Annex I  Objective data contained in the “draft report from the Georgian anthropologist, such as data of historical, geographical or anthropological nature, and maps”

Following the European Ombudsman’s proposal for a solution, the present document collates the objective data contained in the draft report provided to the EIB by the Promoter in November 2016 (referred to by the European Ombudsman as the “draft report from the Georgian anthropologist”) as part of the project appraisal. It is important to clarify that the draft report was never intended as a final stand-alone document. The Promoter used it to elaborate another draft working document, which was then used for the elaboration of Volume 3 of the project’s Social Impact Assessment. The latter is publicly available on the EIB website (http://www.eib.org/en/infocentre/registers/register/80380170).

In full consideration of the European Ombudsman’s proposal for a solution, the EIB assessed the possibility to disclose said “objective data” on the basis of the provisions of the EIB Group Transparency Policy (EIB-TP). Information covered by the exception for disclosure described in section 5 of the EIB-TP has been redacted and replaced by the symbol […], in addition to non-objective data. This concerns information which if disclosed would undermine the protection of international relations (Art. 5.4 a, first bullet), as well as the privacy and integrity of individuals (Art. 5.4 b). No overriding public interest has been found that would prevail over relevant exceptions.

Conclusion on Indigenous People's Issues

Statement 1. Svans are Georgians. Svans comprise an ethnic sub-group of Georgian (Kartvelian) ethnic group. Svan and Megrelian languages belong to a family of Georgian (Kartvelian) languages and they have close general linkage to the national Georgian language.

a) Origin of Svans
First mentioning of Svans in reference materials is made by Strabo, who called them Soanes/Shoans. "Svans... are masters of the country around them, and occupy the heights of Caucasus above Dioscurias. They have a king, and a council of 300 persons. They can assemble, it is said, an army of 200 000 men..." (Kaukhchishvili, 1952, pp. 125-126).

To be mentioned that Strabo refers to Soanes as to Iberians (Kaukhchishvili, 1957, pp. 14, 126). Iberians is the name of Georgian (Kartvelian) tribes that lived in the eastern and southern parts of Georgia and had main role in the formation of Georgian nation.
As of historical processes that preceded the period described by Strabo, scientists believe that the self-designation of Svan as Mushni/Mushuan (the same as Shoni in Megrelian and Svani in Georgian) is identical to a tribal name of Mushki, which are the same Meskhians, the main tribes who established Iberian Kingdom. In IX-VII centuries BC, Mushks established in the eastern periphery of the Asia Minor a powerful kingdom, which is identified as Phrygia according to ancient Greek tradition. It seems that part of Mushks were mixed with Indo-European tribes who were ancestors of Armenians and arrived in VIII century BC; other part of Mushks started migration to the north, to the territory of the present Georgia and established Iberian Kingdom there. Then, they started migration approximately in 1 century BC, leaving signs of their presence in the toponymy both Eastern and Western Georgia, and finally occupied the territory of modern Svaneti. During Strabo times, they already represented a single tribal union of Soanes.

The territory of Western Georgia was densely populated by Georgian (Kartvelian) tribes from ancient times.

Based on Strabo, academicians I. Orbeli (Orbeli, 1911) and G. Melikishvili (Melikishvili, 1959) regarded Sanigs and their ancestor Heniochi tribes as Georgian and Svan in particular. According to Strabo, numerous tribe of Svan occupied heights above Dioscuria (Kaukhchishvili, 1957). This statement is not about Svaneti - valleys of Enguri and Tskhenistskali Rivers - but Abkhazia, where Svan toponymy are preserved not only in upper part of the Kodori valley, but also at mountain foothills and lowland areas. The mentioned toponymy include: Bukolusi (Buqlosi), Svandi Castle, Pusta, Mukorisi, Likhi, Skhemari, Tskhumi, Mokvi, Gagra, Skiomari, Guma, Tskhubeni, etc. Laz, or Megrelian were other Kartvelian tribes who together with Svan widely populated these territories and who afterwards spread over the entire territory of Abkhazia. The same territory and areas beyond it up to Nikopsia and Kubani River were occupied by Heniochi and various Kartvelian tribes including Coles, Corakses, Sanigs, Abazgians, Meskhians, Aphshils, Svano-Colchians, Misimians, etc.

Besides, the modern territory of Abkhazia was compactly populated by Georgian tribe of Misimians, who are believed to be Svan. They occupied an upper part of the r. Kodori valley, historical geographical name of which is 'Misimianeti' or 'Dali'. Misimianeti is also called as Abkhzian Svaneti. Once the Russian Imperia conquered Georgia, they introduced new administrative division of Georgia, and named the discussed territory and its environs Tsebeldadali Sabokaulo Da

Based on information given in Byzantine writings, S. Kaukhchishvili concluded that Misimians were Svan tribes (Kaukhchishvili, 1936, pp. 277-280). P. Ingorokva shared
this opinion of S. Kaukhchishvili proving it using respective Georgian ethnonyms such are: Misimiani, Svani, Zani, Chani, etc. Besides, P. Ingorokva proved Svan (Georgian) origin of Misimians using historical materials, in particular Strabo writing which says that Svans: are superior perhaps to all the (Pontus) tribes in strength and courage, they command all tribes around them and occupy heights of Caucasus above Dioscurias (Ingorokva, 1954, p.144).

P. Ingorokva proved the resettlement of Misimians in Zemo (Upper) and Kvemo (Lower) Abkhazia in VI-VIII centuries BC using information provided by Greek historian writers Ptolemeos and Faustus of Byzantium, according to whom Kolkheti population were comprised of Svano-Colchians, or Egrosans (Ingorokva, 1954, p.144).

This brief extract from the mentioned sources shows that Svans are not resettles and they are indigenous population of Georgia.

b) Linkage of Svans ethnic sub-group with Georgian ethnos
Georgian ethnos comprises ethnic sub-groups (Megrelians, Lazes, Svans) and local ethnographic groups (Kartlians, Kakhetians, Imeretians, Gurians, Adjarians, Tushs, Pshavians, Khevsurians, Kakhs, Mokheviants, Mtiulians, Gudamakrelians, Rachians, Lechkhumians, Meskhians, Javakhians, Imerkhevians (Turkey) and Ingiloians (Azerbaijan)), which have different dialect and traditional daily culture (Georgians, 2016, p. 9). Besides these ethnographic groups, one more Georgian group (Fereydanians) compactly resides outside the territory of Georgia - they were forcibly resettled in Iran, though still retain Georgian language.

An indigenous population of Svaneti, that is Svans, identify themselves as an integral part of Georgian ethnos. According to historical traditions and anecdotal evidences, Svans and Megrelians derive from the same people (tribe). Cohabitation in Georgia was an important and decisive factor for them, as this created a pre-condition for Svans to participate in the formation of united Georgian kingdom and culture, like other historical-ethnographical provinces of Georgia. Important factor is a common religion. The existence in united Georgian kingdom was important for Svans, considering natural and geographic conditions of Svaneti.

The ethnogenesis research of modern population showed that cultural and language relationships between ethnic groups are often inconsistent with their genetic linkages and common genetic pool, because an ethnos is a complex and proteiform phenomena formed as a result of long terms historical processes. It appears, evolves and sometimes decays, and none of ethnos could be preserved in their original, unaltered form. Subject to changes are not only language, culture, etc., but also
morphological type of an ethnos and this raises a necessity to study an ethnic group across space and time.

Morphological criterion is a decisive factor of the anthropological research because the language and culture can disseminate without their carrier, meanwhile then an anthropological type always carries own language and culture (Debets, Levin, Trofimova, 1952).

Georgian nation has united not only Georgian speakers. The language is not unique, but one of characteristic of an ethnos. Ethnogenesis researches apply a complex approach including: anthropology (paleoanthropology and ethnic anthropology), ethnology, history, archaeology, linguistics, etc. Archaeology and anthropology have a decisive role for ancient epochs, as written and other sources are unavailable for them.

Morphological peculiarities of modern Svans are studied using various anthropologic systems such are cephalometry and cephaloscopy of the face, description of skin relief on fingers and palm (dermatoglyphics), isoantigenic system of blood. Like other classical representatives of the Caucasioni type, most of Svans have wide and long face, wide head, horizontal or lowered nasal tip, medium or long nose, medium or low nose saddle, and medium or high body. Bizygomatic diameter is of high importance for taxonomy. To be mentioned, morphological forms that are the closest to Svans fall outside of groups that are united into the Caucasioni anthropological type, and in some cases carriers of other types (e.g. Colchic, Iberian) are more resemble to them. The number of the closest groups notably varies in different systems (Bitadze, et al., 2014).

According to dermatoglyphic polymorphic systems, which establish ancient relations between populations, the closest groups include: Abkhaz and especially Abkhaz from Gudauta, Megrelians from Gali and Zugdidi, Gurians from Chokhatauri and Ozurgeti, Lechkhumians, Imeretians from Samtredia, Rachians from Ambrolauri, Kartlians from Khashuri. All these indicates that the modern Georgian population has derived from an ancient common layer/substrate, and on the basis of morphological, and genetical signs proves that Svans are Georgian.

Svaneti has not been isolated during any of epochs. It continuously maintained relations with lowland (Samegrelo, Imereti, Guria) and highland (Racha, Takveri, Lechkhumi) provinces of Western Georgia, as well as with the North Caucasian and other neighbouring ethnic groups. Such relations are well-proved by names, traditions and ethnographic materials that are common for almost all provinces of Georgia and especially Samegrelo, which is the only immediate neighbouring region for Svaneti. It should be mentioned that Svaneti was crossed by a trade and political route, which
led from the Kodori valley to the Kubani River valley and its tributaries. This road, which passes through the Klukhori Pass, is the easiest and shortest route. It is currently known as Sukumi Military Road.

Population changed their location and migrated due to some reasons, though they always left their trace. According to T. Mikeladze, some current toponymy still retain a trace of Svan names in Western Georgia, what demonstrates that Svan-speaking population lived in these areas for long time and shows their movement direction. This author gives examples of respective toponymic evidences including suffix 'ish' and prefix 'le', which are common for Samegrelo and Lechkhumi, and states that they have Svan origin (Mikeladze, 1974). Svans definitely lived in the North Caucasus, namely in the valleys of Bakhsan, Chegem and Kuban Rivers, and Bezingi and Balkaria regions in the middle of XVIII century. This is proved by toponymy and onomastics of these regions. Chardin mentioned that Svans lived together with Alans in the Northern Caucasus in XVII century (Gelovani, 2003).

Definitely, on the anthropological map of the Caucasus, Svans should be put among groups carrying Caucasiani morphological type. At the same time, anthropologic signs that are characteristic to Svans could be found in different proportions among modern population of Georgia. All the above mentioned shows that Svans as much Georgian as population of other historical-ethnographical provinces of Georgia.

c) Svan Language
Georgian is the main language for all Georgians of any origin and among them Svans. At the same time, indigenous population of some historical-geographical regions of Georgia have their own language including: Svan, Megrelian, Laz. Linguists believe that Svan, Megrelian and Laz are the languages of Kartvelian family (Arn. Chikobava, 1948, pp. 272-273.). To understand linkages between Georgian and Svan languages it is important to mention about Svans belief that Svan language has preserved old Georgian lexical units (Topchishvili, 2015, pp. 7-9). Svans and Megrelians, which besides to Georgian speak their own Kartvelian language, identify themselves as Georgians and believe that they speak old Georgian (Topchishvili, 2015, p. 7).

All constitutions of Georgia (1921, 1922, 1926, 1937, 1978, 1995) assigned the status of the national language to Georgian. Moreover, Georgian was given this status already in 284 BC, during Hellenistic period. According to The Georgian Chronicles (natively known as Kartlis Tskhovreba), the first king of kings of the entire Georgian kingdom Pharnavaz spread the Georgian language, and there was no language but Georgian only in land of Kartli. Georgian language became not only the language of
a royal chancellery, but sole language of education, science, literature, culture and religion\textsuperscript{1} in Georgian kingdom and remains such until now (Kurdiani, 2016, p.91).

**Statement 2.** Svans did not integrate into Georgian kingdom as a result of colonization by other nations and did not incorporate in the united kingdom due to the expansion of alien state on their land. Svans sub-ethnic group constituted one of main, backbone elements that formed Georgian nation and kingdom. During further historical processes, Svans played a significant role in the preservation of the identity not only of Svans ethnic sub-group, but the entire Georgian nation.

During the antic period, Svan ethnic sub-group was one of main and primary elements for formation of Georgian kingdoms, and Svaneti has always been a part of "Georgian World" despite continuous and complicated historical processes of disintegration and reintegration of its parts, what is well-demonstrated on maps of the Historical Atlas of Georgia (2003).

In different historical periods, Svaneti was a part of the united Georgian kingdom, or one of Georgian kingdoms (Historical Atlas of Georgia. Georgia in II-I centuries BC, p. 12) and it was a semi-independent principality in other times (Historical Atlas of Georgia. Georgia I-II centuries AD, p.12). Though, Svaneti has always been a significant part of Georgian world. This territorial unit managed to maintain relative independence and protect itself against the influence of various foreign empires, and thus played an important role in the preservation of the identity not only of Svans ethnic sub-group, but Georgian nation as a whole.

Georgian statehood is several millennia old. Assyrian and Urartian cuneiform scripts of XIII –VIII centuries BC give information on the presence of two big coalitions Diauehi/ Diaokhi (Taokhi, Tao) and Colchis (Kolkheti) on the south-west territory of Georgia.

The coalition of the western Kartvelian tribes created the basis for the formation of a powerful kingdom of Colchis. In the middle of VIII century BC, Colchis (Kolkha) was already an integral political unit, which had own "king", "royal cities" and viceroys who governed provinces (Melikishvili,1970). Both, a cultural carrier of Late Bronze Age and population of ancient Colchis Kingdom were mostly comprised of Kartvelian tribes. Karts and Megrel-Chans did not have linguistic differences during this period and Svan was the only language distinguished from the common Kartvelian language; though, Colchian culture and ancient Colchis Kingdom comprised this

\textsuperscript{1} Only Georgian was used for the liturgical service
ethnos as well. Ancient Colchis Kingdom, which existed in XI-VIII centuries BC, was the oldest state of ethnically Georgian tribes (Melikishvili, 1965, pp. 50-93). Colchis Kingdom reached its zenith during VI-IV centuries BC, when it encompassed the entire territory of Western Georgia and spread towards the northwest until Nikopsia (Muskhelishvili, 2016, p.36).

Daiaeni in Assyrian scripts, Diauehi in Urartian scripts and Taokhi in ancient Greek sources is the first state-like formation of Eastern Georgian tribes, which was established under Taokhian hegemony in IX-VIII centuries BC between the Chorokhi River basin and wide plateau of Arzrumi (Muskhelishvili, 2016, p. 35). The coalition of so called Khalitu, or same Khalidias appeared on Diauehi territory in VII century BC, and early state-like union was created under the hegemony of Saspers, or Iberians in VI century BC. The end of IV century BC was marked by the formation of Kartli (Iberian) Kingdom, with the centre in Mtskheta. The first king of Georgia united the territories of the east and west Georgia and created the first united Georgian kingdom (Muskhelishvili, 2016, p. 36).

Thus, the creation of these two early kingdoms of Colchis and Iberia facilitated to the formation of consolidated Georgian nation and **Svan sub-ethnic group, as a backbone element of the Colchis state, had an important role in the formation of Georgian nation and statehood.**

The consolidation process was supported by the fact that Georgian kingdoms embraced Christianity in the beginning of IV century AD (326 year) (Iv. Javakhishvili, 1979, p. 216). Located on the crossroad of protracted Roman-Persian wars, the early Georgian kingdoms disintegrated into feudal regions during early Middle Ages (Iv. Javakhishvili, 1979, p. 276). Despite high pressure of neighbouring Muslim empires, Georgian people managed to maintain Christianity and formed **a unified Kingdom of Georgia** in the 9th-10th centuries AD (Iv. Javakhishvili, 1949). Georgia had a golden age in the 11th century AD. The Kingdom of Georgia reached its zenith in the 12th to early 13th centuries AD (Muskhelishvili, 2016, pp. 40-41), which was followed by a rapid declination due to Mongol invasions. George V managed to unify a disintegrated country, liberate it from almost century-long Mongol rule, and reintegrated mountains and lowlands of Georgia. He left a kingdom, which was respected by eastern and western European countries. Georgian people named George V as Brilliant for these merits. He was a king of the united Kingdom of Georgia (1299-1302; 1318-1346). After his death, some local rulers start fighting for the independence of their principalities. They wished to separate from the central government of the kingdom. This process continued until the total disintegration of the Kingdom of Georgia in the 15th century AD. In 1490, the Kingdom of Georgia fragmented into three independent kingdoms and five semi-independent principalities (**Svaneti** was one of these five principalities) (S. Kaukhchishvili, 1973, pp. 286-288). Even after the collapse of the
united kingdom, Georgian language remained a literature language of newly emerged kingdoms and principalities, though some of them had their own vernacular language as well. Perception of national and cultural unity did not disappeared even after the disintegration of the united Kingdom of Georgia, it did not disappeared even during heavy economic and political decay (Janashia, 1988, p. 193).

Until the annexation by Russians and integration into the Russian Empire, the Eastern Kingdoms of Georgia (Kartli and Kakheti, which later united in one Kingdom) were under the strong influence of Iran, while the western part of Georgia (Imereti Kingdom) - under the influence of the Ottoman Empire (Muskhelishvili, 2016, p. 46).

The Russian Empire annexed and incorporated two Georgian Kingdoms during 1800-1815. The Principality of Guria was abolished and integrated into the Russian Empire in 1829, while Svaneti was annexed step by step during 1858. Megrelia, although a Russian protectorate since 1803, was not absorbed until 1867 (Essays on Georgian History, IV, 1973).

Statement 3. Svans are historically attached to the territories where they currently live. Svans could be considered as indigenous people like any other ethnic sub-groups (Megrelians, Lazes) and ethnographical groups (Imeretians, Tushs, Khevsurians, Kakhetians, etc.) of Georgians, or like all Georgians and all Europeans could be taken for indigenous people, who are attached to their homeland and have specific features.

Historical maps of Georgia starting from VI millennium BC up to nowadays show that Svans have resided over territories in the north-west part of Georgia, which is situated on the southern slopes of the Great Caucasus. They have been living on these lands for millennia. […] Majority of settlements are situated between 1300-1700 datums in the Zemo (Upper) Svaneti. Specifically, 55% of villages, 64% of households and 65% of population are present in the given elevation range. The average size of a household is from 5.8 to 6.7. (Al. Javakhishvili, 1963, pp.257).

Svans speak one of Kartvelian, specifically Svan language. They have distinguished traditions, customs, dispute resolution mechanisms (such is the Council of Elders), remains of household and spiritual culture, agricultural practices of land cultivation and cattle growing, highly elaborated civilian and religious woodwork structures, household objects and weapon smithery, jewellery goldsmithery, highly developed painting, etc. (Berdzenishvili, 1971, p. 67).
One may say that they differ from the rest of Georgians. However, all these differences are of the same type and character, as in case of other provinces and especially highland rural areas of Georgia.

**Statement 4.** Like other historical-ethnographical Georgian provinces, Svaneti is fully integrated into the overall legal and socio-economic system of Georgia. Many representatives of Svan ethnic sub-group play an important role in the political, social, scientific and cultural life of the country. Svans themselves have notably contributed to the research of history, traditional culture and customs of Svaneti (see the list of References).

[...]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions of Asian Development Bank</th>
<th>Response of Nenskra Hydro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are the Svans living in the project area considered as ethnic or national minorities? Yes/No, please explain.</td>
<td>Representatives of different scientific studies believe that Svans are an ethnic sub-group of Kartvelian ethnos (Arn. Chikobava, 1948, pp. 272-273; Chikobava, 1948; Kurdiani, 2002). Official censuses do not consider them as a distinct ethnic group. Official demographic census integrates Svans into Georgians ethnic group (Totadze, 1999, p. 37; Number and Composition of USSR Population, 1985, p. 184; Bruk, 1981, p. 210). Tbilisi Regional Office of the European Center for Minority Issues does not consider Svans as a separate ethnic group. The Framework Convention of the Council of Europe for the Protection of National Minorities, which was ratified by the Parliament of Georgia in 2005, is the only mechanism for the recognition of ethnic minorities. However, there are still many questions regarding the implementation of this Convention and exact definition of the term “National Minorities in Georgia”. Svans are Georgian. Svans are an ethnic sub-group of Georgian (Kartvelian) ethnic group. Svans did not join Georgian kingdom as a result of colonization or expansion of alien state on the Svan's land. During the antic period, Svan ethnic sub-group was one of main and primary elements for formation of the first Georgian kingdoms and Svaneti has always been a part of &quot;Georgian World&quot;. [...] Svans always consider themselves as a part of Georgian nation and Georgian state. [...] Common Kartvelian language started splitting in IV-III centuries BC, in the following consequence: first separated Svan language, then Georgian-Zan unity split into Georgian, Megrelian and Laz languages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Svan language is likely to separate from common Kartvelian at the end of III millennium BC, and Georgian-Zan language - in I millennium BC (Klimov, 1998; Deeters, 1930).

Linguistic, cultural and genetical memory of Kartvelian tribes, that kept information about common origin, made possible the formation of Kartli Kingdom under the hegemony of a single group first and united Kingdom of Georgia afterwards.

2. Are there national or local laws or policies as well as anthropological/ethnographic researches/studies that consider these groups present in or using the project area as belonging to "ethnic minorities", national minorities, or cultural communities?

Regarding National laws or policies see above. Official demographic censuses do not consider Svans as an ethnic group or ethnic minority.

As of ethnographic and historical researches, there are some studies dedicated specifically to Svaneti (Gabiani, 1925; Ingorokva, 1941; Chartolani, 1977, 1996; Collection of Works for Ethnographic Research of Svaneti (“ქრებული სვანეთის ეთნოგრაფიული შესწავლისათვის”), 1970; Takaishvili, 1910) and numerous historical monographs and papers, where the Svan history is presented in the context of the history of entire Georgia (Melikishvili, 1965; 1970; Gegeshidze, 1979; Berdzenishvili, 1971; Bardavelidze, 1957; Gasviani, 1973; Robakidze, 1993; Abdushelishvili, 1953; Abdushelishvili, 1964; Bitadze et. al. 2014, 2015; Bitadze 2001, 2002; Shurr et al. 2015). Neither of the above mentioned or any other publication consider or could consider Svans as an ethnic minority, national minority or cultural group - this statement applies to any other ethnographic groups of Georgians. Any ethnos is characterized by polymorphy and this is a necessary condition for its existence. Georgians comprise a unique ethnos in these terms: they created three Georgian alphabets (Asomtavruli, Nuskhuri, Mkhedruli) and has maintained Kartvelian languages (Georgian, Svan, Megrelian), morphological diversity (Colchic, Iberian and Caucasioni anthropological types), ethnographic
3. Are there studies/researches about Svans history and extent to which they are mainstreamed into Georgian society and culture?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>diversity and common self-identification and self-consciousness up to nowadays.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are some historiographical materials, which describe the history of Svaneti and history of its integration into united state of Georgia (Gabliani, 1925; Ingorokva, 1941; Chartolani, 1977, 1996; For Ethnographic Research of Svaneti, 1970; Takaishvili, 1910) and numerous historical monographs and papers, where the Svan history is presented in the context of the history of the entire Georgia (Melikishvili, 1965; 1970; Gegeshidze, 1979; Berdzenishvili, 1971; Bardavelidze, 1957; Gasviani, 1973; Robakidze, 1993; and anthropologic and genetic researches (Natishvili, Abdushelishvili, 1953; Abdushelishvili, 1964; Bitadze, et al. 2014, 2015; Bitadze, 2001, 2002).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The integration level of Svans is absolute. They have repeatedly proved their belonging to Georgian nation, they kept and rescued national civilian and religious treasures, and they were and still are guards of Georgia. All the mentioned are determined by common past and history, which are lost to millennia. Svans together with the western Kartvelian tribes (Meskhians, **Suans (Svans)**, Megrelians, etc.) established the first Georgian state of Colchis, they played an important role in the **formation of Georgian nation and Georgian statehood.**

Despite continuous historical processes of disintegration and reintegration of Georgian kingdom, Svaneti was always an important part of the Georgian World. During certain periods Svaneti was a part of the united Georgian Kingdom, or one of the Georgian kingdoms, whilst in other times it was semiindependent principality (**Saeristavo**). However, Svaneti has always been a significant part of Georgian world. This territorial unit managed to maintain relative independence and protect itself against the influence of various foreign empires, and thus played an important
| 4. Do the Svans in the project area self-identify as being part of a distinct social and cultural group? | Yes, they identify themselves as Svans (and as Georgians at the same time), which represent a separate ethnic sub-group and distinguish from other Georgians with their customs and language, the later being family language. Svans identify themselves as Georgians. Similarly, representatives of all Georgian provinces (ethnographic groups of Kakhetians, Imeretians, Gurians, Pshavians, Khevsurians, etc.) that constitute the Georgian nation self-identify themselves as separate subgroups and at the same time they consider themselves to be Georgians and a part of Georgian nation and state. Svans and Megrelians, who speak their own Kartvelian language besides to Georgian, identify themselves as Georgians and believe that they speak old Georgian (Topchishvili, 2015, p. 7).

Morphologically, Svans together with other highland groups of the Western and Eastern Georgia (highland Rachians, Mtiulians, Khevsurians, Pshavians, Kakhs, Tushs, Gudamakrelians, Mokhevians) are united into Caucasioni anthropologic type, which is described by A. Natishvili and M. Abdushelishvili (Natishvili, Abdushelishvili, 1953; Abdushelishvili, 1964).

Characteristic signs of groups that are united into Caucasioni anthropological type are as follows: wide face, wide lower jaw, long face, large transverse diameter of the head, wide forehead, morphologically long face, straight or lowered nasal tip, medium or high percentage of light-coloured eyes (throughout

role in the preservation of the identity not only of Svans ethnic sub-group, but Georgian nation as a whole (see maps 1-9).

Svans are fully integrated in the cultural environment of Georgia. This could be possible because Georgian language is native for them, as for any other Georgians. Svans use this language to participate in public life and communicate with other provinces of Georgia. They enjoy all rights that the Constitution of Georgia gives to all citizens of the country (Constitution of Georgia, 1995).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>5. Do the Svans in the project area whose ancestors have settled there over several centuries maintain collective attachments to distinct habitats or ancestral territories and/or to the natural resources in these habitats and territories?</strong></th>
<th>Yes, the Nakra and Chuberi (Nenskra) valleys as a whole are their traditional residential areas. It should be mentioned that Svans are not settlers, but indigenous people of Svaneti and occupy this territory not for centuries, but for millennia (see map. Maps of Georgia for VI-III centuries BC and following periods).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Do the Svans maintain in varying degrees any cultural, economic, social, and political institutions distinct from the dominant society and culture? e.g. the Svan traditional way of settling conflicts in the communities - is this the same as in other Georgian communities?</strong></td>
<td>Svan people are Georgian Orthodox Christians, and were Christianized in the 4th–6th centuries AD. However, some signs of pre-Christian beliefs have been still maintained there. Economic activities of Svan population do not differ from those in other provinces and especially mountainous regions of Georgia. Nowadays, there are the same administrative institutions in Svaneti as in other regions of Georgia. So called “Council of Elders” still has an important role in conflict resolution at the local community level. This is not specific only for Svaneti, but characteristic to all mountainous provinces of Georgia (Tianeti, Pshavi, Khevsureti, Tusheti, etc.). Please note that the webpage presenting the Svan Council (covering the entire Svaneti region) states that: “The last time the council met is so long time ago...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that it is barely within living memory among the oldest members of the community."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Do they speak a distinct language or dialect? To what extent is Svan language used in everyday life?</th>
<th>Usually, Svans are bilingual: they speak their own, unwritten Svan language and Georgian, which is the official state language. Svan language is used by the local people in everyday life. Georgian language is used for official communications. [...] Svan and Megrelian languages both belong to a family of Georgian (Kartvelian) languages and both of them have close genetic link to Georgian language (Chikobava, Kurdiani, 1996). Linguists believe that Svan, Megrelian and Laz are Kartvelian family languages (Arn. Chikobava, 1948, pp. 272-273.). To understand linkages between Georgian and Svan languages it is important to mention about Svans belief that Svan language retained old Georgian lexical units (Topchishvili, 2015, pp. 7-9). Svans and Megrelians, who besides to Georgian speak their own Kartvelian language, identify themselves as Georgians and believe that they speak old Georgian (Topchishvili, 2015, p. 7).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Has such groups (the Svans) been historically, socially and economically marginalized, disempowered, excluded, and/or discriminated against?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Are they represented as &quot;ethnic minorities&quot; or &quot;national minorities&quot; in any formal decision-making bodies at the national or local levels?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Will the project directly or indirectly affect their traditional socio-cultural and belief practices? (e.g. child-rearing, health, education, arts, and governance)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. To what extent will the loss of forest lands and grazing lands within customary lands affect the cultural, ceremonial, spiritual uses that define the identity and community of Svans?

Land acquisition for the project will not have any impact on landuse for cultural, ceremonial, or spiritual purposes, which determine the identity of Svans community.

[…] According to historical sources, Svans used to migrate for a seasonal income to other historical-ethnographical provinces of Georgia (Written Monuments of Svaneti, 1986).

Paragraph 37.3-5 of the Constitution of Georgia stipulate that:

3. Everyone shall have the right to live in healthy environment and enjoy natural and cultural surroundings. Everyone shall be obliged to care for natural and cultural environment.

4. With the view of ensuring safe environment, in accordance with ecological and economic interests of society, with due regard to the interests of the current and future generations the state shall guarantee the protection of environment and the rational use of nature (15.10.2010. N3710 to be enforced from January 1, 2011).

5. A person shall have the right to receive a complete, objective and timely information as to a state of his/her working and living environment. (15.10.2010. N3710 to be enforced from January 1, 2011).

[…]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indigenous Peoples Characteristics as per the Lenders Social Safeguards</th>
<th>Lenders Safeguards</th>
<th>Do the Svans possess these Characteristics?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Self-identification as members of a distinct indigenous cultural group and recognition of this identity by others</td>
<td>IFC PS5, EBRD PR7, ADB SR3</td>
<td>[…]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Collective attachment to geographically distinct habitats or ancestral territories in the project area and to the natural resources in these habitats and territories</td>
<td>IFC PS5, EBRD PR7, ADB SR3</td>
<td>[…] It should be mentioned that Svans are not settlers, but indigenous people of Svaneti and occupy this territory not for centuries, but millennia (see map. Maps of Georgia for VI-III centuries BC and following periods). Historical maps of Georgia starting from VI millennium BC up to nowadays show that Svans resided over larger territories historically. According to Strabo, numerous tribe of Svans occupied heights above Dioscuria. This statement is not about Svaneti - valleys of Enguri and Tskhenistskali Rivers - but Abkhazia, where Svan toponymy are preserved not only in upper part of the Kodori valley, but at foothill and lowland areas as well. […]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Customary cultural economic, social, or political institutions that are separate from those of the dominant society and culture</td>
<td>IFC PS5, EBRD PR7, ADB SR3</td>
<td>[…]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[…] Svaneti is fully integrated into the overall legal and socio-economic system of Georgia. […]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
> Descent from populations who have traditionally pursued non-wage (and often nomadic/transhumant) subsistence strategies and whose status was regulated by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations

| EBRD PR 7 | Historically, customary occupation in Svaneti was a symbiosis of land cultivation and cattle breeding. […] |

A distinct language or dialect, often different from the official language or dialect of the country or region

| IFC PS5, EBRD PR7, ADB SR3 | Usually, Svans are bilingual: they speak their own, unwritten Svan language and Georgian, which is the official state language. Svan language is used by the local people in everyday life. Georgian language is used for official communications. [...] Linguists believe that Svan, Megrelian and Laz are Kartvelian family languages (Arn. Chikobava, 1948, pp. 272-273). To understand linkages between Georgian and Svan languages it is important to mention about Svans belief that Svan language retained old Georgian lexical units (Topchishvili, 2015, pp. 7-9). Svans and Megrelians, who speak their own Kartvelian language besides to Georgian, identify themselves as Georgians and believe that they speak old Georgian (Topchishvili, 2015, p. 7). |
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Annex II Clarifications by the EIB on the content of the European Ombudsman’s proposal for a solution

For the sake of completeness, and for the European Ombudsman’s consideration in possible future communications on this matter, the items below present clarifications by the EIB on the past exchanges with the complainant, referred to in the European Ombudsman’s proposal for a solution (hereinafter: the Proposal):

• Point 2 of the Proposal: In its initial request of 8 February 2018, the complainant requested “expertise the bank possesses related to the issue of identification of Svans as indigenous people.”

• Point 5 of the Proposal: “[P]rivacy and integrity” exception referred to the request to disclose the name of the anthropologist, and not the report.

• Point 13 of the Proposal: The EIB did not just interpret that the complainant was referring to an “external anthropological study allegedly commissioned by the EIB”. In terms of the complainants’ initial request of 8 February 2018 for an “expertise the EIB possesses related to the issue of identification of Svans as indigenous people”, the EIB interpreted this to be a request about the “explanations about the criteria used by the EIB on the issue of the identification of Svan as Indigenous people”, as indicated in the EIB’s response of 23 April 2018. The reply included an invitation for further clarifications, which the complainant did not provide.

Only in its message to the EIB Complaints Mechanism of 30 April 2018, the complainant took the view that “[d]uring the meeting on 6th February the Bank project team explained that it did not rely on the project promoter’s ESIA assessment of the status of Svans as indigenous people but it commissioned an external analysis from the expert”. Furthermore, in the same message she clarified that “[t]his analysis was a subject of my request for disclosure.” In its reply of 16 November 2018, the EIB clearly explained that “the EIB has not commissioned and does not hold any standalone document that could be considered as a study carried out by a Georgian anthropologist regarding the identification of Svans as indigenous people.”

• Point 14 of the Proposal: The requests were clear from the EIB side and the complainant was invited to provide clarifications.
The EIB welcomes observations made by the European Ombudsman in the Proposal concerning the following:

• Inadmissibility of the complaint concerning the EIB’s reply to the additional request (Points 11 and 18 of the Proposal).

• Disclosure of documents containing opinions for internal use as part of deliberations and preliminary consultations between the EIB and its partners (Point 18 of the Proposal).