

Environmental and Social Standards Task Force (ESSTF)

Eleventh Meeting – October 1 9:00 am EDT

Attendees:

Mirjam de Koning
Laura Warner
Camila Monteiro (Individual)
Karen MacDonald-Gayle
Kathy Mikitin (Individual, Task Force facilitator)

Minutes of September 17 Meeting

The minutes were re-distributed to the full Task force since few of the persons present actually attended the meeting.

Follow-on Discussion of September 17 Meeting

Kathy briefed Mirjam, Laura and Karen on what transpired at the September 17 meeting since they were not present.

An interesting comment by Sebastien Cognet was made at that meeting: according to what he has observed regarding CTFs, many pieces of an ESMS are already being implemented. What is lacking is their integrated organization and better communication and reporting.

Laura agreed with the observation on communication and reporting. Her experience has also shown that there are many exchanges between CTFs and their grantees and beneficiaries with considerable information gathered through their regular work. This needs to be formalized. Karen added that NGOs are actively addressing many of the issues, but report-in needs to increase.

ESMS Framework – Two Views of ESMS Components

The group first looked at Camila's matrix of components and found it a very useful checklist for CTFs to ensure they had all covered all elements of the tools they would create and then improve over time.

The group also looked at a Components and Tools visual that offered a variation on Camila's approach. It attempted to show a framework of actions and tools used to create and refine an ESMS over time. The framework tried to identify the simplest actions or tools possible, in some cases by making incremental changes to introduce ESS into the tools that CTFs already use such as an operations manual or the questionnaires used to assess the eligibility of grantees. The actions and tools should begin with the basics and then become more advanced as risks and operations became more complex over time.

The matrix form was not used because the number of levels of complexity could vary from one “component” to another. There might be three levels or six levels, and a CTF would stop at the level that is appropriate to address the risks faced by its operations and consistent with its means.

The group reviewed the “feedback” component which attempted to lay out progressively more complex elements of grievance mechanisms that would be appropriate for different types of beneficiaries and increasingly sophisticated operations. Discussion centered on the context in which the different iterations would be appropriate and the additional actions a CTF needed to take to have reasonable certainty that grievances could be made known and adequately addressed.

The “components” were divided up among the participants (and Scott) who agreed to revise and improve upon the various levels of complexity and to note down any explanations that helped define the actions or tools, conditions required to make actions or use of tools effective and associated costs. Kathy offered to put the “components” together for discussion at the next meeting.

Camila suggested that we should give consideration when work is more advanced to a visual presentation that could reinforce important principles such as the flexibility and progressive complexity of the components.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for October 15 at 9 am EDT. The focus of the meeting will be on expanding the levels, conditions and costs of the Components and Tools table. Additional components might also need to be added.

