

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION..... 1

Tables

Table 1: Responses to Stakeholder Comments and Updates Due to Completion of Disclosure 2
Table 2: Updates, Additional Information and Clarifications 5
Table 3: Modifications on Typographic Error and Inconsistencies 8

1 INTRODUCTION

This appendix is a register of the amendments made during the ESIA disclosure period leading to the production of the final ESIA for submission to the Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development for review and approval.

Amendments have been made to this document to account for:

- The Project responses to stakeholder comments as described in Appendix C2
- Updating references to the public disclosure process which has now been completed
- Minor modifications to the Project design
- Clarifications to aid interpretation of the document
- Correction of erratum.

These amendments are included in the following tables:

- Table 1: Responses to Stakeholder Comments and Updates Due to Completion of Disclosure
- Table 2: Updates, Additional Information and Clarifications
- Table 3: Modifications on Typographic Error and Inconsistencies.

Where an amendment has been noted against a commitment in Appendix E, although not specifically referenced in the table, this change has been made to the commitment in all other locations within the ESIA e.g. Chapter 5, 10, 12 and Appendix D. The ESIA Section Reference column in the tables below reflects the section and table referencing in the final report and should be used for cross-referencing.

Table 1: Responses to Stakeholder Comments and Updates Due to Completion of Disclosure

Responses to Stakeholder Comments and Updates Due to Completion of Disclosure			
Chapter	Section	Table / Figure	Description
1	1.5.3	-	Added information about Appendix C3.
1	1.6	Table 1-1	Amended structure of Appendix C to include Appendix C2 Response to comments during disclosure and Appendix C3 Draft ESIA amendments log.
1	1.6	-	Removed the statement regarding acceptance of comments due to completion of disclosure phase.
3	3.9.6	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 2, removed reference to sanitary water and added a footnote on planned discharges of wastewater as there will be no planned discharge of sewage effluent.
3	3.12	-	Updated the section with details of the completed ESIA disclosure and information regarding the approval of the Final ESIA.
4 (Georgian)	-	-	In response to MENRP comments no. 8-9, minor discrepancies in the Georgian version were addressed; text was aligned with the English version.
4	4.2.3	-	Text regarding the length of option B was corrected in response to MENR comment no. 6.
4	4.4.2	Figure 4-1	New section added in response to MENRP comments no. 4 and 10. The section describes alignment selection for re-route RP-001a.
4	4.4.4	Figure 4-3	New section added in response to MENRP comments no. 4 and 10. The section describes alignment selection for re-route RR-004a.
4	4.4.5	Figure 4-4	New section added in response to MENRP comments no. 4 and 10. The section describes alignment selection for Supsa river crossings.
4	4.5	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 7, added reference to Section 5.5 where the preferred de-oiling option is discussed in more detail.
4	4.5.1	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 7, expanded explanatory text detailing de-oiling options that have been considered by the Project.
4	4.5.2	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 8, added cross-reference to Section 5.5.5 where sectionalisation of redundant pipe is explained.
5	5.2.4	Table 5-2	In response to MENRP comments no. 5 and 11, Section 5.2.4 (Pipeline crossings) has been expanded to include a comprehensive crossings schedule (Table 5-2). Added note explaining that routes for cattle/sheep movement are being identified within the process of land rights acquisition; consequent data with consents from respective parties will be a part of the Construction Permit application package.
5	5.3.6	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 12, added explanation that separation distance is based on Document L51861, Line Rupture and Spacing of Parallel Lines, prepared by Pipeline Research Council International (2002).
5	5.4.13	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 13, paragraph added explaining that HDD is below and beyond the active zone of the river Supsa.

Responses to Stakeholder Comments and Updates Due to Completion of Disclosure			
Chapter	Section	Table / Figure	Description
5	5.5.4	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 21, added a note explaining that de-oiling and cleaning will not use water, thereby avoiding the generation of oily water.
5	5.5.5	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 8, made it clearer that sections will be left filled with air except under main roads and rivers.
5	5.7.1	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 20, added reference to Resolution of the Georgian Government No. 424, dated 31/12/2013 on "Removal, Storage, Use and Recultivation of Topsoil" and statement that Reinstatement Management Plan will be prepared by Contractor.
5	5.8.6	Table 5-8	In response to MENRP comment no. 21, added explanation that the Contractor's Waste Management Implementation Plan will classify wastes in accordance with the Waste Management Code and the new Resolution. De-oiling and cleaning will not use water, thereby avoiding the generation of oil water. No processing or disposal of waste in situ is envisaged. It is anticipated that all wastes will be transferred to licensed waste management facilities. Table 5-8 was expanded to include classification of waste in accordance with the Waste Management Code.
5	5.8.6	Table 5-9	In response to MENRP comment no. 23, Table 5-9 was updated and includes emissions during de-oiling.
6	6.3.4	Table 6-3	In response to MENRP comment no. 21, added an entry for Resolution of the Georgian Government No. 426, "on Definition and Classification of Waste Register by Types and Characteristics."
7	7.3.3	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 14, added explanation that erosion rates of class 3 or lower have proved to be acceptable on the WREP, BTC and SCP pipelines as soil loss is relatively small and can be rectified by routine management measures.
7	7.5, 7.5.3	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 15, added information on pre-construction monitoring of water quality that commenced in July 2016.
7	7.7.4	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 1, a new section on Forest Fund land was added.
7	7.7.4	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 19, information on migratory fish species potentially present in river Supsa was added.
7	7.8.3	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 16, Section 7.8.3 was revised using data from the 3rd National Notification report of Georgia.
7	7.10.1	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 17, information on independent Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for landscape protection zone for the Mtskheta World Heritage Site was added.
7	7.10.8	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 17, a new section on independent Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for landscape protection zone for the Mtskheta World Heritage Site was added.
9	9.2	-	Text amended to reflect completion of disclosure consultations.
9	9.7.1	-	Amended the list of locations where the Draft ESIA report was made available for review and comments.
9	9.7.2	Table 9-6	New section providing details of the ESIA disclosure announcements.

Responses to Stakeholder Comments and Updates Due to Completion of Disclosure			
Chapter	Section	Table / Figure	Description
9	9.7.3	-	New section detailing the ESIA feedback mechanisms used.
9	9.7.4	Table 9-7	Amended section title to specify that it relates to public meetings. Added new Table 9-7 containing details of the public meetings held during the ESIA disclosure. Added reference to Appendix C2 where consultation results and responses to comments can be found.
9	9.9	-	Added text describing the meeting held with the National Forestry Agency and Biodiversity Protection Service to agree the methodology for preparing tree inventories and proposed mitigation and/or compensation for loss of GRL and CITES species. The meeting was held in response to MENRP comment no. 18.
10	10.3.4	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 14, a footnote was added to explain that soil erosion Class 3 had been used as a benchmark for the WREP, BTC, SCP and SCPX pipelines and had been generally considered to be acceptable.
10	10.5.3	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 2, text was added clarifying that there will be no planned continuous discharges to surface water.
10	10.5.4	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 3, a description of the proposed content of the hydrotest management plan was added.
10	10.7.3	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 19, an assessment of potential impacts of HDD operations on migratory fish was added.
10	10.8.3	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 23, clarification was added explaining that fugitive emissions during de-oiling will be very small and limited to small, short-term vapour releases during transfer of oil via break tanks.
10	10.10.2	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 17, information on independent Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for landscape protection zone for the Mtskheta World Heritage Site was added.
10	10.10.4	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 17, a new commitment was added: schedules for work within the Mtskheta WHS LPZ and delivery of equipment and materials via the road to Jvari monastery (AR69) will be agreed in advance with Mtskheta Historic Monuments' stakeholders including NACHP, the Patriarchate of Georgia and community leaders (27-19). Conclusion of the HIA was added.
15	-	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 12, added reference to Document L51861, Line Rupture and Spacing of Parallel Lines, prepared by Pipeline Research Council International (2002).
Appendix E	-	-	In response to MENRP comment no. 17, a new commitment was added: schedules for work within the Mtskheta WHS LPZ and delivery of equipment and materials via the road to Jvari monastery (AR69) will be agreed in advance with Mtskheta Historic Monuments' stakeholders including NACHP, the Patriarchate of Georgia and community leaders (27-19).

Table 2: Updates, Additional Information and Clarifications

Updates, Additional Information and Clarifications			
Chapter	Section	Table / Figure	Description
1	1.5.3	-	Expanded the list of materials that were disclosed to include environmental and social baseline report (ESBR) and technical summary.
1	1.6	Table 1-1	Added Technical Summary to the description of the ESIA structure.
2	-	-	Added definition for dB_{ht} (<i>Species</i>).
2	-	-	Expanded definition of abbreviation <i>HIA</i> to include heritage impact assessment (in the context of cultural heritage).
3	3.8	-	Added text on independent heritage impact assessment (HIA) to assess potential impacts of the WREP SR Project on the historical monuments of the Mtskheta World Heritage site.
4	4.4	Table 4-1	Added explanation why the alignment of the Supsa Export pipeline has changed since the publication of the draft ESIA.
4	4.4.3		Removed commitment 17-38 due to completion of verification surveys.
5	5.2.1	Table 5-1	Details of Supsa River crossings were updated in Table 5-1 following realignment. Cross-reference was added to Section 4.4.5 and Appendix A, where additional information can be found regarding the new crossing alignment.
5	5.2.3	-	Number of new sections of road has changed from nine to eight as AR373a is no longer required. Reference to AR373a was removed.
5	5.4.4	Table 5-4	Number of new sections of road has changed from nine to eight as AR373a is no longer required. In Table 5-4, newly identified AR54 was added; reference to AR373a was removed; total length of roads was updated.
7	7.1.1	-	Updated baseline surveys information to include year 2016.
7	7.7.1	-	Updated baseline surveys information to include those conducted in year 2016.
7	7.7.3	Table 7-11	The list of plant species of conservation value was updated following surveys carried out in spring 2016.
7	7.7.5	Table 7-12 Table 7-13	Section and tables were updated to include the results of ecological surveys carried out in spring 2016.
7	7.7.6	Table 7-14	A line for high conservation value herbaceous plants was added.
7	7.8.4	Table 7-16	Removed location Supsa Export HDD crossing tie-in area, AR373a due to change in HDD alignment. Amended entry on AR373 as use of AR373a is no longer required.
7	7.9.1	Table 7-17	Removed location Supsa Export HDD crossing tie-in area, AR373a due to change in HDD alignment. Amended entry on AR373 as use of AR373a is no longer required.

Updates, Additional Information and Clarifications			
Chapter	Section	Table / Figure	Description
7	7.10.6	-	Added a note stating that AR223 was not surveyed due to late addition to the Project scope and will be subject to an archaeological watching brief during construction.
7	7.10.7	Table 7-18	Added entries on AR223 and AR225 (surveys completed since disclosure)
7	7.10.9	-	Added AR69 to the list of cultural heritage sensitivities.
8	8.4	Table 8-8	Removed an entry on receptors near export pipeline HDD and tie-in site adjacent to AR373a due to the change of the crossing alignment.
8	8.4	Table 8-8	Changed AR373a (no longer required) to AR373; added a farm to the list of receptors for AR373.
9	9.4.1	-	Added Kvemo Kartli and Gardabani to the list of local government entities that have been identified as local government stakeholders.
9	9.6	-	Amended the section title to read "9.6 Pre-disclosure Consultation Results."
10	10.7.2	Table 10-12	Table 10-12 was updated with verified locations of plant species of conservation value following surveys carried out in spring 2016.
10	10.7.3	-	First subheading was amended to read "Habitat and population loss and severance"
10	10.7.3	Table 10-13	New commitment 17-51 was added to mitigate loss of natural habitat/vegetation.
10	10.7.3	Table 10-14	New commitments 17-45 to 17-49 and 17-51 were added for high conservation value plants. Commitment 17-38 was removed as the surveys had been completed. Potential impact was rephrased to read "Loss/disturbance of high conservation value, herbaceous species (CITES and endemic); potential and residual impact significance was revised to C3 Medium/C2 Low respectively and commitment 17-23 was removed as not applicable to this impact.
10	10.7.4	-	Commitment 17-38 was removed as the surveys had been completed. New commitments 17-45 to 17-49 and 17-51 were added.
10	10.8.2	Table 10-16	Removed location Supsa Export HDD crossing tie-in area and AR373a due to change in HDD alignment. Amended entry on AR373 as use of AR373a is no longer required.
10	10.8.3	Table 10-18	Removed location Supsa Export HDD crossing tie-in area and AR373a due to change in HDD alignment. Amended entry on AR373 as use of AR373a is no longer required.
10	10.9.2	Table 10-19	Removed location Supsa Export HDD crossing tie-in area and AR373a due to change in HDD alignment. Amended entry on AR373 as use of AR373a is no longer required.
10	10.9.3	Table 10-23 Table 10-24	Removed location Supsa Export HDD crossing tie-in area and AR373a due to change in HDD alignment. Amended entry on AR373 as use of AR373a is no longer required.
10	10.10.3	Table 10-26	AR69 and AR223 were added to the impact assessment table.

Updates, Additional Information and Clarifications			
Chapter	Section	Table / Figure	Description
11	11.3.4	-	New section was added describing Jvari Monastery conservation and tourist infrastructure works.
11	11.4	Table 11-1	Added assessment of Jvari Monastery works.
11	11.4.3	-	Incorporated Jvari Monastery works into assessment of cumulative impact on landscape.
11	11.4.8	-	Incorporated Jvari Monastery works into assessment of cumulative impact on cultural heritage.
13	13.3.1	-	Added explanatory text for the Environmental and Social Monitoring and Management Plan (ESMMP). Amended the entry on the schedule of monitoring, inspection and audit of environmental performance of contractors.
13	13.4.4	-	Added that environmental and social management plans will be developed by BP and their main construction contractors.
13	13.4.4	-	Removed reference to ESMMP as the source of Project requirements.
14	14.3.1	Table 14-1	Changed AR373a (no longer required) to AR373.
14	14.3.3	-	Removed Supsa river crossings as the alignment has been agreed.
14	14.4	-	Removed reference to older infrastructure as the Project focuses on avoidance of geohazard.
15	-	-	Added new reference sources for cultural heritage impact assessment, impact of horizontal directional drilling on fish, and pipeline separation distance.
16	-	-	Expanded the list of contributors to include ICOMOS Georgia, Biodiversity Protection Service, National Agency for Protected Areas, National Forestry Agency, UNESCO.
Appendix A	-	-	Maps updated to include new survey information. Larger scale maps added for clarity.
Appendix B2	-	-	New commitment 17-51 was added to issue A17.
Appendix B3	-	-	Updated throughout to reflect the results of recent surveys, add the new commitments and delete the commitments that are no longer applicable.
Appendix E	-	-	New commitments 17-45 through to 17-49 and 17-51 were added. Commitments 17-38, 17-42 and 27-18 were deleted as no longer applicable.

Table 3: Modifications on Typographic Error and Inconsistencies

Modifications on Typographic Error and Inconsistencies			
Chapter	Section	Table / Figure / Commitment	Description
4	4.2.3	-	Removed encroachment on Tbilisi National Park (TNP) as a constraint along route option A as this is not the case since the TNP boundary has changed.
4	4.2.3	-	Added the Mtskheta LPZ to the list of constraints that route options B and C aimed to minimise.
4 (Georgian)	-	-	Minor discrepancies in the Georgian version were addressed; text was aligned with the English version.
6	6.3.4	Table 6-3	Resolution of Georgian Government No. 42 "on Approval of Technical Regulation on Inventorying Stationary Sources of Emissions into Atmospheric Air": amended the format of the date of enactment for consistency.
7	7.5.2	Table 7-5	Coordinates for R. Jachviskhevi were corrected.