ESY-MAP

A diagnostic tool for assessing the quality of a national Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) system.

Hand-out Detailed Scan

Capacities

Enabling conditions

ESIA performance

ESIA process

Context

March 2021

SECTION I - ESIA PROCESS		How to score	Max score	Score
Question nr		How to score	Max score	Score
Screening - requirements				
1.1	Is screening a legal requirement? If yes go to next question, otherwise **skip to practice**	Yes = 40 No = 1	40	
1.2	What is the quality of the screening step, in terms of requirements? Consider: • Is it clear who is responsible for what? • Is a starting document (or equivalent) required with sufficient information to enable screening? • Are there criteria for the screening decision: activity lists, thresholds, etc.? • Are the criteria sufficient for clear and consistent screening decision-making? • Are the criteria appropriate to be able to differentiate on the environmental and social risk? (i.e. identify high risk) • Is there a specific provision against splitting project into subprojects a to avoid ESIA (Salami tactics) into for example: § Separated phases of a project; § Disassociation of linked activities; § Multiple smaller projects. • Is there a requirement for consultation with other government agencies in screening? (such as the environmental inspectorate, health agency, etc) NB: Broader stakeholder engagement is addressed elsewhere. • Must the final screening decision be justified? Be public? Be published?		60	
	Score		100	
Screening - practice				
1.3	% of projects implemented that were incorrectly screened for example should have been subjected to ESIA but were not; or underwent an ESIA where one was not needed.	0-20 = 50 20-40 = 40 40-60 = 30 60-80 = 20 80+ = 10	50	
1.4	% of screening decisions where other government agencies were consulted on screening.	0-20 = 10 20-40 = 20 40-60 = 30 60-80 = 40 80+ = 50	50	
	Score		100	

Start of the ESIA - requirements				
Start of the ESIA - requirements				
2.1	Is there a clear start to the ESIA procedure in the form of a public announcement (NB: can be the published screening decision)?	Yes = 100 No = 1	100	
	Score		100	
Start of the ESIA - practice				
2.2.	% of cases where the start of the ESIA was publicly notified	0-20 = 20 20-40 = 40 40-60 = 60 60-80 = 80 80+ = 100	100	
	Score		100	

Scoping – requirements				
Scoping – requirements				
3.1	Is scoping (or equivalent step) a formal step in the ESIA procedure? (Y/N) If yes go to next question, **otherwise skip to practice**	Yes = 40 No = 1	40	
3.2	What is the quality of the scoping step in terms of requirements? • Is it clear who is responsible for what? • Is there instruction in the regulation on how to undertake scoping (i.e. methods, such as checklists)? • Do the scoping requirements include consultation with other government agencies? (such as the environmental inspectorate, health agency, etc) (NB: stakeholder engagement is addressed elsewhere.) • Does it include a distinct and verifiable scoping result? Like a scoping document or a ToR? • Is a quality check on this outcome required? How?		60	

	• Must the scoping conclusion (i.e. approved ToR) be justified? Be public? Be published?			
	Score		100	
Scoping - practice				
3.3	% of all ESIAs that were scoped	0-20 = 5 20-40 = 10 40-60 = 15 60-80 = 20 80+ = 25	25	
3.4	% of all ESIAs that included consultation of relevant government agencies in scoping	0-20 = 5 20-40 = 10 40-60 = 15 60-80 = 20 80+ = 25	25	
3.5	% of all ESIAs where the scoping conclusions were published	0-20 = 5 20-40 = 10 40-60 = 15 60-80 = 20 80+ = 25	25	
3.6	% of the ESIAs that were scoped well (led to early identification of key issues, alternatives and stakeholders)?	0-20 = 5 20-40 = 10 40-60 = 15 60-80 = 20 80+ = 25	25	
	Score		100	
Impact Assessment (incl. alternatives) - requirements				
4.1	Does the legislation clearly set out the _principles_ for good practice in impact assessment, for example: • The mitigation hierarchy? 1) Anticipate & avoid, 2) reduce & minimise, 3) offset and compensate • The assessment will be proportionate to the potential risks and impacts of the project • Including any associated facilities, necessary offsite investment, suppliers? (Or only direct project activity) • Including integrated assessment of all relevant direct, indirect and cumulative environmental and social risks and impacts throughout the project life cycle. • Include both biophysical and social context & impacts of the project? (NB: often depends on the definition of the environment) • Including land use and resettlement? • Including labour conditions (child labour, right to join a union, fair pay, etc – not occupation health and safety)? • Including indigenous/traditional knowledge. • Including whether impacts fall disproportionately on vulnerable or disadvantaged groups.		50	

4.2	Does the legislation clearly set out a comprehensive list of _content_ requirements for the ESIA report, following good practice? For example
	• Summary
	• Legal& institutional framework (environmental and social requirements, project's fit with the planning framework)
	• Project description
	  § Project rationale/problem analysis
	  § Project description & context
	  § Clear map showing location and affected area
	• Baseline
	  § Including 'business as usual' or a reference scenario?
	• Impacts (identification & assessment, both negative and positive opportunities), including:
	  § People and communities, their health, safety and security.
	  § Indigenous peoples
	  § Accidents and disasters
	  § Occupational health and safety
	  § Gender
	  § Cultural heritage (includes tangible and intangible change, built environment and landscape)
	  § Resource efficiency
	  § Climate change (adaptation & mitigation)
			50	

	§ Pollution § Biodiversity/ecosystem services § Transboundary • Alternatives (design, technology, location and operation) • Mitigation measures § Residual effect after mitigation § Feasibility, cost, capacity • Gaps in knowledge and the implications of these gaps • Appendices: § Who contributed to the ESIA § References used including ToR for the ESIA § Associated reports • Description of stakeholder engagement (such as record of meetings, etc.) (NB: Broader stakeholder engagement is addressed elsewhere.)			
	Score		100	

Impact Assessment (incl. alternatives) - Practice				
4.3	% of ESIAs that lived up to country requirements	0-20 = 6 20-40 = 12 40-60 = 18 60-80 = 24 80+ = 30	30	
4.4	% of ESIAs that lived up to good practice	0-20 = 8 20-40 = 16 40-60 = 24 60-80 = 32 80+ = 40	40	
4.5	% of ESIAs with a good balance between social and biophysical assessment	0-20 = 4 20-40 = 8 40-60 = 12 60-80 = 16 80+ = 20	20	
4.6	% of ESIAs with a clear link between the assessment and the proposed activity	0-20 = 2 20-40 = 4 40-60 = 6 60-80 = 8 80+ = 10	10	
	Score		100	

ESMP - requirements				
5.1	Does the law require an ESMP?		25	
5.2	Is the ESMP part of the ESIA, in that it is submitted with the ESIA (or as part of the ESIA), made available for consultation at the same time, etc.?		25	

5.3	Does the legislation clearly set out a comprehensive list of _content_ requirements for the ESMP, following good practice? This could include for example:
	   o Mitigation
	      § Clear and detailed description of measures (setting out impact, mitigation measure, indicators, responsible persons, timeframe and budget)
	      § Consistency with other mitigation plans including RAP
	   o Monitoring
	      § Clear & detailed description of monitoring, including rationale, thresholds for action, who will monitor, frequency, locations, and methodology
	      § Reporting procedures
	   o Institutional & capacity measures
	      § Capacities and institutional arrangements needed
	      § Actions needed to ensure the capacity needed
			50	

	Score		100	

ESMP - practice			
5.4	% of ESMPs that address the key issues of the ESIAs	0-20 = 10 20-40 = 20 40-60 = 30 60-80 = 40 80+ = 50	50
5.5	% ESMPs that are actionable and verifiable	0-20 = 10 20-40 = 20 40-60 = 30 60-80 = 40 80+ = 50	50
	Score		100

Review - requirements			
6.1	Does the law set the _**requirements**_ for government review, for example: • Is it clear who is responsible? For example, env agency, sectoral agency, intergovernmental panel, or independent body. • Is there instruction in the regulation on how to undertake the review? (methods, criteria or checklist). • Does the review process include a site visit? • Do the review requirements include consultation with other government agencies? (such as the environmental inspectorate, health agency, line ministries, etc) • Does the law require review of the EA process/procedure and content? • Must the review address appropriateness and feasibility of ESMP? • Can the ESIA be rejected if judged inadequate? • Can additional assessment work be required if ESIA is judged insufficient? • Does it include a distinct and verifiable review outcome? Like a review report? • Must the review conclusions be justified? Be public? Be published?		100
	Score		100

Review – practice			
6.2	% of ESIAs that are reviewed according to country requirements	0-20 = 2 20-40 = 4 40-60 = 6 60-80 = 8 80+ = 10	10
6.3	% of ESIAs where a site visit takes place during review	0-20 = 2 20-40 = 4 40-60 = 6 60-80 = 8 80+ = 10	10
6.4	% of ESIAs where government agencies are consulted during review	0-20 = 2 20-40 = 4 40-60 = 6 60-80 = 8 80+ = 10	10
6.5	% of ESIAs in which both process and content where reviewed	0-20 = 2 20-40 = 4 40-60 = 6 60-80 = 8 80+ = 10	10
6.6	% of ESIAs where the ESMP is reviewed	0-20 = 2 20-40 = 4 40-60 = 6 60-80 = 8 80+ = 10	10
6.7	% of ESIAs where reviewers formulated additional conditions	0-20 = 2 20-40 = 4 40-60 = 6 60-80 = 8 80+ = 10	10
6.8	% of ESIAs where review conclusions were formally justified and published	0-20 = 2 20-40 = 4 40-60 = 6 60-80 = 8 80+ = 10	10

6.9	% of ESIAs where review contributed to better ESIAs	0-20 = 4 20-40 = 8 40-60 = 12 60-80 = 16 80+ = 20	20	
6.10	% of ESIAs considered to be of sufficient quality	0-20 = 2 20-40 = 4 40-60 = 6 60-80 = 8 80+ = 10	10	
		Score	100	

Third party review - requirements				
7.1	Are there provision in the law for the environment agency to have the ESIA and EMP reports reviewed by an third party? • Requirement to mobilise expertise for this third party review (could be consultants, or a team of experts assembled for that purpose by the agency.) • Assurances in place that there is no financial or hierarchical relationship that could influence the review outcomes. (Regardless of whether the third party is at government cost, or at the cost of the proponent)? • Must the third party review conclusions be documented, public, published?		100	
		Score	100	
Third party review - practice				
7.2	% of ESIAs which are subjected to third party review	0-20 = 10 20-40 = 20 40-60 = 30 60-80 = 40 80+ = 50	50	
7.3	Are the independent review reports made public?	Yes = 50 No = 0	50	
		Score	100	

Decision making & accountability - requirements				
8.1	What is the quality of the requirements for the formal decision on the project? In deciding on quality, consider: • Is it clear who is responsible for this decision (=project approval)? • Are there criteria for this decision? (I.e. meeting environmental and social standards) • Are these criteria sufficient for clear and consistent decision-making? • Do the requirements include consultation with other governmental agencies on the formal decision? • Must the decision be justified with reference to the ESIA? • Is there a provision in the law that sets a time limit on the validity of the decision? i.e. the project must commence within a certain timeframe after decision-making, or the permit/licence will lapse. • Must the decision be public/published?		100	
		Score	100	
Decision making & accountability - practice				
8.2	% of ESIAs where the formal decision on the project was made as prescribed by regulation	0-20 = 2 20-40 = 4 40-60 = 6 60-80 = 8 80+ = 10	10	
8.3	% of ESIAs where other government agencies were consulted in decision-making	0-20 = 2 20-40 = 4 40-60 = 6 60-80 = 8 80+ = 10	10	
8.4	% of ESIAs where specific conditions for project implementation were specified in the decision	0-20 = 2 20-40 = 4 40-60 = 6 60-80 = 8 80+ = 10	10	

8.5	% of ESIAs where the formal decision was justified (with reference to the ESIA)	0-20 = 2 20-40 = 4 40-60 = 6 60-80 = 8 80+ = 10	10	
8.6	% of ESIAs where the formal decision was published	0-20 = 2 20-40 = 4 40-60 = 6 60-80 = 8 80+ = 10	10	
8.7	% of project authorisations where the ESIA conclusions and recommendations were taken into consideration in the issuance of permits or licences by <u>other</u> relevant government agencies (Ministries, Departments, Agencies)	0-20 = 10 20-40 = 20 40-60 = 30 60-80 = 40 80+ = 50	50	
	Score		100	

Follow up – requirements				
9.1	What is the quality of requirements for <u>proponents (private or government)</u> to: • Monitor the impacts (as identified in the ESIA/ESMP)? • Take action when impacts are not as expected (when measures are not working, are insufficient, or when unexpected impacts arise)? • Report on this monitoring and management? • Publish this report? • Regularly adapt the ESMP when circumstances or project changes require it?		25	
9.2	What is the quality of requirements for the competent authority to: • Check that the project is implemented as approved (including implementation of any measures in the ESMP and/or approval conditions)? • Check on ongoing monitoring, management and reporting? • Undertake inspection site-visits? • Take action when impacts are not as expected or approved (non-compliance)? • Report on this monitoring and management? • Must this reporting be public/published?		25	
9.3	Are there any requirements for third party involvement? • community monitoring, or • independent expert verification (including through certification schemes)?		25	
9.4	Are there provisions to put in place a financial commitment for implementation of measures?		25	
	Score		100	
Follow up - practice				
9.5	% of ESIAs where <u>proponents</u> undertake 3 or more of the following activities: • Monitor the impacts (as identified in the ESIA/ESMP)? • Take action when impacts are not as expected (when measures are not working, are insufficient, or when unexpected impacts arise)? • Report on this monitoring and management? • Publish this report?	0-20 = 3 20-40 = 6 40-60 = 9 60-80 = 12 80+ = 16	16	
9.6	% of ESIAs where <u>government</u>: • Checks that the project is implemented as approved (including implementation of any measures in the ESMP and/or approval conditions)? • Checks on ongoing monitoring, management and reporting? • Undertakes inspection site-visits? • Takes action when impacts are not as expected or not as approved (non-compliance)? • Reports on this monitoring and management? • Publishes this report?	0-20 = 4 20-40 = 8 40-60 = 12 60-80 = 16 80+ = 20	20	
9.7	% of projects where ESIA/ESMP is incorporated into contractor ToRs, tenders and contracts?	0-20 = 3 20-40 = 6 40-60 = 9 60-80 = 12 80+ = 16	16	
9.8	% of ESIAs where third parties were involved in follow up	0-20 = 3 20-40 = 6 40-60 = 9 60-80 = 12 80+ = 16	16	

9.9	% of ESIAs where financial commitments were put in place	0-20 = 3 20-40 = 6 40-60 = 9 60-80 = 12 80+ = 16	16	
9.10	% of ESIAs where non-compliance during follow up was rectified?	0-20 = 3 20-40 = 6 40-60 = 9 60-80 = 12 80+ = 16	16	
	Score		100	

Stakeholder engagement & access to information - requirements				
10.1	Must a stakeholder engagement plan be part of the ESIA process?		12	
10.2	Is there is a requirement to tailor to the needs of specific groups, which may include indigenous people, disadvantaged and vulnerable?		24	
10.3	Should specialists assist in stakeholder engagement?		12	
10.4	Is a project specific grievance mechanism required?		12	
10.5	Are there any specific provisions to ensure easy access to relevant ESIA documents? (Everyone has a right to view the ESIA; ESIA (draft) reports easily accessible by (e)-mail or internet; associated costs do not hinder access, the information is understandable)		12	
10.6	Are there special provisions on the conditions that have to be created that enable engagement? (culturally appropriate, free of manipulation, interference, coercion, discrimination and intimidation)		12	
10.7	How do you judge the quality of the requirements for stakeholder engagement in the ESIA process? Consider: • Choice of stages in which stakeholder engagement is required: Start/screening, Scoping, Assessment, Review, Decision making, Follow up (i.e. during project implementation) • Is there instruction in the regulation on methods for stakeholder engagement? I.e. public hearing, etc. • Is there a definition, or are there stakeholder identification criteria, that ensure inclusive stakeholder engagement? • Specific requirements on access to information. • Whether stakeholder input must be recorded (uncensored) and responded to? • Whether the outcome/decision within the ESIA process, and on project approval must be justified in the light of stakeholder input? • On which formal decisions the public can make use of any right to appeal via the administrative appeal option?		16	
	Score		100	
Stakeholder engagement & access to information – practice				
10.8	Does stakeholder engagement take place early enough to influence assessment and project design?		15	
10.9	% of ESIAs in which project and stakeholder engagement options were announced early	0-20 = 3 20-40 = 6 40-60 = 9 60-80 = 12 80+ = 15	15	
10.10	% of ESIAs that lived up to country requirements on stakeholder engagement	0-20 = 3 20-40 = 6 40-60 = 9 60-80 = 12 80+ = 15	15	

10.11	% of ESIAs that can be considered good practice; meaning that:
	• Stakeholder engagement took place at the right stages throughout the process, and…
	• … took place at each of these stages under the right conditions as to:
	  ○ being all inclusive or restricted to specific stakeholders
	  ○ being recorded
	  ○ outcomes being justified in the light of stakeholder input
		0-20 = 3
		20-40 = 6
		40-60 = 9
		60-80 = 12
		80+ = 15
			15	

10.12	% of ESIAs that delivered on the objectives of good practice stakeholder engagement. Meaning that all stakeholders: • that wanted to be included were included, and… • …were able to raise the issues & grievances important to them, and… • …received appropriate response to these.	0-20 = 3 20-40 = 6 40-60 = 9 60-80 = 12 80+ = 15	15	
10.13	% of ESIAs where stakeholder input improved the ESIA and/or project	0-20 = 5 20-40 = 10 40-60 = 15 60-80 = 20 80+ = 25	25	
	Score		100	

	Environmental and social assessment professionals - requirements			
11.1	Is there a requirement for ESIAs to be undertaken by appropriately qualified professionals with relevant experience		25	
11.2	Is there a requirement stipulating that ESIAs should be undertaken by independent environmental and social assessment professionals (ESAPs)?		25	
11.3	Is there a mechanism to formally recognise environmental and social assessment practitioners i.e. certification or registration? Y/N (If No, skip question 11.4)		25	
11.4	What is the quality of the certification or registration system? Consider: o Clearly defined criteria for qualifications, experience and competence? o Professional development requirement? o Does it need to be renewed at regular intervals or is it awarded for life o Each registered professional has to sign a Code of Conduct o A mechanism to ensure poor performance is penalised? (Complaints procedure, for example)		25	
	Score		100	
	Environmental and social assessment professionals – practice			
11.5	% of all practising Environmental and Social Assessment Professionals who are registered and certified	0-20 = 6 20-40 = 12 40-60 = 18 60-80 = 24 80+ = 30	30	
11.6	% of ESIAs undertaken by appropriately qualified professionals	0-20 = 14 20-40 = 28 40-60 = 42 60-80 = 56 80+ = 70	70	
	Score	100		

	Reviewers – requirements			
12.1	Is there a legal requirement for ESIAs to be reviewed by appropriately qualified professionals with relevant experience		35	
12.2	Is there a mechanism to formally recognise ESIA reviewers i.e. via certification or registration? Y/N		35	
12.3	What is the quality of the certification or registration system? Consider: • Clearly defined criteria for qualifications, experience and competency? • Does it need to be renewed at regular intervals or is it awarded for life • Each registered professional has to sign a Code of Conduct • A mechanism to ensure poor performance is penalised? (Complaints procedure, for example)		30	
	Score		100	
	Reviewers – practice			
12.4	% of ESIA reviewers who are registered and certified	0-20 = 6 20-40 = 12 40-60 = 18 60-80 = 24 80+ = 30	30	
12.5	% of ESIAs reviewed by appropriately qualified professionals	0-20 = 14 20-40 = 28 40-60 = 42 60-80 = 56 80+ = 70	70	
	Score		100	

	Timelines requirements & practice			
13.1	Suitability of procedural timelines from the perspective of the administrator		15	
13.2	Suitability of procedural timelines from the perspective of the proponent		15	
13.3	Suitability of procedural timelines from the perspective of stakeholder engagement		15	
13.4	Are there provisions for flexibility in timelines (extension possible?) (Y/N)		15	
13.5	% of ESIAs in which the procedural timelines are met	0-20 = 8 20-40 = 16 40-60 = 24 60-80 = 32 80+ = 40	40	
	Score		100	

	User friendliness requirements and practice			
14.1	Is the administrative burden of the ESIA procedure reasonable ? (number of forms, number of offices to visit in the procedure, etc.)		40	
14.2	Customer friendliness of the administrating agency (giving updates on processing, give additional advice providing information online)		20	
14.3	Do the relevant government authorities take an active role in making ESIAs documents (such as the scoping and ESIA report) actively available to public?		40	
	Score		100	

	Transboundary ESIAs requirements			
15.1	Are there requirements to ensure that an affected country is notified early on the ESIA process, in case of potential transboundary impacts?		25	
15.2	Are there requirements to include transboundary impacts in an ESIA/ESMP, where relevant?		25	
15.3	Are there requirements to engage stakeholders in an affected country in the ESIA process?		25	
15.4	Are there requirements to notify relevant parties in an affected country on the outcomes of the ESIA process (ESIA report and decision).		25	
	Score		100	
	Transboundary ESIAs – practice			
15.5	% of the ESIA cases (with potential transboundary impacts) where the affected country is notified early in the ESIA process?	0-20 = 5 20-40 = 10 40-60 = 15 60-80 = 20 80+ = 25	25	
15.6	% of the ESIA cases (with potential transboundary impacts) where transboundary impacts are included in the ESIA/ESMP?	0-20 = 5 20-40 = 10 40-60 = 15 60-80 = 20 80+ = 25	25	
15.7	% of the ESIA cases (with potential transboundary impacts) where stakeholders in an affected country are involved in the ESIA process?	0-20 = 5 20-40 = 10 40-60 = 15 60-80 = 20 80+ = 25	25	
15.8	% of the ESIA cases (with potential transboundary impacts) where relevant parties in an affected country are notified on the outcomes of the ESIA process (ESIA report and decision).	0-20 = 5 20-40 = 10 40-60 = 15 60-80 = 20 80+ = 25	25	
	Score		100	

NOTES

SECTION II – ENABLING CONDITIONS

Question nr		Max score	Score
Regulatory framework for ESIA			
16.1	Is there an act that sets requirements for ESIA?	7	
16.2	Is the Environmental and/or Social Act complimented by ESIA regulations?	8	
16.3	Is the ESIA coverage appropriate?	8	
16.4	How well is ESIA linked with project decision-making? (I.e. for example: timing ESIA versus other project approvals)	8	
16.5	Does the possibility exist to make a project approval decision at the end of the scoping phase (ESIA light)?	7	
16.6	Does the regulation make provision for a dedicated agency for ESIA? For example: o Does it exist? o Does it have the right mandate? o Does it effectively coordinate with other agencies?	8	
16.7	Is there appropriate decentralisation of the ESIA mandates that enhances ESIA effectiveness?	7	
16.8	Are there arrangements for co-ordination between agencies in the ESIA process? o Involvement of the environmental and/or social inspectorate? o Involvement of sectoral agencies (for example, infra, water)? o Involvement of topical agencies (for example, health)?	8	
16.9	Are competences or mandates in ESIA & related licensing/permitting clear and workable? (I.e. no overlapping mandates?)	8	
16.10	Is redress possible? o Administrative appeal option (as part of domestic administrative law) o Judicial appeal option (including possibility for public interest lawsuit)	9	
16.11	Do penalties exist for non-compliance with the ESIA requirements? o Are there general penalties under environmental, social or other law? o ESIA-specific penalties? o Are penalties sufficient to deter non-compliance?	8	
16.12	Does guidance exist on the Act and Regulations? Is this guidance widely accessible?	7	
16.13	Does the Act or regulation specify that the proponent must cover the costs associated with the ESIA, as well as the costs for any remedial action post-decision (Polluter pays principle)?	7	
	Score	100	
Finance			
17.1	Is there sufficient structural financing available to administer the ESIA process, including follow-up (human, technical and physical resources)?	40	
17.2	Is sufficient budget allocated to undertake ESIA? o Is there earmarked ESIA budget in governmental budgets for projects that are undertaken by government? o Is there earmarked ESIA budget in private sector budgets for projects?	40	
17.3	Is there a dedicated financing mechanism for-ESIA related fees and costs, such as an Environment Fund?	20	
	Score	100	
Awareness & Commitment			
18.1	Is ESIA given attention in the public domain (media)?	20	
18.2	Is ESIA on the political agenda and are high level decision-makers personally supportive of the ESIA process? Consider: o Is there a policy to promote ESIA? o Is ESIA ever on cabinet or other agendas for example, Inter-ministerial Committee?	40	
18.3	Is there sufficient level of public/ professional interest and participation in ESIA related events (seminars, etc)? Consider: o Number of events o Turn-out for events o Quality of discussion at events	20	
18.4	Is there recognizable, accepted, and effective leadership on ESIA in the country? Consider: o Professional organisation o Mentors/champions	20	
	Score	100	

ESIA education and professional training				
	NB: education = tertiary level ESIA teaching at academic institutions training = professional development			

19.1	Is good quality ESIA education available?
	   o ESIA teaching is co-ordinated or under quality control (unified curriculum etc)?
	   o Competent students are delivered?
			50	

19.2	Is good quality professional development training accessible? Regularly organized workshops etc. for ESIA professionals to further develop their skills & knowledge (not one-off training)		50	
	Score		100	
Provision of advice on ESIA procedure & practice (ESIA helpdesk)				

20.1	**Helpdesk**
	   o Is the helpdesk itself easily accessible? ? In other words: is there support for people trying to get involved in ESIA?
	   o Is it used?
	   o Does the helpdesk facilitate access to data and information relevant for ESIA practice?
	   o Is it effective in influencing practice?
			100	

	Score		100	
Monitoring of implementation of the ESIA system				

21.1	**M&E**
	   o Are ESIA effectiveness studies being undertaken?
	   o Is there sufficient budget available for monitoring the ESIA system?
	   o Does (public) reporting on progress take place?
			30	

21.2	Is there an accessible database or repository of ESIA reports which is regularly maintained?		20	
21.3	Does system monitoring lead to improvement efforts of the ESIA system?		50	
	Score		100	
Enabling professional exchange				

22.1	Platform / network of experts
	   o Does a platform/ network exist?
	   o Is there a good level of activity on the platform?
	   o Does the platform / network promote good practice?
			50	

22.2	Are ESIA professionals sharing data and information relevant for ESIA amongst each other?		50	
	Score		100	

SECTION III - CAPACITIES

	Environment agency (i.e. administrative agency for ESIA)			
Mandate, structure and resources				
23.1	o Mandate clearly defined in legal texts o Structural financing secured to execute mandate o Organisation has committed and stable leadership o Organisation has clear and functional organisational structure o Offices established, facilities and equipment needed available o Number of staff available sufficient to perform tasks o Information management system exists giving access to information required to perform tasks o Tools/guidance available to support tasks (working procedures, checklists, etc)		25	
Management				
23.2	o Vision/Strategy/multi-annual plan exists and informs the work of the organisation o Vision/strategy/planning documents accessible and known o Decisions are taken, communicated and acted upon o Regular planning/ coordination meetings are held o Management encourages exchange and learning o Management anticipates new developments		25	
Expertise				
23.3	o Expertise available to perform all ESIA administrative tasks o Staff regularly trained and effort made to maintain expertise for tasks and institutional memory o Approriate finances and mechanisms available to access external expertise if needed (such as for ESIA review) o Finances and mechanisms available to access (external) data bases and sources of information if needed (specifically for ESIA baseline and impact assessment)		25	
Maintaining strategic relations				
23.4	o Co-ordination/co-operation with relevant partners takes place o Leadership in ESIA of organisation duly recognised by partners o Platforms/networks/coalitions for exchange (both national and international) identified by organization, and organisation (pro)actively participates in these o Organisation willingly shares data and information o Status of environmental agency in the government hierarchy		25	
	Score		100	

	Environmental and social assessment professionals (ESAPs)			
Resources				
24.1	o Number of ESAPs available is sufficient to meet the demand for ESIA work o ESAPs have access to data, maps, etc required to undertake ESIA work o There are tools available to support ESIA work (formats, checklists, etc)?		40	
Expertise				
24.2	o ESAPs have expertise available to do ESIA work o ESAPs are regularly trained and have opportunity to develop career as a professional in ESIA		30	
Maintaining strategic relations				
24.3	o ESAPs work together with CSOs, government agencies, and knowledge institutes in their ESIA work o ESAPs partake in platforms/networks/coalitions for ESIA (if these exist). o ESAPs share data and information to improve ESIA practice, among each other but also with government or other external parties.		30	
	Score		100	

	NGOs, CSOs, civil society			
Mandate (Role), structure and resources				
25.1	o The role of CSOs in ESIA is clearly defined in legal texts o Structural financing secured for CSOs to execute their role in ESIA practice o CSOs have offices established, facilities and equipment needed available o Number of CSOs active in ESIA is sufficient to fulfill CSO role o CSOs have access to databases, maps, etc required to be involved in ESIAs o There are tools available to support CSOs in their rol in ESIA (formats, checklists, etc)?		36	
Expertise				
25.2	o CSOs have expertise needed to perform role in ESIA o CSO staff are trained on ESIA and have opportunity to specialise in ESIA work o Finances and mechanisms are available to CSOs to access external expertise if needed (such as for ESIA review)		36	
Maintaining strategic relations				
25.3	o CSOs work together with EAPs, government agencies, and knowledge institutes within ESIA processses o CSOs partake in platforms/networks/coalitions for ESIA (if these exist). o CSOs share data and information to improve ESIA practice, among each other but also with EAPs, government or other external parties.		28	
	Score		100	

	Other government agency (with specific role in ESIA)			
Mandate, structure and resources for ESIA				
26.1	o Mandates clearly defined in legal texts o Structural financing secured to execute mandate o Staff, facilities and equipment available are sufficient o Information management system exists giving access to information required to perform tasks o Tools/guidance available to support tasks (working procedures, checklists, etc)		25	
Management of ESIA tasks (input, advice, review, comment, implement)				
26.2	o Decisions regarding ESIA are taken, communicated and acted upon o Regular coordination meetings are attended o Management encourages exchange and learning		25	
Expertise				
26.3	o Expertise available to perform their ESIA tasks o Staff regularly trained and effort made to maintain expertise		25	
Maintaining strategic relations				
26.4	o Co-ordination/co-operation with relevant partners takes place o Proactive participation in platforms/networks o Organisation willingly shares data and information		25	
	Score		100	

	Other if relevant			
27	Other 'group' with a role in ESIA? If so, discuss the most relevant questions above and present the total score.			

SECTION IV - ESIA PERFORMANCE

	Statistics (background info) to be separately collected from ESIA authority, not used in scoring	
a	How many ESIAs procedures started in the past year?	
b	How many ESIAs submitted for review in the past year?	
c	How many ESIAs rejected outright in the past year?	
d	What was the number of ESIAs in the past year where supplementary work was required?	
e	What was the number of ESIAs approved in the past year?	

ESIA's carried out on time			
28.1	% of projects for which ESIA is required, but for which no ESIA is carried out.	0-20 = 50 20-40 = 40 40-60 = 25 60-80 = 10 80+ = 0	50
28.2	% of projects for which an ESIA is required and undertaken, but the ESIA is done too early (i.e. takes place during the pre-feasibility stage of the project lifecycle when there is not enough project detail to perform an ESIA.)	0-20 = 25 20-40 = 20 40-60 = 15 60-80 = 10 80+ = 0	25
28.3	% of projects for which an ESIA is required and undertaken, but the ESIA doesn't take place until after project implementation has started? (i.e. construction already ongoing, ESIA "after the fact")	0-20 = 25 20-40 = 20 40-60 = 15 60-80 = 10 80+ = 0	25
	Score		100
Influence on decision-making			
29.1	Are projects withdrawn during decision-making because the ESIA shows that the project is not feasible (from environmental and/or social perspective)?	never=0 rarely=15 regularly=35	35
29.2	Are projects redesigned during decision-making due to the ESIA (because of unacceptable environmental or social consequences)	never=0 rarely=15 regularly=35	35
29.3	Do ESIA processes influence decision-making on the project in other ways than through withdrawal or redesign? I.e. project approval rejected, or more stringent conditions applied.	never=0 rarely=15 regularly=30	30
	Score		100
Outcome on the grounds			
30.1	% of ESIA processes that influenced project outcomes on the ground? (i.e. environmental or social problems avoided, more sustainable development)	0-20 = 20 20-40 = 40 40-60 = 60 60-80 = 80 80+ = 100	100
	Score		100

Learning				
31.1	% of ESIA processes leading to improved awareness and capacity on amongst stakeholders (including proponent)?	0-20 = 5 20-40 = 10 40-60 = 15 60-80 = 20 80+ = 30	30	
31.2	% of ESIA processes leading to improved acceptance of the project by stakeholders	0-20 = 5 20-40 = 10 40-60 = 15 60-80 = 25 80+ = 35	35	
31.3	% of ESIA processes that led to improved co-operation between different govt agencies/departments	0-20 = 5 20-40 = 10 40-60 = 15 60-80 = 25 80+ = 35	35	
	Score		100	

NOTES

SECTION V - CONTEXT			
Norms & standards			
32.1	What is the quality of the environmental and social norms and standards in place?	Very good = 100 Good = 75 OK = 50 To be improved = 25 Bad = 0	100
	Score		
Judiciary			
33.1	Is there an independent judiciary?	Very good = 40 Good = 30 OK = 20 To be improved = 10 Bad = 0	40
33.2	What is the quality of the judiciary as to environmental and social issues? 　o Does the judiciary have sufficient expertise in environmental and social issues? 　o Are there trained environmental and social lawyers? 　o Is there a dedicated environmental and social judicial mechanism (for example, environmental court)? 　o Is there a body of environmental and social case law (jurisprudence)? 　o Does the constitution/legislative framework recognise environment and social rights or wellbeing?		40
33.3	Is there enabling legislation promoting access to information?		20
	Score		100
Media			
34.1	o Is there an independent media? (Freedom house indicator, 3 categories: Free, partly free, not free) 　o Do journalists have sufficient knowledge of environmental and social issues?		100
	Score		100
National discourse			
35.1	Do environmental and social issues feature prominently during the national discourse, for example, election campaigning?		100
	Score		100
Knowledge infrastructure			
36.1	o Does baseline data exist in user-friendly format? o Is it possible to readily access baseline data, up to date maps, statistics, etc?		100
	Score		100
Corruption			
37.1	% of the cases where there is political interference and/or corruption in ESIA based decision-making	0-20= 100 20-40= 80 40-60= 60 60-80= 40 80+ = 20	100
	Score		100

What is ESY-MAPPING?

ESY-MAP is a diagnostic tool for assessing the quality of a national Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) system. Practitioners and stakeholders involved in ESIA in a country jointly apply the tool in an interactive workshop. They analyse ESIA requirements and performance with the help of a standard set of questions. The outcome is a graphical representation of the quality of the current ESIA system. This informs a shared view on strong and weak points, and where action is most needed.

How does it work? At the heart of the ESY-MAP is a questionnaire that addresses key elements of the ESIA system. It consists of two levels. There are 37 Quick Scan questions that address the ESIA system more generally. Each of these questions is linked to the second level: a set of 150 detailed questions for more refined analysis. These 150 questions make up the Detailed Scan of the ESIA system. The ESYMAP explores both regulatory requirements and practice.

The 150 DetailedScan questions are divided over 5 sections:

- ✓ SECTION I – ESIA PROCESS
- ✓ SECTION II – ENABLING CONDITIONS
- ✓ SECTION III – CAPACITIES
- ✓ SECTION IV – ESIA PERFORMANCE
- ✓ SECTION V– CONTEXT