

SUMMARY OUTCOME OF THE REVIEW OF THE FINAL EIA/EMP		
Aspect evaluated	Judgment (C / A / I) C: Complete or comprehensive A: Adequate or acceptable I: inadequate	Comments
A. Scoping Report	I	The scoping report submitted is inadequate.
B. EIA Report		
1. Non-technical summary	I	The non-technical summary is inadequate and does not contain all the information necessary. For instance, the cost-benefit analysis has not been carried out. Vague language is used and the criteria and standards used are not specified and explained.
2. Administrative, legal and policy requirements	I	The EIA does not comply with administrative, legal, and policy requirements.
3. Public participation process conducted	I	The public participation was poorly conducted and it is therefore insufficient. For instance, capacity building programmes required to enable informed stakeholder involvement have not been conducted.
4. Description of the environment	I	The EIA report has some flaws in describing the environment that may be affected by the activity.

5. Assessment of alternatives to the project.		Alternatives to the activity were not adequately considered in the EIA. For instance, there is bias in the analysis of agriculture importance, which is clearly underestimated.
6. Description of the project.		Description of the project is insufficient. For instance, the technologies to be used have not been described, including suitable diagrams and layout plans.
7. Assessment of impacts		The assessment of impacts is inadequate. People, communities and public health impacts have not been identified and investigated.
8. Scientific assessment process		Independent review of the scientific assessment process is necessary.
9. Mitigation of impacts		Where there are no generally accepted standards or criteria for the evaluation of significance, the report does not make a clear distinction between fact, assumption and professional judgment.
10. Conclusions and recommendations		The report does not give prominence to, or place emphasis on the severe adverse impacts, to substantial environmental impacts, and to controversial issues.
11. General approach		The analysis of the report indicates manifest bias on the part of the consultant in favour of the mine, through its significant downplaying of the serious impacts on the host community.
12. Specialist studies		Independent review of specialist studies is necessary. Several specialist studies are still outstanding.