

**Mining Policy Research Initiative**

**External Review**

**Evaluator: David Szablowski**

**Prepared For: IDRC Programs and Partnerships Branch  
Management**

**November 2003**

## **Executive Summary**

1. This report has been commissioned by IDRC to provide an external review of MPRI, a corporate project launched by the Centre in 1998 which aims to promote sustainable development in mining in Latin America.
2. The objectives of the report are to:
  - assess the extent to which the program is meeting its objectives and aims and identify any evolution in objectives;
  - document results of the program (i.e. outputs, reach, and outcomes); and
  - offer reflections on the program's thematic approach and strategies in relation to the current state of the field(s) in which the program is active.
3. MPRI was created in response to an increase in social and environmental concerns arising from the boom in mining investment in Latin America in the 1990s. The Initiative was conceived initially as a multi-stakeholder driven research program that would build consensus among and derive support from receptive sectors of the mining industry, NGOs, and governments. MPRI received core funding from IDRC and was expected to raise much of its project budget from outside sources and through cooperation with IDRC's program initiatives.
4. MPRI's objectives have evolved in two ways. First, the program has evolved from a multi-stakeholder driven initiative to a self-directed one that is responsive to research demand in the region. This decision was motivated by the cost and difficulty of direct multi-stakeholder involvement in MPRI decision-making. Second, MPRI's broad initial research agenda has come to focus increasingly upon the needs of groups who are disadvantaged in mining and sustainability debates: mining affected communities, indigenous peoples, and artisanal and small scale miners.
5. The evolution of MPRI has allowed it to made important advances in realizing its strategic goals. In particular, MPRI has had considerable success in developing an evolving research agenda that is responsive to changing research needs within the region. MPRI has also made progress with regard to reducing the gap between researchers and research users.
6. However, MPRI has been unable to attract outside financial support to the degree expected. In particular, support from the mining industry has not been forthcoming due to a fall in metals prices, the launch of an industry-sponsored sustainability initiative, and to the reluctance of firms to sponsor research not specifically oriented towards their individual operations. Administrative difficulties have hampered close collaboration between MPRI and IDRC's program initiatives. As a result, throughout its existence, MPRI's activities have suffered from a severe shortage of resources.
7. The project sample reviewed for this report reveals that MPRI has made substantial progress towards its research objectives and has produced important results.

8. MPRI has produced a number of consultative processes that seek in various ways to “take the temperature” of the policy environment relating to mining and sustainability and to clarify the perspectives of different stakeholder groups. MPRI has used these projects to guide its own work and to increase understanding among stakeholder groups of other positions and perspectives.
9. MPRI has been active in expanding technical and policy knowledge in a wide range of areas related to mining and sustainability. These include environmental assessment, multi-stakeholder processes, corporate-and-community development activities, mine closure, mining and indigenous peoples, and artisanal and small scale mining.
10. In general, outputs from these projects are of a high technical quality. They differ however in the degree to which they provide accessible resources for research users. While some projects have created less accessible reference works using non-participatory methodologies, others have made use of action research approaches to link projects more closely to communities of research users. MPRI has been moving towards this latter approach in order to increase the reach and influence of its projects. This strategic change is reflected in MPRI’s recent program on artisanal and small scale mining (ASM). MPRI has focused its initial efforts in this area on mobilizing a policy community which includes other donors, researchers, NGOs, and small scale miners. MPRI is thereby helping to create a critical mass of activity on ASM which will also help to magnify the policy influence of its own work.
11. With a view to improving MPRI’s capacity to exercise a policy influence with its projects, several areas can be identified for further reflection including:
  - the need for research partners to possess policy entrepreneurship capacities;
  - the integration of properly funded strategies for dissemination and active promotion of project results into project design;
  - the challenges associated with carrying out ambitious projects with low budgets;
  - the need for increased use of action research strategies to reach local and indigenous community actors; and
  - the challenge of producing durable results for local and indigenous communities.
12. Mining and sustainable development remains an urgent and a strategically important area for IDRC involvement in Latin America. MPRI has developed considerable expertise, respect, and savvy with regard to what can be a politically sensitive policy field and is well-placed to continue and expand its work in this area.

## **Background to the Report**

### **I. Objectives of the Evaluation Report**

This report has been commissioned by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) to provide an external review of the Mining Policy Research Initiative (MPRI), a Corporate Project launched by IDRC in 1998. The report represents the first external review of MPRI and is one of a number of review exercises initiated by IDRC's Programs and Partnerships Branch (PPB) Management in 2003. The purpose of these external reviews is to assist PPB Management to improve program effectiveness. They are to be used in conjunction with other monitoring and evaluation findings in order to improve the credibility of information about performance, verify internal findings, promote dialogue about program effectiveness, and inform decisions about current and future programming. PPB Management will use these external reviews in the following ways:

1. To provide accountability for program results;
2. To inform management decisions aimed at future programming directions;
3. To provide input for program learning and improvement.

The following review objectives have been set in the Terms of Reference established for the external reviews (see Annex B):

1. Assess the extent to which the program is meeting its objectives and aims, as set out in its prospectus, and identify any evolution in objectives.
2. Document results of the program (i.e. outputs, reach, and outcomes).
3. Offer reflections on the strengths and weaknesses of the program's thematic approach and strategies in relation to the current state of the field(s) in which the program is active.

### **II. Methodology**

The review requested is one which examines MPRI as a program. Evaluators are instructed in the terms of reference to look beyond individual projects to focus on how the program, as a whole, is performing. Accordingly, the review methodology draws information from multiple data sources at the program and project levels in order to address the review objectives and questions.

Program-level data has been collected through a review of program and project documents (including webpages), interviews with IDRC and MPRI staff (both former and current), interviews with members of MPRI's Advisory Group, and interviews with concerned stakeholders in the Latin American region. Project-level data has been collected using a sample of seven MPRI projects selected for review. Interviews have been conducted with project leaders and researchers and key project documentation has been reviewed. Of these seven projects, three have been selected for in-depth case study. With respect to these three projects, visits have been conducted to project field sites and interviews have been conducted with project participants and those said to (or expected to) have been influenced by the project. Project-level data has been complemented by a review of documentation relating to several projects outside the sample.

MPRI has 18 open and closed projects in six thematic areas (see Annex J for a list of projects). These thematic areas are:

1. Multi-stakeholder Dialogue and Engagement
2. Partnerships for Local Development
3. Mine Closure and Reclamation
4. Impacts and Management Tools
5. Sustainable Artisanal and Small-scale Mining (ASM)
6. Mining and Indigenous Peoples

In each thematic area MPRI has conducted one, or at most two, major projects, and one to three smaller or subsidiary projects. These major projects represent MPRI's principal initiatives in each field. The sample of projects reviewed for this evaluation was designed to include each of these major projects.<sup>1</sup> This will allow the evaluation to reflect both the breadth of MPRI's research activities and the bulk of its research results. The sampling strategy was arrived at in consultation with MPRI and IDRC evaluation unit staff. The projects included in the sample are:

1. Regional Coordination of the Mining, Minerals and Sustainable Development Project in South America (**Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue**)
2. Multi-stakeholder Processes for Co-Management of Mining Impacts in Peru (**Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue**)
3. Organization and Institutions of Small Scale Miners (**ASM**)
4. Improving Public Participation in the EIA Process in Mining (**Impacts and Management Tools**)
5. Artisanal and Small-scale Mining Network (**ASM**)
6. Community Development Activities by Mining and Other Natural Resource Companies in Latin America (**Partnerships for Local Dev**)
7. Legislative Proposal on Mine Closure in Chile (**Mine Closure**)

The first three of these projects have been selected for in-depth case study. Of the seven projects in the sample, these three were identified as those most likely to provide valuable and instructive information as a result of further inquiry. The third project in the case study sample, *Organization and Institutions of ASM*, was included despite the fact that it was in its initial stages of development when the review was taking place. It is MPRI's first sizeable research project in the area of ASM, and thus has provided the opportunity to inquire into a major new strategic direction currently being taken by MPRI. Its inclusion in the sample allowed the reviewer to conduct interviews with researchers, prospective research participants, and stakeholders in order to compare this new policy arena with MPRI's operations in other fields.

Face-to-face interviews were conducted with IDRC and MPRI staff, project researchers, project participants, regional stakeholders, and others, during 35 days of fieldwork in Bolivia, Chile, Peru, and Uruguay (the location of MPRI's office). In addition, a number of telephone interviews were conducted to contact researchers in other countries. The principal methodological shortcoming with respect to fieldwork comes from the failure to visit Brazil which, together with Bolivia, Chile and Peru, is one of Latin America's major mining centres. The decision not to travel to Brazil resulted from restrictions on time and resources, and was also due to the relative scarcity of MPRI projects in that country. As a result, the regional perspective gained from stakeholder interviews is likely to have emphasized views held in these Andean countries.

---

<sup>1</sup> Due to time and resource constraints, the sample does not include a project from the "Mining and Indigenous Peoples" thematic area. MPRI has only one project in this area: a recent consultation of Indigenous Peoples in Panama on Mining Code reforms. An e-mail interview has been conducted with the leader of this project.

## Evaluation Findings

### I. Summary of the Development and Evolution of MPRI

#### 1. Conception and Design of MPRI

MPRI was created in response to the boom in mining investment in Latin America in the mid-1990s. This boom, in which Canadian companies played a very prominent role, was associated with sharp rises in social conflict in areas affected by mining, particularly relating to social and environmental impacts, indigenous rights, and the division of development benefits. Within IDRC, this situation was identified as an opportunity in which both the Centre's expertise and Canadian experience with multi-stakeholder processes (such as the 1994 Whitehorse Mining Initiative) could be mobilized in order to address important development issues in Latin America. Considerable stakeholder interest in IDRC's initiative was identified.

In this context, MPRI was designed with three expectations in mind:

- to fill a practical knowledge gap concerning mining impacts and the promotion of sustainable development;
- to function as a consensus-building space in which stakeholders from different sides of the issue would be involved in designing an appropriate research agenda; and
- in a time of declining budgets at IDRC, to enable the Centre to achieve important development objectives by leveraging financial support for this work from enlightened sectors of the mining industry as well as from other donors.

MPRI was provided with Cdn\$1.2 million core funding from IDRC for two years, roughly half of which would be devoted to fixed administrative costs and half to project financing. In addition, commitments were obtained from three of IDRC's PIs, Minga, TEC and EcoHealth, to assign a portion of their budgets to mining-related projects. This was expected to mobilize an additional Cdn\$2 million for mining and sustainable development projects between 1998 and 2000. After this initial investment, it was expected that MPRI would soon be devolved as a Secretariat, that is to say, a quasi-independent entity receiving core funding from IDRC and additional funding from other donors.

MPRI's Project Approval Document (PAD) dated February 25, 1998 set out the following program objectives:

*General Objective:*

To promote multi-stakeholder collaboration of Canadian and Latin American organizations in support of applied public interest research, networking, dissemination and related activities, to ensure that mining is supportive of sustainable development in Latin America and the Caribbean Region.

*Specific Objectives:*

a) Strategic Objectives

- i) to mobilize the stakeholder community (government, business, NGOs) in the definition of research priorities;

- ii) to reduce the gap between researchers and research users, thus strengthening the quality and policy relevance of research;
- iii) to promote the sharing of experience and knowledge in a partnership mode, through research and other mechanisms;
- iv) to mobilize and administer funding from IDRC and non-IDRC sources for research on priority issues

#### b) Research Objectives

- v) to promote improved understanding of the positive and negative impacts of mining on communities, indigenous cultures, human health, the environment, and the economy;
- vi) to investigate and recommend improved legal, regulatory and policy frameworks for mining;
- vii) to identify, devise and propose best practices relating to mining at the community and enterprise levels, regarding the relationship between the mining company and the community, environmental and social considerations, and other issues of sustainable development.

## 2. Overview of MPRI's Activities

### 2.1 *First Phase: Financial Years 1998/99 and 1999/2000*

MPRI's first director was contracted in September 1998. The director's term of office was to last roughly a year and a half before he left MPRI in March 2000 to direct the Mining, Minerals and Sustainable Development (MMSD) project, a two-year, industry-sponsored global research and consultation program that has been a major global event in MPRI's field of work. The period roughly corresponding with the first director's tenure was an exploratory one dedicated to institution-building, regional networking and managing stakeholder involvement.

MPRI formed a 21 member Advisory Group early in 1999, which included Canadian and Latin American representatives from governments, NGOs, the mining industry, multilateral organizations, and academia. The Advisory Group was used to develop a broad research agenda and subsequently to evaluate 94 research pre-proposals received as a result of two large calls made to researchers on the basis of the agenda. Close involvement of the Advisory Group in decision-making and the large calls for pre-proposals were intended to generate enthusiasm around MPRI, to support its legitimacy among different stakeholder groups, and to stimulate key actors to help finance its work. This was especially important given that MPRI was expected to raise much of its project funding budget from outside sources.

This strategy proved to be unworkable over the period it was attempted. Expectations went unmet on several fronts. While some project funding commitments were secured from conventional donors (such as the Ford Foundation), MPRI failed to receive financial support from the mining industry. MPRI's collaboration with IDRC's Program Initiatives (PIs) would result in a number of PI-managed initiatives, but did not significantly increase its own project portfolio. With limited funding available for projects, MPRI could not meet the expectations created by its large calls for pre-proposals. And finally, degrees of disillusionment, overwork, and conflict within the Advisory Group reduced the willingness of its members to continue to play an active role in MPRI's decision-making processes.

## **2.2 Second Phase: FY 2000/01 and 2001/02**

MPRI's present director (a member of MPRI's Advisory Group) was recruited effective August, 2000, some five months after her predecessor's departure. What followed was a period of stock-taking which resulted in the redesign of elements of MPRI's strategic and research approaches (see Annex I for text of Vision and Mission Statements developed at this time). These included an increased focus on disadvantaged actor groups and the adoption of participatory and network research approaches. By this time, MPRI had generated large expectations in the research community and had a number of projects in various stages of development. Efforts were chiefly dedicated to executing these projects with available funds. Projects were modified in accordance with the MPRI's new priorities, although these changes were constrained by existing commitments to outside funders and budgetary considerations. MPRI's Advisory Group was no longer convened as an active multi-stakeholder advisory body. Instead, MPRI provided it with periodic written reports regarding program activities and consulted its members individually on questions relating to their expertise.

In addition, MPRI accepted the offer to coordinate the Latin American portion of the MMSD project's global consultation process. As stated above, MMSD was a global, industry-sponsored consultation and research process on mining and sustainable development.<sup>2</sup> Although it provoked suspicions within several stakeholder groups, the process proved to be highly influential in Latin America, and constitutes the high water mark with respect to multi-stakeholder processes related to mining and sustainable development in the region. MMSD put MPRI on the map with respect to many stakeholders and provided it with the means to produce its first widely-seen tangible results. MPRI's performance in the politically and emotionally charged atmosphere of MMSD has been important to establishing its credibility.

## **2.3 Third Phase: FY 2002/03+**

Over the last year, MPRI has entered a new phase marked by the closure of the MMSD project and the winding down of the projects developed from MPRI's initial calls for proposals in 1999/2000. MPRI has been focusing many of its new energies and resources on Artisanal and Small Scale Mining (ASM). Little-studied and often ignored by government agencies, ASM has been identified by MPRI as site urgently requiring attention and one in which important development benefits can be achieved. Given this situation and its own limited finances, MPRI has developed a regional network-building strategy designed to generate a critical mass of awareness and coordinated activity on ASM. MPRI has been using an innovative approach, working with small scale miners, researchers, and other donor agencies (including the UK's DFID, the World Bank's CASM, and UNESCO) in order to expand both the amount and quality of the work being done in this area. During this period, MPRI has also prioritized work relating to mining and indigenous peoples. However, due to a lack of resources, MPRI's work in this latter thematic area has been minimal thus far.<sup>3</sup>

## **II. Evolution and Achievement of Program Objectives**

<sup>2</sup> A more in-depth outline of the MMSD project is presented in section III.1.1 of this report.

<sup>3</sup> MPRI advises that a call for proposals will be launched for 2004-2005 for a project related to the practice of small-scale mining by indigenous peoples.



## 1. Evolution of Objectives

In the SMC Request for Supplement and Extension dated December, 2000, MPRI's specific objectives were modified for the financial years 2001/02 and 2002/03 as follows (changes from the original objectives are italicized):

### Strategic Objectives

- a) to reduce the gap between researchers and research users by implementing a demand driven research agenda, thus strengthening *its policy relevance and applicability, that is, planning for "closing the loop" from the outset;*
- b) to promote the sharing of experiences and knowledge through research, *dissemination, networking, workshops* and other mechanisms;
- c) *to facilitate and promote inter-stakeholder and inter-cultural communication around mining and sustainable development issues in LAC;*
- d) to mobilize and administer funding from both IDRC and non-IDRC sources for research, *capacity building and other activities* on priority issues identified.

### Research Objectives

- a) *to promote applied research that promotes improved local governance through the engagement of local communities (including local governments) and other stakeholders in capacity building processes for negotiation, evaluation, monitoring and co-management of mining impacts;*
- b) *to improve understanding and disseminate knowledge and information about the workings of partnerships among communities, governments and mining companies in mining regions;*
- c) *to support evaluative and policy relevant research that identifies legal, political, technological and social requirements for moving towards more sustainable artisanal and small scale mining and disseminate guidelines and lessons for improved decision making and management by governments and industry.*

MPRI's revised approach places an increased emphasis on assisting disadvantaged actors, especially local and indigenous communities and artisanal miners. This stems from a recognition of the power imbalance among actors involved in mining policy debates. Accordingly, emphasis is placed on capacity building and the promotion of inter-stakeholder and intercultural communication and understanding. This also represents a shift away from the initial vision of MPRI as a multi-stakeholder-driven initiative. The revised objectives portray MPRI to a greater degree as an actor expected to make independent decisions regarding how to be involved in regional mining and sustainability debates. MPRI's approach to these objectives is further illustrated by Vision and Mission Statements developed in 2000 (see Annex I for full text).

## 2. Progress Toward Reaching Strategic Objectives

This section will evaluate the progress that MPRI has made towards achieving the various strategic objectives set for it. As noted above, these strategic objectives

have evolved. Accordingly, the discussion that follows is divided into four parts that address the four main issues raised by MPRI's past and present strategic objectives:

- producing a demand-driven research agenda;
- promoting the sharing of experiences and inter-stakeholder communication;
- mobilizing funding from external sources and within IDRC; and
- reducing the gap between researchers and research users.

## **2.1 Producing a Demand-Driven Research Agenda**

While MPRI's initial objectives included the mobilization of the stakeholder community in the definition of research priorities, this objective was removed in the December 2000 revision. Nevertheless, MPRI's revised strategic objectives include a commitment to a "demand-driven research agenda" and the general objective's reference to "promot[ing] multi-stakeholder collaboration" remains unchanged.

MPRI has been successful in developing an evolving demand-driven agenda that focuses upon research needs and the dynamics of the policy context within the region. The six thematic areas that define its research output between 1998 and 2003 (see Annex J) broadly address the major issues of concern among stakeholders in the region over this period: multi-stakeholder dialogue, local development, environmental management, artisanal mining, and indigenous peoples (MMSD 2002). MPRI is currently narrowing this focus in order to direct scarce resources onto priority areas. MPRI's decision to prioritize work that produces results for disadvantaged actors (particularly small scale miners and indigenous communities affected by mining) is based on an astute reading of the developing policy context in Latin America. It has become clearer over the past five years how important it is for these actors to be effectively involved in mining policy debates; nevertheless, throughout the region their participation remains marginalized.

MPRI has struggled with developing an institutional arrangement for identifying and prioritizing research demands. MPRI's initial effort to do so—the Advisory Group model applied in 1999 and 2000—proved to be a problematic means for translating stakeholder input into a workable research agenda. There are several reasons for this:

- Consensus on a focused set of research priorities was not achievable through the Advisory Group process. Differences in interest and perspective among stakeholders produced a "laundry list" agenda that was overly broad for an initiative with limited resources (see Annex H). In addition, close collective scrutiny of all proposed projects proved apt to provoke conflict rather than consensus when one stakeholder's priorities would fall into another stakeholder's list of unacceptable topics.
- The Advisory Group was too closely involved in operational decision-making. After several meetings, the early enthusiasm of the Group's members was tempered by the demands being made of them. In particular, review and debate over pre-proposals consumed both time and resources for all concerned. In interviews, several Advisory Group members remarked that this kind of body should be responsible for agenda-setting, not operational decision-making nor the evaluation of project proposals.

- The Advisory Group lacked representation from a key stakeholder group: local and indigenous communities either affected by large mines or engaged in small scale mining.

Building consensus is costly, time consuming, and not guaranteed to succeed. MPRI found that it could not afford to make its own operational decision-making dependent upon this work given the time and administrative costs involved. Since 2000, MPRI has opted instead to manage its research agenda based upon its own experience and knowledge in the region. This is a more appropriate institutional arrangement that has greatly facilitated MPRI's capacity to do its work. It has lowered the transaction costs involved in developing projects, enabled MPRI to act quickly when necessary, and freed the initiative from satisfying every constituency with every project. Since 2000, MPRI has been able to rely upon several important consultation processes to provide it with information regarding stakeholder priorities and pressing needs within the region. These include the regional MMSD consultation in 2002 (described in section III.1.1 of this report), the regional ASM conference co-sponsored in 2002 by MPRI (described in section III.2.1), and an MPRI-funded project completed in 2000 which assembled representatives from mining-affected communities to set out their own desired research agenda ("Workshop to Identify the Research Needs of Local Communities Affected by Mining").

Since 2002, MPRI has developed a process based on close and continuous stakeholder engagement in order to establish its research agenda with regard to its new strategic focus on Artisanal and Small Scale Mining (ASM) issues. Together with UNESCO, MPRI convened a multi-stakeholder regional workshop on ASM to (1) build a multi-stakeholder vision for a sustainable and equitable sector and (2) to identify strategic objectives for the realization of this vision. MPRI's current ASM projects (*Organization and Institutions of ASM; Experiences of Formalization of ASM*) have emerged from the needs and knowledge gaps identified by this workshop. Through its promotion of an active network on ASM, MPRI is able to take advantage of new opportunities and partnerships as they present themselves. A disastrous landslide in the artisanal mining community of Chima, Bolivia, has prompted MPRI to seek partners to develop an emergency response system for the sector (see section III.2.1).

## **2.2 Promoting Sharing of Experiences and Inter-Stakeholder Communication**

Virtually without exception, MPRI's project and program activities are oriented towards achieving one or both of these goals. MPRI's projects aim to gather and disseminate policy-relevant experiences to audiences throughout the region. In the area of inter-stakeholder communication, MPRI has promoted two major regional processes. These are the MMSD consultation (see section III.1.1) and the Artisanal and Small Scale Mining (ASM) Network (see section III.2.1). Over its five years, MPRI has become an experienced and knowledgeable actor in these fields. Further insight into MPRI's progress towards these strategic objectives is provided in the previous section and the subsequent discussion on "closing the loop" (see sections II.2.4 and IV.3).

## **2.3 Financial Issues**

### **2.3.1 Mobilizing External Funding**

Since 1998, MPRI has mobilized funding from the following external sources:

- CIDA (Cdn\$200,000) for “Multi-Stakeholder Processes for Co-Management of Mining Impacts”;
- CoDevelopment Canada (Cdn\$3,000) for “Rapid Socio-Economic Evaluation of Chima, Bolivia”;
- Ford Foundation (US\$89,000) for “Community Development Activities by Mining and Other Natural Resource Companies in Latin America and the Caribbean”;
- IIED (US\$219,500) for coordination of the MMSD consultation in Latin America;
- UNESCO (US\$17,500) for activities related to MPRI’s Artisanal and Small Scale Mining program;<sup>4</sup> and
- Researchers and others (Cdn\$127,206) for “Organization and Institutions of Artisanal and Small Scale Mining”.

To date, MPRI has been unable to attract financial support from the mining industry. Interviews with industry sources and other knowledgeable actors suggest two principal reasons for this. First, the collapse of metals prices as a result of the 1998 Asian economic crisis slowed the mining boom and reduced the discretionary funds available to mining companies. Second, the launch of the MMSD process in 1999 absorbed a great deal of the mining industry’s money and attention with regard to sustainability issues. A third set of reasons was also mentioned by informants. Mining firms have tended to evaluate the pros and cons of financing MPRI according to a fee for service model: would MPRI provide them with a sufficiently valuable service in a timely fashion and at a reasonable cost? Assuming that this is an appropriate role for MPRI, the Initiative was, for several reasons, not able to satisfy mining companies they would get value for money.

- Research projects of general application are often unattractive to private sector companies. Individual mining firms are much more inclined to fund consultant-style projects that promise a direct benefit to the firm’s own operations.
- General research also creates a free rider problem for private sector firms: if general research will benefit a donor company why should that company incur the expense of a project that will equally benefit its competitors?<sup>5</sup>
- Some industry actors remained unsure as to whether a development-oriented agency like IDRC/MPRI might produce research viewed as “anti-mining”.

The initial assumption that MPRI could raise much of its budget from the mining industry in support of a program of general research was, in the circumstances, misconceived.

### **2.2.2 Mobilizing Funding Within IDRC**

IDRC management obtained commitments from three Program Initiatives (PIs)—Minga, TEC and EcoHealth—to assign a portion of their budgets to mining-related projects. This was expected to mobilize an additional Cdn\$2 million for mining and

---

<sup>4</sup> This funding, which is controlled by UNESCO-Montevideo, has been mobilized as a result of a joint application to UNESCO from UNESCO-Montevideo and MPRI. MPRI has established a strategic partnership with UNESCO-Montevideo with regard to ASM.

<sup>5</sup> MMSD solved this problem by forming a coalition of large mining firms which agreed to share the economic costs and political risks of the initiative.

sustainable development projects between 1998 and 2000. Initially, a close collaboration was contemplated between MPRI and these PIs. MPRI's first director hoped to be able to use PI funds and staff in order to implement projects that would contribute to MPRI's specific program of action and stakeholder engagement. However this close degree of collaboration proved to be elusive. First of all, a significant amount of PI funds had already been directed to mining-related projects that preceded MPRI (including a project entitled *Large Mines and the Community* conducted with the World Bank).<sup>6</sup> In addition, PIs had their own priorities and policy objectives that did not always mesh with the purely sectoral focus of MPRI. In the words of one interviewee, PIs were under pressure to bring greater coherence to their project portfolios; they did not want to produce a "jumble of projects" only loosely related to one another. PIs were naturally inclined to retain control over their projects and budgets in order to advance their own program objectives. Accordingly, MPRI's early efforts to leverage funds from the PIs was made problematic by the need to satisfy several constituencies at once. Project design and approval had to be negotiated with the MPRI Advisory Group, the team of the relevant PI, and the project proponents. This arrangement increased the transaction costs involved in developing projects and did not work well.<sup>7</sup>

Instead, MPRI and the PIs have developed a relationship based on operational autonomy and cooperation. Each entity funds and manages its own mining-related projects, however MPRI and the PIs periodically cooperate in various ways. MPRI channels appropriate projects from its own project pipeline to the relevant PIs (For a list of these projects see Annex K). MPRI has also played a role in the dissemination of mining-related research produced by PIs.<sup>8</sup> MPRI has funded and produced material to be included within PI publications.<sup>9</sup> MPRI has co-financed one project with Minga and is in the process of collaborating on another.<sup>10</sup>

### **2.3.3 MPRI's Overall Financial Situation**

With limited external funding and few financial collaborations with PIs, MPRI has had to rely on extensions of its core funding from IDRC in order to continue operations and develop its program budget. In addition to its core funding of Cdn\$1.2 million for 1998 and 1999, MPRI has received supplemental funding from IDRC in the amounts of Cdn\$800,000 in 2000, Cdn\$500,000 in 2001, and Cdn\$1,000,000 in 2002 (for the period 2003-2005). This has translated into core funding for MPRI of roughly

---

<sup>6</sup> PIs also dedicated significant resources to the initial review process of MPRI.

<sup>7</sup> MPRI's experience also suggests that linkages across PIs can be facilitated where geographic proximity between key decision-makers increases the possibility of familiar interpersonal relations. Collegial relations developed between the directors of MPRI and Minga at LACRO appear to have promoted the somewhat closer cooperation between these entities.

<sup>8</sup> MPRI played a prominent role in dissemination activities related to two of TEC's projects: *The Environment and the Net Benefits of Trade: The Case of Mining* and *A Natural Resource Cluster Development Strategy: The Case of Mining*. MPRI also funded complementary dissemination activities with respect to the former project.

<sup>9</sup> MPRI has funded a project (called "Contaminación por Arsénico en el Norte de Chile y su Impacto en el Ecosistema y la Salud Humana") that will provide a paper within an EcoHealth publication (CAD\$5,500). MPRI has also written the preface for a TEC publication entitled *Aglomeraciones Mineras y Desarrollo Local en America Latina*.

<sup>10</sup> This project is entitled "Improving Public Participation in the Mining EIA Process" co-financed by MPRI (Cdn\$37,420) and Minga (Cdn\$149,500). Minga and MPRI, in collaboration with PBDD are currently involved in a thirty-year review of IDRC's mining-related projects. Funding (Cdn\$17,500 from MPRI, Cdn\$17,500 from Minga, and Cdn\$5,000 from PBDD) is administered from MPRI's chart of accounts.

Cdn\$600,000 per year from 1998 to 2003. Nearly half of these funds have had to be dedicated to operating costs (including personnel, overhead, consultancies, translation, etc.). This has left some Cdn\$300,000 annually for programming which has been supplemented by external funds amounting to less than Cdn\$200,000 per year on average.<sup>11</sup> This is a very low level of project funding given both the ambitions of MPRI and the significance of the policy field which it seeks to influence. As a result, throughout its existence, MPRI's programming efforts have suffered from a shortage of resources. This has put enormous pressure on MPRI staff to obtain external funds and to find ways of achieving results with limited resources.

Currently, MPRI is developing a resource expansion strategy centered upon its activities on Artisanal and Small Scale Mining (ASM). With support from PBDD, it is working on developing a partnership between IDRC and CIDA for a program for sustainable development of mining municipalities in Bolivia, with an emphasis on ASM issues. This initiative is still in the discussion stage at present. MPRI's plans for an ASM strategy in Bolivia are outlined in greater depth in section IV.4.2.

#### **2.4 Reducing the Gap between Researchers and Users: "Closing the Loop"**

A review of the cases in the project sample outlined in Part III of the research findings shows that MPRI's performance at closing the loop between researchers and research users has been inconsistent at first. It has been marked by a steady process of learning and improvement over time. In particular, the project design and dissemination innovations adopted in 2000, and progressively implemented in the following years have yielded important results<sup>12</sup> (see section III.4.3.2). The issue of "closing the loop" is discussed at greater length in section IV.3 of this report. The discussion here will be limited to a few key points.

The most successful projects in terms of closing the loop have one or more of the following characteristics:

- They actively involve research users in research activities.
- They are carried out by research organizations who are policy entrepreneurs and/or possess strong links to the relevant community of research users.
- They provide accessible tools for the targeted group of policy actors.

Two of the projects in the sample ("Public Participation in EIA" and "Community Development Activities") have produced specialized reference works that lack comprehensive strategies for dissemination and promotion of their policy findings. As a result, these projects are less likely to be encountered by or to influence potential research users. However, it should be noted that MPRI's approach to its recent work on Artisanal and Small Scale Mining (ASM) represents a quantum leap forward with regard to closing the loop. MPRI has undertaken a number of complementary activities designed to promote an active and networked research and policy community on ASM. These activities appear to be highly effective in

---

<sup>11</sup> The funding received by MPRI from external sources from 1998 to 2003 (see section II.2.2) totals roughly Cdn\$759,000. Divided over MPRI's four years of project implementation provides an average of Cdn\$189,750 of external project funding received per year.

<sup>12</sup> These innovations include the adoption of a network research model, the expanded use of ICTs to link researchers and disseminate research results, the free distribution of research outputs, and the convening of regional workshops to involve regional stakeholders in debating the issues raised.

connecting with their intended users. Nevertheless, even with regard to its most successful projects, the greatest challenge for MPRI remains that of producing effective and usable research results for local actors: including small scale and artisanal miners and local and indigenous communities. Such local groups are the most elusive of research users and require concerted and specialized efforts (see section IV.3.2 for further discussion).

### **3. Progress Towards Reaching Research Objectives**

Summarized briefly, MPRI's initial specific research objectives involved promoting:

- Understanding of positive and negative mining impacts;
- Improved legal, regulatory, and policy frameworks for mining; and
- Best practices on sustainable development at community and enterprise level.

Since their revision in 2000, these research objectives have involving promoting:

- Community engagement for improved local governance of mining impacts;
- Understanding of partnerships among communities, governments, and mining companies; and
- Sustainable artisanal and small scale mining.

Over its five years of existence, MPRI has made significant progress with regard to its research objectives. It has produced several important studies and diagnostic reports in the areas of large mine and community relations, legislative and policy frameworks for improving the management of mining impacts, and mine closure. In general, MPRI's work is evolving in line with its revised objectives from producing reference works to promoting action research and providing tools for research users. Most recently, it is helping to promote a networked and resourced policy community capable of addressing the sustainability challenges presented by Artisanal and Small Scale Mining (ASM).

### **4. How is the Program Undertaking and Using Evaluation in its Work?**

Evaluation is undertaken and used by MPRI at various levels. First, on completion of a project, MPRI staff assess research results and provide feedback to researchers within relatively short periods of time. This feedback is typically recorded in correspondence with the researchers.

Second, programming lessons from projects are reviewed internally by the MPRI team. The team holds weekly planning and evaluation meetings, in which the Initiative's ongoing activities and programming directions are discussed. These discussions are used to review lessons learned and strategize with regard to future programming activities. Due to its nature as a Corporate Project, MPRI is regarded by IDRC's project information management systems as a project itself with a single project number. As a result, MPRI's projects do not appear within these systems and MPRI does not produce Project Completion Reports (PCRs) in the same manner as IDRC's Program Initiatives.

Third, MPRI carries out certain evaluation and strategizing activities within LACRO. Programming and projects are periodically discussed with the LACRO Regional Director. These discussion help to provide overall guidance to MPRI and develop responses to ongoing issues. Soon after MPRI's present director joined the Initiative,

a one-day strategic workshop was organized involving the Regional Director and all of LACRO's program officers. This workshop was used to evaluate the risks and opportunities for MPRI involved in coordinating the regional MMSD consultation. It helped MPRI to decide that the benefits of participation outweighed the risks.

Fourth, MPRI has formal evaluation responsibilities to its outside funders. Both CIDA and the Ford Foundation have required MPRI to produce annual progress reports with regard to the projects they support. MPRI is in the process of preparing project closure reports for both of these funders with regard to recently completed projects. These processes are used by MPRI both for accountability to donors and to assess the need for modifications to projects. Other funders rely on more informal processes. For example, IIED and WBCSD, the funders of the regional MMSD consultation, accepted and disseminated the work done by MPRI on this project.

Fifth, many of MPRI's projects involve participatory consultation with stakeholders which involve informal opportunities for evaluative feedback on MPRI's research agenda and general project activities. This is particularly true with regard to projects such as the MMSD consultation and the ASM Network (see sections III.1.1 and III.2.1). These projects have had a significant influence on MPRI's programming decisions.

Sixth, MPRI currently has several formal processes of overall evaluation and reporting. MPRI conducts overall evaluations of its own performance that are presented in annual reports that are submitted to the MPRI Advisory Group. Similar evaluations appear in MPRI's supplement and extension documents that have been periodically submitted to IDRC in order to extend MPRI's funding. In 2003, the LACRO Regional Director asked MPRI to produce an annual report to the IDRC Board of Directors. The draft annual report is currently awaiting comments by the Regional Director and the DPA before being sent to the Board.

Two conclusions arise from this review of MPRI's evaluation procedures. First, MPRI should consider whether the formal project evaluation processes required by outside funders are of sufficient value (to project oversight, institutional learning, and accountability goals) that they ought to be applied to all the Initiative's project activities. Second, the Advisory Group is no longer a body that is either engaged with MPRI's work or adequately representative of MPRI's policy constituencies in Latin America. It is a hold-over from the initial vision of MPRI that has little relevance as presently constituted. Although this Group receives annual reports, it is not meaningfully involved in the oversight of MPRI's activities. MPRI's responsibility to report to its stakeholders in this fashion can be better achieved by posting its unabridged annual reports to the IDRC Board on the MPRI website. Notice of the posting should be disseminated over MPRI's discussion lists and feedback requested. Further discussion with regarding MPRI's Advisory Group is provided in section IV.4.5.

### **III. Documentation and Evaluation of Program Results**

To provide an accounting and an evaluation of the program's results to date, this section outlines the results of the three projects in the case study sample, followed by four projects in the general sample. Major results at the program level will also be examined. The section will close with a discussion of conclusions regarding MPRI's project and program-level results.



## 1. Case Study Projects

### 1.1 *Mining, Minerals and Sustainable Development (MMSD): Regional Coordination of Consultation Process*

Countries: Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, and Peru.

Budget: US\$219,500 (IIED)

Dates: April 2001-May 2002

MMSD was an initiative of nine of the world's largest mining companies that proposed a process of participatory analysis to explore the role of the mining sector in the transition to sustainable development. Regional consultations and research in four continents were combined with a global process to produce an overall report and four regional reports within a fixed period of two years (2000-2002). The results were presented in 2002 at an industry-sponsored conference in Toronto, and at the World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg, South Africa. MMSD was coordinated by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) in London, at an arm's length basis from the project sponsors, and under the oversight of a multi-stakeholder Assurance Group.

MPRI was contracted to coordinate the MMSD consultation process in Latin America. This involved the formation of a multi-stakeholder Regional Advisory Group, the coordination of national consultation processes in Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, and Peru, and the co-publication and distribution of a Regional Report. The Report was produced together with CIPMA, a Chilean NGO contracted to coordinate the regional research component of MMSD South America.

#### 1.1.1 *Outputs and Quality*

The MMSD consultation produced the following outputs:

- approximately 50 stakeholder consultation and regional workshops in five countries, involving roughly 700 direct participants;
- an internet survey of stakeholder views on sustainability issues;
- a website in Spanish providing access to all MMSD-LA documents ([www.mmsd-la.org](http://www.mmsd-la.org));
- a regional database of mining sector contacts with over 1000 entries;
- a 623-page Regional Report, published as a book in Spanish;
- an executive summary of the Regional Report (1000 Spanish copies, 500 English copies, and 500 Portuguese copies); and
- a two-page summary of regional outcomes in the Global MMSD Report entitled "Breaking New Ground".

The Regional Report is a comprehensive document which collects the views and priorities of different stakeholder groups concerning mining and sustainable development and combines this material with up-to-date research on the particular context of each country. It represents a unique and valuable contribution to work in this field in Latin America. The consultation workshops were well-organized and conducted (although see the comments under "constraining factors" below). Participant interviews indicate generally high levels of satisfaction among all stakeholder groups with both the conduct of the workshops and the Regional Report. The MMSD website is a well-designed and straightforward resource.

### 1.1.2 *Reach*

The report is a large paperback reference work, accessible to those interested in research. Some 1700 copies have been distributed free of charge throughout Latin America (over 1400 copies of the executive summary have also been distributed). The report is also available on-line on the MMSD South America website. The research agenda it provides at the end of the report is not well-known among persons interviewed, which suggests a need for follow-up and further networking. One NGO with strong grassroots links has copied a section of the report for use in its work with communities. The Global MMSD project (managed by IIED in London) has not planned a dissemination or follow-up strategy in Latin America beyond publication of the report. The MMSD-LA website is hosted on MPRI's own site and provides ongoing electronic access to all relevant documents.

The national and regional stakeholder workshops constitute the principal mechanism through which this project has exercised an influence. MMSD involved nearly all of the major actors in each of the major mining countries in the region and asked them to address the question of sustainable development. Due to its scale and high profile as an international event, MMSD has been a key development in Latin America that has influenced both discourse and attitudes among actors. Discussion of MMSD's outcomes is provided in the following section.

### 1.1.3 *Outcomes*

Of the three countries in which participant interviews were conducted, outcomes have depended greatly on the pre-existing national context relating to mining and sustainable development issues. In each case, influences on policy and behaviour are difficult to measure given the many other forces at work.

In Chile, participants in the MMSD consultation report that the process led to a greater rapprochement and cordiality among industry and government circles on the one hand and conservationist NGOs and moderate critics on the other—particularly in relation to environmental issues. These improved links represent gains in the policy capacity of these actors. However, the disarticulation of indigenous and community actors in Chile, and the relative scarcity of advocacy NGOs working with mining-affected communities, appears to have restricted the capacity of MMSD to promote effective dialogue that includes these actors. Chilean industry and government actors largely deny that there is significant social or indigenous conflict related to mining in Chile, while community advocates disagree (see OLCA 2003).

In Peru, the MMSD process has been one of several factors that has led to a dramatic expansion in multi-stakeholder engagement and dialogue in recent years. Effective organization of mining-affected communities on a national level, and the presence of experienced advocacy groups, appears to have provoked a high level of recognition among all actors of the need for solutions. Participation in MMSD was wide ranging and the process appears to have helped to institutionalize sustainable development discourse among actors in Peru. Significant momentum has been developed in Peru with regard to mining and community issues.

In Bolivia, the MMSD process was influenced by the enduring crisis faced by its national mining industry. Participation among industry and governmental stakeholder groups was poor given industry's preoccupation with the crisis and government's low priority for the debilitated mining sector. However, significant participation was achieved from local communities and small scale miners for whom mining is an

important social issue. In Bolivia, small scale mining is a widespread subsistence-level survival strategy. It is carried out by some 50,000 small scale miners and their families, many of whom work on concessions abandoned by the state mining company in the 1980s.

MMSD's regional frame of reference also appears to have fuelled the trend in South America towards thinking on a regional scale and towards stakeholder networking on mining issues. Apart from governments, this networking appears to be most pronounced among Latin American advocacy NGOs and community organizations who have reached out to one another partly in response to the perceived threat of the industry-sponsored MMSD process.

As a result of this project, MPRI has significantly built up its contacts and institutional knowledge in the region. It has also dramatically increased its profile among stakeholders. Many informants interviewed for this evaluation asserted that before MMSD they were not aware of MPRI. For the most part this reputation is positive, however two groups have gained a negative view of MPRI as a result of the MMSD process. This is discussed further in the section below.

#### **1.1.4 Constraining or Facilitating Factors**

Budget restrictions and the short timeline required by the global MMSD project imposed limitations on the national consultation processes. More workshops could have been conducted in more remote areas. These restrictions are most likely to have prejudiced indigenous and community participation in the MMSD process. In some countries, this participation was further affected by an anti-MMSD boycott organized by a coalition of NGOs and community groups from the North and South suspicious of the uses to which the industry-sponsored process would be put. MPRI's high-profile involvement in MMSD has carried the risk of alienating stakeholder groups. In particular, Northern NGOs are prone to view MPRI as pro-industry because of its work on MMSD. However, interviews conducted for this report suggest that MPRI's reputation in Latin America among NGOs and grassroots organizations is strong, and that its performance in coordinating the regional MMSD consultation is generally viewed as balanced by these groups.

Interestingly, it was a coalition of industry and government representatives from Chile who, in the final stages of the regional MMSD process, mounted the most concerted opposition MPRI has yet experienced in one of its projects. Several informants present at a key regional meeting report that Chilean industry and government representatives felt threatened by aspects of the MMSD initiative and engaged in a concerted lobbying effort to weaken the social component of the work that had been done. The lobby asserted that MPRI sought to misrepresent the results of the regional participatory processes in order to promote a pro-community agenda. In contrast to the Chilean position, industry and government MMSD participants from Peru interviewed for this evaluation maintain a generally favourable view of MMSD and MPRI. This contrast between the Chilean and Peruvian perspectives on the regional MMSD process appears to have more to do with the state of the dynamic policy landscape in each country rather than the actions of MPRI.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Peruvian government representatives present at the meeting supported the position of the Chilean lobby. Nevertheless, the Peruvian officials interviewed for this report indicate a generally favourable view of MPRI and no distrust of its motives. In Peru, MPRI's position in favour of community dialogue is not radical. In contrast, interviews with actors from the public and private sectors in Chile suggest that MPRI, and Canadian efforts to address community

## **1.2 Multi-Stakeholder Processes for Co-Management of Mining Impacts**

Countries: Peru  
 Budget: Cdn\$200,000 (CIDA)  
 Dates: June 2001-ongoing

This is an action research project which focuses upon a government-sponsored multi-stakeholder roundtable process concerning the environmental management of a heavily polluted lake in the central Andes of Peru. Located in a region with a long history of mining investment and social conflict, the project constitutes both an analytical study of the roundtable process and a series of interventions aimed at informing and building capacity among stakeholder groups.

### **1.2.1 Outputs and Quality**

The project outputs include:

- a multi-stakeholder workshop involving presentations regarding roundtable and environmental co-management efforts from Bolivia, Canada, and other regions of Peru;
- several capacity-building workshops conducted for local communities; and
- a final report which presents an analysis of the conflict, its history, and a critical account of the roundtable process.

These workshops appear to have been valuable interventions. This is particularly the case for the multi-stakeholder workshop. This event brought together many of the principal actors in Peru involved in innovative stakeholder engagement activities in order to share their experiences with the participants in the local roundtable process. This workshop was singled out for praise by a number of local and international participants interviewed for this review. The capacity-building workshops were also positively viewed by local actors interviewed. Together these workshop activities have sought to provide information and perspective to local actors from different stakeholder groups in order to facilitate the roundtable dispute resolution process. The final report is not yet available, however discussions with researchers and drafts reviewed suggest that it will provide an important contribution to the comparative study of socio-environmental conflict resolution processes.

### **1.2.2 Reach**

A discussion panel involving project researchers will take place during an international conference in Lima on mining issues in November 2003. Events include a roundtable discussion on the project jointly hosted by IDRC/MPRI and Peru's National Mining Roundtable (Mesa de Dialogo Minero). This last event provides an open forum in the national capital that is expected to be attended by important stakeholders from all sides. However, the extent to which further dissemination and policy promotion activities will be conducted in the region studied is not yet clear. Field visits carried out for this report indicate the need for this type of work given the weakness of local leadership institutions and the failure of local leaders to communicate effectively with their communities. This has been a problem for the

---

issues in general, continue to be viewed with suspicion by these groups. One interviewee suggested that Canadians are suspected of trying to export their indigenous and social problems in order to "level the playing field" with Chilean mining operations.

roundtable process studied by the researchers as well as for the researchers themselves. Although this project has had an action research focus, the level of direct communication with communities (through presentations at assemblies, a regular presence in the region, etc.) could have been expanded with regard to introducing the project, providing updates, and disseminating results. This would of course have increased project costs. Where relations are established chiefly with leaders, the knowledge and trust built can be swiftly lost with periodic changes in leadership. Local residents in the Andes are increasingly prone to distrust NGOs and researchers when they hear of work being done but see few results.

### **1.2.3 *Constraining or Facilitating Factors***

Significantly, the roundtable process which this project has sought to study and support, has broken down during the term of the project. Whether the breakdown is a temporary or a lasting one is unclear. However, interviews with participants suggest that the oppositional dynamics responsible for the impasse are deeply rooted both in the history of the region and in the resistance of state officials to recognize certain local claims. While the project represents an important opportunity to evaluate and learn from what has gone wrong with a roundtable process, it also illustrates the limits of a project's influence with respect to the ongoing dynamics of a conflict. While a project has a set budget and fixed completion date, social processes do not, and may prove highly resistant to interventions that do not match their own timeline.

The deep divisions that have formed between stakeholders have also caused problems for the project researchers. In particular, it has been difficult for the researchers to occupy the neutral position they have sought to establish. The researchers have been accused of partiality by actors on both sides of the conflict. Government officials interviewed for this report find bias in the fact that the researchers recognize certain community actors as valid representatives of local interests, while some peasant community leaders feel that the researchers should offer them more direct support. The project has thus become an element of the conflict itself. As a result, attacks on the project's credibility may be a pre-emptive means of neutralizing criticisms that may appear in the researchers' report.

### **1.2.4 *Outcomes***

As the final report has not yet been drafted, its policy impacts cannot be evaluated. The workshops conducted in the project area have increased knowledge and capacity among their participants, particularly with respect to comparable multi-stakeholder and co-management experiences currently taking place elsewhere in Peru and the Americas.

This project has employed an innovative form of network research in which three different NGOs have been encouraged to work together. Two are advocacy NGOs with experience advising mining-impacted communities while the third is a research NGO known for its consulting work for mining companies and multilateral organizations. Each of the three is an important actor in the highly politicized national debates on mining in Peru, and each has a somewhat different constituency. While the collaboration undoubtedly has efficiency costs, it has also increased the likelihood that research results will be viewed as legitimate by a broader audience. In addition, the collaboration has built policy capacity among all three organizations by deepening their links with one another.

### **1.3 Organization and Institutions of Artisanal and Small Scale Miners**

Countries: Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru (project coordinator).  
 Budget: Cdn\$214,780 (MPRI), Cdn\$127,206 (Other sources—mostly researchers)  
 Dates: May 2003-ongoing

This is a comparative diagnostic study intended to provide qualitative baseline information on the organization and institutions of artisanal and small scale miners in five countries. Given the scarcity of social science work done in this field, the study is meant to enable more effective work in the ASM sector by MPRI, international development cooperation agencies, governments, donors, and small scale mining organizations themselves. This is a network research project being coordinated from Peru and involving national teams in Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru. The study will employ a participatory methodology which will involve small scale mining organizations in the research process. At the time of preparation of this report, this project was still in its pre-execution stage.

#### **1.3.1 Outputs and Quality**

Expected outputs include:

- an initial regional workshop involving the five national research teams;
- reports from each of the national research teams;
- a report by the regional coordinator;
- national workshops presenting research results; and
- a regional workshop for presenting the final report.

Of these outputs, only the first, a regional workshop designed to establish a joint conceptual framework for the research teams, has been executed. Written reports and interviews with participants suggest that it was a very useful exercise. The analytical framework developed at this workshop is a valuable resource.

#### **1.3.2 Outcomes and Reach**

This is the first sizeable MPRI project to be executed in the ASM sector. It is part of an integrated strategy to develop specialized knowledge and promote work in this field. The project is expected to produce outcomes in three main areas:

- The project aims to build a network of specialists on socio-cultural aspects of ASM. An initial four-day regional workshop has been conducted in which national teams have developed a shared conceptual framework and analytic vocabulary. This workshop also included a significant gender perspectives component to build capacity among national research teams. Researchers will have the opportunity for further exchange through an on-line discussion list maintained during the research period, and at a final regional workshop.
- The participatory research work conducted with organizations of small scale miners and the dissemination of research results are intended to increase the policy capacity of these ASM organizations and strengthen them as institutions.
- The research results are expected to be used by MPRI and other actors (international cooperation agencies, governments, donors, etc.) to inform and improve the quality of work done with respect to the ASM sector.

### **1.3.3 Constraining or Facilitating Factors**

The results of this project may be constrained by its very low budget for research activities. Each national team is provided with roughly Cdn\$19,000 to conduct research. Researchers are contributing additional sums ranging from Cdn\$5,391 to Cdn\$31,051.

## **2. Projects in Broader Sample**

### **2.1 Artisanal and Small Scale Mining Network**

Countries: Chiefly throughout Latin America  
 Budget: Conference funded by UNESCO (US\$17,500); discussion list hosted by IDRC.  
 Dates: 2002-ongoing

The Artisanal and Small Scale Mining (ASM) Network is the product of a regional multi-stakeholder conference held by MPRI in conjunction with UNESCO in Lima in April, 2002. This conference, which involved artisanal miners, government officials, experts, NGOs, donors and international cooperation agencies, aspired to create a positive vision of where ASM should be in ten years. The conference was highly successful in generating momentum among its participants and resulted in the establishment of the ASM Network e-mail discussion list.

#### **2.1.1 Outputs and Quality**

The conference which launched the ASM Network has been a timely and successful event. It has catalyzed a vigorous and diverse policy community active on ASM issues. It has also helped to establish common priorities and understandings among the growing number of organizations and individuals involved in ASM. The conference was very highly praised by the participants interviewed for this report. The ASM Network itself, which is hosted by IDRC, has expanded considerably. Starting with 30 participants the Network now includes 256 subscribers. The ASM Network both reflects and promotes the increasingly coordinated activity taking place with respect to ASM.

#### **2.1.2 Outcomes and Reach**

The ASM Network is an important resource that complements MPRI's ongoing work in this area. Its reach is of course limited to those with internet access, thus reducing its effectiveness as a tool for linking small scale mining organizations and communities. Communications are predominantly in Spanish.

In a dramatic example of its usefulness as a network of experts and practitioners, the ASM Network proved to be an important resource for coordinating an international response to a local mining disaster in Bolivia. In March 2003, a landslide in a Bolivian small-scale mining community called Chima killed 69 people and buried between 10 and 20 percent of the town of 3000 inhabitants. Within several days, a group of volunteer experts was mobilized from Peru and Spain through ASM Network and its Spanish associate CYTED in order to provide assistance with risk assessments in Chima. Requests for assistance for Chima have been disseminated through the ASM Network. In addition, MPRI has co-funded (with CoDevelopment Canada) a rapid socio-economic assessment in Chima detailing the urgent needs of the community and the challenges to be faced in order to avoid a future disaster.

At present, MPRI together with CYTED, is seeking to promote the development of a system of prevention, preparedness, and response to local emergencies for the ASM sector. This work is being begun with partners in Bolivia and involves close cooperation with the ILO, Swiss Aid, and CECI.

## **2.2 Community Development Activities by Mining and Other Natural Resource Companies in Latin America and the Caribbean**

Countries: Chile, Colombia, and Peru (project coordinator).  
 Budget: US\$58,150 (MPRI), US\$89,000 (Ford Foundation)  
 Dates: March 2001-ongoing

This was a multi-country study, co-funded by the Ford Foundation, regarding how the activities of mining projects can contribute to development within local communities. National teams in Chile, Colombia, and Peru conducted studies in each of their countries regarding the legal and institutional framework, national practices, and in-depth analysis of two selected cases.

### **2.2.1 Constraining or Facilitating Factors**

From the outset, the terms of reference of this project were overly-broad. This difficulty was compounded by problems with project coordination at the regional level. The result has been a project in which has generated a great deal of research output, but which has lacked overall focus. This project was designed during MPRI's first phase of activities, and then subsequently modified and executed after MPRI's change of direction in 2000. This changeover appears to have contributed to the project's conceptual problems. Nevertheless the networking aspect of this project was well-designed. A discussion paper on a project-wide conceptual framework was developed at the outset, and the three teams had the opportunity to affect overall project design at two regional workshops: the first at the outset of the project, and the second mid-way through. These efforts however were not sufficient to remedy the project's overall difficulties.

### **2.2.2 Outputs and Quality**

This project has produced a conceptual framework and three lengthy national reports, all of which are available on MPRI's webpage. The conceptual framework is a concise, effective work useful for researchers working in the field of community development. The reports are very large documents that provide an encyclopaedic approach to the presentation of each national situation. Since the completion of this evaluation, these reports have been synthesized into an electronic book in Spanish entitled *Empresas Mineras y Desarrollo Local*. MPRI has also produced an executive summary of the publication in both English and Spanish. Given the time frame of the evaluation, it has not been possible to review this publication.

### **2.2.3 Outcomes and Reach**

This research has further increased the knowledge of the teams that performed it. The network research model employed has involved two regional workshops and an electronic discussion list designed to promote exchange among the researchers. However, the project has not produced lasting links among the different researcher teams nor has the research process produced outcomes among research participants through either action research or participatory methodologies. The



national reports reviewed for this evaluation are of interest principally to researchers and policy-makers. MPRI advises that the electronic book and its executive summary are more accessible resources. MPRI is in the process of distributing copies of both the electronic book and the executive summary to over 500 stakeholders. MPRI will be sponsoring a panel discussion on mining companies and local development (involving presentations by the project researchers) at UNESCO's MOST Regional Summer School on Local Development and Governance in Uruguay.

### **2.3 Improving Public Participation in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)**

Countries: Canada, Chile, Mexico, Peru (project coordinator), and the United States.  
 Budget: Cdn\$37,420 (MPRI), Cdn\$149,500 (Minga)  
 Dates: April 2000-ongoing

This project has produced a comparative study of legislation and practice with respect to public participation in the EIA process for mining projects in Canada, Chile, Mexico, Peru, and the United States. It was carried out by a group of legal and environmental NGOs, most with experience collaborating with one another on similar projects. This project has been co-financed with IDRC's MINGA.

#### **2.3.1 Outputs and Quality**

The study has been published as a Spanish-language book of some 185 pages. The book provides a discussion of the role of public participation in the EIA process which is followed by short chapters relating the state of legislation and practice respecting public participation in the EIA process in each country. It closes with the presentation of two case studies of mining-related environmental assessments per country. The study is a useful reference work providing comparative information and analysis on law, policy, and practice.

#### **2.3.2 Reach**

This project adopted a sub-optimal research network model from the point of view of realizing gains from exchange between the various national research teams. The project used a "wheel and spokes" strategy for networking its research teams, which emphasized links between each research team and the central coordinator rather than among the teams themselves. With respect to the case studies carried out, the project has employed straightforward information gathering methodologies. These activities were not designed to promote results among research participants. This project was designed during MPRI's first phase of operations before participatory research approaches became the norm.

Apart from publication and distribution of the final report, no dissemination or policy promotion strategy was budgeted into this project. This is perhaps less of a concern where the national researcher is heavily involved in ongoing EIA and mining-related advocacy and is well-networked with government, industry and NGO counterparts (as is the case in Peru). However, in other countries, a dissemination and promotion strategy for research results is required to optimize their potential influence on policy. Properly promoted, the report is an advocacy tool that can advance efforts to improve EIA legislation and practice. Perhaps the most likely and effective users of the report are the researchers themselves (or similar organizations) which combine expertise and advocacy work on legal and environmental issues.

### **2.3.3 Outcomes**

The final report was published as a book very shortly before interviews were conducted for this evaluation. It was therefore too early to gauge its policy influence. As noted above, this influence will likely depend upon developing an appropriate dissemination and promotion strategy suited to the national policy context in each country.

## **2.4 Policy Proposal for Legislation on Mine Closure in Chile**

Countries: Chile  
 Budget: Cdn\$141,180  
 Dates: April 2000-Feb 2001

This project was conducted by Cochilco, a Chilean state agency that had been previously active on the issue of mine closure. The project assembled a team of lawyers, sociologists, engineers and economists to design a policy framework for proposed mine closure legislation.

### **2.4.1 Constraining or Facilitating Factors**

Efforts to promote effective mine closure legislation in Chile predate this project by several years and have helped to bring together a network of like-minded experts, government officials, and policy actors for whom the issue is a priority. This network has sought to build support among public and private institutions through inclusive processes of dialogue and research. Accordingly, the MPRI-funded project has lent support to key actors in the network and helped to build the momentum of ongoing efforts in this policy field in Chile. The effectiveness of the project has been greatly facilitated by its strategic insertion into ongoing policy processes taking place in Chile.

### **2.4.2 Outputs and Quality**

The report produced by this project has built upon and provides several advances upon previous policy efforts in Chile. The report proposes a detailed system for regulating mine closure backed by a concrete facility for establishing financial guarantees. In addition to policy prescriptions, it provides economic and legal arguments in favour of its recommended framework. It presents a clear and well argued policy proposal, and is generally of high quality.

### **2.4.3 Outcomes and Reach**

The project has not resulted in legislative changes in Chile in the short term. Opposition to mine closure legislation within the public and private mining industry in Chile remains sufficiently strong to dissuade legislators from taking action. However the project has helped to strengthen the position of actors in Chile intent upon promoting effective regulation. In particular, it has helped to promote consensus among these actors concerning the shape and specifics of a necessary framework. Cochilco and its allies are waiting for the next political window to advance the issue. In addition, the project researchers report that national thinking in Chile with regard to mine closure has changed since the project's conclusion. Planning for closure is increasingly seen as a corporate responsibility within the industry.

### 3. MPRI Program Level Outputs, Outcomes, and Reach

#### 3.1 *New MPRI Website and Use of ICT*

In November 2002, MPRI launched its own website outside of the IDRC network. At that time IDRC's web facilities lacked the interactive capacity that MPRI sought to develop. The MPRI website provides regularly updated news on mining and sustainable development issues and features an on-line library providing access to the Initiative's research reports and to a wide range of other relevant documents.<sup>14</sup> It also advertises the existence of the ASM Network to prospective subscribers. While the site is a highly useful source of information, its existence was not yet well-known among the stakeholders interviewed for this report. This suggests the need for further efforts to promote its visibility. The "visits" column in the table provided below shows the increasing usage of the MPRI website over its first year of operation.

#### **MPRI Website Visits and Views Since its Launch**

<b>Month</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Views</b>	<b>Visits</b>
November	2002	18,354	1,527
December	2002	9,953	2,730
January	2003	8,472	3,114
February	2003	11,363	2,905
March	2003	12,343	3,900
April	2003	15,796	4,462
May	2003	21,569	7,997
June	2003	45,912	10,445
July	2003	30,330	7,527
August	2003	14,755	3,962
September	2003	21,705	8,062

From Webtrends.com through Bellanet

MPRI has also been making expanded use of ICT in its program and project activities. These include the ASM Network discussion list, the networking of research teams involved in multi-country projects, the MMSD-LA website, and widespread e-mail notification when new publications are made available on MPRI's electronic library.

#### 3.2 *MPRI Involvement in Regional and Global Forums*

Both the past and the current directors of MPRI have been active and visible participants in forums dealing with mining and sustainable development issues in the Latin American region and globally. MPRI personnel have made presentations in events organized by the Conference of Mines Ministries of the Americas (CAMMA), the World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD), the Global Mining Initiative (GMI), the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the World Mines Ministers' Forum, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC). Having a vocal presence in these forums is an important part of MPRI's work. A

<sup>14</sup> MPRI's webpage provides access to 200 news items, 155 library documents, and 283 links to relevant websites. MPRI advises that most of these other sites have reciprocal links to MPRI. MPRI has also published seven special features addressing major mining and sustainability issues.

number of regional stakeholders interviewed for this report have remarked upon the positive contribution made by MPRI representatives at these events. MPRI is also called upon to participate on expert advisory panels for institutions addressing mining issues. MPRI staff have provided this assistance for the International Finance Corporation and the World Bank's CASM program. These represent important opportunities to further the values and goals of MPRI's policy mission.

## **4. Conclusions Regarding MPRI Project and Program-level Results**

### **4.1 Outputs**

MPRI's outputs fall into two major categories set out below.

#### **4.1.1 Promoting Consultation Processes**

MPRI has been successful in promoting various consultative processes that "take the temperature" of the policy environment and the attitudes of actors with regard to mining and sustainable development issues. These include the *MMSD Regional Consultation*, MPRI's promotion of the *ASM Network*, the *Research Needs of Local Communities* workshop and the *Consultation of Indigenous Peoples in Panama on Mining Code Reforms* project (these last two projects do not appear in the study sample). The documentation of these activities and their dissemination has been useful for guiding MPRI's own work and has contributed to broader outcomes by spreading knowledge and understanding of stakeholder perspectives. Given the tendency for polarization among policy actors involved in mining and sustainability debates, these activities have been important contributions.

#### **4.1.2 Expanding Technical and Policy Knowledge**

MPRI has also been active in developing reference works for use by policy actors. Examples include the *MMSD Regional Report* (providing comprehensive country level snapshots), the *Public Participation in EIA* project (setting out comparative information on legislation, policy and practice on EIA in mining), and the *Organization and Institutions of ASM* project (which will outline socio-cultural aspects of organization of ASM). These can be valuable tools. Their significance increases with both their quality and the degree to which they are adapted for their target audience. To a lesser extent, MPRI has promoted research that seeks to provide new conceptual tools for understanding mining and sustainability issues. These include the conceptual frameworks developed by the *Community Development Activities* and the *Organization and Institutions of ASM* projects. As discussed at greater length in section IV.3 of this report, the effectiveness of all of these initiatives depends greatly upon the existence of dissemination and policy promotion strategies designed to place these tools in the hands of their intended users. While the *Public Participation in EIA* and the *Community Development Activities* projects appear to lack important aspects of such a strategy, the *Organization and Institutions of ASM* project appears to be well-designed in this respect.

### **4.2 Outcomes**

MPRI's outcomes vary greatly from activity to activity at both the project and program levels. Several major categories of outcomes are outlined below.

#### **4.2.1 Promoting Researcher Capacity**

MPRI's projects have promoted capacity among their researchers with regard to mining and sustainability issues. Given the high level of research capacity found in Latin America generally, these increases chiefly arise from knowledge gains with regard to the research subject area or from new links made with other researchers and policy actors. MPRI projects promote these links through the adoption of a network research model (see III.4.3.1 below) and by organizing national and regional dialogue processes. The potential exists for it to expand this role in the future. Its work in ASM is a good example of what can be achieved with judicious planning and attention to the needs of policy actors.

#### **4.2.2 Outcomes for Project Participants**

With regard to their implications for research participants, projects fall into two groups: those that simply study participants, and those that involve participants directly in project activities. The consultations tend to fall in the latter category, and often produce their most important results from these participatory activities. This may be true for example of the MMSD Project where the consultation process appears to have had a greater impact in some countries than the subsequent publication of the report. MPRI stands to achieve its greatest direct benefits for local actors through its use of action research strategies. The *Multi-Stakeholder Processes* and the *Organization and Institutions of ASM* projects provide examples of these strategies.

#### **4.2.3 Promoting Change at a Regional Level**

MPRI has been active on the regional scene in Latin America as an actor dedicated to the promotion of sustainable development in mining. It has played a noteworthy role in this respect, chiefly for the NGO and research communities, however its involvement with other actors has been significant. In particular, with MMSD, MPRI has acquired a higher profile among a diversity of stakeholder groups. With these gains, and given its general reputation as an honest broker on sustainability issues, MPRI may be expected to play an expanded role in regional dialogues on mining and sustainable development in the future.

#### **4.2.4 Promoting Gender Analysis**

Of all the projects reviewed in the sample, none have mainstreamed a gender perspective in their design, execution, or follow-up save for the recent work on ASM. With the exception of the project on *Organization and Institutions of ASM* which integrates gender analysis into its activities, gender issues have been outside of the focus of MPRI's projects. This is an oversight given the significance that gendered differences have with regard to the economic, social, and environmental impacts of mining activity.

### **4.3 Reach**

The reach of MPRI's activities has three dimensions. The first concerns how project/program activities involve and affect research participants; the second concerns how these activities involve researchers; and the third relates to the dissemination and promotion of research results.

#### **4.3.1 Strategies for Promoting the Reach of Projects**

Since 2000, MPRI has initiated several program-wide strategies for promoting the reach of its activities and results. These strategies make integral use of ICT. All projects begin and end with regional workshops and seminars. The cost of printing and disseminating research results is included within project budgets so that materials can be distributed free of charge. All research results are made available on MPRI's webpage. MPRI has also promoted a network research model in which different research teams carry out project activities in several countries simultaneously. The opening regional workshop is used to develop familiarity between researchers, refine project design, and develop common concepts and approaches. During project execution, researchers remain linked through private discussion lists. Once research is completed, researchers hold national events to present their work, and the research teams are brought together again for a closing workshop involving national and regional actors.

Together, this set of strategies can have a considerable multiplier effect upon project results. It can contribute to dialogue between national stakeholders, it can promote regional awareness and links among policy actors, it can produce lasting networks between researchers and other actors both within and across borders. MPRI's experience with these strategies has improved over time. Implementation has proved difficult with two projects in the sample (*Community Development Activities* and *Improving Public Participation in EIA*). Both of these projects were designed in MPRI's first phase of operations, and then modified after 2000 to accord with the Initiative's new emphasis on participatory and networked approaches. MPRI performance in this field has been more assured with regard to those projects developed after 2000. In particular, MPRI's work on ASM has made very successful use of networking strategies. Indeed the ASM Network represents the high water mark of what this approach can achieve: an active and engaged international network of diverse actors interacting on a continuous basis with regard to a complex issue area. The Network provides the Initiative with an audience, a resource, a researcher pool, a sounding board, a means for recruiting emergency volunteers, an information dissemination system, and a broad-based constituency. It has become integral to MPRI's continuing work on ASM.

#### **IV. Reflections on MPRI's Thematic Approach and Strategies**

##### **1. Should IDRC Focus on Mining and Sustainability in Latin America?**

Mining remains both an urgent and a strategically important site for attention in Latin America. Over the last two decades, Latin American countries have been engaged in struggles to redefine themselves as they have faced repeated financial and political crises. Economic liberalization, democratization, the increasing recognition of indigenous rights, and a rise in claims for social accountability are among the developments that characterize these ongoing struggles. In many Latin American countries, mining plays a central role in these processes of social change. Mining represents a point of articulation between global economic forces, local claims, and national interests. While large mining is vital to the macroeconomic stability of many Latin American countries, it is also responsible for substantial local costs and often provokes claims from local and indigenous peoples for the recognition of local rights, participatory governance, and increased governmental and corporate accountability. Similarly, Artisanal and Small Scale Mining (ASM) is a crucial livelihood strategy for hundreds of thousands in the region, but questions remain regarding its potential for environmental, social, and economic sustainability.

Since 1998, the regional policy context in Latin America relating to mining and sustainable development has shown considerable progress. Over the past five years, significant parts of the Latin American region have witnessed a general increase in sophistication, tolerance, and dialogue among actors, as well as greater acceptance of sustainable development as a benchmark for industry, community actors, and government. While resistance to progressive change is still commonplace, Latin America is now home to an increasing number of innovative experiments in sustainability and mining. The regional policy landscape in this area is currently in flux. A programmatic focus on mining and sustainable development provides MPRI with a strategic opportunity to influence an area which is capable of producing very significant outcomes relating to development, the environment, good governance, and social justice.

## **2. Is a Specialized Initiative Required for this Work?**

MPRI's experience has shown that the conditions for effective multi-stakeholder engagement in the mining sector are not arrived at easily or quickly. A wide gulf often separates the perspectives of different actors and mutual suspicion can easily lead to increasing polarization. To identify opportunities and appropriate strategies in each country, a close knowledge of national context, policy actors, and ongoing processes is required. Limited budgets and fixed timelines mean MPRI's projects constitute small pushes that are applied to ongoing social and political processes. However, strategic efforts that exploit opportunities in the national or regional policy context can produce important outcomes.

This suggests that influential work on mining and sustainable development in Latin America requires focused, knowledgeable, and extended engagement with actors in the region. MPRI's field of work requires a "hands-on" approach to stakeholder engagement and project management. Trust must be built among different stakeholder groups, and project opportunities are best identified by closely following national debates and processes. To date, MPRI has made substantial investments in building its knowledge and reputation in the region. It is well placed to continue this work and to expand it in the future.

## **3. Reflections on MPRI's Strategies for Promoting Policy-Relevant Research**

It is helpful at this point to summarize the conclusions of Loayza (2003) regarding how to improve the policy influence of IDRC research projects. Loayza emphasizes the importance of non-traditional strategies for disseminating research findings and for promoting the research's policy implications within relevant policy circles. Simply relying on seminars, workshops, and publications may be insufficient to bridge the gap between research and policy change. Loayza underlines the important role that can be played by research partners who possess policy entrepreneurship capabilities, who are interested in promoting research results, and are capable of forming strategic coalitions to do so. Loayza adds that IDRC must not only integrate a policy-impact strategy into project design, execution and follow-up but also dedicate additional funds to support such a strategy. This approach recognizes that institutions are resistant to change, and that institutional learning requires not only dissemination but the active promotion of ideas.

Loayza concludes that IDRC initiatives need to ensure that they are investing in policy promotion, not simply dissemination. His argument contains several lessons for MPRI that are addressed in the following sections. The innovations adopted by MPRI in 2000 and progressively implemented over the following years (including the

network research model, expanded use of ICTs, and various strategies for increasing the reach of project activities) have had important results. However, significant barriers still need to be overcome in the effort to place effective and appropriate research tools into the hands of those who would use them to promote progressive policy change. The sections that follow highlight several issues:

- Developing and working with policy entrepreneurs with close links to target audiences;
- Further investment in responsive and community-based action research strategies;
- Guarding against the negative effects upon project results that can arise from low budgetary resources.

### 3.1 *Choosing Research Partners*

The application of the principles of sustainable development to mining remains an area in which there is great uncertainty. Actors lack practical models for building consensus regarding how to reconcile environmental, development and social concerns. However the need for practical solutions in individual cases also means that Latin America is a site of substantial *ad hoc* experimentation and innovation. This has generated a policy arena dominated by intermediaries, translators, and policy entrepreneurs oriented towards different stakeholder groups. For example, mining companies rely on specialized staff, private consultants, and research organizations in order to develop their social and environmental policies. Communities on the other hand tend to receive information and advice from advocacy NGOs, community leaders, and grassroots organizations. Governments often have specialized officials engaged with the area, and may also turn to expert consultants for policy proposals. These intermediaries are key players within the policy field. Decision-makers among stakeholder groups often do not read lengthy and complex research reports. Instead, they rely upon summaries and impressions communicated by trusted intermediaries.

MPRI's research partners are generally to be found among these communities of intermediaries. MPRI's researchers are thus also influential policy actors operating in a politicized environment. The choice of research partners is highly important. The key capacities to be found in an appropriate research partner (or coalition of research partners) are:

- a) research capacity,
- b) policy entrepreneurship, and
- c) linkages to the stakeholder group(s) whom the research is intended to influence.

These conditions may be satisfied by a single research organization or researcher, or they may require establishing a coalition of researchers with different capacities. Since research capacity is self-explanatory, the following paragraphs will deal with the latter two points.

*Policy Entrepreneurship.* Field work conducted for this review suggests that the greatest gains often come from employing researchers who are already involved in policy debates related to the research topic, and who will continue to do so after the project is concluded. These actors are more likely to use and disseminate the tools and knowledge created by the project. They are also more likely to follow up on the project with continued work in the policy area or geographic region, with funding from



other sources. A distinction should be made between research-for-hire organizations that are in the business of producing reports, and policy-entrepreneurial organizations who are motivated by a policy mission. Where a research-for-hire organization is used, the project's policy impact strategy may have to rely upon the involvement of MPRI staff or a suitable policy entrepreneur.

*Linkages to Stakeholder Groups.* Research organizations have different profiles. In general, an organization without close, pre-existing links to a stakeholder group will be in a poor position to influence them with research results (or to mobilize that stakeholder group behind a campaign designed to influence others). Influencing rural communities for example, requires grassroots contacts and established experience. Mining companies on the other hand will often disregard research that comes from a source that they view as biased. Stakeholder groups involved in mining policy debates often analyze the messenger before looking at the message.

Where a country lacks intermediaries who possess either the desired stakeholder linkages or the capacity for policy entrepreneurship, MPRI should consider directing resources in order to promote these qualities. This is of course long term work.

### **3.2 The Challenge of Reaching Mining-Affected Communities and Small-Scale Miners**

The choice made by MPRI to focus its efforts on assisting disadvantaged actors such as indigenous peoples, mining-affected communities, and artisanal miners is a very valid one. These groups are the least able to communicate their concerns in the policy-making process and the least likely to be heard. Arguably, the presence of community concerns on the policy agenda in Peru and their absence in Chile is linked to the high level of organization and activism seen among mining-affected communities in the former country.

Providing durable project results for local communities is perhaps the most challenging aspect of MPRI's chosen field of work. The challenge has two dimensions, first communicating research results to community actors, and second doing so in a way that is enduring and not simply temporary. For both of these tasks, articulating work with grassroots organizations and closely linked NGOs can help a great deal. Such organizations can play an important role in translating research reports for a local context, and can act as a storehouse of information accessible to community actors.

In general, research reports tend to have the most limited impacts upon community actors while involvement in workshops, participatory processes, and action research strategies tend to provide direct results. Accordingly, the research process itself may constitute a project's most important contribution to local community actors. The action research strategy of the *Multi-Stakeholder Processes* project, which included local workshops directed at providing information on the roundtable process and regarding comparable processes elsewhere in Peru and in the Americas, provided community actors with information and spaces for deliberation. In contrast, the *Public Participation in the EIA Process* project involved only brief information-gathering fieldwork in mining-affected communities.

However providing durable research results among rural communities remains a difficult task. This is an issue that was raised with respect to the *Multi-Stakeholder Processes* project. New elections among the nine peasant communities in the project area, shortly before field work was conducted for this report, produced a set

of leaders unfamiliar with the project and suspicious of the researchers. Neither the relations of trust established by the researchers with the earlier set of leaders nor the knowledge gained by these leaders was passed on to their successors. This suggests that the action research component of the project was not sufficiently extensive to disseminate results far enough beyond the current set of community leaders. In these circumstances, an appropriate action research strategy might dedicate more time, effort and funds to allow for a broader community engagement.

### **3.3 The Project Implications of Budgetary Challenges**

Several of the MPRI projects reviewed for this report have been executed on very tight budgets. As observed earlier, MPRI has been a highly ambitious initiative which, since its inception has sought to do a great deal with scarce project funding. MPRI has been generally successful in this aim and has produced impressive work. However, review of several projects suggests that the effort to stretch out limited funding is associated with factors that can impact negatively on project results.

Tight project budgets can encourage researchers to try to find cost savings that can impact upon a particular set of field based activities, including field work, participatory and action research, local communication strategies, and local dissemination of research results. This can mean that a sub-optimal number of such activities are carried out. Where it occurs, this dynamic can influence project results in two ways. First, it can limit the quality of project research outputs by limiting the field and participatory work on which research is based. Second, and perhaps most importantly, it can curtail those project activities that are most important to producing durable results for community actors. Action research, participatory methodologies, capacity-building workshops, and extensive local dissemination of research results all require substantial investments in time, funds, and energy in order to make a lasting difference in local and indigenous communities. Where these investments cannot be made to the degree required, the shortfall in potential results is likely to impact chiefly upon the benefits that could have been achieved for local communities. So long as MPRI is a program operating with limited project funds, it must be vigilant to guard against this dynamic.

## **4. Future Opportunities and Directions for MPRI**

Over its five years of existence, MPRI has gained stature and experience in its policy field, it has established its credibility among certain key constituencies, it has made important contributions to policy debates, and has promoted intensified networking among national and regional actors. The question now is what future direction should MPRI take? MPRI has begun to answer this question in its new approaches to programming and engagement initiated in 2002. This has involved addressing several interdependent issues:

- Defining a program of work;
- Developing a resource expansion strategy;
- Determining how to engage with stakeholder community (agenda-setting, accountability, feedback, decision-making);
- Reconsidering the location of MPRI's office; and
- Determining MPRI's place within IDRC.

The sections that follow will examine each of these issues, elucidate the options and opportunities available to MPRI, and discuss MPRI's current strategies for addressing them. Please note however that this report is not in a position to provide

exhaustive or highly detailed analysis of these matters. As set out in the evaluator's terms of reference, this is predominantly a retrospective report, intended to outline and evaluate where MPRI has been. The following reflections are intended to assist MPRI and IDRC in assessing the Initiative's options and opportunities.

#### **4.1 Defining a Program of Work: The Current State of the Policy Field on Mining and Sustainability in Latin America**

There are three overlapping policy arenas dealing with mining and sustainability issues in Latin America. Each one presents MPRI with different opportunities, and entails the cultivation of somewhat different partnerships and linkages. These are:

1. National policy and regulation of the mining sector;
2. Large mines and local community relations; and
3. Artisanal and small scale mining.

Many actors participate in more than one of these arenas, however each policy arena is quite distinct from the others. Each differs in the priority it assigns to particular issues, in its mode of operation, in its flexibility and responsiveness to change, and in the criteria by which it accords status to participants in its policy debates.

The arena of national mining policy concerns such issues as fiscal policy, environmental management, taxation, labour policy, mine closure, etc. and their relation to the mining sector. Status among participants in this arena is closely linked to the possession of establishment credentials and political influence. As a result, government, opposition parties, prestigious think tanks, national and transnational industry, international organizations and (at times) organized labour have greater clout in these policy debates than grassroots movements or NGOs. The national policy arena is the one most capable of producing change on a large scale, however it is also the slowest moving of the three, and the most resistant to innovation. At present the main issues addressed in debates over national mining policy in Latin America concern the appropriate institutional arrangements required to ensure that mining activity contributes to sustainable national development. Increasingly doubts are surfacing about the suitability of the neoliberal structural reforms implemented in the 1990s. Furthermore, a growing body of international scholarship is demonstrating that resource-rich economies face special institutional challenges before they are capable of translating resource wealth into lasting development. The recently released report of the World Bank's Extractive Industry Review has made a significant contribution to these debates (EIR Secretariat 2003).

The policy arena regarding relations between large mines and local communities continues to be highly active in Latin America.<sup>15</sup> Community actors, NGOs, and grassroots movements are more significant players in this field, while state agencies have tended to avoid participation here. This arena is dominated by transnational mining enterprises and their consultants on the one hand and local and indigenous communities, Latin American NGOs, and transnational advocacy networks on the other. The principal issues addressed are multi-stakeholder negotiations, management of local impacts, and local development. This arena is characterized by decentralized experimentation; different enterprises and different communities are involved in encounters in sites across Latin America. In some cases this is producing

---

<sup>15</sup> Issues related to mining and indigenous peoples essentially fall into either this policy arena or the ASM arena. The indigenous movement in Latin America is involved in both of these debates.

significant innovations, in others it is producing conflict with national and regional consequences. Continuing debate and engagement since the mid-1990s is producing change within the thinking of actors, many of whom are looking for the means to get beyond simple confrontation. An opportunity exists to become involved in recent initiatives for developing new non-state institutions for addressing corporate and community conflicts.<sup>16</sup> With their greater resources and organizational capacity, there is a danger that corporate actors will set the agenda and develop these initiatives in ways that alienate community actors and their allies. Counterbalancing resources are needed to assist grassroots organizations and local communities to participate in and help direct these debates.

ASM is a neglected area in Latin America, which until recently has not had a developed regional policy arena focused upon its issues. MPRI has played a major role in the promotion of this arena through various initiatives already covered in this report: the regional agenda-setting workshop conducted in Lima in 2002, the founding of the ASM Network, and MPRI's development of strategic partnerships with UNESCO in Uruguay, CYTED in Spain, and CETEM in Brazil. The main players in this field include these key institutional partners, as well as researchers, NGOs, donors, government officials, and most significantly, organizations of small scale miners themselves. This is a loosely structured and dynamic policy arena in which actors are keen to develop and exchange information in order to find solutions for the sector. This attention is overdue. ASM has long been neglected or pathologized by government and industry. Yet, it is an enduring survival strategy that continues to be practiced by hundreds of thousands in Latin America, often in conditions of extreme poverty. ASM exists in every mining country and there is little to indicate that it is going away. Neither the domestic mining sector nor large scale transnational operations are capable of replacing the employment and livelihood role played by ASM. Furthermore, the ASM sector is a significant provider to international markets. For example some 15 percent of Peru's gold is produced through ASM.<sup>17</sup> However ASM often remains dangerous, environmentally damaging, and highly inequitable. Of the three policy arenas, ASM is most clearly directed towards addressing poverty issues at the grassroots. Work in this policy arena is currently focused upon understanding ASM as a social and economic phenomenon. Medium term objectives involve developing tools that will enable ASM organizations, NGOs, donor agencies, and local and national governments to promote sustainable livelihoods among those who rely on ASM.

During MPRI's first phase of operations, its projects focused upon the first two policy arenas. In 2000, MPRI began phasing out its activities in the national policy arena in favour of greater engagement with large mines and local communities. Since 2002, MPRI has increasingly focused its work upon the ASM arena and has been developing its partnership and resource mobilization strategies with a view to deepening this engagement.

---

<sup>16</sup> Significant initiatives include the following. The International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM) is involved in developing indicators for sustainability reporting together with the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI). National NGOs in Bolivia, Chile, Peru, and Ecuador are involved in a project coordinated by the Environmental Law Institute, Oxfam America, and the SPDA in order to consult communities with regard to developing private regulatory institutions (or "certification institutions") for the mining sector. The World Wildlife Foundation in Australia has partnered with a number of transnational mining enterprises to study the possibility of certification of mining with its Mining Certification Evaluation Project (MCEP) in Australia.

<sup>17</sup> Ekamolle. 2003. *Organización e Institucionalidad de Pequeños Mineros en el Perú— Propuesta*.

Each of these three policy arenas could benefit greatly from MPRI's concerted involvement. However, MPRI's ability to do so is limited by its available resources, both from IDRC and other sources. It is the evaluator's opinion that the primary opportunities for MPRI lie in the latter two policy arenas: both ASM and large mines and local communities. There are three reasons for this:

- These two arenas are highly dynamic. In contrast with the more static and inflexible national policy arena, these two provide greater opportunities for innovation and policy promotion. New initiatives are more capable of rapid adoption in these arenas, and successful experiences can be institutionalized and encouraged to spread. Successes developed in these arenas have the potential to influence the national policy arena.
- MPRI has built up substantial experience and credibility in these two arenas.
- The ASM and large mines/local communities arenas provide MPRI with opportunities to work directly with and provide results for disenfranchised groups.

If MPRI is to do work in only one arena, it should be ASM. This is where MPRI has built up considerable recent momentum and where it is currently most productive. Furthermore, ASM forms the basis of MPRI's current resource expansion strategy (see below). It would be unfortunate however for MPRI to abandon wholly its work in the large mines and local communities arena. MPRI has made very significant investments in knowledge, capacity, contacts, and credibility in this area. It is well-positioned to continue with this work and much remains to be done. MPRI is capable of consolidating itself as a program with two streams: one dealing with ASM and the other with local and indigenous mining-affected communities. If the resources to work in both of these arenas is not forthcoming in the short term, MPRI should not foreclose the possibility of expanding its scope in the future.

#### **4.2 *Developing a Resource Expansion Strategy***

Currently, MPRI is developing a resource expansion strategy centered upon its ASM activities. This involves one major initiative at present.<sup>18</sup> With support from PBDD, MPRI is working on developing a partnership between IDRC and CIDA for a program for sustainable development of mining municipalities in Bolivia, with an emphasis on ASM issues. MPRI is planning an integrated program for Bolivia involving applied research projects, local training activities, and pilot projects that address social, economic, and environmental problems related to ASM. This program also seeks to bring the Bolivian public sector (with an emphasis on local government) into the ASM policy arena through capacity-building and by encouraging the development of public policy that is responsive to the needs and realities of the ASM sector. MPRI is proposing to apply a sustainable livelihoods framework that regards ASM as one of a number of strategies used by families and communities for economic survival.

This initiative on the part of MPRI is well thought out. Bolivia is a strategic priority for CIDA in Latin America, and ASM is a very important issue in Bolivia. The evaluator accompanied MPRI and IDRC staff on part of a scoping visit undertaken in Bolivia. Interviews revealed both significant interest and capacity among MPRI's potential local partner organizations. MPRI is positioning itself as an expert intermediary, able to add significant value through its knowledge of the issues and actors and through its innovative approach.

---

<sup>18</sup> MPRI is also currently looking for donor interest in the development of an emergency response system with regard to local disasters in the ASM sector. See section II.2.1.2.

This is MPRI's only major resource expansion strategy at present. With this in mind, MPRI may consider developing a parallel resource expansion initiative based upon its large mines/local communities activities with an emphasis on supporting indigenous peoples in these struggles. Questions addressed in MPRI's ASM activities may cross-fertilize with research undertaken here: how, for example, are sustainable Andean livelihoods affected or promoted by the arrival of mining activity? Initial work on this kind of parallel plan may prove to be a wise investment, particularly if support for MPRI's ASM activities is delayed.

### **4.3 Engagement With the Stakeholder Community**

What are the appropriate arrangements for MPRI agenda-setting, accountability, feedback-gathering, and decision-making? MPRI's experience to date suggests that these goals are best achieved through an informal relation between MPRI and its stakeholders that is characterized by frequent communication and degrees of close contact and collaboration. The Advisory Group experience underscores that MPRI requires operational autonomy from its stakeholders, and should not tie its decision-making to the need to satisfy multiple constituencies. MPRI needs to be able to act where and how it sees fit. Agenda-setting and the gathering of feedback are best accomplished by the means developed by MPRI in its ASM activities: i.e. making full use of regional multi-stakeholder workshops, electronic networking, documented consultation processes, and engagement with strategic partners. These strategies provide MPRI with the information and choice required to place itself at the forefront of mining and sustainability initiatives in the region. MPRI may also find it useful to experiment with an additional periodic "Advisory Network" consultation process. In such an arrangement MPRI would periodically (perhaps once annually) contact members of one or more Advisory Networks, requesting input with regard to relevant issues and new directions for investigation. Requests by e-mail would be followed up with telephone conversations. Members of an Advisory Network would be knowledgeable stakeholders with expertise on the subject matter of the Network (e.g. ASM or Large Mines and Local Communities).<sup>19</sup> In this manner, MPRI staff would both gather information from diverse sources on a regular basis and maintain close contact with key regional stakeholders.

Accountability is best accomplished through transparent reporting to MPRI's stakeholders. This can be achieved by posting unabridged annual reports to the IDRC Board on the MPRI website. Annual reports should be clear, written in plain language, and available in Spanish and Portuguese. Notice of the posting should be disseminated over MPRI's discussion lists and feedback requested. The Advisory Group is not useful as an accountability mechanism. As currently constituted it is not adequately representative of MPRI's policy constituencies in Latin America, nor is it meaningfully involved in the oversight of MPRI's activities. Investment in transforming a revitalized Advisory Group into a representative board for MPRI is likely to consume time and resources that could produce greater results if directed elsewhere. MPRI should consider disbanding its Advisory Group and including its members on its discussion lists.

### **4.4 Location of MPRI's Office**

Currently MPRI is housed in IDRC's LACRO office in Montevideo, Uruguay. Uruguay does not have a mining industry and is remote from the countries in which MPRI

---

<sup>19</sup> Advisory Network members would be selected by MPRI and suggested by other members.

does its work in terms of airline travel. A large number of stakeholders asked saw value in relocating MPRI's office to one of the key mining countries in the region: either Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, or Peru. With this kind of proximity, MPRI would be more accessible to its projects and researchers. Day-to-day presence in one of these four countries would also provide MPRI with a set of additional opportunities:

- Bolivia is the most important country in the region for Artisanal and Small Scale Mining (ASM). It has the highest per capita number of small scale miners and the greatest degree of organization of this sector. Significant gains to work in the field of ASM would be provided a closer day-to-day proximity to events in Bolivia.
- While mining in Brazil represents a smaller part of the economy than it does in the other countries listed here, the Brazilian mining industry is nevertheless large in absolute terms. Brazil has both a considerable small-scale/artisanal and large mining sector.
- Chile presents considerable opportunities for work on national policy issues including macroeconomic and development effects, and mine closure. The current debate in the country concerns whether the state should impose a royalty on mining. Work with mining-affected communities is also urgently needed but would require substantial investments of time and effort to build up momentum.
- Peru presents a high level of opportunity with regard to work addressing engagement between large mines and local communities. Actors in Peru are currently involved in an unprecedented level of dialogue and a number of innovative efforts regarding corporate-and-community engagement are underway in various parts of the country.

Of course, other considerations need to be evaluated. MPRI currently gains support from the collegial environment at LACRO. Furthermore, the viability of any move would depend upon the identification of a suitable host institution to house the Initiative.

#### **4.5 MPRI's Place Within IDRC**

This is an important pending issue for MPRI. MPRI's initial design as a Corporate Project was based on assumptions that were not borne out in practice. Since then, MPRI has re-invented itself in line with the changing realities of its field of work and secured additional interim funding from IDRC and other sources in order to pursue its objectives. Since 2002, MPRI has begun to concentrate its resources in line with a new programmatic focus and resource expansion strategy. In doing so, MPRI has helped to catalyze a dynamic new area of work that it is undertaking as part of a developing applied research community.

MPRI's immediate future depends greatly upon the form and degree of support that it receives from IDRC. This report has argued that the thematic area addressed by MPRI is one in which IDRC could profitably make greater investments in order to achieve significant development outcomes. Ideally, MPRI should be funded to continue its work in the area of mining and community relations and expand its work related to ASM. Transforming MPRI into a secure internal initiative of IDRC would be a positive step. MPRI's work would benefit from the stability provided by longer-term funding guarantees. However MPRI's relation with IDRC is to be structured in the future, the issues covered in this report suggest two conclusions about appropriate approaches. First, the nature of the policy field relating to mining and sustainability issues is such that this work is more effectively carried out by a knowledgeable and

specialized initiative that is recognizable to regional stakeholders (see section IV.2). MPRI should be an identifiable and self-directed entity. Second, requiring PIs to dedicate resources to mining-related projects is not an effective way of assisting MPRI to manage a coherent and integrated thematic program of research and stakeholder engagement (see section II.2.2.2). Where budgetary resources are intended to promote MPRI's program of work, they should be placed under MPRI's control.

## **5. Concluding Remarks**

MPRI has shown itself to be an adaptable initiative, capable of evolving with its volatile policy environment, and capable of taking a leadership role in the development of new research and policy networks. Its output, on the whole, has been impressive, and MPRI has gained the experience necessary to play an increasingly prominent role in its field of work. As outlined above, MPRI's current challenges are related to the need to consolidate its institutional position; it must integrate its resource expansion efforts, programmatic focus, and strategic partnerships in a manner that will enable it to do so.



## Annexes

### Annex A: List of Acronyms

ASM	Artisanal and Small Scale Mining
CAMMA	Conference of Mines Ministries of the Americas
CASM	Consultative Group for Artisanal and Small Scale Mining
CECI	Centre canadien d'étude et de coopération internationale
CIPMA	Centre for Environmental Research and Planning ( <i>Centro de Investigación y Planificación del Medio Ambiente</i> )
CP	Corporate Project
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
EcoHealth	Ecosystems Approaches to Human Health
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GMI	Global Mining Initiative
ICMM	International Council on Mining and Metals
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
LACRO	IDRC Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
MCEP	Mining Certification Evaluation Project
Minga	Managing Natural Resources
MMSD	Mining, Minerals and Sustainable Development Project
MPE	Artisanal and Small Scale Mining ( <i>Minería de Pequeña Escala</i> )
MPRI	Mining Policy Research Initiative
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PAD	Project Approval Document
PI	Program Initiative
PPB	Programs and Partnerships Branch
SPDA	Environmental Law Society of Peru ( <i>Sociedad Peruana de Derecho Ambiental</i> )
TEC	Trade, Employment and Competitiveness
UNESCO	United Nations Education, Science, and Cultural Organization
WBCSD	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
WSSD	World Summit for Sustainable Development

**Annex B: Terms of Reference and Reviewer Guide**

**Annex C: List of Persons Interviewed**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Relation to MPRI Activities</b>
1. Lisa Burley		IDRC	Ottawa, Canada	Former MPRI (program?) officer
2. Simon Carter	Team Leader (MINGA)	IDRC	Ottawa, Canada	
3. David Brooks	(Former) Research Manager	IDRC	Ottawa, Canada	
4. Jean-Claude Lauzier		CIDA	Ottawa, Canada	MPRI Advisory Group
5. Tony Andrews	Executive Director	Prospectors & Developers Assn of Canada	Toronto, Canada	MPRI Advisory Group
6. Alan Young	(Former) Executive Director	Environmental Mining Council of BC	Ottawa, Canada*	MPRI Advisory Group
7. Jim Cooney	General Manager Strategic Issues	Placer Dome Inc.	Vancouver, Canada*	MPRI Advisory Group
8. Jeffrey Davidson	Senior Mining Specialist	World Bank Formerly, Placer Dome Inc.	Washington D.C., USA*	MPRI Advisory Group ASM Stakeholder
9. Luke Danielson	(Former) MPRI Director		Colorado, USA*	First MPRI Director MMSD Director
10. Laura Baretto		CETEM	Ottawa, Canada*	MMSD Brazil Coord
11. Cristina Echavarria	MPRI Director	IDRC	Montevideo, Uruguay	MPRI Director MPRI Advisory Group
12. Patricia Gonzales	MPRI Research Officer	IDRC	Montevideo, Uruguay	MPRI Staff Closure Researcher
13. Federico Burone	LACRO Regional Director	IDRC	Montevideo, Uruguay	
14. Jorge Ellis	National Program Officer	UNESCO	Montevideo, Uruguay	Former MPRI Staff ASM Stakeholder
15. Andres Ruis	TEC	IDRC	Montevideo, Uruguay	
16. Patricio Cartagena	Executive Vice President	Chilean Copper Commission (COCHILCO)	Santiago, Chile	Closure Researcher
17. Raul Campusano	Consultant	INGEDER Consultores Ltd.	Santiago, Chile	Closure Researcher
18. Mauro Valdes	Community Relations, La Escondida	BHP-Billiton	Santiago, Chile	MMSD Advisory Group
19. Hernan Blanco	Researcher	formerly CIPMA now RIDES	Santiago, Chile	MMSD Chile Resrchr
20. Valeria Torres	Researcher	formerly CIPMA now RIDES	Santiago, Chile	MMSD Chile Resrchr
21. Cesar Padilla		Observatorio Latinoamericano de Conflictos Ambientales	Santiago, Chile	MMSD Non-Participant

Name	Title	Organization	Location	Relation to MPRI Activities
22. Miguel Stuzin		Agricultural and Livestock Services (SAG), Government of Chile. Previously with CODEFF	Santiago, Chile	EIA Chile Researcher
23. Gustavo Lagos	Director	Centre for Research on Mining and Metallurgy (CIMM)	Santiago, Chile	MMSD Regional Coord
24. Juan Aste	Mining & Communities Program	ECO	Lima, Peru	MSP Researcher MMSD Peru Participant
25. Jose de Echave	Director, Mining & Communities Program	Cooperacion	Lima, Peru	MSP Researcher MMSD Peru Participant
26. Manuel Glave		GRADE	Lima, Peru	MSP Researcher MMSD Peru Researcher
27. Zoila Martinez	Executive Director	Ekamolle	Lima, Peru	ASM Regional Coord MMSD Peru Participant
28. Luis Buezo de Manzanedo	Researcher	Ekamolle	Lima, Peru	ASM Researcher
29. Iris Ramos	Researcher	Ekamolle	Lima, Peru	ASM Researcher
30. Claudia Hintze Martinez	Researcher	Ekamolle	Lima, Peru	ASM Researcher
31. Juana Kuramoto		GRADE	Lima, Peru	ASM Researcher MMSD Peru Researcher
32. Jose Mogrovejo	Vice President Corporate, Environmental Affairs	Doe Run Peru	Lima, Peru	MSP Participant MMSD Peru Participant
33. Juan Ossio	Anthropologist	Catholic University of Peru	Lima, Peru	Cmty Dev Regional Coordinator
34. Darinka Cziscke	Researcher	Formerly with CIPMA	London, UK*	Cmty Dev Researcher, Chile
35. Manuel Pulgar Vidal	Executive Director	Peruvian Environmental Law Society (SPDA)	Lima, Peru	MPRI Advisory Group MMSD Advisory Group MSP Participant EIA Regional Coord
36. Ada Alegre		Peruvian Environmental Law Society (SPDA)	Lima, Peru	EIA Researcher
37. Cesar Polo	Vice-Minister of Mines	Ministry of Energy & Mines, Peru	Lima, Peru	MMSD Peru Participant
38. Eduardo Rubio		Anglo-American	Lima, Peru	MMSD Peru Participant

Name	Title	Organization	Location	Relation to MPRI Activities
39. Carlos Aranda	Manager, General & Technical Services	Southern Peru Corporation	Lima, Peru	MMSD Peru Participant
40. Javier Aroca		Oxfam America	Lima, Peru	MMSD Non-Participant
41. Martin Scurrah		Oxfam America	Lima, Peru	MMSD Non-Participant
42. Catherine Ross	Coordinator	Oxfam America	Lima, Peru	MMSD Non-Participant
43. Steve Botts	Vice President, Environment	Compania Minera Antamina	Lima, Peru	MMSD Peru Participant
44. Miguel Palacin	President	Coordinating Committee of Communities Affected by Mining (CONACAMI)	Lima, Peru	MMSD Peru Participant
45. Claudio Campos	President	Peasant Community of Villa Junin	Junin, Peru	MSP Participant
46. ??	Lieutenant Mayor	Regional Government of Junin	Junin, Peru	MSP Participant
47. Informal Group	Community Leaders	Peasant Community of San Juan de Ondoles	cc. San Juan de Ondoles, Peru	MSP Participant
48. Carlos Rojas		National Environmental Commission, Government of Peru (CONAM)	Tarma, Peru	MSP Participant
49. Benito Caldixto	Secretary of Institutional Development	CONACAMI Pasco	Cerro de Pasco, Peru	MSP Participant
50. Mario Arteaga Valdes	President	Peasant Community of Cochabamba	Cerro de Pasco, Peru	MSP Participant
51. Ronaldo Monge		APEMIN	Oruro, Bolivia	ASM Stakeholder
52. Bernardo Reyes		Political Ecology Institute, Chile (IEP)	Oruro, Bolivia	MMSD Chile Participant
53. Rene Joaquin	Mayor	Municipality of Potosi	Potosi, Bolivia	ASM Stakeholder
54. Pascual Mamani Lugo	President	Regional Chamber of Mining of Potosi	Potosi, Bolivia	ASM Stakeholder
55. Juan Carlos Enriquez	President	Servicios Ambientales S.A.	La Paz, Bolivia	MMSD Bolivia Coord
56. Ana Maria Aranibar	General Manager	Cumbre del Sajama S.A.	La Paz, Bolivia	ASM Researcher
57. Paul Warner	Manager, Community Relations	BHP-Billiton	Santiago, Chile*	MMSD Peru Participant MSP Participant
58. Mario Luna	Services & Projects	Fundacion MEDMIN	La Paz, Bolivia	MMSD Bolivia Coord
59. Pedro Gomez		CEPROMIN	La Paz, Bolivia	MMSD Bolivia Partcpnt ASM Stakeholder
60. Fredy Beltran	General Coordinator	CEPROMIN	La Paz, Bolivia	MMSD Bolivia Partcpnt ASM Stakeholder
61. Rudy Valdivia		National Institute of Natural Resources (INRENA), Government of Peru	Lima, Peru*	MSP Participant
62. Fernando Loayza		Servicios Ambientales S.A.	La Paz, Bolivia	MPRI Advisory Group MMSD & ASM Participant

Name	Title	Organization	Location	Relation to MPRI Activities
63. Juan Albarracin	Presidente	Fundacion Bartolome de Las Casas	La Paz, Bolivia	MMSD Bolivia Partcpnt
64. Norma Gonzales	Conflict Resolution Specialist	NegoCom.International	La Paz, Bolivia	MSP Consultant
65. Roberto Villas Boas	President	Centro de Tecnologia Mineral (CETEM)	Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*	MPRI Advisory Group MMSD Researcher ASM Researcher
66. Hector Huertas	Project coordinator	Public Legal Aid Centre (CEALP)	El Dorado, Panama**	ICP Researcher

\* = telephone conversation

\*\* = e-mail communication

Cmty Dev = Community Development Activities Project

Closure = Mine Closure Project

EIA = Public Participation in Environmental Impact Assessment Project

MMSD = Mining Minerals and Sustainable Development Project

MSP = Multi-Stakeholder Processes for Co-Management of Mining Impacts Project

ASM = Organization of Small Scale Mining Project

ICP = Indigenous Peoples Consultation Project in Panama

## **Annex D: Breakdown of Review Activities**

April 14 to 16	Attended evaluator training at IDRC in Ottawa; conducted interviews with IDRC staff.
April 17 to May 19	Design and planning of evaluation activities, review of documents, telephone interviews.
May 20 to June 23	Field visits to Uruguay, Chile, Peru, and Bolivia.
June 24 to Aug 30	Preparation of report.

## **Annex E: Project Sites Visited**

### Multi-Stakeholder Processes for Co-Management of Mining Impacts

- Communities in Junin and Pasco region surrounding Lago Chinchaycocha, Peru.

### Artisanal and Small Scale Mining Program

- Communities in Oruro and Potosi regions, Bolivia.

## **Annex F: Sample Interview Instrument**

### Questions for Project Researchers

1. What Happened Before the Project?
  - 1.1. How did the project arise?
  - 1.2. How did MPRI influence project design?
  - 1.3. What role did MPRI's advisory group play in project design?
  - 1.4. Were gender considerations included in project design? How?
  - 1.5. Please describe any obstacles involved in developing this project.
2. What Occurred During the Project?
  - 2.1. What were the objectives of the project?
  - 2.2. Please describe the project's activities.
3. Research Methodology Issues
  - 3.1. What role was played by the project's advisory committee?
  - 3.2. What were the advantages and challenges presented by network research?
4. Project Results
  - 4.1. What were the project's outputs?
  - 4.2. What is your opinion with regard to the quality of these outputs?
  - 4.3. What impacts has the project had with regard to:
    - relations between different actors or stakeholders
    - research capacity of researchers and research participants
    - policy and practice relating to mining and sustainable development among actors
  - 4.4. Are the researchers still in contact with one another? Have research networks been formed?
5. After the Project
  - 5.1. Who are the expected users of the research results produced by the project?
  - 5.2. What are the challenges involved in reaching this group of users?

- 5.3. How have project results been disseminated?
- 5.4. What further activities are planned in order to promote the policy influence of the research results?
6. Questions for MMSD Participants/Non-participants
  - 6.1. Did you choose to participate in the MMSD process in your country? Why/why not?
  - 6.2. What is your opinion of the consultation process?
  - 6.3. What were your expectations of the process?
  - 6.4. What happened during the consultation process?
  - 6.5. Do you think that MMSD has had an impact upon the situation in your country?
  - 6.6. Have you seen the Regional MMSD Report? What do you think of it? Is it useful to you?
  - 6.7. Have you seen the Regional Research Agenda in this report? Has it influenced your work? Why/why not?
7. General Questions
  - 7.1. Does your work still relate to mining and sustainable development issues?
  - 7.2. What sources do you rely on for information on mining and sustainable development issues?
  - 7.3. To whom do you pass on such information?
  - 7.4. Has MPRI's presence or output in the region influenced your work? How?
  - 7.5. What is MPRI's reputation among your colleagues and affiliated organizations? Why?
  - 7.6. What do you think of the fact that MPRI is based in Uruguay?
  - 7.7. What do you think are the key opportunities and challenges facing MPRI in the future?
  - 7.8. Are there any further points you would like to address?

### **Annex G: Evaluator Biography**

David Szablowski is a lawyer and a consultant currently based in Eritrea. Mr. Szablowski has worked for nearly ten years in the areas of public interest law, environmental law, and issues related to indigenous peoples. As a researcher and consultant, he has worked extensively in the Andes on sustainable development and community issues. Mr. Szablowski is a graduate of Osgoode Hall Law School in Toronto, and a member of the Ontario bar (Law Society of Upper Canada). He is currently a Ph.D. candidate at Osgoode Hall Law School.

### **Annex H: MPRI Research Program 1998-1999**

- I. The Legal and Policy Framework
  - a) Property Rights
  - b) Sharing of Benefits
  - c) Economic Burdens
  - d) Protection of Other Local Interests
  - e) Information and Public Participation
  - f) Resolution of Disputes
  - g) Policy Framework for Small and Artisanal Enterprises
  - h) Mine Closure



## II. Interaction Among Communities, Mining Enterprises and the State

- a) Expectations and Roles
- b) Effective and Efficient Negotiation
- c) Capacity of Communities
- d) Sustainability of Economic Benefits and Communities
- e) Community and Occupational Health

## III. Impact Identification, Measurement and Management

- a) Baseline Information
- b) Role of the State
- c) Understanding Impacts
- d) Diverse Types of Impacts
- e) Informal Mining Sector

### **Annex I: MPRI Vision and Mission Statements, 2000+**

#### **What is our vision?**

Mining contributes to the generation of improved levels of well being and to the sustainable and equitable development of mining regions in Latin America and the Caribbean because:

- governments have better access to information and improved capacity and political will to assess the trade-offs inherent in different development options, as well as growing freedom to choose the most sustainable ones;
- mining companies are environmentally and socially responsible and respect diversity;
- Civil Society Organisations, and particularly the most vulnerable groups, effectively influence the development and the impacts of mining projects, from prior consultation to post-closure.

#### **What is our mission?**

- To contribute towards the development of research capacity in the region and to promote the participation of research groups in giving social use to existing knowledge about mining, well being and sustainable development.
- To promote and facilitate communication among diverse stakeholders involved in mining through the development of networks of suppliers and users of relevant knowledge and information, in order that they can identify and implement more sustainable policies and practices.
- To promote more inclusive and equitable decision-making processes, by strengthening the capacities of the more vulnerable stakeholders and by increasing their access to information and to capacity building opportunities for the co-management of mining impacts.

### **Annex J: List of MPRI Projects 1998-2003 by Thematic Area**

#### Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue and Engagement

- Internship: Database on Indigenous Peoples, 1999

- A Workshop to identify the research needs of local communities affected by mining (Canada), 2000
- Regional Coordination of Mining, Minerals and Sustainable Development Project in South America
- Multi-stakeholder process for co-management of mining impacts in Peru, 2001 (ongoing)

#### Partnerships for Local Development

- Compilation of a Bibliography of Private Sector Development Institutions (UK), 1999
- Study of Private Sector Development Institutions (UK), 2000
- Community Development Activities by Mining and other Natural Resource Companies in Latin America and the Caribbean (ongoing)

#### Mine Closure and Reclamation

- Internship: Regulation of the Post-operational Phase of Mining Projects and Planning for Closure in Mining Countries in Latin America (Uruguay), 1999
- Policy Proposal for Legislation on Mine Closure in Chile, 2000
- Regional Agreement for a Memorandum of Understanding on Principles for Mine Closure Regulation in Several Countries in the Latin American Region (Chile), 2000
- Mine-closure and Reclamation Bibliographic Database Project (Canada), 2000

#### Impacts and Management Tools

- “Arsenic contamination in Northern Chile and its Impact on Ecosystems and Human Health”, chapter in IDRC book “Mining and Health in Latin America” (Chile), 2000 / with EcoHealth
- Combining Economic and Engineering Data for a Better Understanding of Environmental Impacts from Mining (Chile), 2000 / with TEC
- Improving Public Participation in Environmental Impact Assessment in Mining in the Americas (Peru), 2000 / with Minga

#### Artisanal and Small-Scale Mining (ASM)

- ASM Network, 2002 (ongoing)
- Organization and Institutions of Artisanal and Small Scale Miners, 2003 (ongoing)
- Systematization of Experiences in Formalization of Artisanal and Small-Scale Mining in LAC, 2003 (ongoing)

#### Mining and Indigenous Peoples

- Consultation of Indigenous Peoples of Panama on Reforms of the Mining Code (ongoing)

### **Annex K: Projects Brought in to IDRC from MPRI**

The following projects have come into IDRC through the MPRI pipeline.

- EcoHealth (Cdn\$803,219): “Manganese Exposure in General Population Resident in a Mining District, Mexico” by Instituto de Salud, Ambiente y Trabajo. ECOHEALTH’s contribution was Cdn\$350,000, while CIDA and

Consejo Estatal de Ecología del Estado de Hidalgo contributed Cdn\$50,326 and Cdn\$402,893, respectively.

- Minga (Cdn\$250,663): “Exploring Indigenous Perspectives on Consultation and Engagement within the Mining Sector of Latin America and the Caribbean” by the North-South Institute.
- TEC (Cdn\$240,600): “The Environment and the Net Benefits of Trade: The Case of Mining” by CIPMA.
- TEC (Cdn\$214,320): “A Natural Resource Cluster Development Strategy: The Case of Mining” by ECLAC.
- Minga (310,000 CAD) "Sustainable Dialogue: Managing Mining Conflicts in Bolivia, conducted by CECl (Centre Canadien d'Etudes et de Coopération Internationale, Montreal, Canada).

## **Annex L: Documents Consulted**

### **1. General Bibliography**

Earl, Sarah, Fred Carden, and Terry Smutylo. 2001. *Outcome Mapping*. Ottawa, IDRC.

EIR Secretariat. 2003. *Extractive Industries Review Draft Report*. <http://www.eireview.org>

Loayza, Fernando. 2003. *Strategic Evaluation: Research Influence on Policy*. Ottawa, IDRC.

Macdonald, Ingrid and Brendan Ross. 2002. *Mining Ombudsman Annual Report 2001-2002*. Victoria, Australia, Oxfam Community Aid Abroad.

McMahon, Gary and Felix Remy (eds.). 2001. *Large Mines and the Community: Socioeconomic and Environmental Effects in Latin America, Canada, and Spain*. Ottawa and Washington, IDRC and World Bank.

MMSD. 2002. *Breaking New Ground. Mining, Minerals and Sustainable Development. The Report of the MMSD Project*. London, Earthscan.

Neilson, Stephanie. 2001. *IDRC-Supported Research and its Influence on Public Policy*. Ottawa, IDRC.

OLCA. 2003. *El Abuso de la Minería. Conflictos Mineros en las Regiones de Atacama y Coquimbo*. Video CD. Santiago, OLCA.

### **2. MPRI Documents**

#### **2.1 Project Reports**

Aste, Juan, Jose de Echave, and Manuel Glave. 2003. *Procesos Multi-Actores para la Cogestion de Impactos Mineros en Peru. Tercer Informe de Avance*.

CEALP. 2003. *Informe Final Detallado de las Actividades Llevadas a Cabo en los Talleres Realizados con los Pueblos Indígenas sobre las Propuestas de Reformas del*

*Codigo Minero.*

Cochilco. 2000. *Normativa de Cierre de Faenas en Chile. Informe Final de Consultores.*

Czischke, Darinka, Andrés Marín, Claudia Gana, and Diego Carrasco. 2001. *Actividades de Desarrollo Comunitario de Empresas Mineras y Extracción de Recursos Naturales en America Latina y el Caribe—Informe Nacional Chileno.*

Damonte, Gerardo, Camilo Leon, and Boris Dávila. 2001. *Actividades de Desarrollo Comunitario de Empresas Mineras y Extracción de Recursos Naturales en America Latina y el Caribe—Informe Nacional Peruano.*

Equipo MMSD America del Sur. 2002. *Minería, Minerales y Desarrollo Sustentable en América del Sur.* Ottawa, London, & Geneva, IDRC, IIED, & WBCSD.

Leon, Camilo. 2001. *Políticas de Desarrollo Comunitario de Empresas Mineras y de Extracción de Recursos Naturales en America Latina y el Caribe—Terminos de Referencia Sobre Aspectos Politicos y de Gobernabilidad.*

Loayza, Fernando. 2003. *Evaluación Socioeconómico Preliminar—Chima.*

Miningwatch Canada. 2000. *On the Ground Research: Results from a Workshop to Identify the Research Needs of Local Communities Affected by Mining.*

Pulgar-Vidal, Manuel and Adriana Aurazo (eds.). 2003. *Mejorando la Participación Ciudadana en el Proceso de Evaluación de Impacto Ambiental en Minería.* Ottawa, IDRC.

Vargas, Andrea, Hernando Escobar and Ivo Santiago Beracasa. 2001. *Actividades de Desarrollo Comunitario de Empresas Mineras y Extracción de Recursos Naturales en America Latina y el Caribe—Informe Nacional Colombiano.*

## **2.2 Other Project Documents**

Gibson, Ginger. 2002. "Transformando el futuro: Aplicando las lecciones aprendidas de los procesos multi-actores canadienses a la situación actual en el Perú" Consultant's Report.

MMSD-SA Team. 2001. *Noticias MMSD—America del Sur.* Bulletins 1, 2, and 3.

MPRI. 2003. Ideas Preliminares: programa para el desarrollo sustentable de localidades mineras en Bolivia.

MPRI, UNESCO and Ekamolle. 2002. Informe: Taller de Trabajo Sobre Minería de Pequeña Escala, Lima April 4-5, 2002.

Project Proposals for:

- Consultation of Indigenous Peoples of Panama Regarding Mining Code Reform
- Organization and Institutions of Small-Scale Miners
- Legislative Proposal on Mine Closure in Chile
- Multi-stakeholder Process for Co-management of Mining Impacts in Peru

- Promoting Sustainable Mining in the Americas: A Research Initiative to Improve Public Participation in the EIA Process

Terms of Reference and Memorandum of Understanding for MMSD Project.

Terms of Reference for researchers regarding “Community Development Activities” project.

Unsigned. 2002. “Comentarios al documento sintesis de los estudios ‘Actividades de desarrollo comunitario de empresas mineras y extraccion de recursos naturales en America Latina y el Caribe’” Consultant’s Report.

## **2.4 Program Documents**

MPRI. 2003. List of Public Presentations made by MPRI staff.

MPRI. 2001. Letter to Advisory Group dated Nov 25, 2001.

MPRI. 2001. Letter to Advisory Group dated June 15, 2001.

MPRI. 2001. Letter to Advisory Group dated Apr 6, 2001.

MPRI. 2001. Letter to Advisory Group dated Feb 9, 2001.

MPRI. 2000. “Process for Approval of Research Projects”

MPRI. 2000. “MPRI Process for Evaluating Research: Options” Draft Discussion Note. Feb. 29, 2000.

MPRI. 1999. *Annual Report*.

MPRI. 1999. “MPRI Research Programme. Research Areas Identified by the Advisory Group”

MPRI Project Approval Documents:

- Project Approval Document, February 1998.
- First Request for Supplement and Extension. December 2000.
- Second Request for Supplement. 2001.
- Third Request for Supplement and Extension. October 2002

Real Lavergne, Trip Report, Montevideo, Santiago, Lima for April 7-23, 1999.

Real Lavergne, Trip Report, Lima for June 22-July 15, 1998.

## **2.5 Websites**

MMSD-South America. 2003. Website. <http://www.mmsd-la.org/>

MPRI. 2003. Website. <http://www.iipm-mpri.org/>