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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASGM</td>
<td>Artisanal Small- and Medium-Scale Gold Mining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Conservation International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Executing Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA</td>
<td>Environmental Management Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESIA</td>
<td>Environmental and Social Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESMP</td>
<td>Environmental and Social Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCPF</td>
<td>Forest Carbon Partnership Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFEM</td>
<td>French Facility for Global Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Global Environmental Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFC</td>
<td>Guyana Forestry Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGB</td>
<td>Guyana Gold Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGDMA</td>
<td>Guyana Gold and Diamond Miners Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGMC</td>
<td>Guyana Geology and Mines Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLSC</td>
<td>Guyana Lands and Surveys Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoG</td>
<td>Government of Guyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWD</td>
<td>Guyana Wildlife Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWMO</td>
<td>Guyana Women Miners Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>Mercury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus infection and Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAST</td>
<td>Institute of Applied Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDB</td>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDC</td>
<td>Intended Nationally Determined Contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCDS</td>
<td>Low Carbon Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC</td>
<td>Land Reclamation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBP</td>
<td>Mainstreaming Biodiversity Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFMDF</td>
<td>Mercury-Free Mining Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoIPA</td>
<td>Ministry of Indigenous Peoples’ Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNR</td>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoBT</td>
<td>Ministry of Business and Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoF</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoH</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoP</td>
<td>Ministry of the Presidency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoSP</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRV</td>
<td>Monitoring, Reporting and Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWG</td>
<td>Minamata Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAP</td>
<td>National Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBSAP</td>
<td>National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDS</td>
<td>National Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norad</td>
<td>Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPAS</td>
<td>National Protected Areas System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>National Parks Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTC</td>
<td>National Toshaos Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Protected Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Protected Areas Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG</td>
<td>Project Preparation Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Project Steering Committee–El Dorado Gold Responsible Mining for Guyana Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTCCB</td>
<td>Pesticides and Toxic Chemicals Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDC</td>
<td>Regional Democratic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMI</td>
<td>Responsible Mining Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STD</td>
<td>Sexually Transmitted Diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>University of Guyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCCD</td>
<td>United Nations Conventions to Combat Desertification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFCCC</td>
<td>United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>World Wildlife Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 1: PROJECT SUMMARY

1. Guyana’s Artisanal, Small- and Medium-scale Gold Mining (ASGM) sector has been in existence for more than one hundred years. Unlike most other countries, the ASGM sector has legal status in Guyana. Under the Mining Act (1989) mining activities have been fully legalized, with the scale of mining (small, medium or large) dependent on the size of the dredging equipment and technology used. In addition, artisanal miners are considered to be legal under the Mining Act, once they have registered and paid for mining claims. The ASGM sector accounts for 70 percent of the country’s gold production.

2. Gold in Guyana is produced primarily by hydraulic dredging and sluices, and mercury is used in the final stage of the gold extraction process (amalgamation). Mercury is used primarily by the ASGM sector; the large-scale miners use cyanide. Mining is the largest consumer of mercury and accounts for 94 percent of Hg emissions (Ministry of Natural Resources, 2017). Between 2008 and 2010, an estimated 60,000 kg of mercury was imported annually. More recent data suggests a steep decline in reported imports, with only 5,313 kg and 25,480 kg of mercury being imported for 2014 and 2015 respectively.

3. Miners do not follow safety measures when working with mercury, and the waste is released into the environment since there are usually no containment structures for the generated waste. The main barriers for shifting to mercury-free mining have been identified as lack of knowledge on the harmful effects of mercury, the demonstration of and financing for mercury-free technologies, and market incentives for producing mercury-free gold.

4. From 2007 to 2016, the average annual increase of gold production was 13 percent, compared to 9 percent decrease annually from 1999 to 2006. In 2014 and 2015, gold production was 459,004 and 495,000 ounces respectively, compared to 712,707 ounces produced in 2016 (a 44 percent increase over the 2015 gold production figure) (Bureau of Statistics, 2017). Gold production in Guyana is projected to remain at around 712,706 ounces in 2017 and increase to 736,000 ounces in 2018 (Jordan, 2017).

5. Gold plays a central role in the economy, accounting for 15 percent of GDP, 78 percent of the value of mineral production, and 24 percent of exports (Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment, 2015). Legally declared gold generated approximately 64 percent of all the country’s foreign exchange. The ASGM sector has extensive backward and forward linkages to the retail and services sectors, is the main source of employment and revenue for hinterland communities, including indigenous communities and, provides direct employment for over 18,000 persons (NAP 2016), many of whom are youths that would be otherwise unemployed. Guyana has a long-established jewelry sector, with approximately 273 small goldsmith enterprises producing hand-crafted artisanal gold jewelry that is highly sought after throughout the Caribbean, and seven major jewelry manufacturing houses that also produce jewelry for local use and export.

6. Gold mining has traditionally been dominated by men; however, women do participate, and their role is evolving. Significant numbers of women currently own mining operations, work directly in mining operations, and provide services such as cooking and laundry. The Guyana Women Miners Organisation (GWMO) estimates that there are 14 women miners in Region 9, 32 in Region 8, and 21 in Region 1; the regions where this project will be implemented. Many women also serve as vendors of various products in shops close to the mining operations.
7. However, the way mining is being carried out causes environmental problems. It is the biggest driver of deforestation, presenting a real challenge to Guyana’s status as a high forest cover/low deforestation rate country and its global climate commitment. Along with deforestation, the main environmental impacts of the ASGM sector in Guyana are land degradation and mercury contamination. The discharges from hydraulic mining operations cause turbidity and siltation downstream of the mined sites, significantly affecting fish for human consumption and the domestic water supply of the hinterland communities. Additionally, the physical disturbance alters river channels and creates stagnant pools that become breeding places for malaria and other mosquito-borne diseases including yellow fever and dengue, which endanger the health of local populations. Small and medium-scale gold mining is the main source of direct exposure to mercury and discharge into the environment, including the aquatic food chain. In one mining community studied, more than 85 percent of the study population had mercury levels that exceeded the World Health Organization (WHO) guideline (Singh, Watson, & Mangal, 2001).

8. The continued expansion of the extractive sector and increasing demand for land and forests puts pressures on the rich intact ecosystems in Guyana, and indeed on the entire Amazonia Ecoregion, threatening the well-being of its people and compromising the services provided by its biodiversity and ecosystems. The Amazonia Ecoregion, of which Guyana is a part, is the largest tropical forest and largest river basin on earth. Guyana is also located within the Guiana Shield, one of the regions with the highest biodiversity in the world. Guyana itself has over 8,000 species of plants, 814 species of birds, 225 species of mammals, 179 species of reptiles, 130 species of amphibians, and 467 species of fish. An estimated 15 percent of the species of flora are endemic and of the known species, 4.5 percent of mammals, 3.3 percent of reptiles, 3 percent of amphibians, 0.4 of birds and 0.3 percent of freshwater fish are threatened (Government of Guyana, 2014). The 2015 IUCN Red List identifies six critically endangered, nine endangered, and 49 vulnerable animal species in Guyana. Approximately 86 percent of Guyana’s total land area is still forested.

9. Addressing the effects of mercury pollution is a national priority (Ministry of Natural Resources, 2017). The main industry body representing miners, the GGDMA, is also fully committed and has been working in collaboration with the Guyana Geology and Mines Commission (GGMC) to test suitable technologies. This project will assist the Government of Guyana (GoG) to meet its commitment under the National Action Plan (NAP) under the Minamata Convention, which commits to 100 percent mercury-free mining by 2025, by directly creating market incentives for private sector enterprises. It will involve business enterprises with a profit motive for leading the shift in the development of a mercury-free ASGM supply chain and downstream El Dorado Gold branded jewelry. The project will demonstrate innovative approaches and tools, and strengthen partnerships with public and private sector actors for guiding the switch to mercury-free mining and adopting environmentally-friendly approaches to mining. The project will be implemented through six strategically linked components.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Components</th>
<th>Project Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 1: Appropriate mercury-free technologies</td>
<td>By the end of the project, demonstrations established and mercury-free technology transferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainstreamed in Guyana’s ASGM sector.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2: Mechanism for financing capital investments for</td>
<td>By the end of the project, a financial mechanism for capital investments for mercury-free technologies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 3: Markets established for branded mercury-free Gold from Guyana.
By the end of the project, a chain of custody process, verification mechanism for gold and, an El Dorado Gold branding scheme is developed and institutionalized.

Component 4: National policies and incentives for mercury-free gold established.
By the end of the project, a national policy on responsible gold production and value-added and requisite laws/regulations refined/drafted to support a responsible gold commodity chain.

Component 5: Monitoring and Evaluation.
By the end of the project, regular monitoring of project activities against targets and outcomes and management of risk will be done, and reported semi-annually against the Results Framework. Adaptations will be made to the project implementation based on monitoring reports.

Component 6: Communications and Knowledge Management.
A strategic communication plan for awareness raising and policy advocacy aimed at key stakeholders, including miners, decision-makers and other actors within the supply chain is developed and implemented.

10. Project activities will be carried out in three areas: two in Region 8 (Mahdia/Campbelltown and the Upper Potaro area), and one in Region 9 (the Marudi Mountain area). Additionally, Port Kaituma in Region 1 was selected as a control area, and will be used as a baseline to assess project results by comparing areas with the intervention versus this area without the intervention.

11. To ensure involvement of stakeholders, indigenous peoples, and men and women, the project has prepared a Stakeholder Engagement Plan, an Indigenous People’s Plan, a Gender-mainstreaming Plan, and an Accountability and Grievance Mechanism (see Appendix VI).

12. The Executing Agency of this project will be Conservation International (CI) – Guyana together with the co-executing partners GGDMA and GGMC. The executing arrangement of the project will be through a public-private partnership between CI, the GGDMA, and the GGMC. The project will be complemented by the Responsible Mining Initiative (RMI) also led by CI-Guyana. The RMI is a project funded by the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad), which focuses on engaging the gold mining sector to increase adoption of improved practices, in order to reduce pressure on forests.
SECTION 2: PROJECT CONTEXT

2A Geographic Scope

13. The sites and area selection were based on a set of criteria derived from consultations with stakeholders during the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) phase, and after planning and coordination under CI-Guyana’s RMI, and with other key actors working in the sector.

14. Project activities will be carried out in three areas: 1) in two areas in Region 8 (Mahdia/Campbelltown and the Upper Potaro area), and 2) one in Region 9 (the Marudi Mountain area). Additionally, Port Kaituma in Region 1 was selected as a control area, and will be used as a baseline to assess project results by comparing areas with the intervention versus this area without the intervention (please see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Geographic Scope of Project Interventions.

15. During this project, two types of activities will be undertaken: (1) practices and technology transfer towards eliminating mercury-use and reducing forest loss through efficient exploration and extraction will be carried out in all three areas described above, and (2) landscape-level activities to design and implement measures to improve resource management will be carried out in Region 9. Activities described in (1) are technology-driven, and will be led by the GGDMA. Activities in (2) will feature multi-stakeholder
resource management planning, using a sustainable landscape approach, and will be led by CI-Guyana.

16. By project design, testing of mercury-free exploration and extraction technologies will be conducted at specific sites in the two identified regions of the country in order to capitalize on and build synergies with activities currently being undertaken by the GGM and the GGDMA. Through having established sites in two regions, the project design allows greater opportunity for more miners to visit these sites and observe the operation of the technologies and practices.

17. Practices and technology transfer interventions in Region 8 will take place mainly in the Potaro River watershed above and immediately below Kaieteur National Park. Considerable impacts on natural capital are already being observed, and this is particularly of concern in the Upper Potaro watershed above the park, since there is a direct effect on the management of this protected area. The GGMC is currently working to improve mining practices within the Mahdia/Campbelltown area and its vicinity, north of the Konawaruk River watershed below the park. Given the multiple and seemingly competing land uses, the impact of project intervention can be substantial. These areas are relatively easy to access given the existing interior roads. There is one significant population centre around the Mahdia/Campbell town area, which comprises families who have been resident there since prior to 1950, plus those persons who are there only as part of the gold mining supply chain.

18. Landscape (or area-defined) interventions will be designed within the context of developing a brand of gold that can be traced to a specific region of the country. This will be carried out in Region 9, and will be a conscious, deliberate effort to manage natural capital use, by optimizing the spatial relations and interactions among a range of land cover types, institutions, and human activities in an area of interest. The goal of the sustainable landscape approach is to mobilize people within these landscapes to cooperate and work together to sustain their livelihoods and conserve the environment, or nature, upon which they all depend. Through this intervention, the project can immediately start to accelerate the process towards understanding the value of branding and brand definition as part of the gold mining value chain.

19. Within the Marudi Mountain area in Region 9, Romanex Guyana Exploration Ltd is interested in operating a large-scale gold mine. The company is also interested in developing partnerships with neighbouring ASGM operators, through supporting the use of mercury-free technologies. It is estimated that there could be one million ounces of gold in the area. Currently gold-mining is taking place under an agreement mediated by the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) between several small-scale miners and Romanex. This is an attractive area to implement the project, as there is a history of conservation and local stewardship within the region, including recent activities such as the Regional Development Planning process led by the Regional Democratic Council, indigenous community development planning, the Konashen Community-Owned Conservation Area in the south, and the Kanuku Mountains Protected Area to the north. Furthermore, the South Rupununi District Council was recently established under the Amerindian Act, which provides a strong basis for engagement with the communities collectively.

2.8 Environmental Context and Global Significance

20. The Amazonia Ecoregion, of which Guyana is a part, is the largest tropical forest and largest river basin on earth. This region is home to more species of terrestrial plants and animals than anywhere else on earth, and is the source of one-fifth of all freshwater flows on the planet. Almost all of Guyana is located within the Guiana Shield, one of the regions with the highest biodiversity in the world. Guyana is home to five separate physiographic regions
and six major ecosystems, including: a) coastal, b) savannah, c) freshwater, d) forest, e) wetland, and f) marine ecosystems. The vast biodiversity and ecosystems provide environmental goods and services such as climate regulation, water purification, watershed protection, hydropower, forestry, fisheries, and other livelihoods. Guyana has over 8,000 species of plant, 814 species of birds, 225 species of mammals, 179 species of reptiles, 130 species of amphibians, and 467 species of fish. An estimated 15 percent of the species of flora are endemic, and of the known species, 4.5 percent of mammals, 3.3 percent of reptiles, 3 percent of amphibians, 0.4 percent of birds, and 0.3 percent of freshwater fish are threatened (Government of Guyana, 2014). The 2015 IUCN Red List identifies six critically endangered, nine endangered, and 49 vulnerable animal species in Guyana. Approximately 86 percent of Guyana’s total land area is still forested.

21. Region 8 encompasses the drainages of the Potaro and Siparuni Rivers and two tributaries of the Essequibo River. The area is part of the Guianas Highlands and contains many tepui mountains. These highlands, with isolated peaks and varying microclimates, are known for their high endemism. These high levels of endemism are recorded despite relatively little biodiversity cataloguing having been done in the region. This region is also important for its freshwater provision, because it provides the highest precipitation and water surplus in Guyana and the Amazon. The region is covered primarily with sub-montane forests, upland savannahs, and shrub lands. The Kaieteur National Park and the Iwokrama Forest, two national protected areas, can be found in the region, and there is interest in the further protection of portions of the highlands, including savannahs and shrub-lands. As an area where mining has been carried out for a long time, Region 8 is highly impacted by mining. Many rivers in the region carry high sediment loads and other pollution resulting from these activities.

22. Region 9, the Rupununi Region, is one of the richest in Guyana in terms of natural capital, especially biodiversity, and includes the upper reaches and source of Guyana’s largest river system, the Essequibo River. The region is covered mainly by a variety of forest types (approximately 5.4 million hectares) and savannahs (approximately 1 million hectares). The Rupununi savannah is part of a larger savannah landscape which extends across the border into Roraima State, Brazil. Wetlands, savannah and forests occupy much of the region between the Pakaraima and Kanuku mountains. This mix of habitat contributes to the rich number of species that can be found in the region. The gold mining activities in the Marudi Mountains are already impacting downstream habitats and freshwater resources, in addition to the deforestation that they are creating. The Rewa River has its source waters there, and is currently showing signs of impact such as turbidity and sedimentation from gold mining. Several rivers and creeks that flow through the Kanuku Mountains Protected Area and the North Rupununi wetlands are also linked to the Marudi Mountain area. Improving practices in gold mining in this area is a precondition for the conservation of these highly important ecological areas, and will have a knock-on impact on the ecological functionality of the larger landscape. In response to the environmental concerns identified above and the associated social impacts, the GoG is currently working closely with local stakeholders to regularize the range of gold mining related activities in the Marudi Mountain Area and to establish a base on which responsible gold mining can be fostered.

2.C Socio-Economic and Cultural Context

23. Guyana’s population is estimated at 767,085 (Caribbean Development Bank 2016), comprising the following ethnic groups: East Indian-Guyanese (39.8 percent); Afro-Guyanese (29.3 percent); Amerindians (10.5 percent); mixed race (19.9 percent); and others (0.5 percent) (2012 National Census).
24. Guyana’s ASGM sector has been in existence for more than one hundred years. Unlike most other countries, the ASGM sector has legal status in Guyana. Under the Mining Act (1989) mining activities have been fully legalized, with the scale of mining (small, medium or large) dependent on size of dredging equipment and technology used. In addition, artisanal miners are considered to be legal under the Mining Act, once they have registered and paid for mining claims. The ASGM sector accounts for 70 percent of the country’s gold production.

25. Legally declared gold generated approximately 64 percent of all the country’s foreign exchange, has extensive backward and forward linkages to the retail and services sectors, is the main source of employment and revenue for hinterland communities, including indigenous communities, and provides direct and indirect employment for over 90,000 persons (Thomas, 2009). Overall, gold plays a central role in the economy, accounting for 15 percent of GDP, 78 percent of the value of mineral production, and 24 percent of exports (Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment, 2015).

26. From 2007 to 2016, the average annual increase of gold production was 13 percent, compared to 9 percent decrease annually from 1999 to 2006. In 2014 and 2015, gold production was 459,004 and 495,000 ounces respectively, compared to 712,707 ounces produced in 2016 (a 44 percent increase over the 2015 gold production figure) (Bureau of Statistics, 2017). Gold production in Guyana is projected to remain at around 712,706 ounces in 2017 and increase to 736,000 ounces in 2018 (Jordan, 2017).

27. While Indigenous Peoples hold the title to their land and can partake in mining (except at the large-scale), following the national laws governing mining, they do not have absolute rights over the extraction of minerals (Amerindian Act, 2006). Overlap between historic mining and community land titling occurs often, which leads to conflict.

28. Since indigenous populations utilize ecosystem services heavily for their subsistence living, they are affected by disruptions in the ecosystem from mining operations. Indigenous communities also face negative social impacts, including displacement and resettlement of villages, disruption of the social structure of the village due to men leaving their families to work in gold mining, and abandonment of farms leading to food and nutritional insecurity (Fontaine and Viera, 2006).

29. Gold mining has traditionally been dominated by men, however women do participate, and their role is currently evolving. Significant numbers of women currently own mining operations, work directly in mining operations, and provide services such as cooking and laundry. Many women also serve as vendors of various products in shops close to the mining operations. Guyana has a long-established jewelry sector with approximately 273 small goldsmith enterprises producing hand-crafted artisanal gold jewelry that is highly sought after throughout the Caribbean (Gaskin, 2017).

30. Sex disaggregated data is available at the regional levels, but not at sub-regional levels and thus figures are not currently available on the gender makeup at specific sites. However, the Guyana Women Miners Organisation (GWMO) estimates that there are 14 women miners in Region 9; 32 in Region 8; and 21 in Region 1 (which will be the project control site). GWMO, a partner in this project, works to improve conditions for women in mining by, a) decreasing physical abuse and exploitation of women, b) promoting the rights of indigenous and local communities, and c) educating stakeholders on mining laws and regulations.

31. Nationally, Guyana has made progress in recent years in promoting gender equality and the empowerment of women. Guyana met the target under Millennium Development Goal 3 to eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education. In 1996, Guyana passed the Domestic Violence Act and in 2010 passed the Sexual Violence Act. Guyana also carries out activities under the United Nations Secretary General’s “UniTE to End Violence against Women” campaign, geared to strengthen protection against sexual violence and advocate
for reforming the law on sexual offences. The Women and Gender Equality Commission was established in 2009 to promote women’s rights and gender equality. Additionally, in 2010 Guyana adopted the Women of Worth programme to address access to loans, and more broadly, women facing poverty. Currently, women hold around 35 percent of seats in the National Assembly (Singh R., 2016).

2.D Global Environmental Problems and Root Causes

32. Mining is the biggest driver of deforestation, presenting a real challenge to Guyana’s status as a high forest cover, low deforestation rate country, and to its global climate commitment. The main environmental impacts of the ASGM sector in Guyana are deforestation, mercury contamination, land degradation, and habitat destruction. Since 2008, when gold prices increased in response to the global economic crisis of 2008, close to one hundred jaguars were killed due to conflict with miners (Dell’Amore, 2015).

33. The subsequent deforestation causes erosion and changes in soil quality in the mining areas, which negatively impacts forest regeneration. The discharges from hydraulic mining operations also cause turbidity and siltation downstream of the mined sites, significantly affecting fish for human consumption and the domestic water supply of the hinterland communities. Additionally, this physical disturbance alters river channels and creates stagnant pools that become breeding places for malaria and other mosquito-borne diseases, including yellow fever and dengue, which endanger the health of local populations. The continued expansion of the extractive sector and increasing demand for land and forests puts pressures on the rich, intact ecosystems in Guyana, and indeed on the entire Amazonia ecoregion, threatening to compromise the services provided by its ecosystems and biodiversity, and, by extension, threatening the well-being of its people.

34. The ASGM sector is the leading cause (37 percent) of global atmospheric mercury (United Nations Environment Programme, 2013). Gold mining releases mercury in two forms: a mercury vapor released during roasting, and a metallic form released during amalgamation. As a toxic, non-biodegradable element, mercury poses a serious threat to ecosystems. The effects of pollution may be even more profound in Guyana’s tropical rainforests, as growing evidence suggests that the higher organic matter, temperatures, and biological activity in rainforests increase the rate of conversion to methylmercury (mercury’s more toxic form). Negative impacts of mercury pollution include: a) negative hormonal, reproductive, and behavioral alterations in mammals (mercury is a neurotoxin to mammals); b) root damage in plants; c) negative impacts to avian breeding such as fewer laid eggs and increased embryo death; and d) changes to the soil microbial community, which leads to slower primary production. Along with these effects, the movement of mercury-contaminated water is an international concern. Further, since mercury is not biodegradable, mercury contamination remains long after mining ceases (Veening, Bulthuis, Burbidge, & Strupat, 2015). In Guyana, the three (3) main groups of mercury release sources are: primary metal production (excluding gold production by amalgamation) 15,357 Kg Hg/y (54 percent); gold extraction with mercury amalgamation 11,777 Kg Hg/y (41 percent); and use and disposal of other products 1,499 Kg Hg/y (5 percent) (Ministry of Natural Resources, 2016).

35. Mining-induced deforestation, land degradation, and mercury contamination stem from unsustainable mining practices. Gold in Guyana is produced primarily by hydraulic dredging and sluices. Mercury is used at the final stage to form an amalgam which extracts the gold from the sediment. This process also requires the application of large volumes of water for mining and mineral processing. Often, there are no containment structures for the generated waste.
36. Along with the mining process, two root drivers of global environmental problems are a) poverty, which is widespread in Guyana, and b) the country’s pricing mechanism for gold. The Guyana Gold Board (GGB) trades gold on behalf of the government. It also verifies licensed gold dealers and reviews the dealer’s records. Given the significant authority of the GGB, it has a huge influence on providing incentives for mercury-free mining, but has not yet provided these. The explanation for lack of incentives for mercury-free gold mining is that Guyana has only recently (May 2017) drafted a National Plan of Action (NAP) on the elimination of mercury-use, a proposal that followed the country’s signing of the Minamata Convention on 10 October 2013 and ratification on 24 September 2014.

2.E Barriers to Addressing Global Environmental Problems and Root Causes

37. Guyana has undertaken several initiatives to address environmental problems stemming from gold mining. Despite the effort, and important contributions from various bilateral and multilateral development agencies, Guyana’s progress to reduce mercury use has been limited. A stated policy by the GoG under a previous administration to offer financing to miners for mercury-free technology, called the Mercury-Free Mining Development Fund (MFMDF), was never fully established and therefore remains non-subscribed.

38. While many miners have expressed an interest in the use of non-mercury processing technology, they state a lack of information, capital, and incentives (Ministry of Natural Resources, 2017) as hindrances.

39. Some mercury-free technologies (Appendix IX) have demonstrated recovery rates of 65 percent when comparing the gold assay in the ore body versus the gold recovery (Guyana Gold and Diamond Miners Association, 2017), but there are a number of barriers that exist. These include:

a. Few incentives or disincentives to improve gold mining practices. Private-led ad hoc credit (hire-purchase) arrangements include no performance guidelines other than meeting loan repayments.

b. Some mercury-free equipment is more expensive than the technologies currently in use, hence capital financing is sometimes a barrier.

c. Startup costs to introduce the new technologies are considered to be high compared to business as usual. This relates not only to high financial outlays for retooling, but also the downtime in actual gold extraction as the equipment is optimized, and for training.

d. Applicability of the technology in the various geophysical conditions of Guyana’s gold-mining areas was never fully tested.

e. The education and outreach programmes that have been carried out have not sufficiently captured the role profit motivation plays in the industry, or the impact on livelihoods and family life of the current practices in the industry. Miners also have insufficient capacity to implement environmental regulations and codes of practice (Vieira, 2006).

f. There is limited sharing of information and a silo approach to decision-making, leading to limited inter-agency consultations and strong resistance to institutional change for global environmental objectives.

g. Enforcement and compliance is limited. Guyana has insufficient personnel or institutional capacity to monitor and enforce the regulatory framework and reduce the impacts of mining. Though the MNR has recently formed a Compliance Division,
its small core team requires urgent and immediate institutional strengthening to meet the policy direction of the MNR in monitoring, mediation, and enforcement.

h. Along with capacity issues, there are legislative issues; for example, the GGMC does not have the authority to monitor activities of jewelers and other mercury-users (Ministry of Natural Resources, 2017).

40. Even with proper information sharing there is the more substantive issue of overlapping land uses. For example, in large areas, portions of lands are allocated and licensed for both forestry and mining. This means that neither the miner nor the forester can act independently to responsibly operate their concessions in keeping with their permits.

41. Few if any markets/buyers (including the GoG) differentiate between mercury-free and traditionally produced gold. Undifferentiated pricing, when combined with limited awareness, acts as a disincentive to miners to change from business-as-usual mining to mercury-free technologies.

42. There is also a lack of monitoring of mercury trading and direct use in the mining sector, though there is limited monitoring of importation into the country by the GGMC and the Pesticides and Toxic Chemicals Control Board (PTCCB).

2.F Current Baseline (Business-as-Usual Scenario)/Future Scenarios without the Project

43. Without this project, it is likely that efforts to address mercury use in the ASGM sector would remain focused on discrete aspects of the value chain, rather than on an integrated and responsible approach that captures community needs and livelihoods, profit motivations and economy, environment and society. Further, efforts are more likely to be top-down, less focused on measurable results, and less impactful. Investor interest in mercury-free technologies and availability of public and private finances and incentives is likely to remain low, negatively affecting adoption and scaling up. Furthermore, even if viable mercury-free technologies can be demonstrated and made available under other future projects, the ASGM sector would be unable to adopt them due to relatively high capital costs and the skills needed.

44. The ASGM sector is the largest consumer of mercury and the largest source of anthropogenic mercury released into the environment in Guyana (Ministry of Natural Resources, 2017).

45. While the ASGM sector is a significant economic driver, it presents challenges to the Green State Development Strategy that is currently under development, largely because of asymmetries between policies and practices in the sector and green growth.

46. Non-compliance with regulations is a significant problem. Per the MNR’s Strategic Framework, there are four main reasons for non-compliance: a) limited knowledge of the laws; b) disregard for the laws/regulations; c) lack of awareness of the harmful effects of mining; and d) awareness of, but an indifference to the harmful effects. Compliance is also limited because of inadequate monitoring.

47. Over the past decade, Brazilian involvement in the mining sector has transformed the gold mining industry through new technologies and investments, introducing several of the least efficient and environmentally sound practices (Ministry of Natural Resources, 2017), and there is little knowledge of Guyanese regulations. As such, overall, Brazilian miners have had a net negative impact on the gold mining sector in Guyana.

48. Although regulations exist, appropriate safety measures are not used by the GGB in their facility, hence the air in surrounding areas have historically tested with high levels of mercury (Ministry of Natural Resources, 2017).
Since the mid-2000s, the amount of mercury imported into Guyana annually has more than tripled. Between 2008 and 2010, an estimated 60,000 kg of mercury was imported annually. More recent data suggests a steep decline in reported imports, with only 5,313 kg and 25,480 kg of mercury being imported for 2014 and 2015 respectively (Draft MIA Report, 2016). This recent trend is suspected to be a result of hoarding, undertaken in anticipation of a mercury importation restriction after Guyana became a signatory to the Minamata Convention in 2013.

Studies conducted in the PPG phase have shown that approximately 89 percent of the owners of mining operations use mercury at some stage. Approximately 91 percent of this group use mercury in the final stage of the gold extraction process, i.e. in amalgamation; approximately 20 percent use mercury at the separation stage in the sluice box; and approximately 12 percent use mercury in the open mining pits. This situation will continue unless the barriers to the adoption of improved practices and technologies are reduced or removed.

The GoG has taken several steps to address the use of mercury by the ASGM sector, including ratification of the Minamata Convention on Mercury and the development of a regulatory framework, strategy, and NAP (completed in 2017) for the phasing out of mercury. In April 2017, the MNR revived the Minamata Working Group (MWG), comprising of organizations whose focus intersects with the issue of mercury use. Currently, the MWG aims to assist the MNR to work towards Guyana’s fulfilment of the convention.

The main industry body representing miners, the GGDMA, is committed to reducing mercury and has been working in collaboration with the GGMC to test suitable technologies. Uptake of these technologies is slow, however, as they are still not yet suitable for mobile small operations and alluvial ores.

Some integral social actors operating in the gold value chain, including equipment retailers and fabricators, goldsmiths, jewelers, licensed gold buyers and exporters, who work in partnership with miners to develop and pioneer low-cost technologies suitable for the local context are seldom, if ever, the target of efforts to reduce mercury in the value chain.

**2.G Alternatives to the Business-as-Usual Scenario**

One alternative scenario is a project that focuses on developing and testing mercury-free mining technologies. This is arguably the most expensive intervention, and may not on its own lead to transformation in the sector unless it is supported by good education and awareness, capacity building, strong leadership by example, and access to financing. This will require working with a representative number of miners to achieve consistently successful rates of recovery, and then either through incentives or regulation (or a combination of both), to move the ASGM sector along the line of compliance. An exclusive technological approach would however not address the barrier of access to financing by the ASGM sector.

Another option is to create a system to operationalize financing for technology improvement as a viable business proposition and to reinstate the government’s policy for the establishment of the Mercury-Free Mining Development Fund (MFMDF). This will be dependent on demonstrating viable technologies, and on establishing sufficient confidence with the miners in the technology. This would hopefully increase uptake.

A more traditional approach would be to introduce regulations and financial disincentives such as increasing taxes on mercury-produced gold. While this may work effectively in a well-ordered society in which laws are developed and followed, this is not the norm in a country like Guyana and for a sector like the ASGM. Such approaches are also more workable
in areas that are easier to police and to access, but would be very challenging to implement successfully in the remote regions of Guyana where the ASGM sector tends to operate.

57. A value chain approach takes into consideration the need to work from the source through to the market for the commodity. This approach will include the introduction of technology, access to finance for proven technologies, consideration of the market interest in certain kinds of production systems for the commodity, and the use of education, awareness and communication tools to connect the source with the market. This approach will require also an overall understanding of key aspects or “pressure points” within the value chain, which, when triggered, will hasten the connection of the source to the market.

2.H Cost-Effectiveness of Chosen Alternative

58. The value chain approach with forward and backward market linkages, is the best option as it allows for the use of a combination of techniques to address failures in the value chain, instead of approaching it with a suite of prescribed solutions. In addition to this, the initiative will use CI’s Sustainable Landscape Methodology to tailor and adapt solutions over the life of the project to maximize impact. This methodology is built around multi-stakeholder involvement to generate innovation, collective ownership, and confidence; an adaptive management approach by which miners will learn by doing; and recognition of the multiple objectives and interests that stakeholders (including miners) will have in a landscape.

59. Complementary to this project, the World Wildlife Fund Guianas (WWF-Guianas) in collaboration with the French Facility for Global Environment (FFEM), will be implementing a four-year project beginning in 2018, in support of the gradual phase-out of mercury in the Guianas (Guyana, Suriname and French Guiana). The objective of the project is to curb mercury contamination in the Guiana Shield by 2025, by phasing out mercury use in the ASGM sector, and by limiting mercury emissions associated with deforestation caused by mining. The expected results from this project include: a) national policies targeting the gold sector reinforced and regionally coordinated, in line with the Minamata Convention on Mercury; b) a mercury-free gold extraction model that has demonstrated locally its technical and economic viability, as well as its social acceptability; and c) key data on mercury updated and made available by a regional mercury observatory. The proposed Global Environment Facility (GEF) project will coordinate activities with the WWF/FFEM project to ensure synergies in the areas of policy and mercury-free technology development, testing, and demonstration. The proposed GEF project will focus in areas where the WWF/FFEM project is not working to eliminate overlap and ensure efficient use of resources.

60. Cost-effectiveness will be achieved through cost-sharing with the Norad-funded component of CI-Guyana’s RMI (described above), which focuses on engaging the gold mining sector on increasing adoption of improved practices to reduce pressure on forests. This proposed GEF project will engage business enterprises and actors across the gold mining value chain to shift away from mercury use. Through this initiative, synergies will be established by the project partners, i.e. CI-Guyana, the GGDMA, the GGMC and the National Toshaos Council (NTC), to maximize resource usage in order to simultaneously achieve reduced pressure on the forests and reduced mercury use. In this regard, CI has ear-marked co-financing for the six components of the GEF project, as detailed in the budget.

61. The project will ensure cost-effectiveness through integrating project activities with those of development partners, in order to capitalize on synergies. Lessons learned from baseline projects will be incorporated into the project implementation, so that GEF resources can be used in the most efficient manner. Cost-effectiveness was initially increased during the PPG Phase by incorporating lessons learned to inform the project design. See Section 3.O.
SECTION 3: PROJECT STRATEGY

3.A Objective, Components, Expected Outcomes, Targets, and Outputs

62. The objective of this project is to assist Guyana with converting to mercury-free mining by 2025, by directly involving business enterprises with a profit motive in leading the shift towards the development of a mercury-free ASGM supply chain, and downstream El Dorado Gold brand jewelry.

63. By 2021, mining operators in at least one region of Guyana will have successfully demonstrated mercury-free gold extraction technologies and replaced mercury in the production of gold in the region because of this project. This is expected to have catalytic effects on policy and practice. The demonstration of an integrated approach to managing the gold mining supply chain within a low-emission, green economy framework will trigger revision or creation of policies that support national efforts towards responsible gold supply chains. Because the project includes a strong component on development of a brand of gold, the opportunity will be taken to ensure that the branding process takes into consideration other important environmental and social safeguards that would be required at a minimum by buyers. These minimum requirements will be determined through review of existing internationally recognized standards and certification schemes, and will be incorporated, through a participatory process, in the brand definition.

64. By incorporating the use of incentives in its engagement with communities that rely on mining, the project strengthens the overall relationship with local stakeholders, and builds trust and confidence to positively impact small-scale mining. Incentive programmes, such as the Government of Ecuador’s Socio Bosque Conservation Agreement Programme, which produce both beneficial socio-economic and environmental outcomes, have long been a key component of CI’s success with local communities. In Guyana, CI is working with the Ministry of Indigenous Peoples’ Affairs (MoIPA) on sustainable village planning and development using their Sustainable Development Framework. This programme provides a formal structured framework by which communities receive financial and technical support for community improvement in conformity with the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Like the Socio Bosque Programme, the work in Guyana is being built on a monitoring and evaluation platform that allows for tracking how well communities meet the conservation and development targets that they set, triggering appropriate responses from the government and other external partners.

65. Establishment of financial mechanisms for mercury-free technologies will be built on demonstrating workable mercury-free technologies, and the establishment of a robust policy and regulatory framework in which the ASGM can operate. However, to ensure the early buy-in and support for these approaches by the private sector, this project will create market incentives for private sector enterprises to shift to mercury-free mining. It will be implemented through a public-private partnership between CI, the GGDMA, and the GGMC, which is responsible for guiding the switch to mercury-free mining, and using a specific region of the country to demonstrate the possibilities of growing private investment in and markets for responsibly mined gold by adopting environmentally friendly approaches to mining. It will build on work currently being initiated between the GGDMA and CI to reduce deforestation in mining though low-impact exploration methods and increasing recovery rates, to increase technical and financial support to small miners to access more efficient technologies, and to improve other social and environmental practices as part of brand definition. In addition, the GGDMA is currently examining options for the establishment of a model site to demonstrate a business model for low impact mining with requisite social, environmental, labour, and community best practices (please see section 3.B). This project
would complement these efforts through creating direct market access that would incentivize private sector participation.

66. This project takes a ‘pilot approach’, and will entail piloting practices and technologies in Regions 8 and 9, and undertaking a landscape or area-defined intervention in Region 9, with both geared for national amplification in the future. These regions were selected based on a list of criteria designed during the PPG phase after stakeholders were consulted, and after planning and coordination with the Norad-funded project, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and other key actors working in the sector. The aim is to demonstrate an effective model for ensuring responsible gold mining and associated improvements in livelihoods, profits, environment, and society that can be traced back to one region. Producing responsible gold (mercury-free, having met environmental and social safeguards, with improved recovery rates and reduced emissions) and successful market introduction of responsibly produced gold will influence the refinement/creation of national policies and regulations and support amplification at scale in the future. If the sector expresses seeing value in such a process, it will be in a strong position to work towards adoption by the government. The first stages of the project, conducted in conjunction with the implementation of the NAP, will be used to increase awareness of the value of third-party certification.

Component 1: Appropriate mercury-free technologies mainstreamed in Guyana’s ASGM sector

67. For project implementation, two types of interventions are expected on the ground: (1) site-specific interventions that feature practices and technology that eliminate mercury-use and reduce deforestation, and (2) a landscape intervention that designs and implements measures to improve resource management. The first type of intervention is technology-driven and will be led by the GGDMA in Regions 8 and 9. CI-Guyana will lead by facilitating the second type of intervention that will feature multi-stakeholder resource management planning using a sustainable landscape approach in Region 9.

Outcome 1: By the end of the project, demonstrations established and mercury-free technology transferred

Two kinds of demonstrations will be developed: (1) site-specific, and (2) landscape-specific:

68. Two separate demonstration sites will be established, one in Region 8 and the other in Region 9, to test and demonstrate practices and technology as a critical step to capitalize and build synergies on activities currently being undertaken by the GGMC and the GGDMA. Miners will be able to visit sites that are closer to them improving the likelihood of interacting with people they know than if they had to travel to an entirely new region of the country. Functional sites that are easily accessible will ensure stakeholder buy-in and cost-effectiveness. Practice and technology interventions will be tested and operated over an extended period; the results will be more robust and there will be greater confidence if these practices and technologies can be seen to work in more than one location. Most importantly, demonstrating replicability in more than one site improves scalability as well as influence on national policy.

69. Building on the work under CI-Guyana’s RMI, the demonstration landscape established in Region 9 will be used to demonstrate an effective model for ensuring production of branded, traceable, responsibly-mined gold. Through this demonstration landscape, stakeholders will be able to observe firsthand and participate not only in improving practices in gold mining, but will be able to effectively interact with the miners who are involved in piloting these
practices and technologies. The branded gold produced will be specifically labelled as “El Dorado Gold” originating from the Rupununi Region of Guyana.

70. Exchange visits between Brazilian and other equipment manufacturers and local Guyanese fabricators and retailers will investigate small mobile technologies currently in use in Brazil and other countries, where alluvial gold ores mined are like those mined in Guyana.

71. Finally, Technology Innovation Clinics will be organized with miners, fabricators, and equipment retailers to test and select suitable equipment for two sites. The specific needs and motivations of miners and communities will form the basis from which specific technologies and equipment, as well as mechanisms for cooperation, will be adopted. In consultation and collaboration with miners and communities, designing and testing of a centralized processing facility will help in determining the feasibility of technologies particularly for small and dispersed mining operations.

**Outcome 1 Target:**
1. By the end of the project, mercury-free technologies have replaced the use of mercury in ASGM in at least one Region.
2. Reduction in mercury use of about 15 metric tons.

**Output 1.1: Two sites for demonstrating mercury-free practices and technologies are established and functional**

72. A formal agreement with a specific mining concessionaire will be negotiated in Regions 8 and 9. The criteria for selection of each concessionaire will be developed through a participatory process and will be based on a fully transparent and objective set of rules. Decisions will also be informed by site visits and an independent evaluation process. Criteria to be considered include legal tenure; demonstrated willingness to embrace new practices and technologies; willingness to contribute resources (cash and in-kind as required) and to dedicate time to the effort; willingness to accommodate exchanges with others; and willingness to allow research and sharing of non-commercial data.

73. Mercury-free technologies will be installed, tested, and demonstrated in these sites in collaboration with the GGMC, GGDMA, and with international technical support from WWF-Guianas. These sites will be operated by members of the ASGM sector and will serve as field bases for the Technology Innovation Clinics. The practices and technologies used will be evaluated and assessed, and the results will be used to build knowledge products to help inform stakeholders, particularly those that will help shape policy.

**Indicator 1.1.1:**
Number of sites demonstrating mercury-free practices and technologies established and functional.

**Target 1.1.1:**
Two (2) sites demonstrating mercury-free practices and technologies.

**Output 1.2: Mercury-free gold is produced from one region.**

74. Activities will be closely aligned with the efforts of the GoG to streamline operations in Region 9. Through the project, strategic approaches will be tested to catalyze the transition away from the use of mercury in gold extraction and to demonstrate the value of other sustainable landscape management practices. These plans will look at the full life-cycle of the ASGM sector in the selected landscape, with an emphasis on the demonstrating of mercury-free gold mining technology.
75. The landscape management plan will include recommended approaches for gold prospecting and the disposal of mine tailings. The landscape management plans will also lay out a programme of landscape restoration activities, best practice reforestation of mercury-mined gold sites, and identify a set of practicable and sustainable non-timber forest product livelihood options for the communities in and around the project landscape area. The gold mining supply chain will also be closely integrated within the landscape plan for the area, comprising multiple stakeholder interests.

76. An important element in the landscape plan will be the incorporation of conservation agreements that provides incentives to gold miners to participate in the El Dorado Gold branding scheme and contribute to landscape restoration activities, reforestation of mercury-mined gold sites, and participation in practicable and sustainable non-timber forest product livelihood options for the communities in and around the project landscape area.

Indicator 1.2.1:
Number of landscape management plans developed to manage natural resources and catalyse mercury-free gold mining prepared.

Target 1.2.1:
Three (3) landscape management plans developed; one (1) for each project site.

Output 1.3: Mercury-free gold mining practices and technologies transferred to miners in Region 9, and mining operations in Region 8 are exposed to these practices and technologies

77. Mercury-free gold mining technologies are already being used in several mining districts in Guyana by larger mining operations, with some lessons learned as to their practicability and applicability. These lessons will be documented and augmented with the examination of other existing technologies that have possible application to Guyana.

78. Technologies for ASGM areas in Guyana where existing mercury-free technologies are not used will be identified. Local manufacturers and retailers of mining equipment will be exposed, through exchanges, to mercury-free technologies in countries such as Brazil, where most of the current technologies originate.

79. Building on these overseas exchanges by local manufacturers and an independent analysis of alternative mercury-free gold mining technologies, a select number of mercury-free gold mining technologies will be identified, and the manufacturer of these technologies invited to demonstrate their applicability in Regions 8 and 9, and in the major population centers where technology fabrication can be done. These demonstrations will be organized as “clinics”.

80. Clinics will demonstrate and promote mercury-free technology, and provide technical support on the use of these technologies. They will be organized in targeted communities to facilitate ASGM mining operations to adopt mercury-free gold mining technologies. The project will seek to demonstrate clear business opportunities in the fabrication, operation and maintenance of the technologies.

81. The design of a centralized processing facility will be improved and tested in one of the demonstration sites, to determine the feasibility of technologies, particularly for small and dispersed mining operations. This facility will build upon the facilities currently operated by the GGMC that promote safety and efficiencies in mining operations and processing facilities. Attention will be placed on developing miners’ trust in the processors.
**Indicator 1.3.1:**
Number of mercury-free gold mining technologies identified, tested and adopted.

**Target 1.3.1:**
At least four (4) mercury-free technologies tested in field conditions.

**Indicator 1.3.2:**
Number of Technology Innovation Clinics organized with miners, fabricators, and equipment retailers to test and select suitable equipment for two (2) sites.

**Target 1.3.2:**
At least six (6) Technology Innovation Clinics organized with miners, fabricators, and equipment retailers to test and select suitable equipment for two (2) sites.

**Indicator 1.3.3:**
Number of improved and tested centralized processing facilities to determine the feasibility of mercury-free technologies.

**Target 1.3.3:**
One (1) centralized processing facility improved and tested.

**Component 2: Mechanism for financing capital investments for mercury-free technologies established and functional.**

82. As finance is a critical barrier, the establishment of accessible facilities, mechanisms or instruments to provide the capital outlay necessary for smaller ASGM operators to transition to mercury-free technology is of great importance. There is no a priori expectation on the specific form that the financing mechanism should take, since there are several possibilities, including but not restricted to direct incentive schemes, a dedicated credit facility (i.e., a special window for financing mercury-free technology), credit-schemes established by equipment dealers, a trust fund, etc.

**Outcome 2: By the end of the project, a financial mechanism for capital investments for mercury-free technologies is established and functioning**

83. As noted in the NAP, a long-term financing mechanism for mercury-free technology will be established. Support will be provided to access credit or other financing for producers in model sites to be able to convert to non-mercury technology.

**Outcome 2 Target:**

1. By the end of the project, a financial mechanism to facilitate the transition of mercury-free technologies will be established and operational.

**Output 2.1: An assessment of financing mechanisms for ASGM miners to adopt mercury-free technologies is undertaken.**

84. A major hurdle to the adoption of mercury-free technology in the ASGM sector is the financial means to support the initial cost of such technology. This is the reason the MFMDF was proposed in 2014. Attention therefore must be put towards finding innovative approaches to reduce the cost of such technologies, either through direct payment for the technologies, tax and other fiscal breaks, or through an incentive scheme.

85. An assessment of financing mechanisms for ASGM miners to adopt mercury-free technologies will be undertaken. This assessment will build on recent financial analyses, particularly those undertaken to establish the policy on the MFMDF in 2014 and the reasons
behind its lack of uptake. The assessment will include a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis and gap analysis of existing funds and other mechanisms in and outside of Guyana. Based on the findings and recommendations of the assessment and extensive consultations with a wide range of stakeholders, including government, banking institutions, and artisanal miners, a proposed financial mechanism for the procurement of mercury-free gold mining technology will be designed and a feasibility study for its institutionalization conducted. The design will consider structural options, such as whether the MFMDF should be an endowment, sinking-fund, revolving fund, etc. Consultations and negotiations will be conducted to validate and legitimize the desired design on the financial mechanism to culminate with the formal approval by the appropriate parties, including possible parliamentary approval if necessary, and the establishment and capitalization of the mechanism.

86. Noting the wide range of financial mechanisms that are available to incentivize change in behaviour, the assessment will also examine various other models including the use of conservation agreements, tax incentives, and hire purchase arrangements with equipment suppliers and fabricators.

87. The assessment will be subject to broad stakeholder input, with a view towards finding an optimal private-public partnership that enables the establishment of a successful financial mechanism. Such a mechanism may be capitalized through a government fund like the MFMDF, but with a stronger and clearer framework for accessing and management. It may also be via private-public collaboration in which government offers tax waivers, or a percentage of the royalties collected. Alternatively, it may be through smaller financial instruments such as conservation agreements with miners or mining groups that reward good practice.

\textit{Indicator 2.1.1:}
Number of feasibility assessments completed on mechanisms for financing technologies appropriate to Guyana based on mechanisms tested around the world.

\textit{Target 2.1.1:}
One (1) feasibility assessment completed on mechanisms for financing technologies appropriate for Guyana.

\textit{Output 2.2.: A financial mechanism for the procurement of mercury-free gold mining technology is established and functional}

88. The legal and institutional arrangements for the most feasible design option for the financial mechanism will be established. This may include its capitalization to a level sufficient to meet the required demand to realize full conversion of the ASGM sector to mercury-free technology as outlined in the NAP.

89. The potential client base of the mechanism (miners and other operators in the gold supply value chain such as financiers, fabricators, operators and maintenance technicians) will be engaged to improve their capacities to access and appropriately manage the fund and other financial instruments.

\textit{Indicator 2.2.1:}
Number of long-term financing mechanisms for mercury-free technology established and functional to access credit and financing for producers in model sites to be able to convert to non-mercury technology.

\textit{Target 2.2.1:}
One (1) long-term financing mechanism for mercury-free technology established and functional.
Component 3: Markets established for branded mercury-free gold from Guyana

90. The project will seek to engender and sustain change to mercury-free ASGM gold extraction in Guyana. This will be done through a market-led approach that encourages the growth of markets for mercury-free, responsibly mined gold and gold products, and which connects producers through the value chain to these markets.

Outcome 3: By the end of the project, a chain of custody process, verification mechanism for gold and an El Dorado Gold branding scheme is developed and institutionalized

91. Assessment of domestic, regional, and international markets for Guyana’s gold and the market potential of the brand for El Dorado Gold will identify high-potential markets. This assessment will be used to inform the communications plan outlined in Component 6. A chain of custody process and verification mechanism for gold produced at model sites will be developed, and an El Dorado Gold branding scheme, linked to the GEF GOLD brand, will be developed. An important element of this mechanism will be a system for ensuring traceability from source to enable trade in responsibly-mined gold involving the local gold jewelry industry. Education, training, and other requisite organizational support will be provided for goldsmiths and jewelers desirous of participating in the creation of a responsible gold brand of Guyana jewelry: “El Dorado Gold”. El Dorado Gold producers will be identified and linked to a responsible gold market. To improve the chain of custody, the link between the producer and buyer will be more regularized and strengthened to ensure less transaction costs. Coupled with the increasing efficiency in gold mining through CI-Guyana’s RMI, project beneficiary miners are expected to obtain higher revenues even only if through the shortened supply chain.

92. It must be noted that the project will serve more as a pathfinder to sell and buy responsible gold, and create the enabling policy framework that will support such a trade. In time, as the global trade in mercury becomes increasingly restricted, and the international markets increasingly demand mercury-free gold, Guyana would have already established a pathway for continued production from the ASGM sector and for maintaining international market access.

93. Third-party certification of Guyana gold will also be explored, based on assessments of existing certification schemes, and the interests of key buyers who are interested in purchasing mercury-free and certified gold. Elements of these schemes will be tested in pilot sites towards the longer-term ambition of third-party certification of Guyana’s gold and increased access to high-value markets (e.g. high-end jewelers). The design of the Branding Scheme will be informed by the basic structures and systems that will be required from third-party certification schemes, and thus be part of a step-wise approach toward certification and access to premium markets. Simultaneously, the project will engage in consultations to sensitize miners, communities, decision-makers, etc. on the benefits and feasibility of certification to grow the broad-based support needed to continue toward certification through policy, future programmes, initiatives, and projects.

Outcome 3 Target:

1. By the end of the project, the branding of El Dorado Gold has been shown to result in increased gold sales and revenues to artisanal and small-scale miners in Guyana.

Output 3.1: Social and environmental standards, a chain of custody process, and a verification mechanism for El Dorado Gold, linked to the GEF Gold brand is developed and institutionalized
94. A critical analysis of the SWOT associated with marketing “El Dorado Gold” will be undertaken by assessing the domestic and international markets for mercury-free gold. This analysis will build on past studies and lessons learned from exploration of the concept of “green” gold and the marketing of responsibly-mined gold.

95. An in-depth analysis of the historical and cultural attributes of the concept of “responsible gold” and the use of the El Dorado Gold brand will provide the basis for trademarking of the brand. Broad-based consultations, largely driven by the private sector and artisanal gold miners will serve to build a consensus on the concept of “El Dorado Gold”, following national and international procedures (the latter dictated by the World Intellectual Property Organization) to secure the trademarking of “El Dorado Gold”.

96. Existing standards and certification schemes for “responsible gold” most commonly adopted by international downstream supply chain actors, such as Fairmined and Fairtrade, will be assessed to inform the social and environmental safeguards and standards that would apply to stakeholders who represent the full value chain of ASGM gold in Guyana (from production to final consumer), and will serve to ensure the holistic construct of a tracking protocol for El Dorado gold. This study will examine the best practices and lessons learned in the use of those standards, tracking protocols and certification schemes for responsibly produced natural resource commodities. The use of the tracking protocol throughout the value chain will be tested, and consequently, will inform the revision and finalization of such a protocol, and the identification and formulation of alternative approaches that take into account the unique contexts of the ASGM miners in different communities.

97. The project will also test third-party certification of responsibly mined mercury-free gold in tandem with the testing of the tracking protocol outlined previously, and these two elements will be intimately linked. This will aim to provide an in-depth understanding of the key drivers and unintended consequences of certifying El Dorado gold. This project will not aim to institutionalize the certification of El Dorado gold, but rather, to lay the foundation for future work towards this end.

*Indicator 3.1.1:*
Number of chain of custody process verification mechanism for gold produced on model sites developed and an El Dorado Gold branding scheme developed that is linked to the GEF GOLD Brand.

*Target 3.1.1:*
One (1) chain of custody process verification mechanism and an El Dorado Gold branding scheme.

*Output 3.2: El Dorado Gold producers are linked to international responsibly produced gold markets*

98. The institutional dynamics surrounding potential marketing of responsible mercury-free gold will be analyzed to produce policy and institutional recommendations for creation of the foundation for the independent labeling of El Dorado Gold. Further, assessment of the feasibility of third-party certification of responsibly produced mercury-free gold in Guyana, building on past and project assessments, will outline the feasibility of work necessary to carry out the independent labelling of El Dorado Gold.

*Indicator 3.2.1:*
Number of market systems analyses and feasibility studies for the establishment of an institutional mechanism for trade in El Dorado Gold.
**Target 3.2.1:**
One (1) market systems analysis and feasibility study for an institutional mechanism.

**Component 4: National policies and incentives for mercury-free gold established**

99. Learning from the implementation of Components 1, 2 and 3 of the project, the project will support development of a national policy on responsible gold production, particularly in the ASGM sector, including the development of incentives to produce gold using mercury-free technologies. This component is essential to the sustainability of the impact of the project.

**Outcome 4: By the end of the project, a national policy on responsible gold production and value added and requisite laws/regulations are revised/drafted to support a responsible gold commodity chain**

100. Support would be provided to the MNR and the GGMC to lead the development of a draft national policy on responsible gold production and value added, and requisite laws and regulations revised or drafted to support a responsible gold commodity chain. These policies, laws, and regulations will address the suite of tools used to change behaviour and improve practices. These include incentives, controls, and improvement in enforcement.

101. The process will include stakeholder consultations, and education and awareness sessions across the country for the gold mining community on the options and benefits of responsible gold production and purchase of gold products, as well as education targeting policy makers and the public to build national commitment for a sustainable responsible gold value chain in Guyana.

102. This set of activities would be closely tied into the Sustainable Development Programme being undertaken by the MoIPA, with community participation at the very earliest stages to ensure mining-based interventions support the socio-economic needs of the said communities. A monitoring and evaluation mechanism that documents lessons learned would be established. A business model would be developed for scaling up nationally.

**Outcome 4 Target:**

1. **By the end of the project, at least one national policy and attendant requisite laws/regulations in support of responsible gold production and value added in the gold commodity chain revised/drafted.**

**Output 4.1: Multi-stakeholder fora convened to provide input for the revision/drafting of a national policy for responsible ASGM gold mining and capacity built to ensure compliance with mining policy.**

103. A number of past analyses have looked at Guyana’s policies as they relate to mercury-free gold mining and related issues. The project will undertake an updated and comprehensive SWOT and gap analyses of the policy and legal framework as it relates to legitimizing policy interventions necessary for ensuring compliance with the principles of the El Dorado Gold concept, along the entire value chain.

104. Based on the findings of the policy analysis, further consultations and learning-by-doing workshops will serve to negotiate the formulation of a revised policy on the concept of responsibly-mined gold. Workshops will also formulate and/or revise, as deemed necessary, by-laws, codes of conduct, and standards, among others. This activity will culminate with a set of validated texts, including compliance texts (incentives and disincentives), and be
linked to institutions mandated to oversee compliance. To the extent that there is a gap in the mandates of institutions to ensure compliance, these texts will include recommendations to update the requisite mandates, roles, and responsibilities. The project will also seek to secure cabinet approval of the national policy on responsible gold mining, emphasizing a set of on-going negotiations among social actors, with an emphasis on various ministries, private sector stakeholders, and government bodies, but not to the exclusion of other parties.

105. Support to the Compliance Division of the MNR will be provided to build capacity, including knowledge and understanding of integrated natural resource management, and the institutional capacity to contribute to policy creation and implementation of relevant laws and policies. The newly-established Compliance Division is mandated to serve as an arm of the MNR to ensure that relevant policies and regulations are implemented and adhered to. An important element of this support is to aid uptake of incentives and enable the system to deter poor practice. Good policy must be practical and implementable, and must not only provide incentives but must also be clear about disincentives and how these disincentives are implemented.

106. A multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism will give advice on the formulation and implementation of the new national policy on responsible gold mining, and provide policy and programme advisory services for the long-term adoption of mercury-free gold mining technologies. This mechanism may be the already established Minamata Working Group that is chaired by the MNR. This mechanism will have an intimate relationship with other multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms, particularly those already in existence, such as under the WWF/FFEM project. Careful attention will be paid to the membership of this mechanism, how often it will convene, and the ability of this mechanism to catalyze policy decisions. This design of this mechanism will also have strong institutional linkages with the clinics set up under Component 1 and the stakeholder platforms established under Component 5.

**Indicator 4.1.1:**
Percentage of staff in the Compliance Division of the MNR whose capacity in integrated natural resource management has increased and are able to contribute to policy creation and implementation.

**Target 4.1.1:**
Seventy-five (75) percent of the Compliance Division of the MNR has increased capacity in natural resource management and are able to contribute to policy creation and implementation.

**Indicator 4.1.2:**
Number of multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism to provide policy and programme advisory services for the long-term adoption of mercury-free gold mining technologies established.

**Target 4.1.2:**
One (1) multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism for long-term adoption of mercury-free gold mining technologies.

**Indicator 4.1.3:**
Number of national policies for responsible ASGM gold mining revised/drafted.

**Target 4.1.3:**
One (1) national policy for responsible ASGM gold mining revised/drafted.
Component 5: Monitoring and Evaluation

107. Effective monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the project will provide the basis for ensuring the desired results through informing adaptive management.

Outcome 5: Regular monitoring of project activities against targets and outcomes and management of risk will be done and reported on semi-annually against the Results Framework. Adaptations will be made based on monitoring reports.

108. Regular monitoring of project activities against targets and outcomes and management of risk will be done and reported on semi-annually against the Project Results Framework. These will inform the adaptive collaborative management of the project, ensuring not only the cost-effective implementation of project activities, but, in collaboration with the WWF/FFEM project, the monitoring of mercury exposure and impacts in the ASGM communities. The terms of reference for the multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism described above will include providing advice on the implementation, suggesting strategic approaches, adaptations, risk management issues, and identifying opportunities and challenges.

Outcome 5 Target:
1. By the end of the project, monitoring and evaluation of the use of mercury in gold mining is institutionalized within the appropriate agencies.

Output 5.1: A monitoring and evaluation programme for adaptive collaborative management of instituting mercury-free mining is instituted

109. A monitoring and evaluation programme and framework for the adaptive collaborative management of instituting mercury-free gold mining will be designed and implemented. This will emphasize the determination of the cost-effectiveness of the policy, and institutional and individual capacities strengthened under the project that serves as the foundation for El Dorado Gold. A very important component of the monitoring and evaluation programme will be the examination of impact, and will involve entities such as the Ministry of Labour and Human Services and Social Security, the Ministry of Public Health, and the WWF/FFEM project (which intends to monitor mercury exposure and impacts). Particular focus will be placed on matter related to Occupational Safety and the 2010 Occupational Safety and Health Act of Guyana.

110. The monitoring and evaluation programme and framework will be closely aligned to the national reporting requirements under the Minamata Convention.

Indicator 5.1.1:
Number of M&E programmes for instituting mercury-free gold mining established.

Target 5.1.1:
One (1) M&E programme for instituting mercury-free gold mining.

Component 6: Communications and Knowledge Management

Outcome 6: A strategic communication plan and materials targeting key stakeholders, including miners, decision-makers, and other local and international actors within the supply chain for awareness raising and policy advocacy are developed and implemented.
111. A strategic communication plan and materials (e.g., policy papers, factsheets, videos, etc.) will be developed aimed at key stakeholders, including miners, decision-makers, and other local and international actors within the supply chain for awareness raising and policy advocacy. Lessons learned and best practices will be captured through the M&E component, and presented nationally and internationally to promote learning, information exchanges and partnerships, and to influence decision-making on policies, strategies, programmes, and projects. The project will also coordinate with the global project on K&M activities.

112. Stakeholder platforms will be developed to catalyze an exchange of information, best practices, and lessons learned, and to foster cooperation and partnerships. A conference/discussion forum will be held at the end of the project to assist in evaluating and reporting on project outcomes/impacts, with presentations from key stakeholders involved in implementation and beneficiaries.

**Outcome 6 Target:**

1. **By the end of the project, twenty (20) strategic plans and awareness materials targeted at policy makers, mining and indigenous communities, and other key stakeholders on responsible gold mining in Guyana.**

**Output 6.1: A strategic communication plan prepared and implemented, and materials prepared (e.g., policy papers, factsheets, videos) aimed at key stakeholders, including miners, decision-makers, and other local and international actors within the supply chain for awareness raising and policy advocacy.**

113. Lessons learned will be documented and made available through the knowledge management platform within the global project under this project. This will entail a comprehensive exercise to collate knowledge generated during project implementation and organize it in a manner that contributes to the adaptive collaborative management of the global programme and to the body of knowledge on the reduction of mercury use and responsible mining in the ASGM sector. Materials produced under this activity will be largely technical in nature, which is distinct from the awareness-raising material that will also be produced under Output 6.4.

114. Awareness-raising material to promote responsible mercury-free gold mining technology, financial mechanisms for transitioning to mercury-free technology, and best social and environmental practices nationally and internationally will be produced, collated, updated, and organized in a way that they are effective tools to communicate the benefits of adopting and/or supporting mercury-free gold mining technology and related responsible gold mining techniques. Critically, these materials will undergo an independent quality assurance vetting process to ensure that only the highest quality and most effective materials are produced and shared.

115. Stakeholder platforms will be established to share best practices and lessons learned, and give a greater voice for the concerns of the ASGM miners in the mining districts with policy-makers and other decision-makers. The organization and agenda of these platforms will be informed by the lessons learned and information collected during the clinics of described in Component 1.

**Indicator 6.1.1:**
Number of strategic communications plans aimed at key stakeholders, within the ASGM supply chain for awareness raising and policy advocacy, developed and implemented.

**Target 6.1.1:**
One (1) strategic and communications plan aimed at key stakeholders, within the ASGM supply chain for awareness raising and policy advocacy, developed and implemented.

**Output 6.2: Biennial Conference and annual dialogues organized to promote project findings and responsible gold mining**

116. A biennial El Dorado Gold Conference on Sustainable Development will be promoted through seed funding from this project to present results as well as solicit other papers and input on the responsible mining sector. Collaboration will be sought with entities including the University of Guyana, GGMC, representatives from all multilateral donor agencies working in Guyana, the private sector, journalists, private sector, non-governmental organizations, and civil society, with the latter including representatives from indigenous societies. The launch will situate the project within the broader landscape of institutional actors that are undertaking development interventions to reduce the use of mercury in gold mining, to reduce deforestation, and to promote El Dorado Gold. Local communities, women and indigenous representatives from the ASGM will share their personal experiences with conference participants. Representatives from the private sector will share their experiences of the market for El Dorado Gold Jewelry.

117. In addition to the conferences to be held at the beginning and end of the project, an annual dialogue will be convened within the Annual Mining Week Conference organized by the GGMC to promote country-wide awareness and appreciation of mercury-free gold mining. This annual dialogue (with more than 50 diverse stakeholder representatives) will be organized to coincide with other similar venues and related environmental issues, such as deforestation, biodiversity conservation, and sustainable land management practices.

**Indicator 6.2.1:**
Number of education awareness materials and activities to promote mercury-free gold mining technology nationally prepared and published.

**Target 6.2.1:**
One (1) fully funded education awareness program to promote mercury-free gold mining technology.

**Output 6.3: Coordination with the global project on knowledge management activities.**

118. Strategic engagement with the global GEF GOLD project’s community of practice as well as with CI’s global network of partners will facilitate exchange of lessons learned and best practices internationally. This will link the stakeholder platforms of Component 5 and the clinics of Component 1 with the sharing of lessons learned through the parent (global) GEF GOLD programme using electronic media. It will include managing a database that mirrors that of the GEF GOLD project, and using the same information technology necessary for a smooth and low maintenance/management effort of communication and information sharing. The project will also participate in the annual meetings of the GEF GOLD programme.

**Indicator 6.3.1:**
Number of documented lessons learned made available to the knowledge management platform within the GEF GOLD Programme

**Target 6.3.1:**
At least one (1) documented lessons learned made available to the GEF GOLD knowledge management platform.
Output 6.4: Education and awareness on options and benefits of responsible gold production and education targeting policy-makers to build national commitment to a sustainable responsible gold value chain in Guyana

119. An education and awareness plan focused on highlighting the options and benefits of responsible gold production will be developed targeting gold mining communities and districts. The plan will seek to raise awareness among civil societies and miners on the health risks of exposure to mercury, as well as the socio-economic losses associated with deforestation and land degradation. The plan will include special target to groups such as youths, women and marginal miners.

120. Meetings will be convened to raise awareness of the risks and benefits associated with mercury-free gold mining to strengthen the long-term legitimacy of the project activities, as well as to facilitate the adaptive collaborative management of the project. These meetings will be broad-based, and aim to provide a platform for civil society, including women and indigenous people, to voice issues related to the efforts to transform the ASGM sector in their respective districts.

121. Policy dialogues will be undertaken to reinforce political commitment to mercury-free gold mining by building consensus nationwide on the importance of eliminating the use of mercury in the production of gold, while not reducing or marginalizing the ASGM sector. This activity will be on-going and will complement the stakeholder platforms, clinics and other awareness-raising activities of the project.

Indicator 6.4.1:
Number of education and awareness plans targeting policy-makers and mining communities on benefits of responsible gold production gold value chain in Guyana.

Target 6.4.1:
One (1) fully funded education awareness plan targeting policy-makers and mining communities builds commitments on benefits of responsible gold production gold value chain in Guyana

3.8 Associated Baseline Projects

122. CI-Guyana, the GGDMA and the MoIPA signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) to enhance sustainable development of indigenous villages and develop viable practices within the mining industry. The MOU with the MoIPA enables collaboration in areas of mutual interest, towards the enabling of green economic growth and development.

123. With CI-Guyana’s support, the MoIPA has developed a programme that supports the development objectives of indigenous communities, including land-use planning. For 2017-2018, CI-Guyana and the MoIPA are investing $145,000 in this to further design and implement the programme. Each community will develop its own Sustainable Village Plan (SVP) with the support from the Ministry. The SVP, which may include mining if this is practiced in the community, will be implemented under a framework agreement between the two parties in which each party agrees to contribute to the realization of the plan. For communities with development goals that include gold mining, the SVP will provide a bottom-up means for the project to support Indigenous Peoples to mine for gold in a responsible manner.

124. CI is currently implementing a project, Addressing the Drivers of Deforestation in Guyana and Peru, which is funded by the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad). In Guyana, the focus of this project is on engaging the gold mining sector towards adoption of improved practices to reduce pressure on forests. CI and its partners have agreed to
implement the Norad funded project along with this project under an initiative “El Dorado Gold—Responsible Mining for Guyana”. While maintaining objectives and congruity with the individual projects, the initiative will facilitate green development within Guyana’s extractive industry sector, with focus on gold mining.

125. The Institute of Applied Science and Technology (IAST) has been working to develop technology for mercury-free gold mining in Guyana. IAST also plans to develop a training video and manual for the safe utilization of the chemicals and the equipment involved in the process. The IAST is developing an application for iPads and mobile phones for miners to use in the field to determine the amounts and concentrations of chemicals to be used. The GGMC will be endorsing the technology and helping to disseminate it the mining sector.

126. The Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) is providing a policy-based loan in the amount of US$16.92 million to Guyana to strengthen the environmental sector through a project that was approved in December 2013. The project is comprised of four components focused on: a) macro-economic stability; b) regulatory framework; c) institutional strengthening; and d) monitoring, reporting and verification system. Specifically, the project will support measures to update the country’s regulatory framework to maintain low rates of deforestation and forest degradation caused by mining, logging and agriculture, as well as, improve the government’s institutional capacity to enforce legislation.

127. The WWF has also worked to support the government to lessen negative environmental and human impacts from ASGM gold mining. WWF has provided technical and financial resources and has worked with a range of stakeholders, including the GGMC, mining communities, and small- and medium-scale gold miners.

128. The GGDMA is currently examining options for establishing a model site to demonstrate a business model for low impact mining with requisite social, environment, labor, and community best practices. GGDMA was also part of a project by the Small Business Bureau project that provided training for micro- and small-enterprise development and building alternative livelihoods for vulnerable groups in mining communities.

3.C Incremental Cost Reasoning

129. The implementation of this project is expected to create demand for and the will to capitalize of the MFMDF, a likely additional US$5 million investment. This project will also complement and expand the work being undertaken by the GoG, WWF, Norad and other agencies working in the mining sector.

130. The GEF allocation of US$2,752,294 will be targeted to finance activities that will directly result in the reduction of mercury use in the ASGM sector. Each of the activities described in Section 3A above will be implemented through cost-sharing with the CI-Norad and WWF/FFEM projects.

3.D Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs)

131. In line with the Minamata Convention, this project will address the harmful impacts of mercury use caused primarily by ASGM operators in Guyana. The project will yield reductions in mercury use and emissions of about 15 metric tons, thus protecting terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity and ecosystems. By addressing the impacts of mining through a sustainable development approach and incentives based on community needs, the likelihood of success is much greater than past efforts that relied too heavily on “top down” approaches or technological fixes with inadequate consideration of the needs of miners and communities.
132. The exact amount of mercury used in Guyana is unknown. Using a mercury flow approach to estimate use, McRae (2014) estimated that 35.92 metric tons of mercury was used in 2013. An end of project target of just less than 50% of this figure has therefore been used. It is acknowledged that a more accurate assessment of mercury use is needed, requiring a revision of this target (McRae, 2014). Through the dissemination efforts of the GOLD Programme within the country, it is expected that the reduction target will be doubled during the three (3) years following the GOLD Programme, recognizing that such a target is in keeping with the country commitments under the Minamata Convention while appreciating the complexities in replication of techniques.

133. With the co-financing from the Norad project, this project will conduct trials of new exploration technologies aimed at improving efficiency in the mining industry while bringing together miners and forestry personnel to reduce unnecessary forest loss. This will be a significant benefit of the project since Guyana’s ASGM sector is associated with lack of formal exploration (ore reserve estimation) and mobility. The lack of formal exploration leads to a level of uncertainty that results in difficulty in arranging financing, and experimentation with new mining technologies. The effect is the indiscriminate clearing of forests, the consequences of which are increased severity in deforestation and environmental degradation. Along with deforestation, negative impacts of mercury pollution include root damage in plants and changes to the soil microbial community, leading to slower primary production. This project will reduce these negative impacts by reducing mercury use.

3. E Socio-Economic Benefits

134. The GEF project is designed for implementation within the context of a wider CI-Guyana Responsible Mining Initiative, namely, “El Dorado Gold: Responsible Mining in Guyana”, which includes the project, Arresting the Drivers of Deforestation in Guyana and Peru. Through this initiative a wide range of stakeholders in the ASGM sector are engaged in processes to design policy, technological, financial and other solutions to ensure that:
   a. Gold mining activities are only carried out in places where viable deposits are located;
   b. Effective integrated planning is implemented to reduce the impact of exploitation on forests and fresh water as well as improve the livelihood impact of the sector;
   c. More efficient methods are employed to improve the recovery of gold from ore and phase out the use of mercury;
   d. Markets are established for ASGM gold and gold products certified to have been produced responsibly; and
   e. Mining sites are rehabilitated for planned after-use.

135. From the perspective of the expected socio-economic benefits, the goal is to maximize the positive effects of the project on the lives of people while minimizing the negative effects. These effects are expected to be reflected in the impact on present and future generations of men and women miners, jewelers, and their families. The gold-mining sub-sector is the main source of employment and revenue for many hinterland communities, including indigenous communities, and provides direct employment to coastland residents, many of whom are youths that would be otherwise unemployed.

136. In addition, considerations must also be given to environmental outcomes linked to expected reduction of mercury use in the gold-mining sub-sector, and the impact this is expected to have on health and safety. Indigenous men and women, and especially children and pregnant women, will benefit from reduced mercury exposure in their environment.
The project will ensure that men and women miners, but especially women given their roles in managing health and nutrition in the household, will be equipped with socio-culturally sensitive knowledge to advocate for mercury-free technologies. Women may have an influential role on miners within their households if they understand the adverse and severe impacts on health and development of children.

137. Men and women miners will also benefit from financing to shift to mercury-free, with special measures to ensure equal opportunity to access financing. Further, the GEF project will engage business enterprises and actors across the gold mining sector to adopt improved practices to reduce pressure on forests and to shift away from mercury use.

138. By introducing and promoting mercury-free technologies, this project will support the ASGM sector, and by extension several other livelihoods that depend upon the sector; including service industries such as trucking, ground and aircraft transportation, equipment suppliers, security firms, farming, surveying and other professions. This expected socio-economic benefit must be viewed against the backdrop of GoG ratification of the Minamata Convention in September 2014. This has significant implications for Guyana’s ASGM sector which extensively uses mercury in the process of recovering gold. The sector employs about 15,000 workers, directly supports about 30,000 persons, and is critical to the well-being of a sizeable portion of Guyana’s population (NAP, 2016). The phasing out of mercury without an acceptable alternative for the ASGM sector to recover gold will put at risk a significant proportion of the population that depends, both directly and indirectly, upon the sector to sustain their livelihoods.

139. With co-financing from the Norad project, the project will establish three (3) model multi-stakeholders management plans using a Sustainable Landscape Approach. These plans are expected to be a departure from the current and past approaches that focus exclusively on compliance with the law to maintain environmental integrity. The landscapes within which gold-mining takes place have several actors and livelihoods—miners, loggers, established or nascent indigenous communities and other human settlements. The multi-stakeholder management plans will assist in resolving resource use conflicts in Guyana’s hinterland areas where gold mining prevails. The goal of the sustainable landscape approach is to mobilize the people within these landscapes to cooperate and work closer together to sustain their livelihoods, concurrent with effective stewardship of the natural capital on which they all depend. A sustainable landscape approach is a conscious, deliberate effort for managing natural capital use, by optimizing the spatial relations and interactions among a range of land cover types, institutions, and human activities in an area of interest.

140. Currently, the gold mining practices in the Guyana’s ASGM sector only recover about 25-30 percent of gold from ore using the present technologies. It is expected that, with this project’s intervention with mercury-free technologies, mining operators will improve recovery rates by 65 percent, and decreased mercury emissions by 80 percent.

141. Finally, Guyana’s economy has traditionally been based on primary production with very limited processing and value-addition. This project offers a timely opportunity for value-addition to gold through production of branded gold-jewelry based on responsibly-mined gold (mercury-free, meeting environmental and social safeguards, yielding improved recovery rates, reduction emissions, and improving livelihoods). Guyana’s long-established jewelry sector includes seven (7) major jewelry manufacturing houses that produce jewelry for local use and export. Through the activities of Component 3 of this project, it is expected that Guyana’s branded El Dorado Gold Jewelry will become a pathway to transform a predominantly primary commodity into one with significant value-addition in the form of design (taking advantage of motifs inspired by diverse and rich cultural heritages of the
Indigenous Peoples, Hindu, Muslim, and African Guyanese population), responsibly mined gold, and access to international markets.

3.F Risk Assessment and Mitigation

142. The risks identified during the PPG phase and their mitigation measures are presented in the Table 1 below. Although there are risks to project implementation, these do not pose a significant threat to success.

Table 1: Identified Risks and Mitigation Measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Outcome</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Risk Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1:</td>
<td>Few miners adopt mercury-free practices and technologies as a result of project interventions</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>Ensure a full market systems approach to alternative livelihoods. Tie the El Dorado Gold brand and the project closely to Guyana’s commitment under the Minamata Convention, demonstrating that the project provides real and tangible support to the ASGM sector to participate effectively with GoG on the implementation of the convention’s commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1:</td>
<td>GGDMA and GWMO do not engage and contribute to the project in its execution</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Extend existing memorandum of understanding between the GGDMA and CI-Guyana to include activities under this project. Establish a memorandum of understanding with GWMO. Partner with the GGDMA in the project preparation phase. Engage with any new executive body of the organizations at the earliest opportunity to secure their continued commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2:</td>
<td>Government does not establish or capitalize the financing mechanism</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>The project includes the government in the Project Steering Committee which will help build ownership for the project and advocacy for the establishment of the financing mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3:</td>
<td>The Guyana Gold Board does not distinguish mercury-free from mercury gold</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>Differentiate mercury-free gold through branding, and highlight for peer recognition, those miners who opt to participate in the El Dorado branding exercise. Participants would also be prioritized for training and exposure to practices and technologies. Branding will...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and institutionalized. specify how gold is produced and highlight its responsible history. Branding will act as a signal to consumers that more of the revenue from gold sales goes to support gold miners who practice responsible mining.

| Outcome 4.: By the end of the project, a national policy on responsible gold production and value added and requisite laws/regulations are refined/drafted to support a responsible gold commodity chain | Sustainability of the project outcomes is unrealized at a landscape level | Moderate | Build on CI’s long history of success in multi-stakeholder processes, with a focus on “bottom up” solutions from miners and communities as the basis of all project interventions.
Take an approach of building from points of agreement in order to address more complex issues. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 6.: A strategic communication plan and materials targeting key stakeholders, including miners, decision makers, and other local and international actors within the supply chain for awareness raising and policy advocacy are developed and implemented.</td>
<td>Lessons learnt do not reach target audiences</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Build on CI’s long history of engagement at the international level in climate change and nature conservation. Further, the GEF GOLD programme is deliberately designed (separate child project) to provide opportunities for sharing of lessons learned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Outcome 6.: A strategic communication plan and materials targeting key stakeholders, including miners, decision makers, and other local and international actors within the supply chain for awareness raising and policy advocacy are developed and implemented. | Brazilian miners who are legally working in Guyana undermine successful execution of project activities | Moderate | Ensure the project includes Portuguese language communications (and other relevant languages).
Engage the Brazilian Miners Association. |
| All outcomes | Climate change | Low | The project will track changes in the environment due to climate change impacts and adapt the project accordingly. |
3.G Sustainability

143. According to the 27th UNEP Governing Council (decision 27/12), the Council noted that the three (3) components of an integrated approach to Chemicals and Waste are: (1) mainstreaming; (2) industry involvement; and (3) dedicated external financing. The project supports the leveraging of resources from the private sector and government to contribute to greater progress to eliminate and reduce harmful chemicals and waste. The project addresses all three (3) of these components and adds policy formulation to cement sustainability of the project’s results.

144. Component 4 on the development of national policies and laws/regulations to support mercury-free gold will facilitate sustainability of the project’s impacts. The education and awareness activities across stakeholders on options and benefits of responsible gold production is also key to enhance buy-in for a sustainable responsible gold value chain, and in the longer term, certification in Guyana. The establishment of a financing mechanism and the direct engagement with the private sector and businesses along the supply chain will also provide critical support for the sustainability of this project.

145. In addition, Component 4 involves building the capacity of the Compliance Division of the MNR to better understand and implement integrated natural resources management and to contribute to policy creation and implementation of relevant laws and policies. This process will allow the MNR to strengthen their institutional capacity to coordinate (internally and externally) and execute their mandate, resulting in a better managed natural resources sector.

146. By using a sustainable landscape approach, the project will avoid a predetermined unidirectional pathway. By enabling stakeholder participation and a well-structured and facilitated dialogue from the design stage of the process, a diversity of perspectives and potential solutions will be tabled resulting in a more holistic and robust intervention logic implemented. This will help to build confidence among stakeholders, increase buy-in and reduce conflict and thus improve likelihood of success through reducing costs overall. This holistic approach will support Guyana’s efforts to achieve its commitment to the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) process. The main SDGs that the project will be contributing to are SDG 3 (Good Health and Well-Being), SDG 6 (Clean Health and Water), SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production), SDG 13 (Climate Action), SDG 14 (Life Below Water), SDG 15 (Life on Land), 16 (Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions) and SDG 17 (Partnerships for the Goals).

147. This project takes a market systems approach to mainstreaming mercury-free mining in Guyana’s sustainable development efforts. The El Dorado Gold branding scheme will be aligned with international certification standards, and through this will serve as a pathfinder for international mercury-free gold markets as they emerge with the implementation of the Minamata Convention commitments globally. The sustainability is therefore not only in relation to the results of the project, but to the sustainability of the ASGM sector, an important part of the Guyanese society.

3.H Innovativeness

148. The project will address the shortcomings of previous approaches to addressing mercury use in Guyana’s mining sector. This is exemplified by ensuring that the profit motivations and livelihood considerations of various stakeholders in the mining supply chain are understood and a supply chain wide approach is adopted to incentivize good practices in the sector. Opposed to previous “top down” approaches, the project will base its
interventions on the socio-economic needs of miners and communities, addressing the
impacts of mining through the lens of sustainable development.

149. The project will address the acute issue of inadequate financing in support of mercury-free
technologies, especially for the ASGM sector, through the establishment of a finance
mechanism for investments in the same. In this respect, the project will support a financial
mechanism, such as the MFMDF. Key to unlocking finances is research on appropriate
technologies for Guyana and the development of robust systems for their effective
operationalization.

150. There has been insufficient focus on private sector involvement which is required for
transformational change. This includes historical exclusion of components of the value
chain, in particular gold producers, equipment retailers and fabricators, goldsmiths and
jewelers, and licensed gold buyers and exporters. This project includes measures to directly
target the full value chain.

3.I Replicability and Potential for Scaling Up

151. This project is designed to be scaled up, demonstrating impact in one of the ten regions in
Guyana, which will showcase operators producing gold meeting environmental and social
safeguards, realizing improved recovery rates, and decreasing mercury emissions. The
selection of the test region was based on criteria developed through consultation with
partners. The model developed in this test region can be adopted in other regions, as
business enterprises continue to reach more markets for responsible gold and El Dorado
Gold Jewelry.


152. After ratifying the Minamata Convention on Mercury in 2014, Guyana began to develop a
regulatory framework, strategy, and National Action Plan (NAP) for the phasing out of
mercury. This project will focus on developing and testing the models to inform their
refinement and implementation. It will inform and be shaped by the policy and regulatory
framework being developed by the government with the support from WWF and UNDP. The
project will closely evaluate the objectives and mercury reduction targets of the NAP, review
the stated strategies, and work with the government to ensure that the project activities are
consistent with the road map defined in the NAP.

153. Guyana’s NAP for the elimination of mercury intends to create a “mercury-use profile that
meets the terms, goals and objectives of the Minamata Convention within 10 years”. The
government’s 10-year implementation of the Minamata Convention is set to begin in 2018.
The primary objective of the NAP is to reduce mercury use by 55 percent in five years, and
eliminate its use in ten years. A secondary goal is increasing the efficiency of ASGM miners.

154. The project is consistent with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP).
The NBSAP identifies mercury use as a key issue in the mining sector and reports significant
impacts on freshwater resources in both urban and rural areas where surface water quality
is under serious stress because of mining and other activities. The NBSAP cites elevated
levels of mercury in sediments in parts of the Potaro River Basin with apparent origins in
gold mining activities. The NBSAP points to the adoption of innovative technologies as an
opportunity to address mercury related issues and reduce threats to the environment.
Guyana’s Third NBSAP for the period 2012-2020 identified gold mining as a growing industry
that threatens Guyana’s environment and biodiversity, due to chemical use and the removal
of trees and soil.
155. The project is consistent with the country’s national Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS) and Guyana Green State Development Strategy, which seek to create added value in supply chains, and increase the flow of benefits to resource owners whilst maintaining ecosystem integrity. Through this process, there will be less pressure on and loss of natural capital from short-term livelihood activities, hence reducing ecosystem loss while increasing human wellbeing. It also supports the government’s policy to decentralize decision making to regions, through “Plans of Actions for Rural Development” which is being led by the Ministry of Communities. Through these ‘Plans,’ regions are expected to take greater responsibility for management of their resources and create livelihood enhancing activities.

156. This project will contribute to the fulfillment of Guyana’s Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) submitted to the UNFCCC, which speaks to the implementation of awareness and incentive programmes to improve the efficiency of technologies and practices in the mining industry, including addressing inefficient mercury-based technology.

157. The project is consistent with Guyana’s Aligned National Action Plan to Combat Desertification, which identified gold mining as a threat leading to pollution and land degradation. The plan aims to ensure that mining is sustainably managed in a manner that maintains ecosystem productivity and ecological functions while promoting environmental protection, economic growth and livelihoods.

158. Guyana’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper II (2011-2015) describes the country’s macroeconomic, structural and social policies and programs that promote broad-based growth and reduce poverty. The Strategy is built on five pillars: a) broad-based low carbon led job-creation, economic growth; b) stronger governance, institutional and regulatory structures; c) accelerated investments in human capital and primary health; d) accelerated investments in physical infrastructure in support of the growth strategy; and e) special intervention programmes to address regional and demographic pockets of poverty.

159. Guyana’s approach to sustainable development is outlined in the National Development Strategy and the Green Development Plan (Bynoe, 2012). The Green Development Plan was launched in 2009 as the LCDS to promote economic development while at the same time minimizing impacts of climate change. Since the LCDS placed emphasis on climate change, this strategy has the unintended consequence of de-leveraging interest and commitment to other priority issues that are not directly related to climate change. The National Development Strategy, first developed in 1997, revised in 1999 and updated in 2001 outlines the developmental priorities of and challenges to Guyana’s economic and social development. The overall objectives of the strategy are: a) to attain the highest rate of economic growth that is possible; b) to eliminate poverty; c) to achieve geographical unity; d) to attain an equitable geographical distribution of economic activity; and e) to diversify the economy (Government of Guyana, 2001).

3.K Consistency with GEF Focal Area and/or Fund(s) Strategies

160. The GEF provides financial resources to support the Minamata Convention and to help countries reduce the prevalence of harmful chemicals and waste. This project aligns with the GEF’s Chemical and Waste Focal Area, Chemical and Wastes (CW) Strategic Objective 2: “Reduce the prevalence of harmful chemicals and waste and support the implementation of clean alternative technologies/substances”; and Program 4: “Reduction or elimination of anthropogenic emissions and releases of mercury to the environment.”

161. The project will contribute to reducing exposure of humans and the environment to mercury through (1) support for determining mercury-free technologies that are suitable for Guyana and (2) to enable the financial, institutional, public/private policy frameworks needed to
catalyze holistic and transformative change. The project will directly address the reduction and elimination, where feasible, of mercury in the ASGM sector through outreach on options and support for adopting mercury-free technologies. The GEF-6 Tracking Tool in Appendix 4 defines focal area targets that the project intends to meet.

### 3.1 Linkages with other GEF Projects and Relevant Initiatives

162. As mentioned above, this project will directly coordinate with the Norad funded project, Addressing the drivers of deforestation in Guyana and Peru, which is already in implementation stage.

163. Another relevant project is the GEF-funded project (UNDP), Minamata Initial Assessment for Guyana, which is undertaking activities to help Guyana implement the Minamata Convention on Mercury. It is the intention to access a full-sized project after this project is completed. The two components of this project are: a) create an enabling environment for decision-making regarding the implementation of the Minamata Convention; and b) develop a national mercury profile and a mercury initial assessment report. Environmental awareness raising activities are also part of the project. This CCCD project will explore opportunities to build on these activities to achieve synergies, such as jointly organizing awareness raising activities.

164. The GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) in Guyana serves as a natural partner, with chemicals being one of its focal areas. Within this focal area of the SGP there is specific emphasis on, among others, reducing mercury use and exposure in ASGM, increasing local awareness and developing alternative methods for gold mining that do not use mercury. Further, the defined landscapes identified in GEF SGP Country Programme Strategy align with the demonstration sites in Regions 8 and 9. CI and SGP can join efforts in preventing, reducing and eliminating mercury use in ASGM. Specifically, the proposed collaboration can focus on the following activities: a) the piloting and replication of demonstrative mercury-free mining technologies; b) capacity development, training and local awareness; and c) government – civil society – private sector dialogues.

165. An additional related project is the GEF/UNDP, Enhancing Biodiversity Protection through Strengthened Monitoring, Enforcement and Uptake of Environmental Regulations in Guyana’s Gold Mining Sector. The objective of this project is to improve monitoring and implementation of biodiversity-friendly practices in gold mining to protect biodiversity and maintain ecosystem functionality. So far, project activities have resulted in new communications, information technology, and audio-visual equipment to strengthen the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) capacities for monitoring and enforcement.

166. CI will collaborate with the UNDP project, Strengthening the enabling framework for small and medium-scale gold mining in Guyana and uptake of practices to reduce biodiversity loss, habitat loss, and mercury use, given the overlap between the UNDP and CI’s focus on: (1) policy and regulatory frameworks; and (2) promotion of good practices among miners for responsible mining. Additionally, CI will collaborate with the WWF project, Support for the gradual phase-out of Mercury in the Guianas.

167. CI will engage the UNDP and other partners supporting the sector to present the projects, to exchange ideas, and coordinate design and implementation to maximize complementarity and synergies and avoid duplication to fast track replication and amplification and strengthen impact toward informing policy and practice.
3.M Consistency and Alignment with CI Institutional Priorities

168. Conservation International is a US registered non-profit environmental organization, whose mission is to empower societies to responsibly and sustainably care for global biodiversity for the well-being of humanity. This is accomplished through building upon an existing foundation of science, partnerships, and field demonstration.

169. Along with being a Project Agency for the GEF, CI contributes funds and implements environmental projects around the world. In Guyana, CI is supporting forest conservation and low-carbon livelihoods. Specifically, CI is designing and piloting innovations for climate-resilient, sustainable business models for community tourism and agriculture. So far, 73 stakeholders from businesses, the private sector, NGOs communities, and financing institutions have participated. Overall, at least 23 community-based enterprises (or 42 percent of the region’s population) will directly benefit from the initiative.

170. CI-Guyana’s work is based on a core belief that people need nature; the organization’s strategy is to help Guyana pursue the conservation of nature as the foundation of development and as a means to measurably improve and sustain human wellbeing. CI-Guyana’s initiatives include efforts to raise environmental awareness, strengthen climate and environmental policies, support conservation planning, build human and other capacities for sustainable development, demonstrate integrated approaches to natural resource management, and conserve Guyana’s natural ecosystems and biodiversity. Specifically, the strategy recognizes the importance of:

a. Facilitating strong evidence-based means of monitoring performance, decision-making, and influencing changes in natural resource management that will build greater confidence in stakeholders and demonstrate good practices to the international community;

b. Supporting civil society to take a more active and strategic role in shaping policies for sustainable natural resource management;

c. Consolidating proofs-of-concept at a local and sub-national level that integrate natural resource management both at the sectoral and inter-sectoral level; and,

d. Establishing strategic relationships with partners involved in the management of the EEZ – a new frontier of economic development and which plays a major role in securing our mostly coastal population from high climate vulnerability.

3.N Communications and Knowledge Management

171. Mechanisms for knowledge management will be built around the stakeholder platforms that will be facilitated by the Norad-funded project mentioned prior. Experiences will also be shared between Peru and Guyana regarding sustainable gold certification. As the issue of mercury use in gold mining is a significant issue across the Guianas (Guyana, Suriname, and French Guiana), CI will take this opportunity to establish a conservation network across the Guianas that is already being considered by WWF, CI, Parc Amazonien de Guyane, and the governments of France, Guyana and Suriname to share information and build a knowledge resource database to ensure that findings from the project are disseminated.

172. This project has a dedicated and funded component for communications and knowledge management. Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention area, and engage with the global GEF GOLD project’s community of practice (part of the UNEP Live platform) to exchange lessons learned and best practices globally. Additionally, the project will identify and participate, where relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through lessons learned. Component 6 of the project explicitly allocates time and resources for documentation and dissemination of lessons learned. Moreover, by
3.0 Lessons Learned during the PPG Phase and from other relevant GEF Projects

173. Experiences and lessons will be documented for technical and non-technical audiences nationally and internationally to inform policy and practice.

174. During the PPG phase, a considerable amount of time and resources were devoted to the stakeholder engagement processes with the aim to share information about the project and to gather inputs for developing this GEF ProDoc. Through these various discussions and consultations, several lessons were learned and incorporated into the project design. First, stakeholders observed that the gold miners are amenable to change, but only if it could be demonstrated that such change would enhance their livelihoods. That is, if switching to mercury-free gold mining techniques and technology were to result in a significant increase in gold yields, then they would certainly pursue those alternatives. This is apparently not a difficult transition, made easier by local banks readily available to finance loans for the ASGM operators to access such technologies. This issue of sustaining livelihoods is a central motivation for miners (NAP, 2016).

175. Relatedly, a second lesson was the validation by stakeholders of the need for the project to straddle the objectives of environmental stewardship and sustainable livelihoods. This issue of sustaining livelihoods is a central motivation for miners and was most poignantly summarized by one miner on the issue of using mercury in the recovery of gold: “I prefer to use mercury now over a period of time, than not use it and not be able to eat today”, (NAP, 2016).

176. Thirdly, during the PPG phase it was observed that interest groups within the mining sub-sector were becoming more vocal and revealing their allegiances and political sensitivities and if not approached carefully, this would have made it difficult or even impossible to mobilize stakeholders whose support was critical for the successful implementation of the Norad and GEF projects. To address this challenge, CI-Guyana considered the need to engender a wider engagement with key stakeholders, give them a greater sense of ownership, and place them at the forefront of project activities. In this regard, CI-Guyana was proactive in getting the MNR to activate the Minamata Working Group to coordinate the agencies with programs involving mercury reduction and related mandates. Following this outcome, CI-Guyana organized three (3) stakeholders’ consultation meetings/workshops under the auspices of the Minamata Working Group.

177. Another finding was that despite the existence of seemingly open consultative mechanisms and engagement with relevant stakeholders, the sharing and understanding of information remains uneven. That is, it will be difficult to reach agreement on issues if there is no visibility or accountability related to the process, for example, if results of these consultation are not shared widely.

178. Previous approaches to addressing mercury in mining in Guyana have had a generally low degree of success. Lessons learned include: (1) these approaches largely failed to capture the relevance of profit motivations and broader impacts on livelihoods and did not take a supply chain-wide approach to incentivize good practices; (2) there was limited access to financial support for capital investment in such technologies; and (3) there was insufficient involvement of actual businesses with the profit incentive to lead a shift. There were four (4) components of the value chain that were not yet directly involved in the process: (i) large numbers of gold producers; (ii) equipment retailers and fabricators (fabricators play an integral role in the gold industry and have historically worked in partnership with miners to
develop and pioneer low cost technologies suitable for the local context); (iii) goldsmiths and jewelers who produce sought after Guyanese jewelry; and (iv) licensed gold buyers and exporters. These lessons can be related to use of “top-down” approaches, rather than to a more holistic response to the needs of miners and communities themselves that is cognizant of their overall livelihoods and circumstances. A holistic approach will also involve the integral but previously excluded components of the value chain.
SECTION 4: COMPLIANCE WITH CI-GEF PROJECT AGENCY’S ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK (ESMF)

4.A Safeguards Screening Results and Project Categorization

179. The screening process was conducted by the CI GEF Project Agency. The full results are presented in Appendix V and summarized in Table 3 below.

Table 2: Environmental and Social Safeguards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safeguard Triggered</th>
<th>Triggered (yes/no)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The safeguard screening review determined that the project’s activities will have no significant adverse environmental and social impacts that are sensitive, diverse, or unprecedented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Natural Habitats</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The safeguard screening review determined that the project is not proposing to alter natural habitats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Involuntary Resettlement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The project is not proposing restriction of access/use of natural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Indigenous Peoples</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project does plan to work in lands or territories traditionally owned, customarily used, or occupied by indigenous peoples. The project proposes to work in at least one indigenous community that is involved in mining but the specific community will be chosen in the project design phase through an objective criteria-driven selection process that will identify a shortlist of places. After this process is completed, the shortlisted communities will be consulted using CI's rights-based approach for working with indigenous and local communities prior to final selection. Within the chosen community(ies), the project will seek to test the use of non-mercury mining technologies and other measures to address the social and environmental impact of mining on the community. The project would therefore interface primarily with members of the community involved in mining but also include interaction with the community as a whole to assess and address the wider impacts of mining on the community. Women’s and men’s roles will be promoted during implementation of project activities to reinforce the important experiences and roles of both. The project complements CI-Guyana avoided deforestation project funded by Norad in which sustainable landscape plans (integrated natural resource management plans) will be developed. By design, these plans require building a multi-stakeholder process to design and implement initiatives. CI-Guyana implements CI’s Rights Based Approach in their engagement with stakeholders, especially indigenous communities. In the implementation of this project, full understanding of the community demographics and social stratification will be engendered, and representation of all identified subgroups in engagements will be secured. CI-Guyana’s protocols and processes for engaging indigenous communities are well-established and tested. The project will ensure that the chosen community(ies) fully understand the details and...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
implications of the project and are able to consent to their participation in the project.

CI-Guyana has valuable networks and is cognizant of political and social dynamics that may exist within traditional governance structures that must be acknowledged and managed in order to effectively engage with communities. This includes awareness of the fact that village leadership is not always representative of the views of the entire community. This will necessitate a robust and inclusive process to obtain FPIC to the project that ensure that the views of all are taken into consideration, including those sub-groups traditionally marginalized. Even as FPIC is obtained, efforts must be made to ensure that any potential harm that may be caused during implementation of the project (risks) are identified and measures to avoid, reduce, or mitigate these are developed.

Previous experience working within indigenous communities (with both men and women) and conducting post-evaluations have yielded valuable insights and lessons for this project (e.g. on the importance of translation services, culturally-sensitive communications materials, etc.). These will help to shape the project’s strategy and plan for engaging with indigenous peoples. Our approach to consultation will respect FPIC and thus be culturally sensitive. This means that communities will have the opportunity to negotiate how they would like to participate in, and benefit from the project. The social baseline assessments to be done under the Norad-funded project plus the one under this project will also inform the design of project activities that provide culturally appropriate benefits for Indigenous Peoples. The project governance mechanism will include indigenous institutions that will represent the interests of their constituents at a higher level of project planning, implementation, and oversight to ensure fair and appropriate benefits.

The NTC will participate on a project steering committee which will provide oversight for the project design and implementation. During the PPG phase, the NTC and other indigenous institutions will be engaged to participate in developing the full proposal and a stakeholder engagement plan will be designed and implemented during the project to ensure participatory decision-making.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Pest Management</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There are no proposed activities related to pest management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Physical &amp; Cultural Resources</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There are no proposed activities related to physical and cultural activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stakeholder Engagement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The project is required to engage stakeholders. While the project will engage with a range of stakeholders, there are five groups that are key to achieving the project’s outcomes: the GGDMA, the GWMA, the GGMC, the NTC, and the MNR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The **GGDMA**: The GGDMA is partner to CI-Guyana under the Norad-funded *Addressing Drivers of Deforestation in Guyana and Peru* (AdoD) project, and thus essential to planning and implementing the project to enhance synergies and complementarity. The GGDMA sits on the Project Steering Committee (PSC) of the AdoD project and represents the industry. The role of the GGDMA is to ensure that the interests of its constituency is represented in the planning and implementation of the project. At a meeting with the GoG on the GEF GOLD project the GoG through the MNR, the Department of
Environment, the EPA and the GGMC proposed that the GEF GOLD project also be overseen by the PSC with the request that for this project that the EPA participates as a member of the PSC.

The GGDMA has already been engaged and has provided guidance on the elaboration of the project concept. It will collaborate to ensure complementarity between this project and the ADoD project to address mining’s role in deforestation in Guyana, a project that also focuses on improving technologies, focusing on the private sector, reducing pressures on forests, biodiversity and ecosystems, and establishing financial and technical support mechanisms for small and medium scale miners. This project is intended to support the GGDMA to expand its reach to include smaller scale operations with less upfront capital to invest in better technologies.

The GWMO: The GWMO has been briefed on the concept. They will be further engaged to better understand the realities facing men and women in the ASGM sector, how they are similarly and dissimilarly impacted by mercury, and their roles in effective management of mercury within the sector. Engaging with the GWMO will also allow the project to identify gaps in understanding and prioritize any gender analyses necessary for designing equitable measures for addressing mercury. Engagement with the GWMO is also essential to support the institution’s legitimacy within the sector and to reaffirm the importance of ensuring gender dynamics are well understood and addressed. Under the Norad-funded project, a gender analysis will be conducted and close collaboration with the GWMO is critical. This gender analysis will inform the interventions of this project.

The GWMO focuses on the mining sector from both an economic and from a social perspective. The Organization sits on the PSC of the ADoD project and will be essential to ensuring the project is planned and implemented to result in net contributions to economic and social growth. The organization will represent the interests of miners, especially women miners, and women indirectly associated with the sector to ensure the project is sensitive to gender considerations.

The GGMC: The GGMC was engaged as the agency critical to the formulation of a national policy and regulatory framework to support sustainably sourced gold. The implementation of the project will be through a public-private partnership between CI, the GGDMA, and the GGMC. The GGMC is a government agency under the MNR. They sit on the PSC of the ADoD project.

The NTC: The NTC comprises elected Indigenous leaders across Guyana’s ten regions. The NTC also sits on the PSC of the ADoD project. They have been engaged on the project and have indicated their interest in contributing to ensure that the project represents their constituency’s critical interests. A strong relationship will provide learning opportunities for NTC leadership and foster a link between Indigenous Peoples and miners to create a more collaborative approach to resolving resource-based conflicts, promoting Guyana’s sustainable development agenda, and engendering shared understanding and support for improving national policy.

The MNR: The MNR is responsible for coordination, policy formulation, and overall oversight for the natural resources sector.
They have been briefed on the project concept and contributed to its submission to the GEF Council. They were further engaged to ascertain their role in the PPG Phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Gender mainstreaming</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The project is required to mainstream gender at all levels. The project will seek to fairly benefit men and women and seek to mitigate any negative impacts on them. Specifically, it will seek to understand the role of women and other often marginalized groups, such as children and Indigenous Peoples. A gender analysis conducted under the Norad-funded project will detail the social roles of men and women and the existing power, class, ethnic relations between and amongst them, establish baseline information, and inform this project. This project will support more detailed gender analyses required and pay close attention to the recent work of UNICEF in Guyana that focused on children and impacts of mercury. The purpose of the gender analysis and the integration of knowledge from UNICEF, the GWMO, and others is to (1) understand how impacts vary between men and women (2) ensure the project designs appropriate measures that address both men and women’s roles in management of mercury, (3) ensure that gender differences are well understood and communicated as part of the awareness raising component of the project, and (4) design a gender mainstreaming plan (GMP) with a monitoring and evaluation mechanism.

During the PPG phase, appropriate representation of men and women as well as organizations representing women and men within the sector in stakeholder engagement activities was sought.

The GWMO will participate on the PSC, having direct experience working on gender issues within the sector. They will participate in the overall planning, implementation, oversight, and monitoring of the project.

The EA will ensure that the project team is aware of the gender policy (and other relevant policies), design a GMP, and seek to institutionalize its implementation throughout the project across all partners. The plan will include actions that will yield fair and desired benefits to both men and women and avoid, minimize, mitigate, or offset any harm caused as appropriate. This may require drawing on gender expertise outside of the project team to develop and/or review the plan and the monitoring and evaluation of the same.

The project in fact endeavors to ensure the rights of men and women are upheld within the sector. The gender analysis conducted will assess the risk of human rights infringement and serve as the basis for designing the GMP.

Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that “everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family”. This project aims to improve livelihoods through enhanced efficiency of the mining sector. Producing responsible gold will enhance profits through enabling access to higher-value markets.

In designing interventions that benefit both men and women and enable equitable access to benefits from projects, the empowerment of women can sometimes lead to conflicts between men and women.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Accountability and Grievance Mechanisms</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As a public funded GEF project, a Grievance Mechanism is required. There are two levels of potential conflict. First, the sector as a whole is faced with many conflicting perspectives and there is little appetite for resolution at this stage. Progress in resolution is expected to be built in increments, and must be driven by good, credible information and a process by which such information can be debated and discussed towards reaching agreement on the future of the sector. This is perhaps the fundamental work before us in the two projects that are to be run together. An important element for this kind of conflict resolution lies with the PSC that has been set up for the ADoD Project. It will also provide oversight for the GEF GOLD Project. The PSC will make decisions by consensus. Its responsibilities include provision of issue resolution on matters raised by the Project Lead and Project Team, facilitate relationship building and communications between stakeholders, ensure that the broader community and stakeholders’ reactions and concerns are being addressed, communicate the perspectives of the members’ organizations and constituents, provide high level monitoring, attempt to anticipate potential problems and offer options for resolving them. The PSC currently meets once a month and this frequency will be revised as appropriate. Additionally, local and national stakeholder platforms formed under the ADoD Project will be asked to resolve problems based on objectively generated information. This process is expected to build trust and confidence in a sector characterized by poor relationships between stakeholders. It will be driven by a commitment to discussion and opinions that can be measured against objective information. These platforms will meet on a regular basis and will be an important mechanism to also raise recommendations for policymakers.

- This is a risk that will require mitigation, and is best managed through (1) ensuring the all multi-stakeholder processes are designed to be gender-sensitive and responsive, (2) effective outreach and awareness raising on the role of both men and women in improving the prosperity of households and communities and (3) ensuring both genders contribute to the design of project interventions and are both enabled to access fair benefits from the project.

Results of the gender analysis will be used to understand the roles and power dynamics and other interacting forces to define a GMP that promotes socially appropriate and context appropriate actions to avoid, reduce, and/or mitigate any potential conflicts.

The gender analysis will identify how men and women may be disadvantaged or negatively impacted by the project’s activities and interventions will be designed to address the same. For example, if measures are not taken to ensure men’s and women’s fair access to participation in and benefits of the project, women are likely to be excluded.

The PPG phase will ensure that gender is mainstreamed throughout the full proposal, wherever relevant, including mainstreaming of gender equality and equity principles. The process to mainstream gender within the PSC and among project partners will be supported by the project’s GMP.
The second type of conflict lies in complaints that may arise during project execution as a result of differences in perspectives, or failure of the EA or partners to address a particular matter in a fair and accountable manner. It is expected that the PSC and stakeholder platforms will create an enabling environment to address these complaints. A mechanism will also have to be set up for persons to be able to lodge such complaints without concern of victimization, and a mechanism will be considered for establishment of an independent complaints committee that will be accessible to all stakeholders.

Finally, CI’s Environmental and Social Management Framework will be presented to the PSC and elements of it, especially as it relates to stakeholder engagement and accountability and grievance mechanisms. Copies of the Framework will be provided to members of the PSC, and a summary document will be disseminated to participants of the stakeholder platforms for their information.

4.B Compliance with Recommendations

180. A screening process was conducted by the CI GEF Project Agency during the PPG Phase. It was recommended that safeguard plans for Indigenous Peoples, Stakeholders Engagement and Gender Mainstreaming be developed during the PPG phase. The project has complied with this recommendation. The screening process also required an Accountability and Grievance Mechanism in place to ensure enforcement of CI’s ESMF policies and provide for the receipt of, and timely response and resolution of complaints from parties affected by the CI-GEF project.
SECTION 5: IMPLEMENTATION AND EXECUTION ARRANGEMENTS FOR PROJECT MANAGEMENT

5.A Project Execution Arrangements and Partners

181. The project will be executed by CI-Guyana, the Executing Agency, which will be accountable to the CI-GEF Project Agency for the GEF funding it receives under the project. Other co-executing partners are the GGDMA and the GGMC. The implementation of the project will be through a public-private partnership between CI, GGDMA, and GGMC.

182. The project will include strong partnerships, developed during the PPG phase and in close collaboration with the Norad-funded project, “Addressing the drivers of deforestation in Guyana and Peru”. In addition, there is a natural partnership with the GEF SGP being implemented in Guyana with its Programme having a direct focus on reducing the use of mercury in the ASGM sector. Other main partners include the wider GoG and key civil society groups, such as the GGDMA, NTC, GWMO, and GGMC. These special interest stakeholders of the private sector, the indigenous peoples and women miners, and the government, are also represented on the PSC.

183. The GGDMA represents miners from all mining districts in Guyana. The Association is already collaborating with CI to ensure complementarity between this project and a Norad-funded project to address the role of mining in deforestation in Guyana, a project that also focuses on improving technologies, focusing on the private sector, reducing pressures on forests, biodiversity and ecosystems, and establishing financial and technical support mechanisms for small and medium scale miners. This project is intended to support the GGDMA to expand its reach to include smaller scale operations with less upfront capital to invest in better technologies.

184. The NTC comprises elected Indigenous leaders from across Guyana’s ten regions. The NTC will be engaged to ensure that the project represents the Council’s constituency’s critical interests. A strong relationship will provide learning opportunities for NTC leadership and foster a link between indigenous peoples and miners to create a more collaborative approach to resolving resource based conflicts, promoting Guyana’s sustainable development agenda, and engendering shared understanding and support for improving national policy.

185. The GWMO is the largest women’s mining organization in the country and has representation in all mining districts of Guyana. The Organization’s continued engagement with the project will provide a better understanding of the realities facing men and women in the ASGM sector, how they are similarly and dissimilarly impacted by mercury, and their roles in effective management of mercury within the sector. Engaging with the GWMO will also allow the project team to identify gaps in understanding and prioritizing any gender analyses necessary for designing equitable measures for addressing mercury. Engagement with the GWMO is also essential to support the EA’s legitimacy within the sector and to reaffirm the importance of ensuring gender dynamics are well understood and addressed.

186. The project will partner with the GGMC, as the agency is critical to the formulation of a national policy and regulatory framework to support sustainably sourced gold. Additionally, the GGMC will be critical to this project due to its role in testing appropriate mercury-free technologies for Guyana’s gold mining sector.
5.B Execution Organizational Chart

187. The organizational chart for the project is shown in Figure 2. The Minamata Working Group oversees the implementation of all projects geared towards reducing and phasing out of mercury use in all sectors and is chaired by the Permanent Secretary of the MNR. The Working Group ensures synergies and coordination in initiatives related to mercury phase out.

188. The PSC provides oversight, advice and feedback, and issue resolutions to the EA and PMU for efficient and effective project implementation. Included in its role is that of advice and leadership; assistance in grievance resolution; communication; and high-level impact monitoring.

189. The EA will be accountable to the CI-GEF Project Agency for the GEF funding it receives under the project. The EA, led by the Executive Director is responsible for the achievement of the project outcomes and oversees the PMU.

190. The PMU is responsible for overall delivery of the project in accordance with the results framework (technical project delivery) and the administrative requirements under the Grant Agreement. The PMU comprises the Project Director, the Operations Manager and supporting staff. The Project Director will be responsible for the overall implementation of the project components and reporting, and manages the coordinators and consultants hired by the project. The Operations Manager oversees the finances of the PMU, prepares financial reports to meet donor requirements, ensures that procurement guidelines are followed, and directs financial audits.

Figure 2: Project Organizational Implementation Structure.
SECTION 6: MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN

191. Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established CI and GEF procedures by the EA’s project team and the CI-GEF Project Agency. The project’s M&E plan will be presented and finalized at the project inception workshop, and will include a review of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of project staff M&E responsibilities.

6.A Monitoring and Evaluation Roles and Responsibilities

192. The project EA, CI-Guyana, will be responsible for ensuring that the M&E activities are carried out in a timely and comprehensive manner. Specifically, CI-Guyana will be responsible for: (i) initiating and organizing the project inception workshop; (ii) preparing the report of the project inception workshop; (iii) reporting on in-process, quarterly and annual progress and implementation; and, (iv) documenting the lessons learned. The EA will also support and cooperate with the independent mid-term and end-of-project external evaluation exercises.

193. Key project executing partners, especially the GGDMA and GGMC in implementing the technological components of the project, as well as other partners and service contractors, will be responsible for providing information required for timely and comprehensive project reporting, including results and financial data, as necessary and appropriate.

194. The PSC will play a key oversight role for the project, with regular meetings to receive updates on project implementation progress, approve annual work plans, and provide technical guidance during implementation. Additionally, the Minamata Working Group, which coordinates efforts towards the implementation of the Minamata Convention (reducing and phasing out of mercury use) in Guyana, will provide continuous ad hoc oversight and feedback on project activities, especially those that relate to mercury use. This Working Group played a critical role in enlarging the stakeholder engagement process of this project during the PPG phase.

195. The CI-GEF Project Agency will play an overall assurance, backstopping, and oversight role with respect to M&E activities.

196. CI’s General Counsel’s Office will be responsible for contracting and oversight of the planned independent external evaluation exercises at the mid-point and end of the project.

6.B Monitoring and Evaluation Components and Activities

197. Table 4 provides summary outlines of the project’s M&E Plan, which will include the following components:

198. The Inception workshop: Within the first three months of the project, a project inception workshop will be held, involving the Executing Agency and the CI-GEF Project Agency, and in coordination with the GEF and UN Environment. The overarching objective of the workshop is to provide the project team and its partners with greater clarity and to take ownership of the project’s objectives and outcomes. The inception workshop will be used to detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of the CI-GEF Project Agency, the Executing Agency, and other executing partners.

199. Inception workshop report: The Executing Agency will produce an inception report documenting all changes and decisions made during the inception workshop to the project’s planned activities, budget, results framework, and any other key aspects of the project. The inception report should be produced within one month of the inception workshop as it will serve as a key input to the timely planning and execution of project start-up and activities.
200. **Project Results Monitoring Plan**: A Project Results Monitoring Plan has been developed by CI-Guyana, and includes the objective, outcome and output indicators, metrics to be collected for each indicator, methodology for data collection and analysis, baseline information, location of data gathering, frequency of data collection, responsible parties, and indicative resources needed to complete the plan. **Appendix III** presents a Table of the Project Results Monitoring Plan, which will help complete this M&E requirement.

**Table 3: Project M&E Plan Summary.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M&amp;E Components</th>
<th>Reporting frequency</th>
<th>Responsible parties</th>
<th>Indicative budget from GEF (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Inception Workshop</td>
<td>Within three months of signing of CI Grant Agreement for GEF Projects</td>
<td>• Executing Agency</td>
<td>4,500 + staff time and travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Inception Workshop Report</td>
<td>Within one month of inception workshop</td>
<td>• Executing Agency</td>
<td>Covered under personnel budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Project Results Monitoring Plan (Objective, Outcomes and Outputs)</td>
<td>Annually (data on indicators will be gathered according to monitoring plan schedule shown on Appendix III)</td>
<td>• CI-GEF Project Agency</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools</td>
<td>i) Project development phase; ii) prior to project mid-term evaluation; and iii) project completion</td>
<td>• Executing Agency</td>
<td>Covered under personnel budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Project Steering Committee Meetings</td>
<td>Semi-annually</td>
<td>• Executing Agency</td>
<td>Covered under personnel budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. CI-GEF Project Agency Field Supervision Missions</td>
<td>Approximately annual visits</td>
<td>• CI-GEF Project Agency</td>
<td>Covered under CI-GEF Project Agency budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Quarterly Progress Reporting</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>• Executing Agency</td>
<td>Covered under personnel budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Annual Project Implementation Report (PIR)</td>
<td>Annually for year ending June 30</td>
<td>• Executing Agency</td>
<td>Covered under personnel budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Project Completion Report</td>
<td>Upon project operational closure</td>
<td>• Executing Agency</td>
<td>Covered under personnel budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Independent External Mid-term Review</td>
<td>Within 90 days prior to or after project midpoint</td>
<td>• Independent consultant contracted by CI’s Internal Audit function.</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Independent Terminal Evaluation</td>
<td>Within 90 days before project end</td>
<td>• Independent consultant contracted by CI’s General Counsel's Office</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Lessons Learned and Knowledge Generation</td>
<td>One knowledge product per year</td>
<td>• Independent consultants contracted by Executing Agency</td>
<td>Covered under personnel budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Financial Statements Audit</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>• Executing Agency</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
201. The Project Results Monitoring Plan includes all indicators identified in the Safeguard Plans prepared for the project, viz., (i) A Gender Mainstreaming (Appendix VI.A); (ii) Indigenous People’s Safeguard (Appendix VI.B); (iii) A Stakeholder Engagement (Appendix VI); and (iv) Accountability and Grievance Mechanism (Appendix VI.D).

202. Baseline data: Any necessary baseline data that have not been collected during the PPG phase will be collected and documented by the Executing Agency, in consultation with relevant project partners, **within the first year** of project implementation.

203. 319. GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools: The GEF-6 Chemicals and Waste Tracking Tool has been completed and this tool will be updated at three points in time: within three months of the start of the grant; at the mid-point of the grant; and within three months of the end of the grant. A comparison of baseline and mid-point scores will inform the mid-term evaluation, while a comparison of baseline and final scores will inform the Terminal Evaluation.

204. PSC meetings: Meetings of the PSC will review and approve the project’s annual budget and work plans, discuss implementation issues, identify solutions and increase coordination and communication between key project partners. The PSC meetings will be recorded, and results adequately reported.

205. CI-GEF Project Agency field supervision missions: The CI-GEF Project Agency will conduct annual visits to project field sites based on the agreed schedule in the project’s Inception Report and annual work plan, to assess project progress. A Field Visit Report will be prepared by the CI-GEF Project Agency staff participating in the oversight mission, and will be circulated to the project team and PSC members within one month of the visit.

206. Quarterly progress reporting: The Executing Agency will submit quarterly progress reports to the CI-GEF Project Agency, including a budget follow-up and requests for disbursement to cover expected quarterly expenditures.

207. Annual Project Implementation Report (PIR): The Executing Agency will prepare an annual PIR to monitor progress. The PIR will summarize the annual project results and progress. A summary of the report will be shared with the PSC.

208. Final Project Report: The Executing Agency will draft a final report at the end of the project.

209. Independent external Mid-term Review: An independent Mid-term Review of the project will be undertaken within 90 days prior to, or after the mid-point of the grant term. The Mid-term Review will: (i) determine progress in achieving project outcomes; (ii) identify course correction if needed; (iii) highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and (iv) present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings and recommendations of the Mid-term Review will be incorporated into the design of the project to secure maximum project results and sustainability during the second half of project implementation.

210. Independent Terminal Evaluation: Within the last 90 days before the end of the project, an independent Terminal Evaluation will be conducted in accordance with CI and GEF guidance. The Evaluation will focus on the delivery of the results as reflected in the project’s results framework as initially planned, and any adjustments consequent upon the mid-term evaluation. The Executing Agency in collaboration with the PSC will provide a formal response to the findings and recommendations of the Terminal Evaluation.

211. The Terms of References for the evaluations will be drafted by the CI-GEF Project Agency in accordance with GEF requirements. The procurement and contracting for the independent evaluations will handled by CI’s General Counsel’s Office. The funding for the evaluations will come from the project budget as indicated at project approval.
212. Financial statements audit: A separate audit of the project’s records, accounts, and financial statements will be undertaken annually in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. The purpose of this external audit is to provide assurance on the project’s financial statements and in compliance with the donor’s external audit requirements.
SECTION 7: PROJECT BUDGET AND FINANCING

7.A Overall Project Budget

The project will be financed by a full-size GEF grant of US$2.75 million with a total of US$3.14 million in co-financing from CI, the GoG, and the WWF. A summary of the project costs is given in Tables 5 and 5 below. The project budget may be subject to revision during implementation. The detailed Project Budget is provided in Appendix VII.

Table 4: Planned Project Budget by Component.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Line</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
<th>Component 4</th>
<th>Component 5</th>
<th>Component 6</th>
<th>Component 7</th>
<th>Total US$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>91,856</td>
<td>290,190</td>
<td>42,553</td>
<td>87,416</td>
<td>46,619</td>
<td>88,780</td>
<td>79,966</td>
<td>728,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>88,100</td>
<td>158,700</td>
<td>218,600</td>
<td>35,100</td>
<td>91,620</td>
<td>90,600</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>693,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Meetings</td>
<td>40,918</td>
<td>122,743</td>
<td>46,463</td>
<td>78,799</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>123,834</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>412,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>147,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,123</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>169,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>44,689</td>
<td>154,634</td>
<td>24,327</td>
<td>50,389</td>
<td>21,911</td>
<td>91,149</td>
<td>25,416</td>
<td>412,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Grants</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>483,563</strong></td>
<td><strong>811,288</strong></td>
<td><strong>331,544</strong></td>
<td><strong>334,826</strong></td>
<td><strong>160,130</strong></td>
<td><strong>409,162</strong></td>
<td><strong>121,382</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,652,294</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Planned Project Budget by Year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Line</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Total US$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>156,108</td>
<td>190,457</td>
<td>193,679</td>
<td>188,138</td>
<td>728,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>190,500</td>
<td>287,400</td>
<td>154,900</td>
<td>60,900</td>
<td>693,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Meetings</td>
<td>53,790</td>
<td>168,158</td>
<td>150,851</td>
<td>39,977</td>
<td>412,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>162,923</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>169,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>83,880</td>
<td>126,830</td>
<td>118,848</td>
<td>83,216</td>
<td>412,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Grants</td>
<td>87,500</td>
<td>77,500</td>
<td>67,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>734,681</strong></td>
<td><strong>852,924</strong></td>
<td><strong>688,158</strong></td>
<td><strong>376,531</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,652,294</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.8 Overall Project Co-financing

214. The project will leverage co-financing funding from CI, the GoG, WWF, and other donors. These co-financing include:

   a. CI. This project has strong synergies with the Norad project that CI is currently implementing in Guyana. Co-financing from this project will total US$2 million.

   b. The GoG. CI-Guyana has a strong partner relationship with, and has been working very closely with the GoG. Co-financing from the GOG is expected to total US$649,600.00.

   c. The WWF. The WWF is currently designing a fully-funded project for reducing mercury use in the mining sector. The total co-financing from the WWF will total US$487,000.00.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX I: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Objective: To assist Guyana with converting to mercury-free mining by 2025 by directly involving business enterprises with a profit motive for leading the shift in the development of a mercury-free ASGM supply chain and downstream El Dorado brand jewelry.

Indicator(s):

a. Number of tons of Mercury reduced by end of project.
b. Number of Regions in Guyana in which mercury-free technologies have replaced the use of mercury in ASGM.
c. Number of financial mechanisms established and operational to facilitate the transition of mercury-free technologies in ASGM.
d. Number of chain of custody processes, verification mechanisms for gold, and El Dorado Branding Schemes developed and institutionalized.
e. Number of national polices and requisite laws/regulations in support of responsible gold production and value added in the gold commodity chain refined/drafted.

Expected Outcomes and Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 1: Appropriate mercury-free technologies mainstreamed in Guyana’s ASGM sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1.:</strong> By the end of the project, demonstrations established and mercury-free technology transferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1.1:</strong> Number of regions in Guyana where mercury-free technology has replaced the use of mercury in the ASGM sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1.2:</strong> Number of tons of Mercury reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of Project Target</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. No mercury-free technology in use in the ASGM sector in the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 35.92 metric tons of mercury being used (based on a mercury flow approach estimate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mercury-free technologies have replaced the use of mercury in at least one region of Guyana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reduction in mercury use of about 15 metric tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Outputs and Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.1.:</strong> Two sites for demonstrating mercury-free practices and technologies are established and functional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1.1.1:</strong> Number of sites demonstrating mercury-free practices and technologies established and functional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 1.1.1:</strong> Two (2) sites demonstrating mercury-free practices and technologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.2.:</strong> Mercury-free gold is produced from one Region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1.2.1:</strong> Number of landscape management plans developed to manage natural resources and catalyze mercury-free gold mining prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Outcomes and Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 1.2.1:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.3:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1.3.1:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 1.3.1:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1.3.2:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 1.3.2:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1.3.3:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 1.3.3:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Component 2: Mechanism for financing capital investments for Mercury-free technologies established and functional**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Outcome 2.:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Zero (0) long-term financing mechanisms for mercury-free</strong></th>
<th><strong>A financial mechanism to facilitate the transition of</strong></th>
<th><strong>Output 2.1.:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>By the end of the project, a financial mechanism for capital investments for mercury-free</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An assessment of financing mechanisms for artisanal, small-scale, and medium-scale miners to adopt mercury-free technologies is undertaken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Expected Outcomes and Indicators

| Technologies is established and functioning. **Indicator 2.1:** Number of financial mechanisms established and operational to facilitate the transition of mercury-free technologies in ASGM. |
|---|---|---|
| Project Baseline | End of Project Target | Expected Outputs and Indicators |
| Technology established. | Mercury-free technologies will be established and operational. | **Indicator 2.1.1:** Number of feasibility assessments completed on mechanisms for financing technologies appropriate to Guyana based on mechanisms tested around the world. **Target 2.1.1:** One (1) feasibility assessment completed on mechanisms for financing technologies appropriate for Guyana. **Output 2.2:** A financial mechanism for the procurement of mercury-free gold mining technology is established and functional. **Indicator 2.2.1:** Number of long-term financing mechanisms for mercury-free technology established and functional to access credit and financing for producers in model sites to be able to convert to non-mercury technology. **Target 2.2.1:** One long-term financing mechanism for mercury-free technology established and functional. |

## Output 3.: Markets established for branded mercury-free gold from Guyana

| Outcome 3.: By the end of the project, a chain of custody process, verification mechanism for gold and, an El Dorado branding scheme is developed and institutionalized **Indicator 3.1:** Number of chain of custody processes, verification mechanisms | Zero (0) chain of custody process verification mechanism and an El Dorado Green Gold Branding Scheme. The branding of El Dorado Gold has been shown to result in increased gold sales and revenues to artisanal and small-scale miners in Guyana. | **Output 3.1.:** Social and environmental standards, a chain of custody process, and a verification mechanism for El Dorado Gold, linked to the GEF Gold brand, is developed and institutionalized. **Indicator 3.1.1:** Number of chain of custody process verification mechanism for gold produced on model sites developed and an El Dorado Green Gold branding scheme developed that is linked to the GEF GOLD Brand. |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes and Indicators</th>
<th>Project Baseline</th>
<th>End of Project Target</th>
<th>Expected Outputs and Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for gold, and El Dorado branding schemes developed and institutionalized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target 3.1.1:</strong> One (1) chain of custody process verification mechanism and an El Dorado Green Gold branding scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Output 3.2:</strong> El Dorado producers are linked to international responsibly produced gold markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicator 3.2.1:</strong> Number of market systems analyses and feasibility studies for the establishment an institutional mechanism to trade El Dorado-branded gold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target 3.2.1:</strong> One (1) market systems analysis and feasibility study for an institutional mechanism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Component 4: National policies and incentives for mercury-free gold established**

**Outcome 4.:** By the end of the project, a national policy on responsible gold production and value added and requisite laws/regulations are refined/drafted to support a responsible gold commodity chain.

**Indicator 4.1:** Number of national polices and requisite laws/regulations in support of responsible gold production and value added in the gold commodity chain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes and Indicators</th>
<th>Project Baseline</th>
<th>End of Project Target</th>
<th>Expected Outputs and Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zero (0) national policy on responsible gold production and value added along the gold commodity chain.</td>
<td>At least one (1) national policy and attendant requisite laws/regulations in support of responsible gold production and value added in the gold commodity chain revised/drafted.</td>
<td><strong>Output 4.1.:</strong> Multi-stakeholder fora convened to provide input for the revision/drafting of a national policy for responsible ASGM gold mining and capacity built to ensure compliance with mining policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicator 4.1.1:</strong> Percentage of staff in the Compliance Division of the MNR whose capacity in integrated natural resource management has been increased and are able to contribute to policy creation and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target 4.1.1:</strong> Seventy-five (75) percent of the Compliance Division of the MNR has increased capacity in natural resource management, and are able to contribute to policy creation and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Outcomes and Indicators</td>
<td>Project Baseline</td>
<td>End of Project Target</td>
<td>Expected Outputs and Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gold commodity chain refined/drafted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 4.1.2:**
Number of multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism to provide policy and programme advisory services for the long-term adoption of mercury-free gold mining technologies established.

**Target 4.1.2:**
One (1) multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism for long-term adoption of mercury-free gold mining technologies.

**Indicator 4.1.3:**
Number of national policies for responsible ASGM gold mining revised/drafted.

**Target 4.1.3:**
One (1) national policy for responsible ASGM gold mining revised/drafted.

**Component 5: Monitoring and Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 5.:</th>
<th>Zero (0) M&amp;E programme for instituting mercury-free gold mining.</th>
<th>Monitoring and evaluation of the use of mercury in gold mining is institutionalized within the appropriate agencies.</th>
<th>Output 5.1.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By the end of the project, regular monitoring of project activities against targets and outcomes and management of risk will be done and reported on semi-annually against the Results Framework. Adaptations will be made based on monitoring reports.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A monitoring and evaluation programme for adaptive collaborative management for instituting mercury free mining instituted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 5.1.:**
Number of monitoring and evaluation reports on targets and

**Target 5.1.:**
One (1) M&E programme for instituting mercury-free gold mining.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes and Indicators</th>
<th>Project Baseline</th>
<th>End of Project Target</th>
<th>Expected Outputs and Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>outcomes in the Results Framework completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Component 6: Communications and Knowledge Management**

**Outcome 6.**
A strategic communication plan and materials targeting key stakeholders, including miners, decision makers, and other local and international actors within the supply chain for awareness raising and policy advocacy are developed and implemented.

**Indicator 6.1.**
Number of strategic communication plans and materials (e.g. policy papers, factsheets, videos, etc.) aimed at key stakeholders, including miners, decision-makers, and other actors within the supply chain for awareness raising and policy advocacy developed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes and Indicators</th>
<th>Project Baseline</th>
<th>End of Project Target</th>
<th>Expected Outputs and Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes in the Results Framework completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Output 6.1.**
A strategic communication plan prepared and implemented, and materials prepared (e.g. policy papers, factsheets, videos) aimed at key stakeholders, including miners, decision-makers, and other local and international actors within the supply chain for awareness raising and policy advocacy.

**Indicator 6.1.1.**
Number of strategic communications plans aimed at key stakeholders, within the ASGM supply chain for awareness raising, policy advocacy developed and implemented.

**Target 6.1.1.**
One (1) strategic and communications plan aimed at key stakeholders, within the ASGM supply chain for awareness raising, policy advocacy developed and implemented.

**Output 6.2.**
Biennial conference and annual dialogues organized to promote Project Findings and Responsible Gold Mining.

**Indicator 6.2.1.**
Number of education awareness material and activities to promote mercury-free gold mining technology nationally prepared and published.

**Target 6.2.1.**
One (1) fully funded education awareness program to promote mercury-free gold mining technology.

**Output 6.3.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes and Indicators</th>
<th>Project Baseline</th>
<th>End of Project Target</th>
<th>Expected Outputs and Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination with the global project on Knowledge Management activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicator 6.3.1:</strong> Number of documented lessons learned made available to the knowledge management platform within the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target 6.3.1:</strong> At least one (1) documented lessons learned made available to the knowledge management platform of the UN Environment Global Mercury Partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 6.4.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Output 6.4.:</strong> Education and awareness on options and benefits of responsible gold production and education targeting policy-makers to build national commitment to a sustainable responsible gold value chain in Guyana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indicator 6.4.1:</strong> Number of education and awareness plans targeting policy-makers and mining communities on benefits of responsible gold production gold value chain in Guyana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target 6.4.1:</strong> One (1) fully funded education awareness plan targeting policy-makers and mining communities builds commitments on benefits of responsible gold production gold value chain in Guyana.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX II: PROJECT TIMELINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome 1: By the end of the project, demonstrations established and mercury-free technology transferred.

Output 1.1: Two sites for demonstration mercury-free practices and technologies are established and functional.

Output 1.2: Mercury-free gold is produced from one Region.

Output 1.3: Mercury-free gold mining practices and technologies transferred to at least 80% of miners in Region 9 and 100% of mining operations in Region 8 are exposed to these practices and technologies.

Outcome 2: By the end of the project, a financial mechanism for capital investments for mercury-free technologies established and functioning.

Output 2.1: An assessment of financing mechanisms for artisanal, small-scale, and medium-scale miners to adopt mercury-free technologies is undertaken.

Output 2.2: A financial mechanism for the procurement of mercury-free gold mining technology is designed.

Outcome 3: By the end of the project, a chain of custody process, verification mechanism for gold and an El Dorado Branding Scheme is developed and institutionalized.

Output 3.1: Social and environmental standards, a chain of custody process, and a verification mechanism for El Dorado Gold, linked to the GEF Gold brand is developed and institutionalized.

Output 3.2: El Dorado producers are linked to international responsibly produced gold markets.

Outcome 4: A National policy on responsible gold production and value added and requisite laws/regulations are refined/drafted to support a responsible gold commodity chain.
**Output 4.1:** Multi-stakeholder fora convened to provide input for the articulation of a national policy for responsible ASGM gold mining.

**Outcome 5:** Regular monitoring of project activities against targets and outcomes and management of risk will be done and reported on semi-annually against the Results Framework. Adaptations will be made based on monitoring reports.

**Output 5.1:** Regular monitoring reports of project activities against targets and outcomes and management of risk will be prepared and reported on semi-annually against the Results Framework.

**Outcome 6:** A strategic communications plan and materials targeting key stakeholders, including miners, decision makers, and other local and international actors within the supply chain for awareness raising, policy advocacy is developed and implemented.

**Output 6.1:** A strategic communication plan prepared and implemented, and materials prepared (e.g. policy papers, factsheets, videos) aimed at key stakeholders, including miners, decision-makers, and other local and international actors within the supply chain for awareness raising, policy advocacy.

**Output 6.2:** Biennial Conference and Annual dialogues organized to promote Project Findings and Responsible Gold Mining.

**Output 6.3:** Coordination with the global project on Knowledge Management activities

**Output 6.4:** Education and awareness on options and benefits of responsible gold production and education targeting policy-makers builds national commitment to a sustainable responsible gold value chain in Guyana.
# APPENDIX III: PROJECT RESULTS MONITORING PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator s</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Location(^2)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Responsib le Parties</th>
<th>Indicative Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 1: Appropriate mercury-free technologies mainstreamed in Guyana’s ASGM sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Indicator 1.1:</td>
<td>Number of regions in Guyana where mercury-free technology has replaced the use of mercury in the ASGM sector</td>
<td>Count of regions where mercury-free technology has replaced the use of mercury</td>
<td>0 Region</td>
<td>Q1 &amp; Q2 of Y1</td>
<td>CI Project Team</td>
<td>Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Indicator 1.2:</td>
<td>Number of sites demonstrating mercury-free practices and technologies established and functional.</td>
<td>Count of sites demonstrating mercury-free practices and technologies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 sites</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>CI Project Team</td>
<td>Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 1.1.1:</td>
<td>Number of landscape management plans developed to manage natural resources and catalyse mercury-free gold mining prepared.</td>
<td>Count of landscape management plans Completed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Executing agency secretariat</td>
<td>Y1 and Y2</td>
<td>CI Project Team</td>
<td>Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 1.2.1:</td>
<td>Number of Mercury-free gold mining technologies identified and tested and adopted.</td>
<td>Count of number mercury-free technologies tested and adopted.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Executing agency secretariat</td>
<td>Y1, Y2 and Y3</td>
<td>CI Project Team</td>
<td>Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 1.3.1:</td>
<td>Number of technology Innovation Clinics organized with miners, fabricators, and equipment retailers to test and select suitable equipment for two sites.</td>
<td>Count of number of technology Innovation Clinics.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Demonstration Sites</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>CI Project Team</td>
<td>Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 1.3.2</td>
<td>Number of improved and tested centralized processing facility to determine the feasibility of mercury-free technologies.</td>
<td>Count of number of centralized processing facility improved and tested.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demonstration Sites</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>CI Project Team</td>
<td>Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 2: Mechanism for financing capital investments for Mercury-free technologies established and functional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Indicator 2.1</td>
<td>Number of financial mechanisms established and operational to facilitate the transition of mercury-free technologies in ASGM.</td>
<td>Count of number of financial mechanisms established completed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Executing agency secretariat</td>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>CI Project Team</td>
<td>Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 2.1.1</td>
<td>Number of feasibility assessments completed on mechanisms for financing</td>
<td>Count of number feasibility assessments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Executing agency secretariat</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>CI Project Team</td>
<td>Covered under Salaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
technologies appropriate to Guyana based on mechanisms tested around the world. completed on mechanisms for financing technologies.

| Output Indicator 2.2.1 | Number of long-term financing mechanisms for mercury-free technology established and capitalized to access credit and financing for producers in model sites to be able to convert to non-mercury technology. Count of long-term financing mechanisms for mercury-free technology established and capitalized. 0 | Landscape areas/ Demonstration Sites | Annual | CI Project Team | Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line |

**Component 3: Markets established for branded mercury-free gold from Guyana**

**Outcome Indicator 3.1** | Number of chain of custody process verification mechanism for gold produced and El Dorado Branding Scheme developed and institutionalized. Count of number of chain of custody process verification mechanisms formulated. 0 | Landscape areas/ Demonstration Sites | Annual | CI Project Team | Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line |

**Output Indicator 3.1.1** | Number of chain of custody process verification mechanism for gold produced on model sites developed and an El Dorado Green Gold Branding Scheme developed. Count of chain of custody process verification mechanism for gold produced on model sites developed and an El Dorado Green Gold Branding Scheme developed. 0 | Executing agency secretariat | Y2 & Y3 | CI Project Team | Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line |

**Output Indicator 3.2.1** | Number of market systems analyses and feasibility studies for the establishment an institutional mechanism trade El Dorado-branded gold. Count of market systems analyses and feasibility studies for the establishment an institutional mechanism trade El Dorado-branded gold. 0 | Executing agency secretariat | Annual | CI Project Team | Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line |

**Component 4: National policies and incentives for mercury-free gold established**

**Outcome Indicator 4.1** | Number of national polices and requisite laws/regulations in support of responsible gold production and value added in the gold commodity chain refined/drafted. Count of national polices and requisite laws/regulations in support of responsible gold production and value added in the gold commodity chain. 0 | Executing agency secretariat | Annual | CI Project Team | Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line |

**Output Indicator 4.1.1** | Number of staff in the Compliance Division of the MNR capacity built in integrated natural resource management, and being able Count of number staff in the Compliance Division of the MNR capacity 0 | Executing agency secretariat | Annual | CI Project Team | Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line |
to contribute to policy creation and implementation. built in integrated natural resource management, and being able to contribute to policy creation and implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Indicator 4.1.2</th>
<th>Number of multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism to provide policy and programme advisory services for the long-term adoption of mercury-free gold mining technologies established.</th>
<th>Count of number multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism to provide policy and programme advisory services for the long-term adoption of mercury-free gold mining technologies.</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Executing agency secretariat</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>CI Project Team</th>
<th>Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Component 5: Monitoring and Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Indicator 5.1</th>
<th>Number of monitoring and evaluation reports on targets and outcomes in the Results Framework completed</th>
<th>Count of number monitoring and evaluation reports on targets and outcomes in the Results Framework.</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Executing agency secretariat</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>CI Project Team</th>
<th>Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 5.1.1</td>
<td>Number of M&amp;E programme for instituting mercury-free gold mining established.</td>
<td>Count of number of M&amp;E programme for instituting mercury-free gold mining established.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Executing agency secretariat</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>CI Project Team</td>
<td>Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Component 6: Communications and Knowledge Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Indicator 6.1</th>
<th>Number of strategic communication plans and materials (e.g. policy papers, factsheets, videos, etc.) aimed at key stakeholders, including miners, decision-makers, and other actors within the supply chain for awareness raising and policy advocacy developed.</th>
<th>Count of number strategic communication plans and materials (e.g. policy papers, factsheets, videos, etc.) aimed at key stakeholders, including miners, decision-makers, and other actors within the supply chain for awareness raising and policy advocacy developed.</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Executing agency secretariat</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>CI Project Team</th>
<th>Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 6.1.1</td>
<td>Number of project launch and project results conferences convened.</td>
<td>Count of number project launch and project results conferences convened.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Executing agency secretariat</td>
<td>Project beginning and project end</td>
<td>CI Project Team</td>
<td>Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 6.2.1</td>
<td>Number of documented lessons learned made available to the knowledge management platform within the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership.</td>
<td>Count of documented lessons learned made available to the knowledge management platform within the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Executing agency secretariat</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>CI Project Team</td>
<td>Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 6.3.1</td>
<td>Number of education awareness material and activities to promote mercury-free goldmining technology nationally prepared and published.</td>
<td>Count of education awareness material and activities to promote mercury-free goldmining technology nationally prepared and published.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Executing agency secretariat</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>CI Project Team</td>
<td>Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Indicator 6.4.1</td>
<td>Number of education and awareness plans targeting policy-makers and mining communities on benefits of responsible gold production gold value chain in Guyana.</td>
<td>Count of number of education and awareness plans targeting policy-makers and mining communities on benefits of responsible gold production gold value chain in Guyana.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Executing agency secretariat</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>CI Project Team</td>
<td>Covered under Salaries and Benefits budget line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Location of data collection.
## APPENDIX IV: GEF TRACKING TOOL BY FOCAL AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>A supply chain approach to eliminating mercury in Guyana’s ASGM sector: El Dorado Gold Jewelry – Made in Guyana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Guyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF Agency</td>
<td>CI-GEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF PMIS #</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### [New tools and regulatory, and economic approaches]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Qualitative comments(^1) from the project team or the GEF Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.1.1: Number of demonstrated tools for mercury and waste issues(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.1.2: Prioritized list of actions for reducing/eliminating mercury and mercury containing waste</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.2: Number of technologies demonstrated, deployed and transferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note;
1. Please see introduction.

### [Enabling Activity]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Qualitative comments(^1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.1.1: Number and quality of initial assessment activities completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.2: Number of ASGM NAPs completed</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2.4: Number of baseline monitoring stations established and number of laboratories strengthened.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note;
1. Please see introduction.

### [Progress in MIA]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Status</th>
<th>Yes = 1  No = 0</th>
<th>Qualitative comments(^1) from the project team or the GEF Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIA coordinating mechanism in place(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes.
1. Please see introduction.
2. Include composition of the coordinating mechanism in the "comments" column.

### [Mercury reduction]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Quantity (tons)</th>
<th>Cost¹ ($ per ton)</th>
<th>Qualitative comments² ³ from the project team or the GEF Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project target</strong></td>
<td><strong>Achieved to date</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 4.1: Amount of Mercury reduced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details**

- Reduction and elimination of the use of mercury and mercury compounds in ASGM
- Reduction of emission and releases to the environment of mercury from ASGM and processing,
- Reduction and elimination of mercury from emissive sources⁴
- Reduction and elimination of mercury in the global trade including mercury in products
- Reduction, phase out or elimination of mercury used in certain industrial processes⁵
- Reduction of emission and release of mercury from mercury-containing wastes

Notes
1. Overall costs including packaging, transport, safe storage, and treatment or disposal as appropriate.
2. Please see introduction.
3. Provide information on disposal technology and whether in-country or abroad.
5. Chlor-alkali production, Acetaldehyde production in which mercury or mercury compounds are used as a catalyst, Vinyl chloride monomer production, Sodium or Potassium Methylate or Ethylate, and Production of polyurethane using mercury containing catalysts.

[Regional approaches in LDCs and SIDS]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Qualitative comments&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; from the project team or the GEF Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 6.1: The extent to which countries have successfully mainstreamed chemical priorities into national budgets&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 6.2: Number of regional/sub-regional level plans developed that account for chemicals and waste issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V: SAFEGUARD SCREENING FORM AND ANALYSIS

1. The CI-GEF Project Agency undertakes environmental and social safeguard screening of each proposed project to determine whether an ESIA is required and if so, the appropriate extent and type of ESIA (see Policy #1 and Appendix I for more details). The CI-GEF Project Agency classifies the proposed project into one of three categories, depending on the type, location, sensitivity and scale of the project and the nature and magnitude of its potential environmental and social impacts. The descriptions of the categories and lists of types of projects identified in Appendix I are meant to serve as guidance to proposal reviewers and are not meant to be exhaustive.

2. All proposed activities will undergo safeguard screening to determine eligibility under CI-GEF ESMF policies, the type of ESIA that they are subject to and if proposed project activities trigger any of the safeguards policies.

3. **The Executing Entity** is responsible for providing responses to each of the questions outlined in this form when submitting a PIF to the Project Agency for consideration.

4. **The Project Agency is responsible for conducting** all aspects of the safeguard screening process, from initiation to making the final decision on whether or not an ESIA is necessary and, if so, at what level along with whether a project-level plan is required if a safeguard is triggered.

### I. PROJECT DATA SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country: Guyana</th>
<th>GEF Project ID:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Title:</strong> A supply chain approach to eliminating mercury in Guyana’s ASGM sector: El Dorado Gold Jewelry – Made in Guyana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of the Executing Entity(ies):</strong> Conservation International-Guyana, Guyana Gold and Diamond Miners Association, Guyana Geology and Mines Commission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Project:</strong> 48 months</td>
<td><strong>Start date:</strong> January 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduction:** (location, main issues to be addressed by project)

The goal of the project is for Guyana to convert to mercury-free mining by 2025 by directly involving business enterprises and actors across the gold mining chain with a profit motive for leading the shift in the development of a mercury-free ASGM supply chain and downstream El Dorado branded jewelry.

The project will address the toxic effects of mercury to human and ecosystem health in Guyana through incentivizing the production of El Dorado gold, which is mined under responsible practices, including the use of alternatives to mercury. The simultaneous demonstration of emissions reductions and improved recovery rates realized under this project will have catalytic effects on policy and practice. As other operators become aware of available, affordable, and tested options, uptake is expected to increase. The demonstration of an integrated model to managing the gold mining supply chain within a low-emissions, Green Economy framework is expected to inform refinement of current policies and/or creation of policies that support national efforts toward green gold supply chains, including the introduction of incentives for local communities.

This project will help to create the system to operationalize financing for technology improvement as a viable business proposition which otherwise may not be easily accessible.
to the ASGM sector nor sustainable, and help to re-establish the government’s $5M Mercury-Free Mining Development Fund (MFMDF). The MFMDF was suspended in 2016 because there was little uptake by miners, which in part could have been a result of the same reasons for lack of success to introduce mercury-free technologies. Access to financing is a significant barrier for small and medium scale miners’ uptake of mercury-free technologies.

The project adopts innovative approaches. This includes support for bottom-up versus top-down approaches that are grounded by the practical challenges and priorities, including the profit and livelihood motive, faced by miners. The project proposes to focus on artisanal and smaller scale operators to fill an important gap in current initiatives to reduce dependence on mercury in the gold mining sector through robust policies, good practice, and access to financing. The project will also adopt a supply chain approach to ensure all actors of the gold value chain are engaged to lead the shift to mercury-free, including gold producers; equipment retailers and fabricators, goldsmiths and jewelers who produce sought after Guyana jewelry, and licensed gold buyers and exporters. Previous mercury-free initiatives focused on specific components of the value chain, and thus these actors have been traditionally excluded.

The project will focus on one of the ten administrative regions of Guyana and select two sites for demonstrating responsible mining. The two sites will include an established mining area and a titled indigenous village where indigenous producers are mining for gold and diamonds.

The selection of the Region and model sites must be informed by multi-stakeholder consultation and the design and application of criteria for selection. Engagements during the PPG phase will assist here.

**Project Background:** (description of physical, biological and socioeconomic context, including Indigenous Peoples and reference to how gender may play a role)

**Socioeconomic context**

The gold mining sector is a significant driver of economic growth in Guyana, yet presents challenges to the national Low Carbon Development Strategy and Green Economy growth path of the country. This is largely because of the asymmetry between the low carbon and green growth policy directions and current public and private policy that has yet to incorporate the same. Overall, the participation of the private sector in green growth has been lagging in Guyana, though recent commitments to responsible mining and reducing deforestation by the GGDMA signals a shift in a positive direction.

The small and medium scale gold mining (ASGM) sector in Guyana plays an important role in the national as well as local economies. It generates approximately 50% of all of the country’s foreign exchange, has extensive backward and forward linkages to the retail and services sectors, is the main source of employment and revenue for hinterland communities, including indigenous communities, and provides direct employment for over 15,000 coastland residents, many of whom are youths that would be otherwise unemployed. Unlike ASGM in other countries, Guyana’s miners have been regularized and have operated legally since the inception of the industry in 1880s. There are approximately 3,081 enterprises producing gold, 70% of which are small miners, with the rest being medium scale miners.

The artisanal and small scale miners are least equipped to understand and adopt the policies, technologies, and environmentally-friendly practices that are critical to a responsible gold
mining sector. The high startup costs required to employ new technology has also been identified as a barrier.

Physical and biological context
The Amazonia Ecoregion, of which Guyana is a part, is the largest tropical forest and largest river basin on earth, home to more species of terrestrial plants and animals than anywhere else on earth, and the source of one-fifth of all freshwater flows on the planet. Amazonia is key to freshwater and food security, climate moderation, and preserving Earth’s diversity of species. In Guyana, the continued expansion of extraction threatens the services provided by ecosystems and biodiversity and thus the well-being of people.

Gold in Guyana is produced primarily by hydraulic dredging and sluices. Mercury is used at the final amalgamation stage to extract gold. The toxic health effects of both inorganic and organic mercury are well known and have spurred the Minamata Convention. Small and medium scale gold mining is the main source of direct exposure to mercury and discharge to the environment through direct usage in the amalgamation process, and forest clearing for gold mining, which releases mercury stored in soils into the aquatic food chain. Already, levels higher than World Health Organization safe limits have been found in indigenous and hinterland populations as well as workers in the industry.

Indigenous peoples and gender
CI-Guyana, the GGDMA and the Ministry of Indigenous Peoples’ Affairs signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) which aim to enhance sustainable development of indigenous villages, and develop viable practices within the mining industry. The MOU with the Indigenous People’s Affairs Ministry seeks to form the framework for collaboration between the two entities in areas of mutual interest, towards the enabling of green economic growth and development. Meanwhile, the MOU with the GGDMA will see some US$3M funding from the Norwegian Society used to tackle the environmental challenges that come with mining, especially as it relates to land reclamation and the rights of often marginalized groups like women and indigenous peoples.

The Ministry of Indigenous People’s Affairs with support from CI-Guyana has developed a Framework that supports indigenous communities’ development objectives, including land-use planning. Each community will develop its own plan with the support of the Ministry, and these plans (which may include mining if this is practiced in the community) will be implemented under a framework agreement between the two parties in which each party agree to contribute to the realization of the plan. For those communities with goals with respect to gold mining, these community plans allow the project a bottom-up means of supporting indigenous peoples to mine for gold in a responsible manner. The project will endeavor to optimize synergies and support the Framework within communities interested or engaged in mining.

The project will identify the issues related to indigenous people particularly in the context of the impacts of mercury on them (where they are not engaged in ASGM) and in the context of the particular issues related to indigenous peoples if they are engaged in mining. The project will look at women and other often marginalized groups, such as children and indigenous peoples. A gender analysis conducted under the Norad-funded project will detail the social roles of men and women and the existing power relations between them, establish baseline information, and inform this project.
The project must understand the perspectives, concerns, experiences of both men and women working directly and indirectly in the mining sector as well as those of men and women in Guyanese society at large who also have a stake in the sector. Both men and women must be mobilized to lead the shift to mercury-free, responsible gold through the provision of incentives and clear policies and laws.

**Project Objectives:**

By [2020], mining operators in at least one region of Guyana have successfully introduced into the market, gold products that are shown to have met key environmental and social safeguards that demonstrate improved recovery rates of [65%] and decreased mercury emissions of [80%].

**Project Components and Main Proposed Activities:**

*Component 1: Research and mainstreaming mercury-free technologies in Guyana’s ASGM sector:*

This will entail establishing geographically defined demonstration source areas for gold produced with non-mercury technology, including an established mining area and a titled indigenous village where indigenous producers are mining for gold and diamonds. Exchange visits between Brazilian equipment manufacturers and local Guyanese fabricators and retailers will investigate small mobile technologies currently in use in Brazil where alluvial gold ores mined are similar to Guyana. Finally, Technology Innovation Clinics would be organized with miners, fabricators, and equipment retailers to test and select suitable equipment for two sites.

*Component 2: Establishing a financing mechanism for mercury-free technologies:*

A feasibility assessment would be completed on mechanisms for financing technologies appropriate to Guyana based on mechanisms tested around the world. A long-term financing mechanism for mercury-free technology will be established and support will be provided to access credit and financing for producers in model sites to be able to convert to non-mercury technology.

*Component 3: Assessing and growing markets for certified mercury-free gold from Guyana through branding, toward third-party certification:*

An assessment of domestic, regional, and international markets for Guyana’s gold and the market potential for El Dorado branded gold will be conducted to identify high-potential markets. A chain of custody process and verification mechanism for gold produced on model sites would be developed and an El Dorado Green Gold Branding Scheme developed. Buyers would be engaged to tap into financing and a mechanism would be created for responsible gold buyers linked to a refinery abroad that can establish and maintain the chain of custody for responsibly sourced gold. A market systems analysis and feasibility study would be completed for the establishment a Guyana El Dorado Gold Commodity Exchange. This would likely be operated by private licensed dealers, who would buy raw gold and stock refined Guyana Gold, stock that would be in-country for the local jewelry industry and with the possibility of applying incentives to enable the growth of the industry locally. Education, training, and other requisite organizational support would be provided for goldsmiths and jewelers desirous in participating in creation of responsible gold brand of Guyana jewelry “El Dorado Gold”. El Dorado Gold producers would be identified and linked to a green gold market abroad. A feasibility assessment for third-party certification of Guyana gold will also be conducted based on assessments of existing certification schemes. The design and testing the Branding Scheme in pilot sites would be an initial step toward the longer-term ambition of third-party
certification of Guyana’s gold and increased access to high-profit markets. The design of the Branding Scheme will be informed by the basic structures and systems that will be required from third-party certification schemes and thus be part of a step-wise approach toward certification and access to premium markets. Simultaneously, the project will engage in consultations to sensitize miners, communities, decision-makers, etc. on the benefits and feasibility of certification in order to grow the broad-based support needed to continue toward certification through policy, future programmes, initiatives, and projects.

**Component 4: National policies and incentives for mercury-free gold:**

Support would be provided to the GGMC to develop a draft national policy on responsible gold production and value added and requisite laws and regulations refined or drafted to support a responsible gold commodity chain. Education and awareness will be provided for the gold mining community on the options and benefits of responsible gold production as well as education targeting policy makers and the public to build national commitment for a sustainable responsible gold value chain in Guyana. Incentives for communities will be introduced based on the framework developed by the Ministry of Indigenous Peoples’ Affairs, with community participation at the very earliest stages to ensure mining-based interventions support the socio-economic needs to the said communities. A monitoring and evaluation mechanism that documents lessons learned would be established. A business model would be developed for scaling up nationally.

**Component 5: Monitoring and Evaluation.**

Regular monitoring of project activities against targets and outcomes and management of risk will be done and reported on semi-annually against the Results Framework. Adaptations will be made based on monitoring reports.

A multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism will be established to provide advice on implementation, suggesting strategic approaches, adaptations, risk management issues, and identifying opportunities and challenges.

Stakeholder platforms will be developed to share project information, obtaining guidance on implementation, and help to monitor and adapt.

A conference/discussion forum will be held at the end of the project to assist in evaluating and reporting on project outcomes/impacts with presentations from key stakeholders involved in implementation and beneficiaries.

**Component 6: Communications and Knowledge Management.**

Development of strategic Communication plan and materials (e.g. policy papers, factsheets, videos, etc.) aimed at key stakeholders, including miners, decision-makers, and other actors within the supply chain for awareness raising, policy advocacy.

Lessons learned and best practices will be captured through the M&E component, and presented nationally (e.g. annual Mining Week in Guyana) and internationally to promote learning, information exchanges, partnerships and to influence decision-making on policies, strategies, programs, and projects. The project will also coordinate with the global project on K&M activities.

**Compliance with Environmental Conventions:**

Explain how your project’s objectives, outcomes and outcomes align with the main conventions that CI adheres to. These include UNCBD, UNFCCC, RAMSAR Convention, CITES, and UNCCD.

UNCBD and UNFCCC: Guyana’s National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) identifies mercury use as a key issue in the mining sector and which reports significant impacts on freshwater resources in both urban and rural areas where surface water quality is under serious stress as a result of mining and other activities. For example, the NBSAP cites
elevated levels of mercury in sediments of parts of the Potaro River Basin with apparent origins in gold mining activities. The NBSAP points to the adoption of innovative technologies as an opportunity to address mercury related issues and reduce threats to the environment.

The project will reduce harmful impacts of mercury use caused primarily by Guyana’s ASGM and medium scale gold mining in Guyana. The project will yield reductions in mercury use of about 15 metric tons (to be confirmed during PPG) and emissions, thus protecting terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity and ecosystems.

The project will also complement the Norad-funded project that aims to reduce forest loss from mining by supporting the adoption of technologies that reduce dependence on mercury while enhancing recovery rates and profits, thereby avoiding unnecessary loss of forests.

**Compliance with Country Legal and Institutional Frameworks:**

1. Explain how your project aligns/will align with national laws and/or frameworks related to the environment (this may include national ESIA or EIA laws, etc.)

   The goal of the project is aligned with the national Low Carbon Development Strategy and plan for a Green Economy, prioritizing socioeconomic development and environmental stewardship. There is asymmetry between the low carbon and green growth policy directions and current public and private policy in the extractive sector which are lagging behind these national commitments. The project aims to align these. The project will demonstrate integrated models for responsible mining and inform refinement of policies and/or creation of policies that support a responsible sector.

2. When national legal and institutional frameworks are inadequate, the proposal should include a statement explaining how this problem will be addressed, either as part of the project or by a third-party.

   The MNR is working on refining the mining policy. This project and the Norad-funded project together will inform policy-making through demonstration of successful models and evidence based policy recommendations. In terms of mining law and regulations, there is no coverage of the use of mercury and the outcomes of the project aim to influence the MNR in this regard. While the MNR is finalizing the National Action Plan, the Institute of Applied Science and Technology is testing technologies, and the GGMC is endorsing the same, there is currently no financial mechanism to enable miners to shift to more efficient mercury-free mining. The project will establish a system that will operationalize financing for efficient technologies. Moreover, the MNR and GGMC do not have an effective and consistent strategy for raising awareness and building capacity to encourage the testing and adoption of improved technologies nor the means of monitoring adoption. Effective outreach to raise awareness and improve education will facilitate greater adoption of efficient technologies and good practices through emphasis of enhanced profits rather than solely on reducing forest loss or health impacts.

   There are currently no incentives offered to encourage the private sector to reduce dependence on mercury use. This project will create market incentives for private sector enterprises to shift to mercury-free mining, through demonstrating the possibilities of actually growing private investment and the market by adopting environmentally friendly approaches to mining.
3. When national legal and institutional frameworks do not apply to or impact the project and its objectives, the reason for that conclusion needs to be stated.

The project will have a direct impact on national legal and institutional frameworks. These impacts include the way in which the GoG meets its commitments under the Minamata Convention, the low carbon, green economic policy frameworks and systems for sustainable management of forests.

**Project Justification (e.g., Alignment with Country and CI Institutional Priorities, GEF Focal Area Strategies):**

The project is consistent with the Guyana’s commitments to the CBD. Objective 2 of the COP 6 Decision VI/22 is to mitigate the impact of pollution such as acidification and eutrophication on forest biodiversity activities. This requires increasing the understanding of the impact of mercury pollution on forest biodiversity; support monitoring programmes that help evaluate impacts on forest ecosystems; encourage integration of forest biodiversity consideration into strategies and policies to reduce pollution; and promote pollution reduction levels that adversely affect forest biodiversity.

Guyana’s NBSAP, which identifies mercury use as a key issue in the mining sector and which reports significant impacts on freshwater resources in both urban and rural areas where surface water quality is under serious stress as a result of mining and other activities. The NBSAP points to the adoption of innovative technologies as an opportunity to address mercury related issues and reduce threats to the environment.

The project is consistent with Guyana’s commitment to the Minamata Convention. As the policy and regulatory framework and strategy and National Action Plan for the phasing out of mercury use are being developed, this project would focus on developing and testing the models to inform their refinement and implementation. It would inform and be shaped by the policy and regulatory framework being developed by the Government with the support from WWF and UNDP.

The project is also consistent with the country’s national LCDS and Green Economy which seek to create added value in supply chains, and increase the flow of benefits to resource owners. Through this process, there will be less pressure on loss of natural capital to fuel short term livelihood activities hence reducing ecosystem loss while growing human wellbeing. It also supports the government’s policy to decentralize decision making to regions, through Plans of Actions for Rural Development” which is being led by the Ministry of Communities. In these Plans, regions are expected to take greater responsible for management of its resources and creating livelihoods enhancing activities.

This project will also contribute to the fulfillment of Guyana’s Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) submitted to the UNFCCC under the Paris Agreement, which speaks to the implementation of awareness and incentive programmes to improve the efficiency of technologies and practices in the mining industry, including addressing inefficient mercury-based technology.

The project fits within CI’s three interconnected pillars, Protection of Natural Wealth, Sustainable Production, and Effective Governance. CI engages with key actors across the supply chain in agriculture, mining, and other sectors that rely heavily on natural capital. The organization supports transformation of production and consumption systems for the wellbeing of people and while reducing impacts on natural capital. This entails engaging with
actors across supply chains, including businesses, industry bodies, financial institutions, and others to promote best practices, create incentives and safeguards, and other strategies to transform production and consumption trends. CI has done so through establishing partnerships, providing the science to inform certification programs, and helping to create, expand, and improve markets that value responsible goods. CI prioritizes effective governance, helping to develop and enhance alignment across sectors, policies, investments, tools, and institutions. CI ensures that its efforts build capacity for effective governance at all levels and empower communities to play a meaningful role in decision-making.

The project fits within CI’s Institutional Priorities. CI’s work in Amazonia is an institutional priority. This includes work in Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Peru, and Suriname. CI’s is driven by a vision of a poverty-free and resilient Amazonia with a vibrant and integrated society that drives a new model of development in which: natural capital is valued and sustained through zero net deforestation, the rights of indigenous people and traditional populations are respected, and the benefits generated by natural capital are shared equitably. The global mining sector is an institutional priority and centers on a vision of the transformation of the sector toward sustainable policies that result in positive impacts for people and nature. This means protecting natural capital, implementing sustainable production practices, and promoting human wellbeing. CI focuses on transforming private policies, influencing public policies to promote sustainable production practices in the most critical areas, promoting human wellbeing in mining communities through private and public investments in social programs and demonstrating field-based compensatory and stewardship practices.

The project fits within the Chemicals and Waste GEF Focal Area Strategy. It is aligned with the GEF-6 chemical and waste strategy’s long term goal “to prevent the exposure of humans and the environment to harmful chemicals and waste of global importance, including POPs, mercury and ozone depleting substances, through a significant reduction in the production, use, consumption and emissions/releases of those chemicals and waste.”

The project will contribute to efforts to prevent exposure of humans and the environment to mercury through (1) support for determining mercury-free technologies that are suitable for Guyana and (2) to enable the financial, institutional, public/private policy frameworks needed to catalyze holistic and transformative change.

The project will contribute to the two objectives under this goal:
Objective CW 1: Develop the enabling conditions, tools and environment for the sound management of harmful chemicals and wastes
Program 1: Develop and demonstrate new tools and economic approaches for managing harmful chemicals and waste in a sound manner
Program 2: Support enabling activities and promote their integration into national budgets and planning processes, national and sector policies and actions and global monitoring

The project will support the GGMC to develop a draft national policy on responsible gold production and value added and requisite laws and regulations refined or drafted to support a responsible gold commodity chain. Education and awareness activities will target policy makers and the public to build national commitment for a sustainable responsible gold value chain in Guyana. Financial mechanisms and incentives for miners and communities will be introduced A business model would be developed for scaling up nationally.
CW 2: Reduce the prevalence of harmful chemicals and waste and support the implementation of clean alternative technologies/substances

Program 4: Reduction or elimination of anthropogenic emissions and releases of mercury to the environment

The project will directly address the reduction and elimination, where feasible, of mercury in the ASGM sector through outreach on options and support for adopting mercury-free technologies.

GEF Focal Area(s): Chemicals and Waste

GEF Project Amount: USD 2,652,294

Other Financing Amounts by Source: CI-Guyana

Safeguard Screening Form Prepared by: CI-Guyana

Date of preparation: 06 December, 2016

Comments:

II. PROJECT ELEGIBILITY QUESTIONS

Answer the following questions to determine if the project is eligible for CI-GEF funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will the project:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Propose to create significant destruction or degradation of <em>critical natural habitats</em> of any type or have significant negative socioeconomic and cultural impacts that cannot be cost-effectively avoided, minimized, mitigated and/or offset?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Propose to create or facilitate significant degradation and/or conversion of <em>natural habitats</em> of any type including those that are legally protected, officially proposed for protection, identified by authoritative sources for their high conservation value, or recognized as protected by traditional local communities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Propose to carry out <em>unsustainable</em> harvesting of natural resources -animals, plants, timber and/or non-timber forest products (NTFPs)- or the establishment of forest plantations in <em>critical natural habitats</em>?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Propose the introduction of exotic species that can certainly become invasive and harmful to the environment, for which is not possible to implement a mitigation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Contravene major international and regional conventions on environmental issues?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Involve involuntary resettlement, <em>land acquisition, and/or the taking of shelter and other assets</em> belonging to local communities or individuals?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Habitats considered essential for biodiversity conservation, provision of ecosystem services and the well-being of people at the local, national, regional or global levels. They include, among others, existing protected areas, areas officially proposed as protected areas, areas recognized as protected by traditional local communities, as well as areas identified as important for conservation, such as Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA's), Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) Sites, Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBA's), Biodiversity Hotspot, Ramsar Sites, areas identified as important for ecosystem services such as carbon storage, freshwater provision and regulation, etc.
7. Propose the use of pesticides that are unlawful under national or international laws? [ ] [X]

8. Involve the removal, alteration or disturbance of any physical cultural resources? [ ] [X]

9. Will the project include the construction and/or operation of dams? [ ] [X]

III. PROJECT ELEGIBILITY ASSESSMENT

If you answer YES to any of the questions above, your project IS NOT ELIGIBLE for funding.

If you answer NO to all of the questions above, please proceed to answer the safeguard questions below.

IV. SAFEGUARD QUESTIONS

The sections below will help the CI-GEF Project Agency to determine whether your project triggers any of the CI-GEF safeguard policies. As a Project Agency implementing GEF funding, CI is required to assess all applications to determine if safeguards are triggered, and if so, whether or not appropriate mitigation measures are included in project design and implementation. For further information on CI application of safeguards please refer the Appendix section of this form.

SECTION 1: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (ESIA)

Has a full or limited ESIA that covers the proposed project already been completed?

[X] NO → Continue to Section 2 (do not fill out Table 1.1 below)

[X] YES → No further environmental and social assessment is required if the existing documentation meets the CI-GEF Project Agency “Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF)” policies and standards, and environmental and social management recommendations and/or plans are integrated into the project. Therefore, you should undertake the following steps to complete this screening process:

1. Use Table 1.1 below to assess existing documentation. It is recommended that this assessment be undertaken jointly by the CI-GEF Project Agency and the Executing Entity;

2. Ensure that the development of the full Project Document incorporates the recommendations made in the existing ESIA; and

3. Submit this template, along with other relevant documentation to the Project Agency.

TABLE 1.1: CHECKLIST FOR ASSESSING QUALITY ASSURANCE OF EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (ESIA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the assessment a: (X) A FULL ESIA ( ) A LIMITED ESIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the assessment meet its terms of reference, both procedurally and substantively?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the assessment provide a satisfactory assessment of the proposed project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the assessment contain the information required for decision-making?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Does the assessment describe specific environmental and social management measures (e.g., avoidance, minimization, mitigation, compensation, monitoring, and capacity development measures)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Does the assessment identify capacity needs of the institutions responsible for implementing environmental and social management issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Was the assessment developed through a consultative process with key stakeholder engagement, including issues related to gender mainstreaming and Indigenous Peoples?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Does the assessment assess the adequacy of the cost of and financing arrangements for environmental and social management issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. For any “no” answers, describe below how the issue has been or will be resolved or addressed

SECTION 2: PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS

Will the project cause or facilitate any significant loss or degradation to natural habitats, and their associated biodiversity and ecosystem functions/services?

- [x] NO → Continue to Section 3
- [ ] YES → Continue to Table 2.1. below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2.1: CHECKLIST FOR PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the project located or expected to be located near or in existing protected areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Name, area, management category, governance arrangement, and current management activities of protected areas being affected by the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Description of project activities that will affect existing protected areas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the project located within any other type of critical natural habitat?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Description of the critical natural habitat to be affected by the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Description of project activities that will affect critical natural habitats:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Will the project affect species identified as threatened at the local and/or global levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:

a. Name and conservation status of the species that will be affected by the project:

b. Description of project activities that will affect threatened/endangered species:

4. Will the project implement habitat restoration activities:

If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:

a. Type and extent of habitats to be restored:

b. Description of project activities for habitat restoration:

c. Description of the contribution of the project in restoring or improving ecosystem composition, structure, and functions/services:

SECTION 3: VOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT AND/OR RESTRICTIONS TO ACCESS/USE OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Will the project involve the voluntary resettlement of people and/or direct or indirect restrictions of access to and use of natural resources?

☐ NO → Continue to Section 4
☐ YES → Continue to Table 3.1. below

TABLE 3.1: CHECKLIST FOR VOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT

1. Will the project involve the voluntary resettlement of people?

If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:

a. Name of communities, description of livelihood, ethnicity, and estimated number of people to be resettled:

b. Means by which the community(ies) provided or will provide consent for the resettlement, ensuring that vulnerable/marginal groups such as women are thoroughly consulted:

c. Description of the activities that will be carried out for the resettlement:

2. Will the project introduce measures to restrict people from accessing or using resources that they have been using prior to the implementation of the project?
If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:

a. Name of resource, tenure status, type of use and extent (quantity) of the resources being used, and, if applicable, who tends to use the resources (men, women, youth, etc.):

b. Description of project activities that will affect access to natural resources and their potential positive and negative impacts on the environment and people, and how they will be gender-sensitive if necessary:

c. Means by which the community(ies) provided or will provide consent for the restriction to access and use resources:

d. Means by which the community (ies) or affected people will be compensated:

SECTION 4: INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

Does the project plan to work in lands or territories traditionally owned, customarily used, or occupied by indigenous peoples?

☐ NO → Continue to Section 5
☒ YES → Continue to Table 4.1. below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4.1: CHECKLIST FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLES</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Will the project activities directly or indirectly affect indigenous peoples?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 According to CI Policy on Indigenous Peoples, “CI identifies indigenous peoples in specific geographic areas by the presence, in varying degrees, of: a) Close attachment to ancestral and traditional or customary territories and the natural resources in them; b) Customary social and political institutions; c) Economic systems oriented to subsistence production; d) An indigenous language, often different from the predominant language; and f) Self-identification and identification by others as members of a distinct cultural group”. 
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If your answer was yes, please provide the following information when applicable:

a. Name of communities, description of livelihood, ethnicity, estimated number of people to be affected by the project:

The project proposes to work in at least one indigenous community that is involved in mining but the specific community will be chosen in the project design phase through an objective criteria-driven selection process that will identify a shortlist of places. After this process is completed, the shortlisted communities will be consulted using CI’s rights-based approach for working with indigenous and local communities prior to final selection.

b. Description of the project activities and their impacts on indigenous peoples, including if the project is likely to impact particular subgroups of indigenous people such as women or youth:

Within the chosen community(ies), the project will seek to test the use of non-mercury mining technologies and other measure to address the social and environmental impact of mining on the community. The project would therefore interface primarily with members of the community involved in mining but also include interaction with the community as a whole to assess and address the wider impacts of mining on the community. Women’s and men’s roles will be promoted during implementation of project activities to reinforce the important experiences and roles of both. The project complements CI-Guyana avoided deforestation projected funded by Norad in which sustainable landscape plans (integrated natural resource management plans) will be developed. By design these plans require building a multi-stakeholder process to design and implement initiatives.

c. Means by which the project will respect free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) with the affected communities, while ensuring that marginalized subgroups are included:

CI-Guyana implements CI’s Rights Based Approach in our engagement with stakeholders, especially indigenous communities. In the implementation of this project full understanding of the community demographics and social stratification will be secured and representation of all identified subgroups in engagements will be ensured. CI-Guyana’s protocols and processes for engaging indigenous communities are well established and tested. It will be ensured that the chosen community(ies) fully understand the details and implications of the project and are able to consent to their participation in the project.

CI-Guyana has valuable networks and is cognizant of political and social dynamics that may exist within traditional governance structures that must be acknowledged and managed in order to effectively engage with communities. This includes awareness of the fact that Village leadership is not always representative of the views of the entire community. This will necessitate a robust and inclusive process to obtain FPIC to the project that ensure that the views of all are taken in consideration, including those sub-groups traditionally marginalized. Even as FPIC is obtained, efforts must be made to ensure that any potential harm that may be caused during implementation of the project (risks) are identified and measures to avoid, reduce, or mitigate are developed.

Previous experience working within indigenous communities (with both men and women) and conducting post-evaluations have yielded valuable insights and lessons for this project (e.g. on the
importance of translation services, culturally-sensitive communications materials, etc.). These will help to shape the project’s strategy and plan for engaging with indigenous peoples.

d. Description of the approach to be implemented to ensure that indigenous peoples receive culturally appropriate benefits that are negotiated and agreed upon with them:

Our approach to consultation will respect FPIC and thus be culturally sensitive. This means that communities will have the opportunity to negotiate how they would like to participate in and benefit from the project. The social baseline assessments to be done under the Norad-funded project and this project will also inform the design of project activities that provide culturally appropriate benefits for Indigenous peoples. The project governance mechanism will include indigenous institutions who will represent the interests of their constituents at a higher level of project planning, implementation, and oversight to ensure fair and appropriate benefits.

e. Description of the approach to be implemented to ensure the fair participation of indigenous people in the design and implementation of the project:

The National Toshaos Council will participate on a project steering committee which will provide oversight for the project design and implementation. During the PPG phase, the NTC and other indigenous institutions will be engaged to participate in developing the full proposal and a stakeholder engagement plan will be designed and implemented during the project to ensure participatory decision-making.

SECTION 5: PEST MANAGEMENT

Does the project plan to implement activities related to agricultural extension services including the use of approved pesticides (including insecticides and herbicides) or alien invasive species\(^3\) management?

\(\checkmark\) NO → Continue to Section 6

□ YES → Continue to Table 5.1. below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5.1: CHECKLIST FOR PEST MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The use of approved pesticides and other chemicals?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) Invasive alien species (IASs) are plants, animals, pathogens and other organisms that are non-native to an ecosystem, and which may cause economic or environmental harm or adversely affect human health. In particular, they impact adversely upon biodiversity, including decline or elimination of native species - through competition, predation, or transmission of Will the project include pathogens - and the disruption of local ecosystems and ecosystem functions (CBD, 2006).
If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:

a. Name, description and proposed use of approved pesticides/chemicals:

b. Description of how the Executing Entity will conduct the assessment of the nature and degree of associated risks, taking into account the proposed use and intended users:

c. Description of positive and negative impact on the environment, non-targets, and people:

d. Description of how the Executing Entity will train communities to responsibly manage products, equipment, and containers to avoid harm to human health or broader environmental contamination:

e. Description of how the Executing Entity will avoid the use of herbicides and pesticides near water sources and their contamination with pesticide residues when cleaning the equipment used:

f. Description of how the Executing Entity will ensure that pesticides used would be properly applied, stored, and disposed of, in accordance with practices acceptable to the CI-GEF Project Agency:

2. Will the project include the use of ecologically-based biological/environmental integrated pest management practices (IPM) and/or Integrated Vector Management (IVM)?

☐ ☐
If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:

a. Description of approach to be used:

b. Description of potential positive and negative impacts of the approach to be used in the project:

d. Description of how the Executing Entity will assess the risk of the danger to non-target species:

e. Description of how the Executing Entity will train communities to responsibly implement these approaches:

SECTION 6: PHYSICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Does the project plan to remove, alter or disturb any physical cultural resources (PCRs)?

☑ NO → Continue to Section 7
☐ YES → Continue to Table 6.1. below

TABLE 6.1: CHECKLIST FOR PHYSICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES (PCR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Will the project plan to work in areas that fall into categories under PCR, including archaeological, paleontological, historical, architectural, and sacred sites including graveyards, burial sites, and sites with unique natural values?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 PCRs are defined as movable or immovable objects, sites, structures, and natural features and landscapes that have archeological, paleontological, historical, architectural, religious, aesthetic, sacred sites or other cultural significance.
If your answer was yes, please provide the following information:

a. Name, description of the known physical cultural resources to be affected by the project, and cultural importance to local community(ies):

b. Description of project activities to be implemented and their positive and negative impacts on PCRs:

c. Description of the mitigating measures to be implemented by the Executing Entity:

d. Description of how the Executing Entity will handle issues related to consultations, siting, change-finds procedures, construction contracts and buffer zones:

SECTION 7: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

1. Stakeholders Participation: Describe any stakeholders important to the project and how you have involved or plan to involve them in the planning and implementation of the project.

   The **Guyana Gold and Diamond Miners Association (GGDMA)**: The GGDMA is partner to CI-Guyana under the Norad-funded *Addressing Drivers of Deforestation in Guyana and Peru (ADoD)* project, and thus essential to planning and implementing the project to enhance synergies and complementarity. The GGDMA sits on the Project Steering Committee (PSC) of the ADoD project and represents industry. The role of the GGDMA is to ensure the interests of its constituency is represented in the planning and implementation of the project. At a meeting with the GoG on the GEF GOLD project the Government of Guyana through the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Department of Environment, the Environmental Protection Agency and the GGMC proposed that the GEF GOLD project also be overseen by the PSC with a request that for this project that the EPA participates as a member of the Committee.

   The GGDMA have already been engaged and have provided guidance on the elaboration of the project concept. They will collaborate to ensure complementarity between this project and the ADoD project to address mining’s role in deforestation in Guyana, a project that also focuses on improving technologies, focusing on the private sector, reducing pressures on forests, biodiversity and ecosystems, and establishing financial and technical support mechanisms for small and medium scale miners. This project is intended to support the GGDMA to expand its reach to include smaller scale operations with less upfront capital to invest in better technologies.

   The **Guyana Women Miners Association (GWMA)**: The Guyana Women Miners Association has been briefed on the concept. They will be further engaged in order to better understand the realities facing men and women in the ASGM sector, how they are similarly and dissimilarly impacted by mercury, and their roles in effective management of mercury within the sector. Engaging with the GWMA will also allow us to identify gaps in understanding and prioritize any gender analyses necessary for designing equitable measures for addressing mercury. Engagement with the GWMA is also essential to support the institution’s legitimacy within the sector and to reaffirm the importance of ensuring gender dynamics are well understood and
addressed. Under the Norad-funded project, a gender analysis will be conducted and close collaboration with the GWMA is critical. This gender analysis will inform the interventions of this project.

The GWMA not only focuses on the mining sector from an economic perspective, but equally from a social perspective. The Organization sits on the PSC of the ADoD project and will be essential to ensuring the project is planned and implemented to result in net contributions to economic and social growth. The organization will represent the interests of miners, especially women miners, and women indirectly associated with the sector to ensure the project is sensitive to gender considerations.

The Guyana Geology and Mines Commission (GGMC): The GGMC was engaged as the agency critical to the formulation of a national policy and regulatory framework to support sustainably sourced gold. The implementation of the project will be through a public private partnership between CI, the GGDMA, and the GGMC. The GGMC is a government agency under the MNR. They sit on the PSC of the ADoD project.

The GEF Small Grants Programme (GEF SGP). The GEF SGP is a corporate programme of GEF implemented by UNDP and executed by UNOPS. The programme has been operational in Guyana since 2012 building relationships and implementing project at the community level. CI is represented on its National Steering Committee for which this project falls within the GEF SGP focal area.

The National Toshaos Council (NTC): The National Toshaos Council comprises elected Indigenous leaders across Guyana’s ten regions. The NTC also sits on the PSC of the ADoD project. They have been engaged on the project and have indicated their interest in contributing to ensure that the project represents its constituency’s critical interests. A strong relationship will provide learning opportunities for NTC leadership and foster a link between indigenous peoples and miners to create a more collaborative approach to resolving resource based conflicts, Guyana’s sustainable development agenda, and engendering shared understanding and support for improving national policy.

The Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR): The MNR is responsible for coordination, policy formulation, and overall oversight for the natural resources sector. They have been briefed on the project concept and contributed to its submission to the GEF Council. They were further engaged to ascertain their role in the PPG Phase.

The Guyana Gold Board (GGB): The Guyana Gold Board is a key player in the gold mining supply chain and has been engaged. They are actively considering partnership on the project.

SECTION 8: GENDER MAINSTREAMING

1. Describe how the Executing Entity will ensure that gender is mainstreamed throughout the project according to the CI-GEF Gender Mainstreaming Guidelines (see Appendix VIII of the ESMF for more information):

The project will seek to fairly benefit men and women and seek to mitigate any negative impacts on the same. Specifically, it will seek to understand the role of women and other often marginalized groups, such as children and indigenous peoples. A gender analysis conducted under the Norad-funded project will detail the social roles of men and women and the existing power, class, ethnic relations between and amongst them, establish baseline information, and inform this project. This project will support more detailed gender analyses
required and also pay close attention to the recent work of UNICEF in Guyana that focused on children and impacts of mercury. The purpose of the gender analysis and the integration of knowledge from UNICEF, the GWMA, and others is to (1) understand how impacts vary between men and women (2) ensure the project designs appropriate measures that address both men and women’s roles in management of mercury, (3) ensure that gender differences are well understood and communicated as part of the awareness raising component of the project, and (4) design a gender mainstreaming plan (GMP) with a monitoring and evaluation mechanism.

During the PPG phase, an appropriate representation of men and women as well as organizations representing women and men within the sector in stakeholder engagement activities were sought.

The GWMA will participate on the project steering committee, having direct experience working on gender issues within the sector. They will participate in the overall planning, implementation, oversight, and monitoring of the project.

The EA will ensure the project team is aware of the gender policy (and other relevant policies), design a GMP, and seek to institutionalize its implementation throughout the project across all partners. The plan will include actions that will yield fair and desired benefits to both men and women and avoid, minimize, mitigate, or offset any harm caused as appropriate. This may require drawing on gender expertise outside of the project team to develop and/or review the plan and the monitoring and evaluation of the same.

2. Is there a risk that the project may infringe on men’s or women’s human rights? Explain how these risks will be managed.

The project in fact endeavours to ensure the rights of men and women are upheld within the sector. The gender analysis conducted will assess the risk of human rights infringement and serve as the basis for designing the GMP.

Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that “everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family”. This project aims to improve livelihoods through enhanced efficiency of the mining sector. Producing responsible gold will enhance profits through enabling access to higher-value markets.

3. Is the project likely to create, aggravate or perpetuate inequalities/conflicts between men and women within households and communities? Explain how this situation will be managed.

In designing interventions that benefit both men and women and enable equitable access to benefitting from projects, the empowerment of women can sometimes lead to conflicts between men and women. This is a risk that will need mitigation, and is best managed through (1) ensuring the all multi-stakeholder processes are designed to be gender-sensitive and responsive, (2) effective outreach and awareness raising on the role of both men and women in improving the prosperity of households and communities and (3) ensuring both genders contribute to the design of project interventions and are both enabled to access fair benefits from the project.

The results of the gender analysis will be used to understand the roles and power dynamics and other interacting forces to define a GMP that promotes socially appropriate and context appropriate actions to avoid, reduce, and/or mitigate any potential conflicts.

4. Is the project likely to impact men or women (positively or negatively) in different ways? Explain how these differences will be managed:

The gender analysis will identify how men and women may be disadvantaged or negatively impacted by the project’s activities and interventions will be designed to address the same. For example, if measures are not taken to ensure men’s and women’s fair access to participation in and benefits of the project, women are likely to be excluded.

The PPG phase will ensure that the gender is mainstreamed throughout the full proposal, wherever relevant, including mainstreaming of gender equality and equity principles. The process to mainstream gender within the project steering committee and among project partners will be supported by the project’s Gender Mainstreaming Plan.

SECTION 9: ACCOUNTABILITY AND GRIEVANCE MECHANISM

1. Describe how the Executing Entity will ensure timely response/resolution of complaints from parties affected by the project

There are two levels of conflicts. In the first place, the sector as a whole is faced with many conflicting perspectives and there is little appetite for resolution at this stage. Progress in resolution is expected to be built in increments, and must be driven by good, credible information and a process by which such information can be debated and discussed towards reaching agreement on the future of the sector. This is perhaps the fundamental work before us in the two projects that are to be run together. An important element for this kind of conflict resolution lies with the PSC that has been set up for the ADoD Project. It will also provide oversight for the GEF GOLD Project. The PSC will make decisions by consensus. Its responsibilities include provision of issue resolution on matters raised by the Project Lead and Team, facilitate relationship building and communications between stakeholders, ensure that the broader community and stakeholders’ reactions and concerns are being addressed, communicate the perspectives of the members’ organisations and constituents, and provide high level monitoring and attempt to anticipate potential problems and offer options for resolving them. The PSC currently meets once a month and this frequency will be revised as appropriate.

Additionally, local and national stakeholder platforms formed under the ADoD Project will be asked to solve problems based on objectively generated information. This process is expected to build trust and confidence in a sector characterized by poor relationships between stakeholders. It will be driven by a commitment to discussion and opinions that can be measured against objective information. These platforms will meet on a regular basis and will be an important mechanism to also raise recommendations for policy makers.

The second type of conflict lies in complaints that may arise during project execution as a result of differences in perspectives, or failure of the executing agency or partners to address a particular matter in a fair and accountable manner. It is expected that the PSC and stakeholder platforms will create an enabling environment to address these complaints. A mechanism will also have to be set up for persons to be able to lodge such complaints without concern of victimization, and a mechanism will be considered to establish an independent complaints committee that will be accessible to stakeholders.

Finally, CI’s Environmental and Social Management Framework will be presented to the PSC and elements of it especially as it relates to stakeholder engagement and accountability and grievance mechanisms. Copies of the Framework will be provided to members of the PSC, and a summary document will be disseminated to participants of the stakeholder platforms for their information.
### SECTION 10: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1. **External Assumptions**: Describe any important external factors (risks) that may affect your project during implementation and how you will mitigate these potential risks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Avoidance Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GGDMA does not fully commit to the process.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Extend existing memorandum of understanding between the GGDMA and CI-Guyana to include activities under this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partner with the GGDMA in project preparation phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engage with any new executive body at the earliest opportunity to secure their continued commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian miners in Guyana are not receptive to project</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Ensure the project includes Portuguese language communications (and other relevant languages).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engage the Brazilian Miners Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado Gold label does not generate income levels competitive to those provided by marginal mining.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Ensure full market systems approach to alternative livelihoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assess how other “green gold” certification and marketing efforts have performed and what lessons can be learned to ensure success for El Dorado.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders are not interested, willing, and able to engage in discourse towards problem solving with each other.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Build on CI’s long history of success in multi-stakeholder processes, with a focus on “bottom up” solutions from miners and communities as the basis of all project interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Take approach of building from points of agreement towards the address of more complex issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities do not exist to present project lessons to national and global events.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Build on CI’s long history of engaging at the international level in climate change and conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work through the World Bank network.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Climate change. Low Mining is a water-intensive industry and the predicted changes in rainfall pattern may affect the operation of the mining sector. Also, change in weather patterns such as more intense storms can affect mining infrastructure. The project will track changes in the environment due to climate change impacts and adapt the project accordingly.

2. Long-term Sustainability/Replicability: Describe how project components or results will continue or be replicated beyond the initial project. Note that this may include elements of project design, tools utilized during the project, or project results.

Component 4 on the development of national policies and laws/regulations to support mercury-free gold will facilitate sustainability of the project’s impacts. The education and awareness activities across stakeholders on options and benefits of responsible gold production is also key to enhance buy-in for a sustainable responsible gold value chain, and in the longer term, certification in Guyana. The establishing of a financing mechanism and the direct engagement with the private sector and businesses along the supply chain will also be a critical support for the sustainability of this project. Such a financing mechanism may take the form of a revolving fund with GEF funds used as seed capital to begin working with smaller operators and revenues generated from the sale of gold.

According to the 27th UNEP Governing Council (decision 27/12), the Council noted that the three components of an integrated approach to Chemicals and Waste are (1) mainstreaming, (2) industry involvement, and (3) dedicated external financing. The project supports the leveraging of resources from the private sector and government to contribute to greater progress to eliminate and reduce harmful chemicals and waste. The project addresses all 3 of these components and adds policy formulation to cement sustainability of the project’s results.

This project is designed to be scaled up, starting with the aim of demonstrating impact in one of the ten regions in Guyana, which will showcase operators producing gold demonstrated to meet environmental and social safeguards, realizing improved recovery rates, and decreased mercury emissions. The selection of the test region will be based on criteria developed through consultation with partners. The model developed in this test region can be adopted in other regions, as business enterprises continue to reach more markets for responsible gold and El Dorado gold jewelry.

3. Social Context: Describe the broad socio-economic context of, and local communities living in, the area of the proposed project, with emphasis on men’s and women’s different roles, responsibilities and needs of natural resources that the project seeks to focus on.

The project has not yet identified the region and sites for the demonstration of how responsible mining can drive private investment and markets. This selection will be driven by the participatory design and application of criteria in collaboration with stakeholders. Once the sites have been selected, an assessment of the socioeconomic and environmental context will be conducted to serve as a foundation for engagement.

4. Describe how the project will work in this context and with the local communities, if relevant.

Communities will be engaged in several ways. Technology Innovation Clinics would be organized with miners, fabricators, and equipment retailers to test and select suitable equipment for two sites. The specific needs and motivations of miners and communities will form the basis from which specific technologies and equipment, as well as mechanisms for cooperation, will be adopted. In consultation and collaboration with
miners and communities, designing and testing of a centralized processing facility will assist to determine the feasibility of technologies particularly for small and dispersed mining operations.

A long-term financing mechanism for mercury-free technology will be established and support will be provided to access credit and financing for producers in model sites to be able to convert to non-mercury technology. The design of this mechanism will require consultation with miners and others within communities.

The project will engage in consultations to sensitize miners, communities, decision-makers, etc. on the benefits and feasibility of certification in order to grow the broad-based support needed to continue toward certification through policy, future programmes, initiatives, and projects.

5. Institutional Capacity. Describe the institution’s capacity to implement the safeguard policies.

CI-Guyana will be primarily responsible for ensuring the implementation and monitoring of safeguard policies and agreed actions throughout the project, including through monitoring, adaptation, and evaluation of actions to ensure the implementation of safeguards (e.g. equal access for men and women to benefit from services of the project).

CI-Guyana is guided by CI’s Rights Based Approach, which includes policies on Gender, Indigenous Peoples, and Vulnerable Populations. The institution has executed gender mainstreaming efforts within the organization and within the design, implementation, and monitoring of projects.

CI-Guyana will collaborate with partners to ensure that interventions they lead are consistent with safeguard policies, including designing and review plans, definition of approaches, procurement, and reports produced by partners as well as participating in activities led by partners to ensure compliance.

CI-Guyana will participate in at least one training exercise on CI’s safeguards policies.

The PSC will be guided by its Terms of Reference and will also be exposed to CI’s safeguards policies at a special meeting.
APPENDIX VI: SAFEGUARD COMPLIANCE PLANS

APPENDIX VI. A: GENDER MAINSTREAMING PLAN

(Approved by CI-GEF Agency on 2017-11-16)

1. Goals and Purpose of the GEF Gender Mainstreaming Plan

Conservation International (CI) and the GEF recognize the importance of understanding and responding to gender relations to realize successful projects. Gender mainstreaming is reflected in CI-GEF’s Environmental Social Management Framework (ESMF). This document outlines CI-Guyana’s plan to mainstream gender into the design and implementation, as well as in monitoring and evaluation phases of the GEF-GOLD Project. This GMP will be used to guide the implementation of the broader El Dorado Gold—Responsible Mining in Guyana Initiative, which includes the GEF GOLD project and the Norad-funded Addressing Drivers of Deforestation in Guyana and Peru project. The objectives of this gender mainstreaming plan and its implementation are to:

i. provide reasonable and culturally compatible opportunities for men and women to benefit from and contribute to the project;

ii. to avoid, reduce, and/or mitigate the potential adverse effects on men and women due to project activities;

iii. to ensure respect for men and women’s dignity and human rights.

This will be done at three levels which are summarized below and expanded upon in section 3:

1. **Mainstreaming gender into the project governance**: this means ensuring the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and broader project team, grantees and partners are sensitized on gender issues to understand the link to better project outcomes. It also means equipping them with the tools and know-how to implement and monitor integration measures. It also means ensuring all levels of project governance are aware of the donor requirements to integrate gender. Special care will be taken to ensure that the grant-making processes also embed gender when relevant.

2. **Integrating gender considerations in the various components of the project**: this refers to the 6 components of the project
   a. Mainstreaming mercury-free technologies in ASGM
   b. Financing mechanism for mercury-free technologies
   c. Markets for certified mercury-free gold
   d. National policies and incentives for mercury-free gold
   e. Monitoring and evaluation
   f. Communications and Knowledge Management

   The team will ensure that the sociocultural and economic realities of men and women (including different knowledge, access, challenges, etc.) inform integration in the various components.

3. **Gender sensitive monitoring and evaluation**: Baseline data will be collected and disaggregated by gender and reported in project activity reports where relevant, to measure female and male participation. These reports will be submitted to the PSC to inform adaptive management. The mandatory gender indicators required by CI-GEF will be incorporated. These require that each sub-activity of the project be rated by their relevance to gender equality, including for example, a brief analysis of how the project
expects to achieve its objectives while addressing the different roles and the different needs of men and women. Monitoring and evaluation will use both qualitative and quantitative methods of collecting sex-disaggregated indicators.

The measures outlined in these three areas are guided by a gender analysis conducted based on existing literature and primary data drawn from interviews (see Section 2 below). Throughout the project, CI-Guyana will also make use of other social baseline studies and projects conducted, local and international professionals including convening experts from the University of Guyana and professionals from the Ministry of Social Protection to provide outputs from the project as well as to continually improve project design.

2. Gender Analysis

A gender analysis of available literature and primary data collected through interviews was conducted. CI-Guyana determined that there are several relevant gender considerations that must inform the design of the project. There is the overarching issue of governance and natural resources management and its gender implications. Hinton et al (2003) argues that in small-scale mining those issues pertain to the effectiveness of policy, issues of equality in land rights, representation in decision making processes and overall environment that is conducive to participation.

In Guyana and within the gold value chain, these concerns exist along with a high gender inequality index and gender imbalance. Women’s participation in the sector is below 10 percent according to interviews with sector experts. Whilst there are no laws barring women’s participation in the society and in the gold value chain, systemic sociocultural barriers exist (NDS 2001). The imbalance is especially marked in the ownership of concessions or permits to mine and the gold mining phase of the value chain. The project team must support men and women miners to have equal access to opportunities to improve their operations and livelihoods. Equally important, the project team must acknowledge that some men and women miners, especially marginal miners, prefer not to participate in the sector and simply have no alternative means of eking out a living.

Beyond providing more equal opportunity for men and women’s participation in the sector, the project must also provide equal opportunities to benefit from the project. Recognizing the potential impact that their families have on miners’ knowledge, attitudes, and practices, the project will also share with non-mining men and women information about improved practices that enhance safety, reduce mercury exposure, and preserve the ecosystems households depend on.

Project site selection will be finalized early in project implementation and Region 8 (Mahdia and Upper Potaro) and 9 (Marudi Mountain) have been identified as possible sites. Sex disaggregated data is available at the regional levels, but not at sub-regional levels and thus we do not currently have figures on the gender makeup of specific sites. However, the Guyana Women Miners Organisation estimates that there are 14 women miners in Region 9, 32 in Region 8, and 21 in Region 1 (which will be the project control site). In 2012, the population of Region 8 was 11,077 (Census, 2012). Seventy-two percent (72%) of the population is Indigenous, 16.5% Mixed, 7.7% Afro-Guyanese, 2.5% Indo-Guyanese, and the remainder comprising Chinese, Portuguese, and Caucasian.

Of the 10 Regions, and Region 8 has the highest predominance of men in significant part due to the mining activities located in the Region which require physical labour and likely preference for men’s labour versus women’s. The population of Region 9 stood at 24,238 in 2012. Eighty-five percent (85%) are Indigenous, 11% are Mixed, and the remainder comprise Afro-Guyanese, Indo-Guyanese, Portuguese, Chinese, White, and Other. As with Region 8, Region 9 has a
significant predominance of males as is the case with most hinterland regions compared to coastal. It is clear, however, that the populations of the regions are predominantly Indigenous and thus will have different orientations, traditions, connections to land, challenges, et cetera that will have to be understood and embedded in activity design.

Women in Guyana continue to face barriers to accessing credit and financial services. This has been found in gender studies conducted by CI-Guyana in Region 9. Empirical data indicate that improving women’s income results in more positive impacts for the households than improving the income of males (K’nife, 2015), (National Development Strategy Guyana, 2016). The project will ensure that the design of financial mechanisms is sensitive to gender dynamics and to support men and women’s equal opportunity to access financing. Lessons from developing a gender-sensitive revolving fund in Region 9 will inform the design of this mechanism.

Small scale gold mining has numerous environmental implications. The use of mercury and its subsequent release into the environment has health implications for hinterland populations that utilize the waterways and the riverine fish and other wildlife, namely the indigenous communities whose homes are in proximity to mining areas. Mercury pollution into the environment affects Indigenous men, women and children through different pathways. It is particularly toxic to the fetuses of pregnant women. The clearing of forests to access the ore results in the loss of forest cover and its associated biodiversity. This loss of biodiversity often includes exotic flora and fauna species, resulting in a loss of environmental services and natural resources. This especially affects indigenous communities and can impact women more directly than men as the former are often responsible for sourcing fire wood, drinking water, and other essentials that depend on access to healthy ecosystems. Raising awareness amongst these communities, including men and women miners, but especially amongst women who often manage household resources such as water and food, can empower those women to become advocates for improved practices and technologies.

Mining also impacts men and women socially. Indigenous men are often drawn to work in mining camps due to lack of adequate livelihood opportunities in their communities. Often when men leave their partners behind, the latter end up responsible for managing the household including the family farms. When women cannot manage, the farms are abandoned, the family’s nutritional status often weakens and women have the added burden of finding alternative sources of income for the family.

In addition to women miners who work directly in the industry, there are women who work in mining camps and mining areas, providing a range of services including domestic work, shop-keeping, and prostitution/exotic dancing. Some young women, including indigenous women, are lured to mining areas and exploited as domestic workers, prostitutes, and exotic dancers. The issue of human trafficking in and around mining camps has been documented (US State Department 2015)6. There are also reports of rape of indigenous women and girls in indigenous communities close to mining areas (GHRA 2016, Colchester 2002). These women are attracted to the areas because of the higher salaries and an escape from their poverty. Hinterland and indigenous women are the most vulnerable to poverty (UNICEF 2016). Around the mining camps of Guyana, female prostitutes can be found from as far as Colombia7. The presence of children working in the mines is also a concern. In some mines, young indigenous males below the age of 16 and some as young as 9 can be found working in mining operations (GHRA 2016). Some
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6 https://www.state.gov/j/tip/rls/tiprpt/countries/2015/243449.htm
7 Interview social worker at the Ministry of Social Protection
boys in areas close to mines drop out of school at an earlier age to work in the mines (UNICEF 2016).

**Further gender analysis needed**

It is important to note that men and women are not homogenous groups of people and intersections with age, race, class, culture, citizenship and other categories present a diverse map of stakeholders with diverse interests and needs. Because there is a paucity of literature and data on nuanced gender issues generally and especially on gender issues in the natural resources sector and within mining districts, further data collection and analysis will be conducted early in project implementation to better understand these sub-groups, particularly in the project area. For instance, better understanding is need regarding the orientations and interests of indigenous and non-indigenous men and women in and around the mining sector who are from the hinterland compared to those who migrate from the coast.

A baseline survey is almost complete on Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (KAP) of men and women in the sector under Norad-funded *Addressing Drivers of Deforestation in Guyana and Peru* project. Further, more a targeted gender analysis will be funded by the Norad project and conducted in the first year of this GEF project to fill gaps in knowledge and to further refine project interventions. This will inform the design of specific gender-sensitive interventions and socially and culturally-appropriate indicators (including supporting the design of a gender-sensitive financing mechanism, communications for behavioural change strategy, etc.). These studies will be a significant contribution to the literature on gender and social inclusion in the country and build the capacity of partners and the project team to understand gender issues and to integrate.

### 3. Gender Mainstreaming Plan

#### 3.1 Project Governance

There are few persons on the PSC who are well-versed on gender integration as well as only a handful of persons on the wider project team. In the governance of the project, the Guyana Women Miners Organization (GWMO) is represented on the PSC. The continued participation of the GWMO will ensure that many of the social issues within the sector and particularly the concerns and perspectives of women miners, youth and women engaged in some way in the sector are reflected at the governance level of the project. The project will collaborate and support the GWMO to fully execute its mandate, particularly in relation to the social issues that surround the sector.

Within the first year of the project, the following actions will be taken:

1. **Sensitization and capacity building for the PSC, project team, and sub-grantees on CI’s Rights Based Approach, gender mainstreaming policy, and the GMP and its integrated implementation with the other safeguard plans.**

2. **Targeted capacity building for gender focal points on the project team(s) to ensure resource persons on gender have the tools and skills to implement the GMP and ensure gender integration throughout project implementation.**

3. **The project will attempt, as much as is possible, to also have a participant with gender expertise in the meetings of the PSC. Given the challenge of having few women in senior technical positions in the member organizations of the PSC, it would be difficult to enforce a balance in the membership of the PSC. Gender equity will also be sought in the project management team and the local area committees. At the local committee level, special focus will be paid on ensuring indigenous women and other marginalized and vulnerable women are represented. This will require engaging with community women on their**
interests and availability and ensuring that barriers to their participation are addressed (e.g. providing capacity building to participate, a stipend to participate, etc.).

3.1.4 Where relevant, training will be provided for grantees on the GMP and its implementation and supported to integrate gender-specific interventions and indicators.

3.1.5 Activity reports produced will include information on gender representation and participation (where possible). Biannual reports on the state of gender integration will be produced by the gender focal points of the project team and submitted to the PSC to inform adaptive management.

3.2 Project Design and Implementation

The gender analysis conducted provides CI-Guyana with a good sense of the efforts required to support men and women’s participation in the project. That understanding will be refined so that interventions can be tailored to the range of stakeholders mapped. Building on the gender analysis conducted, CI-Guyana will implement the following actions:

3.2.1 Complementing the baseline KAP study, early in the first year of the GEF project, a full and targeted gender and social analysis will be designed (funded by the Norad-funded project). This is intended to visualize and evaluate the participation and contribution of diverse groups of men and women in the gold value chain beyond available data, their relationship with the environment, their differentiated needs and challenges, etc. to inform specific project interventions; CI-Guyana will work closely with the GWMO to design and execute this exercise;

3.2.2 Informed by (1) above, ensure gender integration in coordination with other safeguards in all project components and present to project team and PSC for review and approval;

3.2.2.1 For instance, CI-Guyana will incorporate a gender dimension in the identification of beneficiaries of the technology training and economic incentives to adopt these technologies. A gender quota will be established, requiring at least 10% women miner beneficiaries. Gender imbalance in both areas are cultural as men dominate in the gold extraction phase of the value chain.

3.2.3 Based on (2) above, integrate gender into relevant project activities to reduce inequalities between men and women and enable equal opportunity for men and women to benefit from the project;

3.2.4 Support the mobilization of Guyanese gender and social inclusion practitioners (e.g. GWMO, Ministry of Social Protection, development organizations with gender policies, and relevant civil society actors) into a Community of Practice to provide guidance to the implementation of safeguards.

3.2.5 All decision-making processes, consultations, and other stakeholder engagements will use methodologies to promote proportional representation and participation of men and women. Measures will be designed to reduce barriers to participation (e.g. tailoring language and messaging, holding gender separated meetings, holding
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8 It is important to note that probing sensitive issues on the ground with men and women and collection primary data around sensitive issues in the sector (e.g. those related to social issues) requires a sound understanding of gender dynamics on the ground in mining camps and communities as well as relationship building and carefully designed engagements. The PPG phase has allowed CI-Guyana a solid foundational understanding of the gender issues in the sector to be able to design a more targeted gender analysis that will assist in refining specific interventions (e.g. gender-sensitive financing mechanism, communications for behavioural change, etc.).
meetings at more appropriate times and dates, building the capacity of persons to decide to participate and/or to be able to effectively participate). The project will review similar gender capacity building activities in the marine and fisheries and other sectors in the Caribbean and elsewhere for their adaptability to the project target group.

3.2.6 Produce a case study of gender integration and social inclusion in the project, capturing lessons, challenges, etc. and execute a one-day policy level seminar on gender considerations in natural resources management and the extractive industries. This will form part of the Knowledge Management and Policy components of the project.

Since the project will occur in areas with high population of indigenous men and women, their capacity building to participate in the project will be essential as they are generally marginalized from society and tend to be based in traditional economies. The project will work with the indigenous peoples plan to ensure that their necessary capacity and empowerment is achieved to ensure maximum participation in the project. Indigenous groups of men and women may not be the only ones requiring more targeted interventions to enable participation or, it may be that only indigenous men and women of a certain age range require specific support. The full stakeholder mapping and gender and social analysis will refine the design of interventions.

3.3 Monitoring and Reporting

3.3.1 Gender will be mainstreamed throughout the results management framework. Sex disaggregated data will be collected to allow the project to monitor the following indicators at a minimum:

i. Number of men and women that actively participated in project activities (e.g. meetings, workshops, consultations)

ii. Number of men and women that received benefits, as proportionate to their engagement in mining, (e.g. employment, income generating activities, training, access to natural resources, land tenure or resource rights, equipment, leadership roles) from the project

iii. Number of strategies, plans (e.g. management plans and land use plans) and policies derived from the project that include gender considerations (this indicator applies to relevant projects);

3.3.2 Beyond these indicators, CI-Guyana will aim to develop impact indicators based on the baseline and gender and social analyses (e.g. assess the impact of dissemination and/or training activities in groups of men and women through pre- and post-activity surveys ex. gender focus groups).

3.3.3 For effective monitoring and evaluation of the engagement of men and women in the project, CI-Guyana will use both quantitative and qualitative indicators. Direct methods such as key informant interviews (KII), focus and group interviews of men and women and at a time and in places conducive to their participation, should be used to assess men and women’s engagement with and perspectives on the project. These direct survey methods should be carried out in the villages or communities by the gender expert or by others using methods designed by the expert. Local and indigenous men women who are impacted disproportionately by mercury pollution and the social impacts of mining should be a special focus of the interviews and assessments/evaluations.

3.3.4 Participatory workshops will be carried out at the mid-term and at the end of the project to evaluate progress and impacts integrating gender. These data will inform the production of biannual reports on the state of gender integration. These reports will be shared with the PSC and key findings should be shared with
other relevant bodies (e.g. Ministry of Social Protection, University of Guyana Gender Institute, etc.).
Background
Conservation International Guyana (CI-Guyana), and the Guyana Gold and Diamond Miners Association (GGDMA), in collaboration with the Guyana Geology and Mines Commission (GGMC), and the Toshaos’ Council (NTC), are implementing an initiative, “El Dorado Gold—Responsible Mining in Guyana”, to realize greater alignment of Guyana’s extractive industry sector (EIS) with national green development ambitions. The initiative has a particular focus on the artisanal, and smallscale gold mining (ASGM) sector in Guyana. One of the projects under this initiative is the proposed Global Environment Facility (GEF) under its Global Opportunities for Long-Term Development of the Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining Sector—GEF GOLD portfolio project called “A supply chain approach to eliminating mercury in Guyana’s ASGM sector: El Dorado Gold Jewelry – Made in Guyana.

The project will, respectively, engage the gold mining sector towards adoption of improved practices to reduce pressure on forests, and engage business enterprises and actors across the gold mining value chain to shift away from mercury use.

The project combines utilization of a Supply Chain Approach to identify opportunities to improve efficiency of the sector and a Sustainable Landscape Approach to further integrate mining activities spatially and temporally into local and regional development. It is also underscored by a Rights Based Approach integrating effective and inclusive Stakeholder Involvement, such as Indigenous and Local Peoples, and Gender. Through this initiative a wide range of stakeholders in the sector are being engaged in processes to design a range of technological, financial and other solutions that can help shape policy that achieve certain key outcomes.

The project has the following main components:

Component 1: Mainstreaming appropriate mercury-free technologies in Guyana’s ASGM sector
Component 2: Financing capital investments in mercury-free technologies
Component 3: Promoting a market for mercury-free gold from Guyana
Component 4: National policies and incentives for mercury-free gold
Component 5: Monitoring and Evaluation
Component 6: Communications and Knowledge Management

The outcomes of the project are:

Outcome 1.1: Demonstration area established and appropriate mercury-free technologies mainstreamed in Guyana’s ASGM sector.
Outcome 2.1: A functioning financial mechanism for capital investments for mercury-free technologies is established.
Outcome 3.1: A chain of custody process, verification mechanism for gold and, an El Dorado Branding Scheme is developed and institutionalized, and linked to international responsibly produced gold markets.
Outcome 4.1: A national policy on responsible gold production and value added and requisite laws/regulations refined/drafted to support a responsible gold commodity chain.
The project will have two demonstration sub-projects which are expected to be in Guyana. The proposed location of the sites are in Region 9. The largest administrative region in Guyana, Region 9 is located in the Upper Takutu-Upper Essequibo bordering the region of Potaro-Siparuni, Berbice-Corentyne to the east and Brazil to the south and west. Lethem, Aishalton, Sand creek, Karasabai, Moco Moco, Annai, Fairview, Apoteri, Surama and Rupertee are all villages in region 9. With Apoteri being an isolated forest community, Rupertee, a savannah community located close to the main road, and Fairview, a forest community lying within a protected area. The main trading centers include Annai, Karasabai and Lethem.

The current population of region 9 is 24,212, comprising mainly indigenous peoples (90%) of Macushi, Wapishana and Wai Wai ancestry. The North Rupununi is inhabited mainly by the Macushi and the south is the Wapishana, who have a keen interest in biological conservation of their ancestral lands. The South Rupununi consists of a forest-savannah eco-zone with settlements today consisting of main villages, satellite villages, hamlets, homesteads, farm camps and hunting and fishing camps that are widely dispersed across the area.

The Region occupies 57,750 km² of Guyana’s land area and has a population density of 0.4 persons per km². Further, the average household size is 4.9 persons/household with most families occupying three different family dwellings: a permanent house in the main village, a house or hut on the family homestead or farm camp near to their farming grounds and a semi-permanent hunting and fishing camp in the bush. 57% of the region’s population age 19 and less with 8-9% being in the 15-19 age range. The region experienced a population growth of 2.5% over the period 2002-2012.

Completion of primary education is practically universal. 38.2% of the population is engaged in Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing with over two-thirds (67.5%) of households deriving incomes from agro-processing Ballayram 2015). However, other non-traditional activities are used to support the household income. The remoteness of communities in this Region impacts food, fuel and other commodity prices which continue to rise. It must be noted that the women preform equally strenuous tasks as the men.

Reports suggest that households in the region possess fairly good health with water borne and mosquito transmitted diseases occurring sporadically. However, hypertension and diabetes is a growing issue. Long and extensive flooding and food security becomes an issue since due to the heavy dependence on the agriculture sector for income. These can augment the health issues of the region. In these instances, communities rely on the government and other NGO’s for their assistance. However, the households employ a range of coping mechanisms in these times. In recently, both governmental and non-governmental organizations have been working in the region advance the welfare of the indigenous peoples. In terms of monetary income, data shows that the region is considered one of the poorest in Guyana.

Mining in Guyana occurs in proximity to indigenous peoples since they mainly occupy the interior of the country, the location of most mining operations. Indigenous populations are therefore disproportionately impacted by both the environmental and social impacts of mining. Environmental impacts include the destruction of the forests and its associated biodiversity, pollution of waterways and streams which are their primary sources of water and environmental health related issues especially mercury exposure and poisoning. Since indigenous populations utilizes ecosystem services heavily in their subsistence living, they are affected by disruptions in the ecosystem from mining operations.
The social impacts include, but is not limited to, displacement and resettlement of villages, disruption of the social structure of the village due to men leaving their families to work in goldmining resulting in indigenous women left to take care of the home and village. When men migrate to mining communities to work, farms are abandoned and the national status of the village declines leading to food and nutrition insecurity. In fact the abandonment of agriculture for mining disrupts the entire subsistence based economy of the indigenous society leading to numerous social issues. There are therefore reported rising instances of alcoholism, drug addiction, prostitution, unemployment and single parent families in villages close to mining communities. Further, gambling and infidelity are also increasing. The absence of men from a village leave the women vulnerable to being attacked by outsiders and increases the likelihood of rape. Human trafficking is also associated with mining camps in Guyana. Sexual exploitation has brought with it an increase in the spread of the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) in mining camps and surrounding villages\textsuperscript{9}. Another major impact of mining is the absence of any formal education setting in mining areas. In cases where there are schools, the literature notes that young boys usually drop out of school to go work in the mines. Therefore, there is a high level of school dropouts in mining areas.

Many indigenous persons are also employed in the mining operations of others, have mining operations of their own or live in villages that have contracted their village lands to mining for a royalty fee. They also provide many related services to the mining industry. Indigenous people therefore benefit economically from mining. The use of mercury in small scale mining operations in Guyana is an environmental health issue affecting mainly the miners and indigenous populations. Mercury is released into the waterways of interior locations in the ore recovery phase of the mining operations. Mercury enters the food chain from the waterways and bio-accumulates to the riverain life of fish and moves it way up to large mammals. Indigenous populations of Guyana diet consists mainly of fish and wildlife, both of which can become polluted by mercury. Indigenous women are therefore excessively at high risk of mercury poisoning.

The demonstration site of the project will occur in Region 9. CI-Guyana will observe all local and international guidelines and best practices in the activities of the project. CI-GEF recognises that consideration must be given to the concerns of the indigenous population in the implementation of the project. It is therefore necessary to provide a safeguard plan according to CI-GEF policy for the interaction of the project activities and the indigenous populations.

\textbf{Indigenous Peoples – National Situation}

The indigenous peoples of Guyana are known colloquially as Amerindians. There are nine (9) Amerindian peoples in the country, namely, the Akawaio, Arawaks, Arekuna, Carib, Makushi, Patamona, Wapishana, Wai Wai and Warrau.\textsuperscript{10}

\textsuperscript{9} Cholester et al, 2002

\textsuperscript{10} Cholester et al, 2002
They are the descendants of the first people to inhabit the varied geographical zones in the northern part of South America. Some groups were coastal dwellers while others lived mainly in the rain forest, savannahs and mountains of the interior. Today most of the indigenous communities are situated in the interior of the country and now constitute about 9.1 percent, or approximately 70,000, of the total population of Guyana.

Despite rapid changes in many areas of the interior, most Amerindians continue to operate mainly outside the cash economy and are still dependent on a subsistence way of life which includes farming, fishing and hunting.

However, in their efforts to earn cash incomes some village leaders (Toshaos) have reached contractual arrangements with loggers, saw millers and gold miners to exploit timber and gold from their villages for a royalty fee. The royalty must be 7 percent or higher according to the Amerindian Act of 2006. Beginning in the early 1980s, the growth in gold and diamond mining has attracted many Amerindian males. Many males have abandoned their villages to work in mining operations affecting the social structure of the village as women and children are left alone for long periods. Agriculture the traditional subsistence economy of villages is affected by the absence of men. Gender relations and roles are impacted as women are now expected to undertake the most of the responsibility within their villages as men leave to work in the mining sector.

215 indigenous communities in Guyana now have legal title to their collectively held lands. These holdings total some 29,000 square kilometres or 13.9 percent of the national territory. This area includes nearly 4 million acres of forested land that is legally under the control of indigenous peoples. The land titling process is currently being undertaken with assistance from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

The issues facing indigenous groups of Guyana are all related to lack of empowerment, their marginal status within the overall society and the affect this has on their self-determination as indigenous people. Impoverished indigenous women and children are particularly at risk of being lured to mining and lumber camps deep in the interior with promises of employment and end up being forced in to prostitution through debt bondage, intimidation or abuse. There is also the issue of human trafficking of indigenous women and girl in and around mining camps.

Access to education and health care in Amerindian communities continues to be limited however the stated government policy is to provide indigenous children with the same educational opportunities available to the rest of the population. In practice, this is not the case. The government of Guyana also has a basic universal health care policy in which all citizens should have access to free basic health care. In the case of hinterland residents the government may transport residents to the capital and regional health care centers to access services not

11 UNDP, October 2013

available in their communities. The Situational Analysis of Women and Children in Guyana (2016) shows that indigenous women and children have lower access to education and health compared to other groups. Further, limited health care services and the deterioration of their physical environment by activities such as mining predispose Amerindians to risks of worsened illnesses.

Safeguards related to the Implementation of the Project
The CI-GEF ESMF policies concerning Indigenous Peoples recognize the distinct circumstances that expose Indigenous Peoples to different types of risks and impacts from development projects. As social groups with identities that are often distinct from dominant groups in their national societies, Indigenous Peoples are frequently among the most marginalized and vulnerable segments of the population. As a result, their economic, social, and legal status often limit their capacity to defend their rights to lands, territories, and other productive resources, and restricts their ability to participate in and benefit from development.

Risks to Indigenous Peoples
Loss of ancestral rights to land and natural resource use areas as well as areas used for social, cultural and spiritual purposes. Such rights would need to be identified and recognized in specific projects;
Changes in land and natural resource use that do not take into consideration traditional resource use practices. Activities that support land and natural resource use changes based on unfounded assumptions that these are unsustainable may inflict both adverse social (e.g., decreased food security) and environmental consequences (e.g., over-exploitation of remaining land use areas). Such activities should only be undertaken based on a thorough understanding of both biological and social evidence, and through consultations with Indigenous Peoples;
Loss of culture and social cohesion. Given Indigenous Peoples’ social and political marginalization and their distinct cultures and identities, which are often intertwined with their land and natural resource use practices, interventions may adversely affect their culture and social organization, whether inadvertently or not. While indigenous communities may welcome and seek change, they can be vulnerable when such change is imposed from external forces without their full participation and consent; and
Inequitable benefits and participation. Given their social and political marginalization, Indigenous Peoples may not reap the benefits of conservation projects. The costs (e.g., in time and resources) of participating in project activities may also outweigh the benefits to Indigenous Peoples. Participation design may not include appropriate capacity building (when needed), appropriate representation of Indigenous Peoples in decision-making bodies, or take into consideration local decision-making structures and processes. This may lead to alienation of Indigenous Peoples or conflicts with and/or between communities. It is important also to recognize that certain subgroups may be at an especially vulnerable position – indigenous women, for example, often have even fewer rights and reduced ability to access benefits and participation. It is important to ensure these subgroups are not ‘glossed over’ and that they are given equal rights to the rest of the group.

Project Requirements
In light of these risks, all CI-GEF funded projects are required to:
Conduct safeguard screening for Indigenous Peoples as early as possible during the project preparation phase;

Implement effective participation of Indigenous Peoples in the preparation of environmental and social impact assessments to assess risks and opportunities and to improve the understanding of the local context and affected communities;

Implement effective consultation processes with the affected Indigenous Peoples’ communities to fully identify their views and to obtain their Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) for project activities affecting them. While FPIC is a community-level process, it is important to ensure that decisions at the community level are representative of all community members, especially those who have historically been left out of decision-making, such as indigenous women; and

Development an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) describing measures to avoid adverse impacts and enhance culturally appropriate benefits in each project.

The level of detail necessary to meet the requirements of the IPP is proportional to the complexity of the proposed project and commensurate with the nature and scale of its potential effects on the Indigenous Peoples, whether adverse or positive. This will be determined by CI’s Project Agency in consultation with the Executing Entity based on a subjective assessment of project activities, circumstances of Indigenous Peoples, social risks and project impacts.

Specific measures to achieve these objectives will be incorporated in the IPP developed with the affected Indigenous Peoples communities.\(^\text{13}\)

Consultation and Consent

With regard to the consultation process for obtaining consent, the project will ensure the effective participation of indigenous peoples and communities. This consultation process will seek to inform them about the project, fully identify their views, inform/adapt the project design, and to obtain their free, prior and informed consent to project activities affecting them and, if its development is required, the IPP. It is important to ensure that community representatives giving consent are truly representative of the community; traditional leaders may not necessarily have the full picture of how a project may impact certain subgroups, such as women, in the community. The following is the process for consultation.

First, "permission to consult and seek consent" should be obtained. It is recognised that there may be a need for capacity building of members of the community to understand the project and their rights to consent and participate in it.

Then, once permission has been granted, the elements of a consultation in good faith should be considered, if permission has been granted; clarity regarding who are the negotiators and who are the decision makers.

Agree on the process and clarity regarding the participation of specialists, advisers and technicians

Agreement regarding timeframes / environment free of coercion

Previous studies on environmental impact / transparency and relevance of the information.

Conditions of the agreement

Fair sharing of benefits

Clarity in the conditions of the agreement

Mechanisms for ongoing processes of negotiation and consensus between the parties

\(^\text{13}\) CI, ESMF 2017
Clear mechanism for conflict and complaint resolution (publish the grievance mechanism in various formats)
Mandatory nature of the agreement (whether consent has been given or not)
Respect for indigenous self-determination and autonomy.

Stakeholder Map
Indigenous Associations and Organizations in Guyana

Ministry of Indigenous Peoples’ Affairs
The Ministry of Indigenous Peoples’ Affairs (MIPA) is the main entity, mandated by law to represent the interests of the Amerindians. It seeks to enhance the social, economic and environmental well-being of Indigenous Peoples and their lands through collaboration, sustainable development and appropriate legislation, while at the same time ensuring the preservation of Indigenous culture and traditional knowledge. This ministry carries out its mandate through the work of several departments that collaboratively seek to represent the Amerindians at all levels. These departments are the Projects, Social Welfare and Health, Hinterland Scholarship, Governance and Community Development and Indigenous Residence.

The Amerindian Peoples Association
The Amerindian Peoples Association (APA) is a non-governmental Indigenous Peoples advocacy organization that seeks to promote and defend the rights of the Indigenous Peoples of Guyana. The Association was formed in 1991 at a conference for Indigenous leaders in Georgetown. These leaders had met to discuss various problems affecting their communities and felt that there was the need for an independent organization to represent their issues especially as these were not being addressed by the government. Such issues included natural resources exploitation on traditional Indigenous lands by large mining and logging companies and various forms of human right abuses including police brutality.

The APA was therefore formed to actively support community initiatives, to address human rights violations and to work towards improving the general conditions of the Indigenous Peoples of Guyana.

Further, the APA conducts extensive programs in the interior, serving as a primary conduit for information about government policies and programs to Amerindian communities, as well as conveying the Amerindian communities’ views to the national government. The APA works primarily with communities in Regions 1, 2, 7, 8 and 9 on various issues which affect them and by providing capacity building workshops on the Amerindian Act and other rights related areas which may have an impact on their lives such as the Low Carbon Development Strategy (LCDS), REDD+ initiatives, among others.

National Toshaos’ Council

In accordance with the Amerindian Act, 2006, the National Toshaos’ Council (NTC) was established as a cooperate body comprising all Toshao. It outlines that the NTC shall elect an executive committee comprising one Toshao from each administrative region of the country and not more than ten additional Toshao. Some of the main functions of the NTC as designated by the Act include:

The promotion of good governance in Villages including investigating matters as requested by a Village and making recommendations.

The preparation of strategies & plans for poverty reduction and improved access to health and education in Villages

The preparation of strategies and plans for the protection, conservation and sustainable management of Village lands and natural resources

To advise the requisite Minister on the protection of Amerindian culture and heritage, including the identification and designation of Amerindian monuments, development of Villages, the impact of legislation or policy on Villages and any changes that should be made to such legislation or policy.

The coordination and integration of the activities of Villages on a national basis.

Amerindian Village Councils

Part III of the Amerindian Act 2006, makes provisions of the establishment of village councils that have oversight of the activities within the respective villages. The functions of the village councils include but are not limited to, representing the Village, providing advice and strategic direction to the Village providing for the planning and development of the Village, holding for the benefit and use of the Village all rights, titles and interests in or over Village lands, managing and regulate the use and occupation of Village lands promoting the sustainable use, protection and conservation of Village lands and the resources on those lands and encouraging the preservation and growth of Amerindian culture.15

Guyana Organization of Indigenous Peoples

Established on July 29, 1990, this organization seeks to facilitate the development of Amerindians through indigenous peoples’ institutes, promote the recognition of the internationally recognised rights and interests of our peoples through partnership with other NGO’s, stakeholders and agencies.16

Amerindian People’s Association

The Amerindian Peoples Association (APA) is primarily an advocacy organization that seeks to promote and defend the rights of the Indigenous Peoples of Guyana. Its membership is composed of units throughout the country. There are 80 such units. The governance of the organization is by an executive committee comprising the President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, Assistant Secretary/Treasurer, thirteen regional representatives, a women’s representative and a youth representative.

The APA seeks to promote the social, economic, political and cultural development of Amerindian communities. The organization’s focus is legislative and policy reform in areas such as participation and representation of indigenous peoples by indigenous peoples themselves, rights under national and international law, sustainable use of the natural resources and to ensure that the state fulfills its obligations in providing basic services to indigenous communities such as health, education, transportation and communication services.

The Amerindian Action Movement of Guyana (TAAMOG)
A national advocacy organization that is based in Georgetown but work in all regions of Guyana. The organization is headed by an executive. Information on its program or activities is not readily available at this time.

National Amerindian Development Foundation (NADF)
No information of contact information for the organization

Indigenous Peoples Commission (IPC)
The IPC is a national advocacy organization. The organization is active in a number of areas across sector and issues. The organization is not listed and little information could be obtained on its structure.

Guyana Organization of Indigenous Peoples
This organization has members in all in all 10 regions with an estimated membership of 3000. The largest membership is in region 9. The organization is governed by an executive committee consisting of 15 members. Elections for office bearer is held every 2 years. The organization focus is advocacy on all issues pertaining to indigenous peoples in Guyana. The main subject areas of activity or programmes include a number of areas such as health, HIV/AIDS, Sports, Welfare and relief, Culture and art, and the Environment.

South Central Peoples Development Association (SCPDA)
A representative organization of Wapichan communities of the South and South Central Rupununi. It is a local organisation that has been working for at least 15 years on traditional land rights claim of the region. The organization was recognised for its work by several international organizations. The project will seek to collect detailed baseline information on the indigenous organizations to ensure all of the indigenous representational organizations are included in its outreach and other project activities.

Regional Democratic Councils (RDCs for regions 1, 7, 8 and 9)
The Regional Democratic Council is the supreme Local Government Organ in each region with the responsibility for the overall management and administration of the Region and the coordination of the activities of all Local Democratic Organs within its boundaries.

Regional Context

Indigenous Associations and Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Indigenous Peoples Affairs</td>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td>225-8416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Toshaos Council</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Joel Fredericks</td>
<td>617-4385, 660-0003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Amerindian Peoples Association  National  Jean La Rose
Laura George
Earl Thomas  227-0275
Fax: 223-8150

Amerindian Village Councils  Regional

Guyana Organization for Indigenous Peoples  National  Mary Valenzuela  225-2479

The Amerindian Action Movement of Guyana  National  Peter Persaud or Pamela Mendonza

National Amerindian Development Foundation  National  Ashton Simon

Indigenous Peoples Commission  National  Neil Bacchus  231-5298

South Central People’s Development Association  Regional  Cedric Buckley  772 9290

Support Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Democratic Council Region 1</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td>777-5029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Democratic Council Region 7</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td>455-2251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: 455-2316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Democratic Council Region 8</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td>225-8655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Democratic Council Region 9</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td>772-2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workplan for the effective participation of indigenous peoples and communities

Project Area

During the selection of the project demonstration site, the indigenous peoples and communities and their respective organizations whose village lands (titiled or un-titiled) that fall within or in close proximity to the proposed project sites will be identified. Other indigenous persons who work in mining and originate from other areas will be given recognition.

Legal Framework

The legal framework directly related to the Indigenous Peoples of Guyana are:
The Constitution of the Cooperative Republic of Guyana – Article 142
Amerindian Act 2006 (Passed February 2006 and accented to on March 14th, 2006)
National Development Strategy – Chapter 24
Amerindian Land Tenure Policy 1995
CI-Guyana will become familiar with all the laws and policies pertaining to indigenous peoples and ensure that they are followed in the implementation of the project activities and sub-activities.

Dissemination of Materials
The project will ensure that all project information developed is reflective of cultural respect of indigenous peoples of Guyana. It will utilise simple language, explaining the objectives and impacts of the project. The project will translate some of the materials in the main indigenous language of the areas in close proximity to the project sites if necessary.

Institutional Alliances
The project will form strategic alliances with national and local representative organisations of indigenous peoples to achieve the stated objectives of the project and ensuring that indigenous perspective is reflective in the project design and in the implementation of the project activities. However, the project will consider both the actual capacity and the absorptive capacity of indigenous organizations and its effect on their ability to fully participate in project activities and consultations. The National Toshao’s Council which was part of the Project Steering Committee for the project preparatory phase will be retained. The retention of the National Toshao’s Council will ensure that the indigenous considerations are reflected in all of the project activities at the project governance level. The possibility of another representative indigenous organization on the PSC will be explored. The Ministry of Indigenous People’s Affairs will be consulted with closely and informed of all of the project activities. It’s involvement in the implementation of the project activities will be on a need basis. Other indigenous organizations will also be consulted and partnerships established on a need basis. The project proposes to establish a local project committee or several local committees. The local communities will be consulted on the community level issues of project implementation. At the local project committee level, village councils, for indigenous villages in close proximity to project sites, will be an integral part of the local committees. The local communities and other populations of affected Indigenous People (those who migrate from afar) will be consulted and asked to specify which representative institutions are entitled to express consent on their behalf.

Proposed Actions to Achieve Indigenous Representation and Participation
Within the area of the demonstration sites of the project and other areas of impact, informational meetings will be carried out with all indigenous organizations in the areas and those whose sphere of influence extends to the area. The Ministry of Indigenous People’s Affairs will also be duly informed. The meeting will inform of the project’s objectives and desired outcomes. The meetings will explain the measures to ensure that Indigenous Peoples receive culturally appropriate benefits, the measures to avoid, minimize, mitigate, or compensate for adverse impacts - culturally appropriate and the grievance procedures, and monitoring and evaluation arrangements. The following actions will occur:
The concerns of the indigenous organizations will be noted and reflected in the implementation of the activities. An introductory workshop/project inception workshop will be held at the local level (project demonstration site area) focusing on indigenous peoples and the project. The workshop should be in jargon free language with translation in the main languages, and in places that guarantee the participation of most stakeholders. The workshop will cover, according to FPIC, the following:

- nature, size, pace, reversibility, scope of project
- reasons for the project
- locality of areas affected
- preliminary assessment of likely economic, social, cultural & environmental impact including potential risks and equitable benefit sharing in a context that respects the precautionary principle
- personnel likely to be involved
- procedures that the project may entail
- A survey will be carried out to identify the main language of the area and the workshop carried out in that language.
- Hire an indigenous specialist to facilitate the inception workshop and document all the indigenous perspectives and concerns regarding the project and the demonstration sites. The indigenous expert should also conduct a baseline survey of indigenous concerns and issues in the project area.
- Establish local project committee and ensure that indigenous organizations and peoples are adequately represented on same. Indigenous women as a special group who are both affected by mercury and can act as change agents in the education on mercury effects should also be adequately represented. Young men who work in mining and boys who leave school early to work in the mines will also be targeted.
- Conduct informational and education workshops/sessions in mining areas on the effects of mining on indigenous use of natural resources and the social impacts of mining. Workshops on participation rights and consultation process to ensure and build the capacity for active participation will be addressed.
- Explore the possibility of translating some of the project information materials in main indigenous language. For example, if one of the project sites is Marudi in Region 9, the main language of the surrounding area is Wapishana. The project site board can be in English and Wapishan.
- Implement stakeholder communications and engagement plan, ensure that indigenous organizations and representatives are reflected in same.
- Publish the grievance mechanisms using both written and oral methods. The catholic church is prominent in Region and respected, the project can use that fora as a means of disseminating both information on the project and
- Ensure a participatory direct approach to monitoring and evaluation done through decentralized assessments including meetings with the local committees and indigenous peoples to verify indicators.

Mechanism for Complaint or Conflict Resolution

The project will establish and publish a grievance mechanism according to CI and GEF guidelines. The project coordinator/manager will be responsible for receiving complaints and ensuring that all grievances are resolved according to CI policy which is as follows:

Grievance resolution will involve the participation of the MOIPA, village councils and the Toshaos’ Council. However, the protection of indigenous rights lies within the government’s indigenous entity the MOIPA. In light of this, the conflict resolution and grievance mechanism
for a project-by-project basis as outlined by CI will be enacted. A summary of this mechanism is outlined below:

Upon receipt of the grievance it will be registered and screened.

Based on the outcome of the screening process, the validity of the claim will be established and the grievance treated as such.

In the case where the grievance is valid an approach to the solution of the problem is derived and the complainant is consulted.

If the approach is agreed up then it will be implemented, monitored and evaluated.

If the approach is not agreed up then further screening and assessment would be conducted, stakeholders would be informed and a new approach derived.

This new approach would then be implemented, monitored and evaluated.

Upon resolution of the grievance, a final report would be submitted to the PSC. However, if the grievance is not resolved, then the said grievance is submitted to the CI in DC for further action and decision.

All grievances will be resolved in 30 days, unless a resolution cannot be reached at the local, Guyana, level. In that instance it will be elevated to CI DC and resolved within 90 days.

Provision of Funds

The following budgetary allocation is needed to effectively implement the plan:

**Table 2: Preliminary Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visits to the project demonstration site/s to ensure community involvement and ownership</td>
<td>USD 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP inception workshops and capacity building activities</td>
<td>USD 2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation and dissemination of project awareness information including project brochures, sign boards, publishing of grievance mechanism etc</td>
<td>USD 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local project committee meetings, including gender specific meetings</td>
<td>USD 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursements for transportation and others costs for participation in workshops</td>
<td>USD 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP groups for monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>500 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,500 USD</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monitoring and Evaluation of the Stakeholder Involvement Process

For effective monitoring and evaluation of the engagement of indigenous people in the project (process and impact evaluation), the process should include both quantitative and qualitative indicators in addition to evaluation of outputs such as the number of educational/informational workshops carried out, and the percentage of attendance at these workshops, discriminated by ethnicity and gender. Direct methods such as key informant interviews (KII), focus and group interviews of indigenous groups should be used to assess indigenous engagement with the project. These direct survey methods should be carried out in the villages or communities by the indigenous expert or the methodology designed by the expert. Indigenous women who are impacted disproportionately by mercury pollution and the social impacts of mining should be a special focus of the interviews and assessments/evaluations. The project will include a
mechanism for anonymity to ensure an environment to disclose grievances not reported because of intimidation or coercion.

It is also recommended that one participatory workshop be carried out mid and at the end of the project in order to measure the degree of information, awareness and ownership of the project and its objectives by indigenous peoples and indigenous women in particular.

**References**


APPENDIX VI . C: STAKEHOLDERS’ ENGAGEMENT PLAN

Introduction

Conservation International Guyana (CI-Guyana), and the Guyana Gold and Diamond Miners Association (GGDMA), in collaboration with the Guyana Geology and Mines Commission (GGMC), and the National Toshaos’ Council (NTC), are implementing an initiative, “El Dorado Gold—Responsible Mining in Guyana”, to realize greater alignment of Guyana’s extractive industry sector (EIS) with national green development ambitions. The initiative has a particular focus on the artisanal, and small-scale gold mining (ASGM) sector in Guyana. One of the projects under this initiative is the proposed Global Environment Facility (GEF) under its Global Opportunities for Long-Term Development of the Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining Sector—GEF GOLD portfolio project called “A supply chain approach to eliminating mercury in Guyana’s ASGM sector: El Dorado Gold Jewelry – Made in Guyana.” The project will, respectively, engage the gold mining sector towards adoption of improved practices to reduce pressure on forests, and engage business enterprises and actors across the gold mining value chain to shift away from mercury use.

The project combines utilization of a Supply Chain Approach to identify opportunities to improve efficiency of the sector and a Sustainable Landscape Approach to further integrate mining activities spatially and temporally into local and regional development. It is also underscored by a Rights Based Approach integrating effective and inclusive Stakeholder Involvement, such as Indigenous and Local Peoples, and Gender. Through this initiative a wide range of stakeholders in the sector are being engaged in processes to design a range of technological, financial and other solutions that can help shape policy that achieve certain key outcomes.

The project has the following main components:

Component 1: Mainstreaming appropriate mercury-free technologies in Guyana’s ASGM sector
Component 2: Financing capital investments in mercury-free technologies
Component 3: Promoting a market for mercury-free gold from Guyana
Component 4: National policies and incentives for mercury-free gold
Component 5: Monitoring and Evaluation
Component 6: Communications and Knowledge Management

The outcomes of the project are:

Outcome 1.1: Demonstration area established and appropriate mercury-free technologies mainstreamed in Guyana’s ASGM sector.

Outcome 2.1: A functioning financial mechanism for capital investments for mercury-free technologies is established.

Outcome 3.1: A chain of custody process, verification mechanism for gold and, an El Dorado Branding Scheme is developed and institutionalized, and linked to international responsibly produced gold markets.

Outcome 4.1: A national policy on responsible gold production and value added and requisite laws/regulations refined/drafted to support a responsible gold commodity chain.

The project will have a demonstration sub-project which is expected to be in the interior locations of Guyana. The proposed location of the sites is in Region 9. The largest administrative region in Guyana, Region 9 is located in the Upper Takutu-Upper Essequibo bordering the region of Potaro-Siparuni, Berbice-Corentyne to the east and Brazil to the south and west. It contains the towns of Aishalton, Lethem, Good Hope and Surama. The population of Region 9
according to the National Census (2012) is 24,238 with 12, 479 females and 11, 759 males. The population of Region 9 consists mainly indigenous Guyanese with Macushi and Wapishanas being the two largest groups with a small but very culturally strong Wai Wai population. The proposed area of the demonstration site is just outside of the titled indigenous lands of the village of Aishalton. The village has formally asked for an extension of its boundaries that will include some of the areas where gold mining occurs. The gold mining that occurs just outside of the village has social and environmental impacts on the villages at its inhabitants. CI-Guyana has an active presence in the area as it is part of the partnership that is leading the development of regional and local development plans. The agency is therefore very familiar with the local committees and social actors in the area.

The successful preparation of the project’s proposal and implementation of the project will require the involvement of all stakeholders from the various sectors of the Guyanese society. Gold mining is an integral part of the Guyanese society and intersects with various stakeholders at all levels of the society national government, regional government, local government, private sector, civil society, local villages etc. CI as an agency values the input of all stakeholders in the development and implementation of its projects. It recognizes that project ownership and sustainability are tied to the early active involvement of all stakeholders.

A stakeholder engagement plan seeks to establish the appropriate channels of information, communication and consultation, based on a dynamic interaction through formal mechanisms established by the project, such as the Project Steering Committee, the Project Management Unit, a Technical Committee, Local Committees, and the general public, especially in the project’s area of influence.

Stakeholder Engagement Process

The proposed multi-stakeholder engagement process consists of four progressive stages (Figure 1). The output of each stage enables the subsequent stage, with a progressively wider group of stakeholders participating at each stage. Adequate representation of the diversity of perspectives and interests must be ensured throughout the process for it to be effective. Therefore, at the earlier stages of the process, when the number of stakeholders involved is smaller, care must be taken to ensure that the diversity of interests related to the issues are represented as best as possible.
Scoping

In the scoping stage, research and data collection activities will help develop a fact base on the issue being addressed through the process. This stage will provide information about the key players, stakeholders related to the issues, and any segmentation based on their roles, interests, perspective on the issue and other factors. This will involve the conduct of research based mostly on data from secondary sources and key informants but augmented as necessary with primary data collection. Emphasis will be placed on ensuring that duly qualified persons conduct research that are objective, comprehensiveness, and cost effective. This would be achieved through due diligence in recruitment, planning research, and reviewing outputs thereof.

Diagnostic

Wider engagement on the issue commences in the second stage of the process, which is informed by the research and data from the first stage. This stage will involve participation by a core set of stakeholders, who have the closest relationship to the issue being discussed. This group is likely to vary depending on the issue but it is anticipated that, owing to their strategic role in the sector, several stakeholders would need to participate regardless of the topic. The intention of engagement at this stage is collaborative identification of high priority issues and the design of options for evidence-based solutions to those issues. Ideally, the key stakeholders who are expected to implement the solutions should be involved at this stage but it is recognized that participation of these stakeholders at this stage would best be through representatives. It is therefore essential that these representatives ensure adequate interface with their constituents so as to ensure proper representation from an informed position. This stage would also help secure “buy-in” and ownership by the stakeholders.

Validation

The third stage of the stakeholder engagement process is validation, where the options for solutions discussed at stage 2 will be discussed with a further expanded group of stakeholders for validation and refinement. This stage will strengthen the proposal and determine the design and focus of the public engagement process towards finalization of the proposed solution. This
stage should also further build stakeholder ownership of the solutions and stir individual and joint action for implementation by stakeholders.

Public Engagement

The final stage is to ensure public engagement with the proposal for wider support and input for its implementation. This stage will also help provide key information to support the implementation of the solutions through critical public feedback mechanisms. A variety of mechanisms, tools and media will need to be utilized at this stage to reach as wide a cross section of the public as is possible. Particular attention will need to be placed on ensuring that stakeholders to be most impacted by implementation of the solution are fully engaged at this stage to augment informed representation which would have been made on their behalf in the earlier stages.

Engaging stakeholders early, often, and through participatory means are key to ensuring and maintaining transparency, and building and sustaining trust. The process will be implemented iteratively to design solutions for each of the issues identified as priority to be addressed through the project. This process for arriving at decisions or results by repeating rounds of analysis to achieve the desired solution is critical, especially in cases that require changes in public or private policy to be addressed.

Objectives of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan

To ensure that all stakeholders are engaged in the entire project cycle
To devise a plan of action that clearly identifies the means and frequency of engagement
To allocate budgetary and other resources in the project implementation and M&E for stakeholder engagement

Stakeholder engagement during the design phase –PPG

CI-Guyana engaged in a series of consultations in the preparatory stage of the project. A project steering committee of the PPG was established consisting of the representative organizations of the various sectors of the stakeholders. The government stakeholders are represented by the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) which is the Ministry that has overall governmental responsibility for the extractive sector including mining and environmental management and regulation. The MNR agencies with responsibilities for mining, the Guyana Geology and Mines Commission which is the regulatory body for mining in Guyana is on the PSC as is the Environmental Protection Agency. The private sector is represented by the Guyana Gold and Diamond Miners Association. The special interest stakeholders of women and indigenous peoples are also represented on the PSC. The Guyana Women Miners Organization (GWMO) is also on the PSC. The GWMO is the largest women mining organization in the country and has representation in all mining districts of Guyana. The National Toshaos’ Council (NTC) the representative body of the leaders of indigenous communities in Guyana is a PSC member. The PSC provided valuable input into the design of the project including providing feedback on the development of communication materials and the selection of the sites. The agencies also provided various technical and material support for the preparation of the proposal. CI considered the project a collaborative approach between members of the PSC and CI. It allowed PSC members, especially the MNR, to lead several of the consultative meetings and workshops.

On April 18th 2017, the MNR resuscitated the Minamata Working Group (MWG) in Guyana with a meeting of all organizations whose focus intersects with the issue of mercury use. The MWGs main aim is to provide a technical working group to assist the MNR to work towards Guyana’s fulfilment of the convention. CI and the MNR used the opportunity to provide information on
the project as a future initiative that will address the issue of mercury use in Guyana. CI-Guyana’s Technical Director presented on the project proposal. The organization gathered some baseline information directly from the stakeholders. It also received important feedback on the relevancy of the project design. CI-Guyana was also informed of other projects, both in the design phase and those being implemented that address the issue of mining and mercury pollution. The organization was therefore able to address synergies with other undertakings and avoiding duplications.

On Tuesday 6th June 2017, CI-Guyana facilitated a stakeholder Inception Workshop aimed at soliciting inputs from participants for the project design and preparation of the CI-GEF project “A Supply Chain Approach to Eliminating Mercury in Guyana’s Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining (ASGM) Sector: El Dorado Gold Jewelry – Made in Guyana”. The workshop was facilitated by the ProDoc writer Kevin Hill. A cross-section of stakeholders attended the session including those represented on the PSC. The outputs of the meeting were incorporated in the Pro Doc. As a follow-up, a workshop was held on June 27, 2017, aimed at validating the findings of the Inception Workshop, and to gather further inputs into the design of the CI-GEF full proposal “A Supply Chain Approach to Eliminating Mercury in Guyana’s Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining (ASGM) Sector: El Dorado Gold Jewelry – Made in Guyana”. Participants at this workshop included those who attended the June 6th Workshop as well as key individual who have significant insights into the gold-mining issues.

From January to June 2017 numerous formal and informal meetings were held with key stakeholders to inform them of the progress in project design, in addition to interviews and meetings with representatives of the public sector, private sector, NGOs, and indigenous peoples, as detailed in Table 1. The purpose of these meetings was to confirm the commitment of these stakeholders to the project, to obtain contributions to the project design, and to ensure that their interests were adequately reflected in the project strategy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Rationale/Issues Discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 12, 2017</td>
<td>Multi-stakeholder Workshop</td>
<td>The overall aim of the workshop was to advance a shared understanding of the state of the ASM Gold mining sector, receive feedback to design an effective dialogue process, and ensure that the interventions were well connected to the needs of stakeholders and produced a high level of impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 21, 2017</td>
<td>Meeting with Mr. Kemraj Parsram (CEO (ag) EPA) and Mr. Veetal Rajkumar (Head Policy Coordinating Unit, MNR).</td>
<td>CI took a strategic approach to engender a wider engagement with key stakeholders, and through this engagement to provide them with greater ownership in the Norad and GEF projects. At this meeting the suggestion was for the MNR to reactivate the Minamata Working Group as the coordinating body for mercury-free technologies in Guyana. (The Minamata Working Group was established to oversee the study on the Minamata Initial Assessment for Guyana).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 22, 2017</td>
<td>Meeting with Mr. Veetal Rajkumar (MNR). (The PS was unavailable for this meeting).</td>
<td>The meeting agreed that the MNR would reactivate the Minamata Working Group (MWG), with function to act as a coordinating body, a clearing house, and a focal point for policies and mercury-free technologies in Guyana, The meeting also agreed that under the auspices of the MWG, CI will hold a stakeholder’s meeting on April 13, 2017 to gather inputs from agencies on projects/activities they were engaged in with the mining sector and to share ideas on how to advance the agenda to eliminate mercury in gold mining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24, 2017</td>
<td>Meeting with Mr. Sam Wright, Consultant with MNR to develop the National Action Plan (NAP) on Mercury elimination in Guyana.</td>
<td>Mr. Wright provided CI with an overview of the draft NAP, and provided his views on what could be a reasonable amount of mercury-use in Guyana for the baseline in the GEF full proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 30, 2017</td>
<td>Meeting with CEO, Land Use Planning Department.</td>
<td>CI presented its “El Dorado Gold: Responsible Mining Initiative” to the CEO and one staff. Much of the discuss that followed centered on how to reduce the impact on forests while at the same time ensuring sustainable livelihoods of persons who depend on natural resources in the hinterland of Guyana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 3, 2017</td>
<td>Meeting with sub-committee on Areas for (Participants were: Major General (ret’d) Joseph Singh; Mr. Carlos Todd, Ms. Dianne McDonald and Mr. Lloyd Bandoo; and Mr. Veetal Rajkumar, MNR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13, 2017</td>
<td>Intervention for CIs Mining Initiative Meeting</td>
<td>Attending the meeting on behalf of CI-Guyana were: Dr. David Singh, Director and Vice President; Dr. Ballayram, Project Leader; and Ms. Kerry Ann Cort, GIS expert. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss and arrive at a revised list of areas for design and implementation of model multi-stakeholder resource management plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25, 2017</td>
<td>Minamata Working Group Meeting</td>
<td>The overall objective of the meeting was to coordinate and mainstream all programmes, plans and projects that are geared towards the implementation of the Minamata Convention. The National Working Group emanated from the work completed in the Minamata Initial Assessment Project in collaboration with the United Nations Development Programme. The Working Group is envisioned to ensure collaboration with all developmental and non-governmental organizations that are collaborating with the Government of Guyana to ensure that there is a phased reduction in mercury-use in Guyana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25, 2017</td>
<td>Meeting with Commissioner, Guyana Geology and Mines Commission (GGMC)</td>
<td>The meeting discussed an alternative to traditional sectoral approaches to addressing natural resource management. The Commissioner was favourably disposed to CI’s proposed sustainable landscape approach (SLA). It was agreed that the first task is to gather objectively determined information on the true cost of mining. This would provide information on the purely economic and environmental costs, as well as an overall cost-benefit analysis. It was felt that this information could be a good foundation for conversations on how to share costs and values among stakeholders in the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 6, 2017</td>
<td>Under auspices of MWG/MNR, CI held Inception Meeting for GEF ProDoc Full Proposal</td>
<td>This was a multi-stakeholder consultation with the aim to solicit inputs for the design of the CI-GEF “A Supply Chain Approach to Eliminating Mercury in Guyana’s Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining (ASGM) Sector: El Dorado Gold Jewelry – Made in Guyana”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1, 2017</td>
<td>Meeting with the Minister of Business</td>
<td>Dr. David Singh had a discussion with the Minister regarding international markets for mercury-free gold. As a follow-up to this meeting, Dr. Ballayram and Mr. Kevin Hill tried to make an appointment with the Minister on the week 5-8 June, but the Minister was unavailable. An appointment will be scheduled for the week 26-30 June, 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 7, 2017
Meeting with Mrs. Han Granger-Gaskin, Manager, TOPAZ Jewelry

Mr. Kevin Hill and Dr. Ballayram met with Mrs. Granger-Gaskin and discussed various aspects of mercury-free gold and gold jewelry. The manager, who had attended the January 17, 2017 Stakeholder’s Workshop, expressed a willingness to work closely with CI on the marketing aspects of the CI-GEF project.

June 27, 2017
Validation Workshop of the GEF ProDoc of the Full Proposal

This was a multi-stakeholder consultation with the aim to solicit endorsement of the final draft document, taking into considerations the inputs of stakeholders from the inception meeting, of the CI-GEF “A Supply Chain Approach to Eliminating Mercury in Guyana’s Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining (ASGM) Sector: El Dorado Gold Jewelry – Made in Guyana”

Stakeholder participation during project implementation

The retention of the PSC, as the main governance body of the project will ensure the continued participation of key stakeholders in the project planning, implementation and M & E. The Project Steering Committee (PSC) is comprised of representatives of the governmental agencies, private sector and special interest groups. The PSC will approve the work plans, be represented on recruitment processes and provide overall strategic guidance to the project.

CI-Guyana and the Guyana Gold and Diamond Miners Association will lead the project implementation. Other stakeholders may be invited to participate in meetings of the PSC, during which strategic guidelines and work plans will be discussed, negotiated, and approved by both executing parties.

During the initial phase of project implementation, agreements will be made regarding the development of each of the expected activities. CI-Guyana and GGDMA will take the lead for most of the activities, and may include other institutions as partners in the implementation of the activities based on their roles and mandates within the environmental, forestry, financial and other sectors related to the project.

Table 2: Partnerships in Implementation of Project Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.1: Demonstration area established and appropriate mercury-free technologies mainstreamed in Guyana’s ASGM sector.</td>
<td>GGDMA and GGMC will lead the implementation of activities in collaboration with CI-Guyana, the MNR, EPA, GWMO, NTO, NDC, Amerindian Villages, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2.1: A functioning financial mechanism for capital investments for mercury-free technologies is established.</td>
<td>CI-Guyana will lead the implementation of activities in partnerships with GGDMA, the PSC, Banks, Ministry of Business and the MNR, Syndicates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome 3.1: A chain of custody process, verification mechanism for gold and, an El Dorado Branding Scheme is developed and institutionalized, and linked to international responsibly produced gold markets. CI-Guyana will lead in partnerships with GGDMA, the PSC, Banks, Ministry of Business and the MNR, Syndicates, WWF Guyana.

Outcome 4.1: A national policy on responsible gold production and value added and requisite laws/regulations refined/drafted to support a responsible gold commodity chain. MNR and GGMC lead in collaboration with CI, GGDMA, PSC, Ministry of Legal Affairs, EPA, NTO, local committees, other NGOs such as the APA, Guyana Human Rights Association etc.

The project will establish a local project committee/s in area/s of the demonstration sites. This local committee will ensure appropriate planning and implementation of project activities, according to the project's objectives and local development and stakeholder priorities, in addition to ensuring complementarity with existing and other planned programs and projects in the area. The PSC, the Project Management Unit and local committee/s will all be closely linked, thereby ensuring that any concerns expressed by local stakeholders are shared with the highest levels of project management, and in the same way that decisions taken by the management team are duly communicated to local stakeholders. If the demonstration site is in an indigenous titled area, the village council will be part of the local communities and the necessary permission will be sought and the Ministry of Indigenous Peoples Affairs be parcel of the negotiations. In non-indigenous areas, the Neighbourhood Democratic Council (NDC) will be part of the local committee and used as one of the channels to disseminate information to the local community.

In achieving stakeholder participation CI will take the following actions:

- Local Committee/s to facilitate local stakeholder participation. These will provide mechanisms for the project to share approaches and strategic actions with local stakeholders, and, at the same time, provide a forum in which stakeholders can express their concerns, interests and suggestions.

- Gender equity and indigenous peoples’ mainstreaming plans. These will secure the involvement of women and indigenous people addressing the impacts account their specific needs.

- A grievance mechanism will be established and published so that all stakeholders are aware of its existence. The project coordinator/manager will be responsible for documenting all grievances and ensuring they are addressed in a timely manner.

- All training programmes and engagement plans will use a participatory approach that is rights based and integrates the perspectives of all users using bottom-up and top-down approaches, integrating the different views of local stakeholders and beneficiaries with those of institutions, authorities and decision makers. CI will utilize the methodologies of its work on local development in Region 9, Guyana.
The Project Implementation Unit (PIU) will implement a stakeholder’s communication plan to ensure communication with all stakeholders. The medium will be stakeholder specific and utilize both traditional methods such as meetings, telephone calls with newer methods such as a listserv, WhatsApp broadcast messaging etc.

The PIU will have active Knowledge Management with the documentation of processes and lessons learned which will be shared with all stakeholders.

Project M&E will be done through decentralized assessments including meetings with the local committees, interviews of direct beneficiaries and their representative organizations, local and national workshops with local and national stakeholders, meetings with special groups such as women and indigenous peoples to verify indicators. The Annual Work Plan and outputs will be the main tool used for monitoring and tracking indicators, with stakeholder participation monitored in-progress evaluations. Progress towards achieving the objectives will be evaluated in terms of the quality and timeliness of products, using appropriate participatory methods which ensure the timely and appropriate adjustment of the project implementation strategy.
### Table 3: Action Plan for Stakeholder Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project stage</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Implementation period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Identify and rank stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Develop communications engagement plan for stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.1 Engage key stakeholders through interviews, meetings, working lunch, information sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Establish governance mechanism for the PPG namely the project Steering Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.1 Develop informational materials on project proposal including brochures and handouts, flyers etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Implement a series of project information workshops with main workshop presenting the Pro Doc and a subsequent Validation Workshop seeking endorsement of the project design from major stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 Develop safe guard plans for the inclusion of special interests groups mainly women and indigenous peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7 Design Grievance Mechanism to address grievances with project activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implementation</td>
<td>2.1. Ensure participation of all stakeholders considering</td>
<td>Project Team</td>
<td>During all project stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2 Establish a PSC and local committees for the project ensuring stakeholder and gender balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.1 Ensure a participatory direct approach to monitoring and evaluation done through decentralized assessments including meetings with the local committees, interviews of direct beneficiaries and their representative organizations, local and national workshops with local and national stakeholders, meetings with special groups such as</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3 Ensure the inclusion of gender and indigenous sensitive indicators in project work matrixes with qualitative and quantitative monitoring data disaggregated for men and women, indigenous peoples, geographical representation etc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>M&amp;E Specialist Consultants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.4 Establish local Committees in project demonstration area</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project Coordinator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5 Implement stakeholder communications plan including using various channels to inform of project and redress mechanisms</strong></td>
<td><strong>During all project stages, and project conclusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.6 Implement gender and indigenous people’s safeguard plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
women and indigenous peoples to verify indicators

4. Training
All training programmes and engagement plans will use a participatory approach that is rights based and integrates the perspectives of all use bottom-up and top-down approaches, integrating the different views of local stakeholders and beneficiaries with those of institutions, authorities and decision makers. CI will utilize the methodologies of its work on local development in Region 9, Guyana.

Conduct gender sensitive training as specified in the gender mainstreaming plan

Conduct indigenous people’s specific training as specified in the indigenous peoples mainstreaming plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshops (Launch, Mid-term, Progress Monitoring and Final Evaluation at the national and local levels)</td>
<td>USD5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>USD3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC Meetings (quarterly meetings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Committee meetings (quarterly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Meetings, gender and indigenous focus groups (as determined by specialist)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of Project Information (quantity determined by the target population of project)</td>
<td>USD2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Production of brochures and leaflets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration sites sign boards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project branding-T-shirts, SMS Messages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of Lessons learnt in audio-visual, print etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone, Internet, Radio SMS Messaging</td>
<td>USD1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>USD12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Chart 1: Activity Gantt chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Month 1</th>
<th>Month 2</th>
<th>Month 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Project launch, development of work plan, installation of PSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Development of materials and documents necessary for dissemination such as project brochures etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Hiring of a specialist to assist with the implementation of the gender and indigenous peoples mainstreaming plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Local committees established and project launched in local geographical area of the project profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Survey of qualitative and quantitative data of the communities (interviews with key local people, community leaders and others) to establish local social baselines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Informative briefings with key local and national officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Information and awareness workshops within the areas of the project demonstration sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Stakeholder Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ministry of Natural Resources</strong></th>
<th>Oversee policy coordination of the various environmental agencies, and institutions (EPA, GGB, GGMC, GFC, PAC, GLSC and WMA) except the OCC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government Agencies and Institutions</strong></td>
<td>These include bodies with particular mandates for Guyana’s natural resources and environment or bodies whose work impacts the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provincial and Local Government</strong></td>
<td>These stakeholders are responsible for planning, development, and implementation at the community levels. They work closely with the NGOs and CBOs. The Local Democratic Organ Act (1980) divided Guyana into ten Administrative Regions. Each region has a Regional Democratic Council. The Regional Democratic Council, which is the supreme local government organ, is headed by a Regional Chairman with support from a Regional Executive Officer and Councilors. At present there are six towns, 65 Neighborhood Democratic Councils, and 95 Amerindian Village Councils. The RDC of Region 4 will be the main stakeholder in this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NGOs</strong></td>
<td>These would include organizations active in project landscapes, such as World Wildlife Fund, the Guyana Marine Turtles Conservation Society, and the Guyana Amazon Tropical Birds Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sector</strong></td>
<td>Development project proponents and investors whose operations are regulated by the EPA, in terms of environmental management. These stakeholders are among the main users of ecosystem services. Included in this group is the Guyana Bankers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academia and Research Institutions</strong></td>
<td>These centres of knowledge creation offer important comparative advantages of providing new data and information for better planning and decision-making to protect the environment. These organizations include the University of Guyana and Centre for the study of Biological Diversity, Smithsonian Institute, the Institute of Applied Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indigenous People</strong></td>
<td>These include a range of social actors that promote the interest of indigenous people such as the National Toshaos’ Council, North Rupununi District Development Board, and South Central People’s Development Association, and others listed in the plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coastal populations (rural communities)</strong></td>
<td>Social Impacts of mining are felt by this group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>These include a range of social actors that serve to promote the interest of gender, such as the Guyana Women and Gender Equality Commission, Women Affairs Bureau, and Men Affairs Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Power</td>
<td>Active Opponent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>University of Guyana Institute of Applied Science Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guyana Forestry Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Guyana Marine Turtles Conservation Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guyana Amazon Tropical Birds Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scope and Goals of the Accountability and Grievance Mechanism Plan

Conservation International-Guyana (CI-Guyana) recognizes that development projects occur in the real-world and often have unintended consequences beyond those that it may envisage in its safeguards framework. It therefore must have a system of accountability and grievance mechanisms to ensure that all unintended actions must be acknowledged and addressed.

The accountability and grievance mechanism devised by CI-Guyana will:

1. provide a way to reduce risk to the project;
2. offer groups of individuals, local and indigenous communities, and organizations impacted by the project an effective process for expressing and resolving concerns and complaints in a timely manner,
3. and promote a mutually constructive relationship in which trust is built.

Overview of the Accountability and Grievance Mechanism Disclosure and Redress

The accountability and grievance mechanism will be housed in the project implementation (CI-Guyana) office. CI-Guyana has the responsibility of ensuring that stakeholders within the project’s area of influence, and the wider society, are aware of the mechanism to address issues regarding the project’s impacts. This policy will be presented at stakeholder engagement workshops. The policy should also be published in various media, and be accessible to the various levels of stakeholders in terms of physical availability and language.

Grievances can be made through many different channels including, but not limited to face-to-face meetings, written complaints, telephone conversations or e-mail. These will be dealt with by the Grievance Mechanism Committee. Issues not resolved at the level of the Committee will be escalated to the Project Steering Committee. Complaints not resolved at the Project Steering Committee and country level will be escalated to CI’s General Counsel’s Office.

The General Counsel’s Office at Conservation International’s Headquarters in Arlington, Virginia, the United States of America, has its own accountability and grievance mechanism. Within this office, the Senior Director of Compliance and Risk Management manages all activities and processes related to the accountability and grievance mechanism, and is responsible for resolving the complaint.

Complaints can also be submitted to CI Ethics Hotline, managed by Navex’s Ethics point. The Ethics Hotline is ‘Safe Harbor Certified’ through the United States Department of Commerce and is available worldwide.

If the complainant is not satisfied with the response from CI, the complaint may be submitted to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Commissioner.

If the complainant is not satisfied with the response from the GEF Commissioner, then the grievance can be referred to a Court of Law for redress.

Grievance Redress Mechanism

Who can submit?
Individuals or groups of people (such as an organization, association, society or other grouping of individuals) residing in the country where the GEF funded project is located.

**Composition of the Grievance Mechanism Committee**
The first assessment of the submitted grievances will be conducted by a **Grievance Mechanism Committee** comprising CI-Guyana’s Executive Director, the Project Manager, technical staff from CI-Guyana and CI-Guyana’s legal counsel.

**Submission of Grievances**
All grievances made via the aforementioned channels must be recorded and documented. Grievances presented in Indigenous languages or languages other than English must be translated and recorded. The aggrieved party must submit the following information:

1. Names, designations, addresses and contact information of the complainants and or their representative(s);
2. If a complaint is made through a representative, identification of the project-affected persons on whose behalf the complaint is made and evidence of the authority to represent them;
3. Whether the complainants choose to keep their identities confidential;
4. A brief description of the impacts and location of occurrence;
5. An explanation of the complainants’ claim that the alleged direct and material harm is, or will be, caused by CI-Guyana’s project activity and failure to follow its operational policies and procedures during the formulating, processing or implementing the GEF funded project; and
6. A description of the operational policies and procedures that have not been complied with by during the formulating, processing or implementing of the GEF funded project.

**Exclusions**
The accountability and grievance mechanism will not consider the following complaints.

a) It is not related to the Project Agency’s actions or omissions during the design and implementing the GEF funded project;
b) Two or more years have passed since the grant closing date of the CI-GEF project;
c) It is frivolous, malicious, trivial or generated to gain competitive advantage;
d) It is about CI non-operational housekeeping matters, such as finance and administration.

The grievance review function also excludes complaints that:

e) are the responsibility of other parties such as the Government of Guyana unless the conduct of these other parties is directly relevant to the assessment of the CI-GEF project;
f) relate to Project Agency Team compliance with its operational policies and procedures;
g) relate to the laws, policies and regulations of Guyana, unless this directly relates to Project Agency compliance with its operational policies and procedures; and/or
h) are about matters already considered by the Grievance Mechanism Committee unless new evidence is presented and unless the subsequent complaint can be readily consolidated with the earlier complaint.

**Table 1: Grievance Procedures and Redress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grievance Procedures</th>
<th>Redress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Point</td>
<td>• The CI-Guyana (GEF) Project Manager is the access point and will be responsible for the intake of all grievances, and is accessible in person at CI-Guyana Offices:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grievance Procedures | Redress
---|---
- 91 Robb Streets, Bourda, Georgetown, or Lot 164 Lethem, Rupununi, Region 9 Guyana;
- telephone numbers: (592) 225 2978 /227-8171-2, and (592) 772 2228;
- e-mail: GEFgrievances@conservation.org.

- Contact to the access point will be advertised through CI-Guyana’s website and other means including signboards at project sites.
- The Project Manager shall be responsible for crafting and communicating responses to grievances related to this project.
- Grievances can also be made via the aforementioned channels to the Executive Director (ED) and/or the designated representative of the ED at CI-Guyana’s office at 91 Robb Streets, Bourda, Georgetown, Guyana. In this case, the grievance shall be accurately documented and verified as a true account by a third-party.
- Grievances made in writing must be addressed to the Project Manager in CI-Guyana and copied to the Project Steering Committee (PSC), and other project partners.

Grievance Log
- The Project Manager will keep a grievance log of all grievances made.
- All grievances must be signed and dated by the aggrieved party.
- All grievance records shall be copied to the Executive Director of CI-Guyana.

Assessment and Timeframe
- Once the documented grievance has been submitted, the Grievance Mechanism Committee will first assess the grievance, and categorize it, whether it relates to the environment, indigenous peoples’ rights etc.
- The Project Manager should acknowledge within 5 working days, receipt of the grievance and should include a notification of the period necessary to address the grievance to the aggrieved party.
- If the aggrieved person does not receive a response within the agreed time, or is not satisfied with the outcome, the aggrieved party can refer the matter to PSC for redress via a letter of appeal.
- The PSC should acknowledge within 10 working days, receipt of the letter of appeal and should include notification of the period necessary to address the appeal.
- If the aggrieved party does not receive a response within the agreed time, or is not satisfied with the outcome, the matter can be referred to CI’s Ethics Point Hotline at https://secure.ethicspoint.com. However, mindful that some local and indigenous peoples may not have access to internet, CI-Guyana will designate local focal points who can be contacted for assistance with accessing CI Ethics Point Hotline and articulating grievances. Focal points can include Village Councils, Neighbourhood Democratic Council Chairman and Councilors, other local authoritative figures etc. Through Ethics Point, CI will respond within 15 calendar days of receipt, and grievances will be filed and included in project monitoring processes.
- Alternatively, the grievance can be directly referred to the Director of Compliance at 2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500, Arlington, VA 22202, USA. The Director of Compliance will determine eligibility of requests. Eligibility requirements for grievances will include that the complaint:
  - Relates to a project which CI is implementing or executing;
  - Complainant has informed CI-Guyana of complaint and has worked with CI-Guyana towards identifying a solution by following the conflict resolution framework;
**Grievance Procedures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Is submitted by or on behalf of a person or people affected by the project; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Raises potential issues relating to compliance with the GEF’s Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards and Gender Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the aggrieved party is not satisfied with the outcome from CI, the grievance may be submitted to the GEF Commissioner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the aggrieved party is not satisfied with the outcome from the GEF they can refer the matter to the Court of Law for redress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resolution and Follow-up**

| • An implementation plan should be developed for resolution of grievances. The reports and plan developed during the accountability and grievance review process will be shared with all parties involved. |
| • On the spot resolution should be encouraged. However, the process and results should be documented. |

**Specific Activities in the Accountability and Grievance Review Process**

1. Based on determination, the Grievance Mechanism Committee will either follow up on complaint or designate staff to conduct, as needed, a thorough and objective review of grievance. Any designated staff report to the Project Manager. This review can include in-country inspections, interviews of project-affected people, and comprehensive information gathering to allow a factual determination of the issues raised and a reliable basis for any recommendations made.

2. The Project Manager will issue reports with findings to requesters and all stakeholders involved.

3. Based on reports, the Project Manager, with support of the Grievance Mechanism Committee and project partners, will assist the aggrieved party to engage in resolving the problem. This may include: facilitating a consultative dialogue, promoting information sharing, undertaking joint fact-finding, facilitating establishment of a mediation mechanism, and/or using other approaches to problem solving. Remedial actions involving a change in the project require approval from the Project Agency who will then inform the GEF Secretariat.

4. The Project Manager or designated staff, will create a report summarizing the grievance, an implementation plan with steps to resolve the issues, the parties’ decisions, and the parties’ agreement, if any. This report will be made available to all parties involved.

5. The Project Manager is responsible for monitoring the implementation of decisions. As part of the monitoring process all parties involved will be consulted and the Project Manager with support from the Grievance Mechanism Committee will prepare monitoring reports on implementation of remedial actions and submit them to the involved parties.

6. Conclusion of the process occurs after monitoring of remedial actions is completed. The Project Manager or designated staff with the support of the Grievance Mechanism Committee prepares a final report and submits report to all parties involved.

**Mitigation of Grievances and Non-Compliance**

**Grievances**

To reduce the number of grievances that may be brought before the Grievance Mechanism Committee, the CI-Guyana Project team will review project documents to determine potential
conflicts between project implementation and relevant stakeholders. The identification of these potential conflicts should inform a conflict mitigation plan developed by the project team.

CI-Guyana will also ensure that stakeholders, and wider society, hold the project team accountable to this accountability and grievance mechanism through information disclosure. Printed materials about the accountability and grievance review process will be distributed as widely as possible, especially at the project sites. The stakeholder engagement process is one of the mechanisms that can be used to identify and quickly resolve potential conflicts. Information on the accountability and grievance mechanism to be shared includes:

a) Basic information about the complaint review procedures;
b) Instructions for how to file a complaint;
c) Detailed rules of procedure;
d) A grievance log, including basic information about the complaint and the complaint’s status;

Non-Compliance
Recognizing that each situation regarding non-compliance will be project specific, the following actions are proposed steps to mitigate the lack of compliance. The Senior Director of Compliance and Risk Management (with direction from the General Counsel) will conduct the following actions:

1) Work with the CI-GEF Project Agency Team to understand any deviations from the CI-GEF Operations Manual and the ESMF;
2) Propose corrective actions (adaptive management) with a corresponding timeline;
3) Ensure that compliance issues are included in the CI Financial Management and Control Framework (related to managing institutional risk).

In cases of non-compliance on the project, the head of the CI-GEF Project Agency Team will be accountable to the Chief Operating Officer and the General Counsel at Conservation International. The role of the head of the CI-GEF Project Agency Team is to ensure that all CI-GEF policies and procedures were followed in the implementation of GEF funded projects.

In cases of continuous non-compliance actions to be taken by CI, as outlined in CI’s Criteria for Cancellation, Suspension or Termination of Projects, if the Compliance Review process determines that the Project Agency is in continuous non-compliance, the General Counsel’s Office will have the authority to cancel, suspend or terminate the project, and will notify the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Trustee.

Monitoring and Evaluation of Grievances
CI-Guyana will monitor and evaluate the grievance mechanism for effectiveness and collection of data. The following indicators will be included in the monitoring mechanism:

Indicators
1. Number of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project’s Accountability and Grievance Mechanism.
2. Percentage of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project’s Accountability and Grievance Mechanism that have been resolved.
3. Number of stakeholder engagement meetings to identify and resolve conflicts.
## Detailed GEF Project Budget

**APPENDIX VII: DETAILED PROJECT BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detailed GEF Project budget</th>
<th>Percentage Spending by Component (in USD)</th>
<th>Project budget by component (in USD)</th>
<th>Project budget per year (in USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>Component A</td>
<td>Component B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$11,143</td>
<td>$9,852</td>
<td>$11,143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenses Type**
- **Salaries and Salaries**
- **Travel and other costs**
- **Equipment and Repairs**
- **Other expenses**

**Component Description**
- Project Management
- Component A: Research and Development
- Component B: Technology and Innovation
- Component C: Capacity Building
- Component D: Training and Capacity Building

**Summary**
- Total Budget: $114,809
- Yearly Budget: $6,616, $6,240, $25,475, $56,758, $114,809

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$2,669,230</th>
<th>$2,598,750</th>
<th>$3,079,510</th>
<th>$1,605,590</th>
<th>$1,056,910</th>
<th>$351,480</th>
<th>$579,180</th>
<th>$979,070</th>
<th>$1,062,810</th>
<th>$118,320</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Description</td>
<td>Amount 1</td>
<td>Amount 2</td>
<td>Amount 3</td>
<td>Amount 4</td>
<td>Amount 5</td>
<td>Amount 6</td>
<td>Amount 7</td>
<td>Amount 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total estimated cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Airline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Airline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Food and Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year in budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Source of Financings | Amount of CO-Financier | Projected Revenue/Expenditure | Total
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $1,234,567
APPENDIX VIII: WWF SUPPORT FOR THE GRADUAL PHASE-OUT OF MERCURY IN THE GUIANAS

**Project Title:** Support for the gradual phase-out of Mercury in the Guianas  
**Implementing Partner:** World Wide Fund for Nature  
**Project Period:** 2018-2020

The following is a draft of the project results framework, which is due to be finalized by December 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Specific objective</th>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 2030, the Guianas moist forest and the associated ecosystem services are preserved and restored, benefiting the health and livelihoods of local populations</td>
<td>By 2025, curb mercury contamination in the Guiana Shield by phasing out mercury use in the ASGM sector, and by limiting mercury emissions associated with mining deforestation</td>
<td>National policies targeting the gold sector are reinforced and regionally coordinated, in line with the Minamata Convention on mercury</td>
<td>Elements of regional coherence included in the national mercury policy documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A mercury-free gold extraction model has demonstrated locally its technical and economic viability, as well as its social acceptability</td>
<td>Number of durable mercury-free operations in Suriname and Guyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key data on mercury are updated and made available by a regional mercury observatory</td>
<td>Regionally coordinated protocols in place to collect regionally consistent data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mercury-free gold production in Suriname and Guyana</td>
<td>Local Universities, public organizations and civil society participation in the long-term functioning of the observatory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected results</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Detailed activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT 1 National policies targeting the gold</td>
<td>1.1. Creation and sustaining of functional national multi-stakeholder platforms to roll</td>
<td>1.1.1. Elaboration of contractual agreements between stakeholders of the national platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2. Organization of regular meetings of the three national platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.3. Organization of technical workshops on specific topics on national needs and priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mercury-free gold extraction model has demonstrated locally its technical and economic viability, as well as its social acceptability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Mercury Phase-out Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1. Participatory dialogues on the opportunities for change on mercury use and practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4. Participatory dialogues on the opportunities for change on mercury use and practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1.2. Creation and Sustaining of a Regional Coordination Platform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2.1. Formalization of collaborations within the regional platform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2. Organization of regular meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3. Organization of thematic workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4. Organization of specific on-site workshops for the Maroni border area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.5. Communication of the platform results to Brazil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1.3. Region-wide Assessments and Analyses of Mercury Data and Experiences to Inform Mercury-related Decision Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.3.1. Global vision of mercury in ASGM in the Amazon: transboundary issues, global flows, phase-out initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2. Scope study on the economic activities linked to the ASGM sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3. Success/failure factors of previous mercury-free experiments and attempts in Suriname and Guyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.4. Lessons-learnt from the 10-year experience of mercury-free mining in French Guiana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Mercury-free Gold Extraction Model

#### 2.1. Selection of Mining Communities to Become Pilot Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1.1. Field prospects to identify potential pilot sites amongst mining communities in Suriname and Guyana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2. Rapid assessment of potential pilot sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3. Selection of pilot sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4. Formalization of the pilot sites' commitment to the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.2. Development of Support Plans for 1st-generation Pilot Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2.1. Detailed assessment of the mercury-free techniques bottlenecks and administrative formalization issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2. Development of a draft support plan for each pilot site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3. Learning trip to the mercury-free artisanal mines of French Guiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4. On-site validation workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.3. Implementation and Monitoring of Support Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3.1. Support to the formalization process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2. Mercury-free extraction equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3. Training and optimization of the mercury-free process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.4. Development and implementation of support plans for 2nd-generation pilot sites

- **2.4.1.** Development of a draft support plan for each pilot site
- **2.4.2.** On-site validation workshops
- **2.4.3.** Guidance to purchase mercury-free equipment and optimize the financial plan
- **2.4.4.** Training and optimization of the mercury-free techniques
- **2.4.5.** Regular monitoring of the support plan implementation and adaptive management
- **2.4.6.** Documentation of process and lessons learnt

### 2.5. Scaling-up the mercury-free model

- **2.5.1.** Domestic learning trips and exchanges amongst pilot sites, and between pilot sites and other mining communities
- **2.5.2.** Production of didactic dissemination tools
- **2.5.3.** Organization of a mercury-free innovation contest
- **2.5.4.** Interaction with investment tools accessible to miners to promote locally relevant solutions
- **2.5.5.** Capacity-building and sharing with government agencies on smallscale mercury-free mining
- **2.5.6.** Participation of local universities and training institutes on mining and engineering in the pilot site support process
- **2.5.7.** Support the setup of business agreements for import of relevant mercury-free extraction equipment.

### 2.6. Support of pilot sites for certification of the gold production

- **2.6.1.** Selection of the most relevant certification options
- **2.6.2.** Development of support plans towards certification
- **2.6.3.** Implementation of support plans towards certification
- **2.6.4.** External certification audits

### 2.7.1. Communication to showcase certified mercury-free gold from the Guianas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT 3</th>
<th>Key data on mercury are updated and made available by a regional mercury observatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7. Promotion of (certified) mercury-free gold from the Guianas</td>
<td>2.7.2. Strengthening of relations between certified gold producers and gold buyers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3.1. Creation of trustful and lasting partnerships with local Universities | 3.1.1. Formalization of collaboration between mercury-expert Universities and local Universities |
| 3.2. Collection of available data on mercury | 3.1.2. Exchange programmes between universities on the mercury topic |
| | 3.1.3. Joint Organization of mercury conferences |
| | 3.2.1. Review of existing knowledge |
| | 3.2.2. Analysis of coherence between the data from different countries |
| | 3.2.3. Organized compilation of available data |

| 3.3. Research and creation of new data on mercury | 3.3.1. Identification of outdated, unprecise or unavailable data |
| | 3.3.2. Design of methodologies and protocols to address knowledge gaps |
| | 3.3.3. Field work to produce new data |
| | 3.3.4. Publication of new data on mercury |

| 3.4. Creation and animation of an online tool | 3.4.1. Design of website and functionalities |
| | 3.4.2. Regular mercury data upload |
| | 3.4.3. Regular news upload |

| 3.5. Production of mercury observatory reports | 3.5.1. Scientific coordination and writing of the mercury observatory reports |
| | 3.5.2. Release and publication of the mercury observatory reports |

| 3.6. Empowerment of populations exposed to the mercury risk | 3.6.1. General awareness on the mercury risk |
| | 3.6.2. Sharing of the observatory results with exposed populations in a locally adapted format |
| | 3.6.3. Participative monitoring of mercury contamination |
APPENDIX IX: ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGIES

From 2010 to present, the Guyana Geology and Mines Commission (GGMA) has and continues to test, promote and demonstrate (train: in the case of cyanidation) the following mercury-free technologies:

1. **Centrifugal concentrators (CCs)**: the MPU has demonstrated Falcon, Knelson and APT (Gold Kacha GK) centrifugal concentrators in several areas; including but not limited to Mahdia, Karrau, NWD and Puruni. The Commission’s R&D facility offers a range of free technical support and analytical services including gravity recoverable gold (GRG) and extensive gravity recoverable gold (EGRG) testing using this technology, and as of mid-2017 plans to assemble and testing/demonstrating 2 GK processing circuits in all 6 mining districts.

2. **Jigs**: As with centrifugal concentrators, the GGMC tests and demonstrates this technology, which is a high efficiency recovery method for fine gold. The GGNC is currently considering a proposal develop a processing circuit comprising a jig, an H3 crusher, and a 6" gravel pump. This is a low impact high recovery processing option using accessible and familiar technology, it is expected that this approach will encourage and see greater buy-in from the sector.

3. **Flotation separation**: This is relatively still in the beginning stages of testing and training. However the Commission’s mineral processing engineers (MPEs) are trained trainers of trainers competent in operating the technology and will move to field and lab simulated testing over the next year. The GGMC undertook a pilot testing of a 6-cell flotation bank at the Commission’s Linden facility. A final report was submitted and is available for additional review and further research work.

4. **Cyanidation**: In 2010, towards the end of the GENCAPD II initiative, a capacity building project was funded to create a Cyanide Technology Laboratory at the Commission’s R&D Facility at Linden and to train a core group of trainers of trainers to operate the laboratory and train and certify operators who express interest in employing cyanidation for gold recovery. Both objectives were accomplished and the MPEs (aforementioned core group) currently trains and certifies selected candidates. Work on intensive cyanide leaching was also done at a site at 9 miles Issano.

5. **Optimization of the sluice box (SB)**: The MPU has designed, tested and created supporting literature (brochures and posters) and visual aids (DVD) for an optimized sluice box employing best practices. Coupled with the SB are mercury-free gold concentrate upgrading and clean up options such as the Knelson concentrator MD3 (KCMD3), Falcon L60, Gold Cube/Konka, shaking table etc.
APPENDIX X: NORAD PROJECT: ADDRESSING DRIVERS OF DEFORESTATION IN GUYANA AND PERU

Duration: March 2016 to March 2021
Total Budget: US$ 5.7 million for Guyana and Peru
Donor: Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation’s (Norad) Climate and Forest Initiative Support Scheme: Funding for Civil Society 2016-2020

Goal: This project’s goal is to facilitate green growth by engaging the private sector that is driving forest loss and encouraging adoption of improved practices, or provision of alternatives, that reduce pressure on forests and result in improved livelihoods and wellbeing in Guyana and Peru. The project will work directly with private sector actors with the most influence on deforestation rates: mining in Guyana and coffee and cacao in Peru.

Project Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>International policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•A multistakeholder dialogue process informed by relevant awareness tools and research is implemented</td>
<td>•An outreach and technical services programme is established by the GGDMA, ensuring equitable reach and availability to all genders.</td>
<td>•Two exchange workshops, one each in Peru and Guyana are conducted to showcase the learning of the projects to stakeholders who participate in international REDD+ dialogue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Guyana, the project will be implemented through a partnership between Conservation International-Guyana and the Guyana Gold and Diamond Miners Association (GGDMA). The project is directed to strengthen capacities for the more meaningful design and implementation of appropriate public policies to reduce negative environmental impacts on forests. The target
beneficiaries in the mining sector are the small and medium-scale gold and diamond mining sub-sector, which includes the artisanal miners. Beneficiaries also include the riparian communities in the mining district. The project will undertake a set of awareness-raising activities to promote a greater understanding of the detriment that deforestation causes to socio-economic development and climate change. This will programme will be based on the REDD+ concept and best practice approaches, which will include the testing and introduction of technologies to both reduce ecosystem impact and improve productivity of deforested and forest-degraded ecosystems. One of the key approaches to demonstrating a holistic approach to reducing deforestation and forest degradation in these mining communities is by taking a value chain approach that tracks the commodification of the extracted natural capital, as well as to take into account how gender issues and the rights of indigenous people can be better integrated into sustainable solutions.

**Project Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Demonstration of Models</th>
<th>Capacity Building</th>
<th>Influencing Public and Private Policy</th>
<th>Dialogue and Communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Research on specific resource use practices, management challenges and viable options for alternative management approaches and livelihoods.  
• Feasibility studies will be completed on affordable, low impact prospecting services for small- and medium-scale miners.  
• Outcomes of research will be used to feed platform dialogues and help build consensus.  
• Research under this project will appropriately take considerations of the gender roles and the rights and concerns of vulnerable groups into perspective. | • Demonstrate three model integrated community strategic resource management plans in Guyana, incorporating REDD+ and Free, Prior and Informed Consent Principles, to ensure that specific needs and priorities of different community members – such as men and women – are wholly reflected. | • Keep miners informed of their important role in supporting REDD+, and high-efficiency and high-return technology alternatives, including low-impact prospecting services  
• Create a coordinated national awareness program to improve public participation in decision making. | • Support roundtables as a means to discuss and build consensus on climate change issues and encourage sustainable production practices.  
• Build greater alignment between public and private sector policies.  
• Support to the REDD+ Strategies, as well as sharing lessons learned and progress on the international stage.  
• Create a coordinated national awareness program to improve public participation in decision making; |
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Parmaribo, 25 October 2017

Dr. Miguel Morales
Vice President, CI-GEF Project Agency
2011 Crystal Drive
Suite 500
Arlington, Virginia 22202
USA

Subject: Co-Financing support for “A supply chain approach to eliminating mercury in Guyana’s ASGM sector: El Dorado Gold Jewellery – Made in Guyana”

Dear Dr. Morales,

On behalf of WWF Guianas, I am pleased to submit this letter which serves to indicate our commitment to collaborate in and support Conservation International’s GEF project: “A supply chain approach to eliminating mercury in Guyana’s ASGM sector: El Dorado Gold Jewellery – Made in Guyana”.

The co-financing comes from our project: “Supporting Mercury Phase-Out in the Guianas”, which has been submitted to Fonds Français pour l’Environnement Mondial (FFEM), for financing. It is expected that the project will be reviewed and approved for implementation over a four-year period during the first quarter of 2018. WWF Guianas’ in-kind support can potentially amount to approximately US$ 487,000 as the two projects share common elements and approaches, and are aligned to have an impactful outcome at the national level.

At this time, provided that the project is approved, we anticipate that co-financing from our project can potentially support significant portions of the following areas of your project:

1. Component 1: Appropriate mercury-free technologies mainstreamed in Guyana’s ASGM sector
2. Component 2: Establishing a financing mechanism for Hg-free technologies
3. Component 3: Markets established for branded Hg-free gold from Guyana
4. Component 4: National policies and incentives for Hg-free gold established
5. Component 5: Monitoring and Evaluation
6. Component 6: Communications and Knowledge Management
WWF Guianas (and technical partners) and CI- Guyana have had numerous discussions over the past few months with a view of mapping linkages between our two projects, both at the activity and coordination levels. We are working to elaborate our mode of coordination and collaboration which includes the development of a Memorandum of Understanding between our two offices.

Our support should not be considered limited to the activities described above as it can be extended depending on the fully developed project documents.

We look forward to this collaboration and the success of these initiatives at phasing out mercury use in the ASGM sub-sector, offering alternative environmentally responsible mining technologies and reducing impacts on the people, biodiversity and environment of Guyana and the wider Guiana Shield.

Sincerely,

Laurens Giomes
Suriname Country Representative
WWF Guianas
1st November, 2017

Dr. Miguel Morales
Vice President, CI-GEF Project Agency
2011 Crystal Drive
Suite 500
Arlington, Virginia 22202
USA

Subject: Co-Financing support for “A supply chain approach to eliminating mercury in Guyana’s ASGM sector: El Dorado Gold Jewelry – Made in Guyana”

Dear Dr. Morales,

On behalf of Ministry of Natural Resources, we are pleased to commit an in-kind contribution of USD $ 649,600 for co-financing to Conservation International in support of the GEF, “A supply chain approach to eliminating mercury in Guyana’s ASGM sector: El Dorado Gold Jewelry – Made in Guyana”.

This co-financing has been costed through the Ministry and the Guyana Geology and Mines Commission’s work programmes and plans, and will support the above titled project during the period of four (4) years. Specifically, the co-financing represents the major contribution of the GoG, through the GGMC, for the use of mercury-free gold extraction equipment, field studies and expeditions, and personnel time.

The Ministry notes that there will be no transfer of funds between Conservation International and the Ministry or into any designated bank account as this figure is an in-kind contribution.

This contribution as described above is intended to qualify as co-financing should the project proposal be successful.

With Kind Regards,

[Signature]

Mr. Joslyn McKenzie
Permanent Secretary
Ministry of Natural Resources,
Guyana, South America
November 1, 2017

Dr. Miguel Morales
Vice President, CI-GEF Project Agency
2011 Crystal Drive
Suite 500
Arlington, Virginia 22202
USA

Subject: Co-Financing support for "A supply chain approach to eliminating mercury in Guyana’s ASM sector: El Dorado Gold Jewelry – Made in Guyana"

Dear Dr. Morales,

On behalf of Conservation International Foundation (CI), I am pleased to inform you that CI plans to contribute $2,000,000 of cash co-financing in support of the GEF-funded project, "A supply chain approach to eliminating mercury in Guyana’s ASM sector: El Dorado Gold Jewelry – Made in Guyana".

This co-financing is from a grant to CI funded by the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad) for the Addressing Drivers of Deforestation project in Guyana, and will support all components of the GEF project during the period of January 1, 2018 to April 30, 2021.

This contribution as described above is intended to qualify as co-financing should the project proposal be successful.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jennifer Morris
President
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