

17<sup>th</sup> August 2026

**The Director General**  
**Sindh Environmental Protection Agency**  
EPA Complex, ST-2/1, Sector-23  
Korangi Industrial Area, Karachi

RECEIPT & ISSUE SECTION  
Sindh Environmental Protection Agency  
Government of Sindh  
ST-2/1, Sector 23,  
Korangi Industrial Area, Karachi  
Date: 17/8/26 Time: 01-06 PM



**SHEHRI - CITIZENS**  
**FOR A BETTER**  
**ENVIRONMENT**

**Sub: PUBLIC COMMENTS/FORMAL OBJECTION On the Draft Environmental & Social Impact Assessment (ESIA)**

**KARACHI PORT TO QAYUMABAD CORRIDOR PROJECT**

**Document No.: KPQ/ESIA/001, Rev. 00 — Proponent: PTQ Expressway (Private) Limited**

Sir, Assalam-o-Alaikum

This submission is made in the exercise of the right to comment on projects requiring an Environmental Impact Assessment under Sindh law, and in the interest of the communities, ecosystems, and public resources affected by the proposed project.

### 1. Introduction and Purpose

This document sets out formal objections and requests for correction concerning the Environmental & Social Impact Assessment ("ESIA" or "the Report") prepared for the Karachi Port to Qayumabad Corridor Project ("the Project"), Document No. KPQ/ESIA/001, Rev. 00, prepared by EMC Pakistan (Private) Limited on behalf of the proponent, PTQ Expressway (Private) Limited.

A detailed review of the 408-page Report — including its main body, the Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by EA Consulting (Private) Limited, and the Mangrove Damage Assessment & Validation Report attached as Annex II — has identified serious, documented inconsistencies between what the Report concludes and what its own underlying data, annexes, and consultation records actually show.

These are not minor drafting errors. They go to the heart of whether the Report has honestly disclosed the Project's likely impacts on people's homes, livelihoods, and a legally significant mangrove ecosystem, and whether it satisfies the legal standard required for approval under Section 17 of the Sindh Environmental Protection Act, 2014.

**Express Tribune 08-08-2026**

**SINDH ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**  
**GOVERNMENT OF SINDH**  
**PUBLIC NOTICE**

Sindh Environmental Protection Agency hereby notifies that M/s PTQ Expressway (Private) Limited (Office Address: A-22, KDA Scheme #1, Main Karsaz Road, Karachi) has submitted the Environmental & Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) report for the proposed "Qayumabad to Karachi Port Corridor Project" which will aim to provide a direct link to freight traffic destined for other parts of the country, in the form of a 4 Lane (2 Lane each side) elevated expressway, originating from Karachi Port, travelling through the city and culminating at Qayumabad, Shahr-e-Bhutto, for a dedicated elevated corridor which will provide uninterrupted access to the Karachi Hyderabad Motorway M-9. The ESIA report identifies the potential environmental impacts associated with the construction and operational phase of the project and proposes appropriate mitigation measures to minimize adverse environmental impacts.

The general public, stakeholders, experts can pursue/consult the ESIA report in the Office of the Director General, Sindh Environmental Protection Agency located at: Plot No. ST-2/1, Sector-23, Korangi Industrial Area, Karachi. Public Notice along with ESIA report is available on SEPA website ([www.epa.sindh.gov.pk](http://www.epa.sindh.gov.pk)).

A Public Hearing will be conducted by the Sindh EPA at 10:30 am on 18<sup>th</sup> August, 2026, at local football ground at "Plot # ST-20, Scheme-5 Block 1, Clifton, Karachi, 75600, Pakistan" (nearby benchmarks are Bay View High Pre School and Ma Sha' Allah Tower on Marine Promenade Road, Karachi) in which the proponent will make a presentation about the project. The general public, concerned citizens, civil society organizations and all other stakeholders are requested to attend this public hearing. All others who are interested to offer their comments in writing may communicate the same to Director General, EPA, Sindh on the above-mentioned address or through email at [epasindh@gmail.com](mailto:epasindh@gmail.com), within 10 days of the publication of the notice.

**Deputy Director (Tech)**

Page 1 of 9

Donations to Shehri-CBE are approved under Section 2(36)(c) of the Income Tax Ordinance, 2001

88-R, Block-2, P.E.C.H.S., Karachi-75400, Pakistan. Tel : 92-21-34530646, 34382298 Fax : 92-21-34530646  
E-mail: [info@shehri.org](mailto:info@shehri.org) Website: [www.shehri.org](http://www.shehri.org), Facebook: [www.facebook.com/shehri.citizens](https://www.facebook.com/shehri.citizens), Twitter: @shehriCBE





This document is organized in three parts:

- Part A — Procedural objections concerning the sequencing and integrity of the consultation and assessment process;
- Part B — Substantive objections concerning factual inconsistencies, apparent cross-contamination of content from an unrelated project, and unresolved contradictions on resettlement and ecological impact;
- Part C — Objections concerning gaps in legal and regulatory compliance; followed by a consolidated set of requests (the “Prayer”) addressed to SEPA.

Each objection below identifies the specific page(s)/section(s) of the Report where the issue arises, quotes or closely paraphrases the relevant text, and explains why it constitutes a material deficiency.

## **PART A — PROCEDURAL OBJECTIONS**

### **Objection A1: Stakeholder consultations were conducted before the environmental, ecological, and traffic impact data existed**

Chapter 7 (Stakeholder Consultations) records that essentially all primary and secondary stakeholder consultations — including the Key Informant Interviews and community meetings at Bhutta Village and Gulshan-e-Sikandarabad, and meetings with KDA, Sindh Human Settlement Authority, Karachi Electric, and the Sindh Forest Department — were conducted between 17 March 2025 and 23 April 2025 (Report, Ch. 7, pp. 108–126).

However, the Report's own environmental baseline monitoring (ambient air quality, noise, and water quality) was carried out in May 2026 (Annex, monitoring log dated 13–24 May 2026), and the Traffic Impact Assessment annex is dated June 2026. The Mangrove Damage Assessment (Annex II) is similarly undated within the same March–April 2025 window.

*“For the primary data acquisition, the E&S team conducted detailed field visits throughout 2025 and 2026...” (Section 5.2, Reconnaissance & Field Visits, p.46)*

This means the communities and government stakeholders who were consulted in early-to-mid 2025 could not have been shown, and could not have commented on, the actual environmental baseline results, the traffic modelling outcomes, or the ecological/mangrove damage findings — because none of that data existed yet at the time they were consulted. A consultation process that precedes the impact data it is supposed to inform people about cannot be described as “informed consultation.” This is inconsistent with the disclosure and consultation standards referenced within the Report itself (the ADB Safeguard Policy Statement and IFC Performance Standards, cited in Section 3.3) and undermines the legitimacy of the consultation record now being relied upon to support the ESIA.

Request: SEPA should require that affected communities and stakeholders be re-consulted after all baseline, impact, and mitigation findings (including the mangrove assessment and traffic assessment) are finalized and translated into Urdu/Sindhi, and that this be completed before any approval is granted.

AA



**Objection A2: Material project information is disclosed only in a buried annex, not in the main ESIA**



The total estimated Project cost — PKR 64.2 billion — appears only in the Traffic Impact Assessment annex (pp. 7, 15, and the annex cover data), and nowhere in the main ESIA body (Chapters 1–9) that the public and SEPA reviewers are expected to rely on. A project of this financial scale should have its cost, financing structure, and phasing disclosed transparently in the primary ESIA document, not left to be discovered inside a sub-consultant's annex.

Request: The main ESIA body should be amended to disclose project cost, financing/PPP structure, and implementation phasing directly, consistent with the disclosure expectations under Section 17 read with the 2021 Review Regulations.

**PART B — SUBSTANTIVE FACTUAL INCONSISTENCIES**

**Objection B1: The Mangrove Damage Assessment (Annex II) appears to belong to a different, unrelated project**

This is the most serious integrity problem identified in the Report. Annex II, “Mangrove Damage Assessment & Validation Report,” which is the sole technical basis for assessing the Project's impact on mangroves in Chinna Creek, is explicitly written for a different project:

*“The project under consideration, titled “Assessment of Mangroves at Risk from Malir Expressway (MEW) Phase-I Alignment,” is linked to a key initiative of the Karachi Development Authority. The Government of Sindh, under the Public-Private Partnership (PPP) mode, intends to implement the Malir Expressway Phase-I Project in Karachi...” (Annex II, “Rationale” section)*

*“The Malir Expressway Phase-I is a proposed 12.5 km\*elevated 4-lane freight corridor in Karachi. It will connect Karachi Port's East Wharf with Malir Expressway Phase-II...” (Annex II, “Project Outline”)*

This is not the Project under review. The ESIA under review is the Karachi Port to Qayumabad Corridor Project, proposed by a private proponent, PTQ Expressway (Private) Limited (Report, Section 1, p.1). Annex II instead names the Karachi Development Authority as the implementing agency of a differently-named, differently-scoped project (“Malir Expressway Phase-I,” 12.5 km). The term “Malir Expressway” appears 15 times across the Report package, including in the Traffic Impact Assessment's description of the road network the Project connects to (pp. 6, 14, 33, 41 of that annex) — raising a real question as to whether parts of this ESIA package were copied wholesale from an earlier or parallel assessment prepared for a public-sector project bearing a different name, sponsor, and (possibly) alignment, without being properly adapted or re-verified for the Project actually before SEPA.

The consequence is serious: the figure the Report relies on for its single most sensitive ecological impact — approximately 423 mangrove trees to be removed at Chinna Creek (Report, p.83; Annex II) — cannot be confirmed to have been derived from a site-specific assessment of the Karachi Port to Qayumabad Corridor alignment as currently designed. If the underlying assessment was performed for a different project's alignment (Malir Expressway Phase-I, 12.5 km, KDA-sponsored), the mangrove impact figures, mitigation measures, and Forest Department consultations described may not be valid for the Project actually seeking approval.



Request: SEPA should require the proponent to commission and submit a fresh, project-specific mangrove and creek ecology assessment, tied explicitly and verifiably to the Karachi Port to Qayumabad Corridor Project's approved alignment, together with an explanation of how and why content referencing an unrelated KDA project ("Malir Expressway Phase-I") came to be included in this ESIA package.

**Objection B2: The Project's own length is reported inconsistently across the same ESIA package**

|                                       |                                                         |                                         |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
|                                       |                                                         |                                         |
| Main ESIA – Introduction              | 16.5 km                                                 | Section 1, p.1                          |
| Traffic Impact Assessment annex       | 15.4 km (Karachi Port to Jam Sadiq Bridge)              | Executive Summary, p.7; also pp. 27, 87 |
| Mangrove Damage Assessment (Annex II) | 12.5 km (different project: "Malir Expressway Phase-I") | "Project Outline" section               |

A single project cannot simultaneously be 16.5 km, 15.4 km, and 12.5 km long. At minimum, the main ESIA and its own Traffic Impact Assessment annex disagree on the Project's physical length by 1.1 km — a discrepancy that should have been caught and reconciled during internal quality review before submission to SEPA. This discrepancy also calls into question which alignment the air quality, noise, water quality, and traffic modelling in the Report actually correspond to.

Request: The proponent should submit a single, reconciled, statement of Project length, alignment, and design chainage that is used consistently across the ESIA, the ESMP, and all annexes, with the discrepancy explained.

**Objection B3: A promised project budget table is missing, and the table numbering is duplicated**

The Table of Contents lists "Table 2.1 – Tentative Breakdown of Budget for Project" at page 12 (Report, Table of Contents). This table does not appear anywhere in the 408-page document. Instead, the table actually numbered "Table 2.1" in the body of the Report is a different table entirely — "Table 2.1 – Geometric Design Criteria" (Section 2.4, p.13–14) — meaning the promised budget breakdown was silently dropped and the table numbering was never corrected.

Request: The proponent should supply the missing project budget breakdown referenced in its own Table of Contents, correct the table numbering throughout the document, and confirm that no other tables or annexes referenced in the Table of Contents are similarly missing.

**PART C — THE REPORT'S DENIAL OF RESETTLEMENT AND LAND ACQUISITION IMPACTS IS CONTRADICTED BY ITS OWN CONSULTATION RECORD**

**Objection C1: Chapter 6.6.1 states there is no resettlement, land acquisition, or displacement impact**



Section 6.6.1 ("Land Acquisition, Resettlement, & Permitting"), the Report's formal impact-assessment conclusion on this topic, states in full:



*"The expressway is situated and will pass through major existing roads of the city, hence, there is no land acquisition involved in the project. Similarly, given that the expressway will travel along the median of main roads, no removal/destruction of residential/commercial structures is involved that may involve any potential involuntary resettlement." (Section 6.6.1, p.81)*

*"No mitigation measures are required as there is no land acquisition and resettlement." (Section 6.6.1, p.81)*

On the strength of this conclusion, the Report treats resettlement as a non-issue: no Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) or Land Acquisition & Resettlement Plan (LARP) is prepared or annexed, notwithstanding that the Report's own legal review (Section 3.2) identifies the Sindh Resettlement & Rehabilitation Policy as requiring exactly such a plan "detailing the extent of displacement, compensation strategies, relocation sites, and support for livelihood restoration" wherever a project causes displacement (Table 3.2, item 21, p.32) — a requirement the Report dismisses as inapplicable, saying "No further requirements given that Policy is not applicable."

**Objection C2: The Report's own stakeholder consultation record documents exactly the displacement it denies exists**

Chapter 7 records direct testimony from residents of two informal settlements sitting on or immediately adjacent to the proposed alignment — Bhutta Village (described as consisting of "thousands of households," p.113) and Gulshan-e-Sikandarabad — which flatly contradicts Section 6.6.1's conclusion:

*"He also emphasized fears of displacement due to the project and raised concerns about privacy being disturbed if the expressway passes directly over residential areas..." (Table 7.5, Bhutta Village, respondent Irfan, p.114)*

*"As he is a resident of the area for 20 years and a homeowner, it was emphasized that his household must not be affected by the project. He strongly recommended that the route be altered to pass over the water rather than residential areas... and provide updates regarding potential compensation if the route remains unchanged." (Table 7.5, Bhutta Village, respondent Ameen-ur-Rehman, p.114)*

*"Residents expressed strong opposition to the expressway crossing their community and did not agree with the proposed route alignment... A majority of residents stated that they do not seek resettlement compensation either; they simply do not want to be displaced." (Table 7.6, Gulshan-e-Sikandarabad, p.115)*

Government stakeholders confirm the same point. A senior KDA traffic engineering official is recorded as stating that Gulshan-e-Sikandarabad and Bhutta Village are "encroachments on illegal land" (p.119). The Director of the Sindh Human Settlement Authority (formerly the Sindh Katchi Abadis Authority) is recorded as confirming that these two settlements are "not officially recognized by their department and are considered illegal settlements," and cautioning that:

*"if these settlements are to be removed, proper policies must be followed, and adequate compensation should be provided." (Human Settlement Authority, KII record, p.121)*

AA



Even the Report's own Grievance Redress Mechanism chapter, drafted separately from Chapter 6, contradicts Section 6.6.1's "no resettlement" finding when justifying why a GRM is needed:



*"PAPs need quick relief for their problems, particularly when projects are likely to cause property loss and displacement which could push PAPs into a state of high vulnerability, insecurity, and impoverishment." (Section 8.1, Need for GRM, p.128)*

It is not credible for the same ESIA to assert, in Chapter 6, that there is no possibility of displacement or resettlement requiring any mitigation, while its own Chapter 7 documents named residents describing fears of losing their homes, a route explicitly requested to be diverted away from their houses, and two government authorities characterizing the affected communities as unrecognized settlements whose removal would trigger a compensation obligation — and while its own Chapter 8 assumes displacement as a live risk the GRM must be ready to handle.

**Objection C3: Legal consequence: the "no resettlement" finding appears designed to avoid, not satisfy, applicable resettlement law**

Because Section 6.6.1 declares that there is no land acquisition or resettlement, the Report treats the Sindh Resettlement & Rehabilitation Policy, and the ADB Safeguard Policy Statement / IFC Performance Standard 5 provisions on involuntary resettlement that the Report itself cites as applicable international guidelines (Section 3.3), as simply not triggered — with no RAP, no census of project-affected persons, no cut-off date, no livelihood restoration plan, and no compensation framework for the residents of Bhutta Village or Gulshan-e-Sikandarabad, titled or otherwise. Under safeguard practice generally (and consistent with the Sindh R&R Policy's own stated objective, quoted in the Report at p.32, of ensuring "fair and timely compensation, proper relocation, and the restoration of livelihoods for project-affected persons"), the informal or unrecognized legal status of a settlement does not extinguish the obligation to assess and mitigate displacement impacts on its residents — it is the fact of displacement, not the land title, that triggers the safeguard.

Request: SEPA should decline to accept Section 6.6.1's "no resettlement" conclusion on its current basis and should require the proponent to: (i) conduct and disclose a proper resettlement/land-use impact assessment covering Bhutta Village and Gulshan-e-Sikandarabad and any other settlements within the Right of Way and Area of Influence; (ii) prepare a Resettlement Action Plan / Livelihood Restoration Plan consistent with the Sindh Resettlement & Rehabilitation Policy where any displacement, loss of structure, or loss of livelihood is found; and (iii) reconcile this finding with the contradictory statements already in its own Chapters 7 and 8 before the ESIA is considered complete for approval.

**PART D — THE REPORT'S DENIAL OF PROTECTED/ECOLOGICALLY SENSITIVE AREAS IS CONTRADICTED BY ITS OWN MANGROVE ANNEX**

**Objection D1: The Report twice states there are no protected areas or ecological hotspots in the Project area**

*"There are no identified protected areas within the project area, or the project's Area of Influence." (Section 5.7.4, Protected Areas, p.71)*

*"Project is located within Karachi, where there are no identified sites of ecological importance, or wildlife hotspots." (Table 3.2, item 11 (Sindh Wildlife Protection, Preservation, Conservation and Management Act, 2020), p.31)*



**Objection D2: The Report's own annex describes the same corridor as containing an ecologically significant, protected mangrove ecosystem**



Annex II, prepared to assess the Project's impact on mangroves along Chinna Creek, states the opposite:

*"Recognizing these threats, Karachi's mangroves were declared protected in 2010, and global frameworks such as UNFF, CITES, CBD, UNFCCC, and the Ramsar Convention have reinforced their conservation." (Annex II, "Introduction to Mangroves")*

*"These mangrove stands are of exceptional ecological significance, serving as natural barriers against coastal erosion, reducing the impact of storm surges, and acting as highly efficient carbon sinks. They also provide critical breeding and nursery grounds for fish, shrimp, and other marine life..." (Annex II, "Rationale")*

The main ESIA body also acknowledges, elsewhere, that approximately 423 mangroves will be removed by the Project (Section 6.6.5, p.83) and that the Chinna Creek mangrove stands and intertidal mudflats depend on "regular tidal exchange, sediment transport and saline water circulation" for their ecological functioning (Section 5.3.4, Hydrology, p.53). Multiple government stakeholders consulted for the Report separately and repeatedly stressed that mangroves "must not be affected by the project under any circumstances" (KDA, p.119; Sindh Forest Department representative, p.120; Karachi Water & Sewerage Corporation, p.85).

A resource that the Government of Sindh has declared protected since 2010, that provides coastal defence and nursery habitat, that the proponent's own consultants describe as having "exceptional ecological significance," and that multiple government departments insist must not be touched, cannot simultaneously be truthfully described as located in an area with "no identified protected areas" and "no identified sites of ecological importance." This is a direct, page-referenced self-contradiction within the same ESIA.

**Objection D3: The Sindh Forest Act and mangrove-specific forestry protections are not addressed in the legal review chapter**

Chapter 3 (Review of Pertinent Legislations) reviews thirteen national and provincial laws and policies but does not include the Sindh Forest Act or any mangrove-specific forestry notification, even though Annex II itself identifies the "Office of the Chief Conservator of Forests (Mangroves), Sindh of Forest Department" as the legal "custodian of mangroves" (Annex II, "Introduction to Mangroves") whose consultation and clearance would govern any mangrove removal. A legal review chapter that omits the governing forestry law for the Project's single most significant natural-resource impact is materially incomplete.

Request: SEPA should require Section 5.7.4 and Table 3.2 to be corrected to accurately reflect the presence of protected mangrove habitat within the Project's Area of Influence; require the legal review chapter to be supplemented with the Sindh Forest Act and applicable mangrove protection notifications; and require documentary proof of a project-specific No Objection Certificate from the Sindh Forest Department (Mangroves) tied to the verified, current Project alignment (see Objection B1 above).

AA



## PART E — ADDITIONAL LEGAL AND REGULATORY COMPLIANCE GAPS



### **Objection E1: Inconsistent name and definition of the child labor law relied upon**

The Report's legal review chapter names and describes the relevant statute as follows:

*"The Prohibition of Child Employment Act (PCEA) 2017 disallow child labor in Sindh. The PCEA defines a child as a person who has not completed his/her fourteenth years of age..." (Table 3.2, item 12, p.31)*

Later, in the impact-assessment chapter, the Report names and defines what it describes as the same law differently:

*"the Sindh Restrictions on Employment of Children Act, 2017 prohibits the employment of children... whoever employs or permits a child (person under the age of 15 years) to work in an establishment shall be liable to punishment..." (Section 6.7.14, Child Labor, p.103)*

The Report cannot rely on two different names and two different statutory age thresholds (under-14 versus under-15) for the same underlying legal protection without creating confusion as to what standard its own contractors and monitors are required to enforce on site. This should be corrected and a single, verified citation used throughout.

### **Objection E2: Land Acquisition Act, 1894 is invoked to justify avoiding formal land acquisition procedure, without addressing its resettlement-adjacent obligations**

Section 6.6.4 states that the Land Acquisition Act (LAA), 1894 "will not be involved" because any land needed for construction camps will be temporarily leased rather than acquired (p.83). This may be an appropriate approach for construction camps and laydown areas. However, it does not address — and should not be read as resolving — the separate and more serious resettlement question raised in Part C above concerning permanent displacement of residents along the alignment itself, which the LAA analysis does not purport to cover.

### **Objection E3: Environmental monitoring described as capturing seasonal variation does not, on its own dates, do so**

Section 5.5.1 states that ambient air and noise monitoring was "carried out at these points at different points of the year also to understand the temporal variations" (p.63). The two monitoring rounds actually relied upon are dated March 2025 and May 2026 — roughly fourteen months apart, spanning two different calendar years rather than representing complementary seasons (e.g., wet/dry) within a single annual cycle. Presenting this as "temporal variation" baseline monitoring, when it is in fact two snapshots over a year apart with an unexplained gap, overstates the robustness of the baseline used to judge future compliance.

Request: The proponent should clarify the monitoring design, add at least one additional monitoring round to capture seasonal (wet season/dry season) variation within a single year, and explain the reason for the 14-month gap between the two rounds relied upon.

### **Summary of Requests ("Prayer")**

For the reasons set out above, it is respectfully requested that the Sindh Environmental Protection Agency:





- I. Decline to approve the ESIA in its current form and return it to the proponent for material revision, in view of the internal contradictions identified in Parts B, C, and D above.
- II. Require the proponent to reconcile and correct the Project's stated length, cost disclosure, and table numbering across the main ESIA and all annexes (Objections B2, B3, A2).
- III. Require the proponent to explain and resolve the apparent inclusion of content prepared for an unrelated project ("Malir Expressway Phase-I," Karachi Development Authority) within Annex II, and to submit a fresh, project-specific mangrove and creek ecology assessment tied to the verified current alignment (Objection B1).
- IV. Require a proper resettlement and land-use impact assessment covering Bhutta Village, Gulshan-e-Sikandarabad, and any other settlements within the Right of Way/Area of Influence, and a Resettlement Action Plan / Livelihood Restoration Plan consistent with the Sindh Resettlement & Rehabilitation Policy wherever displacement, loss of structures, or loss of livelihood is found — rather than accepting Section 6.6.1's unsupported "no resettlement" conclusion (Objection C1-C3).
- V. Require correction of Section 5.7.4 and the legal review table to accurately reflect the presence of protected mangrove habitat, supplementation of the legal review chapter with the Sindh Forest Act and applicable mangrove protection notifications, and submission of a project-specific NOC from the Sindh Forest Department (Mangroves) (Objection D1-D3).
- VI. Require correction of the inconsistent naming and statutory age definitions used for the child labor law relied upon (Objection E1).
- VII. Require an additional, seasonally-representative round of ambient air, noise, and water quality monitoring before the baseline is relied upon for compliance purposes (Objection E3).
- VIII. Require that all affected communities and stakeholders be re-consulted, using complete and corrected impact information (including the corrected mangrove, resettlement, and traffic findings), and that this be done in Urdu and Sindhi as well as English, before any public hearing or approval decision is finalized (Objection A1).
- IX. Ensure that the public hearing required under Section 17 of the Sindh Environmental Protection Act, 2014 is held only after the corrected and reconciled ESIA is republished, so that the public is commenting on an accurate document.

These objections are submitted in good faith, based on a direct review of the Report's own text, tables, and annexes as submitted. Supporting page references are provided throughout so that each point can be independently verified against the Report.

**Prepared for submission under:** Section 17, Sindh Environmental Protection Act, 2014; Sindh EPA (Review of IEE and EIA) Regulations, 2021.

Sincerely,

  
**Amber Alibhai**  
General Secretary  
Shehri-CBE



c.c. Secretary Environment, Climate Change & Coastal Development, Sindh  
Chief Conservator of Forests (Mangroves), Sindh Forest Department  
Director General, Sindh Human Settlement Authority  
Director General, Karachi Development Authority  
Chairman Karachi Port Trust