

# 2006-07 CMCA Review Evaluation

## Compiled Responses

22 August 2007

This is a compiled report of responses received when evaluating the 2006 CMCA Review. All comments have been included. Community response forms have been slow returning so this interim report is provided. An updated report will be circulated if further evaluations are received.

### RESPONDENTS

Respondents to date were as follows:

Community:	5
Independent review team:	7
Government:	4
PNGSDP:	1
NGO/church:	2
Ok Tedi Mining Ltd:	<u>10</u>
Total:	29

### QUALITY OF OUTCOME:

Please rate the quality of the outcome of the CMCA Review from your perspective:

Very poor (1)    Poor (2)    Moderate (3)    Good (4)    Very good (5)    Don't know

Average response:	4.7	<b>Good to Very Good</b>
Number of responses:	28	

### THE OBJECTIVES OF THE CMCA REVIEW:

**OTML set the following objectives for the review from the outset. Please indicate to what extent you believe these objectives were met:**

Objective a). Ensure the process (framework) embodies the following principles: integrity, transparency, equity (participation), fairness, respect, responsiveness, adequacy of information, and timeliness  
(this objective is assessed in detail later in this evaluation form).

Objective b). Contribute positively to an enduring social and economic legacy from the mine (beyond mine closure)

Not at all (1)    Partially (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response:	4.4	<b>Good to Very Good</b>
Number of responses:	29	

Objective c). Manage the cost of any additional compensation and benefits within acceptable parameters and in a manner that takes into account future challenges to mine operation and market.

Not at all (1)    Partially (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response:	4.0	<b>Good</b>
Number of responses:	29	

## **General comments:**

**Please provide any general comments you have about the extent to which the review met the company's objectives:**

*The review has pushed for the mine to continue operations and on the other hand has brought benefits to the impacted communities. [Community delegate]*

*The review met the company's objectives adequately, but there is an unfairness of the leaders request from them has not been met. [Community delegate]*

*The general increase of 4X to the CMCA benefits to address the environmental, social and economic concerns of the mine impacted communities during and after mine closure. [Community delegate]*

*At this review, it has been our initiative to adopt the concept of OTDF to establish our entity which I think was the company's objective so our resources are better controlled and managed if we are catered additional compensation and benefits. The challenge for the company would be to pipe down acid rock tailings to a more secured well to minimise impacts increasing. [Community delegate]*

*It was fair to almost every citizen involved and parties to understand the core meaning of the review and all that it involves within and around. It was an educational process, educating very party to know and understand the important roles and functions and partners in participating fully to accomplish its purpose. [Community delegate]*

*At my level of understanding, after the completion of the review, the company's objectives are met at moderate. [Community delegate]*

*It was satisfying to note that the communities for the first time wanted to take charge of their own affairs and plan for their future and hence took full advantage of the review, with frustrations of course, but it was very positive and to some extent timely and successful for all or else they would not have had any opportunity at all without the review. [Community delegate]*

*On a number of occasions, the lead facilitators (Keystone) seemed to drive the agenda rather than to act as independent facilitators - "women's issues" appeared to have significant buy-in and push from Keystone. Keystone appeared to lack specific background knowledge about the 9th supplemental agreement and historical events and agreements - also lacked general PNG experience. Whilst Adler had good negotiation strategies and facilitation techniques, his two junior assistants appeared to add little to the process. [Independent review team]*

*Settled in the minds of majority of the impacted communities that K1.1b is a win-win situation, leveraging exceedences of previous predictions (2001) with the level of financial input from the three major stakeholders (OTML, State, PNG). The challenge now is the issue of good governance and effective implementation of these financial resources and projects for sustainment of the livelihood of impacted communities beyond mine closure. [Independent review team]*

*My view is that objective "a" was met although, in terms of equity, the question remained as to whether or not women meaningfully participated in this process. Otherwise, the objectives of "b" and "c" were largely satisfied. [Independent review team]*

*Although I felt the review was generally meeting the company's objectives (or for that matter, the objectives of government - or those sections of government which bothered to consider it) I remain concerned that it may be seen lacking in the longer term given the nature of ownership rights and representational roles in the communities. Put simply, people often do not feel as committed to agreements reached as some would wish. [PNGSDP]*

*The company (Managing Director) was in both camps so I personally do not know how transparent the company was. [Church/NGO]*

*Much more could be done. [Church/NGO]*

*Objectives a, b & c were always the signposts in all activities undertaken during the review. [Government]*

*I think the review would have fully met the company's objectives if the regulator (the Government) was fully involved in leading discussions/or meetings. [Government]*

*I think the review has provided a win-win situation for all parties concerned. It wasn't easy when other parties decided against certain benefits but in the end they basically gave the go ahead. [OTML]*

*One fact remains which concerns me a lot is the ability of the new entity, or any organisation for that matter, to meet the needs of the communities under the huge funds allocated to the CMCA, especially after mine closure. The communities have been given very high expectations again with the huge amount of money in this package. Looking at the track record of the last five years, I feel a bit uneasy. The new OTFRDF will be smaller in size compared to the current OTDF and yet the current group struggles to deliver all the projects, even though they are working so hard. [OTML]*

*Obviously, only time will tell, but participants were generally satisfied with the outcome so it was a good deal at the sign-up stage. Whether that is a longer-term satisfactory deal is obviously dependent on the perceived delivery of benefits. [OTML]*

*The objectives were covered to the extent where most communities' concerns were addressed and catered for. [OTML]*

*The review was completed six months after the scheduled timeframe but still acceptable. The process is fair, and thorough consultation with the communities happened. I am convinced the package was accepted and communities are happy. [OTML]*

*The extensive consultation and information dissemination to regional and village groups has also contributed to this [too long duration of review]*

*Met company's obligation under clause 27 of the CMCA. [OTML].*

#### **TIMING:**

**Thinking about the 18 months that the review took to complete, do you think this was:**

- Much too short (1)       A bit too short (2)       About right (3)       Too long (4)       Much too long (5)       Don't know

Average response: 3.1 <b>About right</b>
Number of responses: 29

**Please provide any general comments you have about the time aspects of the review:**

*Timing was about right because it allowed for everyone to have a say from the village level to the regional team and finally at the working group meetings. [Community delegate]*

*The timing was good. My only comments will that the team (community delegates) that were at the table had different level of background understanding knowledge. Recommend in the near future the leaders community reps should be invited on merits and provide CVs to have best candidates. [Community delegate]*

*Timeframe set for this review as not too long as others may think. Instead, it's about right, unlike the timing set for the first agreement. This timing also permitted all parties to find best solutions to issues, which the landowners addressed in order that our aspirations were met by OTML and the shareholders. [Community delegate]*

*The review should have been completed within six months time given the number of working group meetings we had, which is six WG meetings. If this was not possible, it should have taken only 12 months. [Community delegate]*

*Given village politics and the nature of the delta or vast coverage of the whole mine affected area, I felt the time taken was enough to cover all that were planned and executed. [Independent review team]*

*The communities especially needed this extra time to really understand the messages/information from the top levels of the review structure to help them make informed and logical decisions. [Independent review team]*

*I don't see the period as being too long. The timing was just about right. The issues were being really put to perspective and the people were slowly beginning to appreciate the issues as we were coming to the tail end of the process, which, in my view, commenced about November 2006 in the 4th working group and regional meetings. [Independent review team]*

*More time could have been given. [NGO/Church]*

*The period of time is bit too short because to create and give awareness among the people (who are mainly illiterate) in affected areas it was insufficient. [NGO/Church]*

*This was sufficient time due to the level of consultation given the nature of the area and logistics involved etc. [Government]*

*I think the prolonged review was due to the additional village meetings that were held. The regional meetings basically were very good forums that have addressed many common issues for the regions. [OTML]*

*The regional and working group representatives should have been pressured more to actively disseminate information to the communities they represented to cut the time and the huge costs spent on patrols. We should have utilised the Fly FM in a planned systematic manner to disseminate review updates and key messages again to cut the time spent on patrols. The patrol teams should have been smaller again to cut costs. The last village patrol for example in LOT we had just 2 people in a team and that was quite adequate. There was a bit too much emphasis on food during the patrols - large quantities of food ordered went out of date or rotten and had to be discarded, again waste of money. Many of the leaders were given fuel to come to catch their flights for the meetings but very frequently they had to be picked up by OTML officers from their villages and this caused delays and increased fuel and oil costs. A lot of the communities (Highway) said they wanted the signing to be earlier towards the end of 2006 and did not want too much talking and too many meetings. They want the implementation to take effect immediately! Delay in trying to work out how legally valid the structure of the MOA could have been avoided if it was drafted with the input of some of the Government lawyers present in the WG. [OTML]*

*It took as long as it should take. It was all about the process and perception so the duration needed to be curtailed otherwise the participants would have let the "party" continue. OTML drove conclusion but not to the detriment of the process, just be being more focussed than other players. [OTML]*

*The timing was not too short or much too long. It was just about the right time to finish off the CMCA review process sufficiently on a good note. [OTML]*

*12 months will be adequate timing to undertake such exercise. [OTML]*

*The timing factor of 18 months that is about right, but we need to get the transition team to work extra time to get this entity set up as quick as possible before 18 months so that our people in the mine impacted community could see the job all of us is doing. [OTML].*

## RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAKEHOLDERS:

How do you think relationships between OTML and its major stakeholders after the review compare to how they were before the review?

- Much worse (1)     A bit worse (2)     About the same (3)     Better (4)     Much better (5)     Don't know

Average response: 4.78 <b>Better to Much better</b>
Number of responses: 28

## STRUCTURE OF THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW TEAM:

The structure of the review was underpinned by provision of a support team that was independent of all the negotiating parties. How well do you think each of these roles worked in terms of their contribution or benefit in achieving a good outcome?

### Lead independent facilitators

- Little or no benefit (1)     Some benefit (2)     Moderate benefit (3)     Large benefit (4)     Very large benefit – essential (5)     Don't know

Average response: 4.4 <b>Large benefit to Very large benefit/essential</b>
Number of responses: 29

### PNG partner facilitators

- Little or no benefit (1)     Some benefit (2)     Moderate benefit (3)     Large benefit (4)     Very large benefit – essential (5)     Don't know

Average response: 4.7 <b>Large benefit to Very large benefit/essential</b>
Number of responses: 29

### Independent observers

- Little or no benefit (1)     Some benefit (2)     Moderate benefit (3)     Large benefit (4)     Very large benefit – essential (5)     Don't know

Average response: 4.6 <b>Large benefit to Very large benefit/essential</b>
Number of responses: 27

**Special advisor**

- Little or no benefit (1)     Some benefit (2)     Moderate benefit (3)     Large benefit (4)     Very large benefit – essential (5)     Don't know

Average response: 4.6	<b>Large benefit to Very large benefit/essential</b>
Number of responses: 27	

**Independent scientist**

- Little or no benefit (1)     Some benefit (2)     Moderate benefit (3)     Large benefit (4)     Very large benefit – essential (5)     Don't know

Average response: 4.4	<b>Large benefit to Very large benefit/essential</b>
Number of responses: 29	

**Independent funds administrator**

- Little or no benefit (1)     Some benefit (2)     Moderate benefit (3)     Large benefit (4)     Very large benefit – essential (5)     Don't know

Average response: 4.5	<b>Large benefit to Very large benefit/essential"</b>
Number of responses: 27	

**General comments:**

**Please provide any general comments you have about the structure of the review team:**

*There was a very strong guidance and control from the independent review team from day one to the end. Without the review team wouldn't run smoothly and decision won't be reached as it is. [Community delegate]*

*By the structure's smooth flow, the outcome of the process was successful. The coordination and functions was properly managed and guided. [Community delegate]*

*The independent review team participation meant a lot to this process where OTML, shareholders and the landowners were guided, ensuring all parties' discussions were within the legal agreement and the timeframe set for the review. Also, their participation was absolutely necessary because, if there had been disagreements on certain issues, surely they would intervene to iron out disagreements between the parties as far as their roles is concerned in this process. [Community delegate]*

*Fair to everyone. There is transparency in every issue discussed. Giver people confident to talk about issues that are of great importance in big length of time. There is clarity. It gives opportunities for other things to take place. Enough time to report everything back in good enough time. The longer the time is the better. Value is achieved. [Community delegate]*

*The structure of the review team is good as their participation and contributions were vital of importance as we have achieved better outcomes from the review process. [Community delegate]*

*The structure of the review team was commendable and all parties benefited by gaining new experiences and relevant facilitating skills and consultation skills at the various levels of the Review Process. [Independent review team]*

*I believe all parties did their best in all their contributions from the start to the finish and some still continuing to do further contributions post MOA signing. This shows PNG a new way forward in dealing with a mine related development problems and such issues as compensation of this magnitude and quite a complex model perhaps unutilised in the Southern Hemisphere or Pacific/ Asia region to my knowledge. [Independent review team]*

*It was a privilege to have met with people who are respected with wide background knowledge and experience in their respective fields. [Government]*

*The structure of the review team is good as it allows for transparency and participation by all concerned. [Government]*

*The review team was excellent. [OTML]*

*The review could have used the lawyers more whether they were in the WG or Independent observers or advisors. During patrols, because OTML staff were not allowed to talk during meetings, there were often errors made during facilitator – community discussions – but OTML staff were confused as to whether they should intervene and correct the error at the time or not. [OTML]*

*Revisiting roles by some sort of "reality check point" process may have helped. Clearer role descriptions, maybe. Better project definition and monitoring may have helped. [OTML]*

*The structure was very well designed in the way communication was disseminated from working group to village leaders then to the communities and visa versa. It was designed in a way to allow the flow of communication too and from. In that process, communities were informed of common issues in various CMCA regions and they made the informed collective decision as to the signing of the MoA. [OTML]*

*My assessment is based on the fact that the communities were convinced about their independence and participated fully and supported the process all through. [OTML]*

*Commendable concept and allowed the process to proceed with the stakeholders especially the community reps having a sense of security and support. [OTML]*

*The role of the lead negotiators and independent scientist would have been very essential if certain members of Keystone Centre and the independent scientist in my view have not taken sides with a negotiating party. [OTML]*

*I for one would say these kind of review process is first time of its kind and these principle can be applied to other resource provinces in the nation. [OTML].*

## **PARTICIPATION:**

**The review included some participants such as NGOs, women and youth representatives and churches that were not parties to the final agreement. How important was their participation in terms of achieving the objectives of the review?**

- Not at all important (1)     Slightly important (2)     Moderately important (3)     Important (4)     Essential (5)     Don't know

Average response: 4.6	<b>Important to Essential</b>
Number of responses: 29	

## **General comments:**

**Please provide any general comments you have about the involvement of these other organisations:**

*Their involvement is very significant because they publicize that there is no secret deals to any individual groups. [Community delegate]*

*This was for the first time women and youth NGOs and churches invited to fully participate in such big discussions and decision-making. I believe without women's involvement and also independent observers, special advisor, independent scientist allocation for women and children will not be approved. [Community delegate]*

*The involvement of other organisations to the process was not consistent. Breakdown of complete key messages. [Community delegate]*

*They have issues and problems to address to the government which they still live with, however, they have been ignored for too long. The process then paves the way for their participation to address these issues and problems so that together we can find best solutions for them to actively participate in planning control and manage their resources on programmes. [Community delegate]*

*The best review because it involves every member of the community to contribute to the betterment of everyone in this province in their participation as included organisations. Many times these people are behind the scene in many things. We need to recognise the importance of these valuable people who can best contribute from their own perspective. [Community delegate]*

*Their participation and contribution is very important. They play vital roles in the communities and there are also part and parcel of the communities. [Community delegate]*

*The involvement of NGOs, women and youth representatives gave a sense of care, diligence and a sense of direction to the delegates of the impacted communities in the discussions at the Working Group Level. [Independent review team]*

*It is perhaps one of the most important aspects of the review as they played a power broker role in the negotiations, especially they put into perspective the need for leaders at the local level to respect and work with the gender development issues as we saw that clearly in the Women and Children representative participation and was positive all the way. [Independent review team]*

*The environmental delegation should have been stronger, though great outreach efforts were made to secure additional participation. [Independent review team]*

*Most community structures (including traditional) evolve around church programs with the community, who also provide some much needed services to their people. It was important that they were recognised from the beginning. [Government]*

*Basically, the involvement of these other parties again provides for transparency, fairness, respect and participation in resolving a complex issue. [Government]*

*It was important to have these groups involved so that they are aware of what is happening and have some input to the agreement. [OTML]*

*The inclusion of women reps was very important because it focused on the needs of women and now hopefully the community women can benefit a bit more than they did in the last 5 years. [OTML]*

*Their actual input was minimal but leant an air of inclusion. A degree of tokenism in fact, but necessary, and could have contributed more with better structure to discussion. [OTML]*

*These organisations play very important roles in communities and recognition at the working group in terms of financial and project assistance will have the greater impact in changing the mindsets and improving the lifestyle of the communities. These organisations should work together in community development process. [OTML]*

*Their participation /involvement /input made it more transparent and community acceptance. [OTML]*

*For PNGeans, involvement of these stakeholders brings hope and life for the process from a different perspective. [OTML]*

*Some members of the [NGOs, women & youth representatives] tend to have pre-conceived ideas about OTML while those from the Western Province were more interested in "what's in it for themselves". [OTML].*

**PREPARATION:**

**Do you think there was enough preparation prior to beginning the review?**

- Very poorly prepared (1)    
  Poorly prepared – a lot more preparation needed (2)    
  Moderately well prepared – quite a lot more should have been done (3)    
  Well prepared but could have done more (4)    
  Very well prepared – no more needed (5)    
  Don't know

Average response:	4.2	<b>Well prepared to Very well prepared</b>
Number of responses:	29	

**General comments:**

**Please provide any general comments you have about the amount of preparation:**

*The review process was well prepared unlike the original negotiations and agreements done in 2000. [Community delegate]*

*The delegates came from different backgrounds and experiences - inputs - there should be more preparations / workshop for others to fully corp[unreadable]. [Community delegate]*

*There had been adequate amount of preparation in terms of availability of resources for the review. Everything worked out well because OTML had the money available to support the review. [Community delegate]*

*People or parties involved need to prepare in advance before anything takes place in the future as such. Preparations should involve people, concerns and know the background from which they are coming from. The preparation is useful and clearly understood by all in its purpose and functions. [Community delegate]*

*Prior to the actual start of the review, timing for the review process should have been captured properly in the preparation work in terms of having the review completed within 12 months. [Community delegate]*

*I believe that a region-wide awareness could have been done using all media support to pre- announce the review, to allow the messages for the village people, regional leaders and WG level participants to be fully ready for the review to commence. [Independent review team]*

*Preparation was excellent right from the start to the finish. [Government]*

*The preparation of the review was well thought for and the logistical support was very good given the vast area of coverage. [OTML]*

*The preparations began in 2004 -2005. It took a long time to get one plan agreed to because things kept changing. We should have given the communities adequate time and information to appreciate the review process being drawn up and the options, which were suggested prior to the commencement of the review. [OTML]*

*Either we started without too much preconception, which gave the less powerful more chance to be heard, or we gave more structure, which would give more clarity but suffers from the perception of controlling the process. I think we got it about right. [OTML]*

*No more needed in that preparatory work was reflected in the work we undertook in negotiation process a success and the signing of MoA. [OTML]*

*I think we put in a lot of effort to identify, develop and prepare for the process or approach taken. [OTML]*

*Being the first of its kind and OTML stating up front that it is a journey, the level of preparedness was second to none. [OTML]*

*The preparation time for these negotiations process of 18 months is enough. [OTML].*

**COST OF THE PROCESS:**

**The total cost of conducting the CMCA review process has been estimated at about PGK7 million (excluding the cost of logistics and the benefits package). From your perspective, and bearing in mind the final outcomes of the review, to what extent did this provide “value for money”?**

- Very poor value for money (1)     Poor value for money (2)     Moderate value for money (3)     Good value for money (4)     Very good value for money (5)     Don't know

Average response: 4.3	<b>Good to Very good value for money</b>
Number of responses: 28	

## EVALUATION AGAINST THE PRINCIPLES GUIDING THE CMCA REVIEW

The independent observers have reported against the following principles throughout the review. We felt it would be instructive if we asked participants to do the same in this final evaluation.

### HONESTY:

**Honesty was apparent and any attempts to corrupt the process were dealt with effectively:**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.3 <b>Largely to Fully</b> Number of responses: 29
--

**Integrity appeared to be maintained as well as in fact being maintained:**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.4 <b>Largely to Fully</b> Number of responses: 29
--

**The process agreed to by the parties was followed or only modified with their consent.**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.3 <b>Largely to Fully</b> Number of responses: 29
--

### TRANSPARENCY:

**Relevant information was made readily available to parties to the discussions or to other people with an interest in them:**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.4 <b>Largely to Fully</b> Number of responses: 29
--

**Information was available to parties and to people outside the process on how the process was conducted and how and what decisions were made.**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.4 <b>Largely to Fully</b> Number of responses: 29
--

**EQUITY:**

**Information was presented in appropriate forms and languages.**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.4 <b>Largely to Fully</b>
Number of responses: 29

**Information was presented at appropriate times.**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.2 <b>Largely to Fully</b>
Number of responses: 29

**Participation of women and youth was actively sought and supported.**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.3 <b>Largely to Fully</b>
Number of responses: 29

**FAIRNESS:**

**Fairness was observed.**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.4 <b>Largely to Fully</b>
Number of responses: 29

**There was an absence of complaints about conduct of the process or complaints were found to be baseless when independently reviewed.**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 3.9 <b>Moderately to Largely</b>
Number of responses: 29

**RESPECT:**

**Issues raised by parties or other people with a genuine interest in the process were treated as valid and properly considered.**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.6 <b>Largely to Fully</b> Number of responses: 29
--

**Company people behaved in a respectful manner at all times towards communities and other participants.**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.4 <b>Largely to Fully</b> Number of responses: 29
--

**The discussions were conducted at a pace that allowed parties to understand the information and, where necessary, consult with those that they represented before continuing.**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.5 <b>Largely to Fully</b> Number of responses: 29
--

**RESPONSIVENESS:**

**Questions raised were answered at the time to the best of the team's abilities.**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.6 <b>Largely to Fully</b> Number of responses: 28
--

**Questions taken on notice were responded to diligently.**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.5 <b>Largely to Fully</b> Number of responses: 28
--

**Communities were given feedback on how they have influenced company behaviours and decisions.**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.3 <b>Largely to Fully</b> Number of responses: 26
--

**ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION:**

**Information provided to communities was accurate.**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.3 <b>Largely to Fully</b> Number of responses: 27
--

**Information provided covered the range of issues relevant to the community's circumstances.**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.4 <b>Largely to Fully</b> Number of responses: 27
--

**TIMELINESS:**

**Diligent efforts were made to deliver the process within the agreed timeframe.**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.4 <b>Largely to Fully</b>
Number of responses: 28

**Diligent efforts were made to ensure the time between issues being raised and responses being formulated and conveyed was as short as possible.**

- Not at all (1)    A little (2)    Moderately (3)    Largely (4)    Fully (5)    Don't know

Average response: 4.4 <b>Largely to Fully</b>
Number of responses: 28

**WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN DONE BETTER?**

**If you have suggestions on how a process such as this could be done better next time and if they haven't been covered in other questions, please provide them below.**

*A rough idea is that such situations like this, the matter should be resolved when it is beginning because, if it goes wider range, then it is very complex in resolving rather than resolving when it is from the start. [Community delegate]*

*The review and the offer looks good, but want it much better next time. Offer must be tabled according to what people request, instead of telling people to accept the offer. [Community delegate]*

*There should be legal workshop create creative critical and logical thinking - the references to the existing agreement. To help and guide the decisions, should have references to other mines in the country or abroad - learning from the experiences. [Community delegate]*

*Suggestions on how a process could be done better in due course would be rather not to comment as it was properly done unlike the first agreement. The first agreement was very poorly done, as we've observed. [Community delegate]*

*Right from the beginning of this process, the women should have been involved. Since women/children have their 10% we need them coming three times in each year. The women/children need the support of everybody in the process. [Community delegate]*

*More background information on the 9th Supplemental Agreement and others should have been made available to the facilitators so that we went into the communities with sufficient knowledge to deal with matters relating to the appropriate Agreements during the community meetings. [Independent review team]*

*I believe much more awareness for the village people should be done in any future review, to enable their full participation as many were not present during the village briefings, in the South Fly, H/ Way and Lower Ok Tedi, including North and Mine villages. [Independent review team]*

*Communities needed a bit more time to understand contents of MoA. However, this can still be achieved through community relations information packs covering areas communities need to know. For example, messages on accessing funds from the three stakeholders and CMCA wanbel istap hand book etc. can be delivered consistently following the CMCA review model. [Independent review team]*

*Way in which the replacement observer was selected did not seem right to me, given the very high merits of alternative candidates. [Independent review team]*

*Written summary before all sessions. [Government]*

*Giving out the information to the communities by using their language through interpreters. Feedback from the communities could be collected, not only from the leaders. Could educate the leaders to give awareness in the communities. [NGO/Church]*

*I think a lot would have been achieved in a short time frame if the Provincial Government and National Government were involved to lead. [Government]*

*I think the process was first of its kind but was executed very well. There were some problems but they were dealt with and the important thing was the process didn't break down. [OTML]*

*The whole process could have been smaller and cheaper and less time consuming. The communities to this day do not quite understand the CMCA documents but would they allow the process to go this way if they understood the relevant clauses fully. The landowners will always feel that they were hard done by because their interest was not addressed. The good thing is they have so much money now and the most difficult part of it has just started - implementing and spending the funds wisely and honestly to develop their villages and themselves. [OTML]*

*The process ended a little elitist, so that the delegates became the elite. Maybe there should have been a reality check as to how the communities perceived their representatives, more clearly articulating the delegates' mandate at various times. Difficult, but possible. [OTML]*

*The provincial government officials could have been more fully involved in village consultation process. This is to establish working relationships in development process and in addressing community issues with OTML in the communities now and after mine closure. [OTML]*

*Was there a win-win outcome? [OTML]*

*I think the process is one of the best and it would have been better if other stakeholders (senior Gov't and PNGSDPL people) provided more commitment to attend the meetings. [OTML].*

**Please provide any other general comments below:**

*Generally, the process was good, transparent, open and all stakeholder supported to be equally considerate and responsible to commit to the impacted communities - but should have done better of others. [Community delegate]*

*My comment here is specifically for 10 mine villages or 12 villages. When it comes to a review in 2011 or 2013, I'd like Kwim wun descend be recognised as principal landowners when reviewing in 2013. [Community delegate]*

*Although we've asked another 5% to be reviewed annually apart from what OTML has rendered each region, the amount of money does not really change but the impact continues to multiply. Therefore, it is the challenge for OTML to consider precautionary measures as it has planned to pipe down the Acid Rock tailings into a more secure well. Even other preventative measures to remedy the river situation. [Community delegate]*

*We continue to strengthen the relationships of the OTML and the CMCA leaders with the communities. That we continue to have transparency in all areas of the CMCA's for the next six years before the mine closes. [Community delegate]*

*Generally, overall review process was very good in the way it was conducted. This review was good in sense of involving all relevant stakeholders, OTML and the impacted communities. [Community delegate]*

*All logistical support, boarding and lodging was of an excellent order and OTML and all the staff involved in the Review patrols are to be commended for a JOB WELL DONE! [Independent review team]*

*I just want to acknowledge and thank Ok Tedi Top Management and the tireless CR Manager and the staff for the unique support and experience gained by all participants in the review. I have no doubt in my mind that this review has brought closer many development players in the region. Notably, the*

*Provincial Administration and their much needed support and future role, the regional leaders and villagers closer to Ok Tedi, NGO's and even other stakeholders and development partners. It was a successful review process worthy of direct application to any development project in PNG at this point in time. [Independent review team]*

*A very unique process which not only brought about satisfying outcome, ie. Increased compensation, but, setting the balance between environment damages and level of compensation payment from stakeholders. This will need to be managed with all sensitiveness as community expectation may downplay what was perceived to be a significant compensation in comparison to the remaining 2001 CMCA package up to 2001. One other point is each CMCA region might take advantage of certain clause of the MoA, example, clause 9 "environmental exceedences" where provision is made for each region to discuss revision of payments on a case-by-case basis in the event that an exceedence occurs in one region. No doubt, you have capable team to defuse any unfounded claims, such as Lower Ok Tedi. [Independent review team]*

*Overall, a remarkable achievement for all involved. [PNGSDP]*

*Special thank you to all those who helped achieve what we have - this would not have been possible without that support. [NGO/Church]*

*Generally, the entire process was done well and in good atmosphere. Formulation of the transition team is a success. The selection of consultants [Tanorama] really shows we are going forward. [NGO/Church]*

*I have full of praise for OTML and all the parties that were involved, one way or other, in the process. It was new and an eye opener for me and I fully recommend this process for future revised if any and for others involved in such industrial initiatives. [Government]*

*The CMCA review evaluation strategy is good and I hope other industries or projects follow such an example if caught in such circumstances. [Government]*

*The cost of the review for the village and regional meetings could have been lower if the OTDF Regional teams were running with the programs. Some of the arrangements were blown out of proportion because of the limited knowledge of the operation area creating unnecessary cost. [OTML]*

*I think many people involved in the review team have learnt many new things about how to go about dealing with such a process and have also experienced the difficult part of operating in a vast area covered with water. [OTML]*

*Better than the first time (2000-2001) but still highly dependent on what is the real expectation out in the villages. If that expectation is not grounded in reality and matches performance, the quality of the review process is irrelevant. [OTML]*

*I am proud of the process and everyone who was involved in supporting, guiding and driving the process to the end. The outcome including improvement of our relations with the communities is the result. This is a model process that should be used with other major development projects. [OTML]*

*Process was probably rushed towards the end due to valid reasons but it did leave a few key issues unresolved by the working group creating some tensions but no fatal flaw. Overall, this is a process that should be replicated elsewhere in PNG and abroad. [OTML]*

*The cost of the exercise could have been less but still achieving the desired outcome if the review was completed in shorter time span, say 12 months. [OTML].*