

# **OK TEDI MINING LIMITED 2006 COMMUNITY MINE CONTINUATION AGREEMENTS**

## **THE INDEPENDENT OBSERVERS REPORT FOR THE WORKING GROUP SIX MEETING AND THE FIVE REGIONAL MEETINGS**

**Prepared by The Independent Observers:**

**Dr. Beno B. Boeha, CBE, Ph.D  
P.O. Box 487  
Boroko  
National Capital District  
Papua New Guinea**

**and**

**Mr. John Kawi, LLM, LLB  
P.O. Box 4903  
Boroko  
National Capital District  
Papua New Guinea**

**for**

## **THE WORKING GROUP AND THE CMCA REVIEW**

**April - May 2007**

## CONTENTS

<b>Independent Observers</b>	v
<b>Acronyms</b>	vi
<b>Acknowledgement</b>	vii
<b>1.0 Preamble</b>	1
<b>2.0 Background</b>	1
<b>3.0 Structure and Process of the CMCA Review (For Village, Regional and Working Group Meetings)</b>	2
<b>4.0 Composition of Working Group</b>	3
<b>5.0 Independent Facilitators</b>	3
5.1 Observations 1	3
<b>6.0 Independent Observers</b>	4
6.1 Observations 1	4
<b>7.0 Role of the Special Advisor</b>	4
7.1 Observations 1	4
<b>8.0 Accedences of Environmental Predictions</b>	5
8.1 Observations 1	5
<b>9.0 Independence of the CMCA Review Structure</b>	5
9.1 Observations 1	6
9.2 Observations 2	6
<b>10.0 Working Group 6 Meeting -Tabubil: 16 – 20 April 2007</b>	7
<b>11.0 Summary of Matters and Key Messages Discussed in the Working Group Six Meeting</b>	7
11.1 The Summary of Review Process Map	7
11.2 The OTML CMCA's Financial Offer	7
11.3 The Decisions on CMCA's Allocation	7
11.4 The Recognition of Women and Children	8
11.5 The OTML Tax Credit Scheme	8
11.6 The National Government Financial Offer	8
11.7 The PNGSDP Financial Offer	8
11.8 One Time Five Percent Dividend Payment	8
11.9 The Mine Villages Benefits	8
11.10 The Ok Tedi Fly River Development Foundation (OTFRDF)	8

11.11	The Transition Team from the Working Group	8
11.12	The Changes to the CMCA Trust Arrangements	9
11.13	The Environmental Accedence's	9
11.14	The Health Monitoring and Education	9
11.15	The Memorandum of Agreements (MOA)	10
<b>12.0</b>	<b>Regional Meetings Five: 23 April – 3 May 2007</b>	<b>10</b>
12.1	Observations 1	11
12.2	Observations 2	11
12.3	Observations 3	11
12.4	Observations 4	11
12.5	Observations 5	12
12.6	Observations 6	12
12.7	Observations 7	12
12.8	Observations 8	12
12.9	Observations 9	13
<b>13.0</b>	<b>Principles Guiding Discussions with Communities</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>14.0</b>	<b>Adequacy of Information</b>	<b>13</b>
14.1	Observations 1	14
14.2	Observations 2	14
<b>15.0</b>	<b>Equity</b>	<b>14</b>
15.1	Observations 1	14
<b>16.0</b>	<b>Participation</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>17.0</b>	<b>Responsiveness</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>18.0</b>	<b>Transparency</b>	<b>15</b>
18.1	Observations 1	15
<b>19.0</b>	<b>Integrity</b>	<b>15</b>
19.1	Observations 1	16
<b>20.0</b>	<b>Fairness</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>21.0</b>	<b>Respect</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>22.0</b>	<b>Timeliness</b>	<b>17</b>
22.1	Observations 1	17
<b>23.0</b>	<b>Ownership of Review Structure and Process</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>24.0</b>	<b>Communication, Publicity and Exposure of the CMCA Review Process</b>	<b>18</b>

24.1	Observations 1	18
<b>25.0</b>	<b>Participation in Agreed Outcome (Signing)</b>	18
<b>26.0</b>	<b>Participation by Landowners not Party to the CMCA</b>	19
<b>27.0</b>	<b>Schedule 1</b>	19
<b>Table 1:</b>	<b>List of nine CMCA Regions and the names of Three Regional Delegates representing each region</b>	20
<b>Table 2:</b>	<b>List of Independent Facilitators and Organization</b>	21
<b>Table 3:</b>	<b>List of Independent Observers</b>	21
<b>Table 4:</b>	<b>List of Independent Scientist</b>	21
<b>Table 5:</b>	<b>List of Special Advisor</b>	21
<b>Table 6:</b>	<b>List of Stakeholders and Participants in the CMCA Review Process</b>	22
<b>Table 7:</b>	<b>List of Project Management Team</b>	23
<b>Table 8:</b>	<b>List of Core Group Members with two additional members from Lower Ok Tedi Region</b>	23
<b>Table 9:</b>	<b>List of Names of all Village Leaders from the 9 CMCA Regions</b>	23
<b>Table 10:</b>	<b>List of Names of Transition Team from Work Group and Representation</b>	27

## **INDEPENDENT OBSERVERS**

Dr. Beno B. Boeha, CBE, Ph.D is the former Deputy Vice Chancellor and Senior Lecturer at the Papua New Guinea University of Technology and later as the Director of National Research Institute in Papua New Guinea. He spent over 30 years in the fields of research, science, and education in tertiary institutions. He taught sciences to civil, electrical, communication, mining, petroleum and mechanical engineering students including students in the fields of applied chemistry, surveying, architecture and building, agriculture, forestry and fisheries. He is familiar with many research issues relating to renewable and non renewable resources. He was tasked to assist the 2006 CMCA Review Process as an Independent Observer. He was engaged to assist Mr. John Kawi as one of the two Independent Observers in the later part of the CMCA Review Process.

Mr. John Kawi, LLM, LLB is the former Solicitor General of Papua New Guinea. He has excellent record with vast experiences in implementation of resources law. He has immense knowledge and understanding of challenges and energy law in the renewable and non renewable resources in particular forestry, fisheries, mining and petroleum. He is familiar with current government efforts in tackling issues related to energy law within the natural resources. He was engaged to assist the 2006 CMCA Review Process as one of the two initial Independent Observers in the process.

## ACRONYMS

ARD	Acid Rock Drainage
CBS	Community and Business Support
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CMCA	Community Mine Continuation Agreements
FRPG	Fly River Provincial Government
GoPNG	National Government of Papua New Guinea
IO	Independent Observers
IRM	Interim Regional Meeting
LOT	Lower Ok Tedi
NEC	National Executive Council
NGO	Non Government Organisations
NOT	North Ok Tedi
MOA	Memorandum of Agreements
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
OTDF	Ok Tedi Development Foundation Limited
OTML	Ok Tedi Mining Limited
OTFRDF	Ok Tedi Fly River Development Foundation
PNG	Papua New Guinea
PNGSDP	Papua New Guinea Sustainable Development Program Limited
TCS	Tax Credit Schemes
VPC	Village Planning Committees
RM	Regional Meetings
VM	Village Meetings
WG	Working Group

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The Independent Observers wish to thank various stakeholders including the Ok Tedi Mining Limited, the Government of Papua New Guinea (GoPNG), the Papua New Guinea Sustainable Development Program Limited (PNGSDPL), INMET Mining, the Fly River Provincial Government (FRPG), and advisors/consultants – Offor/Sharp Consultants, the facilitators – The Keystone of United States and Tanorama of Papua New Guinea - for having confidence in us to act as the Independent Observers for the 2006 CMCA Review Process. Our special gratitude goes to the Managing Director of OTML – Mr. Keith Faulkner, the General Manager (CBS) – Mr. David Masani, and the Manager of Community Relations – Mr. Leonard Lagisa for continually checking on our daily upkeep and being highly resourceful in the Review process. Special thanks go to the team in the OTML Community Relations Department for assistances in continuously overseeing such a very difficult and expensive exercise that makes the process a challenging one for everyone involved. Importantly to all the delegates to the Working Group who participated meaningfully and effectively throughout the entire CMCA Review Process, and equally to all community leaders who have given their utmost best in representing their communities in this process.

Thanks are also due to the support staff and field officers of the OTML Community Relations for arrangements of logistics, particularly making available transport, items and equipment to ensure our safety was never compromised in carrying out our duties. These enabled us to always consider the ‘Take Five and Stay Alive’ and feel safe to carry out our duties and responsibilities as Independent Observers.

Special gratitude is also due to all employees of OTML and its contracting companies along the corridor of the nine CMCA communities who have tirelessly assisted us in one way or other during the 2006 CMCA Review process that have eventually seek “*A NEW WAY FORWARD*”.

**Dr. Beno B. Boeha, CBE, Ph.D.**  
**Independent Observer**

**Mr. John Kawi, LLM, LLB**  
**Independent Observer**

## 1.0 PREAMBLE

This Report covers the observations by the Independent Observers (IO) for the Working Group Six (WG6) Meeting convened in Tabubil from the 16 through to 20 April 2007. This was followed by another round of the Regional Meetings Five (RM5) that started from 23 April through to 3 May 2007. Following Regional Meetings Five (RM5) the third round of Village Meetings Three (VM3) commenced. At the time of writing this Report VM3 was still in progress and so we were unable to conduct a desk top review of the VM3 and report on them publicly. We hope to do that after conclusion of the VM3 and publicly report in the Report of the Signing Ceremony.

## 2.0 BACKGROUND

For the sake of completeness, the background to this process is restated, although this has already been outlined in the IO previous Reports.

In 2001, the Ok Tedi Mining Limited (OTML) entered into Compensation Agreements known as Community Mine Continuation Agreements (CMCA) with 14 communities whose environments were adversely impacted by the operations of the Ok Tedi mine. In exchange for the compensation benefits the affected communities agreed not to pursue any legal action or compensation claims against the OTML or its previous shareholders, but allowed the mine to continue its operations until end of mine life which is presently indicated to be around the year 2013.

Following the execution of the CMCA the National Parliament passed and ratified the *Mining (Ok Tedi Mine Continuation) (Ninth Supplemental Agreement) Act 2001* to give the Agreements the force of law.

There are 14 CMCA communities covering some 152 villages and an estimated 50,000 people from the Mine Area (six CMCA), North Ok Tedi, Lower Ok Tedi, and the Highway Region from Tabubil to Kiunga, the Middle Fly, and the South Fly areas (four CMCA), and these are the Manawete region in the North Bank of the Fly River, the Dudi Region in the South Bank, the Kiwaba Region representing the Kiwai and Wabada Islands and the Suki Fly Gogo Regions.

The CMCA established Trusts for each region through which compensation payments are being made. The Trusts administer these funds on behalf of the affected regions. Under the CMCA the communities consented to the continuation of the mine based upon the then predicted environmental impacts.

These Environmental Predictions which are comprehensively set out in the Schedule II to the CMCA are:

- Dirty Water;
- Sand build up; (Sedimentation)
- Flooding;
- Trees losing leaves and dying (Dieback);
- Fish;
- Copper;
- Acid Rock Drainage (ARD); and
- Sago.

The OTML has an obligation under the CMCA to continually monitor the environmental impacts and to ensure that the communities are kept progressively informed of the results. If the environmental impacts exceed the levels predicted, then the River and Highway CMCA's require a meeting with the OTML to discuss the revision of compensation payments.

The continuous environmental monitoring by the OTML since 2001 has now revealed that the Environmental Predictions have changed with sediment depositions, flooding, die back and acid rock drainage (ARD) impacts now much greater than initially predicted in some CMCA regions, particularly in the Middle and South Fly regions.

The CMCA provide for a review of the 'Operation of the Agreement' after the expiration of five (5) years from the termination date which is 31 December 2001. The current Review process commenced in February 2006 and is aimed at being completed by June 2007.

### **3.0 STRUCTURE AND PROCESS OF THE CMCA REVIEW (For Village, Regional and Working Group Meetings)**

The structure and processes of the Review were designed differently to the separate regional negotiations and Agreements entered into in 2001.

It was agreed, as in 2001, that each village of the CMCA communities would select a representative to a Regional Meeting. At each of the regional meetings the village representatives would select three members to represent their region at the Working Group Meetings. There are nine (9) CMCA Regions that participate in the Regional Meetings. The list of the nine CMCA Regions and the names of the three Regional Delegates representing each Region are shown in Table 1 of Schedule 1 to this Report. The WG is the main review and negotiation forum.

The negotiation forum constitutes of the Regional Delegates, Independent Facilitators, Independent Observers, Independent Scientist, Special Advisor and Stakeholder participants. Tables 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of Schedule 1 lists the names of all Independent Facilitators, Independent Observers, Independent Scientist, Special Advisor, Stakeholders, Project Management, and Independent Fund Administrator respectively involved in the CMCA Review process.

To assist the Regional Delegates to the WG progress their deliberations of issues arising from the WG Meetings, the WG formed a Core Group comprising seven (7) of their own Working Group Delegates. Table 8 of Schedule 1 list the names of the Core Group members with two additional members from the LOT region. The main function of the Core Group is to investigate key issues in greater detail and then report the results of their findings back to the Delegates in the WG.

Following each WG meeting, the three Regional Delegates are expected to meet with their respective regional groups in regional meetings to brief their village leaders on the progress and outcomes of the WG meetings. Table 9 of Schedule 1 list the names of all Village Leaders from the 9 CMCA Regions. The WG and Regional meetings are facilitated by Keystone and Tanorama facilitators with IO monitoring, observing and publicly reporting on the

progress of all WG, Core Group and Regional Meeting and the process as a whole.

After the RM, the village representatives, together with leaders who are the WG delegates are expected to conduct the VM to inform their respective villagers of the progress of the WG Review of the CMCA and the issues discussed in each WG meeting.

The whole structure and process is aimed at consulting and empowering people to participate effectively and comprehensively in the CMCA Review process. It is envisaged that through this process there will be a greater sense of consultation, participation, and dialogue among the people, their representatives and the different stakeholders, and in this way the people will take ultimate ownership of the process and any final outcomes.

#### **4.0 COMPOSITION OF WORKING GROUP**

The WG is the prime review and negotiation forum which is attended by all the following stakeholders apart from the regional representatives. These stakeholders are the PNG Sustainable Development Program (PNGSDP), the OTML, the GoPNG represented by the following Departments including Mining, Environment and Conservation, Justice and Attorney General, Treasury and Finance, National Planning and Monitoring and Provincial Affairs. The Fly River Provincial Government (FRPG) is represented by the Deputy Provincial Administrator. There are also representatives of Women, Churches, and Non-Government Organization interested in the environment and the sustainable development issues.

#### **5.0 INDEPENDENT FACILITATORS**

The OTML engaged an American Non-Governmental Organization, the Keystone Centre, who specializes in multi-party negotiation and problem solving through mediation, consensus and dialogue and the PNG based Consultants, the Tanorama as the lead Independent Facilitators in the CMCA Review process. Tanorama Consultants encompass six outstanding Papua New Guineans who have previously held various incredibly senior positions in both the public and private sectors and therefore bring with them wide-ranging wealth of experiences into this process.

##### **5.1 Observations 1**

The engagement of the two independent organisations as the facilitators; viz the Keystone Centre and Tanorama, who specialize in multi-party negotiation and problem solving through mediation, consensus and dialogue have continued to ensure that the CMCA Review process in the WG, RM through to the VM continues to be undertaken independently, impartially and transparently, although in the RM5, in some South Fly regions (Manawete, Kiwaba and Dudi) it was observed that one facilitator appeared to have stepped out of his normal role and expressed what we consider to be highly opinionated opinions while discussing a summary of environmental damages based on the Independent Scientist Report.

## **6.0 INDEPENDENT OBSERVERS**

To further strengthen and enhance the credibility and integrity of the CMCA Review process, the two IO are continuously used to observe, monitor and independently report on the conduct of the CMCA Review process against the Principles outlined in the *“Principles Guiding Ok Tedi Ltd’s Discussions with Communities”*. These Principles against which we report are: integrity, transparency, equity, participation, fairness, respect, responsiveness, adequacy of information and timeliness. Additionally, the IO conduct desk reviews of the reports from VM and also report on them publicly. In this Report VM3 observations are not reviewed and reported, however these will be done and included in the Independents Observers Report for RM6 – the Signing Ceremony.

### **6.1 Observations 1**

The use of the two IO has continued to strengthen and added values and enhanced the integrity of the entire CMCA Review process that starts from the WG, Core Group, RM and through to the VM, although VM3 have not being desk reviewed at the time of writing this Report.

## **7.0 ROLE OF THE SPECIAL ADVISOR**

Sir Arnold continues to play the role of the Special Advisor in all the WG and the Core Group meetings. In the WG6 meeting in April 2007, Sir Arnold played a significant role in assisting the Regional Delegates to evaluate and assess and then participated in the negotiation of the final compensation packages offered by the shareholders. He diligently advised the delegates in many discussions and offered legal advice on legal aspects of the offers. He also offered many other practical advices to ensure that delegates were in possession of quality information before making any decisions on whether to accept the offer or not.

Rather than being restrictive in his scope of works, Sir Arnold also offers other relevant advices within his skills, experiences and expertise as the Special Advisor including legal and political advice and governmental issues as and when required. He consistently maintained confidentiality in his tasks and would act with discretion as required to enable the review process to achieve its aim of negotiating an independent review of the CMCA. Sir Arnold also provided legal advice to the WG members on the final draft of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which was eventually upgraded to the final draft of the Memorandum of Agreements (MOA).

### **7.1 Observations 1**

The CMCA Review process has thus far benefited immensely from the role of Sir Arnold as the Special Advisor. Such role of Sir Arnold together with his skills, experiences and expertise guiding the review process, has enhanced the integrity and credibility of the CMCA Review process. It also encompasses value, fairness and transparency in the entire process before the final MOU is upgraded and accepted as the final draft of MOA which is based on informed consent of the impacted communities. A Letter of Endorsement from Sir Arnold that is attached to the draft MOA is a sign of confidence and supports the

structure and process established for this CMCA Review and the outcomes achieved.

## **8.0 ACCEEDENCES OF ENVIRONMENTAL PREDICTIONS**

During the WG6, delegates were reminded to recognise that there have been accedences of environmental predictions and the CMCA communities have been provided with information through the Environment Report by Independent Scientist on the environmental damages and the degree of environmental accedence caused to date by the mine operations.

The findings of Independent Scientist on environment damages and impacts were used by Regional delegates and Village leaders as the basis for computing damages in the present CMCA negotiations. A Letter of Endorsement and a Summary of Environmental Impacts and Social Impacts from the Independent Scientist is also annexed to the MOA.

### **8.1 Observations 1**

The Environmental Report by the Independent Scientist lends credibility and integrity to this Review process. It ensures that the process of consultation and negotiating a good compensation package between the stakeholders and the people is fair and transparent and one that may have achieved better outcomes in the CMCA Review. In the WG6 and the RM5 a Letter of Endorsement attached to the final draft of the Memorandum of Agreement from the Independent Scientist containing information on environmental accedence of together with social and health issues, also assisted the impacted communities to make better and informed judgements and decisions on whether to accept or reject the offers from the stakeholders. Again the IO made the observations that during the RM5 in some South Fly regions (Manawete, Kiwaba and Dudi) one facilitator had stepped out of his usual role and expressed what we consider to be highly opinionated views on environmental damages and its impacts. From the IO observations such highly opinionated views has the potential to cause division and confusion among the people and at its worst it can even derail the whole process at such a vital phase of consultation.

## **9.0 INDEPENDENCE OF THE CMCA REVIEW STRUCTURE**

The entire WG structure was designed and developed to ensure that the CMCA Review is undertaken independently and impartially and without any undue influence or interference from the OTML or any other stakeholders. To achieve these Independent Facilitators were appointed to facilitate all meetings with the monitoring and observations being done by the IO. There is also a Special Advisor and an Independent Scientist within the structure who are readily available to assist delegates by providing relevant information and advice to the delegates and the review process, as and when required.

Since the WG2 Meeting, the OTML has been playing a greater role in initiating and organizing meetings for the WG, the RM delegates, and the Core Group Meetings. This included the Interim WG Meeting and the Interim RM in August 2006 as well as the earlier Core Group meetings in Port Moresby with the Mining Minister and the PNGSDP. The OTML has also initiated and

organized a trip for the Core Group members to travel to Rabaul at its expense to study the Gazelle Restoration Authority model and discuss other related issues outside Tabubil. Since July 2006, the OTML has initiated and organized many meetings for the Core Group members both within and outside of Tabubil. These Core Group meetings were for the sole purpose of investigating and discussing key issues and then to report back to the main WG meeting. Since the stakeholders made their offers, the Core Group has spent vast amount of time assessing and analysing these offers before reporting back to the WG meeting.

In January and February 2007 there was a Special Core Group meeting and two Core Group meetings with two visits by the Core Group to Port Moresby to meet with the Mining Minister and the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the PNGSDP as well to meet with the Boards of Directors of both the OTML and the PNGSDP to progress discussions and to evaluate and understand better the stakeholders offers. Significant offers from stakeholders and counter-offers by delegates occurred in the WG4 and the WG5 meetings and the February 2007 Core Group meeting.

## **9.1 Observations 1**

Significant progress has been made in terms of discussing, analysing, assessing and provisionally accepting the stakeholders' offers by the delegates.

The leaders have been exposed and their understandings of the key issues that relate to the components of offers which are greatly enhanced through the various stages of the Review process. However, conducting of the RM6 including the forthcoming MOA Signing Ceremonies between relevant parties should operate within the agreed structure of the Review process and guided by the ***“Principles Guiding Ok Tedi Ltd's Discussions with Communities”*** in order to avoid any perceptions of biasness or any other perceptions that the integrity, and independence of the CMCA review structure may be compromised.

Having observed all the WG, Core Group and Regional meetings thus far, the IO are fully satisfied that the OTML initiated and organized several meetings in the past for the sole purpose of dissecting, investigating issues and key messages and progressing important discussions with two paramount matters – The offers and the MOA. It is pleasing to report that the WG6 and the RM5 are held within the agreed framework of the review process and are facilitated by the co-Chairman of the WG and with the facilitators' assistance in the RM and monitored and observed by the Independent Observers. Therefore, we report that there has been no undue influence exerted upon the leaders nor are there any suggestions of attempts by the OTML to either overtly or covertly solicit sympathy or support from the leaders to accept both the stakeholders' offers and the MOA.

Having monitored and observed the WG6 and all the rounds of RM5, the IO are satisfied that the WG6 and some Regional meetings satisfy most of the principles of discussions with the communities.

## **9.2 Observations 2**

The Regional Meetings Six (RM6) is being planned for the signing of the MOA, and to deal with other unforeseen related matters. It is anticipated that the process of the signing of the MOA will continue to be held within the ambience of independence of the Review structure. The current practice of the Independent Facilitators facilitating the meeting and or signing with Special Advisors advising and or witnessing and with Independent Observers monitoring and observing the signing of the MOA ought to be maintained during the Signing Ceremonies, hence to avoid any misreading and misconceptions or any perceptions of bias or compromising the independence of the process.

## **10.0 WORKING GROUP 6 MEETING - TABUBIL: 16 – 20 APRIL 2007**

The WG6 Meeting was held in Tabubil from the 16 – 20 April 2007. Attending the Meeting were the following stakeholders:

- Three representatives from each of the nine CMCA communities;
- The OTML was represented by the Managing Director, General Manager (CBS) and the Manager of Community Relations Department;
- The GoPNG was represented by officers from the following departments: Mining, Environment and Conservation; Justice and Attorney General, Treasury and Finance, National Planning and Monitoring, and Provincial Affairs;
- The PNGSDP delegation was led by their Chief Program officer;
- A representative each from the Catholic Church and the Evangelical Church of Papua;
- Two Representatives of the Women and Children;
- The Fly River Provincial Government was represented by the Deputy Provincial Administrator.

The WG6 Meeting was co-chaired by the facilitators, Dr. Peter Alder of the Keystone Centre and Mr. Martin Brash of Tanorama. In attendance were: Sir Arnold Amet (Special Advisor), Dr Allan Tingay (Independent Scientist) Mr. Tim Ofor (Project Management), and Mr. James Kruise (Independent Fund Administrator), two other members of the Keystone Centre and five members of Tanorama Consultants. The Meeting was observed and monitored by two Independent Observers, Mr. John Kawi and Dr. Beno Boeha.

## **11.0 SUMMARY OF MATTERS AND KEY MESSAGES DISCUSSED IN THE WORKING GROUP SIX MEETING**

The following matters are derived from the WG6 Meeting with the following key messages:

### **11.1 The Summary of Review Process Map**

The summary of the WG, Core Group, RM and VM of the 2006 – 2007 CMCA Review Process were presented including the key messages, issues and progression of offers or outcomes of each stages of the consultation process.

The CMCA Review process will be possibly completed in Working Group Six. This was then followed by the Regional Meeting Five and Village Meeting Three. It is anticipated that there will be a final Regional Meeting Six, during which the MOA will be signed by the respective CMCA Regions.

#### **11.2 The OTML CMCA's Financial Offer**

The presentation of the guaranteed final Compensation financial package with the total CMCA Offer for all the eight CMCA Regions is K324 million for the period 2007 until mid – 2013. In the new Compensation package, the OTML is offering four times the current CMCA funds to be shared among the CMCA regions using the current split.

#### **11.3 The Decisions on CMCA's Allocation**

The amount of the CMCA funds going to development projects, cash and investment will be decided by the regional leaders, after consultation with villages of the respective regions.

#### **11.4 The Recognition of Women and Children**

At least ten percent (10%) of the CMCA, the GoPNG and the PNGSDP funds will go towards Women and Children's projects. Decision on how these funds are spent will be made by women and children leaders.

#### **11.5 The OTML Tax Credit Scheme (TCS)**

Half of the OTML Tax Credit Schemes projects which is a part of the Non-CMCA development package will be spent on projects within the CMCA regions. The decision on what to be funded first will be made by the new entity, the Ok Tedi Fly River Development Foundation. (OTFRDF).

#### **11.6 The National Government Financial Offer**

The GoPNG is offering five percent (5%) of the OTML dividend (1/2 of the money that now goes into the Western Province People's 10% Dividend Trust) as part of the Non-CMCA development package. The amount of money to be paid annually will depend on how much money the OTML makes.

#### **11.7 The PNGSDP Financial Offer**

The PNGSDP is offering two and half percent (2.5%) of the PNGSDP's share of the OTML dividend, or K21.5 million annually, which ever is more. This offer is part of the Non-CMCA development package.

#### **11.8 One-Of-Five Percent Dividend Payment**

This is a one off payment totalling some K90 million from the 10% Western Province People's Fund. WG6 agreed that K45 million from

the 5% Dividend in 2006 will be spent on projects for South Fly communities. The other K45 million will be shared equally among the remaining regions.

#### **11.9 The Mine Villages Benefits**

The Mine villages will share the benefits from the Non-CMCA development package. They will however not benefit from or get any increase in their CMCA funds. This is because their CMCA do not permit such increase, as they do not experience any increased environmental impacts.

#### **11.10 The Ok Tedi Fly River Development Foundation (OTFRDF)**

A new organisation to be known as the **Ok Tedi Fly River Development Foundation (OTFRDF)** will be established to provide communities a high level of ownership and decision-making power over these funds. A Transition Team from the CMCA Working Group is ensuring that the OTFRDF is aptly established.

#### **11.11 The Transition Team from the Working Group**

The new organisation will be established by the Transition Team with the assistance of a consultant. The Transition Team will comprise people from the WG, and they will work on the design and structure of the OTFRDF. The list of these people is shown on Table 10 of the Schedule 1 of this Report.

#### **11.12 The Changes to the CMCA Trust Arrangements**

There will be changes made to the CMCA Trust arrangements that ought to provide Village Planning Committees (VPC) more decision-making power, change of who appoints the Trustees, how long the appointments of Trustees last, and other changes to improve the work of the CMCA.

#### **11.13 The Environmental Accedences**

The MOA recognises that there have been accedences of environmental predictions and communities have been provided with information on these accedences and the greater environmental and social impacts. The draft MOA also include a Letter of Endorsement from the Independent Scientists including a summary of the environmental impacts and social and health impacts.

#### **11.14 The Health Monitoring and Education**

In relation to the environmental accedences, there will be more efforts focussed on the health monitoring and education. It is anticipated that major health issues will arise after the mine closes in six years time, and one of the key issues arising from the Independent Scientist environmental report was the community health issues affecting women and children. Addressing these community health issues was identified as a priority area.

### **11.15 The Memorandum of Agreements (MOA)**

The MOA document was discussed in detail with facilitators discussing each clause one at a time. Many important matters included in the MOA are summarised in section 11.2 down to section 11.14 of this Report. The next step is for the leaders to get these final outcomes and consult the villagers and their communities.

### **12.0 REGIONAL MEETING FIVE: 23 APRIL – 3 MAY 2007**

Regional Meeting 5 was basically structured along the same lines as other RM and the Interim Regional meetings (IRM) conducted in 2006. The RM5 commenced on the 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2007 and continued until the 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2007. They were conducted in all regions including the Mine villages.

There were two teams that conducted and facilitated the RM5. There were two ships available for transportation in the South Fly regions that transported a team consisting of Tanorama and a Keystone Facilitators and OTML personnel who conducted the Middle Fly and Suki Fly Gogo Regional meetings.

They were later joined by three additional Tanorama facilitators while the Keystone Facilitators together with OTML resource personnel and the IO continued to lower South Fly Regions of Manawete, Kiwaba and Dudi. VM3 in suki fly Gogo commenced immediately after the Regional Meeting ended.

Another team consisting of a Tanorama and one Keystone Facilitators together with other OTML personnel conducted the Upper Fly River regions with the Independent Observer, Dr. Beno Boeha, monitoring and observing the LOT, Highway, Mine Villages and North Ok Tedi Regional Meetings. Mr. John Kawi did the same for the South Fly RM5 and he was later joined by Dr. Beno Boeha for Manawete, Kiwaba and Dudi RM5.

The main objectives of the RM5 are outlined below:

- (a) To inform the regional leaders of the status of the CMCA Medium Term Review process.
- (b) To inform the regional leaders on the contents of the CMCA Memorandum of Agreement (MOA).
- (c) To obtain the leaders understanding on the final negotiated benefits and package and share this information with the villages along the impact corridor, who will advise on the leaders' possible signing date and location.

The RM5 was concerned with conveying information to enable regional delegates understand the contents of the MOA, and at the same time to obtain leaders consent on the final negotiated benefits and packages that constitute the CMCA and Non-CMCA compensation packages. During RM5, the discussions were all conducted in an open, honest and frank manner. The leaders were quite frank and very passionate when speaking on issues being discussed. They spoke with clarity when expressing their views and all who wanted to speak were given an opportunity to do so. There were also disagreements on certain issues discussed as can be expected in such meeting.

In certain regions, during the Regional Meetings there were varying degrees of disagreements with regard to the offers from the PNSDP and the OTML. It was frankly expressed that the stakeholders offers were not commensurate with the level of environmental accedence.

During the RM5 leaders listened conscientiously and were respectful when the other regional leaders had the floor to speak. However in some regions, certain regional representatives and facilitators tried to impose their views on others who were silent with particular reference to accedences of environmental predictions. This resulted in a situation where many leaders present did not meaningfully and effectively participate in the discussions. However, the Facilitators successfully facilitated and communicated the key messages of the Offers and the MOA. In our observations this was satisfactorily done in compliance with all the principles guiding the discussions of the CMCA Review process.

### **12.1 Observations 1**

During the RM5, the IO observed that the discussions were all conducted in an open, honest and fair manner. Leaders were fairly frank and spoke with clarity when expressing their views and were given opportunities to speak on issues and key messages on the MOA, and the CMCA and the Non-CMCA offers. Some leaders spoke softly and using languages in communications. As can be expected in any meeting, there were some disagreements on certain issues discussed, in particular with the leaders expressing concerns that the compensation packages offered by the stakeholders were not commensurate with the environmental impacts and the degree of environmental accedence.

### **12.2 Observations 2**

The leaders tried to listen conscientiously and were respectful during occasions when the other delegates had the floor, although in some regions, certain delegates often tried to impose their views on the silent majority. This resulted in a situation where many leaders present did not meaningfully and effectively participate in the discussions. In the NOT there was extensive uses of dialects in the Regional meeting when WG delegates were explaining the final packages of the CMCA and the Non-CMCA. This assisted many leaders, who did not meaningfully understand the meaning of the CMCA and the Non-CMCA financial offers.

### **12.3 Observations 3**

Generally there was effective and meaningful participation by most regional leaders in RM5. The IO are contented and pleased to report that RM5 was conducted in the spirit of mutual respect and in compliance with all the principles guiding the review process.

### **12.4 Observations 4**

Having observed the facilitation of all the rounds of the RM5, Independent Observers are equally satisfied that the facilitation of those meetings by the Tanorama Facilitators in dissemination and communication of key messages of the final fixed packages of the CMCA and the Non-CMCA offers arising from the WG6 Meeting was

done in full compliance and satisfaction of all the principles against which we are required to report.

#### **12.5 Observations 5**

The general observations of the leaders facial expressions of feedbacks of the CMCA and the Non-CMCA offers was generally one of general acceptance of the offers compared to the previous CMCA, but leaders opted to take the packages back to their respective villages for full consultation with their people before making a final decision on the offers.

#### **12.6 Observations 6**

The leaders at RM5 were continuously reminded by their representatives in the WG that as leaders they must seriously take the lead role in assisting their village communities with whatever limited resources in this final fixed CMCA and Non-CMCA financial packages. They were encouraged to be compassionate and responsible and be receptive to the views of the village communities they represent. The leaders were also encouraged to be fair, honest and transparent in all their dealings as representatives of their communities.

#### **12.7 Observations 7**

Some regions again raised the issue of what they term as outstanding leaders payments during RM5. Facilitators however reiterated that the OTML position was that no claims for leaders payment will be ever entertained. It was made clear by OTML that there will be no additional payments over and above the sitting allowances that have been agreed upon at the start of the CMCA Review process. To make additional payments would be perceived as payments intended to solicit support from the leaders.

Objectively, such payments to the leaders at this stage of the negotiations and consultation process can be perceived as an overt attempt by the OTML to solicit support from the representatives so that they could simply agree to the offers being offered by the OTML and the shareholders. The OTML must not make such payments to the leaders other than the sitting allowances.

#### **12.8 Observations 8**

Many leaders at RM5 did not instantly indicate their acceptance of the CMCA and the Non-CMCA offers, as they intended to consult their village communities first before making a decision.

The stakeholders offers is predicated on the continuation of mine operation and linking of wastes pipeline from Mine site to Bige as a strategy for mitigation. If there is no waste pipeline and storage facility built at Bige, then the mine may close early and consequently there will not be any CMCA payments. Therefore, there is an urgent need for all impacted communities to cooperatively address the Bige Waste Pipeline issue.

## **12.9 Observations 9**

The RM5 consultations were all conducted in an open, honest and fair and transparent manner. The leaders were quite frank when expressing their views and those who wanted to speak were given an opportunity to do so and expressed their views with frankness and clarity. Similarly leaders listened attentively and were respectful when other delegates or stakeholders had the floor to speak. The leaders expressed their ideas with clarity when they were given the opportunity to speak. There were disagreements on certain issues that were discussed as can be expected in any meeting.

In the IO observations the RM5 was satisfactorily conducted in the spirit of mutual respect and in full compliance with all the principles guiding the CMCA Review process and against which the IO are required to report.

## **13.0 PRINCIPLES GUIDING DISCUSSIONS WITH COMMUNITIES**

The Independent Observers now make the following observations on the basic compliance with the *'Principles Guiding Ok Tedi's Discussions with Communities'*.

## **14.0 ADEQUACY OF INFORMATION**

This principle requires that the leaders and their communities are provided with necessary adequate information for them to make informed judgements and decisions. A great deal of time in the WG6 and the RM5 were spent in discussing, assessing and analysing the CMCA, Non-CMCA offers, and identifying questions for clarification relating to each components of the offers and the same for the draft of the MOA.

An important aspect of adequacy of information is to understand the information being disseminated particularly when such information will have to be subsequently communicated to the Regional representatives and the village communities. Previous observations were such that in some of the Regional Meetings, many regional representatives still had some degree of difficulties trying to grasp and fully understand and articulate certain key information on the MOA and the stakeholders offers, despite explanations and sufficient materials provided by the facilitators. This was particularly observable when arithmetical figures and graphs and charts were being used to explain how some of the offers were computed.

In the WG6 and the RM5 many delegates and regional leaders appeared confused at times and did not fully understand and articulate what was being discussed. This is particularly so in relation to the differences between the MOU and the MOA, and the explanations of the CMCA and the Non-CMCA offers when various explanations were made using arithmetical figures and diagrams.

## **14.1 Observations 1**

Generally there has been fair and adequate communication of information of the CMCA, the Non-CMCA offers, and the legal implications of the MOA at the WG6, although some people may not have fully grasped and understood the contents of what are being disseminated. During RM5, facilitators did an excellent job in clarifying and explaining many various misconceptions.

## **14.2 Observations 2**

Despite such difficult situations, it is acknowledged that the facilitation of all the rounds of the WG6 and RM5 satisfied most of the principles against which IO are required to Report.

## **15.0 EQUITY**

In the IO previous Reports, the apparent lack of adequate representation for Women and Children in the WG as well as at the Regional level were highlighted. In the WG6 Meeting there was women representation from one of the Regions, along with the WG delegates. It was a great contrast during the RM5 where increased numbers of Women and Children leaders were always present throughout the meetings as observers in all the Regions.

## **15.1 Observations 1**

There is always continuing efforts made to involve women at the WG level. This is a highly commendable effort. Such concerted efforts in involving women at the RM level are being extended to the village level as well. Under the proposed MOA arrangements more recognition is now being given to Women and children. Women are now being empowered through the Trusts and the VPC, to have a greater say in determining their own welfare and destiny. However, delegates tasked with representing Women and Children in the WG and the RM appear to spend less time to explain issues being discussed at the at the WG level to women and children at the wider communities. Meaningful efforts must also be made to target and disseminate information to women, youth and children groups. Until women leaders continue to be involved at these two levels of decision making, it is unsatisfactory to say that the principle of equity has been fully satisfied.

## **16.0 PARTICIPATION**

The Delegates at the WG and representatives at the RM were given every opportunity to participate in the respective meetings. There were differences of certain opinions as can be expected, but those who had differing views did have the opportunity to fully express themselves. It is also observed that increased number of women leaders and observers who attended the RM also participated well in the one-of-special regional group discussions in languages. This observation confirms that women leaders can participate meaningfully and effectively given the right opportunity. The Women Leaders who had been involved in the Review process since its commencement continued to be out spoken on the CMCA, Non-CMCA offers and the MOA matters. This is

highly commendable. Hence, there had been meaningful and effective participation by the WG delegates and women leaders in the WG6 and the Regional Meetings.

## **17.0 RESPONSIVENESS**

It has been previously observed that the concerns and issues raised by village and regional representatives at the Regional, and the WG meetings were responded to promptly base on information available at that point in time. The Core Group meetings also assist by investigating and progressing discussions on many of these issues concerned with the CMCA and the Non-CMCA offers. Furthermore the Core Group Meetings spent some time in reading through the draft MOA to determine whether it truly reflected the concerns and wishes of the people.

The representatives are often advised that any outstanding concerns or issues which could not obtain responses immediately would be immediately referred to the OTML Management for a considered response. We find that issues and concerns raised by delegates and leaders are being attended to and addressed promptly, thus satisfying the principle of responsiveness.

## **18.0 TRANSPARENCY**

The WG6 and the RM5 were all conducted in acceptably transparent manner. The processes of the CMCA Review were explained to the delegates in simple and understandable English. Facilitators used charts, diagrams, written materials and handouts to explain and illustrate the different stages of the review, in particular the Summary of the MOA, and the CMCA and the Non-CMCA offers from the stakeholders.

The structure and processes give transparency and credibility to the CMCA Review process. The engagements of Independent Facilitators, the Keystone Centre and the Tanorama Consultants plus the Independent Observers, and an Independent Funds Administrator have continued to add considerable value and transparency to the CMCA Review process. So too is the process of selection and appointments of the Independent Scientist, the Special Advisor; and the Independent Observers, demonstrates the total value of integrity and transparency of this CMCA Review process. The engagement of these independent professionals must continue into the conclusion of the Review process, which culminates in the signing of the MOA by Regional Leaders at Regional Meeting Six.

### **18.1 Observations 1**

The continued engagement of these independent professionals in facilitating, advising, and observing in their respective capacities and roles continues to ensure that the CMCA Review process is conducted in a transparent manner and any final outcomes is fair and just to all parties involved.

## **19.0 INTEGRITY**

In our previous WG reports, the IO reported that the structure and processes generally satisfy the values of integrity. So too in this WG6 and RM5 Report

we observe that the structure and process have been well embraced and accepted by all stakeholders. Again it is reported here that the structure and process have been morally sound, honest, and free from any corrupting or undue influences particularly from OTML or any of the stakeholders.

The development and publication of a set of Principles to Guide the Independent Facilitators in guiding the conduct of the review and the availability of IO in their monitoring, observation and reporting against them, as is being done here, lend credibility to the structure and process, and the total commitment of OTML in undertaking the CMCA Review Process independently.

The engagement of Independent Facilitators, Independent Observers, Independent Scientist, Special Advisor, and Independent Funds Administrator, other wider interest groups, Provincial and National Government representatives have enhanced the integrity and credibility of this whole CMCA Review process, particularly the provisions of advising the Regional Delegates, Women and Children, and Churches.

Two observations about the representations from the various stakeholders, in particular from the GoPNG and the FRPG were previously made for what appeared to be a lack of interest shown by the FRPG in attending and participating in the WG Meetings. We are now pleased to report that from the WG4 onwards, the Deputy Provincial Administrator has continued to represent the FRPG for the whole duration of the WG Meetings and participated effectively and contributed critically but meaningfully in all discussions. We also note that unlike its National Government counterparts, representation from the FRPG has been at the most senior Executive level, hence demonstrating the Provincial Government total commitment to this Review Process.

The GoPNG on the other hand is being represented by its key Departments, including Mining, Environment and Conservation, Justice and Attorney General, Finance and Treasury, Planning and Monitoring, and Provincial Affairs. The officers from these key Departments are generally at a level where they cannot make decisions themselves or directly influence decisions, but able to provide pertinent information and advices.

### **19.1 Observations 1**

Generally the representation from the GoPNG and the FRPG has been good. To demonstrate the National Government and FRPG continued commitment to this process and the environmental impacts on the livelihood of the impacted people, the Minister for Mining or the Secretary for Mining should be present to sign MOA in RM6.

## **20.0 FAIRNESS**

Generally, the processes surrounding the WG and RM to date have been fair. The observations made above with regard to some aspects of the structure and processes, in particular the less representation of women and children have been reported several times in the past, nonetheless in its entirety, this CMCA Review process has been fair and just.

## **21.0 RESPECT**

Given the historical circumstances of the operation of the OTML and the environmental impacts upon the communities, it appears that sincere efforts are being made by all parties to be respectful. In all the WG and the RM to date, the need to respect another person was always emphasised by the facilitators as one of the principal ground rules for discussions with the communities before the meetings get underway.

The courtesy and mutual respect among delegates and village leaders to permit other participants to express themselves has been agreed upon as good practice and observed in all the WG and Regional meetings.

## **22.0 TIMELINESS**

The time frames for the processes of consultations and meetings appear long, nonetheless these are reasonable periods, given the complexity of the matter and key messages in the CMCA and the Non-CMCA offers, the MOA implications, and the important need to inform and consult all the impacted communities and interested parties. Given the physical spread of communities and the logistics of transport, communication and mobility, IO are satisfied that the length of time between meetings and consultations and briefing of representatives and villages communities is reasonable and sufficient.

In the two recent WG meetings and some RM, some concerns have been expressed about the potential disruption to this CMCA Review process during the upcoming National Elections. As a result it has been suggested that this Review process should be expedited to avoid disruptions from the National Election period. However, it is inevitable that the final lap of this Review process will overlap with the National Elections particularly during the period of campaign.

### **22.1 Observations 1**

The IO acknowledged the possibility of this process being disrupted by the National Election, however there is no evidence to suggest that this will occur. The OTML and stakeholders should be cautious against rushing or postponing the final phase of the Review process. This whole process is all about consultation and participation and so the final outcome must be one which the consulted communities can rightly take full ownership off. Therefore rushing or postponing this process must be avoided.

## **23.0 OWNERSHIP OF REVIEW STRUCTURE AND PROCESS**

The entire process has been structured to allow for full consultation and participation between the stakeholders and the impacted communities. Furthermore it allows for effective and meaningful participation by everyone right down to the men, women, youth and children at the village level. The dissemination of information about issues discussed at the WG level have similarly been communicated right down to the Regional and village levels using effective communication strategies. The CMCA, Non-CMCA offers, MOA and the establishment of the OTFRDF will be the end products of this Review process that is based on informed consent and considered judgement. The communities must therefore take ultimate ownership of the final

products. The IO are pleased and satisfied that every attempt has been made by all parties involved to achieve these ultimate goals.

## **24.0 COMMUNICATION, PUBLICITY AND EXPOSURE OF THE CMCA REVIEW PROCESS**

Apart from the WG, RM and VM, the medium of communication and dissemination of information concerning the CMCA Review process is being done through the print and electronic media. So far in this CMCA Review process, efforts are continually being made to communicate relevant information concerning the process and the issues arising to the impacted communities and the public. Media organizations such as FM Fly are playing a vital role in dissemination of information concerning this Review process in their various radio broadcast programs as well as through their fortnightly news letter "*The North Flyer*". We are satisfied that FM Fly continues to disseminate and publicise information on this important process.

Since RM4 FM Fly took the bold initiative to send a media crew of one camera man to accompany and record pictures of the discussions in various Regional meetings. This continued in RM5. This is a highly commendable effort and this media organization is encouraged to continue this communication strategy of disseminating information and at the same time verifying that the various impacted communities are being meaningfully engaged in this process of consultation and participation.

Such efforts satisfy many of the principles guiding the Review process, particularly those regarding communication of key messages and issues concerning offers from stakeholders that arose from the WG5, WG6 and Core Group meetings.

### **24.1 Observations 1**

The present strategies for communication and dissemination of information concerning this process have been quite effective and satisfactory. Notwithstanding that, the FM Fly and the OTML Management should also consider inviting other outside Media organizations in PNG to attend RM6 and the signing ceremonies which is deemed to denote the positive outcomes and the achievements of the CMCA Review process.

## **25.0 PARTICIPATION IN AGREED OUTCOME (SIGNING)**

In the WG6 and the RM5, the Special Advisor and facilitators took a lot of time and effort to explain the MOA. Some leaders did not appear to have fully understood the legal implications of the new Agreements. Some raised concerns that the MOA did not really capture their concerns particularly when it was compared to some clauses in the current 9<sup>th</sup> Supplemental Agreement. Still others queried whether the MOA would have legal effect and be binding on all parties. All leaders however agreed to consult their regional and village leaders during the RM5 and VM3 before they could decide on whether to sign the MOA or not.

Therefore, consideration must be given to the request and aspirations of the communities that all delegates and village representatives to the WG and RM respectively, should sign the new MOA that covers the new CMCA on behalf of their communities. Many Regional Leaders in many of the Regions, expressed strong desire that before the MOA is signed, their Legal Advisor or a Lawyer should be engaged to explain and translate the contents into simple and understandable English.

The Legal Advisor or lawyers with experiences in resource and energy law must fully explain the contents of the MOA in order for the representatives to understand and articulate before they can sign the final Agreements. This would give the delegates, regional leaders and village communities a greater sense of informed consent and ownership of the MOA.

The desire to have an Independent Legal Reviewer has previously been embraced positively in both the WG and RM. Should this not eventuate, then it would be necessary that a lawyer could be engaged once the contents of the MOA is finalised for signing. In the present time Sir Arnold Amet would continue to provide legal and other necessary advice.

## **26.0 PARTICIPATION OF LAND OWNERS NOT PARTY TO THE CMCA**

This is an issue which has been the subject of the IO previous Reports. The IO are now fully satisfied that proactive attempts have been made by the OTML. In the RM5 in the South Fly Region, the village of Madame has formally applied to participate in the CMCA during the RM5 in Dudi. It is anticipated that a few more of those village communities who have been included in the MOA would apply to participate in the CMCA in the near future.

.....  
**Dr. Beno Boeha, CBE, Ph.D.**  
**LLB**  
**Independent Observer**

.....  
**John Kawi, LL.M,**  
**Independent Observer**

## 27.0 SCHEDULE 1

**TABLE 1: List of nine CMCA Regions and the names of the Three Regional Delegates representing each Region**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>NAME OF CMCA DELEGATE</b>	<b>NAME OF CMCA REGION</b>
1	A) John Wanim b) Joel Dangim c) Brian Yapi	Mine Villages
2	a) Michael Gen b) Penai Napu c) Kerry Krori	Highway Region
3	a) Daniel Atmeyok b) John Dii c) Boston Kasiman	North Ok Tedi
4	a) Alex Maun b) Moses Oti c) Ketu Nuri	Lower Ok Tedi
5	a) Steven Wembut b) Rex Salle c) Richard Zumoi	Middle Fly
6	a) Kenny Maba b) Jacob Kabogi c) Mezaka Daumey	Suki Fly Gogo
7	a) Abel Daruko b) Edwin Iara c) Sakewa Makalisa	Manawete
8	a) Philip Korobe b) Daniel Nawia c) Adoma Maikau	Kiwaba
9	a) Kime Sumai b) Sisa Baidam c) Harry Wekina	Dudi

**TABLE 2: List of Independent Facilitators and Organisations**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>NAME OF FACILITATOR</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>
1.	Dr Peter Adler	The Keystone Centre
2.	Jannesse Brewer	The Keystone Centre
3	Caelan Mcgee	The Keystone Centre
4	Martin Brash	Tanorama
5	Kori Maraga	Tanorama
6	Tony Keket	Tanorama
7	Lalatute Avosa	Tanorama
8	Ruben Kila	Tanorama
9	Patrick Hokmori	Tanorama

**TABLE 3:List of Independent Observers**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>NAME OF INDEPENDENT OBSERVER</b>
1.	Dr. Beno Boeha
2	Mr. John Kawi

**TABLE 4:Independent Scientist**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>NAME OF INDEPENDENT SCIENTIST</b>
1	Dr. Allan Tingay

**TABLE 5:List of Special Advisor**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>NAME OF SPECIAL ADVISOR</b>
1	Sir Arnold Amet

**TABLE 6: List of Stakeholders and Participants in the CMCA Review Process**

NO.	NAME OF STAKEHOLDER	NAME OF PARTICIPANT
1	Ok Tedi Mining Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Keith Faulkner</li> <li>b) David Masani</li> <li>c) Leonard Lagisa</li> </ul>
2	Independent State of Papua New Guinea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Pius Kami - Department of Mining</li> <li>b) Luke Tanikrey – Department of Environment and Conservation.</li> <li>c) Harry Kore - Department of Justice &amp; Attorney General</li> <li>d) Oki Tanda - Department of Finance &amp; Treasury.</li> <li>e) Jerry Noah &amp; Yasap Popoitai - Department of National Planning &amp; Monitoring</li> <li>f) Gevo Mabone - Department of Provincial Affairs</li> </ul>
3	PNG Sustainable Development Company Ltd.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) David Sode</li> <li>b) Joe Hamson</li> <li>c) Lawrence Stephens</li> <li>d) Patricia Kila</li> </ul>
4	Fly River Provincial Government	Willy Kokoba – Deputy Prov. Administrator
5	Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Matilda Koma – CERD</li> <li>b) Ume Wainetti – CIMC-Women</li> <li>c) Rev. Anna Bisai – Women &amp; Youths</li> </ul>
6	Churches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Fr. Anthony Cheramvelil – Catholic Church</li> <li>b) Pr. Sinba Kamaya – ECP</li> </ul>

**TABLE 7:List of Project Management Team**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>NAME OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM</b>
1	Ms. Barbara Sharp
2	Mr. Tim Offor

**TABLE 8:List of Core Group Members with two additional members from Lower Ok Tedi Region**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>NAME OF MEMBER</b>	<b>REGION AND SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP</b>
1	Michael Gen	Highway
2	Steven Wembut	Middle Fly
3	Richard Zumoi	Middle Fly
4	Jacob Kabogi	Suki Fly Gogo
5	Kime Sumai	Dudi
6	Rev. Anna Bisai	Church
7	Ume Waineti	Women and Children
8	Ketu Nuri	Lower Ok Tedi
9	Alex Maun	Lower Ok Tedi

**TABLE 9:List of Names of all Village Leaders from the 9 CMCA Regions****1. MINE REGION VILLAGES LEADERS**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>NAME OF LEADER</b>	<b>VILLAGE</b>
1	Amos Kiki	Migalsimbip
2	John Wanim	Bultem
3	Joel Dangkim	Kavorabip
4	Jerry Musolok	Atemkit
5		Wangbin
6		Finalbin

**2. NORTH OK TEDI REGION VILLAGES LEADERS**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>NAME OF LEADER</b>	<b>VILLAGE</b>
1	Boston Kasiman	Ningerum Tamaro
2	Wanua Aket	Bumbin
3	Singa Ondap	Wurimkanatko
4	Bin Sepman	Haidowogam
5	Daniel Atmeyok	Kumguit
6	Kupsy Walap	Okteditau
7	Samuel Hotip	Nioksikwi
8	Daniel Hotip	Derengo
9	John Dii	Poliwoga
10	Ben Koki	Boungkim
11	Joseph Awirok	Ankit

12	Taken Kevan	Korkit
13	Thomas Tikel	Kawentikin
14	Wesley Bob	Walawam
15	John Wanua	Kelebon
16	Dairi Akewa	Wogam
17	Kowa Keop	Wombon

### 3. LOWER OK TEDI REGIONAL VILLAGES LEADERS

NO.	NAME OF LEADER	VILLAGE
1	Grame Some	Senamrae
2	Frank Diro	Bige
3	Walter Gasnai	Konkonda
4	Unam Bware	Sarae
5	Paschalis Imu	Demasuke
6	Mose Otti	Bongabun
7	Nick Bun	Atkamba
8	Michael Aniap	Dome
9	Jame Ukin	Iogi
10	Beke Kwaden	Birikamba
11	Kawup Konmop	Ambaga
12	Nolbert Kanom	Kungembit
13	Ketu Nuri	Kwaipe
14	Paul Yarogim	Kungim
15	Francis Yombirop	Putmabin
16	Alex Maun	Ieran
17	Pami Ase	Miamrae

### 4. HIGHWAY REGION VILLAGES LEADERS

NO.	NAME OF LEADER	VILLAGE
1	Soti Akaneng	Sisimakam
2	Titka Sriyau	Kwiloknai
3	Samuel Saka	Tapko
4	Sangarai Sire	Hosanai
5	Amsare Sanamboi	Awin Tamaro
6	Michael Gen	Hiorenkia
7	Ombon Todin	Hoskumu
8	Rex Kumari	Pampenai
9	Kevin Deko	Wangenai
10	Andrew Duang	Ienkenai
11	Kerry Krori	Mimigire
12	Jimmy Mtomnai	Matkomnai
13	Lawrence Dwang	Kasenai
14	Eric Tmoi	Grehosore
15	Jerry Dupe	Ipoknai
16	John Waitipe	Dande 1
17	Duen Ateru	Hopnai
18	Penai Napu	Tope
19	Ware Sika	Menumsore
20	Arowa Dudu	Briompenai

21	Bob Wai	Rudmesuk
22	Soe Bebere	Rarengre
23	Peter Lee	Miamsomnai
24	Pexy Kimkai	Gre
25	Sinyea Biake	Tiomnai
26	Willy U'Uho	Gii
27	Terry Dupe	Gregas
28	Patrick Poata	Tmindemsuk
29	Grwe Kelly	Dande 2

#### 5. MIDDLE FLY REGION VILLAGES LEADERS

NO.	NAME OF LEADER	VILLAGE
1	Brian Weke	Mepu
2	Raymond Pivini	Yuluwas
3	Steven Wembut	Moian
4	Nelson Ambros	Erecta
5	Allan Cletus	Karemgo
6	Bruce Kondek	Membok
7	Emmanuel Vincent	Kukujaba
8	Frank Waito	Kwem
9	Norman Nosai	Mipan
10	Joe Lucas	Manda
11	Fredrick Paulus	Bosset
12	Richard Zumoi	Wangawanga
13	Elizah Anato	Aiambak
14	Rex Salle	Kaviananga
15	Naiza Bagle	Levame
16	Senni Poloa	Owa
17	Stanley Papoa	Komovai
18	Max Giawele	Kasa

#### 6. SUKI FLY GOGO REGION VILLAGES LEADERS

NO.	NAME OF LEADER	VILLAGE
1	Jacob Kabogi	Pukaduka 1
2	Jeremaia Naipu	Pukaduka 2
3	Justin Kwai	Kiru
4	Tau Tangura	Aewe 1
5	Bruce Maygam	Aewe 2 (Riti)
6	Moika Sinba	Aewe 3 (Kautru)
7	Sam Semnebe	Gwaku
8	Morea Masika	Eniyawa
9	Gawia Arawas	Serki
10	Jonathan Kwari	Sapuka
11	Tibini Bibi	Sialowa
12	Tilom Samen	Daware
13	Mesaka Daumey	Suame
14	Bruce Sobonnah	Lewada
15	Namusu Bege	Baidowa
16	Kenny Maba	Wasua (Dede)

## 7. MANAWETE REGION VILLAGES LEADERS

NO.	NAME OF LEADER	VILLAGE
1	Saekewa Makalisa	Padaeya 1
2	Muti Alewa	Padaeya 2
3	Agustine Heni	Pogona 1
4	Brain Goware	Pogona 2
5	Gali Albert	Kawiapo
6	Wakeya Aibilo	Waliyama
7	Edwin J. Iara	Kename
8	Watia Haro	Arata
9	Vincent Kearo	Wariobodoro
10	Aniba Samo	Kenedibi
11	Andrew Giasubu	Urío
12	James Sogomi	Damera
13	Ken Kese	Aberagerema
14	Micah Bani	Kea
15	Abel Doruko	Maduduo
16	Marude Mamiri	Kabaturi
17	Adu Awati	Sagero 1
18	Ivan Buangao	Tirere
19	Deini Gemame	Maipani
20	Dere Wamaro	Doumori

## 8. KIWABA REGION VILLAGES LEADERS

NO.	NAME OF LEADER	VILLAGE
1	Mainawa Gaibiri	Kubira
2	Daniel Nawia	Iasa
3	Henry Kuruka	Saguane
4	Bernard Bama	Samari
5	Dominic Korobe	Oromosapua
6	Philip Korobe	Ipsia
7	Henry Goware	Agobaro
8	Vincent Papa	Sagopari
9	John Marai	Wapauru
10	David Garibah	Aibinio
11	Buruga Saso	Wapi
12	George Koprirgo	Gesowa
13	Mario Amoni	Isumo
14	Adoma Maikau	Buria

## 9. DUDI REGION VILLAGES LEADERS

NO.	NAME OF LEADER	VILLAGE
1	Kuruma Kumari	Tapila/Bugumo
2	Mark Kani	Mutam
3	Sagira Arago	Tirio 1 (Madiri)
4	Lot Waragi	Tirio 2
5	Sebadi Kaisi	Baramura
6	Harry Wakina	Aduru
7	Jack Kiake	Wederehiamó
8	Kausu Saki	Koabu
9	Kime Sumai	Severiambu

10	Sisa Baidam	Sui
11	Uduru Bume	Deware
12	Goai Aniba	Parama
13	Fred Lifu (Jr)	Katatai
14	Bani Noel	Kadawa
15	Rev. Anna Bisai	Parama

**TABLE 10: List of Names of the Transition Team from Work Group and Representation**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>REPRESENTATION</b>
1	Alex Maun	Northern District
2	Michael Gen	Northern District
3	Steve Wembut	Middle District
4	Richard Zumoi	Middle District
5	Kime Sumai	South District
6	Jacob Kabogi	South District
7	Ume Wainetti	Women and Children
8	Juliette Hmentori	Women and Children
9	Fr. Anthony Cheeramvelil	Churches
10	Rev. Anna Bissai	Churches
11	Willy Kokoba	Western Provincial Government
12	Pius Kami	Mining Department – National Government
13	David Sode (Alternate: Patricia Kila)	PNG Sustainable Development Program Company
14	Tim Offor	OTML/OTDF
15	TBA	Mine Village