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# Country Context

As the smallest sovereign state in South America, with a total population of approximately 541,638 (Census 2012), Suriname is considered to be a 'High Forest Cover- Low Deforestation Rate' country having a tropical climate with abundant rainfall, a uniform temperature, and high humidity.

With a population growth of approximately 1% per year, 60% of the total population lives in the urban area, 30% in rural areas and the remaining 10% lives in the interior. Suriname is by far one of the least densely populated countries in the world with just 3 people per square kilometer (7/sq mi), which ranks 231st in the world. The population is growing: the expectation by 2030 is a growth to 670,000 (UNDP, 2015). The median age – 29 years – is the same as that for the region. According to the UN (UNDP, 2015), 7.6 percent of the population suffers from multidimensional poverty.

Suriname can be characterized as an ethnically and religiously diverse society. The largest ethnic groups are East Indians (37%) and Suriname Creoles (31%). They are followed by the Javanese (15%), the Surinamese Maroons (10%), the Amerindians (3.7%), the Chinese, Europeans and Brazilians, most of whom are gold miners.

The physical and geographic make up of Surinamese society brings with it an array of complex issues related to land rights. The government, particularly since 2000, has been taking steps to ensure inclusion of indigenous groups in the conversation on land rights. Thus, any effective policy changes that seek to meet international environmental commitments, which in so doing meet Suriname’s sustainable development goals, will have to engage marginalized and minority communities in a meaningful way.

## Economy

For the past few decennia the mining industry, with exports of alumina, oil and gold, has been the cornerstone of Suriname’s developing economy. After closing of the Suriname Aluminum Company (a subsidiary of ALCOA) in 2015[[1]](#footnote-1), the export of mining products are now oil and gold, making the economy highly vulnerable to mineral price volatility.

The mining sector has grown significantly over the last decade (especially gold mining) and has contributed significantly to the Suriname economic as it contributes an estimated 1.62 billion USD in 2012 versus 34 million USD in 2000. According to some estimates, small-scale gold mining may account for as much as 60 percent of Suriname’s total gold production. However, the sector provides only about 3% of total employment by 2013. Thus, the future development impact of mining may be limited, owing to the fact that mine-related activities are enclaves and as such the economic spill-overs to the rest of the domestic economy, especially in terms of employment, are small (IDB, 2014). The impact of the mining sector is reflected in the employment of a small number of people in services such as transportation and food services. Thus Suriname unfortunately appears to conform to the traditional view of enclaves, in which large investments in mining do not generate significant backward or forward linkages within the domestic economy (Hojman, 1983).

According to the Worldbank, economic growth declined annually from just under 5% in 2012 to -7% in 2016. In January 2011, the government devalued the currency by 20% and raised taxes to reduce the budget deficit. As a result of these measures among others, inflation receded to less than 4% in 2015. However, with the exchange rate plummeting, inflation climbed to 39% in 2016.

Suriname's economic prospects for the medium term will depend on continued commitment to responsible monetary and fiscal policies and to the introduction of structural reforms to liberalize markets and promote competition. The government's reliance on revenue from extractive industries will temper Suriname's economic outlook, especially if gold prices continue their downward trend.

# Sector context: ASGM in Suriname

Suriname’s gold deposits are part of the Guyana shield, a geological formation that stretches out across 415,000 km2 of Venezuela, the Guyanas, and Brazil (Heemskerk 2009). Suriname’s abundant gold resources have attracted a large number of illegal miners. The overall impact of informal mining on development is negative: it is a key environmental challenge as it is leading to deforestation, mercury contamination and the pollution of inland waterways.

The majority of the miners and mining service providers (65 to 75 Percent) are international migrants, mostly Brazilians (Garimpeiros). The remaining inhabitants of mining areas are primarily Suriname Maroons, tribal peoples of African descent, and a small number of Amerindians, who inhabit Suriname’s forested interior.

It is unclear how many people are employed in the domestic ASM sector, due to the widespread informal nature of the work, however estimates put that figure at 60,000 miners. There are 17,000 officially registered ASM gold miners, of which 11,000 are nationals (CIRDI, 2016). A large portion of the ASM workforce is made up of migrants, particularly from Brazil[[2]](#footnote-2).

Even though the Garimpeiros and Maroons dominate the small-scale gold mining sector, most concessions are in hands of the urban political and economic elite. These concessions include areas that Maroons traditionally consider as their tribal home lands, to which they claim customary rights (Social Solution, 2016).

Most small-scale gold mining activities takes place in the eastern area of Suriname near the border with French-Guyana. Communities in this part of the country are mainly populated by Maroons. In addition, the region houses a smaller number of indigenous communities. Most of the Maroons in this area work as small-scale gold miners and/or are active in the mining service economy, selling goods and services to the miners. Even though community members profit indirectly from the increased economic activity and money circulation in the villages, the Maroon population of the rural interior lags behind because of lower educational attainment and contraceptive use, higher malnutrition, and significantly less access to electricity, potable water, sanitation, infrastructure, and health care (IDB, 2014). The indigenous peoples seldom work in small-scale gold mining though there are exceptions, particularly in areas where their communities are located in rich gold bearing zones.

The mining sector is one of the major sectors (next to agriculture and in lesser extent forestry) of Suriname’s economy that contribute to land degradation. According to a REDD+ report, gold mining induced deforestation in Suriname has doubled between 2008 and 2014, as compared to the 2001-2008 period (+97%) (Rahm et al. 2015).

Heemskerk (2009) developed a (not official) map of the mining areas based on watersheds that gives a rather good overview of the ASGM scale in Suriname (figure 1).



Figure 1: Map of ASGM sector in Suriname. Source: M. Heemskerk 2009

Most of the mainly illegal miners use large volumes of water and mercury. It has been estimated that each kilogram of gold recovered causes 1-3 kilos of mercury to be discharged to the environment.

Since 2003, the first large scale gold mine has operated in Suriname. At present, three large scale gold mines have been established: Rosebel Gold Mine, Merian Mine and Maripaston.

Local Maroon villagers consider these mining concerns a threat to their livelihood, because of the competition for gold-rich land. Small-scale gold-mining activities are mostly unrecorded. These operations include rudimentary prospecting techniques that utilize bulldozers, excavators, and metal detectors. These often illegal mining operations cause deforestation and loss of multiple benefits such as: biodiversity, arable land and aquatic life, as well as fragmentation of ecosystems and waterways.

According to Duijves and Heemskerk (2014), almost all ASGMs use mercury during the mining process. The effects of the exorbitant use of mercury extend beyond the local mines to the coastal areas and leads to surface and ground water pollution causing damage to the entire food chain and both direct and indirect health hazards to fauna and humans. The interior communities that largely depend on surface water and fish for protein are particularly affected (Social Solutions, 2016). The amount of mercury use and emissions in the country associated with ASGM operations is particularly poorly constrained. According to Legg et al. (2015), 28.5–57 tonnes of mercury may have been used in the Suriname ASGM sector in 2011, but the data is outdated and most likely not accurate anymore (Social Solution).

The small-to-medium scale gold mining sector uses mercury to bind the gold for easy handling. This so called “gold-mercury amalgam” is burned in the open to separate the mercury from the gold. This gold is then sold to official gold buyers and the numerous jewelry shops in town where it is further purified, frequently with the use of mercury. There are public health concerns on the mercury emissions from this sector and a few initiatives have been taken to address these concerns.

## Law and regulations

From the paragraphs above, it is clear that Suriname is negatively affected and threatened by the use of mercury during mining process. Making the situation more challenging, a sound institutional framework is lacking, mandates in the public administration roles are unclear and there is currently no validated mercury policy or strategy available.

Around the mining sector, specifically, there is a large array of missing framework and institutional strength in order to support such important sector to reduce/phase out the user of Mercury. There is also no comprehensive inventory and releases estimated that can be used as source for taking informed decisions.

Suriname does not have an umbrella Environmental Law. Environmental regulation is fragmented and specified per (economic or public) sector. A draft environmental law was presented to the Council of Ministers in 2002, but has never been adopted. A draft State Decree (Staatsbesluit) to regulate mercury is also awaiting approval by the Council of Ministers.

According to NIMOS, there is no legal instrument that specifically mentions mercury besides the government regulation Decision Negative List[[3]](#footnote-3), which forms part of the law on the transportation of goods[[4]](#footnote-4). Here mercury is listed with the items for which an import license is required. In addition, the Suriname legal framework contains no regulations about the sale of mercury.

In order to achieve successful project results, coordination of project activities is important as this is currently lacking. Furthermore, staff capacity to address Mercury issues is fairly limited in addition to awareness on issues such as gender sensitivity and health issues.

Challenges to the enforcement of government policy in mining areas include the remoteness of mining areas, high expenses of travel to the mining areas, the outdated mining law, and the personal interest of politicians in the mining sector.

## Stakeholders initiatives

Several stakeholders (such as WWF, OGS, UNASAT) are in the process trying to reduce or where possible eliminate mercury use. These organisations range from small/medium-scale mining groups looking to maximize production while reducing negative environmental impacts (eg. Nana Resources and GRASSALCO), to educational organisations and small businesses looking to provide the expertise and machinery needed to reduce mercury usage while providing local economic benefits (eg. UNASAT, Lawa Star Industrial) (Social Solutions, 2016). The University of Applied Sciences and Technology (UNASAT) focuses (in collaboration with OGS) on capacity building in mercury free mining. OGS, not directly involved in mercury free mining projects, supports this effort by making land available for field classes, by providing a mine inspector, and by providing security.

In different mining areas the Commission OGS has established Mining Service Centers (MSC). The initial thought behind the MSC was that at these locations, ASGM would be able to register and access services such as technical training, health services, and selling gold. The existing MSC do house rotating OGS staff to keep an eye on ASGM activity. However, apart from a one-time visit from, for example, health workers from the Bureau of Public Health (Bureau Openbare Gezondheidszorg - BOG), the provision of services has been limited (Social Solutions, 2016).

In 2014, a number of public and private organizations established the Mercury Free Partnership (MFP) where members meet monthly to share information and updates. The MFP members include Conservation International Suriname (secretariat), the Bureau for Public Health, the NIMOS, WWF-Guianas, University of Suriname (AdeKUS), and the OGS. Currently, the MFP is inactive, probably due to lack of capacities.

Being aware of the importance of the sector and the level of consumption (and impact) of mercury, the GoS conducted in partnership with the WWF Suriname, trainings to miners on mercury-related issues. The training courses done focused on some ad-hoc work to teach about best practices, but did not have sufficient specialized in-house technical expertise to effectively implement an upscale and self-sustained training program.

# Minamata Convention

Mercury is a global pollutant. Like persistent organic pollutants (POPs), mercury remains in the environment where it circulates among air, water, sediments, soil, and biota in various forms. Atmospheric mercury can be transported long distances, taken up by microorganisms and concentrated up the food chain. Mercury can cause serious damage to ecosystems.

The three most common forms of mercury (elemental, inorganic and methyl mercury) are all detrimental to human health and especially dangerous for fetuses and young children because of their toxicity to the nervous systems (brain and spinal cord). Exposure to elemental mercury, mercury in food, and mercury vapors poses significant health risks including kidney, heart and respiratory problems, tremors, skin rashes, vision or hearing problems, headaches, weakness, memory problems, and emotional changes.

In order to address the challenges posed by mercury on a global scale, in 2009 the decision was taken to start UN negotiations for a global, legally-binding treaty to prevent emissions and releases of mercury. The UN negotiations were concluded in January 2013 with 147 governments agreeing to the draft convention text for the Minamata Convention on Mercury.

The Convention was adopted and opened for signature on 10 October 2013, at a Conference of Plenipotentiaries (Diplomatic Conference) in Kumamoto, Japan. The Minamata Convention on Mercury - named after a city in Japan where serious health damage occurred as a result of mercury pollution in the mid-20th Century - will aim to reduce mercury emissions from all sources, including gold mining, dental practices, chlor-alkali plants, coal combustion, medical uses as well as waste management, storage, fate and transport in the atmosphere and other related issues.

Eighty-six (86) countries and the European Union signed the Minamata Convention on the first day it was open. A further five countries signed the Convention on the final day of the Diplomatic Conference, 11 October 2013. To date 128 countries have signed the Convention. On November 6, 2013, the United States of America was the first country to ratify the Minamata Convention, as such it became the first party to the Convention.

The Convention enters into force 90 days after it has been ratified by 50 nations. It is expected that the Convention will come into force in August 2017.

Suriname hasn´t signed the Minamata Convention, the country however is taking meaningful steps towards to becoming a party to the Convention with a draft Act for ratification of the Minamata convention submitted to parliament and its preparedness to the gradual phasing out of mercury within ASGM, as a national policy priority. This approach considers Suriname’s experience and commitment to the other 30 multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) of which Suriname is part of.

As mentioned before, Suriname lacks an integrated framework on environmental legislation. The existence of challenges on the mercury-related issues in the country is acknowledged, but a deeper analysis must be undertaken to understand the degree of emissions, releases and their impacts related to ASGM, as well as alternatives that can meet Suriname´s needs.

## NAP Suriname

As the artisanal and small-scale gold mining (ASGM) sector is a major source of mercury release and environmental pollution in the world, Suriname is, according to the Minamata Convention, required to develop a National Action Plan (NAP). Article 7 of the Minamata Convention on Mercury addresses artisanal and small-scale gold mining (ASGM), the largest global source of mercury pollution. Under this Article, countries where mercury use in ASGM is “more than insignificant” are required to take steps to reduce and, where feasible, eliminate the use of mercury, by developing a NAP. The Suriname NAP will focus on the ASGM sector for which a strategy to systematically reduce mercury emissions will be articulated.

The Suriname NAP project consists of the following components:

1. Develop Mercury Profile in artisanal and small-scale gold mining (ASGM)
2. Strengthen institutional capacities to achieve the reduction of emissions and releases of, and exposure to, mercury in ASGM sector and processing, including mercury-free methods
3. Prepare a National Action Plan (NAP) and establish a schedule for the implementation of the NAP.

In 2013, NIMOS started a process to advise the government with regards to signature and ratification of the Minamata Convention on Mercury. This process included stakeholder consultations and resulted in an advisory document and a roadmap with activities for the gradual elimination of mercury from Suriname. Proposed activities include registration and legalization of ASGM activities in Suriname.

As per June 2017, Suriname had not yet signed the Minamata Convention on mercury, but it is in the process of taking this step. In early 2017, the council of Ministers approved ratification of the Minamata Convention and in February 2017 the President of Suriname submitted the draft Act for ratification of Minamata Convention to parliament. This draft Act is now awaiting approval by the National Assembly (parliament).

Another policy initiative of the Ministry of Natural Resources in support of the reduction and elimination of mercury is revision of the Suriname Mining Act. Currently, there are no mandatory environmental and social impact assessments (ESIAs) for mines - only voluntary general guidelines for ESIAs and guidelines for the mining sector. To date only large scale gold mining companies have conducted ESIAs voluntarily, but these companies are mining without the use of mercury, however, mercury can still be released in the production process. No legislation/regulation exists in relation to emission standards in the mining industry either. It is therefore acknowledge that the existing Mining Act needs to be updated as it dates back to the Mining Decree E-58 of 1986.

Furthermore, the Government is seeking out ways in updating and/or creating the legal and institutional framework to regulate the sector and the devastating environmental impacts cited in several studies. These studies, which have been carried out over the past years on mercury releases, contamination, freshwater quality and human health in the hinterland, provide data on ecological and health impacts. To guide the decision-making process and to assure that the best information is made available to the stakeholders involved in the accession process to the Minamata Convention, the GoS therefore is undertaking an assessment project, the Minamata Convention Initial Assessment project (MIA), on the current situation of Mercury-related issues (including top-down inventories.

The Minamata Convention Initial Assessment project (MIA) is an enabling activity funded by the GEF that will enable countries to identify domestic mercury challenges and the extent to which existing legal and regulatory frameworks enable a country to implement future obligations under the Minamata Convention. As such, countries develop a national mercury profile that can be used for further action against the dangers of mercury. The MIA-Suriname consist of the following components:

1. Enabling environment for decision-making on the ratification of Minamata established.
2. Development of the National Mercury Profile and Mercury Initial Assessment Report.

Whereas the MIA projects provide a broad overview of the use of mercury in different sectors of a country, the National Action Plan (NAP) projects focus on one sector for which they articulate a strategy to systematically reduce mercury emissions. The development of the NAP focused on the ASGM sector complements the MIA initiative and that the country can achieve the objectives of the implementation phase of the Convention.

In addition, the GoS is currently in the process of preparing the full size GEF project *`Improving Environmental Management in the Mining Sector of Suriname, with Emphasis on Gold Mining*´. The objective of the project is: `Strengthen the enabling environment for the management of mining and promote uptake of environmentally responsible mining technologies in Suriname to reduce negative impacts on biodiversity and forests, mitigate climate change, and enhance local livelihoods`. This project consists of the following two core components:

1. Institutional, policy and planning framework strengthened for improved management of gold mining in Suriname
2. Increased adoption of environmentally responsible practices among gold miners and communities in the Greenstone Belt leading to multiple global environmental benefits

As mentioned before, there have been initiatives to promote the use of mercury-free techniques over the years (e.g. trainings from WWF), but these have still been insufficient to promote non-mercury technologies and demonstrations in the field of their effectiveness. As a result, the Government of Suriname will use the proposed National Action Plan to develop a detailed phased approach which would lead to reduction in use of mercury in the ASGM sector and finally elimination in the use of Mercury.

The ASGM NAP is developed based on the GEF approved ASGM NAP Project Identification Form (PIF) and per the UN Environment guidance note on Developing a National Action Plan to Reduce, and Where Feasible, Eliminate Mercury Use in Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining.

The UNEP guidance note has been developed with the intention of addressing ASGM in a holistic manner and includes a review of legal, educational, economic, regulatory and enforcement frameworks. It also provides guidance on developing budgets and work plans and identifying potential sources of funding and partners.

It is also required to align the ASGM NAP with both the Minamata Convention Initial Assessment project (MIA) and the PPG of the GEF Full Size Project (FSP) “Improving Environmental Management in the Mining Sector of Suriname, with Emphasis on Gold Mining`. The outputs of the NAP and MIA projects will contribute to the PPG project for the ASGM sector.

# STRATEGY

As mentioned before, Suriname has initiated steps for the ratification to become a full party of the Minamata Convention. The NAP will build on, and complement the ongoing MIA and Full Size GEF activities and will provide the opportunity for more longer-term strategy and policy, whilst supporting medium term policy enhancements and building capacity for improving monitoring and enforcement of the regulations in Artisanal and Small-scale Goldmining.

The proposed NAP and the project framework, including envisaged activities, are entirely in line with the GEF Initial Guidelines for Enabling Activities for the Minamata Convention on Mercury (GEF/C.45/Inf.05).

This proposed NAP Enabling Activity should enable Suriname to assess the current situation, determine the national requirements, needs, goals, targets and schedules to reduce/phase-out the use of Mercury (Hg) in the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining (ASGM) sector and processing pertaining to the management of Mercury and to carry out a detailed assessment of the impacts of the Minamata Convention.

## Project Objective

The project´s objective is to undertake a National Action Plan to enable the Government to determine the national requirements, needs, goals, targets and schedules to reduce/phase out the use of Mercury (Hg) in the Artisanal Small-Scale Gold Mining (ASGM) sector and processing.

## Project Activity and Goals

It will do so by implementing 3 activities with the goals to be achieved as specified in the GEF guidelines (GEF/C.45/Inf.05 Section 2):

*1. Assess the Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining (ASGM) sector*

The goal is to assess the institutional capacity of governmental institutions and agencies to determine the capacity needs and gaps that exist for the undertaking of inventories and baseline assessments on Hg use, applications and technologies review, to strengthen these institutions and capacity. The assessment will also review the systems needed to report to the Convention under article 7. The assessment will be carried out following general guidelines set under the Article 7 and the Annex C of the Convention.

*2. Develop or strengthen institutions and further promote the reduction/phase-out of mercury use and releases.*

This activity will target the identification and development/improvement/strengthening of the institutional capacity gaps and regulatory framework, policies and strategies for the ASGM sector. Proposed actions will be discussed and agreed upon among the key stakeholders through several rounds of discussions.

The policy and legislative assessment will be undertaken through a review of existing legislation related to Hg use and management, as well as regulatory pieces applicable to ASGM. Mining in general and cross-cutting issues (such as land property where mines are located, licensing systems, gaps and challenges), and identification of the gaps prevalent in association to issues of mercury.

In addition the legislation review will assess the necessary steps for the establishment of a National Mercury Coordination/Consultation Mechanism for ASGM.

Strategies and policies will also be defined under this component to cope with:

1. The steps to formalize and regulate the ASGM sector
2. The Assessment of methods and technologies to reduce/eliminate the use of HG in ASGM and processing.
3. The management of internal and international trade of Hg and compounds used in ASGM and processing
4. The involvement of stakeholders and general public in different levels of consultation and awareness related to Hg use and its impact into the environment and health of populations, particular most vulnerable ones ) low income families, women and children)
5. An appropriate public health strategy on the exposure of the above mentioned populations.

*3. Develop the National Action Plan*

The ultimate goal of the project will demand the implementation of activities to a National Action Plan, which will be included in the NAP report.

The NAP will relate the objectives and targets prepared for Suriname (including proposed policies/regulatory interventions, capacity building and required investment plans and actions) and the roadmap on its implementation formulated, including the schedules and elements for monitoring the progress of implementation.

# Results and Partnerships

The project will be implemented through National Implementation Modality (NIM) with the NIMOS as the execution agency. The NIMOS coordinates the work on the Environmental (including Chemical) Management, through the IMAC or as applicable other multi-stakeholder bodies which includes relevant ministry bodies and representatives from civil society and private sector.

The proposed project has been organized into three components composed by its outcomes as follows:

Component 1. Develop Mercury Profile in artisanal and small-scale gold mining (ASGM)

***Output 1.1 National capacity built to undertake detailed Mercury inventory in ASGM.***

National capacity to undertake the detailed ASGM mercury inventory and the baseline profile on ASGM will be built through training, which will be conducted and facilitated by the project´s international technical advisor. Training will be provided on data collection, methodologies, reliability, credibility, data analysis, etc.

Training will be targeted towards a group of national technical experts who will conduct and develop the ASGM Mercury Profile. Training will also be targeted towards key government representatives who need sufficient knowledge about conducting a Mercury Inventory to be able to review it and comment on it.

***Output 1.2 National Mercury Profile available***

The Minamata Initial Assessment (MIA) also requires a National Mercury Profile. This is a baseline estimate of mercury use regarding all relevant sectors conform the UNEP inventory level 1 or level 2. Baseline estimates of Mercury use in mining, enable governments to prioritize and develop effective intervention strategies. ASGM in Suriname operate in the informal economy and this presents special challenges when undertaking field surveys. The Mercury inventory in ASGM will therefore review all the relevant ASGM sectors per guidance document “Developing a National Action Plan to Reduce, and Where Feasible, Eliminate Mercury Use in Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining” and per UNEP Inventory Level 2. In addition, the parameters described below will complement the inventory:

* Identification and assessment of the amounts of emission sources of mercury and release sources of mercury to land and water.
* Identification of old, historical sources of mercury contamination (such as mining sites).
* Identification of key sectors, municipalities, communities and other stakeholders affected by or involved with important Mercury sources and/or emissions.
* Establish positive relations with miners at key sites for direct measurements and interviews;
* Develop a baseline team that understands the technical, social, economic, political, and ore processing context
* Build the inventory using multiple lines of independent evidence, then repeat to evaluate long-term change

The inventory will make use of the UNEP guidance document on “Developing a National Action Plan to Reduce, and Where Feasible, Eliminate Mercury Use in Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining” and UNEP `Toolkit for Identification and quantification of Mercury releases level 2´, which is intended to assist countries to develop a national mercury releases inventory. The level 2 toolkit provides a standardized methodology and accompanying database enabling the development of consistent national and regional mercury inventories.

Throughout the data collection, analysis and preparation of the Mercury Inventory, the national expert team will be guided by an international technical advisor.

After completion of the data gathering stage, an ASGM Mercury Profile, including significant sources of emissions and releases, as well as inventories of mercury compounds, will be prepared for review, approval and adoption during a national stakeholder workshop.

Component 2. Strengthen institutional capacities and prepare National Action Plan (NAP), with agreed schedule to achieve the reduction of emissions and releases of, and exposure to, mercury in ASGM sector and processing, including mercury-free methods

***Output 2.1 Legal and regulatory status of ASGM in Suriname reviewed, including land property rights and use permits in mining areas and licensing procedures.***

The work will begin with a review of the structures, institutions, policies and regulations already in place:

* Legislation on the governance of ASGM in general and the capacities of the key institutions will be the initial focus.
* Legislation on the use of Hg in general and specifically related to the mining sector.
* Review of existing legislation, identifications of gaps for meeting the Minamata Convention requirements and initial technical input on proposed amendments.
* Roles of other ministries and institutions related to key sectors where mercury inventory establishes the presence of mercury use, emissions and/or releases are to be analyzed. Capacities of these institutions will be reviewed and the gaps for comprehensive management of mercury issues will be identified.

***Output 2.2 Strategies and policies for reducing emissions and releases of Hg assessed***

National capacity built/established/improved in line with existing structures and practices present in Suriname and where feasible will build/expand on similar structures established in support of other chemicals-related MEAs and coopering with other Mercury-related projects. The strategies and policies will be based on the sound baseline estimations (output 1.2) and can include immediate and long-term strategies.

Taking the above in consideration, the most effective way to reduce emissions, releases and exposures is to reduce and, where feasible, eliminate the use of mercury in ASGM, by transitioning miners to mercury-free techniques, and where this is not feasible, to lower-mercury concentrate amalgamation. Suriname has therefore the intention to establish Mining schools or Mining Service Centres in mining locations as mentioned in the PIF final draft of the GEF Full-Sized project ´Improving Environmental Management in the Mining Sector of Suriname, with Emphasis on Gold Mining`. Within the NAP a pilot study for a Mining school/ Mining service Centre will be conducted, whereby miners and equipment distributers will benefit from training programs offering promotion of mining methods that reduce environmental impact while at the same time increasing gold recovery rates will enhance financial sustainability. To determine to what extend capacity building through the mining school can be sustained, key-stakeholders such as UNASAT and the University of Suriname (AdeKUS) will be involved in the pilot study. The output of this study will serve as input for the PPG project.

In addition, Suriname wishes to have a formal platform for easily sharing data and information collected during the NAP en MIA implementation, and also during other relevant initiatives conducted through NGO´s (e.g. WWF) and other governmental institutions. Alignment of the initiatives with the MIA and NAP is necessary. The platform will provide an opportunity for stakeholders to share information and also review and comment on information provided by others.

As mentioned before, the Mercury Free Partnership (MFP) was established in 2014, although currently inactive. An assessment will be undertaken to determine whether similar partnership for the reduction and phase out of Mercury use can be established and under what conditions. Suggested members can be Ministry of NH (with the OGS), Ministry of Health (MoH), the Bureau for Public Health (BOG), Ministry of trade, the NIMOS, UNDP, WWF-Guianas and ARM, AGC, Medical Mission, Radboud University and the University of Suriname (AdeKUS), potentially in collaboration with the University of Tulane. This partnership is also relevant and supportive for the implementation of the other activities of the NAP.

***Output 2.3 Technically available and economically feasible techniques and technologies that can replace the use of mercury assessed at global level.***

A baseline assessment of the existing methods and technologies used in all the mining areas regarding the use of HG in ASGM and processing will be conducted.

Barriers that would hinder or prevent implementation of the Article 7 of the Minamata Convention will be assessed, including Hg-free technical barriers and challenges. The project will look into, in a global manner, the techniques and technologies that exist in the world and that could be promoted in Suriname. Therefore an assessment of methods and technologies to reduce/eliminate the use of HG in ASGM and processing will be conducted.

***Output 2.4 Public consultation and awareness systems on Hg risks on exposure established, including actions to prevent vulnerable public exposure, especially low income populations, children and women.***

Upon the identification of capacity and/or regulatory gaps (in relation to the Convention´s obligation) the results will direct the work of formulation of a series of strategies under component 2. As well as the component 3 related to the development of the NAP Report. Those results will be organized and disseminate using awareness tools designed to each target group that are related to Hg-issues in the ASGM sector. Special attention is to be paid to most vulnerable groups (women, children, indigenous and low-income populations).

While an explicit focus of the health activities is not envisaged in the NAP, the proposed project will lay the ground work for actions called for under Article 16 of the Convention. Exposure to mercury may cause serious health problems and is a threat especially to the development of the child in utero and early in life, and to workers. Mercury has toxic effects on the nervous, digestive and immune systems, and on lungs, kidneys, skin and eyes. The health sector, as well as other relevant sectors, is key for the protection of populations at risk from exposure to mercury, particularly for providing guidance, adopting health-based guidelines, setting targets for mercury exposure reduction and public and worker education. According to Annex C Paragraph 1(h) a public health strategy is required under the proposed project regarding the exposure of artisanal and small scale gold miners and their communities to mercury. The strategy will include, inter alia, the gathering of health data, training for health-care workers and awareness-raising through health facilities.

Expert teams will draft proposals to be included in the NAP Report on how to address the pertinent gaps and barriers. These proposals will also include an overview of the cost to the Government in meeting its obligation under the Article 7 under the Minamata Convention. After the development of the draft NAP Report, this will be prepared for review, approval and adoption by the national stakeholders.

**Output 2*.5 National Action Plan Prepared***

Following the finalization of the project activities as envisaged under components 1 and 2, the national project team will prepare a NAP report.

The NAP Report will provide information on the following, which will enable the country to comply with the Article 7 of the Convention:

* Structures, institutions, legislation related to ASGM and use of Hg in ASGM.
* Identification of barriers that would hinder or prevent implementation of the Convention.
* National objectives and reduction targets.
* Summary of the results from the Mercury Profile.
* Specific action to eliminate the use of Hg contained in the Annex C. Article 1, Paragraph (b) of the Convention.
* Identification of technical and financial needs for implementation of the NAP, including resources from the GEF, national sources, bilateral sources, the private sector and others integrated.
* Formalization process and proposed regulations required for the ASGM sector.
* Strategy to promote the use of methods and technologies that reduce/eliminate the use of Hg in ASGM and processing.
* A system to manage internal and international trade of Hg and its compounds used in ASGM and processing.
* A national strategy to involve stakeholders and general public in different levels of consultation.
* An awareness program driven to affected communities on Hg use and its impacts into the environment and health of populations, particular most vulnerable ones (low income families, women and children).
* A general awareness strategy on Hg use and impacts on ASGM sector to all audiences as part of the consumption chain of gold.
* An integrated public health strategy on the exposure of the above mentioned populations in close collaboration with Health Authorities.

***Output 2.6 Schedule for the implementation NAP in Suriname made available***

A schedule for implementing the NAP involves turning the goals and objectives outlined in the required chapters (as mentioned above) into specific tasks and activities. The schedule that is developed in the NAP should include a timeline of when each phase or step will be implemented and accomplished as well as the government agency, organization or other stakeholder group that is responsible for implementing the activity.

The mainstreaming exercise will be led and supported by the inter-ministerial coordination with the objective to include mercury priorities related to the Gold Mining sector into national policies and development plans. The mainstreaming exercise will also include a socio-economic study on the effects of mercury and alternatives in ASGM and relevant sectors that were identified in the inventory, which can help inform priority setting for this sector and support decision making to facilitate the mainstreaming of selected priorities.

## Key Partners

Following key partners will provide inputs to the process of executing the activities and developing the NAP:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key Stakeholder |  |
| Ministry of Natural Resources (NH): | Responsible for sustainable management of natural resources. The Ministry is in charge of the development and control of mining policies and regulations, exploration, exploitation or small-scale mining rights to both small- and large-scale mining firms. |
| Geological Mining Division (GMD): | The GMD has the responsibility for the sound management and use of natural resources. The GMD falls under the Ministry of NH and has formally among its tasks geological mapping, inventory of Suriname’s mineral reserves, advising the Minister of NH about mining rights and the control thereof. The GMD also advises third parties about mining concession applications. |
| The Environmental Office within the Cabinet of the President: | Is the national coordination point for environmental issues in Suriname. Environmental policy is developed by the Environmental Office in close collaboration with NIMOS. |
| National Institute for Environment and Development in Suriname (NIMOS): | In collaboration with the Environmental Office of the Cabinet of the President, NIMOS is responsible for the development of environmental policy. NIMOS also serves as the practical working arm for the Environmental Office (i.e. performing field inspections). |
| Commission Regulation of the Gold Sector (OGS): | The OGS was established by the government in 2010. OGS is leading the reform effort to develop sustainable and environmentally responsible gold mining practices and transform informal small-scale gold mining into viable sub-sector of the mining and national economy of Suriname. In addition, the OGS is responsible for development of ASGM policy, law enforcement in ASGM areas, conflict resolution in ASGM areas, management of the ASGM reserve areas and registration and documentation of ASGM. |
| Ministry of Regional Development | The Ministry of Regional Development is responsible for local government, decentralization and development of the interior. |
| Ministry of Finance | Responsible for obtaining and allocating resources necessary for state institutions, in accordance with the priorities of the public policy. Especially in the area of customs, it is related to establish regulation, controls, monitoring of all imports and exports of different products. |
| Ministry of Health: | The Ministry of Health is responsible for the development and implementation of health policies and assumes responsibilities related to monitoring, control, regulation and standardization. In addition, the Ministry of Health registers medical devices, distributes and /or store medical equipment and devices. |
| Bureau Public Health (BOG) | Bureau Public Health (BOG), The Central Lab is in charge of mercury testing. Mercury testing is used to detect the presence of an excessive amount of mercury in a person's blood, urine and/or hair sample |
| Ministry of Labour: | The Medical Bureau of the Dept. of Labour Inspection, Ministry of Labour, is in charge to safeguard the safety, wellbeing and health on the work spot. The Medical Bureau controls gold buying agents on compliance with legal requirements with regard to Hg exposure at work. |
| World Wildlife Fund Guianas: | WWF has worked in Suriname, Guiana and French Guiana since the 1960s and has had a WWF Guianas office since 1999. Mining represents one of the NGO´s priority areas of action. |
| Suriname Conservation Fund (SCF): | SCF focus area is to provide funding for projects that improve the protection or improve the sustainable use of the biodiversity of the Suriname rainforest. |
| Suriname Environmental and Mining Foundation (SEMIF): | This foundation was established in 2008 and receives 0,25% of the royalties of the operation of Rosebel Gold Mines N.V. (subsidiary of IAMGOLD corporation) in Suriname. |
| Foundation Makamboa: | This is an Association of small scale miners from the village of Nieuw Koffiekamp, situated in the concession of IAMGOLD – Rosebel Gold Mines NV. This is the first time a group of small scale miners has organized itself in a foundation. |
| Private Sector (ASGM miners groups): | Involved in various important aspects of the proposed project, consultations will be carried out with formally registered and informal small-scale mining groups, such as Godo Olo, MaLobi, sela kreek, Pakira kondre, and upper Saramaccan area (Matuariers maroon group). |
| Indigenous and Tribal Communities: | There are several indigenous and Maroon tribes living in the interior of Suriname, including Trio, Wayana, Arowak, Caraib, Saramaccan, Aucaan, Matuarier, Paramacca, Kwinti and Aluku People – that are dependent on natural resources contaminated with Mercury, for their livelihoods. Different Indigenous and Maroon tribal groups, clans, and extended families claim specified areas of the interior as their ancestral lands. When ASGM takes place on their lands, a (formal or self-appointed) representative of the land claim holder will request concession fee payment from the gold miners. These payments may also take place in kind, for example, fuel for the community generator (Social Solution, 2016). |
| School of Geology and Mining Technology: | In 2015, the SGMT at UNASAT started offering a 6-month bachelor level course on mercury-free gold mining technologies for graduates of the secondary technical school NATIN and bachelor students of mining. The course teaches competencies to work Hg-free in exploration, concentration and purification phases of gold mining. Field training for students takes place in Brokopondo district within OGS installed mining reserves (Km. 58 and Km. 68 of the Atjoni road) and in the Paamaka gold mining reserve near Snesi Kondre/Merian), which the OGS allocated to UNASAT. UNASAT/SGMT works with the i-concentrator (i-con) and shaking table. The school receives –partly in-kind- support from Surgold. Two UNASAT/SGMT graduates were involved in the testing of an Hg-free mining plant (i-con) on the mining concession of Surgold. The graduates also trained and guided one team of gold miners in a pilot project to promote Hg-free mining among ASGM. |
| Stichting Platform Binnenlandse Ondernemers (SPBO) | Foundation established in 2011 focusing in supporting the entrepreneurs (especially the gold entrepreneurs) in the interior of Suriname. |

Table 1: Key stakeholders within the ASGM

# Gender Dimensions

Women count for approximate 15-20 percent of the ASGM population incl. service sector (Social Solutions, 2016). Women are most prominently present in the mining service sector or sometimes as managers or (as wife of) equipment owners. Recognizing that the level of exposure to mercury and its related effects on human health are determined by social and biological factors, women, children and men might be exposed to different kinds, levels and frequency of mercury. Thus, gender mainstreaming will play a key role in the development of NAP and will be an integral part of the project activities.

Generally, two groups are more sensitive to the effects of mercury. Fetuses and people who are regularly exposed (chronic exposure) to high levels of Mercury (such as populations that rely on subsistence fishing or people who are occupationally exposed). As mercury is passed on from mother to child, fetuses and children are most susceptible to development effects due to mercury. The NAP will pay particular attention to assessing national capacity to keep such risk groups safe. Recommendations on how to improve gender dimensions and gender mainstreaming related to Mercury, and priorities actions in this area will be highlighted in the NAP report.

# Feasibility

Cost efficiency and effectiveness: The cost-effectiveness of the project will be assured through the management of the project with synergies from other POPs- and chemicals-related projects in Suriname. The project will involve national experts as much as possible to facilitate the collection of accurate information and to establish a high-responsiveness of the project to keep a steady momentum in project implementation with an international technical advisor providing succinct, specific input where local expertise gaps exist. Information dissemination with the general public and specific local communities will be more effective through integrating the work through existing activities

Currently, a draft of the Minamata Initial Assessment is being prepared in Suriname. The development of a NAP focused on the ASGM sector complements the MIA initiative and that the country can achieve the objectives of the implementation phase of the Convention

The efforts made by Suriname, mentioned above, show that this project is fully in line with the country's goal to map and prevent environmental and health problems related to mercury in the ASGM sector and to invest in technological solutions and capacity development institution to fulfill obligations under the Minamata Convention

The integration of outcomes and deliverables of this project is also expected to provide significant input to the PPG full sized GEF project. In this respect, enhanced capacities and knowledge on the use and releases of mercury at the ASGM sector will facilitate the development and/or update of current policies and enforcement practices in a more efficient and resource saving approach.

**Risk Management:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project risks | | | | | |
| Description | **Type** | **Impact &**  **Probability** | **Mitigation Measures** | **Owner** | Status |
| Administrative | Administrative | Slow hiring processes (consultants, consultancy services, etc.) due to Government processes. | UNDP CO support will improve outreach to potential consultants and consultancy firms, to speed up recruitment and procurement processes as well as advise on additional partnerships with potential responsible partners such as universities, civil society organizations. | UNDP CO | No change |
| Coordination | Coordination | Poor coordination between key government Agencies and Ministries, as well as other stakeholders. | The project will establish a multi-stakeholder consultation group/ process in order to account for the institutions and assure proper coordination. | NIMOS | No change |
| Technical | Technical | Insufficient awareness, technical knowledge, data availability, etc. available to undertake the MIA | Project will start with the training of consultants and stakeholders on the methodology to be used to carry out the MIA. Secondly the project will carry out a number of awareness raising activities and ensure consultations among key stakeholders to facilitate obtaining data. | Project Team | Reducing |
| Project Team | Project Team | Difficulties in recruitment of a Project Manager with the necessary qualifications for the amount allocated in the Budget | A Project Manager may be shared between two or more chemicals related projects so that his/her time can be shared among projects. | UNDP CO | No Change |

*Table 2: Risk management*

Social and environmental safeguards: This project focused on assessment and planning for ASGM with the required field work to collect data and where substantial part of its activities involves awareness, desk research, surveys and consultation, so social and environmental risks are not associated with its implementation.

# PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **UNMSDF OUTCOME INVOLVING UNDP /Country Programme Results and Resources Framework** **Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted for the conservation, restoration and use of ecosystems and natural resources. (A Sustainable and Resilient Caribbean)** | | | | | |
| **Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets:**  Implementation status of Action Plan of Sound Management Chemicals (SMC)  BL: No action plan on SMC T: National Situation Report (NSR) on Sound Management Chemicals (SMC) finalized and Priority actions agreed  **Extent to which competent national and subnational authorities are implementing integrated natural resources management guidelines.**  **BL: 1 T: 3** | | | | | |
| **Applicable Outputs from the 2014 – 2017 UNDP Strategic Plan:**  Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste. | | | | | |
| **Applicable Output Indicators from the UNDP Strategic Plan Integrated Results and Resources Framework:**  Output 1.3 indicator 1.3.1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or subnational level. | | | | | |
|  | **Objective and Outcome Indicators** | **Baseline[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Mid-term Target3** | **End of Project Target3** | **Assumptions[[6]](#footnote-6)** |
| **Project Objective:** Undertake a National Action Plan to assess challenges and establish a schedule of implementation to the extent to which legal, policy and regulatory framework will enable Suriname to reduce and/or eliminate the use of Mercury in Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining. | *National Action Plan (NAP)* | *No National Action Plan exists* | *N/A* | *NAP prepared and transmitted to the Minamata Conv. Secretariat* | *This is an Enabling Activity* |
| **Component 1. Develop Mercury Profile in artisanal and small-scale gold mining (ASGM)**  Output 1.1. National capacity built to undertake Mercury inventory in ASGM. | * *Number of training conducted.* * *Number of people able to develop and apply surveys and undertaken inventories in the ASGM sector.* * *Number of people able to review and comment on mercury inventories.* | *No official training has been conducted* | *N/A* | *National team of Officers at NIMOS and other relevant stakeholders are trained in conducting and reviewing a mercury inventory.* | *This is an Enabling Activity*  *National counterparts and*  *relevant stakeholders remain*  *engaged and cooperative.* |
| **Component 1. Develop Mercury Profile in artisanal and small-scale gold mining (ASGM)**  Output 1.2.: National Mercury Profile available | * *National Mercury profile within the ASGM sector available.* | *No Mercury profile in the ASGM sector available.* | *N/A* | *National Mercury profile within the ASGM sector prepared.* | *This is an Enabling Activity* |
| **Component 2.** **Strengthen institutional capacities and prepare National Action Plan (NAP), with agreed schedule to achieve the reduction of emissions and releases of, and exposure to, mercury in ASGM sector and processing, including mercury-free methods**  Output 2.1. Legal and regulatory status of ASGM in Suriname reviewed, including land property rights and use permits in mining areas and licensing procedures. | * *Number of policies and auxiliary regulations adopted.* * *Number of institutional capacity gaps and barriers determined.* * *Numbers of different roles of various sectors and organizations identified.* | *Limited targeted awareness pieces*  *No comprehensive approach on Hg issues exists* | *N/A* | *Institutional capacity needs assessment report available.* | *This is an Enabling Activity.*  *Information and key informants will be readily accessible.*  *High level interests and engagement from representatives of key ministries and stakeholder*  *groups* |
| **Component 2. Strengthen institutional capacities and prepare National Action Plan (NAP), with agreed schedule to achieve the reduction of emissions and releases of, and exposure to, mercury in ASGM sector and processing, including mercury-free methods.**  Output 2.2. Strategies and policies for reducing emissions and releases of Hg assessed | * *Number of types of local institutions engaged as a potential partner in the pilot study Mining school.* * *Number of women and men introduced to the Mining school curriculum.* | *Limited targeted awareness pieces*  *No comprehensive approach on Hg issues exists* | *N/A* | *Mining school established.*  *Formal platform determined.* | *This is an Enabling Activity.*  *Information and key informants will be readily accessible.*  *High level interests and engagement from representatives of key ministries and stakeholder*  *groups* |
| **Component 2. Strengthen institutional capacities and prepare National Action Plan (NAP), with agreed schedule to achieve the reduction of emissions and releases of, and exposure to, mercury in ASGM sector and processing, including mercury-free methods.**  Output 2.3. Technically available and economically feasible techniques and technologies that can replace the use of mercury assessed at global level. | * *Number of existing methods and technologies used in the ASGM..* * *Number of feasible methods and technics to reduce/eliminate the use of HG in ASGM.* | *Limited targeted awareness pieces*  *No comprehensive approach on Hg issues exists* | *N/A* | *Baseline assessment of existing methods and technologies in ASGM + recommendations on feasible methods and technologies available.* | *This is an Enabling Activity.*  *Information and key informants will be readily accessible.*  *High level interests and engagement from representatives of key ministries and stakeholder*  *groups* |
| **Component 2. Strengthen institutional capacities and prepare National Action Plan (NAP), with agreed schedule to achieve the reduction of emissions and releases of, and exposure to, mercury in ASGM sector and processing, including mercury-free methods.**  Output 2.4. Public consultation and awareness systems on Hg risks on exposure established, including actions to prevent vulnerable public exposure, especially low income populations, children and women. | * *Number of recommendations in the public health strategy with special focus on vulnerable populations, such as women and children.* | *Limited targeted awareness pieces*  *No comprehensive approach on Hg issues exists* | *N/A* | *Public health strategy established.* | *This is an Enabling Activity.*  *Information and key informants will be readily accessible.*  *High level interests and engagement from representatives of key ministries and stakeholder*  *groups* |
| **Component 2. Strengthen institutional capacities and prepare National Action Plan (NAP), with agreed schedule to achieve the reduction of emissions and releases of, and exposure to, mercury in ASGM sector and processing, including mercury-free methods.**  Output 2.5. National Action Plan prepared | * *National Action Plan in the ASGM sector finalized and approved by GoS.* | *No National Action Plan available* | *N/A* | *National Action Plan for the mainstreaming in the public policies developed with suggested policies and strategies to be drafted.* | *This is an Enabling Activity.*  *Relevant stakeholders remain interested and engaged in the project.* |
| **Component 2. Strengthen institutional capacities and prepare National Action Plan (NAP), with agreed schedule to achieve the reduction of emissions and releases of, and exposure to, mercury in ASGM sector and processing, including mercury-free methods.**  Output 2.6. Schedule for the NAP implementation in Suriname made available. | * *Implementing schedule developed.* | *No experience with specific actions.* | *N/A* | *Implementing schedule is available.* | *This is an Enabling Activity.*  *Relevant stakeholders remain*  *interested and engaged in the*  *project* |
| **Component 3. Knowledge management and Monitoring & Evaluation**  Output 3.1. knowledge management, Project monitoring and evaluation implemented | * *# of human interest stories and learning events, # monitoring and evaluation missions* | *N/A* | *N/A* | *Three human interest, four learning events,*  *Three missions undertaken* | *This is an Enabling Activity* |

# Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan

The project results as outlined in the project results framework will be monitored annually and evaluated periodically during project implementation to ensure the project effectively achieves these results. *Supported by Component Four: Knowledge Management and M&E, the project monitoring and evaluation plan will also facilitate learning and ensure knowledge is shared and widely disseminated to support the scaling up and replication of project results.*

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) for this project will rely on several levels of review, quality control and feedback. Overall M&E will be conducted by UNDP Country Office. The Project Board including the main project stakeholders will meet annually to: (a) review annual work plan, (b) assess progress against M&E targets as indicated in the Project Results Framework, (c) review interim and final reports, and (d) assess any gaps or weakness and make appropriate adaptive management decisions based on progress and achievements.

Project-level monitoring and evaluation will be undertaken in compliance with standard UNDP requirements as outlined in the [UNDP POPP](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/accountability/programme_and_operationspoliciesandprocedures.html) and [UNDP Evaluation Policy](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/accountability/evaluation/evaluation_policyofundp.html). Though these UNDP requirements are not detailed in this section of the project document, the UNDP Country Office will ensure UNDP M&E requirements are met in a timely fashion and to high quality standards. The additional and mandatory GEF-specific M&E requirements as outlined in this section will be undertaken in accordance with the [GEF M&E policy](http://www.thegef.org/gef/Evaluation%20Policy%202010) and GEF guidance materials (link to be added)[[7]](#footnote-7). In addition to these mandatory UNDP and GEF M&E requirements, other M&E activities deemed necessary to support project-level adaptive management, and the exact role of project target groups and other stakeholders in project M&E activities, will be finalized during the Inception Workshop and will be detailed in the Inception Report.

**Oversight and monitoring responsibilities:**

The primary responsibility for day-to-day project implementation and regular monitoring rests with the Project Manager. The Project Manager will develop annual work plans based on the multi-year work plan included in the annexes, including annual targets at the output level to ensure the efficient implementation of the project. The Project Manager will ensure that the standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements are fulfilled to the highest quality. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring the results framework indicators are monitored annually in time for reporting (i.e. GEF PIR), and reporting to the Project Board at least once a year on project progress. The Project Manager will inform the Project Board and the UNDP Country Office of any delays or difficulties as they arise during implementation, including the implementation of the M&E plan, so that the appropriate support and corrective measures can be adopted. The Project Manager will also ensure that all project staff maintain a high level of transparency, responsibility and accountability in monitoring and reporting project results.

The UNDP Country Office will support the Project Manager as needed, including through annual supervision missions. The UNDP Country Office is responsible for complying with all UNDP project-level M&E requirements as outlined in the [UNDP POPP](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/accountability/programme_and_operationspoliciesandprocedures.html). This includes ensuring the UNDP Quality Assurance Assessment during implementation is undertaken annually; that annual targets at the output level are developed, and monitored and reported using UNDP corporate *systems*; and, updating the UNDP gender marker on an annual basis based on progress reported in the GEF PIR and UNDP ROAR reporting. Any quality concerns flagged by the process must be addressed by project management. Additional M&E and implementation quality assurance and troubleshooting support will be provided by the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor and the UNDP-GEF Unit as needed. The project target groups and stakeholders including the GEF Operational Focal Point will be involved as much as possible in project-level M&E. Per GEF guidance this project is not eligible for midterm review and terminal evaluations.

**Audit Clause**: The project will be audited per UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies on NIM implemented projects.

**Additional GEF monitoring and reporting requirements:**

Inception Workshop and Report: A project inception workshop will be held after the project document has been signed by all relevant parties to: a) re-orient project stakeholders to the project strategy and discuss any changes in the overall context that influence project implementation; b) discuss the roles and responsibilities of the project team, including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms; c) review the results framework and discuss reporting, monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities and finalize the M&E plan; d) review financial reporting procedures and mandatory requirements, and agree on the arrangements for the annual audit; e) plan and schedule Project Board meetings and finalize the first year annual work plan. The Project Manager will prepare the inception report no later than one month after the inception workshop. The final inception report will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and will be approved by the Project Board.

GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR): The Project Manager, the UNDP Country Office, and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor will provide objective input to the annual GEF PIR covering the reporting period July (previous year) to June (current year) for each year of project implementation. The Project Manager will ensure that the indicators included in the project results framework are monitored annually well in advance of the PIR submission deadline and are reported on accordingly in the PIR. The PIR that is submitted to the GEF each year must also be submitted in English and shared with the Project Board. The UNDP Country Office will coordinate the input of the GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders to the PIR. The quality rating of the previous year’s PIR will be used to inform the preparation of the subsequent PIR. The project’s terminal PIR along with the terminal evaluation (TE) report and corresponding management response will serve as the final project report package. The final project report package shall be discussed with the Project Board during an end-of-project review meeting to discuss lesson learned and opportunities for scaling up.

GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools: In line with its objective and the corresponding GEF Focal Areas/ Programs, this project will prepare the following GEF Tracking Tool(s): *list the required GEF Tracking Tool(s), as agreed with the UNDP-GEF RTA.* The baseline/CEO Endorsement GEF Focal Area Tracking Tool(s) – submitted in Annex to this project document – will be updated by the Project Manager/Team. If applicable the updated GEF Tracking Tool(s) will be submitted to the GEF.

The UNDP Country Office will retain all M&E records for this project for up to seven years after project financial closure in order to support ex-post evaluations undertaken by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office and/or the GEF Independent Evaluation Office.

**Table 3 - Mandatory GEF M&E Requirements and M&E Budget:**

***Note to project developers:*** *Delete rows with italic text as appropriate (e.g. if the project is medium-sized).*

| **GEF M&E requirements** | **Primary responsibility** | **Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget[[8]](#footnote-8) (US$)** | | **Time frame** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GEF grant** | **Co-financing** |
| **Inception (kick off) Workshop or 2 Field workshops** | UNDP Country Office | USD 2,000 | None | Within two months of project document signature |
| **Inception Report** | Project Manager | None | None | Within two weeks of inception workshop |
| **Standard UNDP monitoring and reporting requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP** | UNDP Country Office | None | None | Quarterly, annually |
| **Monitoring of indicators in project results framework *NIMOS*** | Project Manager | Per year: USD 9,000 | None | Annually |
| **GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)** | Project Manager and UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF team | None | None | Annually |
| **HACT Audit as per UNDP audit policies** | UNDP Country Office | USD 1,500 | None | Annually or other frequency as per UNDP Audit policies |
| **Supervision missions** | UNDP Country Office | None**[[9]](#footnote-9)** | None | Annually |
| **Oversight missions** | UNDP-GEF team | None9 | None | Troubleshooting as needed |
| **GEF Secretariat learning missions/site visits** | Project Manager and UNDP-GEF team | None | None | To be determined. |
| **TOTAL indicative COST**  Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and travel expenses | | *12,500* | None |  |

# Governance and Management Arrangements

Roles and responsibilities of the project’s governance mechanism: The project will be implemented following UNDP’s support to national implementation modality, per the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between UNDP and the Government of Suriname*,* and the United Nations Multi-Country Sustainable Development Framework (UNMSDF) Country Indicative Programme for Suriname. The **Implementing Partner** for this project is the National Institute for Environment and Development (NIMOS)*.* The Implementing Partner is responsible and accountable for managing this project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources.

The project organisation structure is as follows:

**Project Manager**

**Project Board**

**Senior Beneficiary:**

***Local communities***

***Goldminers***

**Excecution Agency:**

***NIMOS***

**Technical Advisory Committee**

**Project Assurance**

**UNDP Suriname Office Programme Officer**

**IMAC/MCM/PCG Environment**

**Project Organization Structure**

**TEAM A**

**ASGM Mercury Inventory Assessment**

**TEAM C**

**NAP and ASGM Advocacy, Education and Awareness**

**TEAM B**

**General Assessment and institution capacities ASGM**

**Key sites for direct measurements and interviews NKK/Makamboa/ETR, Compagniekreek, East Suriname**

The successful development of the NAP will rely on the formation of the Project Board that will guide the NAP development through all its phases and ensure that there is proper project planning and management throughout the process. The Project Board should include members from relevant governmental ministries or departments such as the Ministry of Natural Resources, NIMOS, Ministry of Trade and Industry, Ministry of Health, OGS and the UNDP.

Since Suriname is already developing a Minamata Initial Assessment and other relevant projects (e.g. Mining Act and PPG) it is recommended to invite a representative of each project to take part in the Project Board to ensure coordination of activities.

The Project Board is responsible for making by consensus, management decisions when guidance is required by the Project Manager, including recommendation for UNDP/Implementing Partner approval of project plans and revisions. In order to ensure UNDP’s ultimate accountability, Project Board decisions should be made in accordance with standards that shall ensure management for development results, best value money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. In case a consensus cannot be reached within the Board, final decision shall rest with the UNDP Programme Manager. The terms of reference for the Project Board are contained in Annex 1*.*

In addition, the Project Board will identify a Technical Advisory Committee, composed of stakeholders who possess relevant knowledge and information, and whose collaboration and cooperation will be needed for the successful formulation and implementation of the NAP. The Technical Advisory Committee will include relevant members of civil society with experience and knowledge in the ASGM sector. The Project Board will engage with the advisory group at regular intervals and during all phases of the NAP development and direct feedback on the NAP will be provided through a mechanism to be agreed upon by the Project Board.

The Project Board will meet regularly during project implementation. The Board will evaluate the progress of the project and will take the necessary measures to guarantee the fulfillment of its goals and objectives. The PB will take decisions on the project in line with the project objectives and these decisions will be implemented by the Executing Agency.

**Technical Advisory Group (TAG)**: The Technical Advisory Group (TAG) will include relevant stakeholders who possess relevant knowledge and information, and whose collaboration and cooperation will be needed for the successful formulation and future implementation of the NAP. The PB will engage with the advisory committee at regular intervals and during all phases of the NAP development and direct feedback on these documents will be provided through a mechanism to be agreed upon by the Project Board.

The **Project Manager** will run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the Implementing Partner within the constraints laid down by the Board. The Project Manager function will end when the final project report, and other documentation required by the GEF and UNDP, has been completed and submitted to UNDP (including operational closure of the project).

The **project assurance** roll will be provided by UNDP, who will augment this role to ensure that its fiduciary, environmental and social safeguards and standards are maintained. Further, the Project Assurance role supports the Project Board by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. This role ensures appropriate project management milestones are managed and completed. Additional quality assurance will be provided by the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor as needed.

**Implementing Agency** (IA): this project will be implemented by UNDP and executed by NIMOS. As Implementing Agency, UNDP will be responsible for the overall project supervision, overseeing the project progress through the monitoring and evaluation of project activities and progress reports, including on technical issues. In close collaboration with the Executing Agency, UNDP will provide administrative support to the Executing Agency.

Governance role for project target groups:

The MIA project works with several technical working groups consisting also of beneficiaries. They function as counterpart groups to different project and technical assessment teams at the start of project implementation. The structure of these technical working groups can also be used in the NAP development, because they ensure participatory preparation as well as additional quality assurance and ownership of deliverables.

UNDP Direct Project Services as requested by Government:

The enclosed letter of agreement identifies per which UNDP support services to NIM will be provided to the implementing partner of the project, the national institute for Environment and Development.

UNDP, as GEF Agency for this project, will provide project management cycle services for the project as defined by the GEF Council. In addition, the Government of Suriname may request UNDP direct services for specific projects, according to its policies and convenience.

UNDP and Government of Suriname acknowledge and agree that those services are not mandatory, and will be provided only upon Government request. If requested the services would follow the UNDP policies on the recovery of direct costs. These services (and their costs) are specified in the Letter of Agreement (view annexes). As is determined by the GEF Council requirements, these service costs will be assigned as Project Management Cost, duly identified in the project budget as Direct Project Costs. Eligible Direct Project Costs should not be charged as a flat percentage. They should be calculated on the basis of estimated actual or transaction based costs and should be charged to the direct project costs account codes: 64397 – ‘Services to projects - CO staff’ and 74596 – ‘Services to projects - GOE for CO’.

Agreement on intellectual property rights and use of logo on the project’s deliverables**:** In order to accord proper acknowledgement to the GEF for providing funding, the GEF logo will appear together with the UNDP logo on all promotional materials, other written materials like publications developed by the project, and project hardware. Any citation on publications regarding projects funded by the GEF will also accord proper acknowledgement to the GEF.

Project management*:* project is national in scope with project office operated out of NIMOS in the Capital of Paramaribo.

# Financial Planning and Management

The total cost of the project is USD 500,000*.* This is financed through a GEF grant of USD 500,000. UNDP, as the GEF Implementing Agency, is responsible for the execution of the GEF resources and the cash co-financing transferred to UNDP bank account only.

Parallel co-financing: Is it is an Enabling Activity, no co-finance requirements appl.:

Budget Revision and Tolerance: As per the UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP POPP, the project board can agree on a budget tolerance level for each plan under the overall annual work plan allowing the project manager to expend up to the tolerance level beyond the approved project budget amount for the year without requiring a revision from the project board. Should the following deviations occur, the Project Manager and UNDP Country Office will seek the approval of the UNDP-GEF team as these are considered major amendments by the GEF: a) budget re-allocations among components in the project with amounts involving 10% of the total project grant or more; b) introduction of new budget items/or components that exceed 5% of original GEF allocation.

Project Closure: Project closure will be conducted as per the UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP POPP (see (<https://info.undp.org/global/popp/ppm/Pages/Closing-a-Project.aspx>) on an exception basis only, a no-cost extension beyond the initial duration of the project will be sought from in-country UNDP colleagues and then the UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator.

Operational completion: The project will be operationally completed when the last UNDP-financed inputs have been provided and the related activities have been completed including the final clearance of the Terminal Evaluation Report that must be available in English, and after the final project board meeting. The Implementing Partner through a Project Board decision, will notify the UNDP Country Office when the operational closure has been completed. The relevant parties will then agree on the disposal of any equipment that is still the property of UNDP.

Financial completion: The project will be financially closed when the following conditions have been met: a) the project is operationally completed or has been cancelled; b) the implementing partner has reported all financial transactions to UNDP; c) UNDP has closed the accounts for the project; d) UNDP and the implementing partner have certified a final Combined Delivery Report (which serves as final budget revision).

The project will be financially completed within 12 months of operational closure or after the date of cancellation. Between operational and financial closure, the implementing partner will identify and settle all financial obligations and prepare a final expenditure report. The UNDP Country Office will send the final signed closure documents including confirmation of final cumulative expenditure and unspent balance to the UNDP-GEF Unit for confirmation before the project will be financially closed in Atlas by the Country Office.

Refund to Donor: should a refund of unspent funds to the GEF be necessary, this will be managed directly by the UNDP-GEF Unit in New York.

# Legal Context

This project document shall be the instrument referred to as such in Article 1 of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between the Government of (country) and UNDP, signed on (date).   All references in the SBAA to “Executing Agency” shall be deemed to refer to “Implementing Partner.”

1. Consistent with the Article III of the SBAA *[or the Supplemental Provisions]*, the responsibility for the safety and security of the Implementing Partner and its personnel and property, and of UNDP’s property in the Implementing Partner’s custody, rests with the Implementing Partner. To this end, the Implementing Partner shall:
2. put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried;
3. assume all risks and liabilities related to the Implementing Partner’s security, and the full implementation of the security plan.

UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of the Implementing Partner’s obligations under this Project Document [and the Project Cooperation Agreement between UNDP and the Implementing Partner][[10]](#footnote-10).

1. The Implementing Partner agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that no UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via <http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/aq_sanctions_list.shtml>. This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under/further to this Project Document.
2. Consistent with UNDP’s Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures, social and environmental sustainability will be enhanced through application of the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (http://www.undp.org/ses) and related Accountability Mechanism (http://www.undp.org/secu-srm).
3. The Implementing Partner shall: (a) conduct project and programme-related activities in a manner consistent with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards, (b) implement any management or mitigation plan prepared for the project or programme to comply with such standards, and (c) engage in a constructive and timely manner to address any concerns and complaints raised through the Accountability Mechanism. UNDP will seek to ensure that communities and other project stakeholders are informed of and have access to the Accountability Mechanism.

All signatories to the Project Document shall cooperate in good faith with any exercise to evaluate any programme or project-related commitments or compliance with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards. This includes providing access to project sites, relevant personnel, information, and documentation.

# Total Budget and Work Plan

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Atlas Proposal or Award ID: | | | *00099303* | | | | Atlas Primary Output Project ID: | | |  | | *00102618* | |
| Atlas Proposal or Award Title: | | | National Action Plan | | | | | | | | | | |
| Atlas Business Unit | | | SUR10 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Atlas Primary Output Project Title | | | ASGM National Action Plan for Suriname | | | | | | | | | | |
| UNDP-GEF PIMS No. | | | 5725 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Implementing Partner | | | National Institute for Environment and Development (NIMOS) | | | | | | | | | | |
| **GEF Component /Atlas Activity** | **RespParty/ IA** | **Fund ID** | | **Donor Name** | **ATLAS Code** | **Altlas Budget Description** | | **TOTAL Amount (USD)** | **Amount 2017**  **(USD)** | | **Amount 2018**  **(USD)** | **Amount 2019**  **(USD)** | **Budget note** |
| Component 1 Develop Mercury Profile in artisanal and small-scale gold mining (ASGM) | NIMOS | 62000 | | GEF | 71200 | International Consultants | | 35,000 | 6,000 | | 26,000 | 3,000 | A |
| 71300 | Local Consultants | | 55,000 | 10,000 | | 40,000 | 5,000 | B |
| 71600 | Travel | | 40,000 | 8,000 | | 25,000 | 7,000 | C |
| 72100 | Contractual Services-Companies | | 25,000 | 3,000 | | 20,000 | 2,000 | D |
| 74200 | Audio Visual & Print Prod Costs | | 15,000 | 1,500 | | 10,500 | 3,000 | E |
| 75700 | Training, Workshops & Conferences | | 25,000 | 1,000 | | 20,000 | 4,000 | F |
| 74500 | Miscellaneous | | 5,000 | 500 | | 2,500 | 2,000 | G |
| **GEF Subtotal Atlas Activity 1 (Comp 1)** | | | | | | | **200,000** | **30,000** | | **144,000** | **26,000** |  |
| **TOTAL ACTIVITY 1 (Comp 1)** | | | | | | | | **200,000** | **30,000** | | **144,000** | **26,000** |  |
| Component 2 Strengthen institutional capacities to achieve the reduction of emissions and releases of, and exposure to, mercury in ASGM sector and processing, including mercury-free methods. | NIMOS | 62000 | | GEF | 71200 | International Consultants | | 40,000 | 4,000 | | 31,000 | 5,000 | A |
| 71300 | Local Consultants | | 70,000 | 4,000 | | 55,000 | 11,000 | B |
| 71600 | Travel | | 45,000 | 7,000 | | 31,000 | 7,000 | C |
| 72100 | Contractual Services-Companies | | 20,000 | 2,000 | | 18,000 | 0.00 | D |
| 74200 | Audio Visual & Print Prod Costs | | 16,000 | 1,500 | | 7,000 | 7,500 | E |
| 75700 | Training, Workshops & Conferences | | 25,000 | 2,000 | | 15,000 | 8,000 | F |
| 74500 | Miscellaneous | | 5,000 | 500 | | 3,000 | 1,500 | G |
| **GEF Subtotal Atlas Activity 2 (Comp 2)** | | | | | | | **221,000** | **21,000** | | **160,000** | **40,000** |  |
| **TOTAL ACTIVITY 2 (Comp 2)** | | | | | | | | **221,000** | **21,000** | | **160,000** | **40,000** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Component 3 Monitoring and Evaluation | NIMOS | 62000 | GEF | 71300 | Local Consultants | 12,000 | 1,000 | 6,500 | 4,500 | H |
| 71600 | Travel | 4,000 | 0 | 2,500 | 1,500 | I |
| 75700 | Training, Workshops & Conference | 15,500 | 1,000 | 8,000 | 6,500 | F |
| 74500 | Miscellaneous | 2,500 | 0 | 2,000 | 500 | F |
| **GEF Subtotal Atlas Activity 3 (Comp 3)** | | | | | **34,000** | **2,000** | **19,000** | **13,000** |  |
| **TOTAL ACTIVITY 3 (Comp 3)** | | | | | | **34,000** | **2,000** | **19,000** | **13,000** |  |
| Project Management | NIMOS | 62000 | GEF | 71800 | Contractual Services – Implementing Partner | 19,500 | 0 | 16,500 | 3,000 | J |
| 74596 | Direct Project Costs | 7,500 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 1,500 | K |
| 74100 | Audit | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | L |
| 72500 | Supplies | 14,000 | 1,000 | 12,000 | 1,000 | M |
| 75700 | Training, Workshops & Conferences | 2,500 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,000 | F |
| **GEF Subtotal Atlas Activity 4 (Proj Mgt)** | | | | | **45,000** | **4,500** | **32,500** | **8,000** |  |
| **TOTAL ACTIVITY 4 (Project Management)** | | | | | | **45,000** | **4,500** | **32,500** | **8,000** |  |
| **SUB-TOTAL GEF** | | | | | | **500,000** | **57,500** | **355,500** | **87,000** |  |
| **GRAND TOTAL (Grant)** | | | | | | **500,000** | **57,500** | **355,500** | **87,000** |  |

**Budget notes:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A | International Consultant’s rate is calculated at 600USD per day |
| B | National Consultant’s rate is calculated at 300 USD per day |
| C | International/ National Consultant’s travel, 20 percent consultant rate allocated for travel + travel cost for field research/data gathering/field visits, including consultant travel related to different sectors of the development of the National Action Plan |
| D | Contractual service companies’ costs associated with collection, analysis and dissemination of inventory data (no travel cost included) |
| E | These costs are for communication products for public and policy makers awareness, knowledge sharing. |
| F | This includes inception (kickoff) workshop (component 1) and inter sectorial working groups meetings and workshops, knowledge exchanges. Also training workshops, knowledge exchanges, sensitization of vulnerable communities, and public awareness activities |
| G | Miscellaneous costs |
| H | Local consultant in support monitoring NAP assessment and stakeholder consultation |
| I | Travel for monitoring NAP assessment and stakeholder consultation |
| J | Contractual services provided by the implementing partner in the management of the project |
| K | Refer to Annex “Letter of Agreement for Direct Project Services”. As agreed with NIMOS. |
| L | Audit to be carried out by professional services once throughout project duration |
| M | Supplies for management of the project |

**List of Mandatory Annexes**

* Multi-year Workplan (see template below)
* Monitoring Plan (see template below)
* GEF Tracking Tool (s) at baseline (see separate document)
* Terms of Reference for Project Board, Project Manager, Chief Technical Advisor and other positions as appropriate
* UNDP Social and Environmental and Social Screening Template (SESP)
* Any additional agreements, such as cost sharing agreements, project cooperation agreements signed with NGOs (where the NGO is designated as the “executing entity”), letters of financial commitments, GEF OFP letter, GEF PIFs and other templates for all project types, LOA with the government in case DPCs are applied should be attached.

1. Closing of the operation represented a significant economic blow to the country, in terms of jobs and revenues. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. MPF assessment 2016, p. 35 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Besluit Negatieve Lijst 2003; S.B. 2003 no. 74 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Wet Goederenverkeer; S.B. 2003 no. 58 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Baseline, mid-term and end of project levels must be expressed in the same neutral unit of analysis as the corresponding indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Risks must be outlined in the Feasibility section of this project document. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff time and travel expenses. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF’s participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Use bracketed text only when IP is an NGO/IGO [↑](#footnote-ref-10)