



IMPROVING ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT IN THE MINING SECTOR OF SURINAME, W/ EMPHASIS ON ARTISANAL AND SMALL-SCALE GOLD MINING (ASGM) "EMSAGS – PROJECT"

WORKSHOP REPORT

Capacity Score Card for Managing the Environmental Impacts of Artisanal Small Scale Gold Mining – March 07, 2025

Prepared by: Monitoring & Evaluation





Contents

| 1. | Background | .2 |
|--------|--|----|
| Caj | pacity Scorecard Assessment Process | .2 |
| 2. | Workshop Report | .4 |
| No | table findings from the scorecard discussions | .5 |
| Wo | rkshop Conclusions | .5 |
| 3. | Score Card | .7 |
| Caj | pacity Scorecard Comparison and Analysis (2024 vs 2025) | .7 |
| An | alysis of 2025 Scorecard Results vs. 2024 – ASGM Capacity Assessment | .8 |
| 4. | Score Card Conclusion | .9 |
| Instit | itional feedback summary | .9 |
| Uniqu | e Insights from Specific Institutions | .9 |
| ANN | EX 1: Capacity Scorecard session program1 | 10 |
| ANN | EX 2: Participants list1 | 1 |
| ANN | EX 3: Score Card1 | 14 |
| ANN | EX 4: List of training (basic and advanced)1 | 18 |





1. 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 (Dutch acronym: MNH) and the National Environmental Authority (Dutch acronym: NMA) as national implementing partners, the Ministry of Spatial Planning and Environment (Dutch acronym: ROM) as Beneficiary and with support from the United Nations Development Programme Country Office Suriname (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. This includes the delivery of training, support for key monitoring activities, and the establishment of the mining training and extension (MTEC).

Capacity Scorecard Assessment Process

In May 2024, Stichting Projekta, a consultancy firm, was contracted to conduct the first Capacity Scorecard Workshop. The objective was to complete an initial Capacity Scorecard for managing the environmental impacts of Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining (ASGM), based on data collected during a workshop with project partners and relevant institutions.

During the assignment, it became clear that no detailed data was available to complete a baseline capacity scorecard. It was therefore agreed to expand the scope of the assignment and the workshop to allow for the completion of two scorecards: one reflecting the baseline situation





(covering the period from project inception in 2018 through December 2021), and one capturing the situation in 2023—the period in which the training needs assessment was conducted and training programs under the EMSAGS Project were launched.

It was acknowledged that the baseline data might not be entirely accurate, which could affect the validity of the final capacity evaluation. Additionally, the consultant noted that the original scorecard did not support practical or methodologically consistent data collection. As a result, it was agreed that the consultant would adapt and translate the original English data collection tool into Dutch, to enhance participants' understanding and ensure they could accurately complete the scorecards. This approach supported consistent measurement across both the baseline, the midterm and the current assessment.

To monitor the progress regarding the level of institutional capacity for planning, management and dissemination of environmentally responsible ASGM and for inter-institutional cooperation among central government institutions with a mandate related to ASM, a second Capacity Scorecard Workshop was held on March 7, 2025, at Lalla Rookh Conference Room. This workshop was facilitated by the EMSAGS Engagement Specialist and Monitoring & Evaluation Officer, using the same scorecard and methodology as in 2024 to ensure consistency and comparability. Representatives from the same institutions were invited, and 8 out of 12 participated in this follow-up session. The results of this second assessment form the basis for the endline evaluation of the EMSAGS capacity-building process.

The findings from the March 2025 workshop are integrated into this final report. These results provide insights into capacity improvements between 2023 and 2024 and will inform future recommendations for institutional strengthening in the ASGM sector.





2. Workshop Report

The workshop was held on March 7th, 2025. The day program is included in Annex 1. There were 13 participants from 8 stakeholder organizations, institutes or ministries. The participant's list is included as Annex 2.

The second Capacity Scorecard Workshop, held on March 7, 2025, was opened by the Engagement Specialist of the EMSAGS Project. In her opening remarks, she provided a comprehensive overview of the training activities carried out under Outcome 1 of the EMSAGS Project in 2024. These capacity-building initiatives were developed in response to the findings of the Training Needs Session conducted by ESS in 2023, which identified the needs regarding advanced mining training programs of key stakeholders involved in the environmental management of ASGM. Based on this assessment an advanced trainings program was developed, and the training courses were delivered between March and October 2024.

The complete training courses were (Annex 4):

- 1. Gender training
 - Gender in decision-making and skills for field research related to gender in ASGM
 - Participatory processes and grievance mechanisms.
- 2. Mining training
 - Underground mining
 - The use of explosives in ASGM
 - Gold characterization and recovery
 - Environmental, health and safety choices by small-scale miners
- 3. Advanced drone training
 - Drone data inwinning en verwerking
- 4. Drone training
 - Drone Technology Training
 - Near Real Time Monitoring Training with the application of remote sensing & drone technology training

The training was divided into a theoretical (in-class) component and a practical (field-based at Companie Kreek) component.

The Engagement Specialist began by reviewing the content of the 2024 training sessions with the participants, serving as a refresher to ensure everyone was up to date. Following this, the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer discussed the results of the first workshop with the participants, as the detailed report had already been shared with them beforehand. Additionally, the officer outlined the objectives of this second workshop, emphasizing its importance and expected outcomes.

Except for one participant who did not attend the initial training, all others had completed the advanced training and are aware of the EMSAGS project. This ensured that the majority of the participants were well-prepared for the discussions and activities planned for the workshop.

Furthermore, the participants were divided into groups based on their respective institutions. Each institution was tasked with completing one scorecard after collaboratively reviewing the questions and discussing them within their group. They were also required to provide explanations for the scores they assigned to each component, detailing the reasoning behind their evaluations.





In the previous report, 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)

Furthermore, it was indicated that there are main changes in the field of ASGM (Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining) and the environment since 2018. They noted several key developments:

- Many more institutes and organizations are now aware of FPIC (Free, Prior, and Informed Consent) and have taken steps to apply its principles.
- The Commission for the Regulation of the Gold Sector (Ordening Goud Sector OGS) has been transferred from the Cabinet of the President to the Cabinet of the Vice President, resulting in significantly reduced funding.
- An increasement of information and knowledge about sustainable mining practices.

Following the group sessions, each institutional team documented their assessments and rationale in writing. While no oral presentations were given, the written explanations provided rich insights into the reasoning behind the assigned scores. These written inputs were collected and later analyzed to identify trends, common gaps, and unique institutional perspectives.

Notable findings from the scorecard discussions

- Overall improvements were reflected in nearly all capacity indicators compared to the 2024 workshop.
- Legitimacy and mandate of lead organizations such as National Environment Authority (NMA) are increasingly acknowledged, though institutional coordination challenges persist.
- Engagement with Indigenous and Tribal Peoples (ITP's) has expanded, yet full inclusion in decision-making processes is still limited.
- Environmental awareness among stakeholders has increased significantly, particularly due to targeted training, information and awareness sessions under EMSAGS.
- Information access and use has improved, but public accessibility and inter-institutional sharing remain areas of concern.
- Environmental monitoring remains a significant challenge, as many institutions report the absence of consistent monitoring frameworks, limited use of monitoring data in policymaking processes, and persistent constraints related to financial resources and logistical support necessary for effective implementation.

Workshop Conclusions

- The March 2025 scorecard exercise confirmed that capacity levels have continued to improve since the launch of EMSAGS and the initial 2024 workshop.
- The process reaffirmed the value of structured self-assessment using scorecards, while also emphasizing the ongoing need for inclusive governance, policy coherence, and sustainable resource mobilization.
- All written scorecards have been compiled, and their contents are incorporated into the





The workshop concluded with closing remarks by the Engagement Specialist, who thanked the participants for their written contributions and reaffirmed the importance of collaboration and consistency in advancing environmentally responsible ASGM practices in Suriname.





Capacity Scorecard Comparison and Analysis (2024 vs 2025)

The EMSAGS project aims to strengthen institutional and stakeholder capacity for managing the environmental impacts of Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining (ASGM) in Suriname. This visual report compares the outcomes of the capacity scorecard workshop held in May 2024 with the updated results from March 2025.

| | Score 2024 | Score 2025 | Change |
|--|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Capacity for Engagement | | | |
| Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead organization(s) | 2.2 | 2.13 | ↓ -0.07 |
| Existence of cooperation among stakeholder groups in addition to their involvement (participation and engagement) in decision-making on environment and mining. | 1.79 | 2.25 | ↑ +0.46 |
| Degree to which local populations, miners, indigenous people, women and other vulnerable groups are engaged in policymaking for the ASGM sector | 1.79 | 1.88 | ↑+0.09 |
| Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge | | | |
| Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders on the environmental impacts of ASGM | 2.1 | 2.63 | ↑ +0.53 |
| Access and sharing of ASGM information by stakeholders | 2.04 | 2.00 | ↓ -0.04 |
| Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision- making on ASGM | 2 | 2.25 | ↑ +0.25 |
| Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development | | | |
| Extent of the ASGM related planning and strategy development process | 1.64 | 2.00 | ↑ +0.36 |
| Existence of an adequate policy and regulatory frameworks in terms of environmental aspects of ASGM | 1.63 | 1.75 | ↑+0.12 |
| Capacities for management and implementation | | | |
| Existence and mobilization of resources by the relevant environmental organizations to manage ASGM | 1.87 | 2.00 | ↓ -0.37 |
| Availability of required technical skills and technology to manage ASGM | 1.91 | 1.50 | ↓ -0.41 |
| 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 | 1.07 | 1.00 | ↓ 0.07 |
| TOTAL | 1.82 | 1.94 | ↑ +0.12 |





Analysis of 2025 Scorecard Results vs. 2024 – ASGM Capacity Assessment

The overall average score has slightly increased from 1.82 in 2024 to 1.94 in 2025, indicating a general improvement in capacities related to environmental aspects of the ASGM sector. This upward trend (+0.12) shows progress, though there remain significant gaps—particularly in technical capacity and environmental monitoring.

- 1. Capacity for engagement
 - Positive Developments:
 - Cooperation and stakeholder participation have significantly improved (+0.46), suggesting stronger engagement in decision-making processes.
 - There is also a modest increase in the inclusion of vulnerable groups such as local populations, women, Indigenous people, and miners (+0.09).
 - Point of Concern:
 - The legitimacy or mandate of lead organizations has slightly decreased (-0.07), possibly reflecting reduced trust or unclear leadership within the ASGM policy environment.
- 2. Capacity to generate, access and use information and knowledge
 - Notable Improvement:
 - Stakeholder environmental awareness of ASGM impacts has significantly increased (+0.53), which can influence both behavior and policy pressure.
 - The availability of environmental information for decision-making has also improved (+0.25).
 - Minor Setback:
 - There was a slight decrease in information sharing among stakeholders (-0.04), indicating potential communication or coordination challenges.
- 3. Capacity for strategy, policy, and legislation development
 - Progress observed:
 - There is clear advancement in planning and strategy development related to ASGM (+0.36), as well as modest improvement in policy and regulatory frameworks (+0.12), pointing to increased institutional attention to environmental governance in the sector.
- 4. Capacity for management and implementation
 - Decline in capacity:
 - Both the mobilization of resources by environmental organizations (-0.37) and the availability of technical skills and technology (-0.41) have decreased. This presents a critical barrier to effectively implementing policies and interventions, even as planning improves.
 - These declines may reflect financial constraints or limited access to technical innovations.
- 5. Capacity to monitor environmental impacts
 - Continued weakness:
 - The monitoring score dropped slightly from 1.07 to 1.00 (-0.07), highlighting that environmental monitoring systems remain underdeveloped and insufficiently used to inform policymaking.





4. Score Card Conclusion

- The average capacity score increased from 1.82 in 2024 to 1.94 in 2025, reflecting a 7% improvement over 2024 and a 79% increase compared to the 2018 baseline. The project successfully met its PRODOC target of a 25% capacity improvement, achieving a satisfactory level of institutional capacity to manage the ASGM sector.
- The EMSAGS project continues to play a key role in strengthening stakeholder engagement, environmental awareness, and policy development in the ASGM sector.
- However, further attention is needed to address declining technical and financial implementation capacities, and to strengthen environmental monitoring systems for informed decision-making.

Institutional feedback summary

Common Findings Across Institutions

- 1) Limited inclusion of local and Indigenous communities:
 - FPIC awareness has increased, but its application remains inconsistent.
 - Communities are consulted, but their influence on decision-making is limited.
 - Strengthening FPIC implementation is recommended to ensure meaningful community involvement.
- 2) Lack of financial resources and dependency on external funding:
 - Several institutions (ROM, NMA, SCSD, MNH) reported budget limitations that constrain implementation.
 - Strategic plans and policy efforts are hindered by limited or donor-bound funding.
- 3) Political interference in implementation:
 - Political interests influence policy enforcement and delay practical action.
- 4) Monitoring is inconsistent and often reactive:
 - Institutions highlight that monitoring happens only after incidents.
- 5) Technology and expertise are present but not institutionalized:
 - Technical knowledge exists, but dissemination and application are limited.

Unique Insights from Specific Institutions

- ROM: A large part of the ASGM sector operates outside of formal oversight.
- DC Brokopondo: Reports a lack of clear communication and guidance.
- MNH: Notes active community outreach but acknowledges political barriers.
- SCSD: Highlights limitations of project funding frameworks.
- GMD: Monitoring and information sharing are triggered only by issues or requests.





ANNEX 1: Capacity Scorecard session program



Programma

Workshop Score Card

Date: 7 maart 2025 Time: 8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Location: Jacana Amazon Wellness Resort, <u>Commewijnestraat</u> 35

| Tijd | Omschrijving |
|--------------------|---|
| 8:00 - 09:00 a.m. | Inloop, registratie & ontbijt |
| 09:00 - 9:15 a.m. | Welkom & introductie |
| | Presentatie – door EMSAGS PMU |
| 9:15 - 11:30 a.m. | Score card workshop |
| | Uitleg Score Card |
| | Score Card meeting |
| 11:30 - 12:00 p.m. | Afsluiten en lunch |
| 11:30 – 12:00 p.m. | Uitleg Score Card Score Card meeting Afsluiten en lunch |





ANNEX 2: Participants list

.



Registration Form score card workshop

Date: 7 March 2025 Time: 8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Location: Jacana Amazon Wellness Resort, Commewijnestraat 35

| | loinstion | Name | E-mail address | Mob.# | M | F | Signature |
|-----|--|------------------------|---|----------|---|---|-----------|
| No. | Organization Add//US - Geoscience/ | Damon Finkie | rlfinkie@gmail.com | 1 | | | |
| 1 | Miinbouw | Ramon Finkle | minkleagman.com | - | | | |
| 2 | AdeKUS - | Manisha Balgobiend | Manissha.Balgobiend@uvs.edu | | | | |
| - | AdeKUS - | Sephia | Sephia.djasiman@uvs.edu | | | - | |
| 3 | milieuwetenschappen | Raymondo | emau.raymondobauxietinstituut@gmail.com | 1775772 | X | | B |
| 4 | Bauxite Institute Suriname | Emanuels Ashwin Ram | ram.ashwinbauxietinstituut@gmail.com | | - | | 1. |
| 5 | Commission for the | Eduard | k16eduard@gmail.com | 8373280 | × | | |
| 6 | Regulation of the Gold Sector (Ordening Goudsector) | Kanape | | 0 (1) | | | 7.50 |
| - | Commission for the Regulation of the Gold Sector | John Johanns | johnjohanns@gmail.com | 895,6638 | X | | 1800 |
| ' | (Ordening Goudsector) | Daniella van | denialla vanengel@outlook.com | (april 1 | | | |
| 8 | Geologisch Miinbouwkundige Dienst | Engel | | | | | |
| , | Geologisch | Lugard Roetoe | mogiki2000@notman.com | | | | |
| | Geologisch | Robert | rdoedoe.rd@gmail.com | - | | - | |
| 10 | Mijnbouwkundige Dienst | Renatha | renatha.simson@gmail.com / | | - | _ | |
| 1 | KAMPOS | Simson | kampos.samenteennegerere | | | | Doge 1 |



| No | Organization | Name | E-mail address | Mob.# | M | F | Signature |
|----|--|-------------------------------------|---|----------|---|---|-----------|
| 12 | Medische Zending (MZ) | Maureen Wijngaarde - van Dijk | mvandijk@medischezending.sr | | | | |
| 13 | Medische Zending (MZ) | L. Hoepel | gwendeluc@hotmail.com | | | | |
| 14 | Ministerie van Economische Zaken, Ondernemerschap en Technologische Innovatie (EZOTI) | Ramnewash S | sramnewash49@gmail.com | | | | |
| 15 | Ministerie van Economische Zaken, Ondernemerschap en Technologische Innovatie (EZOTI) | Marcia Emanuel | Marciahit18@gmail.com / Marcia_Grace82@hotmail.com | | | | |
| 16 | Ministerie van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen | Angela Monorath | angiemonorath@gmail.com | | | | |
| 17 | Ministerie van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen | Vikaash Soerdjbalising h | vikaash414@gmail.com | | | | |
| 18 | Ministerie van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen | G, Wijngaarde | genevieve1992@hotmail.com | | | | |
| 19 | Ministerie van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen | D. Vyent | diana.g.vyent@gmail.com | 8553351 | X | < | And |
| 20 | Ministerie van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen | Aron C | juza-nh@hotmail.com | 0000 663 | 3 | X | aturn |
| 21 | Ministerie van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen/ CED | Ramona Olijfveld | Ramona86olijfveld@hotmail.com | | | | |
| 22 | Ministerie van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen/ CED | Selcius Poeketi | poeketi.s@hotmail.com | | | | |
| 23 | Ministerie van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen/ Juridische Afd. | Mw. Aron | aro.clif150@gmail.com | | | | |

Page 2 of 4







| No. | Organization | Name | E-mail address | Mob.# | M | F | Signature |
|-----|--|--|-------------------------------|---------|---|---|----------------|
| 24 | Ministerie van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen/ Suriname Competitiveness and Sector Diversification (SCSD) Project | Clyde Griffith | clydegriffith1977@gmail.com | | | | |
| 25 | Ministerie van Natuurlijke Hulpbronnen/ Suriname Competitiveness and Sector Diversification (SCSD) Project | Reenuska Anandbahadoe r-Mahabier | Reenuska.a.mahabier@gmail.com | | | | |
| 26 | Ministerie van Onderwijs, Wetenschap en Cultuur | Randjieta Patterson | rpattersonminowc@gmail.com | · And | | | |
| 27 | Ministerie van Regionale Ontwikkeling en Sport | Mavrick Boejoekoe | m_boejoekoe@yahoo.com | | | 1 | |
| 28 | Ministerie van Volksgezondheid | Jules de Kom | Jdekom@gmail.com | | | | |
| 29 | Minsterie van Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieu | Nasser Rodjan | nasserrodjan@gmail.com | | | | |
| 30 | Minsterie van Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieu | Kawiesh Debisarun | kawiesh2@gmail.com | 7106811 | X | | Dik |
| 31 | Nationaal Herbarium | Eliza Zschuschen | eliza.zschuschen@uvs.edu | | | | |
| 32 | National Zoological Collection of Suriname and the Environmental Research Center (NZCS/CMO)/ AdeKUS | Gwendolyn Landburg | Gwendolyn.Landburg@uvs.edu | | | | |
| 33 | NMA | Shafridagatoen Asruf | sasruf@nimos.org | - Aller | | | and the second |

Page 3 of 4



| No. | Organization | Name | E-mail address | Mob.# | M | F | Signature |
|-----|---|----------------------------------|---|----------|------|------|-------------|
| 34 | NMA | Steffany Wijngaarde | swijngaarde@nimos.org | Alban. | | X | Discardo |
| 35 | NMA | Marjory Danoe- Alimoenadi | mdanoe@nimos.org | goody | | | Tyrjaarde |
| 36 | NMA | Jaya Bisessar | jbisessar@nimos.org | ASUADY | 1 | X | 1. Bisokhar |
| 37 | OIS | Veronica Geneng - Djoekari | veronicamersd79@gmail.com | 054000 | | | Jovenue |
| 38 | OIS | Patricia Kajoeramarie | oiscoica@gmail.com/ patkaja48@gmail.com | | 1379 | | |
| 39 | Secretariaat Brokopondo | Cladys Jonas | treesje4@gmail.com | NG56304 | 1 | V | ten |
| 40 | Secretariaat Brokopondo | Morel Vonkel | vonkelmorel@gmail.com | 8914300 | | X. | GAAD |
| 41 | Secretariaat Brokopondo | Bonny-wailer Doebe | bonnydoebe155@gmail.com | | -2 | | Config |
| 42 | Stichting Bosbeheer en Bostoezicht | Ilgia Hoepel | i.hoepel@sbb.sr | | | | |
| 43 | Stichting Bosbeheer en Bostoezicht | Sarah Crabbe | sarah_crabbe@yahoo.com | | 192 | - | |
| 14 | UNDP Suriname | Anuradha Khoenkhoen | anuradha.khoenkhoen@undp.org | Mar Sale | | 1999 | 20,000 |
| 15 | Vereniging van Inheemse Dorpshoofden in Suriname (VIDS) | Lilian Armaketo | lilian.armaketo@vids.sr | | | | |
| 16 | Vereniging van Inheemse Dorpshoofden in Suriname (VIDS) | Sathyam Noersalim | sathyam.noersalim@vids.sr | | | | |
| 47 | ROM | Varsha | hiravarshass@gral.com | 8115088 | | × | R |
| La | GMD/NH | Harboundjøjo | fer martaindjojo@gmail.com | 8762820 | | x | Page 4 of 4 |
| 9 | NMA | Ferley | s.ang@nna suri name. 079 | 198934 | ٥ | x | - B |







| No. | Organization | Name | E-mail address | Mob.# | M | F | Signature |
|-----|--------------|---------------|----------------|-------|---|---|-----------|
| 1. | EMSAGS | S. Bihari | | | | x | AL |
| 2. | EMSAGS | M. Fernand | | | + | x | ME |
| 3. | EMSAGS | S. Mahabier | | | - | x | A7755 |
| 4. | EMSAGS | C. Ellioth | | | - | x | and |
| 5. | EMSAGS | E. Soetodrono | | | - | x | Ale |
| 6. | EMSAGS | E. Sosrojoedo | | | x | - | PAL |

Page 5 of 5





ANNEX 3: Score Card

Capacity Score Card

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 of various paints of various paint

| Person Fi | lling: | Name of | Institution: | Date: | | Type of Stakeholder: |
|---|---|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| See particip | ants list | See participants list | | March 07, 2025 | mixed group - see participants list | |
| | | occ parts | | 110101107/2020 | | united Broch - See barrenhauts use |
| | | | | | | |
| Iement of Capacity and Indicator | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Rating | Comment |
| | | c | apacity for Engagement | | | |
| Degree of legitimacy/mandate of ead 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 | 2.13 | This indicator measures if the lead organizations for ASGM are identified, if their respective responsibilities are clearly defined and if the authority of these organizations is recognized. |
| ixistence of cooperation among itakeholder groups in addition to heir involment (participation and ingagement) in decision-making on invironment 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 | 2.25 | This indicator measures the involvement of stakeholders, their identification, the establishment of stakeholder consultation processes and the active contribution of these stakeholders to decision-making on environment and mining. |
| Degree to which local populations, niners, 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 | 1.88 | This indicator measures the extent to which policies, regulations and decisions related to environmental management of ASGM are aligned with local populations priorities, and the contribution of local populations in policy-making |





| | | Capacities to generat | e, access and use information a | 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 environmenta 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 | 2.63 | This indicator measures the level of awareness of stakeholders about the environmental impacts of ASGM and the solutions being implemented and their possibility to participate in the implementation of these solutions. |
| 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 | 2.00 | This indicator measures the information needs, if they are identified, the adequacy of the information management infrastructure in place and the sharing of ASGM information. |
| 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 | 2.25 | This indicator measures the adequacy of the ASGM information available for decision-making; if the information is made available to decision- makers and if this information is updated and used by decision-makers |





| | | Capacities for str | ategy, policy and legislation de | velopment | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|------|---|
| 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 | 2.00 | This indicator measures the quality of the planning and strategy development process; if the planning and strategy development process produces adequate plans and strategies related to environmental management of ASGM; and if the resources and coordination mechanisms are in place for the implementation of these plans, programmes and projects. |
| 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 | 1.75 | This indicator measures the completeness of the policy and regulatory frameworks, the existence and the adoption of relevant policies and laws and if the mechanisms for enacting, complying and enforcing these policies and laws are established with regards to environmental aspects of ASGM. |
| | | Capacities f | or management and implement | ation | | |
| Existence and mobilization of resources by the relevant environmental organizations to manage ASGM | The environmental organizations don't have adequate resources with regrads 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 | 2.00 | This indicator measures the availability of resources within the relevant organizations in order to manage ASGM, if the potential sources for resource funding are identified and if adequate resources are mobilized. |
| 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 neded 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 | 1.50 | This indicator measures the availability of skills and knowledge to manage ASGM, if the technical needs and sources are identified and accessed by the programme or project and if there is a basis for an ongoing national-based upgrading of the skills and knowledge. |





| | Capacities to monitor the environmental impacts of ASGM | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Adequacy of monitoring process | Irregular monitoring is being | An adequately resourced | Regular participatory | Environmental monitoring | 1.00 | This indicator measures the extent to which the | | | | |
| related to the environmental | done without an adequate | monitoring framework is in | monitoring environmental | information is produced timely | | monitoring and enforcement process for the | | | | |
| impacts of ASGM and the extent to | monitoring framework or | place but project monitoring is | impacts of ASGM is being | and accurately and is used by | | environmental impacts of ASGM is used to create | | | | |
| which the monitoring information | indicators related to | irregularly conducted | conducted but this information | the government to learn, | | a better-informed policy context. | | | | |
| informs policymaking for ASGM | environmental impacts of | | is only partially used by the | inform and possibly to change | | | | | | |
| | ASGM | | government in setting new | policies related to ASGM | | | | | | |
| | | | policy | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Average | 1.94 | | | | | |





ANNEX 4: List of training (basic and advanced)

| LIJST van TRAININGEN (ADVANCE – 2024) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--------------|--|----------|--|--|--|
| | Туре | Training | Periode | Aantal dagen | Locatie | Trainer | | | |
| 1. | Gender training | Gender in besluitvorming en vaardigheden voor veldonderzoek t.b.v. gender in ASGM; Participatieve processen en klachtenregeling | 27 & 28 maart 2024 | 2 dagen | Paramaribo | ESS | | | |
| 2. | Mining training | Underground mining | 20 & 21 juni 2024 | 2 dagen | Paramaribo | ESS | | | |
| 3. | _ | The use of explosives in ASGM | 29 & 31 juli 2024 | 2 dagen | Paramaribo | ESS | | | |
| 4. | _ | Gold characterization and recovery | 26-30 augustus 2024 | 5 dagen | Paramaribo | ESS | | | |
| 5. | | Environmental, health and safety choices by small-scale miners | 15-18 oktober 2024 | 4 dagen | Paramaribo; Dreipada; Compagniekreek | ESS | | | |
| 6. | Advanced drone training | Drone data inwinning en verwerking | 20-22 augustus 2024 | 3 dagen | Paramaribo; Compagniekreek | GeoZICHT | | | |
| 7. | Drone training | Drone Technology Training | 4 & 5 april 2024 | 2 dagen | Paramaribo; Compagniekreek | SBB | | | |
| 8. | | Near Real Time Monitoring Training with the application of remote sensing & drone technology training | 16, 17, 23, 24 mei 2024 | 4 dagen | Paramaribo; Compagniekreek | SBB | | | |
| LIJST van TRAININGEN (BASIC – 2023) *(dit gedeelte van de trainingen zijn al gescoord en de scores zijn verwerkt in het rapport van Projecta, mei 2024) | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Gender training | Human rights: ✓ General human rights ✓ Specific human rights ✓ Rights of Indigenous and Tribal peoples ✓ Women's rights Gender: ✓ Introduction to gender ✓ Gender equality and gender mainstreaming ✓ Women in ASGM in Suriname | 27 januari 2024 | 1 dag | Paramaribo | ESS | | | |
| 2. | Mining training | Geology: ✓ geology as a science; | 23, 24, 28 & 29 maart 2024 | 4 dagen | Paramaribo | ESS | | | |







| ~ | model earth; | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| ~ | f plate tectonics; | | |
| v | minerals and rocks; | | |
| ↓ | geological time scale. | | |
| Gold | genesis: | | |
| ↓ | properties of gold (gold chemistry); | | |
| v - | gold mineralogy; | | |
| v - | distribution of gold within the earth's crust; | | |
| v | hvdrothermal geochemistry of gold; | | |
| ↓ | gold depositions: | | |
| ↓ | mineral deposits model. | | |
| Expl | pration: | | |
| Z.ipi | mining cycle: | | |
| ↓ | mineral exploration: | | |
| ↓ | gold exploration: | | |
| ↓ | gold sampling by ASMs: | | |
| ↓ | gold exploited by ASGM in Suriname. | | |
| Mini | ng: | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | mine planning and designing: | | |
| ↓ | mining equipment: | | |
| v | surface mining: | | |
| v | underground mining: | | |
| v | Artisanal gold mining | | |
| v | ASGM in Suriname. | | |
| Proc | essing: | | |
| v | grade and recovery; | | |
| v | gold assaying; | | |
| v | steps in mineral processing; | | |
| ↓ | gold processing; | | |
| v | Available techniques for gold processing; | | |
| √ | gravity concentration; | | |
| √ | gold leaching; | | |
| ↓ | processing in ASGM Suriname | | |