

Please see below our response to your inquire:

To respond to the false publication of the "José Alvear Restrepo Lawyers Collective" portal, it's necessary to clarify the following in advance: Best Coal Company BCC is not a Turkish company. BCC is a Colombian company that acquired the mining titles of the CCX and MPX companies in 2017. Once the titles were acquired by BCC, a rethinking of the mining projects was carried out, which in no way resemble those that had been designed at the time the previous owners. The Cañaverales mining project is not a megaproject, in fact, it is a project that was designed for a total exploitation of approximately 12 million tons of coal, with a useful life of just 10 years. It is far from resembling the large mining projects in Guajira and Cesar territories. It's important to clarify, that the Cañaverales mining project had already obtained an environmental license in 2011 and the license lost its effect in 2017 because the mining project was not started. Once BCC started the process, in order to obtain a new license, the community councils of the black communities appeared in the territory, and through a "tutela" (legal action), they obtained recognized by the Ministry of the Interior, and was mandatory to develop the consultation process with those communities.

Eighteen (18) months after start the consultation processes with eight (8) of nine (9) communities in the influence area of the Cañaverales Mining Project, BCC has completed all the consultation processes and achieving the final protocolization and signing of agreements with the councils: "Nelvis Aragón of Conejo", "Gustavo Castro of El Tablazo", "Wilmer Tirado of Corralejas", "Rafael Zuñiga of Los Pozos", "Diaspora of El Tablazo", "Caminos hacia el Desarrollo of Pondorito and Boca de Monte", "Tiama of Corralejas" and "Luis Enrique Martínez of Sitio Nuevo", except with "Los Negros de Cañaverales). With that community council, has not been possible to initiate a single formal session with different representatives of the Directorate of the National Authority for Prior Consultation DANCP, as there has been absolute reluctance from this community; being summoned through the call procedures established by the aforementioned entity, as stipulated by Directive 8 of September 9, 2020. Their representatives have chosen the alternative of not attending, trying to hide behind excuses and requests for postponement. In addition, they have chosen to use malicious mechanisms to make the community believe that the project will be devastating, that it will affect the Cañaverales spring and that the project will be of the same magnitude as the Cerrejón project. For obvious reasons, this manipulation of the community generates an adverse effect to the mining project and to the good intentions of BCC, which has even wants the protection and improvement of the environmental conditions of the spring area.

Finally, for BCC it is important to deny what they mention about sharing information about the Cañaverales mining project. Here it is simply evident a profound ignorance of what corresponds to a consultation process. Information has been shared with each and every one of the communities, not only about the project, but about the BCC company. However, it is within the framework of the consultation process, when all the detailed technical information of the project should be submitted. Precisely, this is part of the consultation exercise; the communities must have a group of advisers who interpret the information and discuss it in the workshops that are part of the process itself. Obviously, the advice of the communities is assumed from the financial point of view, by the company that owns the project (BCC in this case), thus guaranteeing conditions of balance and equality for the process. The cost of the methodological route is absolutely responsibility of BCC, but the choice of the advisers is liberality of the community.

BCC has had every willingness to develop the consultation process, complying with what was ordered by the Court that ruled the protection in favor of the communities. It is contradictory that, once favored by the ruling, they are reluctant to carry out the consultation process and continue to delay and manipulate, even putting the DANCP at risk, since, by not developing the process, this entity is exposed to incur in breach with serious legal consequences.