

MINUTES
HYDROPOWER SUSTAINABILITY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
MEETING #40 (video conference call)
07 December 2022 (12:00-14:30 UK time)

| Attendees | Apologies |
|---|--|
| <p>Ashok Khosla (Chair, HSGC)</p> <p>Kimberly Lyon (Chair, Financial institutions, Vice Chair HSGC)</p> <p>James Dalton (Alternate, Environmental or conservation organisations)</p> <p>Jiwari Abdullah (Chair, Social impacts/project affected communities)</p> <p>Stéphane Brabant (Alternate, Social impacts/project affected communities)</p> <p>Daniel Menebhi (Chair, Advanced economy country governments)</p> <p>Jürgen Schuol (Chair, Hydropower consultants, suppliers)</p> <p>Knut Sierotzki (Alternate, Consultants and Suppliers)</p> <p>Pedro Sirgado (Chair, Hydropower operators, developers)</p> <p>Catherine Garcia (Alternate, Hydropower operators, developers)</p> <p>Mwape Chikonkolo Mwewa (Chair, Emerging economy country governments)</p> <p>Jian-hua Meng (Chair, Environmental or conservation organisations)</p> <p>Elisa (Jianliang) Xiao (Alternate, Financial institutions)</p> <p>Sunil Poudel (Alternate, Emerging economy country governments)</p> | <p>Geir Yngve Hermansen (Alternate, Advanced economy country governments)</p> <p>Prof Shi Guoqing (Observer, Emerging economy country governments)</p> |
| Observers | Secretariat |
| <p>Joerg Hartmann (Accredited Lead Assessor)</p> | <p>Eddie Rich</p> <p>Joao Costa</p> <p>Alain Kilajian</p> <p>Amina Kadyrzhanova</p> <p>Amira Abdalla</p> <p>Mariana Empis</p> |



| Agenda Item | Minutes |
|--|---|
| HSGC 40.1 Welcome and apologies | The Chair confirmed quorum and welcomed HSGC members to the meeting. He reminded them of the housekeeping rules. The Chair also confirmed there were no objections to representative of Accredited Lead Assessors joining as an observer to the meeting. |
| 40.2 Agenda | The agenda was approved. |
| 40.3 Status of actions from last meeting | <p>The minutes of the last meeting were approved and the status of the actions from the last meeting verified.</p> <p>A Committee member requested HSGC #39 minutes be shared via email in pdf format. The Secretariat provided updates on project assessment pipeline.</p> <p>A Committee member indicated a company’s interest in certifying their project and noted he would email the HS Secretariat with additional details and for record-keeping.</p> <p>A Committee member enquired whether a previously assessed project in Brazil had to go through full reassessment to get certified. The Secretariat confirmed that a reassessment is required.</p> |
| 40.4 Roadmap – status update | <p>The Chair invited the Secretariat to present the Independence Roadmap status update.</p> <p>The Secretariat summarized the progress and highlighted that the initial certification milestones were revised, and the funding milestones now included specific figures. These updates followed feedback from the previous HSGC meeting. The Secretariat also noted that the launch dates were also updated to align with the World Hydropower Congress to be confirmed for October or November 2023.</p> <p>A Committee member requested additional information on the Hydropower World Congress as soon as possible. The Secretariat responded that the public announcement was planned for the second week of January 2023.</p> |
| 40.5 Next steps on governance structure | <p>The Chair invited the Secretariat to present.</p> <p>The Secretariat presented the governance structure and nomenclature. He highlighted minor changes based on feedback from HSGC Meeting #39:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HS “Governance Committee” not “Board” • Independent Review Panel with 3 experts <p>The Secretariat summarized the timeline for next steps and indicated that in the upcoming HSGC the Secretariat would present Terms of Reference for the Independent Review Panel and Directors for HSGC approval.</p> <p>The Chair opened the floor to comments.</p> <p>A Committee member noted that the Secretariat would carry out additional functions to certifying projects and suggested that these be included. He did not support to the term “Chief Executive Officer” at this stage given that this could result in additional salary costs.</p> <p>The Secretariat responded that the term “CEO” was aligned with the conventional nomenclature in similar of standard-setting bodies. He added that the Secretariat was cautious about their finances and were alert that the title would not come with any</p> |



| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>substantial salary increase. The Secretariat added that the title choice should be broad enough to encompass managing the certification system as well as the different work streams of donor-funded projects, running a global training academy and conducting high-level engagement at government level.</p> <p>The Chair agreed that opening doors and meeting high level officials required certain level of credibility which are linked to a title. He noted that this can be particularly relevant in a stage where the Secretariat was seeking funding.</p> <p>A Committee member noted that, based on his experience in similar standard-setting bodies who included a CEO title, we should keep in mind the long-term vision and not restrict our choices by the current financial situation.</p> <p>A Committee member suggested using “Executive Secretary” or “Executive Director”.</p> <p>The Secretariat noted that the term “Director” could carry some legal implications in the UK law context.</p> <p>The Chair proposed that the Secretariat present a few options to find a term which the HSGC would be comfortable with.</p> <p>Decision 1: The HSGC approved the next steps on governance structure.</p> <p>Action 1: The Secretariat to prepare document comparing Chief Executive Officer against other title alternatives.</p> |
| <p>40.6 Preliminary Communications Strategy - draft</p> | <p>The Chair invited the Secretariat to present.</p> <p>The Secretariat presented the preliminary draft of the communications strategy. She indicated that the full communications strategy would be submitted for approval in HSGC Meeting #41.</p> <p>The Chair noted the importance of having a clear target audience and a comprehensive stakeholder engagement approach in the communications strategy.</p> <p>A Committee member commented that the plan was heading in the right direction and asked for more clarity on audience. He noted the opportunity to improve messaging around the hydropower role in renewables. The Committee member also emphasised the importance of a strong crisis response – both for the Standard and for certified projects. He suggested including additional benefits and value that HSA might offer to those certified such as new trainings and annual meetings.</p> <p>A Committee member supported the draft and cautioned against losing existing brand history and awareness through the transition. He suggested keeping in mind what can be replicated when creating the style guide. Another Committee member agreed that was important to keep the links to the roots back to WCD and suggested reaching out to someone in WCD for endorsement.</p> <p>A Committee member suggested adding performance indicators into the KPIs in addition to the outcome indicators and increasing social media presence to promote awareness among younger generation.</p> <p>A Committee member highlighted the importance of networking with the right influencers as allies.</p> <p>A Committee member asked for clarity on the process for reviewing the communications plan draft and whether the mission statement provided was final or a draft. The Secretariat responded that the mission statement provided was a draft and similar to the original mission statement.</p> |



| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| | <p>A Committee member suggested considering legal firms and lawyers as potential stakeholders in the communications plan.</p> <p>A Committee member noted that HSA’s message would have different constituencies and audience compared to IHA website. Another Committee member asked for clarity on the timeline for the launch of the new website. The Secretariat clarified that the new website would replace the old one following the Hydropower Sustainability Alliance (HSA) launch at the World Hydropower Congress in October 2023.</p> <p>The Secretariat thanked all members for the constructive input and confirmed that the communication plan will include further analysis on audience.</p> <p>The Secretariat added that the Secretariat would present the next draft of the communications plan in February before the next HSGC meeting for additional feedback before final approval.</p> <p>Decision 2: The HSGC approved the proposed preliminary draft of the Hydropower Sustainability Alliance Communications Strategy.</p> <p>Action 2: The Secretariat to complete the Communications Strategy considering the inputs from the HSGC.</p> |
| <p>40.7 Certification label</p> | <p>The Chair invited The Secretariat to present.</p> <p>The Secretariat presented the certification label revision which was intended to help manage expectations around certification claims while maintaining the recognition for projects that meet the rigorous requirements.</p> <p>A Committee member supported this change and suggested adding the certification validity to the logo and "Standard".</p> <p>A Committee member suggested considering "Hydropower Standard Certified".</p> <p>A Committee member emphasised the importance of continuing referring to "Hydropower Sustainability Standard" instead of "Hydropower Standard" to ensure the brand was not lost.</p> <p>A Committee member noted the need to consider legal aspects and that the definition of certification should be well defined and leave as little room for interpretation as possible. Another Committee member responded that the Hydropower Sustainability Standard was already well defined.</p> <p>The Secretariat took note of the Committee member’s advice on legal aspects and agreed that the label should be linked to clearly defined documentation on the website that can be used as reference such as FAQs.</p> <p>The Chair summarized that "Hydropower Sustainability Standard" was a well-known body and clearly defined.</p> <p>The Secretariat highlighted that the certification label should be decided before first projects are certified, as expected in February 2023. He noted the Secretariat would prepare a circular with labelling options for HSGC approval in December.</p> <p>Decision 3: The HSGC endorsed the revision of the certification label, from "Certified Sustainable Hydropower" to "Hydropower Sustainability Standard Certified"</p> <p>Action 3: The Secretariat to prepare a circular with the revised label design for HSGC approval.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>40.8 Standard and assurance system update</p> | <p>The Chair invited the Secretariat to present the Standard and assurance system updates. The Secretariat noted that both documents were updated for the public, specifically regarding the gap resolution, the conflict of interest and the glossary sections.</p> <p>The Chair opened the floor to comments. The HSGC did not raise any objections.</p> <p>Decision 4: The HSGC approved the updates to the HS Standard and Assurance System.</p> <p>Action 4: The Secretariat to update the HS Standard and Assurance System.</p> |
| <p>40.9 Process for approving translations</p> | <p>The Chair invited the Secretariat to present.</p> <p>The Secretariat highlighted the need to have standardised processes for approving translations – most importantly for key documents like the HS Standard, the Assurance System and reporting templates. He showed the ways in which the new policy was more efficient and concise than the one created at the time of the Hydropower Sustainability Forum. He confirmed that English versions should always be the reference.</p> <p>The Secretariat raised the question of whether the HSGC would like to continue to be the final approver of translations or delegate this role to the HS Secretariat.</p> <p>A Committee member said that he was in favour of letting the Secretariat handle the process of approving translations without HSGC intervention.</p> <p>A Committee member reminded the HSGC that the original translation policy required that translations remain open to improvements by stakeholders over time.</p> <p>The Chair noted that technological advancements have allowed for strong machine translations and that mechanical translations coupled with peer translations could result in an inexpensive and effective process.</p> <p>The ALA representative communicated a message from the Accredited Lead Assessors suggesting that a good option would be to provide a preliminary text to three translators as an initial step in a standard procurement process and proceed with the one who seemed to have the most accurate approach. The ALAs added that as a longer-term approach, they could think about forming panels of translators for common language needs that are pre-approved based on translations of preliminary texts, and when a translation was needed the translators could make a time and cost proposal.</p> <p>Decision 5: The HSGC approved the new process for approving translations.</p> |
| <p>40.10 Annual Report - draft</p> | <p>The Chair invited The Secretariat to present the Annual Report draft.</p> <p>The Secretariat prefaced this section by saying that the Annual Report was a new document. Prior to this, the Council produced a semi-regular Activity Report. He added that the Annual Report should be used both for internal activity tracking purposes and for external communications.</p> <p>A Committee member asked to what extent an Annual Report would be useful considering the current uptake of the Standard. He added that public Annual Reports are typically reserved for large corporations and that we should consider other ways to communicate our achievements, like distributing the quarterly newsletter to broader audiences. He also questioned whether Council members would agree to include their information in the report.</p> <p>A Committee member noted that while an Annual Report may not be necessary, it was surely useful and appreciated. Demonstrating transparency was certainly important. He</p> |



| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| | <p>agreed with the other Committee member that not all members would be comfortable with their names being publicised.</p> <p>The Secretariat explained that the Annual Report was not only a useful internal management tool, but also a valuable communications tool to external stakeholders, such as potential new funders and donors. He added that we could choose which parts to make public and which to keep private.</p> <p>A Committee member argued that the Annual Report was useful, especially for a standard-setting organisation and ISEAL Community Member. He suggested that the drafts be shared in advance to allow all members to provide comments prior to publication.</p> <p>The Secretariat echoed the Committee member’s comments and added that we should use this year’s report as a benchmark for upcoming editions to demonstrate growth to potential donors.</p> <p>The Committee member reminded everyone of the hydropower industry’s reputation as being secretive and evasive. He added that an Annual Report must be seen as a reformation going forward and we must play to our strength, which was transparency.</p> <p>A Committee member added that he would be happy if the Annual Report replaced the membership list with more general information on supporters, included some information on finances. He found the annexes very helpful.</p> <p>The Chair stressed that, while preparing annual reports might be resource consuming for a small organisation, it could satisfy the funding agencies that may support our work. He agreed with the Committee member’s point that it may be necessary to be selective with which points to make public.</p> <p>Decision 6: The HSGC endorsed the recommendation to publish the Annual Report pending additional edits.</p> <p>Action 5: The Secretariat to edit the Annual Report and proceed to finalise the design. A final version will be shared with the HSGC before publication.</p> |
| <p>40.11 Any other business</p> | <p>The Chair opened the floor to additional comments.</p> <p>A Committee member enquired whether there would be discussion on the other documentation received including the detailed assumptions behind the business plan and the updated business plan. The Secretariat responded that the Secretariat would welcome comments on these documents via basecamp or via email.</p> <p>A Committee member asked for updates on the progress of finding other donors to fill the gap identified in the business plan.</p> <p>The Secretariat indicated that further extensions from SECO and NORAD were being considered. He added that the Secretariat was in early stages of conversation with a number of new donors. He announced that the Secretariat were planning a donor funding webinar in Q1 2023 with the aim of increasing donor support with the participation from current donors.</p> <p>The Secretariat noted the Secretariat would be proposing virtual HSGC meeting #41 on February 27th or 28th.</p> <p>A Committee member added that SECO was considering extending capacity building programme to the French speaking Maghreb region, with the anchor in Morocco, which would be decided in Q2 2023. He indicated that the funding would only partially cover</p> |



| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>the financial gap. Another Committee member volunteered to assist with engagement with potential francophone donors.</p> <p>The Chair thanked the HSGC members for joining and closed the meeting.</p> |
| 40.12 Summary of decisions and actions | <p>Decision 1: The HSGC approved the next steps on governance structure.</p> <p>Decision 2: The HSGC approved the proposed preliminary draft of the Hydropower Sustainability Alliance Communications Strategy.</p> <p>Decision 3: The HSGC endorsed the revision of the certification label, from “Certified Sustainable Hydropower” to “Hydropower Sustainability Standard Certified”</p> <p>Decision 4: The HSGC approved the updates to the HS Standard and Assurance System.</p> <p>Decision 5: The HSGC approved the new process for approving translations.</p> <p>Decision 6: The HSGC endorsed the recommendation to publish the Annual Report pending additional edits.</p> <p>Action 1: The Secretariat to prepare document comparing Chief Executive Officer against other title alternatives.</p> <p>Action 2: The Secretariat to complete the Communications Strategy considering the inputs from the HSGC.</p> <p>Action 3: The Secretariat to prepare a circular with the revised label design for HSGC approval.</p> <p>Action 4: The Secretariat to update the HS Standard and Assurance System.</p> <p>Action 5: The Secretariat to edit the Annual Report and proceed to finalise the design. A final version will be shared with the HSGC before publication.</p> |