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9 CONSULTATION PROCESS

9.1 Introduction

It is normal practice for the ESIA process to include information disclosure followed by consultations with stakeholders. Stakeholders may be considered to be individuals, groups and organisations whose interests may be affected by a proposed project and who may have an ability to influence decisions concerning the location(s), construction and operation of the project prior to and during the approval process. Disclosure and consultations are required throughout the ESIA process and often during the post-approval construction and operational phases of a project.

This chapter includes a presentation of stakeholder consultations (i.e. disclosure and consultation activities) carried out for the SCPX Project ESIA. The ESIA consultation activities were conducted in accordance with a Public Consultation and Disclosure Plan (PCDP) that was prepared at the beginning of the ESIA process (see Section 9.3).

Figure 3-1 shows the stages at which the different interactions between stakeholders and the ESIA process occur. As there is a significant range of stakeholders (see Section 9.4) the numbers of stakeholders involved and the intensity of input varies according to the type of ESIA stage/activity. However, most consultation is undertaken during the baseline and disclosure stages of ESIA.

9.2 Previous and Existing Stakeholder Engagement

BP has been operating in Azerbaijan since the mid 1990s and has established strong relationships with key stakeholders. ESIA-related stakeholder consultations have been implemented for development of the WREP, BTC and SCP pipelines (and associated facilities), the Sangachal Terminal, and offshore exploration and production activities in the Caspian.

During ESIA implementation for those pipeline projects, extensive stakeholder consultation programmes were undertaken, involving, *inter alia*, national and local government entities, NGOs and communities along the pipeline routes. The SCPX stakeholder consultation programme has built upon the lessons learnt from the WREP, BTC/SCP and the WREP-SR projects; and the pre-existing established relationships between current BP operations and key stakeholders.

ESIA work for the SCPX Project began in Q4 of 2010. A draft initial PCDP was prepared in 2011 and further developed in Q1 of 2012. Comprehensive ESIA consultations, implemented in Q1 2012 and based on the PCDP, informed the scope of the SCPX ESIA work. Consultations continued into 2013 with a focus on the public disclosure of the draft ESIA report. The results of these disclosure-related consultations were used to assist preparation of the final ESIA report.

9.3 Public Consultation and Disclosure Plan

In accordance with the requirements of the SCP host government agreement (HGA) as presented in Chapter 6 Policy, Legal and Administrative Framework, the SCPX Project PCDP structure and content was developed to be consistent with the following:

- International natural gas industry standards and practice generally applied to comparable projects
- World Bank Group standards and practice regarding ESIA consultations, as exemplified by the International Finance Corporation’s Performance Standard 1 on
“Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks and Impact”¹ (and accompanying Guidance Note)

- Azerbaijani legislation pertaining to conduct of environmental impact assessments and prescribed requirements for public disclosure and consultations.

In addition, the PCDP is aligned with BP’s practice and recommendations with regard to the conduct of ESIA-related consultations.

The PCDP presents the range of stakeholders to be consulted and the consultation activities to be implemented then links them to key stages in the ESIA process. The aims of the PCDP are to help ensure that:

- Adequate and timely information is provided to stakeholders
- Stakeholders are given sufficient opportunity to voice their opinions and concerns
- These opinions and concerns are considered in determining the ESIA work and in project decision-making.

The PCDP was developed as a flexible, working and ‘live’ document, to be used during the ESIA work, while still adhering to the HGA requirements.

Initially, a draft version of the PCDP was prepared, prior to initiation of the other key ESIA activities, and was used as a basis for the consultations aimed at further informing the scope of the ESIA. Subsequently, as necessitated by changes in the progress of the ESIA, the initial PCDP was updated and amended. A copy of the current version of the PCDP is located in Appendix C.

9.4 Stakeholder Identification

A stakeholder identification workshop was held in Baku on 14 October 2010 involving key SCPX Project personnel and representatives of the BP in Azerbaijan. The aims of the workshop were to identify key stakeholders, including vulnerable groups, key concerns, past and current relationships with stakeholders, and lessons learned from BTC/SCP and current BP operations in Azerbaijan. The workshop participants also developed an initial consultation strategy and timetable, and defined roles and responsibilities for consultation activities.

Following this work a list of key stakeholder groups was developed:

- National and local government authorities
- Project-affected communities (PACs), essentially settlements located wholly or partly within defined distances from SCPX Project components (such as pipeline and access roads)
- International and national NGOs
- Scientific community
- Media (print, radio and TV)
- Diplomatic missions and international organisations
- SCPX Project partners
- BP staff.

¹ In addition, cognisance was taken of the recommendations contained in IFC (2006) ‘Lessons of Experience: The Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan (BTC) Pipeline Project’, Number 2. Washington, DC: IFC. Also, although an archived document, account was taken of IFC’s ‘Guidance for Preparation of a Public Consultation and Disclosure Plan’, Environmental and Social Review Procedure Guidance Note F.
9.4.1 National and Local Government Authorities

The box below shows the key national government stakeholders subdivided into those with a formal role in the ESIA report approval process (primary stakeholders) and those with a recognised interest in the SCPX Project (secondary stakeholders). The government stakeholders listed in the box were considered for consultation as discussed in the PCDP Appendix C.

### 1. Primary (approval)

- **Governmental stakeholders who were consulted in February 2012**
  - Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MENR), the key governmental environmental institution in Azerbaijan. Within MENR, the Office of State Ecological Expertise (SEE) is responsible for reviewing environmental aspects of new projects and issuing environmental permits.
  - The State Oil Company of Azerbaijan (SOCAR); the Host Government Representative for the SCPX Project
  - Ministry of Culture and Tourism (MoCT), Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography (IoAE)

### 2. Secondary (consultation)

- **Governmental stakeholders who may provide data/feedback for the ESIA**
  - Special State Protection Service (SSPS); Export Pipelines Protection Department (EPPD)

### 3. Other (information)

- **Governmental stakeholders that will be provided with information about the ESIA**
  - Milli Majlis (parliament)
  - State Border Service, Customs Committee, Migration Service, Marine Administration
  - State Committee for Standardization and Patents

Local government stakeholders are the appointed officials and elected representatives in those regions (*rayon*), municipalities (*baladiyya*), and self-governing cities in whose territories SCPX Project activities will take place. The current regional and local government structure is illustrated in Table 9-1.

### Table 9-1: Local Government Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Entity</th>
<th>Elected Representatives</th>
<th>Appointed Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional/district (<em>rayon</em>)</td>
<td>Municipality (city) head</td>
<td>Executive authority (<em>Ijra Hakimiyyeti</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baladiyya</td>
<td>(ExCom)</td>
<td>Head of Regional Executive Committee (<em>Ijra</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Head of village municipality (<em>Baladiyya</em>)</td>
<td>Executive authority (ExCom)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All the municipalities of the identified PACs and regions where the PACs are located are considered as local government stakeholders.

9.4.2 Project-affected Communities

One hundred and sixteen towns and villages, of varying sizes, along the proposed route of the SCPX pipeline have been identified as PACs. A PAC is defined (based on an update of criteria used for the BTC/SCP Projects) as an inhabited settlement that falls within the following boundaries or has at least one inhabited structure that is on/within the boundary of:

- The pipeline (including block valves and the pigging station): 2km either side of the centre-line resulting in a 4km-wide zone
- Construction camps: 5km ‘radius’ based on the centre point of the facility
- Pipe lay-down areas and storage yards: 2km ‘radius’ based on the centre point of a yard
- Access roads (new, upgraded and whether temporary or permanent): 300m either side of the centre-line resulting in a 600m-wide zone.

Two approaches to identifying PACs were used. First, application of the boundary criteria listed above. Secondly, consideration of settlements outside the above boundaries, but located nearby. Each such settlement was subject to a case-by-case analysis of its characteristics considering the following factors:

- Number of private land plots owned and worked by residents, and their total surface area, that are located within one of the boundaries defined above
- Surface area of communal or state-owned land that is used as if it were communal land (irrespective of whether such use is by legal or non-binding agreement between the state and the community) and is located within one of the boundaries defined above
- Judgement by the ESIA team that, on basis of previous experience and available data, there is reasonable likelihood that the community could be affected.

This work was conducted by the ESIA team with input from BP social and land specialists and the outcome of each case-by-case analysis resulted in a decision as to whether a settlement outside of a defined boundary was identified as a PAC.

The PAC list has been updated during the ESIA disclosure period to take account of the pipeline construction camp locations and pipe storage and offloading locations.

A list of the current PACs (as of May 2013) is provided in the PCDP (Appendix C1). This list will be further revised and updated once final construction camps, pipe storage area and all access road locations are confirmed.

Consultation with PACs was a central feature of the ESIA process, and engagement with PACs will continue, post-ESIA approval, during Project construction and operations (Photograph 9-1).

---

2 The total is correct as of May 2013. An additional sixteen PACs have been added during the disclosure phase owing to the identification of the pipeline camps and identification of the pipe offloading and storage locations.
International and National NGOs

International and national NGOs have made important contributions to the ESIA process on account of their knowledge and perspective on key issues of concern and/or their strong links with some PACs. NGOs that have previously participated in audit and monitoring programmes and shown an active interest in BP's activities in Azerbaijan, along with the wider NGO community in Azerbaijan are considered key stakeholders. BP Azerbaijan retains a database on NGOs, and their area(s) of interest, for those NGOs that have been involved previously or are currently involved or interested in BP's activities.

The BTC/SCP list of NGOs with which the projects are actively engaged is provided in Appendix A of the PCDP.

Existing internal NGO databases and/or NGO networks and partnerships were used as required to engage this stakeholder group in consultation on the Project.

Scientific/Academic Community

BP has long-standing relationships with members of the scientific and academic community in Azerbaijan. It was recognised that the scientific community should be engaged in the SCPX Project as members of this community are the experts in their field and can contribute to the ESIA Report. Also, they provide advice and consultancy assistance to the government regulators in the draft ESIA report review process and in 'approval' decision-making, and can contribute to the ESIA process in general.

The key specialists in this community for the Project are members of the National Academy of Sciences, including the Institutes of Archaeology and Ethnography, Botany, Zoology, Geology and Geography.
Existing relationships with the scientific and academic community in Azerbaijan were used as required to engage this stakeholder group in consultation on the SCPX Project.

9.4.5 **Media**
BP has existing relations with media organisations which participate in the regular briefings and updates that BP provides on its activities in Azerbaijan. Information on the SCPX Project will be provided through these existing channels.

The media will be involved in the ESIA disclosure process as different media outlets are one of the key mechanisms for disclosure of information on the SCPX Project and key consultation activities aimed at different stakeholders.

9.4.6 **Diplomatic missions and international organisations**
Diplomatic missions, including foreign embassies in Baku, and international organisations such as multilateral lending institutions (e.g. International Finance Corporation and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development) are considered Project stakeholders and will be involved (by provision of high-level information) as part of ongoing engagement activities in Azerbaijan connected to the existing operations.

9.4.7 **SCPX Project Partners**
SCPX Project partners are also stakeholders in the SCPX Project and will be kept informed and consulted on Project progress at regular intervals, generally through quarterly partner meetings.

9.4.8 **BP Staff**
BP staff members are stakeholders in the SCPX Project and will be kept informed of Project progress at regular intervals.

9.5 **Consultations to Inform Scope of ESIA Work**

9.5.1 **Introduction**
These consultations involved:

- National and local government authorities
- PACs
- International and national NGOs
- The scientific community.

The NGOs and scientific community were consulted together during one meeting, held in Baku on 23rd February 2012.

9.5.2 **National and Local Government Authorities**

9.5.2.1 **National government**
National government authorities include the ‘approval’ issuing entity and those that have a legitimate interest in SCPX and its likely impacts. In total three ‘face-to-face’ meetings were held with MENR, SOCAR, MoC and IoAE (the latter two organisations in a combined meeting). At these meetings the SCPX minutes were taken by a BP representative and the issues raised were recorded.

9.5.2.2 **Local government**
Local governments were briefed by BP on the project and discussions on key issues occurred. In addition, notification meetings (see Section 9.5.3.4 below) were held with PAC
leaders and Excoms\(^3\) in each region with as a precursor to the PAC consultations, and again discussions occurred on any project-related issues raised.

9.5.3 **Project-affected Communities**

9.5.3.1 **Strategy for PAC consultations**
In line with previous pipeline ESIs, a decision was made to undertake consultations in all 100 PACs.

Two approaches were used:

- Consultation meetings with key community representatives from all PACs (approximately 5 from each PAC including the elected and/or government-appointed settlement leader)
- Interviews with a representative sample of PAC residents, via a household survey conducted in 1204 households, to record perceptions, views and issues about the SCPX Project.

The household survey was used to ensure that the views of PAC residents (such as women, disabled/chronically sick and unemployed people) that are sometimes under-represented in more formal or public meetings were obtained.

9.5.3.2 **PAC representatives**
Owing to the number of PACs, and their geographic spread, consultations were undertaken only after three key activities were implemented: preparing a mechanism for consulting the PACs; notification of regional and municipal authorities; and prior disclosure of information.

In previous pipeline ESIs a strategy of clustering PACs was implemented successfully, so a similar approach was chosen for the SCPX Project ESIA. Once the PACs were identified an analysis was undertaken to determine the feasibility of clustering, focusing on:

- Location
- Shared language
- Population size
- Logistic criteria.

Based on these factors most PACs could be allocated to PAC clusters, ‘centred’ on one PAC where it was considered feasible to organise a meeting and to which access was considered likely to be relatively easy for all those to be invited. Twenty-two clustered meetings involving 50 PACs were conducted and individual meetings were held with the remaining 50 PACs. Therefore, in total 72 PAC consultation meetings were held.

Once clustering of PACs had been finalised, attention turned to selecting a mechanism for consultation. Three options were considered:

- Public meetings in each cluster
- Public meetings followed by focus groups representing key ‘livelihood interests’ (such as farming) and ‘social categories’ such as women and vulnerable groups taken from each PAC
- Non-public meetings with selected representatives, from each clustered or non-clustered PAC.

---

\(^3\) Heads of local state administration
The advantages and disadvantages of these options were considered both in terms of consultation effectiveness and in the context of time/resource constraints. A decision was made to implement a series of non-public meetings with pre-selected and invited individuals who were considered to provide a reasonable representation of PAC residents and their likely range of interests.

Thus, it was decided that each PAC should be represented by a PAC leader and between four and seven PAC residents. The types of PAC residents recommended were:

- School director or teacher
- Clinic/hospital doctor or nurse
- Farmer, shop-owner, carpenter (or other resident considered to represent an important PAC livelihood activity)
- A young person of 17–22 years (such as a school/college student)
- Registered disabled person or person who is chronically sick
- Senior or long-standing members of community-based organisations or local associations.

These 'categories' of resident are generic; it was realised that not all PACs would have residents that could represent all of the categories. In addition, it was decided that at least one of the PAC residents (taken from the list) should be female, with no upper limit on the number of women from each PAC.

The selection of the individual PAC representatives was considered best left to the individual PAC leaders. However, a guidance document was prepared and given, in advance of the consultation meetings, to each PAC leader during notification meeting to assist him/her select the appropriate residents to invite to the meetings. The PAC leaders were briefed and given the guidance document at a series of pre-consultation notification meetings with local government entities. The nature and role of the notification meetings is discussed in Section 9.5.3.4.

Following 'lessons learnt' from previous pipeline ESIAs, particularly the BTC pipeline, the meetings' schedules were devised to enable BP to be represented actively in all meetings. Therefore, each consultation meeting was attended by a member of the BP social team (the community liaison officer (CLO)). The BP CLOs are familiar with PAC-related issues and, if the proposed SCPX Project is approved, will be the public ‘face’ of BP that PAC residents are likely to see in/around their communities. Their attendance at the meetings meant that PAC participants were able to receive information/response to their questions from the Project proponent directly and not from a third party.

9.5.3.3 Disclosure of information

Two means of disclosing information were used. First, a community pamphlet was produced in Azerbaijani (based on an English language original), which presented key basic details (text and maps) about the proposed SCPX Project and the ESIA process. The BP address and telephone number were included in the pamphlet to provide the opportunity for comments on the SCPX Project to be submitted to BP at any time not just within the context of the formal consultation events. In total 45,000 copies of pamphlets were distributed in the PACs before the consultations. This amount (45,000) was calculated so that there were sufficient copies to ensure that a minimum of one in two households would be able to receive a copy of the leaflet. These pamphlets were distributed via notification meetings with local government entities.

At the notification meetings PAC officials were asked to leave copies of the pamphlet in public places that PAC residents could access easily. In addition, BP personnel distributed pamphlets in PACs in the time period between notification meetings and the PAC consultation meetings and household survey. At the beginning of each consultation meeting there was a brief description of the SCPX Project followed by a session providing an
opportunity for attendees to ask clarification questions. This provided a valuable opportunity for those who had not been able to read the community pamphlet to gain an understanding of the SCPX Project before contributing to the consultation meeting.

9.5.3.4 Notification meetings

As the consultations were organised on the basis of clustering PACs in one location and use of public facilities for the meetings, the cooperation of local government/regional Excoms entities was crucial. Thus, a series of notification meetings was organised for all local government entities in whose administrative boundaries the SCPX Project would be implemented. These meetings had two main purposes: to notify key appointed officials and elected local government members about the SCPX Project and the ESIA, and to request the support and cooperation of PAC-level local government officials in preparing for the meetings and their subsequent participation.

A key element of the notification meetings was obtaining support and assistance from the PAC leaders and regional Excoms for the consultation meetings. Information and guidance was provided to the PAC leaders and regional Excoms on the:

- Location/time of the meetings
- Format and agenda for the meetings
- Role of the meetings in terms of the ESIA process
- Numbers and type of PAC residents to be invited to attend the meetings.

Notification meetings were attended by BP staff and were organised one week prior to the start of the PAC consultations. A one-week period between notification meetings and consultation meetings was selected to balance the need to allow PAC residents time to read, consider and discuss the project information provided in the community pamphlet, and form an opinion (to be passed to the PAC leader or other PAC residents known to be attending the meetings), and the need for the consultations to occur sufficiently soon after notification while issues were still fresh in the minds of those actually attending the meetings. Follow-up telephone calls were made to the PAC leaders between the notification and consultation meetings to re-confirm the meeting venue, date and attendees.

9.5.3.5 PAC consultation meetings

The consultation meetings occurred in February–March 2012 and were held at different times during the working day. Local government officials were involved in setting meeting locations/times and assisted in confirming that the selected participants could attend.

All meetings followed a standard agenda and were held in Azerbaijani. They were opened by the host PAC leader and facilitated by a member of the local ESIA team. Following a brief description on the SCPX Project and a ‘question/answer’ session, most of the agenda time was allocated to obtaining views, issues and concerns regarding possible SCPX impacts on the PACs/residents.

During the meeting another member of the local ESIA team was taking notes of the proceedings. After each meeting a ‘minute’ was prepared recording the details of the meeting (date, time, location) and the participants (for example, name, gender, and job) and the key issues and concerns raised.

Key points with regard to characteristics of participants are as follows:

- In total 596 PAC representatives attended the meetings.
- Approximately 27% of the participants were women. Women were represented at almost all of the 72 meetings
- Approximately:
o 26% of the participants were classed as “representatives of municipal offices”
o 18% of the participants were classed as “youths/young persons”
o 16% of the participants were classed as “educational workers”
o 12% of the participants were classed as “health care workers”
o 8% of the participants were classed as “registered disabled/chronically sick”
o 1% of the participants were classed as “IDPs (internally displaced persons)”
o 7% of the participants were classed as “farmers”
o 5% of the participants were classed as “waged workers”
o 4% of the participants were classed as “unemployed”
o 3% of the participants were classed as “entrepreneurs”.

9.5.3.6 **PAC household survey**

Household surveys were conducted in 43 PACs to obtain socio-economic baseline data. The household survey was based on a common and standardised questionnaire. In total 1204 respondents were interviewed.

The household survey presented an opportunity to ask residents about their knowledge of the proposed SCPX Project and to obtain their views and concerns regarding likely impacts (Section 9.6.3). Interviewers distributed copies of the pamphlets to respondents who had not seen/read a pamphlet prior to the interviews.

9.5.4 **NGOs and Scientific Communities**

NGOs based in Azerbaijan (national NGOs and international NGOs with offices in Azerbaijan) and representatives of the scientific community were invited to attend a workshop in Baku held on 23 February 2012. Twenty-three members from various NGOs and scientific communities attended the workshop. The workshop was organised and led by BP personnel and the workshop agenda and structure followed that used on similar previous occasions:

- Project description presentation covering project schedule, ESIA process and land acquisition process
- Question and answer session.

9.5.5 **Consultation on Potential Cumulative Projects**

Consultations with a number of governmental and non-governmental organisations were undertaken in order to obtain information on future planned developments which may have the potential for cumulative impacts with the proposed SCPX Project. The organisations consulted and the results of the consultations are detailed in Chapter 11, Cumulative and Transboundary Impacts.

9.6 **Consultation Results**

9.6.1 **National, Regional and Local Government Authorities**

The concerns/impact issues raised by national government stakeholders during a series of meetings in 2012 are summarised in Table 9-2.
### Table 9-2: Summary of Concerns and Impact Issues Raised by National Government and Government Agencies Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Concerns/Impact Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MENR</td>
<td>Issue was raised about considering new potential gas sources by the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern with regard to building a new pipeline for each case owing to environmental and social impacts. It is suggested to consider all new potential gas sources, e.g. gas from Turkmenistan, for export in future through SCPX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information request on alternative energy sources such as solar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue was raised with regard to project benefits to local communities that do not have gas supply at their homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issue was raised with regard to applying previous BTC/SCP experience (lessons learnt) for SCPX construction and operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration of alternative routing options for expansion of gas export pipeline system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of SCPX transboundary impacts in accordance with Espoo Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCAR</td>
<td>Questions and issues were raised with regard to length of land acquisition phase, lesson learnt from BTC/SCP, seasonal monitoring of flora and fauna, and crossing points for species during construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoCT, IoAE</td>
<td>Questions and issues were raised with regard to permitting requirements, sourcing local contracts, archaeological excavation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9.6.2 NGOs and Scientific Communities

The concerns/impact issues raised by NGOs and scientific community members in a workshop held in Baku on 23rd February 2012 are summarised in Table 9-3.

### Table 9-3: Summary of Concerns and Impact Issues Raised by NGOs and Scientific Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders Present at Meeting</th>
<th>Concerns/Impact Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGO’s</td>
<td>Issue was raised with regard to compensation procedure and applying Azerbaijani regulations on land prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Analysis Centre</td>
<td>Issue was raised with regard to type of community programmes and implementation of new Community Investment Programmes (CIPs) as the existing community development programmes are not completed yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Research Centre</td>
<td>Concern about the expansion of the pipeline corridor and its impact on agriculture and productivity of lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Economic and Social Development (CESD)</td>
<td>Discussion clarifying that construction of the pipeline started from KP57 in part in order to avoid the World Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Sustainable Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan Green Movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSSC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecomed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Workers rights protection organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Enlighteners Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholders Present at Meeting          Concerns/Impact Issues

Scientific Community
Azerbaijan Science Academy
Institute of Physiology
Institute of Zoology, Azerbaijan Science Academy
Institute of Botanic
State Oil Academy

Other
Ecology Department of SOCAR
SOCAR

Monument “Gobustan Reserve”.
Issue was raised with regard to economic benefits of the project for Azerbaijan

9.6.3 Project-affected Communities
Separate results are presented for the series of PAC consultation meetings and for the household survey.

9.6.3.1 PAC consultation meetings
Following review of all PAC consultation meeting minutes, a synthesis of the issues/concerns raised regarding possible impacts (and related matters) was prepared. Many of the issues/concerns raised at different meetings are similar in focus, but are expressed in different ways. The synthesis allows all these to be captured without repetition. Particular care was taken to avoid omission of any impact issues or concerns. Table 9-4 presents the synthesis of PAC impact issues/concerns and the identity and number of PACs in which a topic was mentioned.

Key generic concerns and impact issues raised by representatives of a range of PACs are listed below (not in order of importance):

- Livelihood/land acquisition and compensation
  - Impact of pipeline on land use (restriction of local access to grazing lands) and the existing infrastructure (water pipe, houses) affecting locals livelihood
  - Type of compensation and the amount that will be paid to land users/owners
  - Distribution of receiving compensation among the residents

- Infrastructure and related social investments
  - Impacts of heavy machinery on roads and effects on local residents from possible decline in road network conditions and concern over liability for repair
  - Repairing the existing infrastructural facilities including drinking water supply, a sewerage system, telephone line and railway track
  - Provision of gas for the villages with no gas supply
  - Provision of heating for medical centre
  - Local concern about lack of surgeries and qualified medical personnel
  - Social facilities (for example, schools, kindergarten, recreation facilities) support/repair
  - Support for vulnerable people
  - Social support to focus on needs of local residents (for example bee keeping and greenhouse projects)
o Provision of low interest loans to entrepreneurs and farmers

- Labour and employment opportunities
  o Effects on job opportunities and accompanying concern that job allocation is equitable and non-discriminatory in terms of gender, ethnicity and age, but to favour PAC residents. Particular interest in ‘spreading’ the benefits from jobs
  o Project benefits associated with employment opportunities with preference to be given to young people
  o Provision of training opportunities by BP
  o Benefits associated with construction camps for villages with regard to employment opportunities

- Environmental effects
  o Damage to the surrounding environment and flora and fauna

- Community health, safety and security
  o Unplanned incidents such as leaks and likely impacts on local people
  o Air quality changes (mainly from particulates) and impacts on health of local residents
  o Impacts of radiation and public health
  o Impacts of noise and disturbance to locals
  o Vehicles exceeding speed limits and possible road accidents
  o Lack of organised security, and on occasions, locals could not access their lands due to project security restrictions.

- Others
  o Provision of project information (type of project, timing) to locals.
### Table 9-4: Summary of Concerns and Impact Issues Raised by PACs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Impact Issues</th>
<th>Comments on Impacts/Concerns</th>
<th>Raised in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Livelihoods 'Land Acquisition and Compensation'</strong></td>
<td>Concern that the pipeline is passing through lands where cattle normally graze. The access to those lands is now restricted by BTC/SCP to local residents, which has an impact on their livelihoods. In Susha village, the BTC/SCP pipeline passed under some houses.</td>
<td>Anver Memmedhali, Susha, Garacamirli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owing to the BTC/SCP pipeline passing by the water plant, people are not permitted to irrigate their crops and do not have access for their farm machinery/tractors. In Boyuk Kesik, BTC/SCP pipeline affected the existing water pipe and locals did not have water for some time.</td>
<td>Atakishily, Khyrdapay, Choxhranly, Boyuk Kisik, Duzdak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns raised about local residents not being able to use land within 500m of the pipeline.</td>
<td>Kechily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions raised about the type of compensation available and what kind of damage will be compensated. In Gillinjbayli, during the BTC project, some land provided to local residents was not restored.</td>
<td>Lyak, Samukh, Padargishlag, Ramal, Shahliq, Alikend, Gillinjbayli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns about method of calculation and distribution of compensation. During the last project, some people who were not residents in the village received compensation, while many of the local residents did not.</td>
<td>Garasu, Padar, Bargyushad, Ashagy Leky, Bozalganli, Padargishlaq, Sigirly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure/Social Investments</strong></td>
<td>Construction/repair of a road(s) in settlements (especially inner village roads). Some of the roads were damaged as a result of the previous project and still have not been repaired.</td>
<td>Garasu, Padar, Chiyny and Anver Mammadhali, Garaberk, Gulabend, Qaracalli, Taza Shilyan, Chobanabadli, Seyidlyar, Agasibayli, Atakishili, Khyrdapay, Choxhranly, Ashagy Ayibly, Chapartly, Dailly Dashbulak, Duyarli, Duz Girigli, Agdaqavak, Alpout, Aran, Azizbayov, Borsunlu, Narimanabad, Padargishlag, Samadabad, Sarov, Sigirly, Talish, Yaharchi Qazakhlar, Yolpak, Zelimkhan, Duzdak, Irevanly, Fahraly, Gurbanzade, Gillinjbayli, Girag Keseman, Govlar, Qushchular, Soyuk Bulak, Kechveli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BP is asked to solve the problem of (drinking) water supply in the village, a sewerage system (Garabujag) and to repair the railway tracks that are in a poor condition (Padar). There is no piped water in Eyvazlilar.</td>
<td>Padar, Mugan, Chiyny and Anver Mammadhali, Taza Shilyan, Ashagy Agasybeyli, Yuxari Agasibayli, Garabujag, Choxhranly, Yeni Shiximly, Sadamabad, Veyisli, Zelimkhan, Ramal, Shahliq, Alikend, Eyyavazli, Nadirkend,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BP is asked to assist in repairing the telephone line and local electrical network which is in a poor condition.</td>
<td>Choxhranly, Susha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Impact Issues</td>
<td>Comments on Impacts/Concerns</td>
<td>Raised in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns raised about heavy machinery damaging the roads, bridges and lands.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mugan, BP, Barych, Qaracalli, Taza Shilyan, Garabujag, Choxtjan, Ashagy Ayibly, Dallyar Dashbulak, Bayramly, Guvakan, Amirax, Padargishaq, Yaharchi Qazakhlar, Ramal, Shahliq, Alikend, Dallyar Djeir, Deller Jirdaxan, Duzdak, Soyuk Bulak, Kechveli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP is asked to solve the problem of provision of gas to the villages. The villages do not have gas supply. In Duzdak, there is a need for restoring the gas line.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dallyar Jirdaxan, Samabadab, Garacamiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about the water pipe damaged by the BTC pipeline which has not been repaired. In Samadabad, underground drainage was damaged during the BTC/SCP construction work. In Garacamirli, a gas pipeline is crossed by the BTC pipeline.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yuxari Agasibayli, Bozalganli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions raised about BP providing social assistance to the village, as there was no assistance provided during the BTC project.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garasu, Mugan, Anver Memmedhal, Garabujag, Choxtjan, Yeni Shiximly, Ashagy Ayibly, Chapartly, Duz Girigiri, Keclihly, Bayramly, Aran, Yaldly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopes expressed that BP will provide social assistance to the local schools with regard to their renovation and gasification. Also, the villagers of Anver Memmedhal expressed hope that they could get a full secondary school in the village, rather than an eight-year school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qaracalli, Narimanabad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents hope that BP will assist in the construction of a new school building.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mugan, Gulabend, Qaracalli, Garabujag, Ashagy Ayibly, Duyarli, Duz Girigiri, Bayramly, Zeyem, Sary Tepe, Narimanabad, Susha, Karrar, Arshaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopes expressed that BP will help in setting up or repairing a kindergarten and a village club/house of culture. In Susa village, there is only a primary school and no secondary school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baryshaad, Fizuli, Garabujag, Dallyar Djier, Duyarli, Zeyem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents hope that BP will help in setting up/refurbishing sports facilities, as well as a music school in the village (Bargyushad and Ashagy Ayibly).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garaberk, Narimanabad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents hope that BP will assist in refurbishing the sports hall of the local school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qaracalli, Taza Shilyan, Garabujag, Talish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents hope that BP will assist in refurbishing the local hospital and renewing the electric network (Qaracalli). The residents of Garabujag hope that BP will assist in purchasing a transformer for the village.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taza Shilyan, Dallyar Dashbulak, Duyarli, Kechly, Ramal, Shahliq, Alikend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP is asked to assist with providing heating for the local school and medical centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Khyrdapay, Choxtjan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Main Impact Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments on Impacts/Concerns</th>
<th>Raised in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP is asked to assist with diverting groundwater from the local cemetery (via the construction of drainage channels)</td>
<td>Khyrdapay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP is asked to assist the village in constructing/setting up street lighting.</td>
<td>Choxhranly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions raised about BP providing heating for the local medical centre and school.</td>
<td>Chapartly, Veyisli, Dallyar Djeir, Deller Jirdaxan, Dallyar Dashbulak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents would like the village to be provided with litterbins.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents would like BP’s assistance in constructing recreational facilities for the village.</td>
<td>Dallyar Djeir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents would like BP’s assistance in repairing the roof of the local hospital.</td>
<td>Duyarli, Govlar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents would appreciate it if BP could help them purchase computers for the local school.</td>
<td>Kechily, Ramal, Shahliq, Alikend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents would like BP’s assistance in organising a solid waste disposal site for the village.</td>
<td>Sary Tepe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP is asked to provide financial assistance in constructing a community centre in the village as well as help to organise training courses for local youth.</td>
<td>Sary Tepe, Yevlakh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions were asked about BP assisting vulnerable people.</td>
<td>Chiyny and Anver Memmeddhal, Gulabend, Garabujag, Choxhranly, Yaharchi Qazakhlar, Garacamirli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents would like BP’s assistance in setting up a forage centre in the village for livestock.</td>
<td>Sary Tepe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents would like BP’s assistance in funding art and essay competitions at the local school.</td>
<td>Sabirkend, Poylu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents would like BP to provide loans to farmers (low interest).</td>
<td>Agdjaqovak, Ashagy Leky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions raised about BP training opportunities which will make people more employable in BP projects.</td>
<td>Ashagy Agasybeyli, Choxhranly, Yevlakh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some local residents suggested that the construction camp should be established in the village to benefit residents.</td>
<td>Padar, Mugan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents hope that the project will create (permanent) employment opportunities. This did not happen during the last project, i.e. there were no employment opportunities for the local population.</td>
<td>Garasu, Mugan, Khyrdapay, Yeni Shiximly, Dallyar Dashbulak, Dallyar Djeirc, Sabirkend, Zeyem, Poylu, Samadabad, Yevlakh, Deller Jirdaxan, Irevany, Eyvazilari, Nematabad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents hope that the project will bring with it employment opportunities (e.g. for local drivers, young people, security staff etc.).</td>
<td>Mugan, Gulabend, Qaracalli, Ashagy Agasybeyli, Atakishili, Garabujag, Choxhranly, Ashagy Ayibly, Duyarli, Duz Girigil, Khuluflu, Kechily, Sary tepe, Agdjaqovak, Ramal, Shahliq, Alikend, Karrar, Arshaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents would like to know if people from the area will be preferred candidates when applying for jobs, and how decisions on recruitment will be reached.</td>
<td>Seyidlyar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents hope that there will be employment opportunities for young people and women.</td>
<td>Taza Shilyan, Samadabad, Veyisli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents are interested to know about the type of jobs that will be available.</td>
<td>Dallyar Djeir, Deller Jirdaxan,Dallyar Dashbulak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents hope the young people will get a preference in the employment process.</td>
<td>Padar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Labour and Working Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments on Impacts/Concerns</th>
<th>Raised in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some local residents suggested that the construction camp should be established in the village to benefit residents.</td>
<td>Padar, Mugan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents hope that the project will create (permanent) employment opportunities. This did not happen during the last project, i.e. there were no employment opportunities for the local population.</td>
<td>Garasu, Mugan, Khyrdapay, Yeni Shiximly, Dallyar Dashbulak, Dallyar Djeirc, Sabirkend, Zeyem, Poylu, Samadabad, Yevlakh, Deller Jirdaxan, Irevany, Eyvazilari, Nematabad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents hope that the project will bring with it employment opportunities (e.g. for local drivers, young people, security staff etc.).</td>
<td>Mugan, Gulabend, Qaracalli, Ashagy Agasybeyli, Atakishili, Garabujag, Choxhranly, Ashagy Ayibly, Duyarli, Duz Girigil, Khuluflu, Kechily, Sary tepe, Agdjaqovak, Ramal, Shahliq, Alikend, Karrar, Arshaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents would like to know if people from the area will be preferred candidates when applying for jobs, and how decisions on recruitment will be reached.</td>
<td>Seyidlyar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents hope that there will be employment opportunities for young people and women.</td>
<td>Taza Shilyan, Samadabad, Veyisli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents are interested to know about the type of jobs that will be available.</td>
<td>Dallyar Djeir, Deller Jirdaxan,Dallyar Dashbulak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents hope the young people will get a preference in the employment process.</td>
<td>Padar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Impact Issues</td>
<td>Comments on Impacts/Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management**  
*Impacts on protected areas, forests/woods, amenity trees and springs* | Ecologist(s) should be involved in the project from the very beginning to assess the potential negative impacts of the project with regard to inhibiting fruit and vegetable growth, as well as impacts on people. | Garasu, Anver Memmedhali, Taza Shilyan |

|  | Damage to the environment, flora and fauna, affecting fertility of lands and productivity of farming. | Alpout, Ashagy Muliku, Yolpak, Fahraly, Gurbanzade, Nadirkend |
| **Community Health, Safety and Security** | Concerns about dust pollution as a result of heavy machinery operation. Also, some residents concerned about the capacity of waste-water treatment projects in the villages (e.g. where the project wastewater will be treated and then discharged). | Padar, Mugan, Gulabend, Dallyarcirdaxan, Dallyar Djieir, Alpout |

|  | Concerns about air pollution resulting from the pipeline construction and operation affecting health. | Mugan, Sarov, Yolpak, Fahraly, Gurbanzade, Qushcular |

|  | Some residents mentioned high noise levels from the generator installed during the previous project. | Mugan, Sarov |

|  | Some residents are concerned about the level of noise and impact on the village and suggested an alternative route for the construction traffic. | Qaracalli, Duz Girigli, Yolpak |

|  | Concerns about potential radiation in the vicinity of the pipeline and its health impacts. | Kechily |

|  | Concerns about security operations not being properly organised. For example, on occasions people have not been allowed to access their fields etc. | Garasu, Padar |

|  | Concerns about the speed of vehicles employed in the project. During the last project, the vehicles were driving too fast, and caused damage to the local people’s property (e.g. fences). Also, there was a lot of disturbance as a result of fast driving. Residents would like to have a telephone number that they can call to report speeding drivers. Also, providing alternative routes for transport would be good. | Garasu, Bargyushad |

|  | Concerns raised about many villages not having local surgeries/dispensaries (polyclinics) and qualified medical personnel. The residents of Anver Memmedhali are waiting for the construction of a hospital. This might be very useful for BP as well. Many villages expressed hope that their local dispensaries will be provided with medicines and medical equipment. | Mugan, Padar, Garasu, Anver Memmedhali, Garaberk, Gulabend, Qaracalli, Ashagy Agasybeyli, Atakishili, Khyrdapay, Ashagy Ayibly, Sabirkend, Nematabad |

|  | Concerns are raised about the safety of the pipeline/risk of explosion/gas leaks. | Mugan, Gulabend, Yeni Shiximly, Sarov, Susha, Veyisli, Yolpak, Ramal, Shahliq, Alkend, Irevanly, Jinli Boluslu, Nematabad |

| **Information Disclosure and Stakeholder Engagement** | Residents hope that the list of landowners (affected by the project) will be prepared and disclosed beforehand, as there were problems with it during the BTC project. | Samukh, Chobanabadli, Fizuli |

|  | Local residents would like to have a meeting with the construction contractor before the start of construction. | Dallyar Dashbulak |
### Comments on Impacts/Concerns Raised in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Impact Issues</th>
<th>Comments on Impacts/Concerns</th>
<th>Raised in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local residents</td>
<td>Local residents would like to have more information about the timing of the project, the type of works to be carried out, and how this will affect villages. In general, very little information has been provided to the villagers with regard to the project.</td>
<td>Garaberk, Hajali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Some villages have large hospitals with all the necessary medical equipment and the local residents hope that BP will make use of their facilities during construction.</td>
<td>Duyarli, Duz Girigli</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.6.3.2 **PAC household survey**

The results from the household survey showed that most respondents (80% approximately) support the proposed SCPX activities (Figure 9-1). Regarding possible benefits, 73% of respondents consider that there will be benefits including benefits for government, and new employment opportunities (Table 9-5).

![Figure 9-1: Local Support of SCPX Activities](image1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive expectations</th>
<th>Negative expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial for government, people, and our village – 30%</td>
<td>There is no benefit of it – 0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New job opportunities for village inhabitants – 27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land compensation – 16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9-5: Positive and Negative Expectations from SCPX

About 40–60% of respondents consider direct employment and receipt of compensation from land acquisition/use as main benefits of SCPX construction (Figure 9-2). About 50% are not concerned about SCPX activities. However, out of those who have concerns, noise, dust and nuisance are mentioned as key Project concerns (Figure 9-3).

![Figure 9-2: Main Benefits of Construction](image2)
Sixty-seven per cent of respondents do not expect any positive or negative effects associated with local camp workers working near their villages (Figure 9-4). Out of those who consider that there will be benefits, 27% consider employment opportunities and 15% consider home rents as main construction benefits (Table 9-6).

The issues raised during all the consultation meetings have been taken into account during preparation of this ESIA.

During the ESIA process attention was paid to stakeholder concerns as expressed during the series of consultation meetings. Key SCPX Project design and location decisions were made after taking account of such concerns. To the extent practical, and without prejudicing the safe and efficient operation of the Project, changes were made to avoid, prevent and/or
reduce adverse impacts. For example, the pipeline will have a thicker wall where it is in close proximity to inhabited sites thus reducing the hazard potential.

In addition, certain impact mitigation commitments were devised, and included in a series of environmental and social management plans, to achieve the same objectives. Examples of mitigation commitments designed to deal, specifically, with stakeholder concerns are as follows:

- Land acquisition and livelihoods: a land acquisition and compensation framework (setting out the principles and key mechanisms by which livelihoods would be maintained) and an accompanying guide to land acquisition and compensation will be prepared and provided to those likely to be affected by land acquisition. In addition, natural resource features that are used for watering of livestock will be preserved or, if this is not possible, a substitute will be provided and access to grazing will be maintained or, if restricted, allowed to the minimum extent practical.
- Infrastructure damage: there are several commitments relating to avoiding damage and to repair, should any damage occur.
- Employment opportunities: there is a presumption in favour of employing local people if the required skills are available. Targets for local recruitment will be set and local recruitment will be monitored regularly to ensure that this commitment is met.
- Pollution: there will commitments applied to suppressing dust and lowering noise to acceptable levels. Air pollutants will be monitored to ensure that the commitments are being applied and achieving their objectives.

9.7 Consultations on Draft ESIA Report

The disclosure consultations are implemented in accordance with the requirements of the HGA as described in Section 9.3. The draft ESIA report (and associated documents) and the non-technical summary (NTS) were issued in Azerbaijani and English. In addition, a community leaflet that summarised the ESIA process and results was prepared in Azerbaijani and English. Ten thousand copies in Azerbaijani and fifty copies in English of the leaflet were distributed between all PACs.

The disclosure period started on 24 January 2013 with the draft ESIA report and associated documents being uploaded to the BP Caspian website and sent to MENR. They were distributed to certain public locations across Baku for public review and feedback (Section 9.7.1). Regional distribution of the draft ESIA report and associated documents was delayed due to transport logistics problems. As a result the period of time allowed for public comments was extended to the 11th April to take into consideration this delay and to ensure compliance with a maximum of sixty (60) days for public comments as stipulated in the HGA.

9.7.1 Information Disclosure

To assist effective disclosure, and subsequent consultations, BP aimed to ensure that:

- The draft ESIA report was comprehensive and provided a fair reflection of the beneficial and adverse impacts of the proposed SCPX project.
- The draft ESIA report and associated documents were provided in the Azerbaijani and English languages.
- The NTS and a mechanism of providing feedback (to allow comments to be submitted to BP) was made freely available in the PACs.
- The stakeholders were informed of the publication of the draft ESIA report and advised about how they can access a copy and obtain copies of the NTS. The disclosure period for the draft ESIA was 60 days, in accordance with the requirements of the SCP HGA.
Prior to disclosure, information about the ESIA process, the availability of the draft ESIA report (and associated documents) and the consultation process was publicised through the following media outlets and other mechanisms:

- Regional and national local newspapers with a circulation focused on municipalities/cities where SCPX activities are proposed for implementation
- SCPX email databases
- Community noticeboards
- Public information displays at selected venues close to the main centres of project activities
- Leaflets, brochures and posters.

The press notification included the following information:

- The name, aims and place of the development
- The address and website, where stakeholders can obtain/read the draft ESIA report and related materials, as well as the name and address to which written comments must be sent
- The deadline for submitting comments
- The time and venue of the public meeting.

The draft ESIA report (and accompanying documents) was made available at certain key public locations in order to allow stakeholders to review it and provide feedback. Such locations included national and regional government offices, public libraries in key locations (selected, partly, for ease of access for all PACs) and offices of main academic institutions and NGOs that participated in the ESIA consultations. Thus, the draft ESIA report was made available in:

In the regions:

- Public Information Centre located at the Kurdamir Olympic Sports Centre, 2nd floor, Kurdamir district, 22 Baku Avenue, AZ3300
- Public Information Centre, Yevlakh district, Nizami Prospekti, 4th cul-de-sac, Building 2
- Public Information Centre, Ganja city, intersection of Shah Ismayil and Fikret Amirov Streets, the “Emon” Hotel
- Central Library, Agstafa city, 46a Heydar Aliyev Avenue
- Youth Centre, Agstafa city, Heydar Aliyev Park area.

In Baku

- M.F. Akhundov Central Public Library, 29 Khagani Street
- Scientific Library of the National Academy of Sciences, 31 H.Javid Avenue.
- Aarhus Environmental Information Center, MENR, 100 B. Agayev Street
- International Eco-Energy Academy, 5 Mammad Arif Street
- Baku Education Information Centre, 40 J. Jabbarli Street, 2nd Floor
- The Azerbaijan State Oil Academy, 20 Azadlig Avenue
- BP Azerbaijan Offices’ receptions:
  - BP office, Hyatt Tower 2, 1033 Izmir Street, Baku AZ1065
  - BP office Hyatt Tower 3, 1033 Izmir Street, Baku AZ1065
  - Bayil, “Villa Petrolea”, 2 Neftchilar Prospekti, Baku AZ1003
For PACs and other local stakeholders (such as local offices of NGOs) copies of the draft ESIA NTS and the community leaflet were distributed within PACs along the route of the pipeline, together with feedback forms to allow comments to be submitted, received and considered during the disclosure period.

Finally, the draft ESIA report, NTS and community leaflet and other accompanying documents were posted on the BP Caspian (Azerbaijan and English version) website.

### 9.7.2 Disclosure Announcements

The disclosure period started on 24 January 2013 with media announcements placed in national level media (Table 9-7), which included information on the disclosure period (60 days), the location of ESIA documentation, the main public meeting date and the mechanisms for providing feedback (see Appendix C1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zerkalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeni Azerbaijan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525-jı gazet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azadlıq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xalq Qazeti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeni Musavat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The announcement was also placed on the BP Caspian website in Azerbaijan and English.

### 9.7.3 Feedback Mechanisms

Stakeholders had access to the following mechanisms for providing feedback on the draft ESIA:

- Feedback forms (in Azerbaijan and English) were distributed with all copies of the ESIA and NTS and were made available to all PACs. Feedback forms could be returned by post to the BP office address or via passing completed forms to the BP community liaison officers who made regular visits to communities during the disclosure period.
- A BP Office address for written responses was provided in the ESIA, NTS, community leaflets and disclosure advertisements.
- A telephone number for the BP Office in Baku was provided on the ESIA, NTS and community leaflets.
- A dedicated email address was provided on the ESIA, NTS and community leaflets.
- Electronic versions of the feedback form were available on the BP Caspian website in Azerbaijan and English. Forms could be completed and submitted by email.
- Five public meetings were held, which provided the opportunity for interested parties to attend and provide feedback directly to the ESIA team.
9.7.4 Disclosure Consultations– Public Meetings

In compliance with the HGA and national requirements, disclosure consultations were held in the form of public meetings to present the findings of this ESIA (draft ESIA report disclosure) and seek feedback from stakeholders during the draft ESIA report disclosure period. These consultations were based, primarily, on the following series of public meetings that BP organised in Baku and at other key locations near the main areas of project activity, namely Kurdemir, Ganja, Agstafa and Yevlakh (Figure 9-5).

![Figure 9-5: ESIA Public Disclosure Meeting (Ganja)](image)

Meeting dates and times were as follows (Table 9-8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Location</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baku</td>
<td>Hyatt Meeting &amp; Conference Centre</td>
<td>11 March 2013</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdemir</td>
<td>Cultural House Ashyg Ahmad street 36</td>
<td>12 March 2013</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yevlakh</td>
<td>Educational department Heydar Aliyev avenue 66</td>
<td>13 March 2013</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agstafa</td>
<td>Cultural House Eyvaz Gelemseli street 5</td>
<td>14 March 2013</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganja</td>
<td>Ramada Hotel Nizami St, 237</td>
<td>14 March 2013</td>
<td>1530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In accordance with the HGA these meetings were held no later than 60 days after disclosure to allow for public comments. The timing of these meetings was selected to assist attendance by members of the public and to allow time to provide feedback to MENR.

BP prepared an executive summary of all written or oral comments received at the meeting. These have been supplied to MENR for review and BP considered these comments, with...
additional comments received via other consultation mechanisms during the consultation period, when preparing the final version of the ESIA report.

The consultation results and responses are included in Appendix C2.

9.8 Tracking Consultation Results

Recording and structured ‘storage’ of stakeholder consultation results are important actions to make consultation results available to all involved in the ESIA and project design work.

A stakeholder database has been designed and is located on a central server. A protocol has been developed to manage the inputting of data including allocating permissions to key ESIA and Project team members in terms of rights to enter data and amend information already in the database.

9.9 Post-ESIA Consultations and Stakeholder Engagement

During certain consultations, advice and guidance was sought on the principles that should apply to the design and implementation of consultation procedures for the post-ESIA report phase, assuming the proposed SCPX Project were to be approved. The suggestions provided by stakeholders will be used as a basis for formulating recommendations for a post-ESIA framework for information disclosure and consultations with key stakeholders, especially PACs and local governments. This will build on existing and historical stakeholder consultation mechanisms with which key stakeholders including many PACs are already familiar.