Benefit-sharing and enhancing outcomes for project-affected communities

Vanclay, Frank

Published in:
Handbook of Social Impact Assessment and Management

DOI:
10.4337/9781802208870.00037

27. Benefit-sharing and enhancing outcomes for project-affected communities

Frank Vanclay

INTRODUCTION

In the context of the social performance of projects and project social impact assessment (SIA), loosely speaking, 'benefit-sharing' refers to the sharing of benefits between a project and its local or host communities (IFC, 2019, 2021). At the very least, this means deliberate attempts to enhance outcomes for project affected peoples. Ideally, however, it means financial or other arrangements so that the project-affected peoples become beneficiaries of the project. Community opposition to windfarms, for example, is likely to be much less when the community as a whole directly benefits from the energy that is produced (World Bank, 2019). Sometimes, the defined recipient group is extended beyond immediate project-affected people to encompass the subnational region in which the project is based. Most international standards and international financial institutions encourage that there be some degree of benefit-sharing in all projects and suggest that all projects should be proactive in thinking about how outcomes for local communities could be enhanced. This can happen by distributing resources to affected communities, providing assistance in various ways, and by careful thinking about how the project is implemented.

Benefit-sharing has been a World Bank requirement of projects involving involuntary resettlement since 1990 (World Bank, 1990; Price et al., 2020), although benefit-sharing was not normally required or expected for projects that did not involve resettlement, even though it was advocated. In recent decades, this has been changing, with most international financial institutions strengthening their policies relating to benefit-sharing. Several countries have implemented laws entailing some form of benefit-sharing arrangements, including Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Greenland, India, Japan, Kenya, Mali, Nepal, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Sierra Leone, and South Africa (Van Wicklin, 1999; DDP, 2007; Égré et al., 2007; Söderholm & Svahn, 2015; IGF, 2020; Price et al., 2020; Wankhede, 2020; Chen et al., 2021; Koenig, 2021; Kung et al., 2022). Although these countries mandate that projects have benefit-sharing arrangements, it was otherwise normally understood that benefit-sharing was a voluntary action beyond mandatory payments (e.g. normal taxation payments, royalties) or compensation for lost land or assets. Compensation that replaces a loss is, by definition, not a benefit, since such compensation is a replacement and is (or should be) an entitlement. Payments of normal taxes and royalties, especially to the nation state, are not what is meant by 'benefits' (unless they are redistributed to local communities), since these are normal requirements of all business operations (Schulz & Skinner, 2022).

Despite the recommendations for benefit-sharing arrangements and enhancement of outcomes, few projects have actually delivered benefits to any significant extent, and all projects could improve their conception and delivery of benefits to affected communities. The purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to increase awareness of the expectation that projects should deliver benefits to local communities, and to improve understanding of the range of possible benefit-sharing mechanisms. It also discusses some problematic issues with benefit-sharing.

Although the ideal form of benefit-sharing might be where local communities become co-owners in the project, this rarely occurs, and in any case would be problematic in a public sector project or any project where there is no revenue flow after construction. Consequently, in the fields of social performance and SIA, 'benefit-sharing' tends to mean any attempt to enhance project outcomes for affected communities beyond what would normally be provided by the project. However, as the International Hydropower Association (IHA, 2019) pointed out, activities that do not impose additional costs on a project and any advantages that are inherent to a project should not be regarded as a benefit. For example, the construction of a power station might ordinarily result in electricity supply to a local community that is cheaper than what was available previously. While this might be advantageous to the local community, it does not constitute a 'benefit' in the sense of what is understood by 'benefit-sharing'. Furthermore, any actions that are done to mitigate negative social impacts would only be a benefit when they are done beyond what was required by local law or international standards.

The concept of benefit-sharing is consistent with the changing understanding of the role of business in society. In the emerging understanding of business, companies do not have an automatic or inherent right to operate, but need to contribute 'shared value' to the communities in which they are located (Porter & Kramer, 2011). Benefit-sharing is also associated with the idea that projects need to have a social licence to operate, make a positive contribution to their host communities, and that they should undertake various activities to enhance their social licence (Jijelava & Vanclay, 2017; Vanclay & Hanna, 2019; Veenker & Vanclay, 2021). Benefit-sharing is an umbrella concept that includes a wide range of actions, some of which are addressed by other chapters in this book. Sometimes, the sharing of benefits is formalised through a Benefit-sharing Agreement, an Impacts and Benefits Agreement, or a Community Development Agreement. Frequently, projects implement some form of social investment strategy, which would normally be part of their benefit-sharing arrangements (whether or not this language is used) (Esteves & Vanclay, 2009). Although the enhancement of benefits has been a key part of SIA for decades (Holden, 1991; Esteves & Vanclay, 2009; Vanclay & Esteves, 2011; Esteves et al., 2012; Vanclay, 2014; Vanclay et al., 2015), the amount of attention given to it has increased in recent years (João et al., 2011; Vanclay, 2020) and there remains a strong need to increase the performance of projects in this regard.

JUSTIFICATIONS FOR BENEFIT-SHARING

The original justification for benefit-sharing in a project context was based around the realisation that there was a lack of fair compensation and especially a lack of effort to restore livelihoods, especially where people were being resettled to make way for projects (van Wicklin, 1999; Cernea, 2008; Price et al., 2020). Recognition that there was considerable harm and suffering being created by development-induced displacement and resettlement (especially from dams) meant that it was only fair that those who were being displaced should also receive some benefits, as van Wicklin (1999, p. 234) argued:

> Giving up one's home and land is much more than an economic transaction: it has profound social, cultural, and psychological ramifications. Communities and neighborhoods, with their mutual support and labor exchange networks, are often broken up and dispersed as a consequence of forced

> relocation. Cultural losses include ties to the land, ancestral sites, indigenous knowledge of local production systems, and other forms of cultural heritage. Among the psychological costs and consequences of relocation are isolation, alienation, anomie, substance abuse, higher rates of prostitution and divorce, and other signs of social disarticulation … Since resettlers [sic] are called upon to make sacrifices for the general good by giving up their habitats and their income generating assets, it is only equitable that they should share in the benefits of the project displacing them.

This line of reasoning, however, is problematic because, in this argument, 'benefit-sharing' is de facto compensation, and thus, strictly speaking, is not a benefit. The contemporary understanding of benefit-sharing is that it is about the sharing of resources above and beyond appropriate compensation for any losses or impacts, including those mentioned by van Wicklin.

There are several reasons why companies might engage in benefit-sharing. Benefit-sharing arrangements are likely to assist communities in coping with change and in overcoming any negative social impacts. They are likely to result in local communities having a positive impression of the project. If the arrangements are structured fairly, they would prevent or reduce increasing disparity in the community, thus contributing to distributive justice. An ethical argument might be that the people who make sacrifices or suffer because of a project should be the first people to benefit from the project (Price et al., 2020). Another rationale is that such actions reveal that the project and its backers recognise and respect the rights of local communities (even where they are not recognised by the state). Finally, from a project perspective, benefit-sharing is likely to contribute to getting a social licence to operate (Veenker & Vanclay, 2021).

SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS FOR BENEFIT-SHARING IN INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS

The various international organisations (UN bodies, international financial institutions, etc.) each have different wordings about benefit-sharing in their policies and other guidance documents, but in general they all encourage some effort to enhance outcomes, although this is not always clearly stated (or mandated) in their standards or guidance. For example, the IFC Performance Standards (IFC, 2012a), which is regarded as the 'gold standard' of international standards (Vanclay & Hanna, 2019), only has minimal explicit mention of enhancement or benefit-sharing, and then primarily in the context of resettlement or Indigenous peoples. For example, Article 9 of PS5 states: 'The client will also provide opportunities to displaced communities and persons to derive appropriate development benefits from the project' (IFC, 2012a, p. 34). Article 14 of PS7 states: 'Ensuring fair and equitable sharing of benefits associated with project usage of the resources where the client intends to utilize natural resources that are central to the identity and livelihood of Affected Communities of Indigenous Peoples and their usage thereof exacerbates livelihood risk' (IFC, 2012a, p. 51). Article 18 of PS7 states: 'The client and the Affected Communities of Indigenous Peoples will identify mitigation measures in alignment with the mitigation hierarchy described in Performance Standard 1 as well as opportunities for culturally appropriate and sustainable development benefits' (IFC, 2012a, p. 52).

The IFC Guidance Notes (IFC, 2012b) has greater mention, but still lacks a strong statement about benefit-sharing. One example is GN6 of Guidance Note 1: 'An effective engagement process allows the views, interests and concerns of different stakeholders, particularly of the local communities directly affected by the project (Affected Communities), to be heard, understood, and taken into account in project decisions and creation of development benefits' (IFC, 2012b, p. 4). Nevertheless, despite this low level of explicit mention of benefit-sharing in the IFC performance standards and guidelines, the strong support for benefit-sharing within the IFC is evident in several other documents it has published (e.g. IFC, 2015a, 2019, 2021).

The World Bank (2017) Environmental and Social Standards are also somewhat understated. However, the Vision for Sustainable Development, which is a preamble to the standards, states that: 'The Bank's vision goes beyond "do no harm" to maximizing development gains. Where the Borrower's environmental and social assessment has identified potential development opportunities associated with the project, the Bank will discuss with the Borrower the feasibility of including these opportunities in the project. Where appropriate, such opportunities may be utilized to promote further development' (World Bank, 2017, p. 2). In ESS1 Para 24, the World Bank states that they expect that the environmental and social assessment will 'evaluate the project's potential environmental and social risks and impacts; examine project alternatives; identify ways of improving project selection, siting, planning, design, and implementation in order to apply the mitigation hierarchy for adverse environmental and social impacts *and seek opportunities to enhance the positive impacts of the project*' (World Bank, 2017, p. 18, emphasis added).

In contrast, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) has its expectations strongly stated in its Safeguards Policy Statement (ADB, 2009). Policy Principle 4 of the Environment Safeguard states: 'Avoid, and where avoidance is not possible, minimize, mitigate, and/or offset adverse impacts *and enhance positive impacts by means of environmental planning and management*' (ADB, 2009, p. 16, emphasis added). The Safeguards Policy Statement provides an example contents listing for EIA reports. Section E of such a report is entitled 'Anticipated Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures', and states:

> This section predicts and assesses the project's likely *positive* and negative direct and indirect impacts to physical, biological, socioeconomic (including occupational health and safety, community health and safety, vulnerable groups and gender issues, and impacts on livelihoods through environmental media … and physical cultural resources in the project's area of influence, in quantitative terms to the extent possible; identifies mitigation measures and any residual negative impacts that cannot be mitigated; *explores opportunities for enhancement*; identifies and estimates the extent and quality of available data, key data gaps, and uncertainties associated with predictions and specifies topics that do not require further attention; and examines global, transboundary, and cumulative impacts as appropriate. (ADB, 2009, p. 41, emphasis added)

There are also provisions about maximising social benefits in the ADB's Operational Manuals, *Gender and Development in ADB Operations* (OM-C2), and *Incorporation of Social Dimensions into ADB Operations* (OM-C3), where it states that the ADB:

> (iii) integrates social analysis in preparing country partnership strategies and regional strategies and programmes; identifies potential social issues during project preparation *to ensure that the project design maximizes social benefits* and avoids or minimizes social risks, particularly for vulnerable and marginalized groups; and
> (iv) *ensures that project design and implementation arrangements include actions to enhance benefits and to monitor and evaluate the distribution of the benefits of the project*, with performance targets and indicators for monitoring and evaluating benefits included in the design and monitoring framework of the project performance management system. (ADB, 2010, p. 2, emphasis added)

The Inter-American Development Bank, which recently updated its *Environmental and Social Policy Framework* (IDB, 2020), also has a strong statement:

> The IDB is also committed to *maximizing sustainable development benefits, in accordance with the 'do good beyond do not harm'* [sic] *principle*. The IDB requires its Borrowers to not only report on ways in which harms will be avoided, but also *consider and report on ways in which project design will enhance both the social and the environmental good*. Where the environmental and social assessment of the project has identified such potential opportunities in sustainable development, the Bank will consider with the Borrower the feasibility of including these opportunities in the project, or mainstreaming them in IDB country strategies to strengthen the country's environmental and social governance systems. Where appropriate, such opportunities may be utilized to promote further sustainability in development. (IDB, 2020, p. 6, emphasis added)

In the extractives sector, there is a fairly strong awareness and culture of the need to provide improved outcomes for local communities. For example, Principle 9 of the ICMM (2020) *Mining Principles* requires that mining companies: 'Pursue continual improvement in social performance and contribute to the social, economic and institutional development of host countries and communities'. This sentiment is also reflected in the ICMM (2022) guidance document on social performance. However, whether mining companies always deliver on this expectation is another matter (Kemp & Owen, 2013; Price et al., 2020). Most other industry sectors seem to lack a culture of commitment to benefit-sharing (Price et al., 2020; Schulz & Skinner, 2022).

CLASSIFYING BENEFIT-SHARING MECHANISMS

Benefit-sharing mechanisms can be classified in many ways, including according to the nature of the benefit, how the benefits are financed, or by the justification about who is eligible to benefit from the scheme. To give some sense of the range of benefit-sharing mechanisms, the following structure is used (developed by drawing on a range of sources including DDP, 2007; Égré et al., 2007; Cernea, 2008; Wall & Pelon, 2011; IPIECA, 2017; Vanclay, 2017a, 2017b; Vanclay & Hanna, 2019; Kung et al., 2022).

Direct Benefits and/or Being an Intended Project Beneficiary

Sometimes, development projects are specifically intended to be for the benefit of local people, for example, regional development or public housing projects. Since these projects are intended to be for this beneficial purpose, the concept of benefit-sharing does not normally apply to these projects, although it should be noted that even projects intended to benefit local communities can still have negative social impacts and may not always achieve their intended goals. For instance, people relocated from flood-prone or landslip-prone locations are likely to experience many negative social impacts, even though they are relocated to a safer location. Improving physical safety (reducing the risk of disaster) is only one aspect of people's wellbeing, and such relocations need to consider the totality of people's lives, including their livelihoods, essential public services, community functioning, and community resilience (Vanclay, 2002; Smyth & Vanclay, 2017). There is room for improvement in all these actions.

Some projects primarily intended for purposes other than benefiting the local community might generate outputs that still could be a direct benefit to local communities. For example, an irrigation dam could also provide irrigation water for local people, and any displaced people might be granted plots of irrigated land. People affected by a hydroelectric dam could be provided with electricity. People displaced by an urban development project could be provided with improved housing in the same neighbourhood. Note that if the provision of the asset or service was only intended to be compensation for the loss experienced, then it is not a benefit – it would only be a benefit where the outcome was additional to reasonable compensation.

Financial Benefits

When people are affected by projects for which they are not an intended direct beneficiary, there is a range of financial mechanisms that can be utilised to enhance their wellbeing. These are often applied in situations where local people have strong rights and/or whose consent must be given before a project can proceed, as well as when people are being resettled or otherwise will experience major negative social impacts from the project. Examples include:

- (for an income-generating project) the allocation of a percentage share of project revenue streams, for example to finance community development programmes on an ongoing basis;
- the establishment of a community development fund (social investment fund) with one or more tranche payments from project funding (perhaps related to project milestones), typically in which the principal is preserved while generating interest to be used for ongoing community development programmes;
- equity sharing in any project-created enterprises that might be established;
- in addition to any normal taxes or charges that might be due, the payment of additional special contributions to regional and/or local governments to support local development programmes;
- the allocation of shares in the ownership of the project to people in the impacted community (either collectively or individually), thus creating co-ownership in the project;
- direct payments to all affected persons (typically as bank transfers rather than as cash);
- (rather than a direct payment) payments that are tied to (i.e. cross-compliance arrangements for) the provision of certain services or the performance of tasks, such as for maintaining heritage or traditional practices, or maintaining habitat (in which case it would be a payment for environmental services).

There are arguments for and against each of these options. For example, providing free electricity or gas might lead to wastage through a lack of incentive for efficiency. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to provide a full analysis of each option, but a general discussion of issues is provided further below. Before any scheme is proposed, careful consideration of how it will work out in practice is needed.

Non-Financial Benefits (Enhancement of Outcomes)

The non-financial benefits or enhancement of outcomes for local communities that a project can provide include:

- providing jobs for impacted or local people;
- appropriate strategies to maximise opportunities for local content and local procurement by removing barriers to entry and employing other strategies to make it possible for local enterprises to supply goods and services to the project;

- the provision of training, mentoring and other support programmes for local people and businesses, especially related to helping them manage effectively in the new operating environment;
- modifying project infrastructure and facilities to ensure that these facilities can also service local community needs and/or by allowing public use of these facilities. This is often called 'shared infrastructure'. One example of shared infrastructure is an airport. Instead of being a company-only airport to only service the project, it could be made into a public airport;
- making project equipment (heavy lift cranes, bulldozers, etc.) available to local authorities to assist in public works;
- various good neighbour, good corporate citizen initiatives, such as encouraging community volunteer work by staff;
- area development – ensuring that the whole local population benefits from things like the upgrading of roads, provision of a new or upgraded airport, flood protection, public services and community facilities including, for example, reliable access to water, electricity, internet, etc.;
- improved public services (healthcare, education);
- in the case of electricity generation projects (e.g. hydropower dams, solar farms or windfarms), transmission lines, or gas pipelines etc., the provision of free or discounted electricity (or gas) to impacted peoples.

A HYPOTHETICAL EXAMPLE: THE BENEFIT-SHARING ARRANGEMENTS THAT MIGHT BE EXPECTED TO BE PROVIDED BY A ROAD PROJECT

To give some sense of what benefit-sharing might mean in actual practice, let's consider what potentially could be done in a road project. As road projects have a specific purpose and create certain direct impacts in the landscape, many road-related enhancement actions can be conceived, many of which are arguably highly consistent with the planning and construction of roads. Some actions are essential to mitigate the negative impacts of construction and ongoing operation of the project, and these would not be regarded as benefits. However, in addition to essential mitigation, a road project could:

- improve local roads, especially those that feed into the major road project, especially in situations where the new main road is not seen as a local benefit;
- provide road safety training programmes to increase road safety awareness (the improvement of major roads is likely to increase the speed of vehicles travelling on the main road, but this can lead to accidents with local traffic using or crossing the main road and/or with roadside pedestrians or farm animals);
- provide roadside fencing if needed, rather than this being a burden imposed on local people;
- negotiate with local communities and carefully consider where appropriate picnic spots and/or lookout stops might be built along the road;
- develop a strategy relating to informal roadside vendors, which could include creating special areas where roadside vendors would be encouraged to operate (pre-existing vendors might be displaced by the road project); the new road will increase traffic volumes

increasing interest in roadside vendor activities; roadside vendors can be a traffic hazard and prone to being harmed by traffic. It would normally be considered irresponsible of the project if there was no vendor strategy developed;

- contribute to the restoration of local buildings and/or sites of heritage value, especially where they are in close proximity to the road and/or likely to be affected by vibration, dust, drainage issues, impact from vehicles coming off the road, or by the increased attention of people due to proximity to the road;
- contribute to local natural resource management and/or environmental management programmes, for example by enhancing or increasing the amount of green space;
- consider aesthetic issues in road design, and beautification of the road, verges, and surroundings, especially in landscapes of high scenic value and those designated as being of outstanding natural beauty;
- where people will become noise affected by realignment of a road or by increased traffic volumes, provide replacement housing or support them to increase the sound insulation of their houses. Noise considerations should also be factored into road design and materials. Note that where this would have to be done because of exceedances of noise limits, this would be impact mitigation rather than a benefit, but where this was done when the noise levels were not above regulatory limits, it would be regarded as a benefit;
- award road maintenance contracts to local people (because this would be a direct benefit to local people and may actually be the most efficient way of undertaking road maintenance);
- where construction will take an extended period of time, negotiate with the local community how worker accommodation should be provided. Instead of always using a temporary construction camp, consider alternatives, which might including using existing accommodation, or building accommodation that can be re-used (re-purposed) by the local community after project construction stops;
- provide training and opportunities (especially for women), for example by assisting them in obtaining a driving licence (apart from being an empowerment action, in rural areas, people may not have had a driving licence before and may create a traffic hazard when traffic volumes and average speed increase);
- provide assistance with regional planning (improved roads have a direct effect on development options because the roads change the background context and possible assumptions about future options);
- facilitate small enterprise development (because roads impact on the local economy);
- help local people (SMEs) with business plans or agricultural development opportunities (to be able to better service the increase in people and/or to deal with economic displacement; and because the increased access facilitated by the new road will impact on the local economy, in that the cost of transport in and out will be cheaper, thus imports will also be cheaper and local exports will be more cost effective);
- provide basic-level language training courses (e.g. in appropriate languages), especially in situations where road users might speak other languages than local people. Providing language training for basic communication could increase the sales volume of small businesses and/or would assist in dealing with any emergencies that might arise, e.g. a traffic accident;
- introduce mechanisms (including but not limited to training) to increase awareness of HIV and sexually transmitted diseases, human trafficking and modern slavery, and gender-based violence.

In many contexts, roads facilitate prostitution, specifically ‘truckstop prostitution’. The concept of ‘mobile men with money‘ is a relative context, and many factors contribute to the interplay between road users (especially truck drivers) and local people. Depending on the context, it might be appropriate to increase awareness in local communities about the social changes likely to occur with a new road, and about the potential for sexual exploitation, trafficking, and prostitution to occur, so that there might be some awareness about how communities and people individually could act in specific situations (Tserendorj et al., 2013).

In addition to the above activities that have a clear connection to roads, it would not be unreasonable to consider that a road project could assist in various off-road works (or non-road works), for example improving drainage systems (water flow) and irrigation (especially when they might be affected by the road). Arguably, a road project has a lot of big equipment on site, and this equipment could be used for other things nearby – especially as a big part of the cost is getting the equipment to the site. Recognising that some rural areas are in poverty and generally have limited public services, the project could assist in encouraging service providers to increase service provision for the benefit of local people as well as for the travellers. This might, for example, include the road company working with telephone service providers to improve phone service and coverage. Or working with the electricity company to expand the electricity network. An increased volume of traffic, higher average speed, more people, and more accidents (although noting that a justification for roads is often to reduce accidents) are likely to put increased strain on the local healthcare services. Thus, improving local healthcare services, especially to deal with accident and emergency situations, is highly appropriate.

As improved rural roads are likely to lead to increased numbers of tourists and tourism opportunities, assisting SMEs in establishing or improving guesthouses or wayside cafés might be appropriate. New or improved roads are likely to generate traffic including day-tripping and stay-over tourists, as well as through travellers wanting a short or overnight stopover. It could be useful to provide training to potential accommodation providers or café owners about small business management, accounting, and the effective business use of social media and booking platforms, etc.

THE ROLE OF FOUNDATIONS AND TRUST FUNDS

Although there are many forms of benefit-sharing, in the past the default fall-back option tended to be establishment of a Social Investment Fund, usually managed by an independent foundation with a Board comprising local people and sometimes a company representative. Perhaps this was done by companies in the belief that this was a minimum-effort, minimum-risk strategy. This arrangement might be justified by arguments that responsibility was being handed to local communities. However, unless the Board is well trained and carefully monitored (i.e. transparency and accountability), and there is a strong commitment to good governance, things may not turn out effectively, and the fund may even become a risk for the project and the community. Much research has been done on good practice in relation to such funds and there are many guidance documents (e.g. World Bank, 2010; IFC, 2010, 2015b; IPIECA, 2017), which should be carefully considered before any fund is established. Nowadays, it is more common for projects themselves to establish a social investment programme, managed in house, with a suite of projects being implemented.

HISTORY OF THE CONCEPT OF BENEFIT-SHARING

It is difficult to establish precisely when the expression 'benefit-sharing' first came into use. However, searching on Google Scholar using decadal date ranges, several papers published between the 1960s and 1990s can be found that used the term in a way that suggested the expression was a normalised concept by then (e.g. Euler & Dobyns, 1961; Michelman, 1967; Larmour, 1989; Holden, 1991) – although perhaps with a somewhat different meaning to this chapter. 'Benefit-sharing' is, of course, a colloquial expression or shorthand for things like sharing project benefits, the fair distribution of benefits, maximising or enhancing positive impacts or outcomes, and 'sharing the gains and not just the pains' from a project. This broader understanding exists whether or not the colloquial expression 'benefit-sharing' is used. This makes it hard to locate all historical literature. Cernea (1995) stated that the idea of sharing project benefits with people being resettled by a project was well established by the mid-1980s, whereas Price et al. (2020) date it from the late 1970s.

A problem, however, is that there is no singular definition or understanding of the concept, and it is clear that it has different meanings across the various discourses in which it is used (Dauda & Dierickx, 2013; Morgera, 2016). For example, the expression is related to the international legal principle of the 'fair and equitable sharing of benefits' (or sometimes only the 'equitable sharing of benefits'), which is present in many international conventions, including: the 1979 United Nations Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and other Celestial Bodies; the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea; and the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity. The sharing of benefits was also a normal part of water catchment planning, where it referred to the notion that there should be a fair and equitable distribution of benefits (e.g. water entitlements for irrigation or hydroelectricity) across the different stakeholders (typically states) who have an interest in a particular catchment (Hansson & Reves, 1982; Dombrowsky et al., 2014), including upstream and downstream users. The notion of benefit-sharing is also present in medical research, where it relates to the idea that the participants in medical research (e.g. the donors of genes, human tissue, blood, stem cells, etc.) should also benefit from that research (Schroeder & Lucas, 2013; Dauda et al., 2016). Often, the international principle referred to sharing between countries, regions, and only sometimes to sharing between different stakeholder groups within a country, and thus it does not have the same meaning as intended in this chapter, which primarily refers to the provision of benefits to project-affected peoples.

Of historical interest is the use of the benefit-sharing concept in the context of the 'new international economic order', which followed the end of colonialism in the 1960s and 1970s. Essentially, newly independent countries (former colonies) found that they were trapped by unfavourable trade arrangements and that, despite the end of political colonisation, they were still gripped by economic colonisation (Greenwald, 1976). The benefits of resource extraction (i.e. mining, oil, and gas) tended to go to the multinational companies (and the countries these companies were based in) rather than to the host countries, which typically only experienced the negative impacts of the operations, a concept called the resource curse (Auty, 1993; Ogwang et al., 2019). Benefit-sharing was a concept used in the 1960s and 1970s (and also subsequently) to refer to the notion that developing countries (at the nation state level) should receive more of the benefits from resource extraction (Greenwald, 1976).

As indicated earlier in this chapter, the most likely first use of benefit-sharing as a concept referring to project-affected communities or host communities was in discussions in the

World Bank, especially in the context of development-induced displacement and resettlement. Another early use of the concept with reference to project-affected communities was in the work of the World Commission on Dams, which was established by the World Bank together with the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). Benefit-sharing is much present in the final report (WCD, 2000), and was also much discussed in the knowledge-base used by the Commission in the preparation of their final report. Subsequent outputs by the Dams and Development Project (DDP, 2007) have also emphasised benefit-sharing.

'ACCESS AND BENEFIT-SHARING' AND THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Although the text of the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity did not specifically use the expression 'benefit-sharing', the three objectives of the Convention were: the conservation of biological diversity; the sustainable use of biological diversity; and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilisation of genetic resources. Genetic resources implies the potential economic value of plants and animals (which are often on the lands of Indigenous peoples). The great potential for profit from exploiting genetic resources has led to bioprospecting (the act of searching for such resources) and biopiracy (the appropriation of these resources). Amidst much concern and after much negotiation, a set of guidelines (CBD Secretariat, 2002) and a protocol (CBD Secretariat, 2011) were developed about rights and responsibilities in relation to access and benefit-sharing in the context of the utilisation of genetic resources. Given the significant international interest in biodiversity, a considerable proportion of the literature that is identified by searching for 'benefit-sharing' is actually related to the Convention on Biological Diversity discourse on 'access and benefit-sharing' and bears little relation to project benefit-sharing as discussed in this chapter.

The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD Secretariat, 2004) also published the *Akwé: Kon Guidelines*, which are a set of guidelines about how environmental and social impact assessments should be conducted when a project will affect Indigenous communities. The language of 'maximise benefits and minimise adverse impacts' is very evident in these guidelines, as it is in the SIA discourse generally. The guidelines provide advice about how an SIA or EIA might be conducted in an effective way, including to enhance benefits.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND BENEFIT-SHARING

Benefit-sharing is something every project should do. The SIA process should normally consider opportunities for benefit-sharing, and make recommendations to the project about appropriate benefit-sharing arrangements that might be considered. However, any firm plans would need to be negotiated with the local community and emerge from a participatory process. While the community profile and social baseline developed as part of the SIA would also inform any benefit-sharing arrangements, developing an effective benefit-sharing strategy takes care, and probably should be done separate to the SIA process (Esteves & Vanclay, 2009).

PROBLEMS WITH BENEFIT-SHARING

Some people have argued that benefit-sharing is a threat to the rights of communities, especially Indigenous communities, because it acts as an inducement or enticement for them to accept projects that are not necessarily in their interests (Altman, 2009; Morgera, 2019). The flow of benefits in a community is not always equal, and the community discussion of the benefit-sharing arrangements and/or about support for the project can create division and conflict within communities. In a situation of existing conflict, the provision of benefits to one group over another group can exacerbate conflict (International Alert, 2018). There can also be disparity between resource-rich regions and other regions within a country, leading to inequality and conflict within a nation. There can also be corruption and political interference in the implementation of benefit-sharing arrangements. Also, considerable elite capture can occur.

A major issue is the lack of gender consideration in how benefits are distributed. If payments are only made to male heads of households, or to the registered owners of land (who are typically men), then women are left out. If community engagement processes to discuss possible ways of providing assistance only include men, then potential arrangements to consider women are not considered. The provision of benefits may increase gender-based violence (Social Development Direct, 2020).

Owen et al. (2021) have argued that affected communities experience considerable hidden costs, including opportunity costs, that are not fully considered in economic analyses about projects. They argue that benefit-sharing and shared value are misnomers because they presume that the benefits provided by a project are 'cost free' to the community. The reality is that, even where a project provides benefits, a full assessment of the overall picture may reveal that communities are still made worse off by the project, despite the alleged benefit-sharing. Furthermore, many writers (including O'Faircheallaigh, 2010; Vanclay, 2017b; Ijabadeniyi & Vanclay, 2020; Vanclay, 2020) suggest that the benefits of projects are often misrepresented or exaggerated, and that they are often little more than greenwashing.

Benefit-sharing schemes (especially when there is a social investment fund) may not always achieve their objectives. There can be a mismanagement of funds, with wastage, spending on ridiculous activities, etc. Sometimes, even when all intentions are good, a lack of understanding of the local cultural context may result inappropriate decisions being made (Hanna et al., 2016). Inadequate planning and/or a lack of thinking about the sustainability of benefit-sharing projects may mean that services quickly deteriorate and may even cease working altogether. In all projects, it will be necessary to ensure that there is careful consideration about how ongoing maintenance will be provided. A further issue is that, too often, the activities done by companies are little more than the pet projects of some manager, rather than carefully considered programmes that meet the needs of local communities.

Any benefit-sharing scheme that results in significant increased wealth to local people will inevitably cause local inflation. This will mean that the value of the benefit is diminished. The inflation will also affect people who are non-beneficiaries, and thus further inequity is created. The benefit-sharing arrangements may lead to changes in people's livelihood and lifestyles, which may themselves cause considerable social impacts (Vanclay, 2002).

Another issue is that the benefit-sharing arrangements may create dependency of the local community on the project. This may be fine while the project continues, but this could be a risk in the future when the project closes or is put on hold during a commodity price downturn.

Finally, there are some higher-level issues created by benefit-sharing. Sometimes central governments do not want companies to support local communities. This can be related to issues around the consequences of companies usurping or supplanting or replacing the state. Or it can be related to the fact the private-sector companies may be overly generous and create new expectations by communities for what should be proved in public-sector projects. An issue too is that some private-sector benefit-sharing arrangements may impose burdens on the state, for example in relation to the provision of schools or hospitals. Benefit-sharing arrangements frequently pay for the hard costs (infrastructure, buildings), but rarely the soft costs (staff salaries, materials needed, consumables, etc.) (van der Ploeg et al., 2017; van der Ploeg & Vanclay, 2018). These issues with benefit-sharing should not be an argument that there should be no benefit-sharing. They only indicate that benefit-sharing is not a panacea, and that benefit-sharing schemes should be carefully considered, implemented, and managed.

CONCLUSION

Benefit-sharing has varying meanings in different discourses. However, in social performance and social impact assessment circles, it means any attempt to enhance the outcomes for local communities from projects. Thus, it includes a wide range of enhancement activities as well as various financial arrangements that might be implemented by a project to benefit people in host or nearby communities. Strictly speaking, benefit-sharing is not compensation or impact mitigation. To be a benefit, the arrangement must make people better off, and must be in addition to any compensation or impact mitigation to which they would be entitled by local law or international standards. Benefit-sharing and enhancement measures should be meaningful, and be carefully developed in negotiation with local communities. They should not be an empty philanthropic gesture, nor should they be insignificant or incompetently implemented so as to be ineffectual or fail to make a meaningful difference to local people.

Most international standards now advocate (or even require) that at least some attention is given to benefit-sharing and/or to the enhancement of outcomes experienced by project-affected communities. However, these standards are generally not clear about what this means in practice, and there is little evidence that adequate attention is given to benefit-sharing in project design or in the conduct or approval of Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs), even though most social performance practitioners would say that it should be considered. Therefore, there is a real need to change the culture and practice of project implementation companies so that they move beyond a focus that is only on project completion at minimal cost to one that properly considers the project context and how the project can add value to local communities. There is a large range of possible enhancement measures that could be implemented, most of which would make a huge difference to local communities, and some of which would be at very little cost to the project. Clearly, development finance institutions, impact investors, and social performance practitioners need to play a stronger role in encouraging greater commitment by project developers to benefit-sharing and enhancement.

A critical issue is the role of ESIA in the identification of possible enhancement measures. The reality is that most ESIA consultants do not devote much attention to enhancement and benefit-sharing, partly because the practice of ESIA has primarily been concerned with minimising harm, and because the role of ESIA has been seen as assisting the project to obtain project approval (rather than to enhance the project). Even from an intellectual perspective, it is probably not appropriate to expect ESIAs to specify actual enhancement or benefit-sharing mechanisms, because devising such mechanisms should be a carefully considered process done in close discussion with affected communities, and potentially negotiated after project approval, not something to be rushed through in a pre-approval impact assessment.

A further problem is that, while most ESIAs typically contain a community profile and baseline data, which are often reasonable, in most projects there usually is far too little follow-up assessment to establish how people are actually affected by the project and how the community changes as a result of the project. Project-induced in-migration (influx) can mean that community profiles and baseline information quickly become out of date. Discussions about enhancement should be based on a more sophisticated understanding of the project and about what impacts will actually occur (including influx) than is available when the ESIA is done. Much more attention is needed in relation to the follow-up monitoring and adaptive management of social impacts. While the development of benefit-sharing arrangements should be a longer, more considered process than is possible during an ESIA process, nevertheless, the ESIA should inform the planning of benefit-sharing and enhancement measures.

The key point about benefit-sharing is that it is completely unacceptable for projects to render people worse off. It is also ethically reprehensible if people affected by projects are not also beneficiaries of the project. Projects need to try harder to improve outcomes experienced by local people and host communities.

REFERENCES

ADB (2009). *Safeguards Policy Statement*. Manila: Asian Development Bank. https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/institutional-document/32056/safeguard-policy-statement-june2009.pdf

ADB (2010). *Incorporation of Social Dimensions into ADB Operations* (OM Section C3/BP). Manila: Asian Development Bank. https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/institutional-document/31483/om-c3.pdf

Altman, J. (2009). Benefit-sharing is no solution to development. In R. Wynberg, R. Chennells, & D. Schroeder (eds), *Indigenous Peoples, Consent and Benefit-Sharing: Lessons from the San-Hoodia Case*. Berlin: Springer, 89–126.

Auty, R. (1993). *Sustaining Development in the Mineral Economies: The Resource Curse Thesis*. London: Routledge.

CBD Secretariat (2002). *Bonn Guidelines on Access to Genetic Resources and Fair and Equitable Sharing of the Benefits Arising out of their Utilization*. Montreal: Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. https://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/cbd-bonn-gdls-en.pdf

CBD Secretariat (2004). *Akwé: Kon Guidelines: Voluntary guidelines for the conduct of cultural, environmental and social impact assessments regarding developments proposed to take place on, or which are likely to impact on, sacred sites and on lands and waters traditionally occupied or used by indigenous and local communities*. Montreal: Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. https://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/akwe-brochure-en.pdf

CBD Secretariat (2011). *Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity*. Montreal: Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. https://www.cbd.int/abs/doc/protocol/nagoya-protocol-en.pdf

Cernea, M. (1995). Public policy responses to development-induced population displacement. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 31(24), 1515–1523.

Cernea, M. (2008). Compensation and benefit-sharing: Why resettlement policies and practices must be reformed. *Water Science Engineering*, 1(1), 89–120. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1674-2370(15)30021-1

Chen, X., Vanclay, F., & Yu, J. (2021). Evaluating Chinese policy on post-resettlement support for dam-induced displacement and resettlement. *Impact Assessment & Project Appraisal*, 39(5), 396–404. https://doi.org/10.1080/14615517.2020.1771051
Dauda, B., Denier, Y., & Dierickx, K. (2016). What do the various principles of justice mean within the concept of benefit-sharing? *Bioethical Inquiry*, 13, 281–293. https://doi.or/10.1007/s11673-016-9706-4
Dauda, B., & Dierickx, K. (2013). Benefit-sharing: An exploration on the contextual discourse of a changing concept. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 14, 36. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6939-14-36
DDP (2007). *Dams and Development Relevant Practices for Improved Decision-Making*. United Nations Environment Programme Dams and Development Project. https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/7613/-Dams%20and%20Development-%20Relevant%20Practices%20for%20Improved%20Decision%20Making-2007770.pdf
Dombrowsky, I., Bastian, J., Däschle, D., Heisig, S., Peters, J., & Vosseler, C. (2014). International and local benefit-sharing in hydropower projects on shared rivers: The Ruzizi III and Rusumo Falls cases. *Water Policy*, 16(6), 1087–1103. https://doi.org/10.2166/wp.2014.104
Égré, D., Roquet, V., & Durocher, C. (2007). Monetary benefit-sharing from dams: A few examples of financial partnerships with Indigenous communities in Québec (Canada). *International Journal of River Basin Management*, 5(3), 235–244. https://doi.org/10.1080/15715124.2007.9635323
Esteves, A.M., Franks, D., & Vanclay, F. (2012). Social impact assessment: The state of the art. *Impact Assessment & Project Appraisal*, 30(1), 34–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/14615517.2012.660356
Esteves, A.M., & Vanclay, F. (2009). Social development needs analysis as a tool for SIA to guide corporate-community investment: Applications in the minerals industry. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 29(2), 137–145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2008.08.004
Euler, R., & Dobyns, H. (1961). Ethnic group land rights in the modern state: Three case studies. *Human Organization*, 20(4), 203–207.
Greenwald, J. (1976). Sharing the world's natural resources: Prospects for international cooperation. *Natural Resources Lawyer*, 9, 577–584.
Hanna, P., Vanclay, F., Langdon, E.J., & Arts, J. (2016). The importance of cultural aspects in impact assessment and project development: Reflections from a case study of a hydroelectric dam in Brazil. *Impact Assessment & Project Appraisal*, 34(4), 306–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/14615517.2016.1184501
Hansson, K.-E., & Reves, R. (1982). The economics of co-operation in shared water resources development. *Natural Resources Forum*, 6(2), 151–166. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-8947.1982.tb00248.x
Holden, A. (1991). The terms of reference for negotiation and reconciliation of resource development and Aboriginal land rights in Queensland in the 1990s. *Policy, Organisation and Society*, 3(1), 39–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/10349952.1991.11876757
ICMM (2020). *Mining Principles*. London: International Council on Mining and Metals. https://www.icmm.com/website/publications/pdfs/mining-principles/mining-principles.pdf
ICMM (2022). *Tools for Social Performance*. London: International Council on Mining and Metals. https://www.icmm.com/website/publications/pdfs/social-performance/2022/guidance_tools-for-social-performance.pdf
IDB (2020). *Environmental and Social Policy Framework*. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank. https://www.iadb.org/en/mpas
IFC (2010). *Strategic Community Investment: A Good Practice Handbook for Companies Doing Business in Emerging Markets*. Washington, DC: International Finance Corporation. https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/topics_ext_content/ifc_external_corporate_site/sustainability-at-ifc/publications/publications_handbook_communityinvestment__wci__1319576907570
IFC (2012a). *IFC Performance Standards on Environmental and Social Sustainability*. Washington, DC: International Finance Corporation. https://www.ifc.org/performancestandards
IFC (2012b). *International Finance Corporation's Guidance Notes: Performance Standards on Environmental and Social Sustainability*. Washington, DC: International Finance Corporation. https://www.ifc.org/performancestandards
IFC (2015a). *The Art and Science of Benefit-sharing in the Natural Resource Sector*. Washington, DC: International Finance Corporation. http://hdl.handle.net/10986/24793

IFC (2015b). *Establishing Foundations to Deliver Community Investment*. Washington, DC: International Finance Corporation. https://commdev.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf/publications/P_Establishing_Foundations_Deliver_Community_Investment.pdf
IFC (2019). *Local Benefit-sharing in Large-Scale Wind and Solar Projects*. Washington, DC: International Finance Corporation. https://www.commdev.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/IFC-LargeScaleWindSolar_Web.pdf
IFC (2021). *A Guide to Local Benefit-sharing in Hydropower Projects*. Washington, DC: International Finance Corporation. https://commdev.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf/publications/Hydro_Benefit_Sharing_Report%20Series_Guide.pdf
IGF (2020). *Guidance for Governments: Improving Legal Frameworks for Environmental and Social Impact Assessment and Management.* Intergovernmental Forum on Mining, Minerals, Metals and Sustainable Development. Winnipeg: International Institute for Sustainable Development. https://www.iisd.org/sites/default/files/publications/igf-guidance-for-governments-esia-en.pdf
IHA (2019). *How-to Guide: Hydropower Benefit-sharing*. London: International Hydropower Association. https://www.hydropower.org/publications/hydropower-benefit-sharing-how-to-guide
Ijabadeniyi, A., & Vanclay, F. (2020). Socially-tolerated practices in environmental and social impact assessment reporting: Discourses, displacement, and impoverishment. *Land*, 9(2), 33. https://doi.org/10.3390/land9020033
International Alert (2018). *Human Rights Due Diligence in Conflict-Affected Settings: Guidance for Extractive Industries*. London: International Alert. https://www.international-alert.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Economy-Human-Rights-Due-Diligence-Guidance-EN-2018.pdf
IPIECA (2017). *Creating Successful, Sustainable Social Investment: Guidance Document for the Oil and Gas Industry* (2nd edn). London: IPIECA. https://www.ipieca.org/resources/good-practice/creating-successful-sustainable-social-investment-2nd-edition/
Jijelava, D., & Vanclay, F. (2017). Legitimacy, credibility and trust as the key components of a social licence to operate: An analysis of BP's projects in Georgia. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 140(Part 3), 1077–1086. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.10.070
João, E., Vanclay, F., & den Broeder, L. (2011). Emphasising enhancement in all forms of impact assessment. *Impact Assessment & Project Appraisal*, 29(3), 170–180. https://doi.org/10.3152/146155111X12959673796326
Kemp, D., & Owen, D. (2013). Community relations and mining: Core to business but not 'core business'. *Resources Policy*, 38, 523–531. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2013.08.003
Koenig, D. (2021). Advantages and obstacles to retrofitting benefit-sharing after development-induced displacement and resettlement. *Impact Assessment & Project Appraisal*, 39(5), 417–428. https://doi.org/10.1080/14615517.2020.1807292
Kung, A., Holcombe, S., Hamago, J., & Kemp, D. (2022). Indigenous co-ownership of mining projects: A preliminary framework for the critical examination of equity participation. *Journal of Energy & Natural Resources Law*, 20(4), 413–435. https://doi.org/10.1080/02646811.2022.2029184
Larmour, P. (1989). Sharing the benefits: Customary landowners and natural resource projects in Melanesia. *Pacific Viewpoint*, 30, 56–74. https://doi.org/10.1111/apv.301005
Michelman, F. (1967). Property, utility, and fairness: Comments on the ethical foundations of just compensation law. *Harvard Law Review*, 80(6), 1165–1258. https://doi.org/10.2307/1339276
Morgera, E. (2016). The need for an international legal concept of fair and equitable benefit-sharing. *European Journal of International Law*, 27(2), 353–383. https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chw014
Morgera, E. (2019). Under the radar: The role of fair and equitable benefit-sharing in protecting and realising human rights connected to natural resources. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 23(7), 1098–1139. https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2019.1592161
O'Faircheallaigh, C. (2010). Public participation and environmental impact assessment: Purposes, implications, and lessons for public policy making. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 30(1), 19–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2009.05.001
Ogwang, T., Vanclay, F., & van den Assem, A. (2019). Rent-seeking practices, local resource curse, and social conflict in Uganda's emerging oil economy. *Land*, 8(4), 53. https://doi.org/10.3390/land8040053
Owen, J.R., Kemp, D., & Marais, L. (2021). The cost of mining benefits: Localising the resource curse hypothesis. *Resources Policy*, 74, 102289. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2021.102289

Porter, M., & Kramer, M. (2011). Creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review*, 89, 62–77.
Price, S., Van Wicklin, W., Koenig, D., Owen, J., de Wet, C., & Kabra, A. (2020). Risk and value in benefit-sharing with displaced people: Looking back 40 years, anticipating the future. *Social Change*, 50(3), 447–465. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049085720953409
Schroeder, D., & Lucas, J. (eds) (2013). *Benefit-sharing: From Biodiversity to Human Genetics*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Schulz, C., & Skinner, J. (2022). Hydropower benefit-sharing and resettlement: A conceptual review. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 83, 102342. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2021.102342
Smyth, E., & Vanclay, F. (2017). The social framework for projects: A conceptual but practical model to assist in assessing, planning and managing the social impacts of projects. *Impact Assessment & Project Appraisal*, 35(1), 65–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/14615517.2016.1271539
Social Development Direct (2020). *Addressing Gender-Based Violence and Harassment: Emerging Good Practice for the Private Sector*. London: Social Development Direct. https://www.ifc.org/content/dam/ifc/doc/mgrt/gpn-addressinggbvh-july2020.pdf
Söderholm, P., & Svahn, N. (2015). Mining, regional development and benefit-sharing in developed countries. *Resources Policy*, 45, 78–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2015.03.003
Tserendorj, S., Tsevelmaa Baldan, T., & Marshall, P. (2013). *Healthy Together, Our Future: Guidebook for HIV/AIDS/STI Prevention in the Context of Mining and Transport*. Manila: Asian Development Bank. https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/project-document/81922/42027-012-dpta.pdf
van der Ploeg, L., & Vanclay, F. (2018). Challenges in implementing the corporate responsibility to respect human rights in the context of project-induced displacement and resettlement. *Resources Policy*, 55, 210–222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2017.12.001
van der Ploeg, L., Vanclay, F., & Lourenço, I. (2017). The responsibility of business enterprises to restore access to essential public services at resettlement sites. In M. Hesselman, A. Hallo de Wolf, & B. Toebes (eds), *Socio-Economic Human Rights in Essential Public Services Provision*. Abingdon: Routledge, 180–202.
Van Wicklin, W. (1999). Sharing project benefits to improve resettlers' livelihoods. In M. Cernea (ed.), *The Economics of Involuntary Resettlement: Questions and Challenges*. Washington, DC: World Bank, 231–256.
Vanclay, F. (2002). Conceptualising social impacts. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 22(3), 183–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-9255(01)00105-6
Vanclay, F. (2014). Developments in social impact assessment: An introduction to a collection of seminal research papers. In F. Vanclay (ed.), *Developments in Social Impact Assessment*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, xv–xxxix.
Vanclay, F. (2017a). Project-induced displacement and resettlement: From impoverishment risks to an opportunity for development? *Impact Assessment & Project Appraisal*, 35(1), 3–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/14615517.2017.1278671
Vanclay, F. (2017b). Principles to gain a social licence to operate for green initiatives and biodiversity projects. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 29, 48–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2017.11.003
Vanclay, F. (2020). Reflections on social impact assessment in the 21st century. *Impact Assessment & Project Appraisal*, 38(2), 126–131. https://doi.org/10.1080/14615517.2019.1685807
Vanclay, F., & Esteves, A.M. (2011). Current issues and trends in social impact assessment. In F. Vanclay & A.M. Esteves (eds), *New Directions in Social Impact Assessment: Conceptual and Methodological Advances*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, 3–19.
Vanclay, F., Esteves, A.M., Aucamp, I., & Franks, D. (2015). *Social Impact Assessment: Guidance for Assessing and Managing the Social Impacts of Projects*. Fargo, ND: International Association for Impact Assessment. https://www.iaia.org/uploads/pdf/SIA_Guidance_Document_IAIA.pdf
Vanclay, F., & Hanna, P. (2019). Conceptualising company response to community protest: Principles to achieve a social license to operate. *Land*, 8(6), 101. https://doi.org/10.3390/land8060101
Veenker, R., & Vanclay, F. (2021). What did NAM do to get a social licence to operate? The social impact history of the Schoonebeek oilfield in the Netherlands. *Extractive Industries & Society*, 8(2), 100888. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2021.02.008
Wall, E., & Pelon, R. (2011). *Sharing Mining Benefits in Developing Countries: The Experience of Foundations, Trusts and Funds*. Washington, DC: World Bank. http://hdl.handle.net/10986/18290

Wankhede, V. (2020). *Benefit-sharing in the Mining Sector in Africa*. New Delhi: Centre for Science and Environment. https://www.cseindia.org/content/downloadreports/9866

WCD (2000). *Dams and Development: A New Framework for Decision-Making*. Cape Town: World Commission on Dams.

World Bank (1990). *Operational Directive 4.30: Involuntary Resettlement*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank (2010). *Mining Foundations, Trusts and Funds: A Sourcebook*. Washington, DC: World Bank. http://hdl.handle.net/10986/16965

World Bank (2017). *The World Bank Environmental and Social Framework*. Washington, DC: World Bank. https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/837721522762050108-0290022018/original/ESFFramework.pdf

World Bank (2019). *Improving the Investment Climate for Renewable Energy through Benefit-sharing, Risk Management and Local Community Engagement*. Washington, DC: World Bank. http://hdl.handle.net/10986/32748