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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COTCO</td>
<td>Cameroon Oil Transportation company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP</td>
<td>Compensation &amp; Resettlement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECMG</td>
<td>External Compliance Monitoring Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEPICI</td>
<td>Esso Exploration and Production Chad, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>Environmental Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP-IS</td>
<td>EMP- Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESIA</td>
<td>Environmental &amp; Socioeconomic Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographical Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Global Positioning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH</td>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHH</td>
<td>Head of Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHM</td>
<td>Household Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAG</td>
<td>International Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IATT</td>
<td>Improved Agriculture Techniques Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>International Finance Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>Local Community Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMM</td>
<td>Land Management Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUMAP</td>
<td>Land Use Mitigation Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoC</td>
<td>Management of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCS</td>
<td>Non Compliance Situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFDA</td>
<td>Oil Field Development Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIMS</td>
<td>Operations Integrity Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONDR</td>
<td>Office National de Development Rural (National Agency for Rural Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP</td>
<td>Project Affected Person(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAP</td>
<td>Participatory Rural Assessment Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAT</td>
<td>Participatory Rural Assessment Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP</td>
<td>Site Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTCO</td>
<td>Tchad Oil Transportation Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION TO PUBLIC RELEASE OF PROJECT DOCUMENTATION

Esso Exploration & Production Chad Inc (EEPCI) (the Project) develops Chadian oil resources located in the southern savanna region of the country. The output from the Oil Field Development Area (OFDA) reaches world markets through a 1070 kilometer export pipeline system with an offshore terminal at Kribi, Cameroon. Oil began flowing through the pipeline in mid-2003.

As the original oil fields were being developed, it became clear that more oil wells would be needed than originally planned to maintain the expected production level. Thus, more land has been required for the wells and their supporting infrastructure than initially expected.

A set of principles set out in the Chad Environmental Management Plan (EMP) approved prior to Project construction and guidelines to their implementation set forth in the Chad Compensation & Resettlement Plan (CRP) have directed the land use and compensation effort.

In June 2006, an independent evaluation was conducted on the Project’s CRP. The evaluation was jointly commissioned by the Project and the World Bank Group’s (WBG) International Finance Corporation (IFC). A recommendation for land replacement strategies was the key theme of the evaluation. The report “Independent Compensation and Resettlement Evaluation (November 2006)” written by Barclay and Koppert is available on the IFC website.

In order to address the issues raised in the report and the pace of temporary occupied land and its return to the local population, a Land Use Mitigation Action Plan (LUMAP) was compiled by EEPCI's Environmental Management Group and finalized in close collaboration with the Environmental and Social Development Department of the IFC in early 2007. This Action Plan was posted on the IFC and EEPCI’s web sites in April 2007. The work described in the LUMAP has been divided into nine Action Areas that breakdown into discrete tasks.

This present document summarizes background of the documents being released by the IFC and the Project on their respective web sites:

- [http://www.ifc.org/ifcext/spiwebsite1.nsf/2bc34f011b50ff6e85256a550073ff1c/fa4e74cc608e365852575e7004d391b?opendocument&Highlight=0,4338](http://www.ifc.org/ifcext/spiwebsite1.nsf/2bc34f011b50ff6e85256a550073ff1c/fa4e74cc608e365852575e7004d391b?opendocument&Highlight=0,4338)
- [www.essochad.com](http://www.essochad.com)

The documents being made public as of June 2009 document the changes brought about through the LUMAP both on land use and livelihood mitigation from mid-2007 through the end of first quarter 2009 (1Q09). These include the various reports that have been regularly filed with the IFC plus summaries of in-house EMP operations procedures and tools that have been refined or developed as part of LUMAP implementation. LUMAP progress has been previously reported on in regularly reported Project Update Reports on [www.essochad.com](http://www.essochad.com).
Through May 2009, the LUMAP is 94% complete and the present document reports the progress made by posting on the websites the results obtained for each of the nine action areas:

- **Identification & Assessment**: Identify the affected population; assess and predict Project impacts.

  EEPCI developed an EMP Information System (EMP-IS) using the Microsoft Sequel Server relational database to incorporate detailed socioeconomic household surveys (based on Barclay/Koppert recommendation), Geographic Information System (GIS) measurement and location of fields used by the household and all of the information generated for land used, compensation, reclamation and return, and resettlement options for the given household. Further details are given in Section 6.

- **Land Use Impact Reduction**: Manage the project to reduce land use impact.

  In early 2006, the Project freed the necessary construction resources to begin clearing the backlog of land reclamation obligations so that the land could be returned to villages. Over the past three years, over 1000 hectares of land has been reclaimed and returned to the villages as viable farmland. The Project footprint has not increased despite additional land needs since December 2005 and indeed has been steadily decreasing. Progress on land use and reclamation are reported in the Project reports published every quarter between 2000 and 2003 and twice a year from 2004 through today. The Project agreements call for quarterly Project reporting up to the time of financial completion which occurs in October 2003 and semi-annually after that time. Project reports are available on the Esso Chad web site (See link page 3).

- **Resettlement**: Resettle affected population if other strategies are judged inadequate to maintain individual livelihoods.

  New options like land for land replacement and delegation of resettlement benefits to another household member were developed and included into EEPCI’s Land Management Manual as described in Section 7. Site Specific Plans were developed to identify village-level issues and to target specific households within the most impacted villages that are vulnerable because of Project land needs and require further assistance in livelihood restoration and support in their access to community resources. The following Site Specific Plans are made available on the IFC website (see link page 3):
  - Dokaidilti Site Specific Plan (February 2008)
  - Dildo Site Specific Plan (February 2009)
  - Ngalaba Site Specific Plan (February 2009)
  - Mouraba Site Specific Plan (February 2009)
  - Danmadja Site Specific Plan (June 2009)
  - Begada Site Specific Plan (June 2009)
  - Bela Site Specific Plan (June 2009)
  - The SSP’s for the other three most impacted villages (Mbanga, Madjo and Bero) will be posted by the end of November 2009
• **Off-Farm & Improved Agricultural training:** Improve effectiveness of the Off Farm Training alternative and Improved Agriculture techniques Training alternative to resettlement.

These resettlement options are intended to provide participants with sufficient training in a non-farm skill to generate income to supplement livelihood lost due to Project land take or to provide participants with sufficient means to implement techniques taught to increase crop production on remaining land. These two programs have been modified as described in Section 7 to improve the likelihood that training will restore livelihood.

• **Individual compensation:** Maintain and enhance individual land use compensation.

The In-Kind compensation catalog was updated and a third party compensation option was included in the revised version of the Land Management Manual (see Section 7). A complete review of all rates and items compensated was carried out in fourth quarter 2007. These surveys are periodically conducted to check for inflation and update the compensation rates. The Compensation rates (2008) are posted on the web sites.

• **Community Compensation:** Maintain and enhance community compensation.

Community compensation provides mitigation for Project impacts at village level in the form of infrastructure or development projects. A Supplemental Community compensation program to benefit the most affected villages in the original three-field area is underway using Chadian NGOs to help the villages determine their needs and select in kind compensation options from the EEPCI catalog using Participatory Rural Assessment Techniques (PRAT).

A catalog has been established to allow the villages to choose a type of infrastructure or a development project depending on the level of impact from Project land needs.

The 2008 PRAT report is posted on the web sites.

• **Consultation & Communication:** Consult and communicate with stakeholders.

In 2008, more than 259 public consultations were conducted locally, involving more than 7500 villagers. Much of the consultation and communication focused on the land use issue in the OFDA; Community Compensation using a Participatory Rural Assessment Process (PRAP); village land surveys; land return procedures; hiring procedures; safety and security issues. The LUMAP results have been regularly documented in the semi-annual Project Reports posted on [www.essochad.com](http://www.essochad.com).

• **Monitoring & Organization** Monitor results and manage livelihood strategies:

The EMP-IS is used to determine actual impacts on villages and households and to indicate mitigation measures to offset the impacts. These results are regularly documented in Quarterly Village Reports and in the Annual Individual Report made available on the IFC & EEPCI’s websites as part of this present document:
In addition, Key Lessons Learned from the LUMAP listed in the following summary are also being made public.

As a result of continuing reservoir challenges post-2007, EEPCI is planning to drill additional wells to maintain the forecasted production level. This “infill” drilling will require some additional land near or adjacent to existing well pads in the core field area.

In order to understand the possible incremental impacts of this infill program, EEPCI in agreement with IFC, commissioned independent consultants to perform a focused Environmental and Socioeconomic Impact Assessment (ESIA) to evaluate the biophysical and social impacts of the additional land needs. The November 2008 study also evaluated the possible impact of additional mitigation measures that could offset additional land take. The ESIA as it stands covers the biophysical impacts possible, and the social impacts so far as can be understood from the LUMAP identification and assessment data and analysis available through April 2009. The ESIA has found so far no significant impacts that cannot be mitigated by the current EMP measures.

- This provisional ESIA Phase 1 Report is being made public through the World Bank and www.essochad.com websites
- The ESIA authors will finalize their sociological conclusions once the complete set of village survey data is available, in Nov 2009 and a final version will be released in early 2010
SUMMARY

Section 1: Background

The documents being made available to the public report on the progress EEPCI has made since the implementation of the Land Use Mitigation Action Plan (LUMAP). These documents have been prepared and compiled by EEPCI’s Environmental Management Plan Department and finalized in close collaboration with the Environmental and Social Development Department of the IFC since the formal LUMAP began in 2Q2007.

The LUMAP, built on the recommendations from an independent evaluation study on the Project’s compensation and resettlement programs commissioned by the IFC and EEPCI, was intended to address land use issues and the slow rate of land reclamation and return in the Oil Field Development Area (OFDA) of southern Chad.

This summary starts with a brief background of the Chad-Cameroon Oil Export Project in Section 2 and its environmental principles for the biological and human environment are described in Section 3. The land use situation is put in context in Section 4.

The various steps which EEPCI, in collaboration with the IFC, has taken to the land use challenge are explained:

- Independent Compensation and Resettlement Evaluation (mid-2006) – Section 5
- Land Use Management Action Plan (LUMAP) (early 2007) – Section 6
  - 9 Action Areas
  - EMP Information System tools for data management, monitoring and evaluation
  - Additional resettlement options and other modifications to a revised Land Management Manual
  - Quarterly Village Reports
  - Annual Individual Reports
  - Site Specific Plans for village and individual recovery from heavy impacts
- Key Lessons Learned – Section 7
- Supplemental Community Compensation delivered through Participatory Rural Assessment Process (PRAP)
- Updated Chad Resettlement and Compensation Entitlement Matrix
- Independent Focused Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) of the Infill Drilling Program in the Kome and Bolobo Oil Fields
- Application of LUMAP tools and Key Lessons Learned to ongoing land acquisition for additional Infill Drilling

These materials are either included here in full or in summary form. For access to the full documents please refer to the websites mentioned earlier in document.
Section 2: The Chad/Cameroon Oil Export Project

The Chad/Cameroon Oil Export Project (the Project) develops Chadian oil resources located in the southern savannah region of the country. The output from the Oil Field Development Area (OFDA) reaches world markets through a 1070 kilometer export pipeline system with an offshore marine terminal in Cameroon. Oil began flowing through the pipeline in late 2003.

The Project is operated by Esso Exploration and Production Chad Inc (EEPCI) and the Tchad Oil Transportation Company (TOTCO) in Chad and by the Cameroon Oil Transportation Company (COTCO) in Cameroon.

Since construction of the pipeline and facilities began in 2000, the Project has compensated nearly 12,900 individual land users in Chad & Cameroon for almost 7,100 Hectares (Ha) of land in 375 villages along the entire length of the Project from the oil fields in Kome, Chad to the offshore terminal at Kribi, Cameroon.

More information is available on the web sites.

Section 3: Compensation and Resettlement Principles of the Environmental Management Plan

A set of principles set out in the Project’s Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for Chad and guidelines to their implementation set forth in the Chad Compensation and Resettlement Plan (CRP) have directed the land use and compensation effort, namely:

- A transparent compensation procedure with a minimum of four information and consultation steps so that the compensated persons understand clearly and agree to the assets being surrendered and the compensation being paid. Such procedures allow the Project to illustrate consistent compensation between residents.

- Sensitivity to cultural practices and local legal requirements. Traditionally, most land is controlled by the village and allocated by the local chief. Legally however, nearly all land is owned by the Chadian state. So farmers, rather than owning land as in Europe or North America, have only the use of the land for crops. The Project therefore cannot and does not buy land but instead compensates for farmer’s labor and lost crop opportunities as provided in the EMP.

- Physical and electronic recording of all compensation transactions. Each payment is archived with a photo of the transaction and the recipient’s thumb print. These transactions are gathered together in an electronic dossier, recording the history of each compensated individual.

- Avoiding physical resettlement of households through project redesign and by offering to households who prefer it to choose other resettlement alternatives that allow them to valorize their production or increase their outside income.
Section 4: Land Use Situation in the Oil Field Development Area

All land users and villages have been compensated according to the Compensation & Resettlement Plan which is one volume of the Chad Environmental Management Plan (EMP) that was approved by the World Bank Group prior to Project construction. In Chad, over the history of the Project, individual land user compensation in the OFDA has been paid for more than 3,800 hectares of land involving just above 4,400 individuals. The Project has thus utilized at one time or another about 3% of the 100,000 hectares (ha) of land in the OFDA. The Project currently occupies just over 2,400 ha in the OFDA.

Over the years, during Project construction and production phases, external monitoring groups have found that the Project’s land use compensation and resettlement programs have performed according to EMP CRP. The Project’s compliance with the EMP compensation requirements has been documented in the Project Update (www.essochad.com) reports and by the World Bank’s External Compliance Monitoring Group (ECMG) and the International Advisory Group (IAG). All these reports are regularly posted on the web at www.gic-iag.org and www.ifc.org/ecmg.

In the OFDA, however, as the three original oil fields were being developed, it became clear that more wells would be needed in order to develop the Doba region oil. This additional drilling and the infrastructure to collect the oil and supply electricity to the wells, was consuming more land than originally anticipated. Ten (10) of the 61 villages of the OFDA impacted by Project’s land use have been more heavily affected because they lost more land than the surrounding areas.

EEPCI’s efforts to address this land use situation began in mid-2005, when it declared a Level II Noncompliance Situation (NCS) regarding the slow pace of reclaiming temporary use land and returning the land to the villages in accordance with the EMP. In early 2006, once earthwork became possible after the rainy season, the Project began clearing the backlog of land reclamation obligations so that the land could be returned to villages for agricultural use. Over the last three years, the Project has reclaimed and returned 1000 ha of land for farming use and has been able to maintain the total surface of land occupied at a constant level even though the land needs are continuing.

Section 5: Compensation and Resettlement Evaluation Study

In June 2006, an independent evaluation began of the Project’s compensation and resettlement programs. The evaluation was jointly commissioned by the Project and the World Bank’s International Finance Corporation (IFC). Information gathering by the study authors, Drs. Barclay and Koppert, focused on the 14 villages identified (at that time and based on declarative data) as the most impacted of the 61 total communities in the Oilfield Development Area. This report is available on the web sites.

The review found that the Project’s compensation and resettlement programs have preserved, and in some cases enhanced, near- and mid-term livelihoods. In large measure, this result stemmed from the Project’s cash and in-kind compensation for land use, as well as stipends paid to participants in two training programs offered as alternatives to physical resettlement.
In the long-term, however, the evaluation study determined that some land-users may not be able to sustain their long-term livelihoods without additional mitigation measures to help them regain enough farmland to support their traditional subsistence farming. This recommendation for land replacement strategies was the key theme of the evaluation. The study also suggested it should be possible to help address the land use situation by improving the effectiveness of the Project’s two training based alternatives to physical resettlement.

Section 6: Land Use Mitigation Action Plan

By the end of 2006, the Project had developed an Action Plan and had begun implementing it. With the help and input from the Environment and Social Development Department of the World Bank Group’s International Finance Corporation the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) group finalized a Land Use Mitigation Action Plan (LUMAP) in April 2007. The LUMAP for the OFDA generally builds on recommendations from the Barclay Koppert study. The Action Plan is available on the web sites.

The work described in LUMAP has been divided into nine Action Areas that break down into discrete tasks. A methodology has been established for each Action Area and for each task an expected result has been spelled out, along with a description of the work to be done, the resources required to do the work, and the milestones that will be used to monitor progress towards completion of the Action Plan by the end of 2009.

The nine Action Areas include:

- **Identification & Assessment:** Identify the affected population; assess and predict Project impacts.
- **Land Use Impact Reduction:** Manage the Project to reduce land use impact.
- **Resettlement:** Resettle affected population if other strategies are judged inadequate to maintain individual livelihoods.
- **Off Farm Training:** Improve effectiveness of the Off Farm Training alternative to resettlement.
- **Improved Agriculture Training:** Improve effectiveness of the Improved Agriculture Training alternative to resettlement.
- **Individual Compensation:** Maintain and enhance individual land use compensation.
- **Community Compensation:** Maintain and enhance community compensation.
- **Consultation and Communication:** Consult and communicate with stakeholders.
- **Monitoring & Organization:** Monitor results and manage livelihood strategies.

Through May 2009, the LUMAP was 90% complete. In particular, as noted, work since early 2006 has reduced the backlog of temporary use land. Over the past three years, over 1000 hectares of land has been reclaimed and returned to the villages as viable farm land. The Project footprint has not increased despite additional land acquisition since December 2005 and indeed has been steadily decreasing.

Fifteen villages that have continued to cede land to the Project, including the ten most impacted, have been targeted for supplemental community compensation and have been through the Participatory Rural Assessment Techniques (PRAT). They are choosing the development project or village infrastructure that will most benefit their community.
The key remaining task is completion of Action Area #1: Identification and Assessment. As Identification and Assessment is done for each village and affected individual the results are regularly reported to the IFC. This Action Area will be completed in third quarter 2009.

- **EMP-IS or Environmental Management Plan Information System**

One of the key tools developed by EEPCI is the EMP Information System (EMP-IS). EMP-IS uses the Microsoft Sequel Server relational database to incorporate detailed socioeconomic household surveys (based on recommendation made by Barclay and Koppert in their Compensation and Resettlement Evaluation), GIS (Geographical Information System) measurement and location of fields used by the household, all of the information generated by EEPCI for land take, compensation, reclamion and return, and resettlement options for the given household.

In June 2008, the ECMG stated that the EMP-IS tools used in this action area are world class and supported EEPCI in continued use of this tool with the most affected villages and vulnerable households.

- **Village Land Surveys**

The EMP team achieved a step change in identifying At-Risk Households through the use of Village Land Use Survey Teams made up of sociologists and topographers. Fields are measured and assets located on EEPCI’s maps using sophisticated Global Positioning System (GPS) hand held computers in the field and incorporation of this data into the EMP-IS using ArcGIS software and Satellite Imagery maps.

All this information is managed and automatically updated in the EMP-IS.
These teams carry out Village Land Use Surveys (VLUS) (GIS mapping of fields and in-depth socioeconomic questionnaires) which provide much more accurate data than was available from the previously used Compensation Questionnaires (declarative information given by the land user to be compensated). When only a handful of people in a village are affected by Project land needs the same tools –GIS mapping of their fields plus the sociological questionnaire –are used to assess their situation and, if necessary, put them on a Fast Track to choose a resettlement option.

LUMAP uses the EMP-IS data in several ways, primarily:

1. To identify households and individuals put “At Risk” by past Project land take when a resettlement option has not restored their livelihood, to assess how to rectify their situations, and then, to implement corrective measures. The survey teams along with the LUMAP Advisor (anthropologist/sociologist/economist) analyze the data collected to determine actual impacts on households and villages and to suggest mitigation measures to offset the impacts. These results are regularly reported in the Quarterly (initially monthly) Village Reports and the Annual Individual Report.

2. To develop and implement Site Specific Plans (SSP) for OFDA villages heavily impacted by land take in their area. The SSP analyze village level data to determine the degree of impact over time. With this information LUMAP elaborates a series of mitigation measures that address these impacts at both the village level and on vulnerable households within the village that have surrendered land for Project use. Each SSP, as it is developed, goes to the IFC for reporting.

Site Specific Plan Framework
Although the absolute footprint of the Project (Permanent Land Take and Temporary Land Take Not Returned) has not grown since December 2005, in the past, the slow return of temporary use land plus the increase in compensated land has significantly impacted certain villages located in the OFDA. These impacts may include:

- Reduced pool of land available for agricultural use;
- Access to bush resources;
- Depletion of bush resources;
- Shortened fallow availability.

To act effectively in mitigating the impacts in villages that have been heavily affected by the Project’s land needs, the precise impacts must be clearly understood. The approach to each village will be somewhat unique. By way of illustration: the economic and social impact of occupying a large area of non-attributed bush in one village is different from sequestering unreturned hectares of farmers’ land used by another village. In a third village composed primarily of fishermen the loss of farm land is less vital to household livelihood. In the first case, crop production is little affected, though the inhabitants will have more difficulty in finding wild produce to supplement their diet, or to gather raw materials for building, tool making. In the second, a return to previous levels of livelihood is governed by the amount of
fallow and bush the village retains to put into cultivation plus the proximity of markets for selling produce, crafts and skills. In the third, a fishing village may, on the whole, be little impacted but specific individuals and families who do not engage in wholesale fishing may have had their farming resources severely curtailed.

Within the OFDA, 10 of the sixty-one (10/61) villages have been judged to be highly affected. The purpose of the Site Specific Plan for each of these villages is to develop measures that mitigate the precise problems the village population is encountering within their own village area. First the study must determine the problems specific to that village. Then the mitigations proposed must be feasible, using the resources that are available to the restricted vicinity and maximizing the knowledge and capabilities of its inhabitants. The plan consolidates all applicable livelihood restoration tactics into a strategy that will lead to livelihood restoration in this severely affected village.

The SSP must also identify the specific households within the village that are At Risk (agriculturally non-viable – less than 2/3 corde per household member (HHM)) because of Project land needs and that will require further assistance in livelihood restoration and support in their access to community resources.

The LUMAP Site Specific Plan for each severely impacted village in the OFDA develops these mitigation measures by clearly defining the village's situation as follows:

- Existing natural resources in this localized area of the OFDA;
- Identification and assessment of complementary economic resources that are available;
- Villagers use of farmlands and bush;
- Current land needs of villagers;
- Specific measures to re-establish the viability of the village;
- List of closely tailored mitigation measures designed to return the village to viability.

The seven (7) currently categorized as highly impacted are:

1. Dokaidilti (population 534; households 85; present village area 686 Ha; population/Ha = 1.41)
2. Dildo (population 1346; households 250; present village area 2118 Ha; population/ Ha = 0.79)
3. Bero (population from chief’s census = 2088; present village area 3717 Ha)
4. Madjo (population from chief’s census = 482; present village area 1814 Ha)
5. Danmadja (population 570 ; households 101 ; present village area 480 Ha; population/ Ha = 1.48)
6. Mbanga (population from chief’s census = 1561 ; present village area 2850 Ha)
7. Ngalaba (population 1324; households 250; village area 2118 Ha; population/Ha = 0.74)

In addition, villages that may continue to undergo land acquisition have also been added to the survey list as approaching high impact (7 +3 = 10 villages described in this document):

1. Bela (population 846; households 143; present village area 2200 Ha;
2. Mouarom (population 447; households 85; present village area 1352 Ha; population/Ha = 0.38)

3. Begada (population 1285; households 259; present village area 3321 Ha; population/Ha = 0.43)

As of May 2009, seven villages (Dokaidilti, Ngalaba, Dildo, Mouarom, Danmadja, Bela and Begada) have been completely surveyed and entered into the EMP-IS. Land and sociological surveys have been completed in two more villages (Mbanga and Madjo) and the data is being entered into the EMP-IS as of 2Q 2009. The survey of the remaining village (Bero) is well on its way. Bero’s data should be cleaned and entered by 3Q 2009. The same survey tools and questionnaires are also being applied to “Fast-Tracker” individuals who live in less affected villages but appear to be At-Risk according to filtered data from the EMP Compensation.

Section 7: Land Management Manual

The Land Management Manual (LMM) is a document containing the implementing procedures developed to implement the CRP and manage land-related activities. The procedures and processes are intended to ensure compliance with EMP principles and requirements.

The LMM contains all land acquisition; compensation; resettlement and land return guidelines and processes for the Project. The processes are captured in a series of flow charts that the EMP group uses to guide their activities.

The LMM also contains all the approved procedures for implementing the Compensation & Resettlement Plan (CRP).

The LMM is an official internal document. All changes to the manual must go through the EEPCI Management of Change (MoC) system that assures that all levels of EEPCI are aware of the changes and that the people charged with implementing the new procedures have been trained to do so.

LUMAP generated a number of MoCs that improved and streamlined the land acquisition and return process. Other MoCs, built on knowledge gained through the Projects’ previous livelihood restoration efforts, offer new resettlement options. All these MoCs were incorporated into the Land Management Manual revised and approved in September 2008.

The topics covered in the Land Management Manual are as follows:

- Land Management Team Responsibilities and Organization
- Job Descriptions and Responsibilities
- Processes and Procedures
  - Land Compensation and Facility Siting
  - Land Compensation Procedures
    - Land Identification for Land compensation
    - Individual Compensation
- Cash
- In-Kind
- 3rd Party
  - Management of Funds
  - Community Compensation
  - Eligibility for Resettlement, Physical Resettlement and Land Replacement Options (Resettlement Action Plan)
    - Selecting Resettlement Options
      - Physical Resettlement in Another Village
      - Seasonal Physical Relocation on Distant Land
      - Additional Land for Economic Viability – 3rd Party Compensation
      - Improved Agriculture Training
      - Off-Farm Training
    - Land Reclamation and Return Processes and Procedures
    - Grievance Procedures and Complaints Handling Processes
  - Land Database Management and Record Keeping Procedures
  - Audits, Monitoring and Reporting
    - Site Specific Plans
    - Livelihood Monitoring and Restoration
  - Key Performance Indicators
  - Chad Resettlement and Compensation Entitlement Matrix

**Land Management Manual Monitoring and Evaluation**

All the livelihood restoration processes built into the Land Management Manual use the same principle for monitoring and evaluation. Whatever the resettlement option chosen, the affected person is monitored for livelihood restoration one year after the option has been implemented. If the option has been ineffective the affected person is offered land that restores the family to agricultural viability. If the option works, but additional reinforcement training is needed, this is provided in the second year. If at the end of the second year the person has still not reestablished a livelihood through the chosen option, then the affected person is offered different land to restore the family to agricultural viability.

In the case of physical resettlement the family is monitored for two years to ensure that it has reestablished itself in its new home and on its new farmland.

The precise indicators of livelihood restoration used to evaluate success are specific to the type of restoration process chosen and are discussed in detail in the sections below.
LUMAP Changes Incorporated into the Land Management Manual

The following summarizes the changes and improvements made to the implementing procedures EEPCI EMP Compensation and Resettlement Plan (CRP – one of the key principles of the EMP). These implementing procedures are contained in the Land Management Manual (LMM). The improvements were added to the LMM using the EEPCI Operations Integrity Management System (OIMS) Management of Change (MoC) management system.

Land Replacement

Third Party Compensation

Third Party Compensation was one of the key recommendations made by Compensation and Resettlement Evaluation Study. Previously, the current Land Compensation procedure did not allow Third Party Compensation or compensation for fields in fallow longer than one year.

The MoC modified the existing Land Compensation Program to permit Third Parties to provide land to Project Affected People (PAP – individuals with land takes leaving them with less than 2/3 cordes per household member (c per HHM)).

The Third Party will receive cash compensation for the land he/she cedes to the PAP.

The MoC also allowed for Third Parties to prepare land that has lain in fallow longer than one year for cession (via compensation) to a PAP.

The following outlines the provisions for these changes:

- The Third Party will cede use of the land to a PAP for use during the PAP’s lifetime or until the Project reclaims and returns for use the land taken from the PAP such that he/she now has >2/3 c per HHM.
- Once the PAP concludes his/her use of the Third Party’s land (as per agreement on date of return) then the land is returned directly to the donor or his/her heirs.
- EMP and PAP resettlement-eligible persons may make this agreement only with an individual who holds recognized traditional rights to more than two (2) c per HHM. This provision ensures the Third Party will have enough land to cultivate and leave in fallow for his/her household’s agricultural needs.
- The Third Party will prepare his/her long-term fallow for cultivation. The Third Party will subsequently present this fallow land as a cession to the PAP provided that the following conditions are met:
  - No protest has been made over residual rights to the fallow by other parties
  - Any protest was resolved in the Third Party’s favor through the traditional justice system
- In cases where the PAP is accessing Third Party land in a village other than his own or his parents’ village, the Third Party agreement must be accompanied by the accord of the Third Party’s village chief and earth priest.
If the Project subsequently completes a land take with the Third Party that reduces his/her traditional land rights to less than 2/3 c per HHM, they are not allowed to retract their agreement with the PAP. The Third Party will be eligible for Resettlement as per the CRP.

**Resettlement to Distant Arable Land**

Previous LMM resettlement procedures did not allow for relocation assistance to resettlement-eligible PAP who may not wish to physically resettle in a new village in order to access supplemental land.

The MoC provided a new resettlement option wherein the PAP receives assistance to cultivate distant arable land (additional land located greater than 3.5 kilometers (km) from their current full time residence) without physically relocating their current full time residence. The former procedures only provided for full physical resettlement in another village.

The following are the provisions of this new option:

- Assistance is offered as a new option in the Physical Resettlement procedure in the LMM.
- Arable land identified and secured by the EMP Department through the LMM procedures or through the community’s traditional land allocation processes is located more than 3.5 km from the PAP’s current full-time residence.
- In order to make this distant arable land feasible for the PAP to use, the following equipment and infrastructure will be provided by the EMP Department:
  - One (1) bicycle
  - One (1) ox-drawn cart
  - Cash sufficient to cover (as per the LMM Compensation Rate Table):
    - The purchase of a team of oxen of the age to be trained to pull the cart
    - A traditional field house of 5 square meters area for use during rains
    - Traditional well

This option does not cover (as the PAP has not lost access to or use of any of these assets):

- Current full-time residence / permanent dwelling
- Existing fields already cultivated or held in fallow
- Individually owned trees
- Cost of relocation of full time residence in the future (this procedure is in lieu of the CRP LMM Physical Relocation procedure.

This option may be used if the distant arable land is obtained through the new Third Party Compensation procedure.

**Physical Resettlement to Another Village**

Previous LMM resettlement procedures did not specify any conditions for Physical Resettlement other than the Project-Affected Person (PAP) qualifying for resettlement, e.g. PAP experienced Project land take that reduced his/her arable land rights to less than 2/3 cordes per household member (c per HHM) or his/her homestead lies in the footprint of Project construction or within the safety barrier around the construction.
The Off Farm Training and Improved Agriculture resettlement option eligibility also requires that the PAP:

- Must have a minimum of 0.5 c per HHM residual land after the Project land take and
- Must attend business/basic literacy/basic numeracy skill training and pass the final examination with a minimum score of 5/10

Given the above requirements for Off Farm and Improved Agriculture along with the addition of the Resettlement to Distant Arable Land to the resettlement portfolio, it is likely that more PAP may choose physical resettlement or rainy season resettlement options over training options.

The requirements in the LMM for physical resettlement required strengthening in order to prevent potential abuse of the option. Therefore, a MoC was developed setting up the following key criteria for Physical Resettlement to another village:

- Physical Resettlement is defined as the PAP accepting land in another village and choosing to relocate full time residence to that village
- Physical Resettlement provides additional criterion that the new village be at least 6.0 Kilometers from the PAP’s current full time residence.

This MoC did not bring any changes to the Physical Resettlement Compensation Package. The compensation package continues to provide:

- Full-time residence / permanent dwelling greater than or equal in both area and in number of rooms to current residence
- Raw mud brick and straw kitchen, if the original homestead had a separate kitchen
- Compensation for existing fields already cultivated or held in fallow
- Individually owned trees
- Cost of relocation of full time residence
- Rental of provisional housing if the original residence must be abandoned before the new housing is complete

**Improved Transparency in the Land Return Process – The Quitus**

The Compensation and Resettlement Evaluation Study reported that some farmers were not aware that their compensated land had been reclaimed and returned to the village. The following MoC was prepared to improve communications and transparency when land is returned to the village.

The EMP CRP calls for land taken temporarily by the Project for construction use to be reclaimed and then returned to the community from whose territory it was taken (CRP, p. 8-11). This process is called the Quitus Process.

Once an area has been reclaimed to arable quality, the EMP-IS will be used to generate a map of compensated fields within the area. It will also generate a list of the names of previous users. This MoC calls for the Local Community Contacts (LCC) to invite the previous users of the land to the Quitus ceremony.

There are two categories of the Quitus Land Return Process to the villages-communities, determined by the availability of known landmarks for identifying individual plots.
Quitus Process – Small Tracts of Land Returned – (formerly/generally used for Well Pads, Flow Lines, Underground Cables, and Overhead Lines)

- As per the EMP, the reclaimed land area is returned to the village
- The Socioeconomic Monitor and LCC arrange for a meeting with the village chief and the former land users at the site to be returned.
- On the day of return the canton and village chiefs sign the Quitus acknowledging the land return to the community.
- In cases where no compensation was paid because the area was either fallow older than 1 year or bush, the village chief is responsible for ensuring that the fallow area goes to the correct/needy person. The Canton Chief is present at the signing to serve as a witness and to intervene if the area is contested.
- The finalization of the signature process is entered into the EMP-IS and the Quitus is archived.

Quitus Process – Large Tracts of Land Returned (formerly/generally used for Borrow Pits, Camps, Gathering Stations, Airstrips and Manifolds.)

- Land Survey/Mapping Database technician generates the list of the names and villages, of the former users, as indicated by their EMP-IS IDs (it must be noted that not all people farming a specific village’s land are necessarily resident in the village).
- In order to ensure that previous users of the land area are informed of the land return, the compensated previous users are invited to the Quitus ceremony. They will be asked to sign a document acknowledging that they have been informed of the return of their previously used land. A topographer will be on hand at the Quitus ceremony to help previous land users identify and mark their previous parcel(s) of land.
  - The individual users sign to acknowledge their notification that their former parcels of land have been returned.
  - A topographer marks out the GPS boundaries of individual parcels in cases such as borrow pits, where specific landmarks are no longer available for farmers to relocate their fields.

The EMP-IS also calculates the impact of the land return to each individual and updates the land-take situation of each recipient in each of the above Quitus processes. In cases where the land return moves an individual/household above the 2/3 c per capita minimum for agricultural viability, the individual/household is noted as having its livelihood restored.

Resettlement Options
Off Farm Training

The Off Farm Training resettlement option is intended to provide participants with sufficient training in a non-farm skill to generate income to supplement livelihood lost due to the Project land take of their agricultural fields.

The income the PAP generates using this skill is intended to bridge the family until the traditional land allocation processes bring them up to 2/3 c per household member or their training skill income is sufficient for full livelihood restoration.

The following changes are designed to increase the participant’s likelihood that Off Farm Training will indeed restore his/her livelihood:
- The participant must have land use of at least 0.5 cordes/household member (c per HHM). The intent is for the participant to continue to farm his/her remaining land and
his/her livelihood is supplemented by income earned through the Off Farm skill. This aligns the Off Farm and Improved Agriculture Training requirements and upholds the principles of the EMP CRP.

- The livelihood Restoration of the graduate using the Off Farm skills acquired is measured by the income earned. Successful livelihood restoration is when the income is equal to or greater than the cash value of the Office National de Développement Rural (National Agency for Rural Development) yield per hectare of sorghum on the land they lost to the Project. EMP representatives monitor the household to determine if indeed their livelihood was restored.

- Participant agrees to participate in Business Skills/Literacy/Numeracy training course. The basic business skills learning was cited as a key to success in the Action Area 4 and 5 assessment of these resettlement options.

- Participant must pass the final examination of the above Business skills training with a score of 5/10 or better to continue on to enrollment in skills training. If not then the participant is moved to the Physical Resettlement program (land for land).

- Participant agrees to and signs the Student Code of Conduct regarding attendance and participation (sets expectations and standards).

- Student adheres to the Student Code of Conduct. The NGO supplying the training is responsible for monitoring students and reporting to EMP oversight contract management firm. The firm is responsible for reporting performance to the EMP Socioeconomics Supervisor. If the student does not meet the Code of Conduct requirements during the training, they are to be removed from the training program and enter the land replacement options physical resettlement program to provide them with the 2/3 c per household member minimum.

- If after one year of the graduate utilizing the learned skill, the participant is found upon annual monitoring by the contract management firm not to have restored his/her livelihood (did not meet or exceed the ONDR yield for sorghum cash value that year), then the remedy is to use the CRP option to obtain at least 2/3 c per HHM land for the participant to farm in the future.

Improved Agriculture Techniques Training (IATT)
The Improved Agriculture Training resettlement option is intended to provide participants with sufficient means and knowledge to implement the improved techniques being taught and thereby increase production on their remaining farm lands to restore livelihood lost to the Project land take.

Changes have been made to the IATT in order to increase the participant's likelihood that Improved Agriculture Training will indeed restore his/her livelihood:

- The participant must have land use of at least 0.5 cordes/household member (c per HHM). This is the minimum amount of land required to replace sufficient livelihood using the improved agriculture techniques, e.g. meet or exceed ONDR yield per Hectare of sorghum (index crop).

- Livelihood Restoration by the participant using the Improved Agriculture techniques is measured in improved agricultural production of subsistence crops and/or value of cash crops. EMP will determine the participant’s livelihood restoration based on the agricultural output he/she achieves on the lands left to them when they became resettlement eligible using the Improved Agriculture techniques. Their agricultural output will be calculated and value indexed to sorghum. Participant will be determined
successful if they achieve the value per Hectare of their remaining lands compared to the National Agricultural Development Office (ONDR) index yield of sorghum per Hectare that agricultural cycle.

- Participant agrees to participate in Business Skills/Literacy/Numeracy training course for the same reason as the Off Farm training.
- Participant signs the Student Code of Conduct (also used by the Off Farm Training program).
- Participant adheres to the Student Code of Conduct (also used by the Off Farm training) The NGO supplying the training is responsible for monitoring students and reporting to contract firm. The firm is responsible for reporting to EMP Socioeconomics Supervisor. If the student fails to adhere then he/she is moved to the Physical Resettlement program (land for land).
- Participant must pass final business examination with a score of 5/10 or better. If not, then the participant is moved to the Physical Resettlement program (land replacement – bring them back up to 2/3 c per HHM) and therefore not allowed to enter into the formal Improved Agriculture Training.
- If subsequent land takes after the land take that triggered the participant to qualify for Resettlement as per the EMP CRP reduce the participants land holding to a level below the minimum required (0.5 c per HHM) to participate in the Improved Agriculture Training program, then the participant is immediately moved to the land replacement Physical Resettlement program to bring the participant up to 2/3 c per HHM. The participant may continue in his/her Improved Agriculture Training to completion.
- If after two agricultural seasons utilizing the improved agriculture techniques, the participant is found upon annual monitoring by the firm that his/her livelihood was not restored (did not meet or exceed the ONDR yield for sorghum that year), then the remedy will be using the CRP Physical Resettlement Program option to obtain at least 2/3 c per HHM land for the participant to farm going forward.

The Improved Agriculture Training program in the CRP calls for a low interest loan to provide the necessary tools and farm animals for the participant to implement the learned techniques. The MoC moved the loan language to grant language, meaning that EEPCI provides the grant items versus providing a loan. Each participant will receive grant funds sufficient for him/her to purchase a full complement of necessary farm implements, animals and seeds in order to implement the improved techniques and thereby realize livelihood restoration, e.g. rain fed agriculture and a dry season technique. The grant funds can also be used through the NGO providing the training to procure and deliver the equipment and traction livestock. Most farmers request to work the grant through the NGO and EEPCI to obtain the equipment at a better cost and delivery to them in their village.

**Delegation of Resettlement Benefit to Another Household Member**

Previously the LMM procedures did not formally allow for a resettlement eligible PAP to delegate his/her resettlement training (Off Farm Training or Improved Agriculture Training) to another household member. Compensation and resettlement experience over the past five years indicates that some of the resettlement eligible PAP are not physically able to participate in the resettlement training programs, however they desire that someone in their household be trained in one of these programs.

The MoC provide a procedure for a resettlement eligible PAP who suffers from an infirmity
that would prevent his/her participation in the Off-Farm and Improved Agriculture Options to Resettlement to designate another person for these programs in his/her stead. To qualify for the right to designate an alternate training beneficiary:

1. The resettlement-eligible PAP must undergo a health examination to confirm that he/she is not physically fit to participate in the training program;
2. The resettlement-eligible PAP, family council, and the village chief (character witness) must all agree that the person designated by the PAP is of suitable character and ability to support the PAP and his/her household post-training;
3. If the designee agrees to training and ongoing support of the eligible person plus household, then the designee undergoes a health examination. If the designee passes the health examination then the PAP and designee sign a delegation of responsibility with the family, village chief and EMP Socioeconomics Compensation Coordinator as witnesses.

The designee then participates in Improved Agriculture or Off-Farm training on the same conditions as other, eligible people as per the LMM: The designee signs Code of Good Conduct:
- Attendance
- Performance
- Attends Business/Literacy/Numeracy School and passes the final examination with a passing grade of 5/10.
- For Improved Agriculture, the designee must have not only the minimum 0.5 corde per household member (c per HHM) for his own household but also 0.5 c per HHM for the eligible person’s household.
- For Off-Farm Training the tuition and stipend are calculated in the same way as for other eligible people. The Household allowance is calculated on the number of dependents the trainee, in this case the designee, will be leaving in the village.

If at any time the designee fails to meet the conditions set for Off Farm or Improved Agriculture training, the designee’s training will end and the eligible person will be brought up to 2/3 c per HHM. Any involvement between Project and the designee is ended.

If, during the two years of monitoring after graduation, the designated Off Farm or Improved Agriculture trainee does not meet the criteria for success:
- Off-Farm earning greater than or equal to the cash value of annual yield from lost land
- Improved Agriculture receiving the annual ONDR crop yield on the remaining land or gardening/animal husbandry
then the Project will provide the eligible individual with 2/3 corde per household member (in the eligible person’s household) and any involvement between the Project and designee is ended.

Section 8: Environmental & Socioeconomic Impact Assessment (ESIA)

The EMP-IS tools and analyses continue to prove their usefulness since a critical task for the EMP/LUMAP group is to identify with rapidity any impact created by ongoing land use need. The EMP-IS, Village Land Use Surveys and Fast-Track Identification and Assessment systems make it possible for the Project to be more forward looking in its application of the
Environmental Management Plan and Resettlement and Compensation Plans. With the sociological and GIS data, EMP has been assessing cumulative land use impacts (total impacts over time) and predicting areas of high potential land use impact, and the likelihood of individual impact.

As the result of continuing reservoir challenges post-2007, the Project has proposed to drill additional wells to test additional oil recovery techniques. Depending on the success of these techniques in offsetting the declining oil production – rising associated water production, the Project may drill around three hundred new wells over the next three years. This infill drilling will require some additional land near to and adjacent to existing well pads in core field areas.

In order to understand the possible incremental impacts of the infill drilling program, EEPCI, in agreement with the IFC, commissioned independent consultants to perform a focused Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA). The study would evaluate whether the biophysical and social impacts of the additional land needs of the Project could rely on the mitigation measures currently in place (since the LUMAP) or would require additional mitigation measures to offset further land take.

The ESIA covers the possible biophysical and social impacts as can be derived from the LUMAP data gathered up until the present time. The ESIA has found no significant impacts that cannot be mitigated by the current EMP measures. Moreover the improvements to wet lands that EEPCI proposes in order to make more land available to the local farmers for rice cultivation, will, with proper design, have no significant biological impacts and potentially positive social consequences. The ESIA went further to indicate that additional studies will be required during the engineering phase of the project (generate new farm land) to confirm the initial environmental finding and ensure appropriate mitigations are developed for the potential social impacts on the transhumant population that uses the riverine lowlands. This Phase 1 ESIA is being made public in mid summer 2009.

The ESIA authors will finalize their sociological conclusions once the complete set of village survey data is available in November 2009 and a final report will be released in early 2010.

Section 9: Key Lessons Learned to Apply to Land Acquisition

As a result of the Compensation and Resettlement Evaluation Study report in 2006, the Land Use Mitigation Action Plan (LUMAP) of 2007, and the advances in data management made possible by the EMP-IS, a number of valuable lessons have been learned. The documents being disclosed here support the validity of these lessons.

These lessons can and should be applied to other projects in other places and it is the IFC’s intention in making these documents public to allow others to benefit from and to apply the lessons learned. The following lessons learned are highlighted in the Site Specific Plan Framework document:

- **Accurate Land Use and Household Socioeconomic Data For Each Project Affected Individual**
  
  Assume from the start of development of an Environmental Baseline Assessment that both project design and the human environment context will evolve. To judge the impacts of this evolution, solid baseline data (land use and household socioeconomic) is required to manage the compensation and resettlement program execution, provide the basis to study trends and identify barriers, to measure effectiveness of corrective
actions and ultimately to evaluate project’s benefits. Land Mapping tools using Geographic Information System technology and detailed socioeconomic survey instruments are essential.

- **Use of Key Performance Indicators**
  The Key Performance Indicators (KPI) involves both Process and Performance Metrics. The Process Metrics are designed to provide the EMP Management team with indications of how well the EMP is working, e.g. procedures, stewardship measurements, projects benefits, etc. The Performance Metrics indicate how well the EMP delivers on its obligations, e.g. bottom line performance.

- **Use of Management of Change Tools**
  Management of Change (MoC) is the EEPCI Operations Integrity Management System (OIMS) tool used to correct and/or improve all procedures regarding safety, health and environmental. The LMM is the set of environmental procedures used to implement the principles of the EMP’s CRP. MoC uses a disciplined approach to ensure that procedural changes receive the appropriate review and approval before being implemented. The MoC process also requires that users of the changed procedure be trained regarding the changed procedure. MoC are used along with the current edition of a set of procedures until the particular procedure set goes through the periodic review process. At that time, the MoC is included in the revision of the procedure set.

- **Use of Key Position Checklist for Project Management Transition**
  The Chad Cameroon Oil Export Project is not unique in that it evolves over time. For instance, the various Project stages involved Exploration, Construction, Production Start Up, Production Operations and Maintenance, Drilling organization and Project Group.

  During Construction decisions are made to move a project along as per Safety, Schedule and Cost. The use of the Key Position Checklist approach to management transitions (Construction to Production etc.) are vital to ensuring that EMP commitments and obligations made during the construction phase are not lost as the Project settles into the phase of long term operation and maintenance. Given that the Project personnel may be coming in from different parts of the world with different approaches to environmental and land use issues, it is imperative that the EMP is communicated effectively and the appropriate management commitment is obtained at each management transition.
Section 10: Public Disclosure

As part of the LUMAP initiative, the Project and the World Bank staff agreed on a formal documentation process for changes resulting from the Action Plan and on a schedule for regular reporting on progress achieved. The EMP-IS information and LUMAP results are, as afore-mentioned, regularly reported in the semi-annual Project Reports, Village Quarterly Reports and an Annual Report on Individual Livelihood.

The documents now being made public record the changes brought about through the LUMAP both on land use and livelihood mitigation from mid-2007 through the end of 1Q 2009. These include the various reports that have been regularly filed with the IFC plus summaries of in-house EMP operations procedures and tools that have been refined or developed as part of LUMAP implementation.

Key Lessons Learned from the LUMAP plus a summary of the Land Management Manual updated to include LUMAP changes are also being made public. The Phase 1 ESIA has been made public and the final version will be released once the sociological conclusions have been confirmed with a complete data set.
Attachment 1: List of Documents disclosed

The following documents have been disclosed on the Project (EssoChad) and IFC web sites for interested NGOs and other stakeholders.

Village Monthly Reports:
- December 2007
- January 2008
- February 2008
- March/April 2008
- May/June 2008

Quarterly Village Reports
- Third Quarter 2008
- Fourth Quarter 2008
- First Quarter 2009


Annual Individual Report for 2008 (February 2009)

CRCP Entitlement Matrix (February 2008)

Compensation Rates (2008)

Site Specific Village Plans
- Dokaidilti (February 2008)
- Ngalaba (February 2009)
- Dildo (February 2009)
- Mouarom (June 2009)
- Bela (June 2009)
- Danmadja (June 2009)
- Begada (June 2009)

Participatory Rural Assessment Techniques (PRAT) Report (October 2008)