



**Report of IFC and EBRD
MULTI-STAKEHOLDER FORUM (MSF) MEETINGS**

on the

**Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan Oil Pipeline, ACG Phase 1, Shah Deniz and
South Caucasus Pipeline Projects**

**Azerbaijan, Georgia and Turkey
August and September 2003**

**Prepared by CDR Associates
(on behalf of IFC and EBRD)**



Note: This report was prepared by CDR Associates (www.mediate.org) on behalf of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) and International Finance Corporation (IFC) of the World Bank Group.

European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)

The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) was set up in 1991 to aid the transition from centrally planned to market economies in central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States. The EBRD is owned by 62 shareholders – 60 countries, the European Investment Bank and the European Community – and operates with €20 billion in capital. The Bank is committed to apply the principles of multiparty democracy, pluralism and market economics. Further details are found on www.ebrd.com.

International Finance Corporation (IFC)

Founded in 1956, the IFC is the private sector investment arm of the World Bank Group. IFC's mission is to promote sustainable private sector investment in developing countries, helping to reduce poverty and improve people's lives. IFC finances private sector investments in the developing world, mobilizes capital in the international financial markets, helps clients improve social and environmental sustainability, and provides technical assistance and advice to governments and businesses. Further details are found on www.ifc.org.

IFC Corporate Citizenship Facility (CCF)

The MSF process was sponsored in part by funding from The Corporate Citizenship Facility (CCF). CCF is available to IFC's direct investment sponsors if they wish to address the "beyond compliance" dimensions of a company's environmental, social, and/or labor performance. CCF is a multi-donor facility that is currently supported by the Dutch and Norwegian governments, as well as the IFC. Further details are available at www.ifc.org/ccf.

**Report of IFC and EBRD
Multi-stakeholder Forum (MSF) Meetings
on the
Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan Oil Pipeline and ACG Phase 1 Projects
Azerbaijan, Georgia and Turkey**

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Planning for the Meetings.....	1
Logistics	4
Structure of this Report	4
Structure of the Meetings	5
TURKEY	7
ERZURUM MEETING	8
ADANA MEETING	14
AZERBAIJAN.....	25
GANJA MEETING	26
BAKU MEETING.....	33
GEORGIA	40
BORJOMI MEETING.....	41
TBILISI MEETING	49
CONCLUSION	57

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	59
APPENDIX B	68
APPENDIX C	70
APPENDIX D	73

**Report of IFC and EBRD
MULTI-STAKEHOLDER FORUM (MSF) MEETINGS
on the
Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan Oil Pipeline and ACG Phase 1 Projects

Azerbaijan, Georgia, and Turkey
August and September 2003**

Introduction

The International Finance Corporation (IFC), the private sector investment arm of the World Bank Group, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) have been asked to consider financing the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan oil pipeline project and the ACG Phase 1 Oil development project. And the EBRD has been asked to consider financing the Shah Deniz gas fields and South Caucasus Pipeline (SCP) projects. The BTC pipeline will run approximately 1,760 km from the Sangachal terminal near Baku on the coast of the Caspian Sea in Azerbaijan, through Georgia to a terminal at Ceyhan on the Mediterranean coast of Turkey. The SCP will parallel BTC through Azerbaijan and Georgia to the Turkish border, where it will connect to an existing pipeline.

In preparation for going to their respective Boards with recommendations on providing funding for these loans, IFC and EBRD jointly convened six multi-stakeholder meetings or fora (MSFs) — two in each of the three affected countries. This report will describe the overall strategy, design and planning process for the meetings; the logistical arrangements that were made in each country in preparation for the meetings; as well as the dialogue and interaction among the stakeholders (including IFC, EBRD and BTC) at the specific meetings.

Planning for the Meetings

CDR Associates, a non-affiliated third party organization, led the MSF planning process, providing both organization and facilitation services. CDR staff met with the IFC and EBRD in mid-June, 2003 in London to discuss the principles and objectives for the MSF process. There was general agreement among all the parties that these meetings were intended to provide the International Finance Institutions (IFIs) access to local communities affected by the pipeline and to allow verification of opinions of local people. The meetings were designed as an

important part of the 120-day disclosure period, which began on June 16, 2003 with the publication of BTC Co.'s Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA).

At the meetings, the two institutions were committed to (1) listen to stakeholder views and suggestions, and (2) communicate their positions on the potential financing of the four projects to concerned stakeholders. The overall purpose was for both institutions to hear directly from the public and present their respective Boards with complete and accurate information before making final lending decisions.

The two institutions then worked together to develop the principles that would govern the MSF process. This discussion resulted in the following principles:

- It was critical that both IFC and EBRD hear directly from a broad spectrum of stakeholders, including non governmental organizations, private citizens and private businesses, national government and regional/local government representatives, academics, research and environmental organizations, donor agencies, and others—especially those who could speak from personal experience regarding the projects.
- There would be two meetings per country.
- The meetings would be designed and conducted to maximize the potential for interaction between the lending institutions and participating stakeholders.
- These meetings should complement and support, rather than duplicate, the comprehensive consultation and community outreach work already carried out by the project sponsors (BTC Co.) as part of the consultation requirements of IFC and EBRD.
- BTC Co. staff would be asked for their input as the meetings were designed and would provide additional support on technical matters during the course of the meetings.
- These meetings would be hosted, designed, and organized by IFC and EBRD (with the assistance of CDR Associates, independent contractors).

In order to gather as much information as possible to inform the design of the meetings, IFC and EBRD agreed that CDR consultants would collect information, both first-hand and existing from several sources prior to the meetings. Based on the input received from members of civil society, CDR would design the proposed meeting agenda to ensure that the meetings would address the recurring themes and crucial issues for participants in each country.

CDR local contractors conducted background interviews and talked to about 400 people in each country—at two locations along the pipeline in each country. The areas where the surveys were conducted were selected based on information

provided by BTC Co., at communities that were within 1 to 2 kilometers of the pipeline, including some locations where construction had already begun.

It was agreed that community members to be interviewed would be selected randomly, that anonymity would be respected, and that no leading questions would be asked. The primary goal would be to look for recurring themes or issues regarding the pipeline. (There was no intent or attempt to analyze the results of these discussions for their statistical relevance.) All those interviewed were asked if they would be interested in attending a public meeting if they were invited. Approximately twenty of those who expressed an interest in participating were specifically invited to each public meeting.

A second source of information for the CDR team was visits to each country approximately one month prior to the meetings. The team, which included local staff in each country, interviewed local public officials and local and national NGOs to determine their major concerns and to inform them about the MSF process. They visited survey locations along the pipeline; met with local representatives of the BTC Co.-operated projects; and finalized logistical arrangements for the meetings. The process of information gathering included interaction with various international NGOs over a period of three to four months.

At these meetings, the venue and process for the MSF meetings were discussed, as well as the most effective process for public outreach. National and local government officials were contacted and were invited to the MSF meetings. In all three countries there were press releases (in local languages) both six weeks and three weeks prior to the meetings and announcements sent to local newspapers and local radio. Many local officials offered to notify people of the MSF meetings. CDR contractors telephoned and met with NGOs, members of civil society, local businesses and industry, universities, and other interested parties throughout the period prior to the meetings. Groups were asked to cooperate by sending only one or two representatives each in order to allow all interested groups to attend.

A serious effort was made through these targeted interviews and other outreach efforts to assemble a balanced group of participants, including local community members, local officials, local and national NGOs and other members of civil society. A smaller number of international NGOs were also expected.

IFC and EBRD were represented at the MSF meetings by management, staff from investment and banking departments, senior environmental and social specialists, legal counsel, civil society coordinators, and country representatives from each institution and the World Bank.

Logistics

Since all meetings were open to the public, venues were selected which would accommodate those who had been invited as well as those who had not been contacted personally but simply had heard of the meetings through word of mouth or the media. Translators were selected who spoke local languages and who, in most cases, were familiar with pipeline issues. In each country a rapporteur was selected to record basic themes and issues discussed in the meetings. These notes would eventually form the basis of the final MSF report. There was also a team of logistics coordinators for each country.

Local facilitators were also selected, based on their experience with facilitation and managing meetings as well as their knowledge of the oil sector. In most cases there were two local facilitators and two facilitators from CDR who shared the management of the meetings and provided support to participants who needed assistance in formulating their questions. The facilitators and translators also collected and translated written comments or questions from audience members who preferred not to speak in front of the group or where there was insufficient time to answer all detailed questions. (Note: Written comments to questions that were asked in Georgia but not answered in the meetings are included here in Appendix A of this report.)

The meeting locations and dates were:

Erzurum, Turkey	August 26 th
Adana, Turkey	August 28 th
Ganja, Azerbaijan	September 1 st
Baku, Azerbaijan	September 4 th
Borjomi, Georgia	September 8 th
Tbilisi, Georgia	September 11 th

Structure of this Report

Each country is discussed in a separate section. However, because each MSF meeting had its own individual character, each of the six meetings is described individually. Discussions varied, but there were consistent areas of interest:

- Land acquisition and compensation issues
- Employment comments and concerns
- Environmental and technical issues
- Community investment and Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) development
- Economic, financial and political issues

Because these were recurring themes in all six meetings, there is some repetition in the report. Questions and answers are not always reported in the order of their occurrence but are frequently grouped, as described above. The summaries of the meetings are primarily based on the rapporteurs' notes.

Generally, the report does not list the names of those asking questions, making statements or responding to questions, but may list the speaker's affiliation, if any.

"Participants' levels of satisfaction," included at the end of each meeting description, provides a summary of participants' written responses to an evaluation form distributed at each meeting.

Structure of the Meetings

Each meeting had a similar format. (Appendix B contains a sample agenda.) In some meetings, a local or national official welcomed the audience and made an official statement. A representative of IFC or EBRD, the MSF convenors, then gave a brief welcoming statement. The press, with video cameras, was invited to film this portion of the meetings. After the welcoming statements, press representatives were invited to remain at the meeting, but without cameras, to assure that participants would not feel intimidated and could freely and openly express their views.

Next the facilitators described the agenda and time structure (generally meetings began at 9:30 and ended at 17:30), the Meeting Guidelines (see Appendix C), and presented a summary of the surveys or interviews which had been conducted by the CDR team in designing the meetings.

IFC and EBRD representatives then presented the meeting objectives and gave a brief overview of the Phase 1 and BTC Co. projects, from the extraction of the oil in the Caspian Sea to shipping from the Ceyhan Terminal in the Mediterranean. They explained that this meeting was an important part of the 120-day public disclosure period and represented an opportunity for the lenders to hear directly from those who might be affected by the pipeline, as well as to provide answers to participants' questions wherever possible. The audience was also informed that the public disclosure period was open until October 14 for EBRD and until October 9 for IFC, and that comments can still be submitted, even after the MSFs have been completed.

The remainder of each meeting (approximately five and a half hours) was devoted to comments, questions, and discussion. As mentioned above, written questions, which, due to time constraints, were not answered at the meetings, are listed and answered at the end of this report. (This occurred only in Georgia—all questions were addressed in both Azerbaijan and Turkey.)

All participants were invited to register, providing their names and contact information, in order to receive copies of this report. (See Participant List in Appendix D.)

Distribution of this report

The convenors informed participants that CDR Associates would prepare a summary report of all six MSF meetings. This report would then be translated into local languages and distributed proactively to MSF participants who provided their contact information, as well as to the public via IFC and EBRD websites and various NGO networks.

**Report of IFC and EBRD
Multi-stakeholder Forum (MSF) Meetings**

TURKEY

TURKEY

Although the meetings in Turkey had fewer participants than those in Azerbaijan and Georgia, there was active participation and a good deal of interest in the pipeline project. The audience at each meeting consisted of community leaders, private citizens, local organizations and local government representatives. In both meetings local officials made welcoming speeches. (The officials then left the meetings, to ensure that there was no potential constraint on open, frank discussion of difficult issues.) At the Turkey MSF meetings, IFC and EBRD were represented by seven and two staff respectively.

ERZURUM MEETING

August 26, 2003

Among the approximately 45 people who attended the Erzurum gathering, were representatives from academia, the business community, farmer associations, village heads (*Muhtars*), and landowners from four villages. Some local officials were also in attendance, along with students, teachers, engineers and other community members. (Please refer to Appendix D for the full list of participants.)

After a welcome from the Vice Governor of Erzurum province (Mr. Gülihsan Yiğit), the IFC representative introduced the two institutions and the BTC project, as well as the goals for the meeting. The IFC representative explained that both IFC and EBRD invest in the private sector, with the ultimate goal of improving people's lives and reducing poverty. He committed the two institutions to listening carefully and to following up on the concerns raised in the meeting. Further, the IFC spokesperson stated his conviction that the project is important for all three countries, as it is expected to promote regional integration and improve relations among them, to generate employment (primarily during the construction period) and to introduce international best practices. He assured the audience that all those involved are committed to doing their utmost to expand the overall benefits to the countries involved.

The EBRD representative explained that Turkey is a shareholder of EBRD but not a country of its operation and, therefore, EBRD does not provide loans to projects in Turkey. However, members of the EBRD team have been involved in discussions and analysis of the pipeline route through Turkey.

The CDR local partner then introduced the meeting guidelines in Turkish and asked participants for their input and cooperation with those guidelines. The meeting then continued with the question and answer session as described above.

Although participants shared thoughts and questions regarding the pipeline's impact on the environment (particularly pipeline security in case of an earthquake), the major focus of this meeting was on community issues. For example, landowners were interested in the standards and policies regarding compensation for land. Others were interested in community investment and the larger economic impact of this project on Turkish villages, towns and cities along the pipeline route.

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

Land acquisition and compensation issues

A representative of the Farmers' Association explained that most of the farmers owe money to banks and/or Agricultural-Credit-Cooperatives and are under stress because of these debts. He added that farmers received credit from banks and/or agricultural credit cooperatives against the value of all of their land. When partial acquisition of the land is required (such as that for the pipeline), the farmers understood that the compensation for the use of the land would not be paid directly to them but rather to the local bank, against the mortgage. They did not agree with this process. On the issue of payment for partial acquisition and use of mortgaged lands, they suggested that a special meeting between the local land team, BTC Co. and the affected farmers should be arranged to help them better understand and resolve these problems.

An IFC representative responded that land acquisition procedures are found in both the Guides to Land Acquisition and Compensation (GLACs) and the Resettlement Action Plan (RAP). Copies of the GLACs were made available outside the MSF venue for interested parties. IFC suggested that the landowner representatives speak directly with BTC Co. and BOTAS/ Designated State Authority (DSA) Land Team representatives to ensure their concerns were being addressed.

Note: A separate meeting was held during the break with the Farmers' Association representative and other landowners with similar concerns. BTC Co. and DSA Land teams clarified the process: All payments for compensation for loss of agricultural production (crops, orchards, pastures, etc.) are paid to the land users in cash and are not subject to any claim by the banks (thus income and livelihoods are not affected). However, in terms of Turkish law, all land payments are paid to the local agricultural bank in the name of project affected landowners. If the landowners have debts to those banks (generally credits for

agricultural activities, as stated above) and if their lands are mortgaged, the banks will take the control of the compensation money and decrease the amount of the debt. However, if the landowner had initially agreed on a payment schedule with the bank before compensation payment was made, the bank does not take the money.)

A participant asked how compensation for “customary owned lands” was going to be paid. Also, compensation for pasture lands was not paid in the previous natural gas pipeline project (East Anatolia Gas Pipeline). Participants wondered how this would be handled in the BTC project? Would there be compensation for losses caused by the previous natural gas pipeline?

In response to the first question, the value of customary lands that have been used for 20 years are fully compensated to the land users in line with the Turkish Expropriation law. However, this is not a straightforward compensation but requires court decisions on customary lands and their value, followed by a 30-day publication period of the decision to determine if there are objections. This whole process is facilitated and paid for by the BTC project. Customary land held for less than twenty years is not compensated, though the value of any crops or pasture on the land is compensated regardless of land tenure.

Although the law does not provide for compensation for land held under customary ownership for less than 20 years, in practice, ownership is determined by local experts assigned by the court from the project affected settlements. These experts (often village leaders or elder committee members) have commonly held that lands have been used more than 20 years when there has been doubt about the current user’s length of time on the land.

IFC also noted that, according to Turkish law, pasturelands are the property of the national treasury even though villagers use them. In the previous natural gas pipeline project, neither pastures nor crops were compensated due to current Turkish legislation. However, in the BTC project, crops are being compensated to land users based on valuations made by the Atatürk University Faculty of Agriculture and others.

Finally, IFC explained that, as part of the Resettlement Action Plan (RAP), BTC Co. has established a separate RAP Fund to provide compensation where informal land users are not covered by Turkish legislation. This RAP Fund is also being used, among other things, to compensate informal users of pasture land or other state land such as Treasury, forest etc. This ensures compliance with IFC and World Bank standards. Information related to the RAP Fund is found in the Resettlement Action Plan document.

Regarding to the question about responsibility for the previous gas pipeline, IFC said that the BTC project has no relationship to the previous East Anatolia Gas

Pipeline project. Compensation would only be paid for impacts of the BTC pipeline according to the RAP, which incorporates IFC/World Bank standards.

Employment comments and concerns

A community member commented that the employment potential of the project is not clear to the public and they would like more explanation. In response, an IFC representative explained that during the construction stage, some employment is to be generated, but that this employment is limited. IFC explained that they were aware that there were high expectations for employment in the villages.

In Turkey, around 1,500 unskilled people will be hired during the construction phase. Some skilled and semi-skilled workers will be hired as well. During the operations phase, the employment requirement will decrease and will be localized (in Turkey mainly at the Ceyhan Terminal, pump stations and a pressure reduction station). There will also be other employment opportunities, such as logistical services. Another commitment of the project is to develop programs for the support of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) that will specifically assist in generating employment in the regions affected by the pipeline. The BTC Co. representative added that while 10,000 skilled and unskilled jobs over the entire pipeline project will be created during construction, after construction the jobs will be greatly reduced and would be mainly at the Sangachal and Ceyhan terminals and the four pump stations.

Environmental and technical issues

A local participant noted that in the previous natural gas pipeline project many farmers had lost fertile topsoil due to poor reinstatement. They expressed concerns and asked questions regarding reinstatement of topsoil, which presents significant problems for farmers, and if not done well results in significant losses in crop and pasture production potential. Their understanding was that no written commitment had been given by BOTAŞ on the topsoil reinstatement issue.

The Lender representative replied that this is a significant issue that the two institutions take seriously, as it affects landowners' livelihoods. It was explained that in the BTC project, there is a requirement for adequate reinstatement of topsoil as part of the loan requirements that were negotiated between the lending institutions and BTC Co. (The written agreements to reinstate topsoil are contained in the Reinstatement Plan found in the EIA disclosure documents.) These agreements state that topsoil is to be stock piled and preserved at the beginning of construction, protected from erosion, and then reinstated after installation of the pipeline. This is among the contractual requirements of the construction contractors. The Lenders, including IFC and EBRD, will monitor this requirement every three months. Even though there is no separate written

commitment from BOTAŞ for proper reinstatement of topsoil, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) addresses the issue and specifies it as a contractual agreement. (Note: For legal reasons in Turkey, this document is referred to as an EIA, and not an ESIA, although it contains the social assessment data.)

Regarding the reinstatement problems with the previous natural gas pipeline, in the course of reinstating land for the BTC pipeline, BTC Co. will make every effort to ensure that BOTAŞ reinstate the area occupied for the East Anatolia Gas Pipeline where the two pipelines closely parallel each other.

A question was asked involving seismic activity. Participants appreciated that environmental and social issues were being considered in this project. They wondered what kinds of safety measures were being considered in case of an earthquake.

A Lender representative acknowledged that the pipeline would indeed be constructed in certain seismically active areas. He added that thorough investigations have been conducted and all faults in the area have been identified and assessed in terms of their potential impact on the project. Significant effort has been directed at identifying active faults and determining likely events associated with these structures. This information has been used in the design of the pipeline and facilities, such that the project will withstand not only the ground accelerations associated with an earthquake, but also potential ground displacement.

Economic, financial and political issues

A representative of the business community commented that 50 million tons of crude oil, costing USD \$6 billion would flow through the pipeline to the international markets. He believed that it would be preferable to turn the crude oil into higher added-value products before it leaves Turkey. He also hoped that new projects could be developed to encourage regional development and employment. Those might include larger scale refineries, fertilizer plants and other petrochemical industry projects. How would the lenders respond to this, he asked?

IFC answered that actual use of the crude oil is the decision of the investors, not the lenders, IFC and EBRD. With regard to further project proposals in the Erzurum area, IFC welcomes any feasible proposals in this regard. (See SME discussion, below.)

Community investment & SME development

A business community participant emphasized that BTC will contribute a great deal to the region and to Turkey. This is the second largest project in Turkey. Erzurum is one of the project focal points and will be an important passage for

energy transport. Capital is scarce and “brain drain” to the west is a big problem. The BTC project is expected to help overcome some of these macro-problems. Overall, he believes this to be a very helpful project that will bring important resources to Turkey.

IFC agreed that the BTC project would potentially have a catalytic effect on regional development. Further, IFC recognizes that SME support is needed to help spur further economic growth in the pipeline area. IFC noted that they have recently assigned a SME expert based in Baku to work closely with BTC in Turkey. Within the scope of this IFC-led SME support program, cooperation is being set up with selected local business and trade associations to improve their capacity to help their members to generate strong local SMEs. Second, relations between IFC and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) have been established to generate funds for energy efficiency and use of alternative energy sources. Concrete project proposals from associations, as well as individuals, are welcomed. Third, micro-finance models are currently under investigation. IFC plans to work with local institutions, non-governmental organizations and local banks in providing micro-finance opportunities. Unfortunately, IFC noted that there are currently some legislative constraints with regard to micro-lending and close coordination with the Turkish government to find solutions is continuing.

It was also noted that BTC Co. is committed to providing additional benefits through its Community Investment Programme (CIP) amounting to USD \$9 million in Turkey. BTC Co. recognizes that there are special problems in the northeastern part of Turkey and USD \$3.2 million has already been allocated in the first tranche, to focus on CIP activities for that area.

Participant level of satisfaction

Evaluations indicated general satisfaction with the way the meeting was managed. Most stated that they were able to express their views fully and that the meeting was beneficial. However, one person made the comment that there are traditional attitudes that impose constraints on the expression of personal views in public and that that some might feel more relaxed at informal meetings, with private communication, rather than at large hotel venues. One participant felt that more announcements should have been made to publicize the meeting.

ADANA MEETING

August 28, 2003

Included in the 55 registered participants at the Adana MSF were villagers (including village heads or *Muhtars*), the Deputy-Governor of Ceyhan, town mayors, members of a cooperative, villagers from four local villages and members of the press. Local and national NGO representatives included the Association for the Protection of the Environment and Consumers; Adana representative of Mediterranean Environment Platform; Chamber of Turkish Engineers and Architects (TMMOB); Association for Mitigation of Erosion (TEMA), Adana Branch; Foundation for Saving Wild Life (DHKV); the local affiliate of WWF; and the Turkey branch of Amnesty International). In addition, several Ministers sent telegraphic welcoming messages. (Please refer to Appendix D for the full list of participants.)

After an opening speech by the Deputy-Governor of Adana Province (Mr. Nevzat Ergin), both IFC and EBRD welcomed the audience and introduced their institutions. The IFC representative also provided a short introduction of the project, emphasizing that the project is important for all three countries and is consistent with IFC's goal of reducing poverty and improving people's lives. He added that the two institutions took environmental, social, economic concerns into consideration and organized these meetings to have an opportunity to hear directly from those affected by the pipeline.

Several members of the press, as well as TMMOB representatives, complained that while they appreciated the meeting guidelines that welcomed members of the press, the request that video cameras be used only during breaks seemed unfair to them. After the morning break, only members of the written press returned to the meeting.

Unlike the meeting in Erzurum, there was less emphasis on land acquisition and compensation, with somewhat more on employment. The majority of comments focused on environmental and economic issues. There were also a number of statements and questions in Adana on the issue of human rights.

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

Land acquisition and compensation issues

A participant noted that there had been a mention of resettlement in initial presentations of the project. He wondered if there would be any physical resettlement during the course of construction of the pipeline. IFC replied that there would be no physical resettlement at any place along the pipeline — in any of the three countries. The Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) was mentioned in

introductory comments, which may have given the impression that physical displacement was being discussed. Actually, the RAP only covers economic displacement, mainly related to acquisition of crop and pasture land. It was stressed again that, although the pipeline passes near 293 villages in Turkey, there has been no need for physical resettlement in Turkey or at any point on the pipeline route. Land acquisition and compensation procedures ensure compliance with IFC/World Bank standards on these issues. As was noted in Erzurum, a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) Fund has been established by BTC Co. to provide for compensation to informal users of state lands, including common land users, tenants without tenancy agreements, and fishermen. The Fund also covers incidental costs incurred through meeting the requirements of the Turkish registration system. Again, this ensures compliance with IFC and World Bank standards.

In addition, the Community Investment Program (CIP), which has a goal of fighting poverty, allows benefits to flow to the wider community in areas through which the pipeline passes. It was noted that a strong emphasis and focus of the CIP would be on the northeastern part of Turkey, where there are the lowest income levels. Within the scope of the CIP, BTC Co. publicized an open 'Request for Proposals' for various organisations to apply for the CIP funds. (Please see discussion of the CIP programs below.)

Employment comments and concerns

Questions were raised regarding the BTC project's employment potential in the Ceyhan area. The fishermen from Ceyhan believed the expansion of the terminal could seriously curtail their livelihood through fishing, and therefore, as compensation, they believe that they should be provided with jobs. IFC indicated that there is a comprehensive framework for compensation of fishermen included in the RAP, in accordance with the requirements of OD 4.30. The fishermen will not be affected until 2005 and consultation over the details of the compensation package is part of an on-going process to be completed well before the fishermen feel the impacts of the project. IFC explained that the development of an appropriate compensation package for fishermen is breaking new ground in Turkey and that it will undoubtedly serve as a model for future development projects that affect fishermen.

A local participant noted that there had been promises of jobs, but no one in Ceyhan has yet been recruited. He spoke of local peoples' concerns when they see people from other countries working and wonder why all workers are not Turkish. It was noted that some people apply to sub-governors for employment. A local official suggested that BOTAŞ and BTC Co. should coordinate with local Governors in the area of recruitment. Also, it was suggested that small-scale community development programs should be developed and be established in

coordination with local administrations, to provide other much-needed employment opportunities.

An IFC representative responded that BTC Co.'s target is to recruit at least 80% national staff. However, some positions require certain skills that may not be readily available locally and these skilled employees will make up the remaining 20%. There is a BTC project commitment to transfer project expertise to BOTAŞ as soon as possible, thus ensuring the hiring of Turkish workers. It was noted that currently, recruitment of 600 people is planned for Ceyhan. Two hundred of these 600 will be from Ceyhan and nearby vicinities. (100 of the 600 are unskilled and would certainly be local.) In fact, it was noted that 100 unskilled people will be employed from four directly affected settlements around Ceyhan Marine terminal and that BTC has already commenced recruitment in those villages. A list of open positions has already been publicized. Further, IFC emphasized that pipeline projects, by their nature, do not create a great many employment opportunities—more in the construction phase than in the operation phase. It is important that local people's expectations are managed carefully on this issue.

There was a question asked about the contracts with local transport cooperatives and why the rates paid by the contractors are below the market rate. BOTAŞ responded by saying that the contracts were not between BOTAŞ and transport providers but between the construction contractors and the transport providers, and that this issue should be discussed with those contractors.

Environmental and technical issues

There were a number of specific concerns related to environmental and technical issues:

A local participant wondered if there are two pipelines within the scope of the project. A Lender representative responded that there are two pipeline projects: one for crude oil (BTC) and another for natural gas (SCP). However, it was noted that the new natural gas pipeline would only come to the Georgian-Turkish border where it will link in with the Turkish gas distribution network via a 'new build' section of pipeline.

A specific question was asked why the construction of the pipeline passing below Kadirli-Osmaniye road, has been stopped for some time and what are the implications of such a delay. A BTC Co. representative responded by saying that the delay in laying the pipeline under Kadirli-Osmaniye road is because of a last-minute design change imposed by recognition of an important ground-water source requiring further survey. This change in the design (to have a deeper horizontal bore) will be completed in four weeks and will not cause a delay in the overall timing of the project.

A local concern was raised regarding road repair, requesting asphalt repair and other refurbishment of the roads used by project vehicles in the Ceyhan area. IFC responded that, according to the Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) and the EIA, the roads used by the project during construction must be maintained in good condition. After the construction phase, all roads are to be returned to at least their original condition, if not better. The EPC contractors' Community Liaison Officers (CLOs) are available to provide information, advice, special requests, complaints and claims. Where dust nuisance is of concern, BTC is taking measures for remediation, as part of the project's environmental and social mitigation. For example, roads near construction must have dust suppression measures and traffic management plans. Telephone numbers of the CLOs were made available to the participants and it was noted that complaints are to be responded to within 7 days. It was noted that IFC and EBRD would be monitoring BTC Co., BOTAŞ and sub-contractors to ensure that they comply with these requirements, if IFC and EBRD do provide loans for the project.

Other environmental or technical issues discussed were as follows:

An NGO participant was concerned that operations based on crude oil create environmental problems, from exploration to production, transportation, processing, and utilization. The BTC project will promote use of crude oil and therefore increase greenhouse gas emissions that cause climate change. Large petroleum companies do not appear to care about this concern. Why does the World Bank promote the use of petroleum?

The EBRD representative responded that the risks involved in production and transportation of crude oil are known and appreciated by the project sponsor, as well as the EBRD and IFC. This issue has been addressed by BTC Co. in the Environmental (and Social) Impact Assessment (EIA) that is available publicly, and mitigation measures have been included in the design, to achieve best practice according to international criteria and to ensure compliance with IFC guidelines. IFC and EBRD are satisfied with the applied technology, guidelines, and procedures. It should be stressed that the pipeline will be built to the highest international standards and that EBRD and IFC will monitor the implementation of such standards. These requirements are included in the Environmental and Social Action Plan (ESAP) that will form a contractual commitment from BTC Co. if EBRD and IFC provide the loans.

Oil spill hazards were on the minds of many participants. One person asked how oil spill and sabotage risks would be eliminated. If there are spills, how will the damage be compensated and by whom?

IFC and EBRD both responded. The BTC pipeline has been designed to minimize oil spill problems to the greatest extent possible. However, there will always be a remote possibility of incidents, such as third-party intervention. To protect the pipeline and avoid spills in environmentally sensitive areas,

preventative measures, such as depth of burial and construction material, are taken. The whole route is equipped with computer-controlled systems to monitor pressure and flow. In case of a leak in the pipeline, the computerized system will notify the operator, shut down the pump stations, and close the automated valves to minimize the amount of oil released. Trained personnel will be mobilized to react to any spill and will be equipped to contain and recover spilled oil. Following these activities, any residual soil contamination would be remedied. Crops affected by any oil spill would be fully compensated by the project.

The region of the BTC project between Adana and K. Maraş is of concern to TEMA, as an NGO dealing with transfer of advanced technologies to and training of farmers, mitigation of loss of pasture and agricultural land, and better use of water resources. The participant pointed out that there are 57 settlements within this area. How much agricultural land and forestry will be affected? How many of the 3,000 endemic plants will be affected within this area? How will the historical heritage be affected? When will the project be implemented?

IFC's representative responded that people should refer to the EIA and RAP for the exact figures on the amount of land that would be affected by the project. Measures to be taken include protection and reinstatement of agricultural soil in the construction area, as well as protection of biodiversity and cultural heritage. With regard to topsoil protection and reinstatement: only a 28m-wide passage is affected except in forested areas where the width of construction is kept at 22m. Within the 28m-wide construction areas, topsoil to a depth of 30cm is to be removed, piled and preserved until the pipeline installation is completed. Then, the topsoil will be reinstated into its original position and measures will be taken to prevent soil erosion.

IFC and EBRD explained further that endemic plants are to be surveyed prior to construction, as discussed in the EIA. Where there are risks to plant life, the construction companies are required to mark the areas to be protected. To proceed, contractors must develop a remedial plan that will be approved by BOTAŞ and reviewed by BTC. Avoidance, translocation or bulb and seed collection are among the processes that will be used to protect biodiversity. Prior to construction, archaeologists will have investigated and cleared (i.e. recovered or documented) all archaeological resources in the sensitive areas. (In Turkey, Gazi University is assigned to this function.) Topography and surface artefacts were identified and classified by significance. If the area is highly significant, the route of the pipeline is changed (which has occurred on five occasions). If the area is moderately significant, then Gazi University takes samples from the site to study and will provide advice on the next steps. The project has developed a Cultural Heritage Management Plan that complies with IFC's standards in this regard.

An NGO, DHKV (an affiliate of WWF), stated that they are reviewing the EIA and will declare their findings by late September 2003. However, the Erzurum Plain is

of much concern to them because of its wetlands and bird sanctuaries. Their concern is that since the oil pipeline passes through the Plain, any spill would be dispersed more widely than in other places on the route, potentially destroying wildlife during the course of remediation (which would also take relatively longer to rehabilitate). This NGO participant asked if it would be possible to change the route in order to eliminate the risk of destroying the Erzurum Plain and the wildlife there.

In response, the EBRD and IFC representative said that serious work has been done and necessary precautions have been taken to minimize environmental and social impacts on the Erzurum Plain. A detailed risk assessment has been done and concluded that the risks are manageable. However, as a general approach, sensitive areas are by-passed if possible. If going through these areas is inevitable, special measures are taken and documented in the EIA. It was noted that bird sanctuaries and wetlands have always been given utmost consideration.

The Chamber of Geophysical Engineers (CGE) noted that there was not enough information provided on the project's interface with the North Anatolian active fault. They would appreciate more information.

The Lenders responded that the recent EIA does include information related to the active fault issue mentioned. IFC noted that the EIA report has been sent to the CGE and is also available at the local Governors' offices. The Lenders indicated that they are satisfied with the design and engineering work dealing with the North Anatolian fault and that independent expert teams will be coming to Turkey for further investigations. A follow-up meeting with CGE can be arranged with BTC Co. if there is interest.

A question was raised about plans in place should there be a forest fire on the route of the pipeline. The response was that the EIA contains numerous mitigation and fire protection measures in Section 6. These include special rules adapted from the UK Forest Commission.

Community Investment and SME Development

Regarding proposals for Community and Environmental Investment Programs (CIPs and EIPs), some NGOs noted that they did not have adequate time to prepare proposals. They asked for earlier notification.

BTC Co., which issued the requests for proposals, responded that they assumed that enough time was given for preparation of CIP and EIP proposals by making the information available on the Internet 10 weeks prior to the deadline. They also sent letters to interested parties proactively. In addition, there were preparation workshops held in Erzurum, Adana, Istanbul and Ankara to provide answers to NGOs' questions.

At this point, an IFC representative made a comment regarding its Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) program, specific to the BTC project. He noted that much has been done to support SMEs in Azerbaijan and that IFC is looking at ways to improve the sector in Georgia and Turkey. One idea is to improve the capacity of the Chamber of Commerce of Adana, along with two other chambers, to provide better services to their members. This will contribute indirectly to greater employment. IFC is also making contacts with local banks, in order to provide better services and financing to SMEs.

Economic, financial and political issues

The chairperson of the Turkish chapter of Amnesty International expressed her general concerns regarding the impact of the pipeline on the human rights of the citizens and asked specific questions regarding security issues.

The first human rights-related concern raised by Amnesty International was that Turkish police and the gendarmerie do not have a good relationship with the public. During the course of installation and operation of the pipeline, what measures will be taken to prevent human rights violations that could be justified for security reasons?

In addition, the representative indicated that Amnesty International is thankful for its concerns being taken into account in the environmental and social plans for the pipeline, but wanted to know if plans are in place for raising the publics' awareness of human rights.

IFC answered that, as a potential lender to BTC, it appreciated the concerns raised in Amnesty International's report entitled "Human Rights on the Line – The Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan Pipeline Project." It was noted that this report was written before Azerbaijan, Georgia and Turkey, together with BTC Co., signed their Joint Statement of May 16, 2003. Under Paragraph 6 of the Joint Statement, related to "Project Security and Human Rights," those parties confirm their mutual commitment to the goal of promoting respect for and compliance with human rights principles. This includes those set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the United Nations Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials, the European Convention on Human Rights and, in a manner consistent with their national laws, the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights (the "International Norms"). Also, the three governments have committed and stated publicly that all pipeline security operations must be conducted in accordance with the "Protocol Related to the Provision of Security for the East West Energy Corridor" (the "Protocol") -- which was signed on July 23, 2003. Under the Protocol, the three governments recognize the need for transparency and agree to share information in all matters relating to the Project security for which they are responsible. They agree to

cooperate in identifying and classifying potential security risks and come up with a common list of potential security risks, share the information they have gathered, cooperate in the mutual training of the members of the security units, establish a joint pipeline security commission; and be in regular consultation with the BTC Pipeline Company and – in Turkey - with BOTAS. Most importantly, they agree to fulfil their obligations in compliance with the principles set forth in the International Norms; to check the background of the individuals to be hired to perform security services to avoid hiring those implicated in human rights abuses; and to pursue credible allegations on human rights abuses. IFC believes that these undertakings have addressed many of the concerns raised by Amnesty International. This response was welcomed and acknowledged verbally by the local Amnesty International representative.

Amnesty International asked about the monitoring of the procedures and the guidelines set by the Lenders on safeguard policies, environmental and social issues, human rights abuses, and safety measures. Who will audit and conduct the monitoring? Will there be in-house monitoring by IFC and EBRD? Is there a role for independent community monitoring by NGOs?

An IFC representative responded that IFC and EBRD have worked with BTC Co. to develop an Environmental and Social Action Plan (ESAP) as well as contractor control plans, which will be part of the investment agreement between IFC, EBRD and BTC Co. These documents can be found on the Internet and also locally in the EIA documentation. In these plans, monitoring is taken very seriously. The Lenders have also contracted an Independent Environmental Consultant that will monitor compliance with IFC and EBRD policies and guidelines as well as BTC Co.'s and contractors' compliance with the EIA, ESAP and the Contractor Control Plans (CCPs). This monitoring will be conducted every three months during construction and their reports will be publicly disclosed. For social and land acquisition monitoring, BTC Co. has appointed a Social and Resettlement Action Plan (SRAP) Expert Panel comprised of three independent international experts on these issues. Their reports will be provided to BTC Co. and the Lenders and will be publicly disclosed. This is in addition to BTC Co.'s ongoing contractual relationship with the NGO Rural and Urban Development Foundation (RUDF), which has been involved with communities as a consultant in social and land acquisition issues from the beginning of the project. There are other monitoring systems, such as universities' monitoring employment and archaeological/cultural heritage information. A comment and feedback mechanism for communities has been developed and is being used by the Project. It was also noted that IFC staff have travelled to all three countries frequently to witness the consultation and resettlement processes. At a higher level, the Caspian Development Advisory Panel (CDAP) looks at BTC Co.'s development role and performance in the broader region. For more information on CDAP's role, go to: www.caspsea.com.

It was noted by a local participant that the USA, the Turkish Republic and BTC Co. support the pipeline project since it will ease the tanker traffic burden on the Black Sea and Turkish Straits. A questioner asked if a similar threat will now be transferred to the Mediterranean Sea.

IFC responded that it lends to a number of Caspian oil projects. As oil-based economies develop, the tanker traffic issue becomes more difficult. However, tanker traffic through the Turkish Straits is so intense now that the BTC project was designed to transport the oil via the Mediterranean Sea because the risk is lower in Mediterranean compared with the Straits. IFC noted that application of international safety guidelines would further reduce the risk of incidence.

A local participant mentioned that Turkey and Azerbaijan would make a profit from the BTC project and asked what benefits the pipeline would bring to Georgia. IFC responded by saying that benefits to Georgia will be substantial. Basically, the amount of benefits will depend on crude oil volume to be transported and the life of the pipeline. Georgia will receive tariffs for transportation of crude oil through the pipeline and will have use of natural gas due to construction of the Southern Caucasus Pipeline (SCP). The transit fee for crude oil will result in sums up to USD \$60million per year— equivalent to 15% of Georgia's current annual governmental revenues. As revenues from the natural gas line are included, the total annual benefit to Georgia could total USD \$600 million.

A local engineer commented that the route of the pipeline was long under discussion and that geophysical engineers seem to be happy with the final route, although some concerns remain. He said that because of the Iraq war, the future of Yumurtalık-Kirkuk pipeline is being discussed now. There are some claims about an alternative route to Yumurtalık-Kirkuk pipeline, that is the Haifa-Kirkuk line. When the pipeline is built, is there any potential risk to change the route for transportation of Caspian oil to the world markets.

IFC responded that the BTC pipeline is to be built for transportation of Azeri crude oil. Currently, there are two more pipelines that are exporting Azeri crude: from Baku to Supsa (the "Western Route") and also via Russia (the "Northern Route"). By 2006, current capacity will not be adequate with these two pipelines only. Therefore, once the BTC pipeline is completed, it will provide the missing capacity. IFC stated that there is no plan to have an alternative to the current BTC route (except for minor changes to avoid, where possible, chance finds of important archaeological sites). However, various alternatives that were considered and rejected are discussed in the EIA documentation.

Questions were asked about the lenders' decision-making process: With this meeting, will public consultation come to an end? How much will these meetings affect the decision making process of IFC and EBRD? Will the two potential lenders make their decisions independently or separately?

Both IFC and EBRD answered these questions. First, IFC noted that, as a procedural issue, the final EIA documentation for IFI participation was released in June of 2003. A period of 120 days is then provided for disclosure and public comment. During this period, potential lenders are looking forward to all possible responses and will respond to written comments and questions. It was noted however that consultation is an ongoing process that commenced with the preparation of the draft EIA and will continue throughout the life of the project. Also EBRD mentioned that the two potential lenders have coordinated very closely during the last two years on all phases of project review and that it would be very unlikely that they would come to different decisions on lending to the project.

Finally, IFC described two stages in achieving the final decision to provide loans to the project. At the first stage, BTC Co. must demonstrate how they will comply with IFC's environmental and social safeguard policies. Over a two and a half year period, numerous environmental and social studies have been performed on the project and these have been disclosed for public consultation. Therefore, IFC feels adequate information is available for environmental and social assessment. According to IFC's and EBRD's internal procedures for this project, there is then 120 days allotted for disclosure and public comment on the EIA documentation. This public commenting assists IFC in its decision making process. After this, the executive directors of both IFC and EBRD will vote on whether to provide loans to the BTC project.

In conclusion, the IFC senior management representative expressed his impression that there is considerable support for the project from the communities. In Adana, the two institutions had heard concerns regarding land acquisition and compensation, employment opportunities, protection of biodiversity, oil spill protection, and human rights issues. The IFC representative stated that both IFC and EBRD believe that BTC has made serious efforts to deal with these concerns. IFC called upon community leadership to assist in conveying realistic expectations of the project, especially regarding potential for employment. The IFC representative also mentioned the ongoing efforts of CIP and SME programs, which are intended to provide positive impacts on both medium and long-term employment problems.

Participant level of satisfaction

Although there was general satisfaction with the management of the meeting, several recommendations were made:

- Better announcements for the meeting could have been made.
- The meeting could have lasted more than one day.
- The goal of the meeting could have been better defined.

- Another site (specifically Ceyhan) would have resulted in more local participation.

**Report of IFC and EBRD
Multi-stakeholder Forum (MSF) Meetings**

AZERBAIJAN

AZERBAIJAN

The number of participants at the two MSF meetings in Azerbaijan was greater than in Turkey and the meetings were more focused. The press participated in one to two hour press briefings before the meetings, as well as interviews during lunch and coffee breaks. There were also more written questions from participants. IFC and EBRD representatives interacted and answered queries informally with the participants over coffee breaks and lunch, to provide more in-depth discussions over specific issues, and to make up for the shortage of time in the larger group sessions. These were interesting and intense meetings that, in Baku, lasted several hours longer than the scheduled ending time. EBRD was represented by 4 staff and IFC by 7 staff at the two Azerbaijan MSF meetings.

GANJA MEETING **September 1, 2003**

Among the over 70 participants were local landowners (primarily from Borsunlu village of the Goranboy District, as well as other districts), representatives of local, national and a few international NGOs; representatives of Azeri scientific institutions; and, local governmental authorities. Specifically there were representatives from the press, the Ganja Agro-business Association, Executive Power of Ganja, the Ganja Education Centre, Regional Ecology and Natural Resources Department, Ganja Business Group, a local university, SOCAR, a youth group and the Helsinki Citizens Assembly. The primary focus of discussions was environmental issues, although many speakers also had community investment and national economic concerns. (Please refer to Appendix D for the full list of participants.)

Emin Abbasov, the representative for Ganja City, made an opening welcome presentation and noted that the pipeline is very important for the economic development of Azerbaijan. An EBRD senior representative then explained the meeting objectives. She also indicated that the EBRD and IFC were in Ganja to hear the opinions and concerns of Azeri society regarding the BTC pipeline and related projects, directly from those affected.

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

Land acquisition and compensation issues

A number of farmers came to the Ganja MSF meeting with concerns that both the oil and gas pipelines were passing through their lands but that they had not received adequate compensation. Further, there was an interest in knowing whether the same principles were being applied to compensation payments in all three countries and if compensation rates were, therefore, the same.

IFC replied that BTC and the Azerbaijani government had agreed on the land acquisition, compensation, and consultation standards of IFC and the World Bank. However, specific individual questions regarding compensation should be taken directly to the BTC land team that was present in the audience. Further, IFC staff clarified that compensation for land use is being paid in both Azerbaijan and Georgia. The only difference is that in Azerbaijan, BTC Co. is leasing the land. In Georgia BTC Co. is buying the land, which may cause some price differentials.

A few participants asked what the compensation amount would be in case of a disaster associated with construction or operation of the pipeline, and who would pay it? They also asked if the compensation amounts take into account wages and prices according to international standards?

An IFC representative responded that BTC Co. was responsible for compensation to cover all mitigation for damages and replacement costs of damaged assets. The clearing up of the damages would be undertaken according to international standards. Compensation amounts, as with the land acquisition process, would be based on local market values.

Employment comments and concerns

At the Ganja MSF meeting, there was concern regarding the potential for project-related employment and level of wages. A representative of the Helsinki Assembly's Legal Commission asked how the salaries and wages of the BTC staff would be regulated? He reported that the salaries of local staff of BTC Co. are low in comparison with international standards and noted that the salaries of expatriate staff are many times higher than the salaries of local citizens. He wanted an explanation for this. Another person asked for the total number of BTC staff in Azerbaijan and in Ganja, specifically.

The response was that salaries in the BTC project are higher for Azeris than the official minimum wage in Azerbaijan. Currently approximately 70% of the overall staff of BTC in Azerbaijan are Azeri nationals, with a goal of having the vast majority of BTC work force made up of Azeri nationals in due course, particularly

during operation of the pipeline. Personnel are divided into skilled, semi-skilled, and non-skilled categories, with the salaries divided into those categories. Expatriate staff are brought in for specific skills that may not be available locally. Also, these expatriate staff frequently have to pay higher taxes and incur double living expenses, which could account for their salaries.

It was noted that as of August 2003, the total staff of BTC in Azerbaijan is 1309, of whom 952 are Azeri nationals and 51 are from Ganja, including skilled and non-skilled people. It was stressed that as the construction nears a specific area, the number of personnel employed from that area will increase, but that construction has not yet reached areas near Ganja. Employment information will be made available in staffed information centers.

Environmental and technical issues

Environmental questions from the audience ranged from the percentage of the total investment of USD \$2.9 billion that would be allocated to environmental capital expenditure, to specific concerns regarding control and protection of the pipeline itself. There were questions regarding to whom to go in case of an accident, what the possible oil leakage amounts could be, and what emergency response systems are in place. Other participants had concerns regarding monitoring.

The EBRD representative responded first by saying that it is not possible to provide a specific dollar amount with regard to how much is being spent on environmental protection and mitigation measures on this project. This is due to the fact that environmental protection and mitigation measures are covered under several different categories and activities, including design, environmental protection, engineering and construction. Although the pipeline is being constructed to the latest and highest international technical standards, there are no requirements regarding the amounts that must be spent (either as a total amount or as a percentage of overall project costs) to reach those standards. EBRD requires compliance with their policies and procedures, regardless of the costs involved.

It was noted that the security of the pipeline is the responsibility of the Azeri government. There will be a variety of methods to ensure that the BTC pipeline is secure, including a similar program to that used in the Baku-Supsa pipeline, where there are twice daily horseback patrols by trained local personnel. In the Baku-Supsa pipeline, there was some damage caused by external parties (“illegal taps”) in Georgia. However, the BTC pipeline will benefit from several additional security measures: mechanisms to monitor the buried pipeline including the use of an “intelligent pig” (a device that moves through the pipeline to measure the thickness of the pipeline wall and any damage to it); a thicker pipe than that in the Baku-Supsa pipeline; cathodic protection and a

computerized system to monitor pipeline flow rates; automated control of pumps and block valves; and a fiber optic cable installed in the trench, which will be used for transmitting data from the pump stations to block valves at the two control centers.

An EBRD representative added that in Azerbaijan there are several environmentally sensitive areas. For example, the pipeline crosses the Kura River at two locations. At each crossing, the thickness of the pipe will be increased and automated block valves will be installed on both sides of the crossings. Extra attention will be given to all environmentally sensitive areas and a full oil spill response plan, detailing equipment, and personnel, will be developed prior to commissioning the pipeline.

It was noted that there are a number of options available for people who would like to contact the project during construction activities: Community members can contact the construction contractor's Community Liaison Officer (CLO) or BTC Co.'s CLO. Currently there are project information centers operating in Sangachal, Yevlakh and Ganja, where people may obtain additional information on safety, employment, etc.

There was a question about the distance between the Southern Caucasus gas Pipeline (SCP) and the BTC oil pipeline. The separation is generally 28 meters. It was further stated that land compensation covers both pipeline projects.

A participant suggested that BTC work more closely with NGOs. The participant asked if BTC had experts on social-and environmental issues and believed that it would be useful to involve NGOs during the monitoring process.

IFC answered by saying that there are several stages of the monitoring process. One stage is the internal monitoring to be conducted by BTC Co.'s environmental and social staff and experts, as well as their own shareholders. The other obligation imposed on BTC Co. by IFC and EBRD is the preparation of quarterly reports on construction and a yearly report on the entire project, which will discuss compliance with IFC and EBRD environmental and social standards. In addition, the Azerbaijani government will monitor the work of BTC Co. NGO monitoring is now being conducted through the local NGO "CLEE," which has been assisting with communities' land compensation concerns. It was also noted that IFC and EBRD have an independent environmental consultant and an independent Social and Resettlement Action Plan (SRAP) expert panel reports on compliance on these issues. The monitoring process will be transparent, with reports made available to the public.

A participant noted that during the construction of the Baku-Supsa pipeline, there were continuing problems with reinstatement of soil. It was asked if there were any sanctions on BTC Co. by the financing organizations.

The response was that IFC and EBRD financed the Baku-Supsa project, that they have carried out monitoring, that the Baku-Supsa pipeline has been in compliance and remains so. In terms of the BTC pipeline, there are strict reinstatement requirements upon BTC Co., agreed with IFC and EBRD. These requirements have been passed on to the construction contractor and will be monitored to ensure compliance.

A question was asked about water produced during the drilling process in the Caspian. The speaker was concerned about the potential damage to flora and fauna if the water is returned to the Caspian Sea. An EBRD representative said that in accordance with Azeri requirements, aquatic bioassay surveys have been completed on the non oil-based drilling fluids and cuttings. The results of these tests indicate that no harmful effects will occur based on discharge of these fluids. It was further stated that there will be no discharge of oil-based drilling fluids from the platform.

Community investment issues and SME Development

There were some questions regarding BTC Co.'s community and environmental investment programs (CIP and EIPs). One question related to the winning of the EIP awards. A BTC Co. representative responded that 24 organizations submitted applications in response to a request for proposals. Following the first stage of review, seven proposals were short-listed and will be subjected to more detailed, second stage review. It is anticipated that the recipients of the grants will be announced by the end of September 2003.

A couple of participants complained that the selection criteria for the CIP proposals were unfair, that this put the local NGOs at a disadvantage, and that criteria could only be met by the international NGOs. For example, before the competition began, there was an announcement that only organizations which had experience of implementing programs with a budget of USD \$1-1.5 million would be considered eligible as lead applicants. It was noted that local NGOs do not have this level of budget and thus would not be able to participate. Can these criteria be changed?

BTC Co. responded that the reason for those criteria was to attract the most experienced organizations to implement community investment projects with the greatest development impact. The BTC speaker noted that they realized that this would be difficult for some local NGOs, but they had a responsibility to find successful organizations that could ensure that these CIPs would have the greatest impact. BTC Co. has asked international NGOs to work in collaboration with the local NGOs. BTC Co. examined the criteria for these partnerships in the various project proposals. Currently four organizations have been awarded grant agreements with a total value of USD \$5.5 million. Three of these organizations have significant local NGO partners as part of their proposals. However the total

amount allocated for the CIP in Azerbaijan was \$8 million, so there is still \$2.5 million to award and consideration will be given to proposals that include local NGOs.

Economic, financial, and political issues

Some questions related to the amounts potentially being loaned by IFC and EBRD and the interest rate of the loans. A participant asked, specifically, what is the amount being loaned to SOCAR, the state oil company, and how much will be loaned to the Government of Azerbaijan?

EBRD answered on behalf of both institutions and noted that they are considering providing loans to BTC Co., not to the government of Azerbaijan. BTC Co. is a private company and 25% of the shares belong to SOCAR. EBRD and IFC are not providing “soft” loans. The details of the potential funding arrangement have not been finalized but are still under discussion. The amount could range from USD \$400 to \$600 million. Since BTC Co. is a private company, lending rates are not publicly available. The maturity period of the loans is twelve years.

A member of the Ganja audience commented that it is clear to him that Azerbaijan is one of the most corrupt countries in the world. He asked what mechanisms would be put in place to assure transparency regarding the use of income generated by this project?

EBRD answered on behalf of both institutions and noted that one way to fight corruption is through transparency, where BTC is taking major steps. Information on the project is published regularly. IFC and EBRD both required that government agreements (e.g., PSA, HGA and IGA) be disclosed and made a matter of public record, which was done in mid-2002. Azerbaijan has joined the extractive industries transparency initiative (EITI) sponsored by the UK government and, as a shareholder in both institutions, is working on this issue.

A newspaper editor raised the fact that the pipeline passes 50km from certain conflict zones and wondered if the project is this worth taking such a high risk. He also suggested that the loans be made subject to a peace accord between Azerbaijan and Armenia.

EBRD answered that the security of the pipeline in Azerbaijan is the responsibility of both BTC Co. and the Azeri government. Again, the same program used in Baku-Supsa will be used (including horseback patrols). Other security responsibilities will be those of the government, which is consulted regularly on this issue.

The EBRD representative continued that everyone is looking for peace, that the Government's dealings with Armenia are a sovereign decision, that the Government was closely involved in the route selection, and that the Government is comfortable (as are the IFIs) with the level of risk near conflict zones.

In ending, the IFC representative thanked participants for their very constructive contributions and emphasized that the lending institutions are encouraged to hear that there is support for the pipeline. He stressed that the lenders have been giving serious attention to job creation and revenue management in the broader context of the pipeline and will continue to do so.

Participant Level of Satisfaction

Of the fifty people who submitted evaluations of this meeting, forty eight felt the meeting was conducted fairly. Most felt they had had an opportunity to express most of their ideas and that the meeting was at least somewhat beneficial to them. Some of the suggestions made were to:

- Have information, including the agenda, distributed prior to the meeting.
- Hold this kind of meeting more frequently.
- Establish information centers along the pipeline route in public accommodations, such as libraries, NGO premises, and schools.
- Involve a broader group of organizations, NGOs, donor/humanitarian organizations, more diversified community, and civil society representatives, teachers of geography and nature studies, and representatives of Executive Power in such meetings.
- Distribute lists of participants and international experts prior to the meeting.

BAKU MEETING

September 4, 2003

Among the nearly 150 participants at the Baku MSF meeting were representatives of local, national and some international NGOs, representatives of the Azerbaijan Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources (MENR), and local landowners and interested community members (many from the Gobustan district). Representatives of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), UNDP, SOCAR, the press, Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences, Azerbaijan Young Lawyers, and The Center for Transport and Energy also attended. (Please refer to Appendix D for the full list of participants.) Because the meeting started late and there was such a large number of participants and lively discussion, the meeting did not adjourn until 19:00.

The Azerbaijan Minister for Ecology and Natural Resources, Mr. Huseygulu Baghirov, welcomed the group and made introductory remarks. He commented on the positive influence of the BTC pipeline and the work the government has done to make this a reality. He said that this meeting's objective is to have discussions among members of civil society and the Lenders, IFC and EBRD. He recognized that the Lenders want to be very sure that this project is designed and constructed as well as it possibly can be. He was encouraged that the local people who most understand the importance of the project were participating in the meeting.

Following the opening welcome by the Minister, the representatives of both IFC and EBRD greeted the participants and thanked them for their interest in attending this meeting. They made the point that the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), which was disclosed to the public in June 2003, would be open for comment for a period of 120 days (until 14 October for EBRD and 8 October for IFC). They expressed the importance of the project for both EBRD and IFC—that the BTC pipeline, ACG Phase I, Shah Deniz and the South Caucasus Pipeline are all about unlocking the oil and gas potential of the Caspian Sea. They believe that the projects will bring benefits to the people of all countries involved, not only financially, through revenue generated, but also environmentally, through avoiding the Bosphorus, as well as through employment, skills transfer, compensation for land use and community investments. Finally, they emphasized their commitment to ensuring that the project is safe, fair, and sustainable.

The meeting then began, with environmental and economic questions consuming most of the discussion.

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

Land acquisition and compensation issues

One speaker said that his understanding is that municipal lands are not compensated and he wondered why.

IFC said that there are approximately 4150 families and 102 municipalities which own land in Azerbaijan along the BTC pipeline route. According to the Host Government Agreement (HGA) signed between BTC Co. and the Azeri government, the “state authorities” are responsible for securing rights for BTC Co. to construct and operate the pipeline. With regard to municipal lands, he stated that municipalities are being compensated according to Azerbaijan law.

[Please note: As outlined in the BTC Project Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) Part B (Azerbaijan), “under the terms of the BTC Host Agreement, rights to use, possess and control necessary municipal and state land will be granted by the State Authorities at no cost to BTC Co. In the case of municipal land, the State is legally obliged to pay municipalities for withdrawal of their lands.”]

A participant commented that the Agro-Eco Center has interviewed 1200 residents from Aghstafa District to Kurdamir. Their results were that 120 residents did not understand the compensation contract that they signed with BTC Co. The Agro-Eco Center wanted to express their opinion that the consultation process was not done well.

In response to the Agro-Eco Center’s comment, a BTC Co. representative stated that his information was that the report to which the speaker referred showed that 95.8% of the 4156 landowners who signed agreements said that no one put any pressure on them to sign agreements or contracts with BTC Co. Those interviewed reported signing of their own free will and with a full understanding of what they were signing. Consultation with all affected land right users had been undertaken thoroughly and each had been visited at least once.

Employment comments and concerns

Many participants from nearby communities were concerned about potential employment and asked about the selection criteria for hiring local staff. Although the BTC pipeline covers 442km in Azerbaijan, 248km in Georgia and 1060km in Turkey, the number of employees in Azerbaijan is 2300, in Georgia 2500 and in Turkey 5000. Why is the number of Georgian employees greater than Azerbaijan?

An IFC representative answered that from the beginning, the focus has been on hiring local citizens. Workers are divided into skilled, semi-skilled, and non-skilled categories. Today, total staff in Azerbaijan is 1309—952 or 73% are Azeri nationals. Contractors, too, have a national employment target of 70%.

Regarding the relative numbers of people hired in each country, the numbers shown reflect those hired during the height of the construction period. The construction of the pipeline in Georgia is more difficult than in Azerbaijan because of the mountainous and rocky lands there. In addition, there are three pumping stations in Georgia. The local staff working in the pumping stations constructed in Azerbaijan was not reflected in the figures shown in the chart the speaker referred to. When those staff are added in, the numbers for Azerbaijan and Georgia are more closely aligned.

Environment and technical issues

Considering the environmental implications of the pipeline, a participant asked why BTC Co. arranged separate meetings with scientists, NGO representatives, and landowners, and if it would have been useful to arrange combined meetings?

BTC Co. explained that they arranged numerous separate meetings in Azerbaijan to explain and discuss different aspects of this project. They often had separate meetings with scientists, NGOs, and landowners because each group had specific interests that could be focused on at each meeting.

A participant asked the distance between the Baku-Supsa and BTC pipelines, to which the lenders responded that it is generally 28 meters. The Baku-Supsa pipeline is parallel to BTC for approximately 60% of its length. Where they are parallel to each other, the distance between them is always at least 25 meters.

A participant asked the capacity of the Bosphorus and how this will change after these new projects are realized. An EBRD representative noted that a key component of this project is avoiding the Bosphorus.

Another question was asked with regard to how the pipeline might cause damage to the environment. For instance, if there is an oil spill or leak which causes damage to land or crops, who is responsible for paying? An EBRD representative answered that BTC Co. will respond if there is a leak in the pipeline and will be responsible for assessing claims for compensation if there is damage to land, crops, or pastures that is attributable to any leak from the pipeline. However, he went on to emphasize that this pipeline has been designed to avoid the most sensitive areas and to minimize the potential for leakage.

An engineer in the audience commented that there would be a telecommunication line constructed along the pipeline that will be used only by

the pipeline itself. Why not construct public information infrastructure along the pipeline?

An EBRD representative answered that there will indeed be a fiber-optic cable along the pipeline for the company's use in communication and leak detection. However, there is currently no plan to link this with the Azerbaijani telecommunication network. Providing the people of Azerbaijan with telecommunication service and infrastructure in general is the government's obligation, not that of a private oil company. However, the revenues derived from the BTC pipeline project should allow the Government to increase their spending in this regard.

A question of great interest to several people in the meeting (including those who remained until 19:00) had to do with the Gobustan Cultural Reserve. An NGO representative noted that there are many historical and cultural monuments (rock carvings) in Gobustan. If there are leaks or explosions because of the pipeline, what will be done to avoid destroying the preserve?

An EBRD senior staff responded by saying that IFC, EBRD, and BTC Co. have great respect for the importance of the Gobustan Cultural Reserve, a critical part of Azerbaijani's cultural heritage. However, due to certain constraints outlined in the ESIA, it was not feasible to move the pipeline completely away from the area designated as the Gobustan Cultural Reserve. While the pipeline will cross 900 meters of the reserve, the pipeline will pass approximately 1000m away from all known cultural artifacts. The width of the construction corridor will be reduced through the reserve and archaeologists will be present during earth moving and excavation activities. BTC Co. will sponsor the development of a Strategic Environmental & Cultural Plan that will assist the Azerbaijan Ministry of Culture in its efforts to obtain recognition of the Gobustan Cultural Reserve under the World Heritage Convention. These actions satisfy the requirements of IFC's Cultural Properties policy.

The pipeline was designed to the highest international standards to prevent any leakage and to comply with IFC's Management of Cultural Property policy. State of the art leak detection and pipeline shutdown systems are included in the project to minimize potential impacts in the unlikely event of a leak.

Community investment issues and SME Development

A local NGO representative asked which NGOs won the CIP competition and why local NGOs were not allowed to participate? A BTC Co. representative answered that local NGOs were allowed to participate and that the organizations chosen to work on the community investment programs in Azerbaijan are Save the Children, FINCA, International Rescue Committee, and Mercy Corps. These organizations were selected through the proposal review process, conducted by

internal and external reviewers. These organizations are working in close collaboration with local NGOs such as Umid, Ganja Business Club, and other civil society and agro-information organizations.

Economic, financial and political issues

A local participant asked the rate of return for loans for this project. How much will Azerbaijan earn from the projects in a year, after ten years, and what are the criteria for the lending of these funds?

An EBRD representative answered that the Lenders are comfortable that the BTC project is commercially sound, based on transportation of ACG volumes. The benefits of the project will depend on oil prices, among other factors. Regarding other criteria for the loan, this is a private loan, so there will not be disclosure of interest rates. However, USD \$400 to \$600 million will be loaned for 12 years, if the Boards of the two lending institutions decide to make the loans.

A participant asked if these two lenders had financed such projects before. IFC answered that they have financed large oil pipeline projects in the past, such as the Chad-Cameroon pipeline in Central Africa. This project had a 3.5-year construction period and is now almost complete. In addition, both IFC and EBRD financed the Early Oil project, which included the Western Route Export Pipeline (WREP) and Northern Route Export Pipeline (NREP).

The questioner asked why the agreements between BTC Co. and the government of Azerbaijan (e.g., the Production Sharing Agreement or PSA) were not disclosed. It was answered that the agreements are available in English and have been on the project's website since mid-2002. They will soon be available in Azeri on BTC's website.

In opening comments, the EBRD representative had mentioned that EBRD and IFC are open to comments until mid-October. An audience member commented that on October 15 there are presidential elections in Azerbaijan and asked if there was any connection between those two dates.

EBRD answered that there is no connection between the date set for Azerbaijan's elections and the lenders' comment period. EBRD has 26 countries of operations in which it works on financing projects; there are always countries that are holding elections while we are appraising projects. The timing of elections has no influence on the timing of the due diligence or public disclosure on individual projects.

A participant asked why Azerbaijan's State Oil Fund is financing the BTC pipeline rather than supporting the non-oil sector. An IFC representative responded that the investments from the Fund could be made in projects of national importance.

He also emphasized the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank Group (WBG) roles in the creation of the Fund, as well as their role in promoting increased transparency of its activities.

Questions then followed regarding safety of people and the pipeline in light of current conflicts in the region.

It was noted that currently the Kurdish terror organization has announced war against the Turkish government. In addition, there are other ongoing conflicts in the Caucasus. What are the lending institutions doing to assure the pipeline will be protected? How will EBRD and IFC resolve the conflicts along the pipeline? Why is the pipeline passing through conflict areas? How will the rights of people living along the route of the pipeline be protected?

Both IFC and EBRD representatives responded to these questions. Regarding the security of the project, there are two levels of responsibility. The first is the day-to-day level, for which BTC Co. must provide security. As mentioned before, the BTC security plan is the same as that for the Baku-Supsa pipeline — through horsemen from the local communities patrolling the buried pipeline route. The governments also have security responsibilities, as described in the Host Government Agreement (HGA). These include responsibilities to protect the pipeline and to assure that every citizen's right to live in safety is respected. To protect the rights of the people, all three governments have signed a joint statement. In this agreement the parties confirm their mutual commitment to the goal of promoting compliance with human rights principles, including those set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the UN Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials, UN Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials, the European Convention on Human Rights and, in a manner consistent with national laws, the Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights.

Further, the pipeline does not pass through conflict areas in Azerbaijan. It also avoids the areas in Turkey where there is historical conflict between the Turkish government and Kurdish para-military groups.

A participant asked what the lenders could do to solve conflict problems.

EBRD and IFC responded that they were established to finance private sector projects. Their mandates do not allow them to interfere in the internal politics of member states. Both institutions, however, hope that there will be a peaceful solution to the ongoing conflicts in the region and that the pipeline, which requires close co-operation of the three countries, may contribute to the stability in the Caucasus.

The meeting lasted until 19:00 with some participants continuing the dialogue informally with EBRD and IFC staff.

Participant level of satisfaction

Of the 65 people who submitted evaluations, 80% felt the meeting was conducted fairly and that they were generally able to express their ideas and concerns. Half had suggestions for how the meeting could have been made better for them. Some of these ideas were:

- Be clearer on the objectives of the meeting.
- Provide simultaneous translation.
- Distribute information on the meeting in advance.
- Invite more environmental specialists and mass media representatives.
- Hold smaller meetings; discuss environmental, economic, land compensation, etc. issues separately, in several different events.
- Have interviews with NGOs and other stakeholders prior to the meeting to develop the agenda (Note: CDR Associates did meet with many NGOs prior to the MSF meetings to hear their concerns and what they would like to achieve in these meetings).
- Hold “awareness raising” workshops for local people and NGOs.
- Organize joint discussions with Turkish and Georgian parties.
- Get more answers from BTC Co., rather than from IFC, and EBRD.
- Allow the public to have the final say on process (such as lengthening the agenda when more time is needed); use flipcharts more, for notes and issues; rely more on local facilitators.

**Report of IFC and EBRD
Multi-stakeholder Forum (MSF) Meetings**

GEORGIA

GEORGIA

The two Georgia meetings were both very well attended (the highest number of participants of all three countries), were characterized by impassioned arguments on all sides of the issues, and were especially focused on the environment and land acquisition/ compensation. There were considerably more NGOs—local, national, and international—who attended these meetings than those in Azerbaijan or Turkey. People seemed very well informed and committed to ensuring that the best interests of the country of Georgia and its people were carried out.

BORJOMI MEETING September 8, 2003

Over 200 people attended the meeting in Borjomi. The participants included among others, representatives of many local NGOs—including the “East-West Corridor” NGO coalition, Green Alternative and Georgia Academy of Sciences; some international NGOs—including the World Wildlife Fund (local, UK and international branches) and CEE Bankwatch; community leaders; representatives of the local administration; the media; Georgian International Oil Company (GIOC); Georgian Ministry of the Environment; school administrators; USAID; Georgian scientists and experts, as well as other local associations. Local citizens were especially well represented, with several large groups in attendance. (Please refer to Appendix D for the full list of participants.)

The press was present prior to the meeting to interview the IFC and EBRD spokespeople and the general level of interest was extremely high. Issues regarding land compensation and environmental protection dominated this meeting (with some political and financial comments and questions); somewhat less attention was paid to employment and community investment comments.

The Provincial Governor of Borjomi attended and participated in the meeting but did not make opening remarks. IFC and EBRD representatives made introductory statements and welcomed the group, describing their interest in the BTC Pipeline and the South Caucasus Pipeline (SCP), which only EBRD is considering financing.

The EBRD representative explained that the primary objective for the two lending institutions at this meeting was to hear the views and concerns directly from interested and affected people, especially regarding the financing of the pipeline.

She also clarified the disclosure process, emphasizing that no final decisions have yet been made and that comments regarding the project may be submitted until October 14 and October 9, for EBRD and IFC respectively.

CDR's local facilitator introduced the meeting guidelines and obtained participants' general agreement to support them.

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

Land acquisition and compensation issues

Many participants were interested in how pasture lands are classified, how and when compensation will be provided, how irrigated and non-irrigated pastures will be treated, what will happen to pasture lands when the pipeline is no longer used, etc. There was also a question, asked by a representative of the Coalition of NGOs "East-West Corridor," regarding the handing over of lands from the state forestry to communities for pasture land.

Regarding the issue of compensation for pastures, an IFC representative mentioned that they were aware of the issue. According to Georgian law, pastures and meadows were formerly state property, but recent legislation has provided for transfer to community ownership. BTC Co., in cooperation with village communities, will define sizes of pastures affected by the pipeline and the pastures that are being registered and transferred to community ownership. The compensation payment will then be transferred to a community bank account. In response to a further question regarding compensation for registered pastures in highland zones, the BTC coordinator of land related issues answered that 24,000 GEL would be paid for each hectare. The money would be transferred to the account of legally registered "temi" organizations.

Regarding lands that change from state forestry to pasture lands, it was noted that many communities were eager for state forestry lands to be handed to them as pasture lands. In this way communities would become eligible for compensation. However, the IFC representative noted that this issue had to be sorted out between the state and the community. If the state agreed to hand over the state land to the community as pasture land, then BTC Co. would take responsibility for the compensation.

In answer to the question regarding irrigated and non-irrigated lands, IFC emphasized that the classification of irrigated versus non-irrigated lands is the responsibility of the state, which then provides BTC Co. with a list of irrigated and non-irrigated lands.

An essential aspect of the project is to ensure that all land is reinstated to its previous condition after the construction is completed. IFC and EBRD made it

clear that they will monitor this very closely so that it complies with their policies and standards.

An IFC representative addressed the issue of decommissioning of the pipeline (in answer to the concern about what will happen when the pipeline is no longer in use). Since the pipeline is buried, land-users are able to utilize the land during the life of the pipeline, with certain restrictions, as well as after the pipeline is no longer in use.

A related question was asked by a representative of a Sakhuneti village, who raised the issue of arable lands that were crossed by the pipeline in her village. The lands are managed by the local administration (the *sakrebulo*), on behalf of the village. The representative stated that villagers were told that they were not eligible for compensation and that only the *sakrebulo* would receive compensation.

To the Sakhuneti village representative's question, a BTC representative responded that the situation regarding pastures and communities along the pipeline was very complex in Georgia. It should be made clear that the responsibility for providing details as to the classification, ownership, and areas of land affected lies with the state authorities. Further, for arable lands described as owned by the state but utilized by local communities or villages, under the terms of the agreement between BTC Co. and the Georgian government (the HGA), the users of that land would receive compensation for crop damage or loss. The project has access to state land without any payment to the state itself. It is also important to differentiate between the two types of compensation. The first is the payment for the purchase of land from private owners or a village and the second is payment for crop losses or other damage caused by pipeline.

[Note: For more information on land acquisition and compensation, interested individuals should consult the BTC project Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) and Guides to Land Acquisition and Compensation (GLAC). These are available on caspiandevlopmentandexport.com.]

A community member from Atskuri asked how long it would take to receive compensation if a community-based organization (*temi*) has already been formed. An IFC representative noted that regarding payment or compensation, first a community organization (*temi*) must be registered and agreed to among all parties, which takes some time. However, as soon as registration is completed, the payment would be immediate. In the case of Atskuri, all documents were in place except for a requirement that the *sakrebulo* confirm the official number of villagers in that village.

An Armenian-speaking Georgian from Askhaltsikhe commented about the lack of information regarding the construction of the pipeline in their region, saying that information went on local TV only in Georgian. Regarding information for people

who do not speak Georgian, the IFC representative explained that some informational material was offered in both Georgian and Russian. Russian was provided for those who do not read or speak Georgian. The IFC representative provided the name of the contact person in Akhaltsikhe who could provide information regarding the pipeline project in Russian.

Environmental and technical issues

On behalf of the village population, a community member from the village of Tiseli in the Akhaltsikhe region expressed deep concern that their land is subject to landslides. The speaker emphasized that the houses of villagers are in such bad condition that even a minor earthquake would cause destruction. The experts were asked to go back to the village and study the existing situation on site.

In addition, a representative of WWF International stated his belief that this pipeline project offered many potential advantages for Georgia. He said that WWF had been working in Georgia for many years, with a focus on Borjomi-Kharagauli National Park, and that they have also worked with oil pipelines in many other international situations. Their experience is that all pipelines leak. In Georgia, WWF has concerns regarding the vulnerable environmental zones of Ktsia Tabatskuri and Borjomi. The concern regarding Borjomi is that the pipeline crosses two areas of major landslide activity. One is Kodiana pass and the other one is Tskhratskaro, which is also an area of high seismic activity. WWF stated that, according to BTC Co., in case of a rupture in the pipeline, it would take ten minutes to turn off the valves and close the pipeline. However, WWF noted that in those ten minutes, over 25,000 gallons of oil would leak from the pipeline. So there exists the threat of pollution of Borjomi drinking water supply and possibly of Borjomi aquifers as well. WWF presented the following two questions to the Lenders and to BTC Co.: (1) could they guarantee that there would be no oil leakage in Borjomi? and (2) if there were a leak, would there be compensation?

An EBRD representative stated that both the Lenders and BTC Co. recognize that slope stability in the area mentioned is a known issue. Detailed geomorphological and geological mapping, combined with instability analyses, have recently been completed in this area, using both international and local experts. The pipeline has been routed in such a way as to avoid the major landslide zones and the detailed analysis recently completed helped to enhance stability of the areas surrounding the pipeline using geo-technical engineering designs. Detailed terrain stability assessments were carried out along the entire pipeline route including Kodiana Pass and Tskhratskaro Pass. Safe areas within the landslide zone at Kodiana Pass were identified and the final alignment was selected to ensure the pipeline remains within these defined safe areas. At Tskhratskaro Pass, the pipeline crosses shallow debris flows, which are not

major landslide areas. Due to the topography, the pipeline will be installed below the depth of the shallow debris flows.

With respect to mineral water, there have been several meetings with WWF to discuss the possibility of contamination of the deep Borjomi mineralized aquifer. The preponderance of evidence suggests that deep mineralized water is not at risk in the unlikely event of a leak from the pipeline.

In assessing the risk of the pipeline through the Borjomi area, the project sponsor applied internationally accepted methodology to consider environmental risk as a function of probability of a leak and the consequences of such an event. Given the factors of safety applied in the design, construction, and operation of this pipeline, it can be stated that the likelihood of a leak on this pipeline is negligible. While it cannot be 100% guaranteed that there would be no spills, the environmental and social mitigation in place will deal with the risks that have been identified and presented in the ESIA documentation. In the unlikely event of a leak, BTC would mobilize a dedicated, specially trained, in-country oil spill response team who has bases strategically placed along the pipeline route, one of which is within the Borjomi area. In the very unlikely event of a major leak, an international specialist team, trained and equipped to deal with major oil spills throughout the world, would support the in-country oil spill response team. BTC Co. would compensate affected parties for any damages, as required under the HGA.

An IFC representative replied to the first question regarding a guarantee that there will be no oil spill saying, that at no time has IFC ever said that there will be no risk of an oil spill on any project. Our task is to reduce and mitigate the probability of this risk, he said.

Some local Borjomi representatives responded a WWF comment that local people had not been informed about, and did not understand, the consequences of the risks of oil spills. These local representatives said that they did indeed understand the risks and believed that they were acceptable. The representatives stated that the area is in desperate need of development initiatives and they believe that the pipeline project would serve as a catalyst, providing many opportunities for them. WWF had been working in the area for 13 years and these representatives said that WWF had made many promises, such as cleaning up and improving water supply systems in the Borjomi area, but nothing had ever materialized from that.

A member of the Academy of Ecological Sciences, on behalf of his colleagues, made a statement to confirm the organization's support for the project, even though they are still working on specific details. They are pleased that their proposal regarding three level monitoring had met with consideration and understanding. (Under this monitoring plan, implementers will conduct the first

level; the second will be the scientific stage; and the third will be carried out by civil society, which they consider rather a unique experience in world practice.)

Another local scientist commented that Borjomi aquifers, over two centuries old, had never seen a case of contamination. He believed that the contamination of the Borjomi aquifer is very unlikely in the future as well, as nature takes care of the safety of aquifers. He commented that the aquifer is present at a great depth in this area, and that an impermeable layer covers it.

Scientists from the Academy of Sciences of Georgia, a representative of NGO coalition “East-West-Corridor,” and the WWF Caucasus all made their comments regarding potential contamination of water resources of Borjomi.

On another topic, a representative of the Union of Environmental Protection, Akhaltsikhe, asked who specifically would be engaged in soil and land use reinstatement and who would implement removal and later return of endemic species to their original places?

An EBRD representative responded that the 44-meter construction corridor would be restored to the extent possible, without trees being placed directly over the two pipelines. In addition to restoration of the corridor, for every tree felled in the corridor, one and a half trees would be planted in another location. BTC is responsible for these activities in coordination with the state forestry commission and local specialists. A number of rare floral species that were found to exist on the 44-meter corridor have been transplanted to local botanical gardens. Under the supervision of BTC Co., these will be replanted on the right of way (RoW) during reinstatement.

A question was asked regarding the protection of cultural heritage. In response to that question, IFC stated that BTC Co. had developed specific procedures in respect to cultural heritage protection to comply with IFC/World Bank standards. BTC Co. is cooperating with the Centre for Archaeological Studies and the Cultural Heritage Protection Department (CHPD) on all phases of the heritage work. In consultation with the CHPD, BTC Co. has compiled a list of 22 monuments that were potentially susceptible to impacts. Mitigation plans have been agreed to and fieldwork is underway to implement them.

A participant asked whether the Lenders’ monitoring process could be done in partnership with local NGOs. EBRD and IFC answered that they monitor projects jointly with independent external experts and these international experts are encouraged to do local subcontracting. In that context, Georgian organizations may be involved in future stages of monitoring.

Concerned citizens from the village of Dgvari also raised concerns regarding the risk of landslides near their village not associated with construction of the pipeline. They asked if the Lenders would look into this.

[IFC followed up on this issue after the MSF meetings. IFC now understands that the Georgian Government has had a program in place for some years now to resettle Dgvari because the village site is situated within an area that has been subject to previous landslides, but that the resettlement has not been completed because of a shortage of funds. The settlement is close to, but not directly affected by the BTC pipeline. The following actions have been taken: 1) The settlement and its environs have recently been mapped in detail by BTC geohazard/landslide specialists at the request of the Georgian Government, and fieldwork was completed in October 2003; 2) A draft report is currently being prepared by BTC Co. and recommendations to address the problem at Dgvari will be included in a report to the Georgian Minister of Environment (MOE); and 3) BTC will produce a brief report for public release.]

Economic, financial and political issues

A representative of the NGO Coalition “East-West Corridor” stated her appreciation for the BTC pipeline project and commented on its great importance in improving migration problems from villages to urban areas by providing opportunities outside of urban areas.

A question was raised regarding the funding of this project. How long will the financing of this project last and what will the interest rate be? In response to the financing question, an EBRD representative emphasized that the loan is a commercial one to BTC Co. and is considered in the range of USD \$400 to \$600 million over a period of twelve years. The loan interest rate cannot be disclosed because of the confidentiality of commercial information.

A participant raised an issue regarding corruption in land compensation. He asked how the Lenders would deal with this and asked whether the Lenders were aware of the investigation being conducted by the Georgian Parliament.

The Lenders were not aware of such an investigation. The Borjomi Governor acknowledged certain cases of financial violations, and stated that BTC has promoted a transparent process. He said that he believes that this project is addressing various violations and weaknesses within Georgia, which will contribute to future development of Georgian statehood. He also noted that the investigation by Parliament was to address a broader set of concerns and that it was not specifically related to the project.

IFC commented further that BTC Co. has taken special care to ensure that compensation payments are conducted safely and transparently. For example, BTC Co. has arranged with the Bank of Georgia to provide a facility that allows landowners owners to establish an account free of charges. Landowners receiving compensation are asked to come to the bank directly to pick up their

money. Additionally, BTC Co., in the land compensation process, has brought a third party independent NGO, the Association for Protection of Landowners' Rights (APLR) into the process. This was designed to provide assistance for landowners and to ensure transparency for their land acquisition and compensation process. The involvement of APLR, the use of notaries and the carrying out of transactions on secure bank premises provides less opportunity for extortion or corruption. Finally, corruption is not a BTC Co. responsibility and should be addressed by the Government of Georgia.

In closing the IFC representative indicated that the two institutions are pleased with the public's level of the knowledge of the project and that both IFC and EBRD are committed to continuing public access to information. He said that NGO participation in monitoring is very important, especially in the area of land compensation. He appreciated the discussions of seismic activity, archaeological research, employment, and reforestation—and hopes that these dialogues will continue. He thanked the group for their energetic participation in this meeting.

The meeting was concluded by an address by the Director of the Georgian International Oil Company.

Participant level of satisfaction

Fifty people submitted evaluations. Most felt the meeting was conducted fairly, that they were able to express their ideas, and that overall it was a useful and beneficial experience. Several made the suggestion that smaller groups (perhaps limiting the numbers from certain villages) should have been assembled, which would have made the dialogue more manageable. Some felt that EBRD and IFC seemed to be speaking in support of BTC Co. and of the project, rather than listening non-judgmentally to input that was being given. Others wished for more focus on specific issues, with longer and more detailed responses and attention to solutions of the problems presented. There was also a desire, by some, to hear more from NGO and community interests and less from the scientific community.

TBILISI MEETING

September 11, 2003

There were approximately 220 people at the final MSF meeting held in Tbilisi. Attending were landowners and land users (many from the Tsalka area); government representatives including the Georgian Minister of the Environment and Director of Georgian International Oil Company (GIOC); representatives of the state Department of Geology; many local, national and international NGOs; members of the scientific community from government, universities and the private sector; international representatives from UNDP, GTZ and USAID; students and many others. (Please refer to Appendix D for the full list of participants.) This was the largest audience of the six meetings. Many participants had attended the Borjomi meeting earlier in the week and came to this meeting with prepared statements.

Representatives of IFC and EBRD described their individual mandates as well as their goals for this meeting. The facilitation team (CDR Associates) then welcomed the audience, described the meeting guidelines, and asked participants for their commitment to following the agenda and the meeting process. Having received a general agreement from the audience, the facilitators opened the meeting.

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

Land acquisition and compensation issues

A member of the Young Lawyers' Association raised a question regarding the form of land acquisition applied in the BTC project in Georgia. He asked why the land was purchased and why other forms of land acquisition such as leasing, which was applied in Azerbaijan and Turkey, were not applied. The speaker noted that in signed contracts it was not indicated that after use of land purchased by BTC Co., the land would be returned to its original owner.

In answer to this question, the difference in forms of land acquisition utilized in Georgia and in Azerbaijan was caused by the fact that Georgian legislation did not provide other options other than buying the land. There was confirmation by BTC Co. that the acquired land would be returned to its original owner to use, subject to some conditions, such as restrictions on building and growing large trees, which was clearly stated in the RAP. The relevant documentation and agreements, which are under discussion with the Georgian government, would be worked out by the end of the year.

The Association for Protection of Landowners' Rights (APLR) representative commented that there are significant cadastral (a public inventory of landowners)

problems beyond the 44-meter corridor. From APLR's perspective, landowners have received good levels of compensation. The unfortunate problem of potential corruption is the responsibility of the Georgian government.

An IFC representative responded that within the 44m corridor, BTC Co. successfully settled these cadastral problems by conducting additional historical research. Outside the 44m corridor, cadastral problems are the responsibility of the Georgian government. IFC noted that they, too, were concerned about corruption and that they believe the necessary controls were in place at the BTC-level to ensure transparency and fairness. Ultimately, this is the responsibility of the Georgian Government.

Green Alternatives (a Georgian NGO) was concerned that, although the process of land compensation is well underway, there is still the issue of the classification of orphaned and isolated plots of land beyond the 44m corridor. Whose responsibility is it to determine whether the plot of land was orphaned or isolated and who is responsible for compensation for those orphaned or isolated plots?

According to an IFC representative, BTC Co. purchased the 44m strip. In cases of orphaned or isolated pieces of land that could not be used productively or accessed easily, the land right holder could approach BTC Co. to request compensation. Each case was different and would be examined on the ground with BTC Co. and the land right holder. If it were found that the use of the orphaned or isolated piece of land was restricted by construction of the pipeline, BTC Co. would pay appropriate compensation as was discussed in the Guide to Land Acquisition (GLAC). To ensure the security of the pipeline there would be some restrictions of land use for 7m on each side of the 44m construction strip (i.e. the total would equal 58m, defined as orphaned and isolated).

There were several comments regarding this land acquisition issue. A Georgian expert on legal issues explained that, although the Civil Code of Georgia provided for various forms of land acquisition, the population of Georgia gave preference to the present land acquisition process (i.e. purchase of land). The speaker also referred to Georgians' free choice regarding the form in which they own lands under community ownership regulations. As village populations may not fully trust village governance, community groups have formed unions independent from official authorities.

A representative from Azerbaijan also made a statement. He had been present in both the Ganja and Baku MSF meetings and had traveled to Tbilisi to make known his concerns. He came to Tbilisi because he wanted to understand whether the level of compensation was higher in Georgia than in Azerbaijan. He understood that the land was purchased in Georgia and leased in Azerbaijan, and this resulted in differences in compensation. An IFC representative stressed that, although there were differences in the way land was acquired or leased, all land users in all three countries were compensated for impacts to crops and

other assets on their land. The rates of compensation were at least equal to local market rates (and were generally well above).

Environmental and technical issues

There was a general recommendation from a participant that a public or NGO monitoring process be established during the project's implementation stage in order to clarify ambiguous issues. The speaker addressed opponents of this project with a proposal to create a joint "trust" team, which would discuss issues in working groups, rather than at such large public meetings as this.

An NGO, Caucasus Environmental NGO Network (CENN), raised the issue of a potential pipeline leak in the Borjomi region. It was reported in Borjomi that in case of a leak from the pipeline, there would be a maximum of ten minutes between the start of the leak and shutdown of the valves. The speaker noted that, according to WWF, in such a case, in ten minutes approximately 25,000 gallons of oil could leak out. The speaker specifically asked a question about certain areas that are hard to reach such as Borjomi Park or mountainous regions. How would it be possible to get a team of "experienced workers" to those sites within a short period in case of a pipeline rupture?

Another question was asked about the choice of pipeline route. Although there were four alternatives, only the Borjomi route was selected — apparently the most hazardous to the environment. Why? And a further question regarding the risks to Borjomi was who would take the responsibility for damage compensation in case of leakage or oil spill in Borjomi (or in other regions of Georgia)?

An EBRD representative responded to the Borjomi leakage question. As was noted in Borjomi, EBRD gave assurance to the audience that the risk of such a leak was very low, as the pipeline has been designed to highest international standards as well as to IFC and EBRD guidelines. In addition, in the Borjomi area, additional mitigation measures were taken, including increased wall thickness and installation of additional valves. In the unlikely event of an oil spill or a leak, ten minutes is the response time needed to shut down the pumps and make the pipeline system safe, followed by a further ten minutes to close the mainline block valves (undertaken remotely from the pipeline control room). The maximum predicted spill volume resulting from a full-bore rupture is approximately 6,000 cubic meters. This figure is based upon a conservative 20-minute pipeline system shutdown duration, which has been used to form the basis of the Oil Spill Response Planning.

An IFC representative added that, with regard to the selection of the Borjomi route for the pipeline, both IFC and EBRD spent considerable time analyzing the various options that had previously been considered by BTC Co. The alternatives were reviewed while considering a number of criteria, including environmental

and social constraints, constructability, long term integrity of the pipeline, terrain as well as geo-hazard constraints, and geo-political constraints. The Borjomi route was finally selected based on all these aspects. This was documented in the BTC pipeline revised routing report, issued in May 2003, and included in the EBRD and IFC disclosure package. The Lenders' independent environmental experts also reviewed the data and concluded that the chosen route was the best option available, given the geopolitical and security constraints.

A further response was made to the question of who is responsible for damages in case of leakage or spill. EBRD answered that it is BTC Co.'s responsibility to compensate under such circumstances. Legally, BTC Co. is liable to third parties for any loss or damages they may suffer because of breach of the standards of conduct in the project agreements. Also, the standards of conduct set up in the Georgia HGA should under no circumstance be less demanding than those of the EU.

A question was asked if there were measures formulated in writing specifically regarding a system for handling leakage and spillage that would provide immediate response in case of accident. EBRD responded to that there is a comprehensive framework Oil Spill Response Plan (OSRP) that is part of the ESIA documentation. The detailed Oil Spill Response Plans are currently under development and will be submitted as drafts to the Georgian government, probably by mid-October of this year. These OSRPs would then be finalized in early 2004. For sensitive areas such as Tsalka and Borjomi, there will be dedicated oil spill response teams based near these locations to ensure timely response in the unlikely event of an oil spill.

At this point, many local experts made strong statements supporting the safety of the pipeline. Others claimed that the pipeline would bring significant harm to the environment.

A participant raised a concern that accidents resulting in the fatalities of animals in the course of pipeline construction could possibly spread communicable diseases along the pipeline route. BTC Co. undertook a contaminated land baseline survey done prior to construction, which included consultation with government departments responsible for potential biological contaminants. To BTC Co.'s knowledge there are no sites of potential biological contaminant on the pipeline route. There is a protocol, however, to address contaminated land.

In response to a question of when reforestation would start, the answer was given that replanting would start after the construction of the pipeline was complete.

A participant believed that the construction in Tsalka started before BTC Co. complied with items 5 and 10 of the environmental permit and without final agreement with the Georgian Ministry of Environment.

In response, BTC Co. agreed that items 5 and 10 of the environmental permit related specifically to protection of ground waters. The BTC representative responded that all reports concerning the protection of ground waters and mitigation measures that were to be implemented on the pipeline within Tsalka and Borjomi regions were complete, as per best current practices and best technology. BTC Co. responded by saying all requirements of GIOC and the Government of Georgia, as well as all ESIA permit requirements had been completed prior to commencement of construction activities in Tsalka.

Community investment and SME development

Several issues were raised regarding community investment programs:

A representative of the “Social House of Georgia” inquired whether it was possible to assist that segment of the population not eligible for land compensation, in order to avoid feelings of frustration among neighboring impoverished people.

A representative of the NGO “Association for the Protection of Landowners’ Rights (APLR) raised the issue of increasing migration from rural to urban areas, especially to the capital of Georgia, because of lack of employment in rural areas and the fact that village inhabitants could not satisfy their basic needs. The question was if there could be programs to retain or to handle the process of migration by creating employment through development of small and medium size business (SMEs). In this respect particular attention should be paid to young people. The speaker expressed the fear that the majority of the rural population would be using their land compensation to move to cities, which would add to both urbanization problems and the related problems of village abandonment.

In response to these questions, an IFC representative answered that the Lenders acknowledge the importance of social and community issues. Although the Community Investment Program would by no means resolve the economic development concerns in local villages, still CIP may act as a catalyst in Georgia. IFC and EBRD have been operating in Georgia (not connected to the pipeline) since the mid-1990s. They have been working on programs to provide financing to small entrepreneurs and businesses. However, it is clear that the BTC pipeline offers an opportunity to dramatically increase the volume and quality of economic development. All donors in Georgia, including IFC and EBRD, have committed themselves to the poverty reduction strategy of the country, with a special emphasis on small and medium size business development (SME), power sector development, sustainability, and infrastructure development. IFC also described briefly their own SME development work, which includes existing programs in leasing, micro-finance, and other planned activities in support of local entrepreneurs.

In response to the question of a landowner as to how evenly the community investments would be distributed among those villages which were adjacent to but outside the corridor, EBRD explained that there are various approaches to financing small and medium size enterprises. One is to target the communities alongside the pipeline corridor, to be implemented during the construction phase. In addition, EBRD, IFC, and BTC Co. are working together on larger assistance program that would be available to the wider country after the construction phase has been completed.

Finally, a concern was raised by an NGO regarding the lack of information on the CIPs. In addition, the speaker was concerned about how local NGOs could be more involved in CIPs.

IFC answered that, while selecting the NGOs to implement CIPs, BTC Co. was most concerned to find groups who had appropriate management experience and understanding of large-scale programs. For that reason BTC Co. selected two international NGOs -- CARE and Mercy Corps, which have partnered in each case with four local organizations. Thus, many of those actually working on these grants are Georgian nationals.

Economic, financial, and political Issues

A concern of one participant was criminal behavior and the possibility of land compensation going into the pockets of criminals. What is the attitude of IFC and EBRD regarding this situation? Are they going to get involved in order to improve the situation?

Regarding criminal behavior and extortion of compensation funds, EBRD responded that both IFC and EBRD had heard about such violations. However the EBRD representative emphasized that the local banks in the region could not provide local security services. The local government has the responsibility of ensuring that their people can live safely in their country. Increased prosperity, such as that provided by this pipeline project, will also add to stability and will enable government to fight criminal activities more effectively. EBRD also promised to continue their policy dialogue with the Government of Georgia, as the Government is a shareholder of the European Bank. The Bank will raise this issue and stress its importance to the safety of the people of Georgia.

One of the participants asked why IFC has sold their shares in the Georgia Glass and Mineral Water (GGMW) Company and what is the reason for this? Is BTC a risk to this investment?

IFC representative stated that IFC considers the risk in Borjomi to be very small and that it considers the benefits for the Borjomi area to far outweigh the possible

risks. IFC wants to hear the concerns of all parties, as this is the only way an informed decision can be made. Regarding IFC and EBRD investments in Borjomi, IFC was a shareholder in the company and EBRD was a lender to the company. The decision to sell IFC's shares in Borjomi was made well before it made any decision in connection with BTC Co. When IFC invests in a company as a minority shareholder it does not take part in the day-to-day management of the company nor is it its role to stay in companies on a permanent basis. As a minority shareholder in GGMW, IFC was not involved in the decision to sell to the entity that eventually purchased the company. The commercial decision to sell was made by the majority of the shareholders. At the time IFC also believed that it had fulfilled its objective. IFC would not consider investing in the BTC project if it were not convinced that the risk had been reduced to absolute minimum.

A representative from the NGO CEE Bankwatch raised several political issues: One is that the constitutional rights of citizens of Georgia have been violated due to an improper and illegal environmental permitting process, which they asked to be suspended. A second concern was that the EU enlargement directorate recently announced that they were going to start an investigation of the Turkish section of the BTC pipeline, while taking into account Copenhagen political criteria. The third issue was that in the United Kingdom, local representatives of OECD received complaints about violations of OECD guidelines by BTC CO. while implementing the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan project. The question is whether IFC and EBRD (in particular EBRD as they were not financing pipeline in Turkey) were aware of these issues and, if so, what is their position? Finally, this NGO asked whether the international finance institutions were going to make a decision while the investigations were ongoing?

In response to the three concerns regarding pending investigations, an IFC representative commented that on September 5, 2003 an NGO in London issued a press release in which they indicated that EU Commission would closely follow developments in Turkey in connection to the pipeline and would give an assessment of the human rights and the minority situation (in connection with Kurdish minority). IFC stated that they were aware of these investigations and allegations. The EBRD representative added that, in order to be entitled to disbursement from IFC and EBRD loans, BTC Co. had to be in compliance with loan agreements including the HGA. Should it be determined that the company was not in compliance with any of these legal requirements, there would be no disbursement.

A farmer from the Axali Samgori village of Gardabani region also raised the issue of corruption in the land acquisition and compensation process. He noted that people had been intimidated during the process. He handed IFC and EBRD a number of documents.

The Lenders answered that they would look into this matter. [Following the MSF meetings, IFC and EBRD asked BTC Co. and APLR to look into this matter and

to meet separately with the speaker. IFC and EBRD will reply directly to him to note that his comments were taken into account and to ensure that he was given the appropriate contacts within BTC and APLR.]

Participant level of satisfaction

Approximately one third of the participants submitted meeting evaluations. Most felt that the meeting was fairly conducted and that they were able to express their ideas and concerns. Like many at the Borjomi meeting, one third of those responding felt that smaller, more targeted discussions (with separate discussions of environmental, social, legal issues) would have been helpful. They would have liked to see the questions submitted in advance, to encourage more focused in-depth answers. Some community members felt that the NGO community polarized the discussions (both in favor and against the project) and suggested more strict enforcement of the 3-4 minute time limit on comments. A similar comment was made by a community member, that NGOs were often speaking for the owners or users of the land, rather than letting those people express their own ideas, which they can do very well for themselves.

**Report of IFC and EBRD
Multi-stakeholder Forum (MSF) Meetings**

CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

These six meetings provided the opportunity for nearly 800 people to meet with and talk directly to staff and management of IFC and EBRD.

Prior to these meetings, IFC validated and witnessed BTC's on-the-ground public consultation with affected communities. Although these MSF processes are above-and-beyond both IFC's and EBRD's regular consultation and procedural requirements, it was important to both institutions that they continue the validation process through their own multi-stakeholder meetings. Both institutions believe strongly that these MSFs have helped to facilitate public comment on the projects and to provide clarification on particularly complex issues. Further, assuring transparency for a project of this size and complexity is extremely difficult. It is hoped that having this number of local people hear directly from senior staff of the IFC and EBRD will increase the public's level of confidence in these projects.

These six meetings have provided IFC's and EBRD's staff, management and Boards access to a cross-section of civil society: local, national and international NGOs; trade unions; locally affected people including landowners and other community members; business leaders; and others. This will ultimately assist these lending institutions to make better, more informed decisions on how large infrastructure projects such as the BTC pipeline will affect citizens of Azerbaijan, Georgia and Turkey.

All those involved in the organization of the meetings (lenders, facilitators, translators and rapporteurs) would like to express their appreciation to the members of the public who shared so much their time and their thoughts on this extremely important project. Their participation and their patience are very much appreciated.

APPENDIX A

IFC/EBRD Responses to Written Questions - Georgia

IFC/EBRD Responses to Written Questions – Georgia

Question

Meteorology and Climate: What is the attitude of the Lenders to local climate conditions during BTC construction and the during the project's utilization in order to achieve environmental security? And how do you detect such hazards as fires and other situations and mitigate the situation? What is the volume of finances to create a database to analyze the climatic data gathered within 10-20 years by special environmental stations along the route of BTC? Bases of this question: (1) "Examination of initial environmental statute" and failure to prepare documentation. (2) In the assessment of environmental impact and other documentation there is insufficient clarification of the above-mentioned issues. (3) The trend of past decade of global warming. (4) There exist a variety of meteorological and climatic factors on the surface of land and around it in certain districts of Georgia. (5) Existing conditions with the aim to create the database of observations (for current Georgian conditions).

Remarks

Please see the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment documentation for more information on climate change. IFC and EBRD believe these issues have been adequately addressed.

Question

Whom should people refer to in order to sort out the rights' violation issues (pasture's compensations), etc.?

Remarks

People should speak to APLR or BTC Co. Land Team Members, both of whom will be able to resolve the issues.

Question

During the employment process, would ethnicity factors be taken into account? (Georgians/Armenians)

Remarks

No, employment will be based on skills, with priority given to villages near the pipeline, especially for unskilled positions.

Question

What is the amount of compensation for high-mountain villages that are in the corridor pipeline?

Remarks

The rates are published in the GLAC for pasture/hayfields. The payment is 20,400 GEL per hectare plus compensation for crop loss for one year.

Question

Will the community receive the hay fields in addition to pastures?

Remarks

BTC Co. will pay for pastures and hayfields where these are intersected by the construction corridor. The areas of pastures and hayfields within the construction corridor will be purchased at the rates published in the GLAC— 20,400 GEL per hectare (plus crop loss).

Question

Resettlement of population: It is expected that population living along the pipeline will be resettled. Are there any plans about resettlement?

Remarks

No physical resettlement will occur at any point along the pipeline.

Question

Who will use the firewood left after cutting down the forestry. Is there is a possibility to provide schools and hospitals with that firewood?

Remarks

Wherever possible, the project will donate excess timber (which is suitable for use as firewood) to the local communities.

Question

Employment: Reimbursement of workers working on the pipeline is 1 Lari per hour. Don't you think that this amount is very much symbolic, (like the salaries in general that are paid in Georgia or the pension, which is 14 Lari)? Is anybody in your countries working for such compensation?

Remarks

Wages are dependent on the skill of each individual worker. These wages are also dependent upon whether the individual/worker is located in a camp accommodation or their own home.

Question

Culture: Are there any cultural programs envisaged for local population and pipeline workers?

Remarks

The questioner should contact the Community Investment Program. The contractor has a cultural awareness program for all his staff. Please address this question to the local Community Liaison Officer, who will be able to provide additional information.

Question

What do you promise to people working in the art field? Will there be cinemas and libraries, corresponding to European standards?

Remarks

Please speak to the Community Investment Program. A number of libraries and village cultural centers have been rehabilitated through the infrastructure component of the community investment program. If a community prioritizes such projects within their Community Investment Program, then, in principle, they can be carried out.

Question

Regarding community investment, please explain and/or comment: CARE is implementing the Community Investment Program. Is it possible to transfer this money to village/community accounts directly, so that people may decide for themselves what they want to do?

Remarks

Please speak to BTC Co. Community Investment Program. CARE is working with villages to prioritize needs and develop projects that are financed under the CIP. In addition they are providing agricultural training, health training and conflict resolution training to local communities. Soon they will begin implementing energy efficiency projects in selected communities. The goal of CIP is to build the capacity of communities to plan and develop for themselves. Early results are that people are very pleased with the results of their CIP activities.

Question

There are inner roads and irrigation channels that cross the fields and were not compensated for. Will there be compensation for those lands?

Remarks

BTC Co. will pay for any land intersected by the construction corridor and confirmed as high mountain village pastures or hayfields.

Question

Will there be construction of roads in Tabatskuvi village (2 and 9 kilometers)?

Remarks

The project contractors have already carried out some improvements.

Question

We live in highest zone of Georgia along the pipeline (2500 meters above sea). Are we eligible for additional compensation?

Remarks

No.

Question

What will be the decision in regard to those people who use pastures and pay taxes already for many years, have not registered their lands for various reasons? This use can be confirmed by the community.

Remarks

BTC Co. is assisting communities to register the necessary land so that the communities can complete transactions with BTC Co. and receive payment.

Question

What is the compensation for the villages directly affected by the pipeline? (The width of the village is up to 1 kilometer.)

Remarks

The amount of compensation paid depends upon the area of high mountain village pastures or hayfields intersected by the pipeline construction corridor. This area can only be confirmed when the state authorities finally confirm the extent of the village lands in those categories.

Question

The pipeline is going through the village of Sakhuneti. These lands are not officially registered. The question is if BTC Co. is paying for these places and if this payment is allocated to the community. The pastures are situated in the

village registered under Sakhusbulo. What is the amount of payment BTC Co. is paying per hectare and will the community receive this compensation?

Remarks

BTC Co. will pay for land which is confirmed as high mountain village pasture or hayfield and is crossed by the pipeline. Per each hectare enclosed within the construction corridor there is a payment of 20,400 GEL plus one year crop loss compensation.

Question

Do you envisage rehabilitation of the 4-km zone in the three villages of Sadgeri, Tba, Tsemi? These villages are in direct line of the project and the pipeline passes within 6-km line.

Remarks

The villages of Sadgeri, Tba, Tsemi are not within the zone (2 km either side of the pipeline) where the Community Investment Program (CIP) is being implemented.

Question

Why there is no information on local channels about the start of pipeline construction and on employment of local people? (What are the conditions?)

Remarks

Different construction activities will start at different times. Construction of camps should begin in October 2003. Specific construction activities (river crossing) should start in November 2003. The main pipeline construction will begin in approximately February 2004. The construction contractor will have an information office in Akhaltsike. The community liaison officer is Kote Chanturishrih, 899-96-33-15.

Question

Villages Tsemi, Tba and Sadgeri possess sufficient hydro resources if the 100 year old Borjomi hydro power station construction in Borjomi park, where work stopped due to the lack of funds, is completed. Is this issue envisaged in the development of infrastructure?

Remarks

The villages of Sadgeri, Tba, Tsemi do not fall within 2 km either side of the pipeline zone where the Community Investment Program (CIP) is being implemented.

Question

Please specify if anything will be done to develop infrastructure in the town of Vale.

Remarks

One of the components of the BTC/SCP Community Investment Program is infrastructure rehabilitation. The Community Investment Program (CIP) is being implemented in 77 villages along the BTC/SCP route. Vale is one of the villages. CARE, an international NGO, is leading implementation of the CIP in Akhaltikhe. The CIP can be contacted through Gia Glonti on 291531 or 291378.

Question

The population in Andezit, Bakuriani is having problems concerning land that should be solved on the state level. This question can't be settled here. The fact is that the CARE representatives assisted us in the implementation of those projects. Thank you for your help.

Remarks

Comment noted.

Question

On the territory of Tskhratskaro, the pipeline route in one zone goes parallel to 2.5 km drinking water line which is used by the population of the villages of Libani, Tba, and Tsemi. The pipeline crosses this drinking water line in two places. Will this drinking water be transported through closed pipes?

Remarks

Where the BTC pipeline crosses any existing water lines, construction would not impact the existing lines. Water supplies would not be affected and the area would be reinstated to better than original condition.

Question

Whose property will be the land plots where pipeline will go through? Would it be corporate property, or property of any state and what will be the rights of Georgia in regards to these plots?

Remarks

Land parcels subdivided and purchased by BTC Co. will remain in the ownership of BTC Co. until the appropriate legal mechanisms are agreed to permit return of the land (without restrictions) to the original owners.

Question

The population of the village of Naokhrebi claim that the lands where the BTC gas pipeline will pass were illegally taken away from people and that they have bribed the court or judge, who actually are the landowners, as they are paying taxes. We've addressed regional court and we are ready to take drastic measures such as blocking the route and hindering the process of work.

Remarks

BTC Co. relies entirely upon the State Authorities for information on land ownership and use. Only the State Authorities and the courts can resolve this matter.

Question

The distance between Oguari village and the pipeline is 500 to 1000 meters. Oguari is located in a landslide zone and 99% of the houses are dangerous for living. This is proved by geological data and conclusions by various commissions. We, the population of Oguari, are eager to know whether international organizations are going to provide aid to us.

Remarks

IFC and EBRD do not provide direct aid to houses or villages. Assessments on whether your village would be impacted by land acquisition have been conducted as part of the Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) process. Please speak directly to BTC Co. on this issue.

Question

We know from the Internet and the press that previous projects implemented by BTC Co. had evoked serious environmental problems, not only within the "corridor" but also outside. Tell us, what preventive (and emergency) measures are envisaged by BTC Co. in order to help protect the population?

Remarks

Please refer to Environmental and Social Impact Assessment documentation and Resettlement Action Plan.

Question

Scientific research confirms that relocation of pipeline from Borjomi valley to Aspindza district is beneficial in many aspects (social, economic and ecological). What would you say to that?

Remarks

The issue of routing the pipeline through Aspindza district has been carefully assessed. This assessment is covered in detail in the BTC Pipeline Routing Report.

Question

More than 4.5 km of the pipeline goes through our village. 18.5 hectares of our lands are included in the 44-meter corridor of pipeline construction by BTC Co. But in the process of laying the pipes, the land beyond the corridor was also damaged (6-7 meters), which caused the loss of harvest (potatoes, wheat, etc). The construction company is not taking the responsibility for these damages, nor have they asked owners for any permission. Lands are spoiled and not compensated. What should we do?

Remarks

The contractor is fully responsible for any such damage caused outside the agreed construction corridor. If any landowner believes that the contractor is not reacting to their problems, that landowner should inform the BTC Co. staff on site. BTC Co. will then ensure that the appropriate action is taken by the contractors.

Question

The planned depth of the pipeline was about 2.5 meters. However, in village Ashkala the depth is up to 3.5-4 meters. This would evoke the drainage and drying of lands that are close to the 44-meter corridor, which in its turn will affect the harvest (decrease it). What measures are planned in order to compensate the losses related to agricultural products?

Remarks

The minimum depth of cover over the pipeline has been started as 1m. This depth or cover creates a newest depth of approximately 2.5 m. In certain sections, due to the necessity to cross obstacles such as roads, rivers, etc. the pipeline depth has to be increased. BTC Co. specialists and engineers decide upon the areas requiring deeper excavation, in conjunction with state departments. Deeper excavation should not have any effect upon the drainage or adjacent land once the pipe trench is backfilled and reinstated. The pipe trench backfill is thoroughly compacted in layers during reinstatement and this will prevent any effect upon drainage of the land.

APPENDIX B

Sample Agenda

APPENDIX B - Sample Meeting Agenda

Location
Date
930 to 1730

0930 to 1000	coffee/tea and registration
1000 to 1015	Welcome by local officials, IFC, EBRD
1015 to 1030	Facilitators <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Meeting agenda▪ Role of facilitators and translators▪ Meeting process and guidelines▪ Preparation for meetings
1030 to 1045	IFC and EBRD <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Description of each institution▪ Goals for this meeting▪ Overview of project
1045 to 1100	coffee/tea break
1100 to 1230	Issue discussion
1230 to 1330	lunch
1330 to 1530	Issue discussion
1530 to 1550	coffee/tea break
1550 to 1700	Issue discussion
1700 to 1730 (flexible)	Final review of issues and conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Next steps▪ Meeting evaluation

APPENDIX C

Meeting Guidelines

PROPOSED MEETING GUIDELINES
Multi-stakeholder Fora
Turkey, Georgia and Azerbaijan
August and September 2003

The goals of this meeting are to (1) provide a forum for the public to express their views on potential financing of the pipeline and (2) allow the lenders (IFC and EBRD) to hear directly from stakeholders before making recommendations to their Boards of Directors regarding funding of the pipeline. In order to assure that this forum is as successful as possible, the following meeting guidelines are proposed:

- ❑ All speakers, whether making a statement or asking a question, will be mindful of time, keeping their comments as short as possible—between 3 and 4 minutes.
- ❑ After making one comment or asking one question, speakers will wait until others have spoken before speaking again. [Both of these first two ground rules are designed to assure that everyone has an opportunity to speak.]
- ❑ Since sequential translation will be provided, speakers will be asked to speak slowly and allow time for each part of their statement or question to be translated.
- ❑ Speakers will respect the facilitators' responsibility to assure that comments and questions are clear, concise and to the point. [Facilitators may have to interrupt from time to time to clarify statements. This is not intended to show disrespect to the speaker.]
- ❑ Forms or paper are provided for those who would like to ask a question or make a comment but would rather not speak publicly. These should be handed in to the facilitator.
- ❑ These meetings are designed for the lenders to hear general concerns or comments. They are not for the resolution of an individual's problem. [Such problems can be handed in on the forms or paper provided and will be responded to at a later time. Please be sure that your contact information is written clearly if you are making this kind of personal inquiry.]
- ❑ There is not time at these meetings to fully address complex technical issues. If these arise, speakers may be directed to the appropriate sources for information.

- The press is welcome, but will be asked to identify themselves and to reserve their questions until after the meeting. Cameras will be allowed only for the introductory remarks. Lender representatives will be available immediately before the meeting as well as immediately after the meeting for brief question and answer sessions.
- All speakers are asked to wait to be recognized by the facilitator and then to introduce themselves before speaking. The facilitators will attempt to call on people who wish to speak, from all areas of the audience, in a fair manner.
- Only one person should speak at a time.
- Please turn off cell phones and refrain from smoking in the meeting room.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

APPENDIX D

Participants List

BTC MULTISTAKEHOLDER FORUM
Erzurum Forum Participants
August 26, 2003

NAME	SURNAME	OCCUPATION	ORGANIZATION
Necati	Gondem	Mechanical Engineer	City Industry And Trade Management
Ebubekir	Kaya		Ataturk Univ.
Refik	Ustaoglu	Mukhtar	Cigdemli Village
Nabi	Ispirioglu	Teacher	Ataturk Univ.
Fuat	Yildirim	Technician	Chamber Of Mechanical Engineer
Ziya	Yurttas	Prof.Dr.	Ataturk Univ.
Yavuz	Saatcioglu	Assignee Of President	Etsu
Mustafa	Oztepe	Map Engineer	Botas
Oguzhan	Bayrak	Coordinator	UNDP
Ebru	Demirekler	Environmental Manager	Botas
Bulent	Cindil	Technician	Gtz-Mvv
Ergin	Salihoglu	Project Coordinator	Gtz-Mvv
Kerem	Ozturk	Marketing Manager	Akay Inc. Co.
Pinar	Yapanoglu	Trade Specialist	UK Embassy
Yilmaz	Kuskay	General Manager	Akay Inc. Co.
Ismail	Efe	President	Ilica Municipality
Semseddin	Erkaya	Sarikamis Governor	Ministry Of Interior
Bahri	Tiryaki	Governor	Susuz District
Hasan	Sildak	Selim Governor	Selim District
Ahmet	Yucel	Mechanical Engineer	
Aga	Takor	Driver	Airport
Mehmet	Abret	Student	Ataturk Univ
Osman	Korkmaz	Supervisor	Ataturk Univ
Selaattin	Cigal	State Officer	A.Univ
Mustafa	Erkayiran	Ilica Governor	
Sirri	Hayta	Manager	
	9	Farmers	
	5	Unlisted occupations	

BTC MULTISTAKEHOLDER FORUM
Adana Forum Participants
August 28, 2003

NAME	SURNAME	OCCUPATION	ORGANIZATION
Metin	Göregen		S.S. Gölovasi Coop.
Mustafa	Süt		S.S. Gölovasi Coop.
Hasan	Zengin	Map Engineer	Chamber Of Map Engineers
Recep	Eker	Mayor	Kurtkulagi Municipality
Ibrahim	Kesler	Forest Engineer	City Environment And Forest Management
Tahsin Cem	Ülker	Correspondent	Dogan News Agency
Kemal	Küçük	Correspondent	Sabah Newspaper
Osman	Balci	Correspondent	Zaman Newspaper
Serhat	Sanli	Cameraman	NTV News Agency
Celile	Ertunç	LTO Advisor	TC Co.
Bünyamin	Yil	Correspondent	DHA
Alev	Akyüz Bahçeci	Environment Supervisor	Botas Bakü Ceyhan
Mustafa	Kebir	Correspondent	Star Newspaper
Ahmet	Sari	Adana Branch Manager	Chamber Of Electric Engineers
Mehmet	Sengül	Manager	
Mehmet	Varan	Correspondent	Aksam Newspaper
Hamza	Gül	NTV Adana Repesantative	NTV
Fatih	Karatasli	Technician	Botas
Bülent	Baratan	Expert	Botas
Cem	Selanik	Engineer	Ministry Of Energy
Mehmet	Tatar	Member Of Board	Chamber Of Geology Engineers
Lütfiye	Ekerbiçer	General Secretary	Adana Chamber Of Industry
Özgür	Opsar	Eu Department	Adana Chamber Of Industry
Nusret	Bas	Member Of Board	Chamber Of Architects
Mahmut	Teberik	Secretary	Chamber Of Mechanical Engineers
Dilek	Akin	Correspondent	A.A
Murat	Barhun	Correspondent	Kanal A.Tv
Burçin	Teymen	Statistician	Adana Cahmber Of Trade
Armagan	Kabakli	Cameraman	Kanal A
Sabit	Özkeser	Correspondent	Dünya Newspaper
Remzi Ümit	Atay	Lawyer	Adana Environment Protection Foundation

NAME	SURNAME	OCCUPATION	ORGANIZATION
Halil	Akyürek	President	Tema Foundation
Mert	Altintas	Project Manager	WWF Turkey
Özlem	Dalkiran	Board Executive	Amnesty International/Uluslararası Af Örgütü
Tamer	Soylu	Project Manager	Tema Foundation
Varol	Öner	Muhhtar	Kurtpinar Kasabasi Merkez Mah. Ceyhan
Duran	Aytuttu	Mayor	Kurtpinar Municipality
Alper	Sezener	Pr Supervisor	Botas
Sinasi	Apaydin	Engineer	Chamber Of Geophysics
	1	Fisherman	
	5	Farmers	
	3	Retired	
	6	Unidentified	

BTC MULTISTAKEHOLDER FORUM
Ganja Forum Participants
September 1, 2003

NAME	SURNAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION
Makhir	Isayev	Journalist	"Media", "Vishka", "Zerkalo", "Bakinets" newspapers
Vugar	Babayev	Vice-president	Ganja Agrobusiness Association
Emin	Abbasov	Senior advisor	Executive Power of Ganja city
Salman	Jafarov	Head	Environmental department
Jamal	Mammadov	Chairperson	"Bilik society" Ganja Regional Organization
Rovshan	Muradov	Chairperson	"Galajajin sasi" youth association
Akifa	Aliyeva	Chairperson	Ganja office of Helsinki Citizen Assembly
Jeyhun	Safarov	Journalist	Internews newspaper
Chingiz	Nazarov		ECO-TES
Teymur	Mammadov	Engineer	"NUR" NGO
Vakhid	Guliyev	President, professor	"Ana Kur" International Environmental Fund
Huseynbaba	Akhundov	Technologist	Ganja Regional Scientific Centre
Fuad	Akbarov	Executive Director	Az (ACG) Ltd. SOCAR
Rauf	Aliyarov	Executive Director	Azerbaijan (Shah-Deniz) Ltd. SOCAR
Irishad	Abbasov	AMEA Ganja Regional Scientific Centre, department director, laboratory director	Ganja Agrobusiness Association
Vagit	Tariverdiyev	local reporter	"Respublika" newspaper
Elnur	Safiyev	Trainer	Centre for Training and Consultancy
Javanshir	Suleymanov	WREP Az. Operations Supervisor	BP AZDP
Hasan	Huseynli	Director	Ganja Education Centre
Alikram	Gurbanov	Head of Flora department	Ganja regional Ecology and natural resources department
Vagif	Hudadatzadeh	Head of Atmosphere and water department	Ganja regional Ecology and natural resources department
Irada	Atai	Environmental issues consultant	Executive Power of Ganja city
Elshad	Huseynov	Head of Fauna department	Ganja regional Ecology and natural resources department

NAME	SURNAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION
Oktay	Hajiyev	Coordinator	CLEE, Ganja department
Safar	Agayev	Scientific officer	Ganja Regional Scientific Centre
Rena	Yuzbashova	Programme leader	CLEE
Emin	Huseynov	Economist	World Bank
Farman	Nabiyev	Editor-in-chief	"Mingechevir ishiglari" newspaper
Giansha	Omarov	President	Mingechevir Human Rights Resource Centre
Sahib	Babayev	Chairperson of legal committee	Helsinki Citizens Assembly, western branch
Mushfig	Jafarov	Coordinator	"Galajaja Korpu" youth association
Telman	Kerimov	Deputy director	Secondary school
Ahad	Mammadov	Teacher	Secondary school # 2
Shahin	Aliyev	Headmaster	Secondary school
Imamverdi	Bayramov	Teacher	Secondary school
Gabil	Hasanov	Director	Ganja Debate Centre
Zaur	Humbatov	Vice-president/ head of botanics chair	1. Azerbaijan Agricultural Academy 2. Organization for environmental control
Matlab	Najafov	Director	Ganja Business Group
Arif	Jakhangirov		Ganja Business Group
Ramiz	Abbasov	Volunteer	CLEE- Ganja office
Zeynab	Ibrahimova	International relations	Bilik
Thomas	Schmutz	Communication Manager	Zurich Municipality
Khatira	Iskender	Community Relations Manager	BP Azerbaijan
Vagif	Imanov	Coordinator	Independent Centre for Civil society
Martin	Skalsky	Manager/ caucasus coordinator	Centre for Transport and Energy
Ursula	Biemann	Professor	University of Art and Design
Israil	Aliyev	Deputy chairperson	"Maishat" association
Saida	Bagirova	Operations Officer/ Acting Country Manager	The World Bank
Rovshan	Novruzov	Chairperson	Ganja Regional Children Fund
		Landowners	9
		Unemployed	1
		Pensioners	1

BTC MULTISTAKEHOLDER FORUM

Baku Forum Participants

September 4, 2003

NAME	SURNAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION
Vugar	Akhmedov	Chairman	Azeri-American Youth Association
Yuliy	Zaytsev	Senior Environmental Advisor, Upstream projects	BP Azerbaijan
Faig	Mamadov	Advisor to the executive director	The IMF
Vagif	Hasanov	HR Specialist	UMID NGO
Alvin	Gul	Sector leader "Marine environment"	Institute of space exploration, Azerbaijan Academy of Science
Huseyn	Panahov	Chairman	Young Azeri Volunteer Association
Oliver	Broad	Communication	BP
Ramiz	Rzayev	Deputy director of Examination department	Ministry of Ecology and Natural resources
Chingiz	Nazarov		ECO-TES
Sabit	Bagirov	President	Entrepreneurship Development Foundation
Huseyn	Bagirov	Minister	Ministry of Ecology and Natural resources
Christian	Lowe	Head of South Caucasus Bureau	Agence France Press News Agency
Fuad	Akbarov	Executive Director	Az (ACG) Ltd. SOCAR
Rauf	Aliyarov	Executive Director	Azerbaijan (Shah-Deniz) Ltd. SOCAR
Juan	Boulos	Senior Manager	CCFC
Fariz	Akhmedov	Oil agreements coordinator	Azerbaijan Greens Society
Kamran	Makhmudov	President	Environmental Research Centre
Ramina	Nazarova	Journalist	Azernews newspaper
Chimnaz	Shabanova	Head of the Group	Ecoscope- Group of Ecological Education
Bakhtiyar	Mamedov	Bisnis Representative	Bisnis, US department of commerce
Shahin	Panahov	Senior Advisor to UN Resident Coordinator	UN Resident Coordinator Office
Sahib	Mammadov	Coordinator	Coalition for BTC public support and monitoring
Jamila	Ibrahimova	Programme Advisor	UNDP
Bakhtiyar	Muradov	Regional Coordinator	Caspian Environment Programme
Ramil	Isgandarov	Deputy Chairman,	Azerbaijan Young Lawyers' Union

NAME	SURNAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION
		Programme Coordinator	
Rena	Yuzbashova	Programme leader	CLEE
Saadat	Babanjarli	Chairman	International Society of Human Rights Protection
Zaur	Hasanov	Editor	ANS TV
Solmaz	Hajiyeva	Chairman	Oilmen Women society
Gulnaz	Guliyeva	Journalist	Caspian Business News newspaper
Kamalya	Mustafayeva	Reporter	Sharg News Agency, Upstream
Azay	Guliyev	President	National NGO Forum
Naila	Yagublu	Advocacy Manager	Himayadar Humanitarian organization
Himayat	Rizvan gyzy	Chairman	Himayadar Humanitarian organization
Sevinj	Hasanova	Local consultant	ADB
Yegana	Babayeva	Deputy director	Women and Modern World
Shahin	Mammadov		Himayadar Humanitarian organization, Vergiler newspaper
Asker	Abbasov		Mechanics-mathematics organization
Nizami	Akhmedov	Lawyer	Ecolex –Azerbaijan
Ramil	Gasymzadeh	Department director	Azadinform
Shamil	Movsumov	Head of environmental department	International Eco-energy Academy
Hasan	Hasanov	President	ODAR
Eldar	Ibrahimov	Deputy chairman	Society and legal public union
Natalie	Voronina		Ecograph
Aliya	Maulesheva	Intern	UNDP
Urkhan	Alakbarov	Manager	AIOC, Azeri Project
Ilkin	Garayev	Director	AzEcoConsulting company
Fuad	Akhundzadeh	Department director	Karvan - Center of Social researches
Evdokiya	Khanbekova	Chairman	Golden Hive
Fizuli	Abiyev	Programme Coordinator	HAYAT
Saadat	Jahangirova	Reporter	Azadlig newspaper
Mirvari	Gahramanli	Chairman	Oilmen rights committee
Martin	Skalsky	Manager/ caucasus coordinator	Centre for Transport and Energy
Shole	Mahmudova	Ecologist	ECORES
Fuad	Akhmedov	Executive Director	SOCAR, Azerbaijan Southcaucasus pipeline
Koroglu	Hajiyev	Director	Mechanics-mathematics organization
Jeyhun	Mammadbayli	Executive Director	Business Development Alliance
Ali	Gasymov	Designer	ATA- ecology
Jeyran	Bayramova	Chairman of	Institute of peace and democracy

NAME	SURNAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION
Imran	Abdulov	environmental department Deputy chief	Ministry of Ecology and Natural resources
Sevil	Isayeva		Ecolex –Azerbaijan
Seymur	Aliyev	Reporter	Sharg News Agency
Lidiya	Guluzadeh	Leader	TETA "Khazri"
Rustam	Ismaylov	Specialist on oil and gas production and transportation	ECORES
Hamid	Aliyev	Member of management	Azerbaijan Greens Movement
Samir	Isayev	National team leader	Environmental Information Education and Public Awareness Project
Esmiralda	Mehdiyeva	Member	Azerbaijan Greens Movement
Mayis	Gulaliyev	President	Caucasus NGO Confederation
Arif	Gambarov	Deputy head of department	AR EA. AMAKA (Az. Aerospace)
Osman	Gunduz	Director	Multimedia Centre
Fargana	Sadirova	Reporter	Bizim Asr newspaper
Islam	Atakishiyev	Press photographer	Bizim Asr newspaper
Farida	Rizayeva	Department director	Azer-press Information Agency
Ali	Khalilov	Member of scientific-technical department	Ecological Innovation Centre of Azerbaijan
Robert	Sadikov	Scientist	AREA AMAKA (Azaerospace)
Abdulla	Abdullazadeh	General director	Ecological Innovation Centre of Azerbaijan
Fagan	Askerov	Editor-in-chief	Caspian Business News newspaper
Radik	Ismaylov		Lider TV
Namik	Najafov	Director	"Origami" public children and teenagers union
Aydin	Kerimova	President	Independent Rights Centre
Afet	Javanshirova	Member of movement	Azerbaijan Greens Movement
Taleh	Bagiyev	Chairperson	
Elchin	Sardarov	Director	Humanitarian Informational Agency SANIYA
Gurban	Gurbanov	Chairperson	Azerbaijan Engineers Union
Gulnara	Yusifova	Executive Director	Azerbaijan Society development
Ingilab	Akhmedov	Director	TREND Agency
Rashad	Shirinov	Journalist	Azernews newspaper
Nabat	Mammadova	Commercial Assistant	British Embassy
Enver	Safarzadeh	Representative	Crude Accountability

NAME	SURNAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION
Gary	Campbell	HSE Director	BP
Sudaba	Shiraliyeva	Director	Women and Art Centre
Sevinj	Heydarova	President, editor-in-chief of the ecology bulletin	For the Sake of Us- Life, Alternative, Development
Farida	Huseynova	Chairperson	Azerbaijan Greens Movement
Azer	Garayev	President of Society	Azerbaijan Society for Protection of Animals
Firuza	Amirova	Leader	"Our Home" Caucasian International Children Environmental Union
Akhmed	Gasahmoglu	Chairperson	Azerbaijan –Holland Fund
Javid	Muradov	Consultant	PR Consulting
Dilara	Veliyeva	President	Forum and Mulk association
Richard	Mc Crensky		US Embassy
Ragiba	Ismaylova	Assistant	Ecolex –Azerbaijan
Malahat	Hasanova		Women of Parliament - public organization
Afet	Mekhtiyeva	Reporter	"Trend" information -analytical agency
Lala	Nazirova	Manager	Safe future
Bahram	Rustambekov	Reporter	Media-Press- information agency
Elchin	Akhmedov	Leading specialist	Ministry of Economic Development
Elchin	Sultanov	Head of Ornithological laboratory	Institute of Zoology, Azerbaijan Academy of Science
Rahim	Huseynov	Director	Centre of Economic reforms, Ministry of Economic Development
Farda	Asadov	Executive Director	OSI-AF
Mirabbas	Mammadov	Reporter	Zerkalo newspaper
Akhmed	Surkhayev		
Naila	Bagirova	Reporter	BBC World Service
Kamal	Abbasov		ATA- ecology
Fikret	Jafarov	Chairperson	Society for sustainable development
Saleh	Huseynov	President	Agroeco-consulting centre
Azer	Zeynalov		BP Enterprise Centre
Salim	Babayev	Editor	AsSA-Irada
Nariman	Agayev	Expert	Independent Consumers Union
Telman	Zeynalov	President	National Institute of Environmental Prognosis
Azad	Aliyev	Chairperson	Centre for Socio-Economic Development of Azerbaijan
Galina	Kozlova	Head	Ecograph- NGO
Shahla	Ismaylova	Chairperson	Women's Association for Rational Development

NAME	SURNAME	POSITION	ORGANIZATION
-------------	----------------	-----------------	---------------------

		Unemployed	6
		Laborers	10
		Unidentified	4

BTC MULTISTAKEHOLDER FORUM

Borjomi Forum Participants

September 8, 2003

NAME	SURNAME	OCCUPATION	ORGANIZATION
Jerry	Anderson		USAID
Gia	Chanturia	GIOC	Tbilisi – Government
Bekauri		Land Management	Tbilisi – Government
Gela	Kvaratskhelia	Governor of Samtskhe - Javakheti Region	Tbilisi – Government
Badri	Tsatava	MoE (Advisor)	Tbilisi – Government
Gia	Djordjoliani	MoE (Head of Department of Examination)	Tbilisi – Government
Tamaz	Gabetsadze	Department of Geology, NGO Coalition	Tbilisi – Government
Shota	Adamia	Georgia Academy of Sciences	Tbilisi – Government
Tamaz mukhuladze		Head of mining industry	Tbilisi – Government
Gedevan	Popkhadze	Gamgebeli of Borjomi	Borjimi – Government
Zaza	Gelashvili	Deputy Gamgebeli of Borjomi District	Borjimi – Government
Vaja	Beridze	Deputy Rtsmunebuli	Borjimi – Government
Amiran	Gogoladze	Dgvari	Borjimi – Community Leader
Suliko	Sandadze	Andeziti	Borjimi – Community Leader
Vaso (or Levan)	Pashchenko	Tsikhisjvari	Borjimi – Community Leader
Zura	Kachidze	Sakuneyi	Akhaltsikhe – Community Leader
Tamar	Matoshvili	Adigeni	Akhaltsikhe – Community Leader
Malkhaz	Gogoladze	Sakuneti	Akhaltsikhe – Community Leader
Nino	Lomidze	Union “Journalists	Saving Bordjomi Valley
Tristan	Tsutskiridze		Media Development Association
Irakli	Giushvili		Union “Borjomi
Vano	Shalutashvili		Borjomi Institute of Public Democracy
Valeri	Lomidze		Newspaper "Borjomi
Marina	Gelashvili		Youth Cultural Center “Caucasus
Givi	Kitiashvili		Borjomi Institute of Public Democracy

NAME	SURNAME	OCCUPATION	ORGANIZATION
Vladimer	Abramishvili	Industrialists Bakuriani	NGO Mretsvelebi"
Ioseb	Maisuradze	Industrialists Bakuriani	NGO Mretsvelebi"
Nugzar	Gongadze	Industrialists Borjomi	NGO Mretsvelebi"
Konstantine	Khetaguri		Citizens interests and rights protection Union
Izo	Kurtanidze		Women for Peace
Tamar	Miqaberidze		Women for Peace
Manana	Orjonikidze		Support for Women and Child Rights
Irma	Chochnidze		Support for Women and Child Rights
Izolda	Tvauri		Public Ideas Hall of Borjomi
Shalva	Gelashvili		Youth Union "Tetri Tagvi
Romuli	Kukulava		Borjomi Georgian – German Social-Cultural Union
Marina	Macharashvili		Borjomi Regional Association of human rights protection and protection of justice regarding prisoners
Nino	Cheishvili		Equal Opportunités for Children
Mevludi	Chaduneli		Ecological NGO "Biospero" of Borjomi
Roin	Gelashvili	Coalition of Borjomi NGO	Borjomi Georgian – German Social-Cultural Union
Lia	Tsiskarishvili		Women for Welfare
Zura	Chilingarashvili		Broadcasting company "Imperia"
Zurab	Magradze		Meskheta Development Center
Nana	Natenadze		Union "Atskuri"
Lela	Inasaridze		Meskheta Voice
Robert	Muradian		Union "Anod"
Khatuna	Khmaladze		Union "EKODAHA
Lili	Gozalishvili		Union « Vale »
Nana	Zubashvili		Environmental NGO "World"
Ramaz	Tedoradze		Nongovernmental organization "Khurotmodzgvari"
Gogi	Ivanidze		"the Way to democracy"
Nodar	Gorakhov		NGO "Metsenati" (Maecenas, Patron)
Nana	Ioseliani		"For women welfare"
Manana	Iadze		Tribe union "Grel"
Amiran	Meskheli		Democratic Meskhs union

NAME	SURNAME	OCCUPATION	ORGANIZATION
Shalva	Dalalishvili		Broadcasting company "Lomisia"
Zurab	Lomidze		« Invalid's union »
Tamar	Matoshvili		NGO "Khvana
Khvicha	Robakidze		NGO "Katarzisi
Dito	Gobejishvili		NGO " Zudi"
Apri	Aprikashvili		Elders council of Arali village
Pavle	Aptsiauri		Georgian Householder's Assosiation
Lela	Inasaridze		Meskheta Voice
Lili	Gozalishvili		Vale
Taliko	Gozalishvili		Khvana
Marina	Modebadze		Union of Democrat Women
Tsira	Meskhishvili		Toleranti
Ramaz	Kordzia		Mtsvane Jvari (Green Cross)
Medgar	Chelidze		GIOC
Guliko	Galdava		GIOC
Zurab	Shurgaia		GIOC
Kakha	Tolordava		WWF
George	Sandanadze		WWF Caucasus
Nugzar	Zazanashvili		WWF
Clive	Wicks		WWF UK
Paul	Steel		WWF International
James	Cayton		WWF UK
Martin	Skalsky		Center for Transport and Energy
Davin	Bremner		International ALERT
Irina	Chitashvili		CENN
Paata	Nakashidze		CENN
Ursula	Kazariani		CENN
Gurgen	Akopov		CENN (Bakuriani organization)
Keti	Dgebuadze		International Information Center of Social Reforms Coordinator of Caucasus Sub-regional NGO Network
Mariam	Begiashvili		Institute of Social Researches
Archil	Gachehciladz		Salpord Georgia
Manana	Kochladze		National coordinator of CEE Bankwatch Network
Nugzar	Buachidze		Provision of Ekohidrometeorological Reliability of Georgian Transit Roads and Oil & Gas Pipelines"

NAME	SURNAME	OCCUPATION	ORGANIZATION
Avelina	Davituliani		Association of Georgian Women Scientists
Mariam	Kimeridze		"Orchis", the Georgian Society of Nature's Explorers
Kakha	Nadiradze		Asociacion for Farmers Rights Defence
Gela	Gligvashvili		Center of Eco-Genetic Security "GALGI"
Manana	Devidze		"Ecology of Caucasus"
Dario	Thuburn		World Maricets Research Center
Otar	Sichinava		Ecocenter for Flood and Flashflood Mitigation
Edisher	Katsadze		Center for Development and Cooperation
Merab	Tvalchrelidze		International Center for the Assessment of Anthropogenic and Natural Impact On the Environment
Marat	Tsitsqishvili		Ecoakademia
Vazha	Aptsiauri		Eco Habitat
Guram	Buachidze		Academy of Sciences
Jemal	Vachnadze		Eco Climate
Loris	Gugushvili		Eco Information
Omar	Janelidze		NGO "Budeki"
Merab	Kachkachishvili		NGO Coalition
Melor	Alpenidze		Society of Geologists
Zurab	Tsqvitinidze		Ekousaprtkheoba
Murtaz	Gongadze		Small enterprise – "Likani"
Zurab	Gelashvili		joint-stock company "Mzetamze"
Nari	Dekanosidze	Lawyer	
Meri	Buachidze	Economist	
Liana	Lomidze	Director	Borjomi #2 Secondary school
Iuri	Tsereteli	Surgeon	
Thomas	D'Vaal		Financial Times
George	Kupatadze		BS Press
Eliso	Chapidze		Resonansi
Tamaz	Turmanidze		Resonansi
Georg	Kraveishvili	Photo Correspondent	"Sakinform"
Teona	Baramidze		Georgian State Television, I Channel
Sophiko	Khetagashvili		Newspaper "Borjomi"

NAME	SURNAME	OCCUPATION	ORGANIZATION
-------------	----------------	-------------------	---------------------

69

Farmers/Landowners/Local Citizens

BTC MULTISTAKEHOLDER FORUM
Tbilisi Forum Participants
September 11, 2003

NAME	SURNAME	OCCUPATION	ORGANIZATION
Jerry	Anderson		USAID
Donna	Kenney		USAID
Kent A.	Larson		USAID
Gogi	Vashakmadze		Parliament, Committee of Energy
Gia	Chanturia		GIOC
Nino	Chkhobadze		MoE
	Bekauri		Land Management
Guram	Buachidze		Georgia Academy of Sciences
Tengiz	Lazarishvili		Georgia Academy of Sciences
Temur	Mdinaradze		GeoWaterProject
Tamaz	Gabetsadze		Geology for the Safe Environment
Geidar	Palavandishvili		GeoWaterProject
Avtandil	Pirtxalava		Institute of Sanitary and Hygiene
Gela	Gligvashvili		Ego-Genetical Security Center
Gia	Zhorzholiani		MoE
Badri	Tsatava		MoE
R. Michael	Cowgill		Georgian Government, Pipeline Advisor
Ilia	Chkheidze		State Department of Geology
Rusudan	Tsereteli		Georgian Information and Cultural Center
Tamaz	Okropiridze		Youth Union for Support to Orphan Children
Irakli	Bebiashvili		NGO "Rustavi City"
Nugzar	Khmiadashvili		Council of Veterans and Pensioners
Dali	Kobakhidze		International Union of Socially Vulnerable People
Mariam	Begiashvili		Institute of Social Researches
Keti	Dgebuadze		International Information Center of Social Reforms Coordinator of Caucasus Sub-regional NGO Network
Avelina	Davituliani		Association of Georgian Women Scientists
Kakha	Nadiradze		Associacion for Farmers Rights Defence
Givi	Kochoradze		European Commission National Contact Point in Georgia in IT Bakhtrioni I corp.
Micheil	Kaviladze		International Center for Nature Study and Rehabilitation

NAME	SURNAME	OCCUPATION	ORGANIZATION
Marat	Tsitsqishvili		Ecoakademia
Eldar	Gugava		Agricultural University, Professor
Levan	Bagdavadze		Borjomi Mineral Waters
Ursula	Kazariani		CENN
Shota	Mestvirishvili		Technical University
Nana	Sumbadze		Institute for Policy Studies
George	Tarkhan	Mouravi	Centre for Geopolitical and Regional Studies
George	Khutsishvili		ICCN
George	Sanadiradze		WWF Caucasus Office
Nugzar	Zazanashvili		WWF Caucasus Office
Kakha	Tolordava		WWF Caucasus Office
Jasques	Fleury		GG & MW Co.
Lasha	Chkhartishvili		Union of Nature and Animals' Rights' Protection "Lobo"
Mixeil	Avaqiani		"Multinational Georgia". Head of Young Armenians Union of Georgia
Tamar	Tssikhistavi		ICCN
Otar	Sichinava		Ecocenter for Flood and Flashflood Mitigation
Givi	Badashvili		GIOC (s.n.s.k)
Beso	Abashidze		GAYLA (Association of Young Georgian Lawyers)
Givi	Tsintsabadze		hydro station "Nadarbazevi" under construction
Elizbar	Elizbarashvili		"Ekoklimati"
Temo	Gochitaishvili		Academy of Sciences (Technical commission)
Shota	Adamia		Academy of Sciences, Tbilisi State University
Merab	Tvalchrelidze		International Center for the Assessment of Anthropogenic and Natural Impact on the Environment
Rusudan	Simonidze		Green Movement of Georgia
Ledi	Maisuradze		Informational – Consulting Studding Center
Givi	Kvirikashvili		Informational – Consulting Studding Center
Manana	Devidze		"Ecology of Caucasus"
Nino	Lomidze		East-West Energetic Corridor for Population and Environment Protection
Mzia	Gvilava		MoE / GRID – Tbilisi

NAME	SURNAME	OCCUPATION	ORGANIZATION
Nino	Nadiradze		UNDP
Ilham	Mehtiev		GTZ (German Technical Cooperation)
George	Sigua		"Ekomed +"
Jimi	Medzmariashvili		"Ekomed +"
Tamila	Liparteliani		"Green Alternative"
Nino	Gujaridze		Network of Central and Eastern European Banks' Supervisors
Manana	Kochladze		National coordinator of CEE Bankwatch Network
Ketevan e	Kvinikadze		"Green Alternative"
Vakhtang	Estatishvili		"Ulpani"
Irishad	Abbasov		NGO "Ecograf" (from Azerbaijan)
Guliko	Galdava		GIOC
Medgar	Chelidze		GIOC
Aladin	Mirzoev		GIOC (Gardabani region)
Archil	Gachechiladze		Salpord Georgia
Zurab	Qaremidze		Institute of America-Caucasus
Grigol	Mamatsashvili		Agro ecological society
Tristan	Chkonia		Agro ecological society
Tamaz	Turmanidze		Agro ecological society
Giorgi	Kandelaki		Open Society Institute NY, Eurasianet
Eter	Khorguani		Agro ecological society
Maia	Akhalkatsi		NGO "Orchis"
Mirian	Gvritishvili		Tbilisi, Botanical Garden
Davit	Zurabishvili		Institute of Independence
Leila	Gaprindashvili		"Leagal Georgia"
Manana	Martkopishvili		Vake Development
Martin	Skalsky		Center for Energy Transportation
Marina	Lashxauri		Association for Ecological and Biological Monitoring
Manana	Grdzlishvili		"Green Alternative"
Irakli	Avalishvili		Institute of Cybernetics
Shalva	Givishvili		Movement for Firm Development of Georgia
Guram	Simonishvili		Union "Simi"
Mariam	Ubilava		Sustainable Development Committee of the Union of Georgian Economists
Beka	Mikautadze		the Urban Institute
Jemal	Vepkhvadze		AgroEcological Society
Gia	Kajaia		Tbilisi State University, Faculty of

NAME	SURNAME	OCCUPATION	ORGANIZATION
			Ecology
Tengiz	Japaridze		Agricultural University
Leila	Injgia		Georgian "Social House"
Tamaz	Mamageishvili		Georgian National Council
Davit	Chichinadze		Department of Veterinary
Shalva	Abramishvili		NGO "Association of Young Nature Scientists"
George	Tsintsadze		Crude Accountability (USA)
Omar	Janelidze		NGO "Budeki"
Marina	Bulia		Rustavi (city), #12 secondary school
Zurab	Kanteladze		Rustavi (city), #6 secondary school
Besik	Mosulishvili		Rustavi (city), School #9
Goderdzi	Tskhovrebadze		Rustavi (city), Classical Gymnasia
Givi	Mumladze		Rustavi (city), #17 secondary school
Guram	Kobiashvili		Rustavi (city), #10 secondary school
Nodar	Sepiashvili		Rustavi, Kvemo Kartli Transport Union
Mukhrat	Muradov		Marneuli district, deputy of Gamgebeli
Pridon	Gvarliani		Trade unions
Liana	Charkviani		Kvemo Kartli school district department
Irakli	Murtskhvaladze		"Union of Students of Tbilisi State University" (NGO)
Giorgi	Makhatadze		Tbilisi State University
Giorgi	Gamkrelidze		Agricultural University, Head of Students Union
Levan	Gogichaishvili		Tbilisi Technical University, Students Union
Lasha	Silagadze		Tbilisi Technical University, Union of Yang Oil Industry Workers
Noe	Sulaberidze		University of Pedagogy, Students Union
Tamar	Giorgadz		Dyfid
Shalva	Pipia		British Embassy, Tbilisi
Emzar	Kobaidze		Gardabani, Village Akhali Sameba
Davit	Apciauri		Gardabani, Village Akhali Sameba
Thomas	DeWaal		Financial Times
Chloe	Arnold		BBC World Service
George	Kupatadze		BS Press
Natalia	Gladchenko		Georgian Times
Kristina	Tashkevich		Georgian Messenger
Merab	Moistsrapishvili		Georgia Today
Svobodnaia	Gruzia		Gabriel namtalashvili

NAME	SURNAME	OCCUPATION	ORGANIZATION
Eliso	Chapidze		Resonansi
Teona	Baramidze		Georgian State Television, I Channel
Mzia	Gvilava		Grid Tbilisi
Nona	Kvlividze		Khvalindeli Dge
Tea	Shtirishvili		"Sarke"

34 Landowners

IFC and EBRD Attendance List

European Bank for Reconstruction and Development

Charlotte Philipps - Senior Banker
Jeff Jeter - Senior Environmental Adviser
Doina Caloianu - Outreach and NGO Relations Manager
Kate Dunn - Media Liaison
Nikolay Hadjiyski - Head, EBRD Resident Office - Tbilisi
Thomas Moser - Head EBRD Resident Office - Baku
Dariusz Prasek - Head, Operational Support

International Finance Corporation (of the World Bank Group)

Rashad Kaldany, Director Oil, Gas, Mining & Chemical Department
Shahbaz Mavaddat, Associate Director, Small & Medium Enterprise Department
Ronald Anderson, Chief Environment Specialist
Carlos Franzetti, Principal Counsel
Hyun Chan Cho, Investment Officer
Ted Pollett, Sr. Social Development Specialist
Shawn Miller, Social Development Specialist
Yasmin Tayyab, Civil Society Coordinator
Felicia Swanson, Investment Officer
Farzin Mirmotahari, SME Specialist
Aliya Nuriyeva, Program Coordinator, Azerbaijan
Anna Akhalkatsi, Program Coordinator, Georgia
Saida Bagirova Operations Officer, World Bank, Azerbaijan

Facilitators

Mary Margaret Golten, CDR Associates
Tim Turner, CDR Associates
Sema Alpan Altamer, Turkey
Jafar Jafarov, Azerbaijan
Sofiko Shubladze, Georgia