

Chapter 18

Conclusion

CONTENTS

18

CONCLUSION

18-1

In accordance with Mozambican legislation, the EIA process for this Project has complied with the Environmental Law (Law no. 20/97 of 1 October), the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (Decree no. 45/2004 of 29 September and Decree no. 42/2008 of 4 November, which amends some articles of Decree no. 45/2004) as well as Environmental Regulations for Petroleum Operations (Decree no. 56/2010 of 22 November).

The aim of the EIA process is to provide information for decision-making to contribute to sustainable development. The overall EIA process has comprised of a number of key steps undertaken in a systematic manner over a period of two and a half years, namely:

- Site selection.
- Scoping.
- Baseline data collection.
- Impact assessment and development of mitigation measures.
- Consultation with stakeholders.

Site selection occurred early on in the process and provided the point of departure for the EIA. The Afungi Project Site was determined to be the preferred site from an integrated environmental, social, and technical perspective.

Scoping entailed identifying the Project's potential impacts, adding input to the Project design, and describing the Terms of Reference for the Impact Assessment Phase and for the specialist studies in particular.

The EIA Team has drawn on both publically available and field-collected data to describe baseline conditions in the study area. The baseline description covers a spectrum of social, environmental and physical aspects. Thereafter the team identified and independently evaluated the potential environmental and socio-economic impacts that may result from the development of the Project. The EIA process has assisted the Project to identify a wide range of specific mitigation measures that will be implemented to avoid or reduce negative impacts and to enhance the potential benefits (positive impacts) that the Project can bring to the Palma District, Cabo Delgado Province and Mozambique.

Project refinements and mitigation measures were developed during the Site Selection process (early to mid-2011), the EPDA Phase (later part of 2011) and through the course of the Impact Assessment Phase (2012-2013). Mitigation measures were developed during a number of integration and mitigation workshops that were held between the EIA Team and the Engineering Team through the course of the impact assessment process. This collaboration helped to further align the needs of the Project with the environmental and

social sensitivities of the area and helped to identify avoidance and mitigation measures suitable to reduce the risk of adverse impacts.

The mitigation measures were incorporated into project design as embedded controls or are part of the ESMP and are Project commitments which will be used to develop a series of construction or operational management plans. *Chapter 16* summarises the identified impacts, pre- and post-mitigation. *Chapter 17* and *Annex D* together comprise the Project's commitments to environmental and socio-economic management.

Consultation with stakeholders (general public, local community members, tourist operators, environmental NGOs and authorities) occurred during the EPDA Phase and Impact Assessment Phase. A Public Participation Report (*Annex A*) describes the consultation process followed and has a table that details comments received and responses by the EIA Team and Project. At a high level, key issues raised to date by stakeholders relate to:

- Land acquisition (process followed and communication).
- Displacement (physical and economic).
- Job creation and training for local communities.
- Economic benefits and community development.
- Impacts on livelihoods (tourism, fishing and agriculture).
- Impacts on biodiversity and ecosystems (marine and terrestrial).
- Impacts on health, safety and security.
- Implementation of mitigation and management measures (effectiveness of mitigation or capacity of authorities to monitor).

The investigation of the issues raised by stakeholders, as well as the range of issues identified by the EIA Team, did not reveal any fatal flaws that could prevent the Project from going ahead. The primary reason for this is the close interaction between the Engineering Team and the EIA Team which resulted in numerous mitigation measures being incorporated into the Project design during Pre-FEED and the early stages of FEED. As FEED is yet to be completed, it is important to note that should the project description change significantly from that described herein, such that new significant impacts would be generated or the identified mitigation measures no longer apply, the Project will liaise with MICOA to identify the appropriate means of addressing the change; this could be an additional EIA process or an addendum to this EIA Report and any associated public consultation.