

PROJEKTA

Governance, Participation and Gender Equality

WORKSHOP REPORT

Capacity Score Card of Managing the Environmental Impacts of Artisanal
Small Scale Gold Mining – May 6th, 2024

Consultant: Sharda Ganga, Stichting Projekta
info@projekta.sr

Contents

Background & tasks of the consultant	2
Background	2
Tasks undertaken by the Consultant	2
Workshop Report	4
Score Cards	6
Annex 1. Capacity Scorecard session program	8
Annex 2. Participants list	9
Annex 3. Score cards	12

Background & tasks of the consultant

Background

The Project “*Improving Environmental Management in the Mining Sector of Suriname, with Emphasis on Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining*”, EMSAGS Project, is a GEF funded project being implemented in Suriname by the Ministry of Natural Resources and the National Institute for Environment and Development in Suriname (NIMOS) as national implementing partners, the Ministry of Spatial Planning and Environment as Beneficiary and with support from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

The project aims to improve the environmental management of mining in Suriname, particularly small-scale gold mining, which is the largest driver of deforestation in the country and contributes to biodiversity loss (through habitat degradation and pollution), climate change (through deforestation) and unsustainable land, water and forest management. The project will address policy and institutional constraints to improve the management of the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining (ASGM) sector as well as to create an enabling environment for the dissemination of environmentally responsible mining practices.

To do so, the project works at the policy level (Outcomes 1 and 2) with government stakeholders, as well as with miners themselves (Outcome 3) to demonstrate the environmental and economic benefits of environmentally responsible mining practices (ERMPs) and technologies. The model proposed is one that relies on the identification of benefits for miners that arise from the application of ERMPs, including social and economic benefits, as well as the design of a system of national level financial, fiscal and regulatory incentives to help re-orient the market towards more responsibly sourced gold. Based on the lessons learned from this model, the project will implement an upscaling strategy that will include knowledge sharing at local and national level, as well as with neighboring countries (Outcome 4).

During the design of the project, a capacity scorecard for the mining sector was developed and filled in by stakeholders in a workshop in 2017. In that assessment exercise, stakeholders in the mining sector had a moderately satisfactory capacity to manage the ASGM sector, reflected by a score of 1.2 on a scale of 0 to three. Some key issues were mentioned, among others the necessity to consolidate knowledge banks for policy formulation, improving coordination, and building trust. The project aims to improve this score by at least 25%, up to satisfactory levels.

Tasks undertaken by the Consultant

The consultant's main responsibility was to complete an initial Capacity Score Card for managing the environmental impacts of ASGM, by collecting data during a session with project partners and relevant institutions.

On April 10, 2024, the consultants and the EMSAGS team had an inception meeting at the EMSAGS office. At that meeting, the EMSAGS team indicated that there was no detailed data on the baseline capacity scorecard. It was therefore agreed to expand the scope of the assignment and the workshop to be able to fill in two scorecards: one for the baseline (the start of the project in 2018 till December 2021) and one for the current situation (since 2022, the year the Training needs

assessment was conducted and the training programs of the EMSAGS Project started). Therefore, the workshop would no longer be a half-day workshop, but a full day. However, it must be expected that the baseline data will not be 100% correct, which in turn will impact the validity of the end-evaluation of the capacity process. Additionally, the consultant observed that the original scorecard did not support practically feasible and methodologically consistent data collection. It was therefore agreed that the consultant would design a data collection tool, in Dutch.

Based on the inception meeting, the consultant submitted a Workplan on April 19th. The data collection instrument was designed and provided to EMSAGS for reproduction prior to the workshop.

Workshop Report

The workshop was held on May 6th, 2024. The programme is included in Annex 1. There were 22 participants from 13 stakeholder organizations, institutes or ministries. The participants list is included as Annex 2.

The opening was conducted by Carmen Elliott, Engagement Specialist of the EMSAGS. She gave a detailed overview of the training that was provided as part of Outcome 1 of the project, based on a 2022 Training Needs Assessment conducted by ESS.

The completed training courses were:

- Gender & Mainstreaming and Human Rights (including women's rights, ITP rights)
- Geology & Mining Aspects (geology, gold genesis, exploration, mining, processing)
- Environment, Health & Safety (gender guidelines for ERM, environmentally responsible mining, occupational health & safety, mine closure)

She indicated that there would be more training from May to August 2024, for the participating institutions.

She then introduced the consultant.

The consultant first held a round of introductions. Approximately 6 – 7 participants had participated in 3 or more training courses for EMSAGS, and approximately 6 – 7 had participated in 1 – 2 training courses. There was only 1 participant who did not participate in any training courses.

The consultant then discussed the aims and benefits of monitoring in general, and what the topic of the day's monitoring exercise was, namely capacity.

Participants share their general impression of the situation before the start of the EMSAGS Project in 2018:

- Widespread mercury use
- Land degradation
- Unsafe working methods in ASGM
- Changes in the natural environment
- Environmental damages
- No Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)

Participants were then divided into groups, and the consultant went through the scorecard per indicator, giving each group some time to fill in their responses for each indicator, before moving to the next one. For this first round, participants were to fill in data and scores for the baseline (2018 – till December 2022, before the start of EMSAGS activities).

In a discussion, participants gave their general findings of the main changes in the field of ASGM and environment since 2018:

- Many more institutes and organizations know what FPIC is, and have taken steps to apply its principles
- 'Ordering Goud Sector' has been moved from the Cabinet of the President to the Cabinet of the Vice President, and received much less funding.
- There is more information and knowledge about sustainable mining practices

The consultant then moved onto the second round, in which participants filled in data for the current situation.

Afterwards, participants briefly presented their general findings. In their view, there is not much change for most of the indicators. The indicators for which their scores between 2018 and the current situation differed the most were Legitimacy (Indicator 1), Cooperation & Engagement (Indicator 2), Access & sharing of information (Indicator 5), and Policy & Information (Indicator 6).

Some of the main changes that participants mentioned were:

- There is more awareness and knowledge about mercury-free mining
- Our work has improved in quality, due to training (e.g. HSE)
- Various stakeholders and local communities never used to be as closely involved
- There is more application of FPIC

As last topic of the day, the consultant held a brief oral evaluation. Some impressions from the evaluation (some paraphrasing for clarity):

- “I thought that we were going to have to summarize and present what we learned from the training, but this was more in-depth”
- “It was a good session, because you could answer from your own experience, but then compare to somebody else’s answers and bring everything together”
- “It was also valuable as a self-evaluation for the organization: where do we stand and how we have improved”
- “It looked difficult in the beginning, but became easier after a while”

The closing of the workshop was done by the Engagement Specialist. She thanked the consultants and the participants for their efforts, despite it being challenging to fill in baseline data so many years later. She was pleased to see that participants were positive about the EMSAGS training courses. She indicated that Suriname still has a long way to go to show the world that we can phase out mercury according to the Minamata Convention, but that we will only achieve this goal if all stakeholders work together.

Score Cards

After the workshop, the data from the expanded tool was entered in Microsoft Excel, the average scores calculated, and brief summaries written per indicator. This data was then entered into the Score Card itself, which are included as Annex 3. These score cards will be sent to participants.

The results of the score cards outcome regarding baseline and current situation

During the score card session of the baseline, participants indicated that the mining and environmental stakeholders had a moderately satisfactory capacity to manage the ASGM sector, reflected by a score of 1.06 on a scale of 0 to three. Some key issues were mentioned, among others the widespread mercury use, land degradation, unsafe working methods in ASGM, changes in the natural environment, environmental damages, and a lack of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). The highest scores were noted for the capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge and the lowest for the capacity to monitor the environmental impacts of ASGM.

During the score card session to determine the current status, stakeholders in the mining sector had a satisfactory capacity to manage the ASGM sector, reflected by a score of 1.82 on a scale of 0 to three. Some key improvement were mentioned, there is more awareness and knowledge about mercury-free mining, our work has improved in quality, due to training (e.g. HSE), various stakeholders and local communities never used to be as closely involved, there is more application of FPIC. Once again, the highest scores were noted for the capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge and the lowest for the capacity to monitor the environmental impacts of ASGM.

The project aims to improve this score by at least 25%. With an improvement of 72%, this target has been exceeded. The table below shows the comparison of the baseline and the current scores for the various elements of capacity.

Element of Capacity & Indicators	Baseline	Current
Capacity for Engagement		
Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead organization(s)	1.07	2.2
Existence of cooperation among stakeholder groups in addition to their involvement (participation and engagement) in decision-making on environment and mining	0.85	1.79
Degree to which local populations, miners, indigenous people, women and other vulnerable groups are engaged in policy-making for the ASGM sector	0.62	1.79
Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge		
Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders on the environmental impacts of ASGM	2.5	2.1
Access and sharing of ASGM information by stakeholders	0.92	2.04
Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making on ASGM	1.23	2
Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development		
Extent of the ASGM related planning and strategy development process	0.75	1.64
Existence of an adequate policy and regulatory frameworks in terms of environmental aspects of ASGM	1.08	1.63

Capacities for management and implementation		
Existence and mobilization of resources by the relevant environmental organizations to manage ASGM	1.08	1.87
Availability of required technical skills and technology to manage ASGM	1.27	1.91
Capacities to monitor the environmental impacts of ASGM		
Adequacy of monitoring process related to the environmental impacts of ASGM and the extent to which the monitoring information informs policymaking for ASGM	0.33	1.07
TOTAL	1.06	1.82

Annex 1. Capacity Scorecard session program



Capacity Scorecard sessie
Maandag 6 mei 2024, Lalla Rookh

Programma

8.00	Inloop en Registratie	EMSAGS
8.30	Welkom	EMSAGS
	Introductie EMSAGS en uitgevoerde capacity activiteiten	EMSAGS
9.00	Uitleg Score card	Projekta (consultant)
	Sessie: Baseline	Projekta (consultant)
10.30	Break	
10.45	Sessie Baseline (vervolg)	Projekta (consultant)
	Sessie: Mid term	Projekta (consultant)
12.30	Break	
12.45	Sessie: Mid term (vervolg)	Projekta (consultant)
14.00	Plenaire terugblik en afronding	Projekta (consultant)
14.30	Sluiting/meeneelunch	EMSAGS

Annex 2. Participants list






SCORE CARD WORKSHOP

Date: 6 May 2024
Time: 8:00 a.m. – 15:00 p.m.
Location: Lalla Rookh building, Conference room 1.

Presentielijst voor de deelnemende organisaties (in de uitvoering)

No.	Organisatie/Instantie	Voor – en achternaam	Email adres	Geslacht		Paraaf
				Man	Vrouw	
1	EMSAGS PMU	Eric Sosrojoedo	logistics.emsags@nimos.org	X		<i>[Signature]</i>
2	EMSAGS PMU	Carmen Elliott - Banai	engagement.emsags@nimos.org		X	<i>[Signature]</i>
3	EMSAGS PMU	Emmy Soetodrono	project-monitoring@nimos.org		X	<i>[Signature]</i>
4	St. Projekta	Sharda Ganga	info@projekta.sr / gangasharda@gmail.com		X	<i>[Signature]</i>
5	St. Projekta	Rayah Bhattacharji	info@projekta.sr / rayahb@yahoo.com		X	<i>[Signature]</i>
6	St. Projekta					





Registration Form score card workshop

Date: 6 May 2024
Time: 8:00 a.m. – 15:00 p.m.
Location: Lalla Rookh building, Conference room 1.

No.	Organization	Name	E-mail address	Mob.#	M	F	Signature
1	AdeKUS – Geoscience/ Mijnbouw	Ramon Finkie	rtfinkie@gmail.com				
2	AdeKUS - milieuwetenschappen	Manisha Balgobiend	Manisha.Balgobiend@uvs.edu				
3	AdeKUS - milieuwetenschappen	Sephia Djasiman	Sephia.djasiman@uvs.edu				
4	Bauxite Institute Suriname	Raymondo Emanuels	emau.raymondobauxietinstituut@gmail.com	8574577		X	<i>[Signature]</i>
5	Bauxite Institute Suriname	Ashwin Ram	ram.ashwinbauxietinstituut@gmail.com				
6	Commission for the Regulation of the Gold Sector (Ordering Goudsector)	Eduard Kanape	k16eduard@gmail.com	8873280	X		<i>[Signature]</i>
7	Commission for the Regulation of the Gold Sector (Ordering Goudsector)	John Johans	johnjohans@gmail.com	8956638	X		<i>[Signature]</i>
8	Geologisch Mijnbouwkundige Dienst	Daniëlla van Engel	daniella.vanengel@outlook.com	8812431		X	<i>[Signature]</i>
9	Geologisch Mijnbouwkundige Dienst	Lugard Roetoe	mogiki2000@hotmail.com				
		<i>Dorede - Rabenf</i>		8577279	X		<i>[Signature]</i>

1



Registration Form score card workshop

No.	Organization	Name	E-mail address	Mob.#	M	F	Signature
10	KAMPOS	Renatha Simson	renatha.simson@gmail.com / kamos.samnerwerkingsverband@outlook.com				
11	Medische Zending (MZ)	Maureen Wijngaarde - van Dijk	mvandijk@medischezending.sr				
12	Ministerie van Economische Zaken, Ondernemerschap en Technologische Innovatie (EZOTI)	Ramnewash S	sramnewash49@gmail.com	8751665	X		
13	Ministerie van Economische Zaken, Ondernemerschap en Technologische Innovatie (EZOTI)	Marcia Emanuel	Marciahit18@gmail.com / Marcia_Grace82@hotmail.com	8647429		X	
14	Ministerie van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen	Angela Monorath	anglemonorath@gmail.com				
15	Ministerie van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen	Vikaash Soerdjbalisingh	vikaash414@gmail.com				
16	Ministerie van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen/ CED	Ramona Olijveld	Ramona86olijveld@hotmail.com				
17	Ministerie van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen/ CED	Selcius Poeketi	pocketi.s@hotmail.com				
18	Ministerie van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen/ Juridische Afd.	Mw. Aron	aro.ctf150@gmail.com			X	
	Medische Zending (mz)	Haepel L	juwendduc@hotmail.com	8598132		X	



Registration Form score card workshop

No.	Organization	Name	E-mail address	Mob.#	M	F	Signature
19	Ministerie van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen/ Suriname Competitiveness and Sector Diversification (SCSD) Project	Clyde Griffith	clydegriffith1977@gmail.com				
20	Ministerie van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen/ Suriname Competitiveness and Sector Diversification (SCSD) Project	Reenuska Anandbahadoer-Mahabier	Reenuska.a.mahabier@gmail.com				
21	Ministerie van Onderwijs, Wetenschap en Cultuur	Sergio Derby	eddyjordan45@hotmail.com	8526997		X	
22	Ministerie van Onderwijs, Wetenschap en Cultuur	Nunzio Koningsbloem	ikbennunzio@hotmail.com	8631310		X	
23	Ministerie van Onderwijs, Wetenschap en Cultuur	Randjieta Patterson	rpattersonminowc@gmail.com				
24	Ministerie van Regionale Ontwikkeling en Sport	Mavrick Boejoekoe	m_boejoekoe@yahoo.com				
25	Ministerie van Volksgezondheid	Jules de Kom	Jdckom@gmail.com				
26	Ministerie van Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieu	Nasser Rodjan	nasserrodjan@gmail.com				
	Min. ROM	Kawiesh Debrisan	kawiesh2@gmail.com	7106811		X	



Registration Form score card workshop

No.	Organization	Name	E-mail adress	Mob.#	M	F	Signature
27	Nationaal Herbarium	Eliza Zschuschen	eliza.zschuschen@uvs.edu				
28	National Zoological Collection of Suriname and the Environmental Research Center (NZCS/CMO)/ AdeKUS	Gwendolyn Landburg	Gwendolyn.Landburg@uvs.edu				
29	NIMOS	Shafri dagatoen Asruf	sasruf@nimos.org	8989340	X		
30	NIMOS	Steffany Wijngaarde	swijngaarde@nimos.org				
31	NIMOS	Marjory Danoe-Alimoenadi	mdanoe@nimos.org				
32	NIMOS	Jaya Bisessar	jbisessar@nimos.org	00540076	X		
33	OIS	Veronica Geneng-Djoehan Josien Aloema-Tokoe	veronica.mensel79@gmail.com oiscoica@gmail.com	8980979	X		
34	OIS	Patricia Kajoeramarie	oiscoica@gmail.com / pakaja.48@gmail.com	8780386	X		
35	Secretariaat Brokopondo	Cladys Jonas	treesje4@gmail.com	8656884	X		
36	Secretariaat Brokopondo	Morel Vonkel	vonkelmorel@gmail.com	8914306	X		
37	Secretariaat Brokopondo	Bonny-wailer Doebe	bonnydoebe155@gmail.com	7646023	X		

4



Registration Form score card workshop

No.	Organization	Name	E-mail adress	Mob.#	M	F	Signature
38	Stichting Bosbeheer en Bostoezicht	Ilgia Hoepel	i.hoepel@sbb.sr				
39	Stichting Bosbeheer en Bostoezicht	Sarah Crabbe	sarah_crabbe@yahoo.com				
40	UNDP Suriname	Bryan Drakenstein	bryan.drakenstein@undp.org				
41	Vereniging van Inheemse Dorpschouffden in Suriname (VIDS)	Lilian Armaketo	lilian.armaketo@vids.sr				
42	Vereniging van Inheemse Dorpschouffden in Suriname (VIDS)	Sathyam Noersalim	sathyam.noersalim@vids.sr				
43	Vereniging van Inheemse Dorpschouffden in Suriname (VIDS)	Lilian Armaketo	lilian.armaketo@vids.sr		X		

UNDP
KAMPUS

Anuradha Khwenkhon anuradha.khwenkhon@undp.org
Simone Rowatha

5

Capacity Score Card - Baseline situation

Managing the Environmental Impacts of Artisanal Small Scale Gold Mining

This Capacity Score Card has been developed in order to assist in monitoring evolution in capacity of all stakeholders to identify, implement and manage environmentally responsible artisanal small scale mining. It was adapted from the following: (adapted from UNDP Capacity Assessment Score Card (REF) and Monitoring Capacity Development Results in GEF (REF). It is designed to be completed at inception, mid-term and end of project. The Score Card will deliver different results according to stakeholders called upon to fill it in. Therefore, a participatory process for measuring the scorecard is required, that brings together a broad spectrum of stakeholder groups, to ensure a thorough reflection of various points of view.

Person Filling:
(see participants list)

Name of Institutions:
(see participants list)

Date:
May 6th, 2024

Type of Stakeholder:
(Mixed group - see participants list)

Element of Capacity and Indicator	0	1	2	3	Rating	Comment
Capacity for Engagement						
Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead organization(s)	Organizational responsibilities for environmental management of ASGM are not clearly defined	Organizational responsibilities for environmental management of ASGM are identified	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management of ASGM are partially recognized by stakeholders	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management of ASGM recognized by stakeholders	1.07	Roles and responsibilities were not legally defined. Environment was under the purview of the Cabinet of the President, but stakeholders from the outside did not know what the structure was on the inside. It was even more unclear for local communities.
Existence of cooperation among stakeholder groups in addition to their involment (participation and engagement) in decision-making on environment and mining	Identification of stakeholders and their participation/ involvement in management decision-making on environment and mining is poor	Stakeholders are identified but their participation in management decision- making on environment and mining is limited	Stakeholders are identified and regular consultations mechanisms are established related to environment and mining	Identified stakeholders cooperate with each other, and they actively contribute to established participative management decision-making processes on environment and mining	0.85	Organizations worked at cross purposes. There were many conflicts of interest. Key ministries such as Ministry of Land Policy and Forest Management (GGB) were not invited. There was insufficient engagement of government institutes in decision making, and even less for local community voices. Input was requested but was not processed in decisions.
Degree to which local populations, miners, indigenous people, women and other vulnerable groups are engaged in policy-making for the ASGM sector	All policies and regulations are enforcement-based and top down, with no local consultation or buy-in	Some forums for local participation in ASGM policy-making exist but few participate	There exist formal avenues for local stakeholder participation in policy-making and their contributions are recognized	Policy-makers and local populations, miners, IPs and women participate on an equal footing in ASGM-related policy-making and a climate of trust exists based on mutual benefits	0.62	They were not or hardly not engaged, but were not united themselves, and there were conflicts of interest. Engagement and dialogue were not structural; indigenous communities (especially those in remote areas) and women were seldom involved in discussions. Policy and decisions were top-down.
Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge						
Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders on the environmental impacts of ASGM	Stakeholders are not aware about environmental impacts of ASGM or about potential solutions	Stakeholders are aware about environmental impacts of ASGM not about the possible solutions	Stakeholders are aware about environmental impacts of ASGM and of the possible solutions but do not know how to implement them	Stakeholders are aware about environmental impacts of ASGM and are actively participating in the implementation of related solutions	2.5	Most ASGM miners did not know about the environmental effects. Only a few had participated in some training, but not enough to know how to implement the solutions in practice. ITP's continually experienced the environmental impacts firsthand, and sounded the alarm with local and national authorities, without response. Without recognition of their communal land rights, they could not act against the miners. Other stakeholders had some knowledge of the environmental impacts, but not of the solutions, namely rehabilitation.

Access and sharing of ASGM information by stakeholders	The ASGM information needs are not identified and the information management infrastructure is inadequate	The ASGM information needs are identified but the information management infrastructure is inadequate	The ASGM information is partially available and shared among stakeholders but is not covering all focal areas and/or the information management infrastructure to manage and give information access to the public is limited	Comprehensive ASGM information is available and shared through an adequate information management infrastructure	0.92	Management and processing of data was not centralized, and could therefore not be used for policy. Some information could be shared with policy makers, but was not accessible or understandable for the general public, even less so for those whose lives are impacted the most. There was no information available on ASGM concessions.
Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making on ASGM	The availability of environmental information on ASGM for decision-making is lacking	Some environmental information on ASGM exists but it is not sufficient to support environmental decision-making processes	Relevant ASGM environmental information is made available to environmental decision-makers but the process to update this information is not functioning properly	Political and administrative decision-makers obtain and use updated ASGM environmental information to make environmental decisions	1.23	Information was often unavailable, outdated, or incomplete, e.g. no information on the effects on flora and fauna, no information from the South of Suriname. Policy makers did not use information optimally, e.g. ITP-information was not taken seriously, and certain information was only collected after disasters.

Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development

Extent of the ASGM related planning and strategy development process	The ASGM-related planning and strategy development process is not coordinated and does not produce adequate environmental plans and strategies	The ASGM-related planning and strategy development process does produce adequate environmental plans and strategies but there are not implemented /used	Adequate ASGM-related plans and strategies are produced but there are only partially implemented because of funding constraints and/or other problems	The ASGM planning and strategy development process is well coordinated by the lead environmental organizations and produces the required environmental plans and strategies; which are being implemented	0.75	Plans were made in seclusion. Input from ITP's was not or seldom included. Plans were often made but not implemented, e.g. Ordening Goudsector. There was often a lack of resources to implement plans, especially for local civil society and ITP organizations.
Existence of an adequate policy and regulatory frameworks in terms of environmental aspects of ASGM	The policy and regulatory frameworks are insufficient; they do not provide an enabling environment for environmental aspects of ASGM	Some relevant policies and laws exist with regards to environmental aspects of ASGM but few are implemented and enforced	Adequate policy and legislation frameworks exist with regards to environmental aspects of ASGM but there are problems in implementing and enforcing them	Adequate policy and legislation frameworks are implemented and provide an adequate enabling environment with regards to environmental aspects of ASGM; a compliance and enforcement mechanism is established and functions	1.08	The Environmental Framework Law did not exist yet. Existing laws were not operationalized in rules and regulations. POLicy was not sufficiently operationalized in programme's, projects, and processes. Policy was often only on paper, but not implemented or enforced. Political interests and a lack of political will also play a role.

Capacities for management and implementation

Existence and mobilization of resources by the relevant environmental organizations to manage ASGM	The environmental organizations don't have adequate resources with regards to ASGM or their programmes and projects and the requirements have not been assessed	The resource requirements in terms of gold mining are known but are not being addressed	In order to manage ASGM, the funding sources for these resource requirements are partially identified and the resource requirements are partially addressed	In order to manage ASGM, adequate resources are mobilized and available for the functioning of the lead environmental organizations	1.08	There were resources available, though limited, mostly via external donors. However, these were difficult to access for many organizations. Government departments only received limited funds from the central budget. At that time, EMSAGS had not yet started.
--	---	---	---	---	------	---

Availability of required technical skills and technology to manage ASGM	The necessary required skills and technology to manage ASGM are not available and the needs are not identified	The required skills and technologies needs to manage ASGM are identified as well as their sources	The required skills and technologies needed to manage ASGM are obtained but their access depend on foreign sources	The required skills and technologies to manage ASGM are available and there is a national-based mechanism for updating the required skills and for upgrading the technologies	1.27	The technology was somewhat known, but not yet sufficiently in-house, despite training projects. It also happened more often that foreign consultants were still chosen, even though the knowledge was in Suriname.
---	--	---	--	---	------	---

Capacities to monitor the environmental impacts of ASGM

Adequacy of monitoring process related to the environmental impacts of ASGM and the extent to which the monitoring information informs policymaking for ASGM	Irregular monitoring is being done without an adequate monitoring framework or indicators related to environmental impacts of ASGM	An adequately resourced monitoring framework is in place but project monitoring is irregularly conducted	Regular participatory monitoring environmental impacts of ASGM is being conducted but this information is only partially used by the government in setting new policy	Environmental monitoring information is produced timely and accurately and is used by the government to learn, inform and possibly to change policies related to ASGM	0.33	There was no adequate monitoring process at the time: no consistent indicators, monitoring was irregular, resources were inadequate, local communities were not involved. The little monitoring information that was available was not translated into policy. The Environmental Framework Act had not yet been adopted.
				AVERAGE	1.06	

Capacity Score Card - current situation

Managing the Environmental Impacts of Artisanal Small Scale Gold Mining

This Capacity Score Card has been developed in order to assist in monitoring evolution in capacity of all stakeholders to identify, implement and manage environmentally responsible artisanal small scale mining. It was adapted from the following: (adapted from UNDP Capacity Assessment Score Card (REF) and Monitoring Capacity Development Results in GEF (REF). It is designed to be completed at inception, mid-term and end of project. The Score Card will deliver different results according to stakeholders called upon to fill it in. Therefore, a participatory process for measuring the scorecard is required, that brings together a broad spectrum of stakeholder groups, to ensure a thorough reflection of various points of view.

Person Filling:
(see participants list)

Name of Institutions:
(see participants list)

Date:
May 6th, 2024

Type of Stakeholder:
(Mixed group - see participants list)

Element of Capacity and Indicator	0	1	2	3	Rating	Comment
Capacity for Engagement						
Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead organization(s)	Organizational responsibilities for environmental management of ASGM are not clearly defined	Organizational responsibilities for environmental management of ASGM are identified	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management of ASGM are partially recognized by stakeholders	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management of ASGM recognized by stakeholders	2.2	Although the Environmental Framework Law has been adopted, the transformation of NIMOS into NMA is not complete. Although there is more knowledge among stakeholders of the roles and mandate, there are still disagreements about this. Although the establishment of miners organizations is an improvement, however, the establishment of the Minerals Authority Suriname (part of the still to be finalized revised Mining Law) is a crucial missing element.
Existence of cooperation among stakeholder groups in addition to their involment (participation and engagement) in decision-making on environment and mining	Identification of stakeholders and their participation/involvement in management decision-making on environment and mining is poor	Stakeholders are identified but their participation in management decision-making on environment and mining is limited	Stakeholders are identified and regular consultations mechanisms are established related to environment and mining	Identified stakeholders cooperate with each other, and they actively contribute to established participative management decision-making processes on environment and mining	1.79	There is a definite increase in stakeholder engagement: there is a Community Engagement Department at the Ministry of Natural Resources, the term FPIC is more widely known (although not often applied), and ITP-organizations are engaged more often. However, the main issue is the continues non-recognition of collective rights.
Degree to which local populations, miners, indigenous people, women and other vulnerable groups are engaged in policy-making for the ASGM sector	All policies and regulations are enforcement-based and top down, with no local consultation or buy-in	Some forums for local participation in ASGM policy-making exist but few participate	There exist formal avenues for local stakeholder participation in policy-making and their contributions are recognized	Policy-makers and local populations, miners, IPs and women participate on an equal footing in ASGM-related policy-making and a climate of trust exists based on mutual benefits	1.79	Local communities are now engaged more significantly than before. FPIC is applied more: there are krutu's before decisions are made (although not often clear if/how this influences decision-making), local communities can apply for projects and receive capacity strengthening. Additionally, representative organizations were closely consulted in the drafting of the new ming legislation. The non-recognition of formal ITP-rights is an obstacle.

Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge

Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders on the environmental impacts of ASGM	Stakeholders are not aware about environmental impacts of ASGM or about potential solutions	Stakeholders are aware about environmental impacts of ASGM not about the possible solutions	Stakeholders are aware about environmental impacts of ASGM and of the possible solutions but do not know how to implement them	Stakeholders are aware about environmental impacts of ASGM and are actively participating in the implementation of related solutions	2.1	There is more knowledge of the environmental effects and of the solutions. However, solutions are not often implemented, usually due a variety of factors such as financial constraints and lack of practical support
Access and sharing of ASGM information by stakeholders	The ASGM information needs are not identified and the information management infrastructure is inadequate	The ASGM information needs are identified but the information management infrastructure is inadequate	The ASGM information is partially available and shared among stakeholders but is not covering all focal areas and/or the information management infrastructure to manage and give information access to the public is limited	Comprehensive ASGM information is available and shared through an adequate information management infrastructure	2.04	There is more information than before, but it is still not shared enough outside of a group of key organizations. Information that is publicly available is not always complete.
Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making on ASGM	The availability of environmental information on ASGM for decision-making is lacking	Some environmental information on ASGM exists but it is not sufficient to support environmental decision-making processes	Relevant ASGM environmental information is made available to environmental decision-makers but the process to update this information is not functioning properly	Political and administrative decision-makers obtain and use updated ASGM environmental information to make environmental decisions	2	There is more information than before, but it is often still outdated. Additionally, it is not used by decision-makers.

Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development

Extent of the ASGM related planning and strategy development process	The ASGM-related planning and strategy development process is not coordinated and does not produce adequate environmental plans and strategies	The ASGM-related planning and strategy development process does produce adequate environmental plans and strategies but there are not implemented /used	Adequate ASGM-related plans and strategies are produced but there are only partially implemented because of funding constraints and/or other problems	The ASGM planning and strategy development process is well coordinated by the lead environmental organizations and produces the required environmental plans and strategies; which are being implemented	1.64	There are more plans and strategies than before, although this is expected to improve substantially after the full DAS/NMA transition. Plans and strategies are often ot fully implemented, due to lack of political will or lack of funding.
Existence of an adequate policy and regulatory frameworks in terms of environmental aspects of ASGM	The policy and regulatory frameworks are insufficient; they do not provide an enabling environment for environmental aspects of ASGM	Some relevant policies and laws exist with regards to environmental aspects of ASGM but few are implemented and enforced	Adequate policy and legislation frameworks exist with regards to environmental aspects of ASGM but there are problems in implementing and enforcing them	Adequate policy and legislation frameworks are implemented and provide an adequate enabling environment with regards to environmental aspects of ASGM; a compliance and enforcement mechanism is established and functions	1.63	There is now an Environmental Framework Law, but it cannot be fully implemented as there is not yet an NMA and not all supporting legislation/policy has been completed.

Capacities for management and implementation						
Existence and mobilization of resources by the relevant environmental organizations to manage ASGM	The environmental organizations don't have adequate resources with regards to ASGM or their programmes and projects and the requirements have not been assessed	The resource requirements in terms of gold mining are known but are not being addressed	In order to manage ASGM, the funding sources for these resource requirements are partially identified and the resource requirements are partially addressed	In order to manage ASGM, adequate resources are mobilized and available for the functioning of the lead environmental organizations	1.87	It is known what funds are needed, and where they can be mobilized. Some funds have been mobilized (e.g. through EMSAGS), but not enough by far.
Availability of required technical skills and technology to manage ASGM	The necessary required skills and technology to manage ASGM are not available and the needs are not identified	The required skills and technologies needs to manage ASGM are identified as well as their sources	The required skills and technologies needed to manage ASGM are obtained but their access depend on foreign sources	The required skills and technologies to manage ASGM are available and there is a national-based mechanism for updating the required skills and for upgrading the technologies	1.91	There are more skills and technology in the country, although much of the capacity and almost all of the funding come from foreign donors. There are insufficient mechanisms for upgrading and dissemination of knowledge.
Capacities to monitor the environmental impacts of ASGM						
Adequacy of monitoring process related to the environmental impacts of ASGM and the extent to which the monitoring information informs policymaking for ASGM	Irregular monitoring is being done without an adequate monitoring framework or indicators related to environmental impacts of ASGM	An adequately resourced monitoring framework is in place but project monitoring is irregularly conducted	Regular participatory monitoring environmental impacts of ASGM is being conducted but this information is only partially used by the government in setting new policy	Environmental monitoring information is produced timely and accurately and is used by the government to learn, inform and possibly to change policies related to ASGM	1.07	Although there have been some improvements in the monitoring framework; actual monitoring is still far from sufficient, often due to lack of resources. Monitoring information does not inform policy for the sector.
AVERAGE					1.82	