sharing such information with indigenous peoples. **Recommendation:** add the following sentences after the first sentence: "A record of the consultation should be kept by the borrower and sent to The Bank for review for adequacy along with the IPP itself. The consultation and sharing of the detailed IPP should be culturally and linguistically accessible to indigenous peoples and should be conducted in a timely manner."

Paragraph 10. This paragraph concerns negotiations between borrowers and The Bank over the IPP and other required measures. It does not mandate sharing of information with indigenous peoples and host governments until the final document is agreed on and released to the public. Sharing post facto information is not participation and this paragraph as presently drafted vitiates the important initiatives on participation elsewhere in the document. **Recommendation:** add these sentences to paragraph 10: "Proposals and working documents exchanged between The Bank and the borrower are also made available in a timely fashion to indigenous peoples, their representatives, and host governments. All final agreements between borrowers and The Bank, including not only the IPP, are to be made available to indigenous peoples, their representatives, and host governments."

Paragraph 11. This paragraph ensures that adequate resources are made available for supervision of projects involving indigenous peoples. As it stands now, it implies but does not make clear that such resources should be sufficient for participation in implementation, monitoring, evaluation, etc. by indigenous peoples themselves, including making available appropriate expertise to support their participation. **Recommendation:** add to the end of this paragraph "including resources and expert support needed for indigenous participation in project implementation and post-implementation phases."

Paragraph 13. This paragraph does not mention indigenous participation in the Implementation Completion Report. Indigenous participation in evaluation is essential to identifying impacts, remaining issues and shortfalls, and future lessons. **Recommendation:** add a following sentence to the portion of the paragraph after item (c) that begins "If the objectives..." The added sentence should read "Indigenous peoples should participate in a meaningful fashion in the researching and composition of the Implementation Completion Report (ICR), and a record of their comments on this kept. The final ICR should be made available to the affected indigenous peoples in a culturally and linguistically meaningful fashion."

Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these proposed policies/procedures. The SfAA would appreciate being notified of further revisions to and developments concerning O.P. 4.10 and

B.P. 4.10. Please direct any further communication on this matter to Dr. Noel Chrisman, President, Society for Applied Anthropology, at the address given below.

[correspondence address]