APPENDIX 8A

Scoping Consultation Presentations and Meeting Minutes

BP- MENR WG Meeting

Date/Venue: 15.00, 5th August 2008 / Expertise Department, MENR

Participants:
BP
Bill Boulton, Environment Team Lead, MPPU **(BB)**
Ayaz Hasanov, ESIA Coordinator, MPPU **(AH)**
Saadet Gaffarova, Senior Environmental Advisor, CET **(SG)**
Ilgar Mammadov, Project in Country Fabrication Director, MPPU **(IM)**

MENR
Tatyana Javanshir, Expert of Expertise Department **(TJ)**
Mirsalam Gambarov, Head of CCEMA **(MG)**

Subjects of discussion:

- Presentation of BP New Projects for the ESIA Development, presentation pack used contained:
  - COP and SDII Project information received from Mel Green & Greg Withers
  - Proposed ESIA schedule for COP, SD II Early Civils and SD II ESIA's
  - Key focus areas of the ESIA's
  - Summary of lessons learnt from previous ESIA
  - Recommendation that technical presentations are provided to the MENR and other key stakeholders as the design work progresses

- Subsea manifold discharges:
  - MENR representative TJ expressed concerns about open loop system on manifolds and discharges of hydraulic control fluid from multiple manifolds. She suggested reviewing alternative options and avoiding the use of open loop systems that result in a discharge of hydraulic fluid
  - **Action:** Early engagement with the MENR on the issue of open vs. closed loop essential. BB to liaise with Leatherhead/Staines team to confirm consultation program with MENR, technical presentation to the MENR required in 3/4Q 2008.

- Produced water forecasts:
  - MENR representative TJ request confirmation on the produced water forecasts for the SDII project and clarification on the presented forecast for COP & ACG
  - **Action:** Non-Technical description on how the ACG produced water forecast was prepared required. AH to liaise with Martin Snodgrass and prepare document covering ACG produced water forecast and issue to MENR by 8/9/08
  - **Action:** Technical presentation with MENR required once better definition on SD II produced water composition, forecasts and handling options. BB to liaise with UK SD II team and plan meeting with MENR late 4Q 2008

- Early civils ESIA and relocation of 3rd party utilities and services:
  - MENR representative MG requested BP to pay particular attention to the requirements of local legislation when planning the removal of third party services, ensuring all relevant authorities are consulted and the MENR would need to be involved in the approval process of the relocation of the services.
  - **Action:** BB to work with Nushaba Guliyeva and Nick Thomas to assess implication MENR involvement in the approval process of the 3rd party services and potential schedule impacts and confirm MENR engagement plan by 1/9/08.
  - **Action:** Nushaba Guliyeva to liaise with Permitting and Regulatory affairs team to confirm list of agencies, which will need to be involved and/ or notified of the 3rd party services relocation, and provide engagement plan by 1/9/09.

- Sangachal Terminal expansion work:
  - MENR representative TJ required clarity on the modifications and changes to Sangachal Terminal that have been made to the terminal that are not covered by the ACG Phase I-III ESIA's and SD Stage I and subsequent ESIA's. TJ recommended that the ESIA covering the SDII project also covers the modifications.

    BP representatives stressed that the SD II Project ESIA's will focus purely on SDII expansion work and that BP would address the modification work issue to the present operating terminal separately.

  - **Action:** Sangachal Operations Team: Abdulla Abdullayev (Sangachal Terminal HSSE Manager) and Amjad Shaikh (Sangachal Terminal Environmental Team Lead) to address MENR request for clarification and meet with the MENR by 15/9/08 – date to be confirmed with Abdulla/Amjad.

- Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Trans-boundary Context:
  - MENR representative TJ request BP to formally notify that the SDII Project and COP will potentially result in trans-boundary impacts. Azerbaijan has ratified the international convention on the subject and MENR will advice whether BP are required to notify riparian countries about COP and SD II ESIA's.
  - **Action:** AH to confirm with AzSPU compliance team, BP's obligations under the convention, confirm BP actions and issue formal response to the MENR by 10/9/08.

Shah Deniz 2 Infrastructure ESIA
Initial Consultation Meeting with IoAE

Thursday 12/05/11, BP Hyatt Tower 2

Attendees:
Rashad Bayramov (RB [C&EA])
Ali Aliyev (AA [C&EA])
Ibrahim Ismayilov (II [C&EA])
Najaf Museyibli (NM [IoAE])
Chris Polglase (CP [URS])
Dave Maynard (DM [Landsker])

1. Introduction (RB)

- Briefly thanked Najaf for attending.
- Explained that we were going to discuss two new projects, one that is imminent and fairly concrete, the other that is just in the early planning stages.

2. SD 2 Discussions (CP, NM)

- CP introduced the project and referred Najaf to the letter that they received earlier this week from BP C&EA.
- CP explained that we are seeking IoAE's input as we plan the project and that we would like their comments in writing.
- CP also explained that BP's plan is to incorporate IoAE's information in our plans for archaeological baseline studies for SD2 and that CP might be back in a few weeks to discuss this further with IoAE.
- NM provided the following initial feedback:
    - He could only think right now of the information that we have already (i.e., the known sites, the caravanserai, and the Muslim cemetery that is well outside of the project area).
    - He said that it is hard to assess archaeological potential without going into the field, but that he expects that some form of archaeological baseline survey would be required and that IoAE would need to be involved.
    - He assumed that any work conducted for SD2 would follow the same principles as were used for BTC/SCP. CP interpreted this to mean he was assuming that we'll follow the 5 phase approach.
    - He wanted to know about the sequence and timing of the work and whether this was part of an ESIA. CP explained that it was in support of an ESIA, and that we might need IoAE support both before the ESIA is completed, and afterwards if there are any needs for additional phases of work. CP also let him know that construction may be a year off.
    - Najaf said that he will need better project details at some time in the future to better plan activities.
    - Najaf stated that we should not need to interact with the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, because the issues for SD 2 related to archaeology. CP explained that because of the presence of the caravanserai, BP needs to consult with MoCT as well.

ACTIONS:		
IoAE (NM)	IoAE will provide written comments to C&EA in response to the letter that initiated discussions related to SD 2. The letter will address concerns regarding known archaeological sites and monuments and expectations for archaeological baseline surveys, if any.	Ongoing
URS (CP)	Upon receipt of written comments from IoAE, URS will draft an SoW for an archaeological baseline survey. When the general plan for this survey is approved by BP, it will be presented to IoAE for consideration and discussions regarding how to execute.	URS is waiting for receipt of IoAE letter w/comments
BP	Provide IoAE with more detailed project plans.	When available

3. SCPx Discussions (DM, NM)

- DM introduced the SCPx project and noted that the project was just in the planning stages.
- NM had few questions, because of the early stage of the discussion.
- No immediate actions required.

4. Meeting Close-out

- NM asked about the status of the Smithsonian book.
- CP explained that it was finished and that his understanding is that it was stuck in customs at Baku airport.
- NM also asked about a previously discussed book launch in Baku. None of the C&EA people had information about the book launch.

Shah Deniz 2 Infrastructure ESIA
Consultation Meeting with MoC and IoAE

Thursday 2/06/11, Caspian Energy Centre

Attendees:
Ali Aliyev (AA [C&EA])
Jeyhun Karamov (JK [BTC Operations])
Steve Laming (SL [Shah Deniz 2])
Guivami Rahimli (GR [C&EA])
Goshchar Goshcharli (GG [IoAE])
Temur ???? (T? [IoAE])
Malahat Farajova (MF [MoC/Gobustan])
Arif Aliyev (Arif [MoC])
Two additional MoC staff (not introduced)
Chris Polglase (CP [URS])

1 Introduction (AA)

- Provided safety note.
- Thanked representatives of MoC and IoAE for attending.
- Provided a brief explanation that BP was preparing an ESIA for the SD2 project and that we were meeting to discuss our needs.

2 SD 2 Description (SL)

- Explained that as part of this presentation he was going to focus solely on the on-shore components of the project.
- Referred to the two projects for SD2 (infrastructure vs. construction) and described the separate project by the Roads Authority for the flyover/interchange.
- Identified broad schedule as the work for the infrastructure project beginning in January 2012 and the work on the flyover/interchange beginning at the end of 2012.
- SL described some of the environmental constraints (i.e., soil and hydrology) that affected the design of the project and that a geotechnical study was underway.
- Asked for questions or comments.

3 Questions/Comments

- GG stated that an archaeological survey would be needed and that it was expected practice to extend that survey beyond the project impact area.
- Arif and MF noted that MoC wanted to know how far the pipeline landfall will be from the Sand Cave and they will want protection around the cave. They indicated that the cave is a protected monument.
- CP indicated that one reason for this meeting and the letter sent in April was for MoC to provide information like this, that BP was not aware that the Sand Cave was a protected monument and that if they had additional similar information, BP would like a response in writing from MoC.
- MF asked how far the project was from the Gobustan reserve and asked for detailed plans of the project.
- One of the unnamed MoC staff asked what controls would BP put in place to protect cultural heritage from catastrophic events, such as the oil spill in the Gulf. SL responded that BP was working on detailed risk analyses so that they could put in place appropriate means for mitigating large-scale events.
- After seeking clarification on the size of the project, Arif explained that any project over one hectare required a permit from MoC. He emphasized that the completion of a report by the IoAE does not mean a project has been permitted. MoC still needs to approve the project. SL asked for clarification on the roles and responsibilities of MoC and IoAE and Arif clarified that MoC was the legal permitting authority and that IoAE provides technical guidance to MoC in permitting projects. Arif explained that MoC has no archaeologists on staff (except at the Gobustan Reserve), so they use IoAE to review and/or conduct studies, but that any reports should be provided to MoC so that they can approve a project. GG concurred with these points.

- Arif also mentioned that the law indicates that MoC may provide an observer during archaeological excavations.
- When offered a brief tour, GG explained that IoAE might need two days to tour the site and would need to come out with appropriate PPE. It was not clear what GG was referring to when suggesting that IoAE might need two days for a tour.
- GG mentioned again the need for a survey and CP explained that he would be in touch with IoAE to begin to scope the survey.
- Arif thanked BP for their efforts and acknowledged BP's commitments to cultural heritage, which he said exceeded most other organizations.

4 Meeting Close-out (AA)

- AA thanked everyone for attending.

5 Bus Tour

- SL guided a brief bus tour out to the expansion area.

ACTIONS:		
URS (CP)	The SD2 team needs to coordinate the scoping of an archaeological survey with the IoAE	Ongoing
URS (CP)	Attempt to limit the archaeological survey to just the SD2 area of direct impacts	Ongoing
BP	Get clarification regarding GG's suggestion that IoAE would need two days to complete a tour of the site.	Ongoing
BP	Seek definitive statement from MoC that they have no concerns regarding maritime cultural heritage that may be affected by the project	Ongoing
URS (CP)	Add the Sand Cave to areas listed in project plans for protection.	Ongoing
URS (CP)	Get coordinates on the Sand Cave	Completed 3/6/11
URS (CP)	Confirm that the Sand Cave is a protected monument	Ongoing
URS (CP)	Check on the law defining responsibilities of MoC and determine if they legally can ask to monitor archaeological studies	Ongoing
MoC (Arif)	MoC will provide written response to letter from C&EA related to SD2.	Ongoing
BP	BP will provide detailed plans of SD2 to MoC	Ongoing

Shah Deniz 2 Infrastructure ESIA
Meeting with MoCT

Tuesday 4/10/11, Hyatt Tower III

Attendees:
Ali Aliyev (AA [C&EA])
Jeyhun Karamov (JK [BTC Operations])
Aysel Yurifsade, (AY [BTC Operations])
Bill Boulton (BB [S'D2 Environmental and Social Manager])
Malahat Farajova (MF [MoCT])
Fazil Mamedov (FM [MoCT])
Haji Hajiyev (HH [MoCT])
Unnamed MoCT Staffers (two)
Chris Polglase (CP [URS])
Carrie Albee (CA [URS])

1 Introduction (AA)

- Thanked representatives of MoCT for attending.
- Brief introductions of meeting participants.

2 SD 2 Infrastructure Project Background (BB)

- Referred to the two projects for SD2 (infrastructure vs. construction) and described the separate project by the Roads Authority for the flyover/interchange.
- Identified broad schedule as the work for the infrastructure project beginning in January 2012 and lasting for 18 months. Construction works will follow.
- Explained that the Cultural Heritage Baseline Surveys (CHBS) were being completed as part of the ESIA for the Infrastructure Project and that the reports from the CHBS would be incorporated into a revision to the ESIA.
- Let MoCT know that there would be a CHBS close-out meeting in November, after the report was submitted.
- Indicated that Watching Brief would be conducted during earthworks activities.

3 Discussion Regarding Architectural Baseline Survey (CP)

- Explained URS' plans for the architectural baseline survey at the caravanserai and the Sand Cave.
- Noted that URS' focus was on the current condition of the monuments, since we do not believe, at this time, that the project will have direct impacts.
- Reviewed schedule for delivery of study.
- Posed a series of question (see below) regarding the monuments.

4 Questions/Comments

- In response to a question of the age of the monuments, FM stated that the caravanserai dated from the 15th or 16th century and the Sand Cave was a natural feature that was very old. He also stated that they had no reason to doubt these dates.
- FM and MF agreed to provide available data related to monuments if Garadagh District and regarding the caravanserai. FM explained that if URS wanted detailed historical research that we could contract to a new department in the MoCT that has been set up for this purpose.
- The MoCT staff reviewed their knowledge of other caravanserai in the area and how the caravanserai were part of a broader transportation system that included wells and bridges as part of the generalized trade routes.
- MoCT staff asked if there would be a watching brief during construction and BB and CP confirmed that there would be such. FM then explained that MoCT can choose to participate during such monitoring and that his team may want to participate alongside the IoAE.

- BB and CP offered to provide a draft protocol for watching brief and interface between BP, their contractors, IoAE and MoCT during the close-out meeting in November and to discuss this protocol at that time.
- FM offered to have a member of his staff, Tarana, be the regular interface with BP and AY will serve as the BP interface.

5 Meeting Close-out (AA)

- AA thanked everyone for attending.

ACTIONS:		
URS (CP)	Complete CHBS fieldwork	Ongoing
BP	Provide CHBS reports to MocT.	Ongoing
BP	Schedule CHBS close-out meeting to include MoCT representatives.	Ongoing
BP	Provide draft protocol for watching brief and interface with MoCT for close-out meeting.	Ongoing