

**Social Dimensions of Transport: consultation on Transport Guidelines for Social Analysis  
MC 11-598, June 2, 2004**

**Summary of Key Discussion Points**

Peter Roberts, TUDTR, chaired the session, and Reidar Kvam, SDV, and Wendy M. Walker, AFTH1 (Transport), presented the Social Analysis framework and the proposed guidelines on transport. Present during the discussion were:

Richard Scurfield, TUDTR; Asif Faiz, ENVCF; Satoshi Ishihara, ECSIE; Marco Nicoli, HDN SP - Disability Team; Suryna Ali, OPCRR; Mitch Asada, SASEI; Jan Pakulski, ECSSD; Cathy Gaynor, Consultant/WBI; Mary Jennings, Consultant/WBI; Yvette Laure Djachechi, AFTS3; Simon Thomas, SASEI; Doug Andrew, IEF; Navaid A. Qureshi, TUDTR; Cynthia Cook, Consultant; Antoine Lema, AFTTR; Santadevi Meenakshy, SASES; Shyam KC, TUDTR; and Hakon Nordang, SDV.

The discussion was very constructive, and the participants endorsed the approach taken. The note below sets out a summary of the main issues raised, starting with a **revised outline for the guidelines** (which includes a more explicit focus on the various levels of social analysis – country; sector; and project-level, and which is tied more closely to the different stages of the project cycle), and followed by firstly, **comments on the project cycle matrix**, and then **general** and more **specific comments** on the **guidelines**.

In addition to getting feedback on whether this document is true to the discussion, the Social Analysis team ([socialanalysis@worldbank.org](mailto:socialanalysis@worldbank.org)) would very much like inputs and guidance on:

- 1) **Good practice examples** which we could use as box-examples in the guidelines, or as case-study annexes (which could also be published as Social Development Dissemination Notes). Additionally, guidance and suggestions are also needed on good examples of particular social analytical products/inputs during the project cycle (i.e. good practice RAP TORs, Social Assessment TORs, PAD section E.6s, ICR's, M&E indicators/systems, etc)
- 2) **Regional specificities** – regionally specific challenges related to implementing this approach, as well as regional specificities regarding policy/reforms; focus of portfolio; social opportunities and risks; resources; indicators; etc

**REVISED OUTLINE**

Based on the comments and suggestions raised during the discussion, we have decided to revise the layout of the guidelines as follows:

(2-part layout where each part would function as stand-alone chapters)

**Part 1. Overview and Summary of Issues**

**A. Preface**

**B. Introduction**

**C. Objectives of Social Analysis**

- *Focus on Opportunities and Risks*
- *Different entry-points and levels of analysis (country; sector; project) as it relates to the transport sector (incl. relationship with Environmental Assessment)*
- *Social analysis as it relates to different modes of transport*

**D. Social dimensions of the sector**

- *Brief description of 5 entry-points of analysis as they relate to the social opportunities, outcomes and impacts of transport-sector projects: social diversity and gender; institutions, rules and behavior; stakeholders; participation; and social risks. These provide a conceptual lens through which one can view the main social issues in transport projects*

- A listing and description of key social issues and concerns in transport projects, in general, and by transport mode (we'll include more on broader macro issues such as restructuring, subsidies, employment and livelihoods concerns, etc)

#### **E. Overview of Social Analysis Inputs and Products**

- Enabling environment: Country/macro-level; sector-level issues; macro-micro linkages  
- Project-level: brief description of project-level inputs, summarized in the matrix

#### **Part 2: Social Analysis in the Project Cycle: a step-by-step approach**

This part would provide a detailed guide to the social analytical inputs, questions, activities, tools/methods, deliverables, responsibilities, good practice examples, etc for each stage of the project cycle. (i.e. a detailed explanation of the guidance provided in summary form in the matrix).

#### **Annex 1: Detailed TOR for Social Assessment**

#### **Annex 2: Regional specificities**

#### **Annex 3: Good practice/case-study examples**

### **THE PROJECT CYCLE MATRIX**

- Very helpful!
- Better clarification of responsibilities: consultants have no responsibilities, the client and the World Bank do.
- Tendering, and contracting, have to be addressed before project appraisal and approval.
- The Matrix could also provide clarifications on the communication and interaction between the SD specialist and the procurement specialist, during the contracting and tendering stage. More information on procurement issues.
- Whilst there is a section on monitoring and supervision, shouldn't there also be something explicit about *implementation*?
- The client/borrower has its own feasibility stage/analysis – a lot of the issues and responsibilities raised by the matrix should be addressed at this, much earlier stage.
- PCN stage and TOR for Social Assessment: make explicit that a TOR for social assessment should also include, where applicable, a TOR for safeguards (IPDP and/or RAP)
- Clarification on role, funding and timing of 2-stage approach needed (Rapid Social Assessment vs. Social Assessment)
- How will an RSA be funded if there is no PPF until the PCN is completed?
- M&E: The client has a very clear and important role and responsibility to play during M&E, though this is not well reflected by the matrix.
- M&E: It would be useful for the guidelines to provide inputs and suggestions for those indicators that are truly **social**!
- MTR and independent evaluation: what is the role of "independent evaluation"? By highlighting this, won't you give more importance to the MTR than mandated by OPCS? One has to be careful about saying that the social assessment process requires something different than the rest of the project. The potential role of independent evaluation during MTR therefore has been clarified: i.e. in high risk projects, independent evaluation during MTR may be identified and built into the project during the design phase. However, such an evaluation will not be able to focus on impact indicators, as indicated in the matrix. It is unrealistic to assume that impacts will be clear at this stage. The evaluation should instead focus on process and outcome indicators. Given the importance of evaluating impact, however, the guidelines should perhaps mention somewhere the importance of building in-country capacity to look at social issues.
- Costs, budget, and financing: how to finance such a comprehensive approach? Is there a way in which some of these costs could be transferred to the borrower?

### **GENERAL COMMENTS ON GUIDELINES**

#### **Integrative Social Analysis vs. Safeguards only:**

- The emphasis on Social Analysis (opportunities and risks) as the entry-point and main focus rather than safeguards (mitigation) only, is very helpful. It helps turn upside down, and hence improve, the relationship between Transport and Social Development – e.g. roads-construction is not seen as something harmful to the poor, but instead about responding to a social need through the creation of access and opportunities.
- However, this integrative conceptual approach also needs to be reflected procedurally – the person doing Safeguards also needs to know how to do Social Analysis. This brings up the question of capacity, addressed in more detail below.
- Emphasis on *opportunities* need to be better mainstreamed in document – whilst conceptually the issues have been turned upside down, there still seems to be a lot of emphasis on risks rather than on opportunities.

#### **Linkages between country/macro, sector, and project-level social analysis**

- The guidelines should also attempt to highlight social issues which should be addressed through social analysis at different levels – i.e. which issues should be addressed at the country-level, at the sector-level, at the project level?
- More guidance on issues specific to sector adjustment loans, SWAPs, etc

#### **Relationship between Environmental Assessment and Social Assessment (potential entry-points for social analysis)**

- It would be useful to have a discussion at some point in the guidelines about the relationship between EA and SA, as this has in the past been one entry point for doing social analysis. This could include a discussion also of the pros and cons of addressing social dimensions through the EA (i.e. focus on impact mitigation, rather than on opportunities, etc).

#### **Bringing attention to broader array of transport modes/sub-sectors:**

- The current draft of the guidelines seems to be somewhat biased towards roads. There is a need for a greater discussion of the social issues related to other transport modes, such as railways, waterways etc.
- The discussion also seems to be somewhat limited to urban transport issues. It is currently quite silent on rural transport concerns, despite very good Bank examples on this – ie rural roads and markets project in Bangladesh, Peru rural roads, etc.

#### **Tools and methods:**

- The guidelines also require a discussion of appropriate tools and methods – Highlighting not only *what* needs to be done, but also *how* to do it. Hence, it is required not only to have a discussion of tools, but also where and how they have been applied well.
- Household surveys - both LSMS type surveys and smaller-scale, targeted surveys - are very useful, and can provide important information for social analysis. However, they very rarely look at the transport dimensions. There is a need to develop transport modules for household surveys. Speak to Judy Baker about the Bank's work on expanding the infrastructure LSMS (?) module.
- Greater guidance is also needed on the methodology of selecting projects based on social criteria (cf. economic/technical feasibility methodologies)

#### **Capacity-building**

- The guidelines should also include a discussion on the capacity-building needs of implementing this approach (paying attention to regionally specific needs, etc):
  - Internal: World Bank SD staff skills-set seems to be mainly focused on safeguards; to enable a shift towards looking at social opportunities and meeting social needs, there is a need for training and capacity-building of staff to ensure that they have the skills-set necessary to apply a more integrative approach to social analysis
  - External: 1) commitment to social issues and quality of skills-set of international/local consultants and client government staff (policy-makers; implementers; etc) who are tasked with facilitating the social assessment process. 2) building in-country capacity for doing social analysis, looking at social issues, monitoring and evaluation, etc. This could also help with

building institutional memory and continuity of social development insights related to a project, etc.

### **Good practices/examples/case-studies**

□ The guidelines need more examples of good practice and good Bank examples. It would be good to not only have a discussion of the issues, and the potential tools available, but also a discussion of where the approach has been applied well. (e.g. Peru rural roads). Additionally, guidance and suggestions are also needed on good examples of particular social analytical products/inputs during the project cycle (i.e. good practice RAP TORs, Social Assessment TORs, PAD section E.6s, ICR's, M&E indicators/systems, etc)

### **Regional Specificities**

□ What are the challenges with regards to implementing this approach across regions? From a capacity perspective, but also otherwise?

□ How do the regions differ with regards to the following issues:

- Policy / reforms / sector approach
- Focus of project portfolio
- Opportunities and risks
- Resources
- Indicators

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON GUIDELINES**

### **Introduction**

□ There is a need to tone down rhetoric about the (lack of) attention to social issues in World Bank transport projects in the past.

### **Stakeholders-section:**

□ list more stakeholders, including ministry of infrastructure, road agency, etc.

□ Also, should not only list the different stakeholders, but also some preliminary attempt at setting out their respective interests and concerns. E.g. what are the interests and concerns of pedestrians etc. Social analysis should help bring attention to these matters.

### **Role of the private sector**

□ The current discussion of the role of the private sector seems to suggest that there is a choice related to private sector participation in transport. This is usually not the case. The private sector in many countries is by default or otherwise the main operator. The key, hence, is for the guidelines to turn the question upside down and ask – how can we ensure that the private sector addresses social concerns and needs? Social analysis can also add value by looking at the ways in which the private sector can provide social opportunities and access.

□ In the "Social Dimensions of the Sector" section, it is important to not only highlight the participation of the private sector, but also to focus on the participation of other relevant stakeholders based on their capacity to absorb and deliver.

### **Consumers vs. Users**

□ Ensure greater consistency of the terms used

### **Risks-section**

□ More is needed on political economy issues – i.e. pursuing reforms not supported by the population; questions of client credibility/capacity, etc