

KESME HEPP

**KIVANC ENERJI ELEKTRIK URETİM
A.S.**

**REPORTING FORM FOR LAND
ACQUISITION
IN ENGLISH**

REPORTING FORM FOR LAND ACQUISITION

KIVANÇ ENERJİ ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş.

1. Information About Project	
Name & Location of Sub-project	KESME HEPP located in Pazarcık district, committed to Kahramanmaraş province.
Project Sponsor	KIVANÇ ENERJİ ELEKTRİK ÜRETİM A.Ş.
Project Cost	8,728,755 EURO
Installed Generation Capacity	2unit*2.43 MW/unit=4.86 MW
Key Dates of Implementation	Permissions were taken from Ministry of Environment and Forest with the decision number 002 in 2010. Permissions will be taken from General Directorate of State Hydraulic Works for power transmission line construction.
General Information	Kesme HEPP is located in the downstream of Kartalkaya dam. There is no location and agricultural land on the project area. The nearest location is 1 km away from the HEPP. 20,250 m ² pasture area was obtained by volunteer purchasing and 60,000 TL was paid for it. There were no fixed or productive assets on this land. 457,988 m ² was rented from Ministry of Environment and Forest. There is no structure or other fixed assets on the land. 60 villagers around the investment area were employed during the construction of HEPP.

2. Inventory of Land & Assets Acquired from Private Owners (completely volunteer purchased)	
Name of Owners/land user	Given on Annex 1
Project Component: Area(s) / plots(s) acquired (ha)	20,250 m ²
Owner's/user's total land holding (ha); % taken for project.	20,250 m ² , 100 % was taken for project.
Land use: pasture, agriculture, residence, etc.	Pasture
Inventory of any structures or other fixed or productive assets (wells, fences, trees, field crops, etc) affected.	No fixed or productive assets.
Indicate if land was rented or informally used by another party.	No
Indicate if non-owner users had assets, trees, crops, etc affected	No
Indicate if land-based activity is primary source of income for owner or land user.	No

Compensation paid.	60,000 TL
Dates delivered.	2011
Impact on income of owner.	No negative impact.

3.Inventory of Public, Community, or State Land Acquired

Land parcels / plots acquired (ha).	457,988 m ²
Land type / land use: Forest, commons for grazing, other.	Forest land.
Ownership: State, community, other.	Ministry of Environment and Forest.
Structures or other fixed assets.	No structure or other fixed assets.
Compensation, land transfer, or other measures to mitigate impacts on land users. Specify measures and dates of delivery.	There are no land users. But compensations for trees, value of leasing the land and deposits were paid to Pazarçık Forest Management Directorate. Details are given in Annex 2.

4.Public Awareness, Consultations, and Communication

In order to exchange views and give information on the possible effects of the project a public meeting was arranged on 15 June 2010 at the site. During the consultation also the land users were informed about areas that would be taken both from the private owners and government. There were no concerns raised at the meeting. Because the land users have no economical and social loss.

5.Status of Land Acquisition

Completed	Pending Court decision	On-going	Follow-up
		X	

6.Other Measures or Assistance provided (beyond cash compensation)

Beneficiary(s)	No beneficiary
Relocation assistance	No relocation assistance
Alternative Land	No
Livelihood restoration measures	-

Summary of impact addressed	-
-----------------------------	---

7. Identification of Vulnerable People

Beneficiary	No vulnerable people.
Method of identification	No
Assistance or other measures provided.	No

8. Grievance Redress

Mechanism(s) made available for project-affected persons to register grievances or complaints.	There was a flume under the power plant located on 2,800 m ² area used by Ali Koçdağ. The whole area is 31,000 m ² . The flume was by-passed and no money paid. There is no problem to irrigate the fields of the farmer.
Were affected people made aware of grievance redress mechanism? If so, when and where?	The affected people can announce their complaints to the construction supervisor.
Was the grievance redress mechanism easy to access and free of cost to affected parties?	Yes.
Was an independent third party engaged in facilitating grievance redress. E.g.: community leaders, NGOs, or other mutually-respected independent parties.	The village headman.

