

MINUTES
HYDROPOWER SUSTAINABILITY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
MEETING #35 (video conference call)
17 August 2021 (12:00-13:30 UK time)

Attendees – 12	Apologies
Ashok Khosla (Chair, HSGC)	James Dalton (Alternate, Environmental or conservation organisations)
Kimberly Lyon (Chair, Financial institutions, Vice Chair HSGC)	Mwape Chikonkolo Mwewa (Chair, Emerging economy country governments)
Jian-hua Meng (Chair, Environmental or conservation organisations)	Prof Shi Guoqing (Alternate, Emerging economy country governments)
Jiwari Abdullah (Chair, Social impacts/project affected communities)	Daniel Menebhi (Chair, Advanced economy country governments)
Stéphane Brabant (Alternate, Social impacts/project affected communities)	Geir Yngve Hermansen (Alternate, Advanced economy country governments)
Elisa (Jianliang) Xiao (Alternate, Financial institutions)	Jürgen Schuol (Chair, Hydropower consultants, suppliers)
Pedro Sirgado (Alternate, Hydropower owners, operators)	Knut Sierotzki (Alternate, Hydropower consultants, suppliers)
Helen Locher (Accredited Lead Assessor)	Sunil Poudel (Observer)
Eddie Rich (Management Entity (ME))	Amina Kadyrzhanova (ME)
Joao Costa (ME)	
Alain Kilajian (ME)	
Bénédicte Nsalambi (ME)	

This HSGC meeting was not in quorum as 4 out of the minimum 5 chambers were present.

ME posted a note on Basecamp on 23 September to provide an opportunity for HSGC members to send objections on the relevant elements of the minutes by Friday 27 August.

ME confirmed that no objections to the Standard, Assurance System, comments from second consultation and Accredited Assessors procedures review were received. This was taken as equivalent to endorsement from the Committee. The Standard was therefore agreed to be launched on 8 September.

Agenda Item	Minutes
HSGC 35.1 Welcome and apologies	The Chair reminded HSGC members of housekeeping rules.
35.2 Agenda	The agenda was approved.
35.3 Status of actions from last meeting	The minutes of last meeting were approved. The Chair mentioned the Decisions and Actions register published on Basecamp.



<p>35.4 Comments from second standard consultation</p>	<p>The Chair invited ME to present the findings of the second Standard consultation.</p> <p>The Chair noted that the ME would be applying for ISEAL membership after the Standard launch, at the first opening in October. On a personal note, ME member added that they were in Tajikistan to observe an HESG assessment. They highlighted the excitement of a local IPP towards the Standard certification and recognition. They then invited an Accredited Lead Assessor to speak.</p> <p>The Accredited Lead Assessor said that the spectrum of views coming through in the consultation was also well-represented in the Standard Working Group. They applauded the ME on the execution of this process and thanked them.</p> <p>The Chair asked members if they agreed and approved the comments received during the consultation.</p> <p>Committee members congratulated the ME’s work.</p> <p>A committee member suggested to make publicly available submissions and records of consultation during and after the consultation to allow respondents to track their contributions and influence on the HS Standard.</p> <p>Decision 1: HSGC members approved the comments received during the second standard consultation.</p> <p>Action 1: The ME to apply for ISEAL membership in October.</p> <p>Action 2: The ME to make publicly available submissions and records of consultation from the second standard consultation.</p>
<p>35.5 Standard and Assurance System</p>	<p>The Chair invited ME to introduce revisions of the Standard document and Assurance System. Following ME’s presentation, the Chair opened the floor to comments.</p> <p>The Lead Accredited Assessor reminded members of the time of the first release of the HSAP and highlighted that the Standard was an evolving document to be improved alongside experience of application.</p> <p>A committee member congratulated on the work of the ME. The member suggested to change the language in the introduction with “informed by” rather than “aligned with” regarding IFI safeguards. They asked for clarification on the assessment process and the tool to use before applying for certification.</p> <p>On their second comment, ME suggested to remove the confusing graphic on the assessment process to clarify everything.</p> <p>The member asked another question on project-affected people highlighting that, if commitments to those communities had not been made in earlier stages, a project assessed during operations using the HSAP was not penalised for it. Another member added that it could be a loophole which should be given some thought. The member continued by highlighting the need for continuous improvement.</p> <p>The Accredited Lead Assessor said that the Standard was better as everything was relevant for operations and accounted for all issues, past or ongoing.</p> <p>ME referred to the language of “aligned with” and its importance. ME stated that saying “informed by” was vague and could lead to parallel processes. A committee member added that the closer the alignment was, the better the Standard would be perceived. ME highlighted that “alignment” was a middle ground which was a step below “compliance” showing that we were on the way to compliance without being there yet. ME proposed to stick with the existing language.</p> <p>The committee member clarified that as long as the language did not suggest that getting a certification qualified a project for financing by specific IFIs such as the World</p>

	<p>Bank, this position was defensible. They stated that it was important to be transparent about this, and this would help to facilitate use of the Standard within IFIs like the World Bank Group.</p> <p>Decision 2: Committee members approved revisions of the Standard document and Assurance System.</p>
35.6 Accredited Assessors procedures review	<p>The Chair invited ME to introduce the AA procedures review.</p> <p>A committee member applauded the improvements. The member reminded that in the early days of the Protocol, they wondered about the involvement of certification consultancies and wanted to know if the ME thought of that.</p> <p>ME answered that they had not considered involving certification consultancies for now but was open to the idea if useful.</p> <p>The Accredited Lead Assessor said that they had done a workshop in London with some certification consultancies and noted that these consultancies wanted a checklist of yes/no criteria, without necessarily knowing anything about hydropower which was something the ME should be careful of.</p> <p>A committee member welcomed these changes and congratulated the ME.</p> <p>Decision 3: Committee members approved the Accredited Assessors procedures review.</p>
35.7 World Hydropower Congress events	<p>The Chair invited ME to present Congress events.</p> <p>ME invited members to register, share and promote Congress events. They added that the ME wanted to start conversations with solar, wind, geothermal and other renewable energy industries to build a common sustainability framework.</p>
35.8 Update on Protected Areas	<p>The Chair invited ME to provide members with an update on Protected Areas.</p> <p>Following ME's presentation, Ashok explained that the objective was to blow the whistle early enough.</p>
35.9 Any other business	<p>A committee member said that reactions from Chinese, Indian, African and Central Asian developers were missing and that we were still under the radar of some of these important players.</p> <p>ME agreed with the committee member's statement and explained that the ME was trying to get CEOs around the world to make the commitment to certify at least one of their projects with the Standard. They added that a press release would go out in conjunction with the launch of the Standard with commitments from companies all around the world.</p> <p>The Accredited Lead Assessor suggested to get commitments from governments to certify at least one hydropower plant/project in their country, which could be viewed as a "model" project.</p> <p>A committee member agreed with the Assessor's suggestion.</p> <p>ME highlighted that they were working closely with the Colombian government and added that they would like to stay with the Assessor on that subject.</p> <p>The Chair closed the meeting.</p>
35.10 Summary of decisions and actions	<p>Decision 1: Committee members approved the comments received during the second standard consultation.</p>



Decision 2: Committee members approved revisions of the Standard document and Assurance System.

Decision 3: Committee members approved the Accredited Assessors procedures review.

Action 1: The ME to apply for ISEAL membership in October.

Action 2: The ME to make publicly available submissions and records of consultation from the second standard consultation.