

## Criteria and questions for reviewers

The list below provides a series of typical questions that reviewers use to assess the submitted EIA.

*Source:* United Nations University (UNU), UNEP, & RMIT. (2007). Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) – Open educational resource. Retrieved from <http://sustainability-research.mcgill.ca/documents/EIA%20readings/eia-local/page173.htm>

### 1. Formal and administrative aspects

- 1.1. Does it comply with the format specified in the regulations or specific guidelines?
- 1.2. Does it comply with basic requirements established in laws, regulations, or guidelines with regard to extension, index, etc.?
- 1.3. Are the classical components of an environmental impact study included?
- 1.4. Is the language simple, direct, and easy to understand?
- 1.5. Does it include an executive summary?
- 1.6. Are the public involved or affected by the project identified?
- 1.7. Are the working teams and those responsible for the study identified?
- 1.8. Are the modifications made to the document during the formal review easily identified?
- 1.9. Is the document easy for the public to read?
- 1.10. Are sources of information and bibliographical references specified?  
Global Qualification:  
Complete \_\_\_\_\_  
Incomplete \_\_\_\_\_  
Deficient \_\_\_\_\_

### 2. Technical and content aspects

- 2.1. Are project objectives clearly described?
- 2.2. Is the project clearly justified?
- 2.3. Are possible project alternatives analyzed and described?
- 2.4. Are there enough background data to describe the project and its characteristics, including economic and social aspects during the different stages of design, construction, operation, and abandonment?
- 2.5. Is the legislation governing the project clearly identified, as well as the framework for decisions?
- 2.6. Are the duration of the project's construction, operation, and abandonment stages, and its connections with other activities or projects indicated?
- 2.7. Are the project's relationships with the population's activities described and its implications for such activities, including the indication of individuals who will be displaced?
- 2.8. Are the project location and its connections properly described and presented?
- 2.9. Are legal restrictions regarding the project's location indicated, such as development plans, protected areas, national monument areas, etc.?
- 2.10. Are the reasons for, and scope of, the environmental impact study clearly justified?  
Global Qualification:  
Complete \_\_\_\_\_  
Incomplete \_\_\_\_\_  
Deficient \_\_\_\_\_



- 2.11. Is the affected area or area of influence of the project beyond the location area clearly identified?
  - 2.12. Are the project's effects on the environment included, as well as the most significant changes that it will cause?
  - 2.13. Is there a detailed description of relevant environmental components of the site selected for project location and its surroundings, including maps?
  - 2.14. Are environmental elements directly and indirectly associated with the project identified and adequately covered in the baseline?
  - 2.15. Have inventories and surveys descriptive of the current situation (baseline) of the environment that will be affected been consulted (or prepared if none currently exist)?
  - 2.16. Is the physical environment described adequately?
  - 2.17. Is the biological environment described adequately (flora, fauna, ecosystem)?
  - 2.18. Is the human environment, including cultural aspects and habits, described adequately?
  - 2.19. Is the landscape described adequately?
  - 2.20. Is environmental quality (pollution) described adequately?
  - 2.21. Is the environmental value of the affected area described adequately?
  - 2.22. Are methodologies for the baseline described adequately? Are they applied correctly?
  - 2.23. Have the significant project impacts on the environment been indicated and described, and established from the baseline (pre-project situation)?
  - 2.24. Does it clearly indicate whether impacts are positive or negative; cumulative; of short, medium, or long term; permanent or temporary; direct or indirect; etc.?
  - 2.25. Does it explain how impacts and methodologies were identified?
  - 2.26. Are significant project impacts adequately ranked and appraised and are methodologies described correctly?
  - 2.27. Are impact characteristics and patterns adequately described?
  - 2.28. Are prediction methods described and are they appropriate for the expected environmental disturbances?
- 
- 3.1. Does the document present a well-structured environmental management plan with a description of the proposed measures?
  - 3.2. Does the document include a program of applicable and sufficiently detailed mitigating measures?  
Global Qualification:  
Complete \_\_\_\_\_  
Incomplete \_\_\_\_\_  
Deficient \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3.3. Are mitigation actions and management measures justified?
  - 3.4. Is there an adequate, sufficiently detailed risk-prevention and contingency program in case of accidents?
  - 3.5. Have alternatives been considered for the installation of the project? Have the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative been discussed in terms of unexpected impacts? Have the reasons for the final choice been specified?
  - 3.6. Have pertinent actions for processes, design, technology, and operation been considered in terms of their environmental effects, and have the reasons for the final decision been specified?
  - 3.7. Have adverse impacts been taken into account in defining mitigating, risk-prevention, contingency and compensatory measures and is any evidence offered that such measures will be effective?
  - 3.8. Has significant impact prevention been addressed adequately?
  - 3.9. Are environmental improvements with the project's EIA clearly identified?
  - 3.10. Are control measures considered for impacts, as well as a schedule for their application?
  - 3.11. Is a budget included for mitigating and compensatory measures?



- 3.12. Is there a commitment on the part of the project coordinator to carry out the indicated control measures, and are detailed implementation plans included?
- 3.13. Is a follow-up program proposed for major impacts during the construction, operation, and abandonment?
- 3.14. Is there a budget to finance the follow-up program?
- 3.15. Is there a participation plan which explains how the public have been involved in the project?
- 3.16. Has there been sufficient public consultation, and is there evidence of the public's participation in the environmental impact study

**Source: EIA Online Learning Platform - <http://www.iisd.org/learning/eia>**