

7. REFERENCES

CSIR (2001) *EIA Project Management Manual, Practical Guide to Managing the EIA Process*, CSIR, Pretoria.

EIA Centre (1995) *Leaflet II: Reviewing environmental impact statements*, EIA Leaflet series, EIA Centre, University of Manchester, UK.

European Communities (2001) *Guidance on EIA: EIS Review*, European Union, Luxembourg. Available at <http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/pubs/home.htm>.

IAIA (1999) *Principles of Environmental Impact Assessment Best Practice*, International Association for Impact Assessment in cooperation with the Institute for Environmental Assessment (UK), IAIA, Fargo, ND, USA.

IFC (1998) *Procedure for Environmental and Social Review Of Projects*, The International Finance Corporation (IFC), Washington DC.

Sadler, B. (1996) *Environmental Assessment in a Changing World: Evaluating Practice to Improve Performance*, International Study of the Effectiveness of Environmental Assessment, Final Report. Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, International Association for Impact Assessment, Canada.

UNEP (2002) *Environmental Impact Assessment Training Resource Manual*, Second Edition, United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, Kenya.

US EPA (2000) *U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Peer Review Handbook, 2nd Edition*, EPA document number 100-B-00-001, United States Environment Protection Agency, Washington DC.

APPENDIX A: Exemplo de Lista de Verificação

Southern African Institute for Environmental Assessment
(Reg. No. T 117/2002)

P.O.Box 6322, Ausspannplatz,
Windhoek, Namibia

Tel: +264 61 220579 Fax: +264 61 259183 Email : saiea@africaonline.com.na Website: www.saiea.com

This review form provides a structure that helps the reviewer to assess the EIA's various components in a scientific way. However, the reviewer must try at the same time to maintain a perspective of the "bigger picture" so that SAIEA can advise the client on whether the EIA report makes sense as a whole and if the process was conducive for planning.

This review form is divided into the following sections:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Methodology utilised in compiling the EIA report | 5. Description of impacts |
| 2. Description of the project | 6. Consideration of measures to mitigate impacts |
| 3. Assessment of alternatives to the project | 7. Non-technical summary |
| 4. Description of the environment | 8. General approach |

Review methodology:

- For each question, the reviewer considers whether the information is relevant to the project. If not, the question is ignored and the reviewer proceeds to the following question.
- If the information is relevant, that section of the EIA report is read to establish whether the information provided is:
 - * **Complete (C)** : all information required for decision-making is available. No additional information is required even though more information might exist.
 - * **Acceptable (A)** : the information presented is incomplete, but the omissions do not prevent the decision-making process from proceeding
 - * **Inadequate (I)** : the information presented contains major omissions. Additional information is necessary before the decision-making process can proceed.

Name of the project	
Country where the project is to be located	
Name of company which compiled the EIA report	
Name of reviewer	
Date of review	

Narrative report (reviewers general opinion of the EIA report):

Resumo da apreciação do relatório do EIA (a completar apenas após a revisão detalhada - ver abaixo - estar concluída)

	Judgement (C/A/I)	Comments
1. Methodology utilised in compiling the EIA report		
2. Description of the project		
3. Assessment of alternatives to the project		
4. Description of the environment		
5. Description of impacts		
6. Consideration of measures to mitigate impacts		
7. Non-technical summary		
8. General approach		

The overall report is graded as follows: (tick one box)

- Excellent:** The EIA report contains everything required for decision-making on the project. There are no gaps.
- Good:** The EIA report contains most of the information required as far as it is relevant in the particular circumstances of the project; any gaps are relatively minor.
- Satisfactory:** The information presented is not complete; there are significant omissions but in the context of the proposed project, these are not so great as to prevent a decision being made on whether the project should be allowed to proceed.
- Inadequate:** Some of the information has been provided, but there are major omissions; in the context of the proposed project these must be addressed before a decision on whether the project should be allowed to proceed can be taken.
- Poor:** The information required has not been provided or is far from complete and, in the context of the proposed project, the omissions must be addressed before a decision on whether the project should be allowed to proceed can be taken.

In your opinion :

	Yes	Don't know	No
* Did the EIA process include genuine public participation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
* Were the consultants unduly influenced by the proponent or the Authorities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
* Did the EIA report focus on the 5 most important issues?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
* Is the EIA report of acceptable quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
* Will the EIA report help to make a more informed decision about the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1. Metodologia	Relevante?	Avaliação	Comentários
	Yes/No	(C/A/I)	
1.1 Does the report clearly explain the methodology used and how these helped to reach the conclusions of the study ?			
1.2 Does the report indicate what data are inadequate or absent?			
1.3 Did the EIA process include genuine stakeholder consultation ?			

		Relevant?	Judgement	Comments
		Yes/No	(C/A/I)	
1.4	If so, were the general public and/or affected communities included in the consultation?			
1.5	Have the views of stakeholders been meaningfully incorporated into the findings of the EIA?			

2. Descrição do Projecto				
<i>Land requirements</i>		Relevant?	Judgement	Comments
		Yes/No	(C/A/I)	
2.1	Has the land required for the project and any associated services, been described and clearly shown on a scaled map?			
2.2	For a linear project, has the land corridor and need for earthworks been described and shown on a scaled map?			
2.3	Has the re-instatement after use of temporary landtake been described?			
<i>Waste and emissions</i>				
2.4	Have the types and quantities of waste generated during construction and operation been estimated?			
2.5	Have the ways in which these wastes will be handled or treated prior to disposal been explained?			
2.6	Has the receiving environment where such waste will be disposed, been identified and described?			
<i>Project inputs</i>				
2.7	Are the nature and quantities of materials needed during construction and operation, clearly indicated?			
2.8	Are the sites where these materials will be sourced from, identified and assessed in terms of impacts, in the EIA report?			
2.9	Have the impacts of workers and visitors entering the project site during construction and operation been assessed?			
2.10	Have the means of transporting materials, products, workers and visitors to and from the site during construction and operation, been explained?			

3. Alternativas				
		Relevant?	Judgement	Comments
		Yes/No	(C/A/I)	
3.1	Were alternatives to the project (including the “no-project” alternative) considered in the EIA?			

	Relevante? Yes/No	Avaliação (C/A/I)	Comentários
3.2 If alternatives were considered, are the reasons for selecting the proposed project adequately described?			
3.3 Does the EIA assess various “within-project” alternatives (e.g. design, location)			
4. Situação de Referência			
4.1 Have the areas expected to be significantly affected by the various aspects of the project been indicated with the aid of suitable maps?			
4.2 Have the land uses on the project site(s) and in the surrounding areas been described and their use and non-use values adequately assessed?			
4.3 As componentes ecológicas/biodiversidade que poderão ser afetadas pelo projecto foram identificadas e descritas de forma suficiente para poder avaliar os impactos?			
4.4 Have the social components (including archaeological and historical) of the environment likely to be affected by the project been identified and described sufficiently for the prediction of impacts?			
4.5 Has the EIA adequately consulted the latest literature and/or unpublished reports and/or data relevant to the study?			
4.6 Have local, regional and national plans and policies been reviewed in order to place the project into context?			
5. Descrição dos Impactos			
<i>Impact Identification</i>			
5.1 Have direct and indirect/ secondary impacts of constructing, operating and, where relevant, after use or decommissioning of the project been clearly explained (including both positive and negative effects)?			
5.2 Is the investigation of each type of impact appropriate to its importance for the decision, avoiding unnecessary information and concentrating mainly on the 5 key issues?			
5.3 Os impactos cumulativos foram considerados			
5.4 Are transboundary impacts considered?			
5.5 Has consideration been given to impacts which might arise from non-standard operating conditions, (i.e. equipment failure or unusual environmental conditions such as flooding), accidents and emergencies? (i.e. risk assessment)			

	Relevant?	Judgement	Comments
	Yes/No	(C/A/I)	
<i>Magnitude and significance of Impacts</i>			
5.6	Has the timescale over which the effects will occur been predicted such that it is clear whether impacts are short, medium or long term, temporary or permanent, reversible or irreversible?		
5.7	O EIA apresenta uma indicação clara de quais os impactos que podem ser mais significativos e quais menos significativos?		
5.8	A magnitude, localização e duração do impacto foi discutida no contexto do seu valor, significância e raridade do recurso/receptor?		
6.	Mitigação		
<i>Description of mitigation measures</i>			
6.1	Has the mitigation of negative impacts been considered and, where feasible, have specific measures been proposed to address each impact?		
6.2	Is it clear to what extent the mitigation methods are likely to be effective?		
6.3	Has the EIA report clearly explained what the costs of mitigation are likely to be, and compared these to the benefits (including the costs of non-mitigation)?		
6.4	Have details of how the mitigation will be implemented and function over the time span for which they are necessary, been presented?		
<i>Monitoring Proposals</i>			
6.5	Has the EIA proposed practical monitoring arrangements to check the environmental impacts resulting from the implementation of the project and their conformity with the predictions made?		
6.6	Has the EIA proposed Limits of Acceptable Change that the developer can use to track impacts and trigger management intervention?		
<i>Environmental Effects of Mitigation</i>			
6.7	Have any adverse environmental effects of mitigation measures been investigated and described?		

7. Resumo não técnico		Relevant?	Judgement	Comments
		Yes/No	(C/A/I)	
7.1	Does the EIA contain a brief but concise non-technical summary that clearly explains the project and the environment, the main issues and mitigation measures to be undertaken, and any remaining or residual impacts?			
7.2	Does the summary include a brief explanation of the overall approach to the assessment?			
7.3	Does the summary provide an indication of the confidence which can be placed in the results?			
7.4	Does the summary indicate whether the project is or is not environmentally acceptable			
8. Abordagem geral				
Organização da Informação				
8.1	Is the information logically arranged in sections?			
8.2	Is the location of the information identified in an index or table of contents?			
8.3	When information from external sources has been introduced, has a full reference to the source been included?			
Apresentação da informação				
8.4	Has information and analysis been offered to support all conclusions drawn?			
8.5	Has information and analysis been presented so as to be comprehensible to the non-specialist, using maps, tables and graphical material as appropriate?			
8.6	Has superfluous information (i.e. information not needed for the decision) been avoided?			
8.7	Have prominence and emphasis been given to severe adverse impacts, to substantial environmental benefits, and to controversial issues?			
8.8	Is the information objective?			