CRP REQUEST NO. 2009/1 – REQUEST ON THE FUZHOU ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (LOAN NO. 2176-PRC)

Terms of Reference for Compliance Review

Introduction

1. These Terms of Reference (TOR) were prepared by the Compliance Review Panel (CRP) to undertake the compliance review in respect of the Fuzhou Environmental Improvement Project (Project)¹ pursuant to a request for compliance review (the Request) (Appendixes 1 and 2).

2. On 24 June 2009, the Compliance Review Panel (CRP) determined the Request was eligible, and recommended to the ADB Board of Directors (Board) to authorize a compliance review. On 15 July 2009, the Board authorized the compliance review.

3. Under paragraph 122 of the Accountability Mechanism policy² and paragraph 37 of the CRP Operating Procedures, these TOR, which cover the scope of review, methodology, and time frame are submitted to the Board Compliance Review Committee (BCRC) for its clearance. After clearance by BCRC, the CRP will provide the TOR to the Board and to all stakeholders, and post it on the CRP website, within 14 days from receipt of Board authorization of a compliance review.

The Request for Compliance Review

4. Brief particulars of the Request and the Project are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Fuzhou Environmental Improvement Project (Loan No. 2176-PRC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower</td>
<td>The Government of the People’s Republic of China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting Parties</td>
<td>Mr. Wang Jie Quan and Mr. Xu Qi Long of Fujian Province. They informed the CRP that they do not request that their names be kept confidential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegations</td>
<td>Noncompliance with ADB Policy on Involuntary Resettlement³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADB operations department responsible</td>
<td>East Asia Regional Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project categorization</td>
<td>Category A for involuntary resettlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project description</td>
<td>Improve the environmental quality and living conditions in the project areas by reducing water pollution and protecting water resources. The Project has three infrastructure components: (i) expansion of the Yangli sewer networks serving the eastern part of Fuzhou; (ii) construction of the Lianban sewer network on Nantai Island in the southern part of Fuzhou; and (iii) rehabilitation of inland creeks for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ Loan No. 2176 (PRC): Fuzhou Environmental Improvement Project.
pollution control and flood protection in Nantai Island. The Project also has a capacity building component for the institutions involved in project execution.

**Project status**

The ADB loan for the Project was approved by the Board on 29 July 2005; became effective on 14 September 2006 and is scheduled to be closed on 30 June 2010. As of 30 June 2009, the physical progress of the Project was at 60%, and the disbursement of the ADB loan was at 22%.

**Project implementation arrangement**

The Executing Agency (EA) is the Fuzhou Municipal Government, and the Implementing Agencies (IAs) are:

(i) The Fuzhou Water Environmental Construction and Development Company for the sewer network component, and  
(ii) The Fuzhou Urban Visual Construction and Development Company for the inland creek rehabilitation component

**CRP**

Mr. Rusdian Lubis, CRP Chair is taking primary responsibility for the compliance review, and Ms. Anne Deruyttere, part time member of the CRP, has been appointed by the CRP Chair as the Lead Reviewer, with assistance from Mr. Antonio La Viña, part time member and the Chair. The CRP will be supported by the Office of the Compliance Review Panel (OCRP).

**Contact person**

Mr. Rusdian Lubis, Chair, CRP  
Mr. Bruce Purdue, Secretary, CRP  
Email: crp@adb.org  
Tel: +632 632 4149

**Purpose and Scope of Compliance Review**

5. The purpose of the CRP is to investigate alleged violations by ADB of its operational policies and procedures in the Project that directly and materially harm project affected people in the course of the formulation, processing, or implementation of the Project. The scope of the compliance review is to focus on determining whether ADB has or has not complied with its operational policies and procedures in connection with the Project. The review is to investigate neither the borrower nor the executing and implementing agencies. The conduct of these other parties will be considered only to the extent directly relevant to an assessment of ADB’s compliance with its operational policies and procedures. After carrying out a compliance review, CRP will issue to the Board its findings and recommendations, including recommendations, if appropriate, for any remedial changes to be implemented by Management in the scope or implementation of the Project.

**Allegations of Noncompliance with ADB Policies**

6. The Requesting Parties claim that the provisions for land acquisition and compensation included in the “Revised Resettlement Plan of August 2008” were not consistent with the “Resettlement Plan of September 2004” which they claim was approved in accordance with the ADB Policy on Involuntary Resettlement of 1995. The specific complaints relate to (i) compensation at below replacement cost for illegal residents; (ii) impoverishment resulting from the loss of income sources; and (iii) the lack of timely and appropriate information and consultation.

7. Based on the allegations by the Requesting Parties of noncompliance with specific provisions of ADB policies, and CRP’s findings in its eligibility review of the Request, the CRP
will consider ADB’s operational policies and procedures that were in effect at the time of Board approval, including but not limited to ADB’s Involuntary Resettlement Policy of 1995, and its Operations Manual (OM), particularly OM Section F2/BP and OM Section F2/OP both issued on 29 October 2003, and any staff instructions relating to the formulation, processing, or implementation of the Project.

Conduct of Compliance Review and Methodology

8. The CRP will carry out its work expeditiously, transparently and in a manner to ensure that there is engagement with Management and staff, the Requesting Parties, project affected people, the Government of the PRC, the Municipality of Fuzhou and its implementing agencies, and the Board, including the Executive Director representing the PRC.

9. The compliance review will include the following:

(i) review of all ADB files and other documents related to the Project;
(ii) conduct of site visits with the prior consent of the Government of the PRC;
(iii) consultation with all concerned stakeholders, including interviews with:
   - ADB Management, staff and consultants,
   - staff from the Office of the Special Project Facilitator (OSPF) on its engagement at the consultation phase of the Accountability Mechanism
   - Requesting Parties, project-affected people,
   - officials from the Government of the PRC, including those from the EA and IAs, and
   - the Board, including the Executive Director representing the PRC,
   all of whom will be given an opportunity to record their views, as necessary;
(iv) use of consultants, translators, and interpreters as appropriate, to assist the CRP in carrying out its work; and
(v) apply any other review methods that the CRP considers appropriate in complying with its mandate.

10. CRP will exercise discretion and maintain a low profile in the PRC. CRP will not give any media interviews at any stage of the compliance review. CRP members will be subject to ADB’s confidentiality and disclosure of information policy, including those provisions aimed at ensuring that confidential business information is not disclosed. Any material or information submitted to any CRP members or the OCRP on a confidential basis from any party will not be released to any other parties without the consent of the party that submitted it. Compliance review is not intended to provide judicial-type remedies and the CRP’s findings and recommendations are not adjudicative.

11. After conducting its compliance review, CRP will issue a draft report of its findings and recommendations to the Management and the Requesting Parties for comments. Both the

---

Management and the Requesting Parties will have 30 days to comment on the draft report. Within 14 days from receipt of the comments on the draft report, CRP will consider the comments and finalize the report, and issue its final report to the Board, including its findings and recommendations. If appropriate the recommendations may include any remedial actions for ADB Management to implement, in order to bring the Project back into compliance with ADB policies.

**Timeframe**

12. The CRP will carry out the compliance review in accordance with the compliance review phase set out in the Policy on the Accountability Mechanism, the corresponding Operations Manual (OM Section L1/BP) and the CRP Operating Procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CRP Draft Report. CRP will issue its draft report of its findings and recommendations to the Management and the Requesting Parties for comments.</td>
<td>12 weeks from the date of clearance of the final TOR for the compliance review by the BCRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Management’s and Requesting Parties’ to CRP draft report.</td>
<td>30 days from submission of the draft report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CRP’s Final Report. CRP finalizes its Report, based on comments received, and issues CRP’s final Report to the Board, with responses from Management and the Requesting Parties as attachments.</td>
<td>14 days from receipt by CRP of comments from the Management and the Requesting Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Board Decision: Board consideration of the CRP’s Final Report. Release of the Board Decision and CRP’s Final Report</td>
<td>21 days from submission of CRP Final Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. This timeframe does not take into account the time needed for (i) obtaining a mission clearance for CRP to visit the project area, (ii) translations and (iii) extensions requested for filing responses, where additional time may be required. If the CRP should experience problems in adhering to the timeframe, the CRP will seek BCRC’s clearance of any proposed revised time schedule.

/S/ Rusdian Lubis
Chair, Compliance Review Panel
29 July 2009

Appendixes

1. Request for Compliance Review (in English)

Request for Performing Compliance Inspection

Dear Secretary:

Greetings! We are farmers permanently living at Qiao Nan of Gao Hu village in Gai Shan county, Cang Shan district, Fu Zhou City, Fu Jian Province. We are farmers with non local resident registry (non local farmer). Wang, Jie Quan and Xu Qi Long are the representatives of our 2 families. We hereby request Asian Development Bank to inspect again the Fu Zhou Environment Improvement project (Loan number: 2176-PRC). Please inspect the actual situation regarding how Government offices comply with the related business policy and procedure. Those business policies and procedure are found in the policies of migrant due to engineering project of ADB, and the Migrant Settlement Plan made by the government which had also been approved by ADB.

Name of the Project: China Fu Zhou City Nan Tai Dao Inner River Improvement Project.

Project Location: Cang Shan District, Fu Zhou City, Fu Jian Province

We believe that during the implementation of this project, the party in charge of implementation and the related department of ADB did not sincerely abide with the business policies and procedures of Asian Development Bank. This is mainly reflected in the unjust compensation for the migrant settlement, and the related monitoring office did not fulfill their responsibilities. The action and behavior of the related departments had severely endangered our normal daily living. It forced our small workshop to stop operation, which ceased the only source of our income. At the same time, the deterioration of the surrounding environment forced us to leave our former house, and we had to migrate to very remote area to continue our lives. Our good living conditions before had already been seriously affected now by this project. On top of all this, in the related report of the government office, they even mentioned to apply forced eviction on our house (Government-comments22April2009). This makes us worry about the real practical meaning of this ADB project which is supposed to improve the living standard of the people in poverty area. Therefore, allow us to give some detailed description here: Wang Jie Quang’s family has 6 members. 2 sons are studying in university right now. Both he and his wife lost their jobs. In the family, there are 2 elder person need to be taken care of. They don’t have any fix and reliable source of financial income, and the life is extremely hard; Xu Qi Long’s family has 6 members. 2 children are studying in university right now. One daughter is disabled. And 2 children are both Hepatitis B carriers. They need to take medications continuously. I myself also have high blood pressure. Before, I do outsourced processing for a living. But now, due to inner river improvement project, outsourced processing work was forced to stop. Our only source of income had been cut, and this could greatly affect the educational stability of my 2 children in university. Because lack of financial resources, children might be forced to stop education. Living condition is very poor. All family members moved here from Ping Yang County of Zhe Jiang Province 15 years ago. The house of former residency had already collapsed due to lack of maintenance. Right now, this is the only house left. According to the current compensation plan of the government, we were ask to buy economic housing, but still have to pay all the difference in price. To us, this would be a burden too heavy that can not be bear. Because in recent market price, economic housing cost 3000 RMB per square meter (First floor cost around 2800 RMB per square meter, and any upper floor would require more cost), to buy a house with 180 square meters area would cost 540 thousands RMB. Subtract the migrant compensation of a little more than 180 thousands RMB, we still have to pay the difference of around 360 thousands RMB. Although this money can be obtained from bank loan, but with the current lowest bank interest, we have to pay a 20 year mortgage at 3000 RMB per month. And since
right now, we are a zero income family, the result is unthinkable. Moreover, we don’t have job now, life is already very difficult, and we will not be able to pay the mortgage. In that case, our house will be confiscated by bank. We would lose everything, and even no where to live.

We wish Asian Development bank could help our problem by the following means:

1. Thoroughly inspect that during the implementation process of this ADB project, what was the reason caused change of location of watercourse; Inspect if the operation of the internal and external monitoring organization had been carried out properly; Inspect if all the people affected are treated equally during the implementation of this project; The project implementation side has no rights to impose forced eviction on us before the negotiation had been concluded. This is a serious violation of the business policies and procedures of ADB.

2. We did already report this unfair treatment imposed upon us due to this project. We reported it to the Beijing office of ADB on May 2008. But on August 2008, the government published a new migrant settlement plan for this project. Why did they amend the contents of migrant settlement plan after we made the complaint? And the amendment is even more unfair to us. We don’t understand what are the reasons behind it.

3. Please urge the project implementation side to strictly follow the Engineering Project Migrant Manual of ADB, and the Migrant Settlement Plan of this project. Please ask them to implement according to the requirement of above documents, and give us reasonable compensation and settlement. For the detailed proposals: First proposal, make the compensation for settlement to be computed by 30 square meters per person, and don’t make us pay the price difference. On top of that, according to the related articles of Migrant Settlement Plan, provide us occupation after the completion of the project. This would help us improve our living standards and also complies with the updated articles of the Migrant Settlement Plan which was published by the government on August 2008. It stated the aim is to at least maintain or improve the living standard compared to the situation before the implementation of the project. Second proposal, implement the resettlement the same way as the compensation plan of Lan Zhou loan project of ADB. This means give resettlement with 30 square meters per person, and no need for us to pay the price difference.

We did report these problems to the staff of ADB and the special coordinator of the project, hoping that these problems can be solved. What happened can be described as follows. From February 11, 2009 to February 13, 2009, representatives from Project Special Coordinator Office came to Fu Zhou to confirm if these complaints already satisfy the standard requirements to initiate discussion under Accountability mechanism. Representatives held numerous meetings with us. These include one group meeting with all of us, and then with 7 complaining individual families one by one. The representatives verified the excluding situation under the Accountability mechanism, checked all the qualification requirements needed in the negotiation stage, and assessed the possibility to resolve the problem through facilitating negotiation. Then at February 12, 2009, Project Special Coordination Office confirmed that this complaint satisfy all requirements for open a negotiation and notified the Complainants, the East Asia Department, and the Fu Zhou Project Management Office. On March 27, 2009, representatives from Project Special Coordinator Office (include coordinator from Hong Kong, China) came to Fu Zhou in order to discuss the issue with us. On the negotiation meeting of March 28, the Project Special Coordinator helped us to negotiate with the government. But government only gave the proposal of a lump sum compensation of 185,640 RMB with a house of 180 square meters as an example, and a quota for purchasing economic housing On April 28, 2009, Project Special Coordinator Office and the staff from East Asia Department called us on the phone, and
discussed this problem. But the compensation plan decided by the government office did not change at all.

The reason why we filed this complaint to the Compliance Inspection Panel is because, in the previous negotiation result, the government shows no sincerity, which is very unacceptable to us. This is mainly showed by the following:

1. The lump sum compensation of 185,640 RMB for the whole family can only afford a 66 square meter economic housing with property rights. And this is the biggest area can be afforded without considering the differences between layers. If consider the differences between layers and the public building shared area, the actual living area is only around 50 square meters. For the 6 family members of our family, each member will have an average living area of less than 10 square meters. The government never considered the poverty group like us who do not have any social insurance. And they never considered helping us pay any insurance, or provide us with fixed occupation to sustain life. They never considered to really improve our standard of living.

2. The government distorted understanding of related concept, and this is the major problem for us to obtain reasonable compensation. During numerous negotiation meetings between the government and us, the government office did mention multiple times that our house is illegal building. But the actual situation is not like what the government office says. To give a short description, the location of our house was a centrally planned area of the village. During the transfer of the residential land area, we paid all related costs to Gao Hu Village. After the transfer process had been approved by the Gao Hu Village, we built our house on 1994, and lived there until now. The building of house has 3 storeys and the total building area is 180 square meters. Our house can be processed with property rights, but we didn’t process it. This point can be proved by showing you that our adjacent neighbors have property rights. And even without property rights, according to the regulations of ADB, the house with property rights and those without property rights shall be treated equally. But the local government did not comply with the ADB business policies and procedures, this cause the government office to treat us differently on the compensation settlement. On top of that, the staffs of East Asia Department of ADB also did not understand well regarding the difficult situation of our family. This causes them to be biased about the situation of our compensation.

Aside from the above information, there are some documents that might help you to understand our situation. Following is a list of documents or reports. At end of each entry, the source is indicated.

1. <Asian Development Bank Loan Project ---- Fu Zhou City Nan Tai Dao Inner River Improvement Project ---- Migrant Settlement Plan> (Published by: http://www.adb.org)

2. <Inner River Improvement Project (Yue Jin River, Long Jin River) Relocation Compensation Settlement Implementation Rules> (Published by: Fu Zhou Land Source Demolition and Relocation Agency)

3. <Asian Development Bank Accountability Mechanisms> (Published by: http://www.compliance.adb.org)

4. <EASS position-21April-2009-CHN > (Published by: East Asia Department of ADB)

5. <Government-comments22April2009 > (Published by: Related government office)
6. < Summary of Current Status-Chinese_21April09 > (Published by: OSPF)

Requested by: Wang Jie Quan and Xu Qi Long
April 28, 2009

Our contact details:
Qu Qi Long: Contact details: +8613991302982 Email: xugilong2009@yahoo.cn
Family Address: no. 71 Gao Hu Village, Gai Shan County, Cang Shan District, Fu Zhou City, Fu Jian Province
Wang Jie Quan: Contact details: 13509384648/059183462702 Email: wangjiequan@yahoo.cn
Family Address: no. 66 Gao Hu Village, Gai Shan County, Cang Shan District, Fu Zhou City, Fu Jian Province
Mailing Address: no. 112 Gao Hu San Zuo, Gai Shan County, Cang Shan District, Fu Zhou City, Fu Jian Province  (Postal code: 350007)
合规检查申请

尊敬的秘书：

您好！我们是常住在福建省福州市仓山区盖山镇高湖村桥南的外地户口（非当地农经户）农民，王接泉和徐其龙是我们这两户家庭的代表。请求合规检查小组帮助我们对亚洲开发银行福州环境改善项目（贷款编号：2176-PRC）在有关亚行制定的工程性移民政策和政府起草公布亚行审批通过的移民安置计划中政府部门遵守有关业务政策和程序的情况进行检查。

该项目名称：中国福州市南台岛内河整治工程。

项目地点：福建省福州市仓山区。

我们认为在项目执行过程中，本项目实施方和亚行有关部门未严格遵守亚洲开发银行有关业务政策和程序，尤其在移民安置补偿不合理和有关监督机构未完全履行职责方面，有关部门的做法和行为，已经严重危害我们的正常生活，造成了我们小作坊被迫停止，唯一生活来源被迫中断，同时由于周围居住环境的恶化导致我们不得不离开原来的居所，到其他偏远地区居住生活，原本良好的生活环境受本项目影响现已极度恶化；更严重的是政府部门在有关的报告中还谈及强制拆迁我们房屋（Government-comments22April2009），令我们十分担心亚行此项目对改善贫困地区人民生活水平所起的真正实际意义，对此我们进行详细描述：王接泉，家中共有6口人，2个儿子上大学，夫妻双双下岗，家中仍有二老需要赡养，无固定经济收入，生活极度贫困；徐其龙，家中共有6口人，2个子女上大学，一个女儿残疾，且2个子女是乙肝携带者，需要不间断地吃药，本人还患有高血压，原本靠来料加工度日，如今因为内河改造，来料加工被迫停止，唯一生活来源被迫中断，这将极大影响两子女上学的稳定性，由于缺少经费子女学业有可能随时被迫中断，生活极度困难，其家庭成员由浙江省平阳县迁来此地居住已经长达15年之久，原居住地房屋因为年久失修早已倒塌，如今仅剩这一住所。如果按照政府现有赔偿方案，让购买经济适用房，还得补差价，那么对我们而言将不堪重负。因为经济适用房就以每平方米3000元来计算（2800元的价格是第一层房子的价格，一层以上还要加价），购买180平方米的房子需要54万元，减去补偿款18万多元，那我还需补差价近36万元。虽然这笔钱可以贷款，但就按银行现在最低利息来计算，贷20年的话我们一个月得
向银行还款近3000元，对我们这种目前零收入家庭而言，可想而知会有怎样的结果。更严重的是我们目前都无工作，生活过的十分艰难，根本无力还款，那么我们房子将被银行收回抵债，结果还是一无所有，流落街头。

我们希望亚洲开发银行能够从以下几个方面着手为我们解决困难：

1、彻底检查亚行本项目在执行过程中，有关部门是出于何种原因要更改河道走向；有关内、外部监督机构工作开展是否到位；本项目在实施过程中是否同等对待所有受影响人；项目实施方有什么权利在协商未果的情况下可以强制拆迁我们房屋，这严重违反亚行有关业务政策和程序。

2、我们于2008年5月向亚行设在中国北京的办事处反映了我们由于本项目受到不公平的对待。然而在2008年8月针对本项目，政府部门却公布了新的移民安置计划。为什么在我们投诉后才去修改移民安置计划内容，且是越改越对我们不公平，我们不明白这其中到底是出于何种原因。

3、督促项目实施方严格按照亚行工程性移民手册和针对本项目的移民安置计划，执行相关内容和要求，对我们进行合理补偿安置。具体方案：第一种方案，以人均30平方米补偿安置，不补差价。另外，根据移民安置计划中相关内容，在项目完成后，为我们提供工作岗位，帮助我们提高生活水平，这符合政府部门2008年8月更新过的移民安置计划内容的最初宗旨——至少维持或改善项目实施前的生活水平。第二种方案，按亚行兰州贷款项目赔偿方案进行。即人均30平方米安置，不补差价。

我们以前曾经向亚行工作人员和项目特别协调人提出过我们所关心的问题，希望能够得到解决。事情的大致经过是：2009年2月11日至13日，项目特别协调人办公室代表团到福州以确定投诉是否达到问责机制下磋商阶段所需条件的标准。代表团与我们举行了几会面，包括我们作为一个团体的第一次会议，之后与七个投诉家庭一一单独面谈。在对了问责机制政策下的各种排除性情况，审核了磋商阶段所需的资质要求，并评估了通过协助谈判来解决问题的可能性之后，在2009年2月12日，项目特别协调人办公室确定了此投诉是符合磋商条件的并通知了投诉人、东亚事务署和福州项目管理部；2009年3月27日，项目特别协调人办公室代表团（包含来自中国香港的调解人）来到福州与我们协商，经过项目特别协调人在3月28日调解会上的努力，政府仅提出了以180平方米的房子为例，总额为185,640元的一揽子补偿价格加上购买经济适用房的指标的赔偿方案。2009年4月28日项目特别
协调人办公室和东亚事务署工作人员与我们通了电话，为我们解释了我们关心的问题，但是政府部门确定的赔偿方案没有任何变化。

我们之所以决定向合规检查小组投诉，是因为以前的协商结果，政府部门太没有诚意，太不能让我们接受，主要表现在：

1、户均总额为185,640元的补偿仅仅能购买到66平方米的有产权的经济适用房，这是在未计楼层间差价的前提下，我们能购买的最大面积，如果考虑楼层间差价及扣除建筑公摊面积，真正实际居住面积仅有50平方米左右，对于我们有6个人口的家庭人均不到10平方米，而且政府从未考虑过为我们的家庭交纳任何保险金或提供固定工作单位以维持生计，更不要提改善我们的生活水平。

2、政府对有关概念歪曲理解，这造成对我们合理赔偿最大的障碍。政府部门在多次和我们协商的过程多次提到我们的房子是非法的，然而实际情况却不是政府部门所提及的那样，简要的说我们所建房屋宅基地是本村村民规划统一项目地块，宅基地在转让的过程中我们向高湖村交纳了相关配套费用，转让过程经过高湖村确认同意后，我们住宅于1994年建造完工并入住至今，楼房为三层，户均总建筑面积180平方米，我们的房屋是属于可办产权但未办产权的房屋，这点有紧挨我们房屋的有产权房子可以提供佐证。就算退一步来说，根据亚行规定，有产权和无产权的房屋应该是同等对待，然而由于当地政府没有遵守亚行业务政策和程序，导致政府部门区别对待我们补偿安置。此外，亚行东亚事务署有关工作人员对我们的现实困难认识不清，导致对我们的赔偿情况有所偏见。

除了上述提及的信息外，还有许多文件或许能够帮助你们了解我们的情况，兹附上文件/报告名录，在文件后注明了文件/报告出处：

1、《亚洲开发银行贷款项目——福州市南台岛内河整治工程——移民安置计划》
（出处：http://www.adb.org）

2、《内河整治工程（跃进河、龙津河）拆迁补偿安置实施细则》
（出处：福州地源拆迁工程处）

3、《亚洲开发银行问责机制》（出处：http://www.compliance.adb.org）

4、《EASS position-21April-2009-CHN》（出处：亚行东亚事务署）
5、《Government-comments22April2009》（出处：政府相关部门）

6、《Summary of Current Status-Chinese_21April09》（出处：OSPF）

申请人：王接泉 徐其龙

2009年4月28日

我们的联系方式：

徐其龙：联系方式：+8613991302982 Email: xuqilong2009@yahoo.cn

家庭住址：福建省福州市仓山区盖山镇高湖村71号

王接泉：联系方式：13509384648/059183462702 Email: wangjiequan@yahoo.cn

家庭住址：福建省福州市仓山区盖山镇高湖村66号

通讯地址：福建省福州市仓山区盖山镇高湖三座112号（邮编：350007）