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Preface

Resettlement projects displace persons from places where ones memories are deeply rooted. No amount of compensation and replacement of one artefact by another can wash away the myriads of valued relations to places and people. However, change is natural, human beings and their social relations are after all parts of nature. The resettlement project in Lalibela is a project which, in the view of those who came to be near the spiritual core of Lalibela, is displacement from their perpetual abode. Such hard feelings have made the study a soul searching one. It needed the participation of many people who believed the conservation of the historic and cultural heritage sites of Lalibela are beneficial not only to them but also to those residents who, deep in their heart, love the churches, the residents of the Core Zone.

For WUB Consult staff this was a very challenging project; but finally to see would-be relocated persons contributing positively to the planning of the new resettlement sites is very encouraging.

First and foremost, I would like to thank the staff of ESTDP in Lalibela as well in Addis Ababa who put unreserved efforts to keep the momentum of the RAP project. I would also like to thank the Lalibela Town administration officials for their contribution in organising public forums. The residents of the Core Zone in Adishade, Chifrgoch, Mikael Ghibi and Gebriel Sefer and farmers in Kurakur area deserve special mention for their trust in our work. I deeply share their concerns, frustrations and uncertainties surrounding resettlement projects. I sincerely hope the new settlement, with its improved layout and services will compensate the loss in proximity to the churches by providing decent and honourable spaces in lieu of the crowded and privacy-less environs of the old Core Zone.

I would also like to thank the professional team of WUB Consult for their dedication to the project ideals and their understanding of the aspiration of the project affected persons while carrying out their professional duties.

August 2011

Wubshet Berhanu (Dr.Ing)
General Manager
WUB Consult
Executive summary

The Government of Ethiopia has identified tourism as one of the key sectors for economic growth. The policy stresses the need to develop the historic and cultural sites in the country so as to make them productive sources of jobs, incomes, and economic growth. To this end, the Ethiopian Sustainable Tourism Development Programme (ESTDP) is conceived in support of this objective. One of the main sites identified for tourism development is the town of Lalibela.

Lalibela Town is renowned for its religious and touristic sites. The main attractions of Lalibela tourist destination emanate from several monolithic rock-hewn churches dating back to the 12th century. The town is considered one of the holy places that pilgrims visit at least once in their life time for most Orthodox Christians in Ethiopia. The traditional Orthodox Church spatial organization demands sites in and around the compound of churches to be clean, free from any worldly/secular activities. Unfortunately, due to unplanned and haphazard urban development, which prevailed until quite recent time, has contributed to the development of residential houses, local bars, and other socially and environmentally incompatible activities within the Core Zone of the World Heritage site.

The encroachment of the incompatible activities has posed an increasingly growing direct threat to the sustainability of the centuries old rock-hewn churches; undermined the spiritual values of the church and made the Core Zone unsightly place due to the unpleasant on-site lack of sanitation. This has been recognised as a threat and resettlement of the residents has been a point of discussion for the last four decades or so, and various scanty resettlement efforts were attempted at various times. However, these previous efforts did not result in a better environment as the measures were not of a sufficient scale, well designed and well resourced to address the complex issue of resettlement.

The only interim solution sought by the Lalibela town administration to halt further expansion of settlement, at least until such a time a full scale resettlement is realized, was the imposition of development moratorium on the residents of the Core Zone. Consequently, property holders in the Core Zone were denied of any property transaction, permission to construct new buildings and even to improve their houses except for minor maintenance. This has caused several inconveniences for residents and property holders in the Core Zone. The residents suffered from the indefinite time frame of resettlement and the impacts of the development moratorium. The frustration from this stalemate has triggered the residents even to come out as far as urging the local administration to resettle them; realizing that resettlement is inevitable. Parallel with the growing public demand, the resettlement issue gained a renewed attention and impetus in the aftermath of the preparation of the first structural plan for Lalibela Town in 1998 and its imposition of a moratorium on a much wider areas than before. The second structure plan (2009-2010) further reinforced the moratorium and identified Core Zone and buffer zone for the historic and cultural sites. In tandem with this, the town administration with the support of the regional government allocated budget and executed the first wave of relocation of 138 households from Mikael Ghibi, which is located at the heart of the historic and cultural sites. It is at this juncture that the ESTDP project was conceived and launched. The coming of the ESTDP further boosted the momentum of the resettlement issue that was already initiated (and on progress) by the regional and local governments.

Owing to the involvement of the World Bank in the financing of the project, the envisaged resettlement and development intervention in the Core Zone of the World Heritage site of Lalibela is to be carried out in compliance with the Bank’s Safeguards policy, specifically Operational Policy 4.12 on Involuntary resettlement. As part of preparation a Resettlement Policy Framework was first prepared to guide the resettlement issues that may arise as a result of the development of the historic and cultural sites. Based on the Resettlement Policy framework, the Ministry of Culture & Tourism has now developed a Resettlement Action plan to ensure that all impacted people are adequately relocated and compensated.

Thus this document, Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) for Lalibela, is a strategy for safeguarding the rights of all persons who have had access to privately owned and/or community resources but will lose their rights as a result of developments that aim to enhance the upkeep of the historic and cultural sites and the promotion of these sites as tourist attraction areas. This Resettlement Action Plan, therefore,
presents the summary of the socio-economic profile of persons affected as a result of the ESTDP project, review of legal frameworks for resettlement project, categories of persons according to entitlement for compensation, audit report on persons relocated, methods of property valuation, modalities for managing allocation of compensation, and other RAP components. This document is an action plan documenting the overall resettlement actions and the sequence of activities for the relocation.

This executive summary of the RAP outlines the salient features of the overall documents of the RAP. It identifies: the major aspects of the resettlement plan including; legal, social, administrative, and financial considerations, specific mitigating activities including their costs and time frame; and identifies implementing agency and mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation. While the GOE policies on expropriation and involuntary resettlement is found to be broadly consistent with the Bank’s policy. Nevertheless, the World Bank policy which provides better benefits to the PAPs is used in the allocation of entitlements.

The RAP includes an audit report and a remedial plan for persons relocated in 2009 from Mikael Ghibbi and the Host community whose land was taken over for resettlement purpose before the official kick-off of the ESTDP. A total of 138 households were relocated from the core zone in this resettlement intervention, out of which 98 households were private homeowners and 40 were tenants of Kebele houses. As this resettlement was conducted before the ESTDP and without RAP, different remedial actions are taken to address the identified gaps. Accordingly, to allow approval of building permit, the required standard of building sizes was reduced from $35m^2$ to $12m^2$; the undue service charges for title deed and building permit will be refunded, three months house rent (Birr 450) will be paid to all property owners so as to compensate the rental fee they incurred due to the demolition of their homes before constructing the new ones in the resettlement site, and rental fee for Kebele house tenants will be reduced taking into account their ability to pay. Besides this, all the impacted communities in the first wave of the resettlement intervention are incorporated in the livelihood and income restoration program. Likewise, the host farmers who were previously displaced are also integrated to benefit from the livelihood and income restoration plan. Moreover, the host community will get the provision of piped water, electricity and access road as these infrastructures are expanding to the farmers homesteads and could be cited as the positive spill over effect of the resettlement activity.

The RAP was prepared by intensively involving different stakeholders including the impacted community. The public consultations conducted with the PAPs, among other things, discussed the need for relocation, eligibility criteria and entitlements, compensation related issues, relocation sites and ways of facilitating relocation, livelihood and income restoration issues, and means of maintaining social networks. The consultations will continue to communicate and involve the impacted community and other stakeholders in the decision making process of the development of the new settlement.

The eligibility criteria and entitlements are established in the RAP. Accordingly, the real property owners are entitled to compensation for loss of property and assets (mostly dwelling houses, fences, business premises, trees and other perennial crops) and a plot of land near equal or bigger in size. About 68 percent of the privately owned houses have plot size of less than $150m^2$; however, all these home owners will receive plot size of $150m^2$. Kebele house tenants are entitled to replacement house or plot of land with $120m^2$ for house construction. Tenants in private houses are entitled to a disturbance allowance at a flat rate of Birr 150 for one month rent. This category of impacted people are very mobile and difficult to trace as obviously there is no a formal rental agreement document between the property owners and tenants. Thus, a cut-off date (August 15, 2010, the date census for ESTDP started) was strictly adhered in dealing with this category of affected persons in order to avoid opportunistic claims. The table below identifies the total number of households displaced and assets to be compensation.
Table 1: Number of structures and households affected by the project in the Core Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Adishade</th>
<th>Chifrgoch</th>
<th>Gebriel sefer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No. of private residential houses</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>48 (+1)</td>
<td>300 (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Non-residential private buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No. of Kebele owned Residential houses</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Non-residential kebele houses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total residential buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Total Non-residential buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No. of Households**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Adishade</th>
<th>Chifrgoch</th>
<th>Gebriel sefer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No. of Owner-occupier households</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tenants renting from private owners</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Total No. of households</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total Kebele tenants</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Adishade</th>
<th>Chifrgoch</th>
<th>Gebriel sefer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of households</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of plots and houses a) Private b) Kebele</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>300 (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All farmers whose land is expropriated for the resettlement purpose are entitled to compensation commensurate with the revenue that can be collected from ten years harvest. In addition, those farmers who have homesteads and/or residences in the resettlement site are entitled to 500m² plot keeping their homes as pivotal point. All project affected persons whose livelihoods are at risk, vulnerable groups and unemployed ones are included in the livelihood and income restoration program.

A mechanism for grievance redressing is designed in the RAP. Potential sources of grievances are identified and mechanisms to deal with them are provided. A Grievance Hearing Committee has been set up to deal with cases arising from being relocated. The committee members are drawn from the impacted community, sector offices of Lalibela Town Administration, the church administration and urban dwellers. Thus, any grievance that may arise in association with the resettlement activity shall be directed to the committee chairperson to the following address:

Ato Desale Ameha  
Chief of the Secretary of the Mayor’s Office  
Located at the new Lalibela Town Administration Building-  
First floor - Office Number: 5  
Cell Phone: + 251-0911780902  
Office Telephone: + 251-0333361140

The overall responsibility for the implementation of the RAP (plot allotment, site development, compensation payment and provision of substitute home for Kebele tenants) rests with the Municipal Service Office (MSO). Taking this into account, the institutional capacity of the MSO is augmented and a Resettlement Coordination Unit comprising of an urban planner/civil engineer and Community Development Expert is established. The implementation of the livelihood and income restoration plan, on the other hand, is primarily financed and run by ESTDP in collaboration with the Micro and Small Enterprises Development Office of Lalibela Town Administration. For the effective implementation of the livelihood and income restoration plan, the ESTDP will recruit a livelihood and income restoration expert to support the Lalibela Site Management Unit.

The RAP will be closely monitored. Hence, internal and external monitoring and evaluations mechanisms are being established. During the RAP implementation, and possibly for some time afterwards, both internal and external monitoring and evaluation tasks will be carried out in order to monitor the progress and ensure that project affected persons are adequately catered for and in any way are left in a position no worse-off than they were prior to their relocation.
The RAP will be implemented according to the implementation schedule that outlines the sequence of activities and possible simultaneity of tasks to be accomplished. This implementation schedule will be presented to the impacted communities in a half day workshop prior to commencement of activities. It is suggested that the land acquisition process has to be conducted first. This is to be followed by ground surveying, site development work and allotment of plots with clear demarcations. Parallel with this, the livelihood and income restoration program shall be initiated. Once plots are allotted through lottery method in accordance to their plot category, the compensation money shall be automatically paid together with the acquisition of title deed and the approval of building permit. Construction of houses shall be carried out while the project affected persons reside in their existing homes and the municipality should support the elderly and other vulnerable persons in building their homes. Once the resettlement site is developed and the homes are constructed, the project affected persons will be relocated to their new settlement site by demolishing their old homes.

The RAP includes the socio-economic situation of households in the Core Zone (Adishade, Chifrgoch and Gebriel Sefer), Mikael Ghibi and the host community in Kurakur area. The census indicated that the number of households living in the three localities (Adishadie, Chifrgoch and Gebriel sefer) is 562 with a total of 2025 household members living in 430 housing units. The survey also revealed that about 59 and 41 percent of the housing units in the three localities were occupied by home owners and tenants, respectively. About 63 percent of the household members claim that they have lived in the Core Zone since birth and still 18 percents indicated that they lived there for more than 10 years. The census also indicated that 80 households comprising of 277 household members are going to be affected among the host community in the land acquisition process, however, only 40 percent of the host people are engaged fully in agricultural activities.

The socio-economic survey revealed that the majority of households in the Core Zone are women-headed, which accounts for 60 percent, and are engaged in informal petty trading activities such as vending local drinks (tella, areki and tei). The overwhelming majority of residents of the Core Zone are Orthodox Christians and entirely belong to the Amhara ethnic group. A quarter of the residents of the Core Zone are below 14 years, those in a working age (15 – 64 years) account for 66 percent and around 9 percent are 65 years and above. The census result also shows that among the total affected persons from the core zone nearly 1,089 persons are found to be economically active, and out of that 72 percent are reported to have engaged in some kind of productive or economic activities. The rest, 28 percent, are jobless or unemployed during the census.

The self reported annual per capita income level of about 75 percent of the impacted households in the Core Zone is less than one dollar per day. Similarly, 53 percent of households that are relocated in 2009 fall in the income category of below one dollar per day. The proportion of households falling under a dollar a day seems relatively low, i.e. 41 percent among the host community. This may be due to the fact that more than half of the households in the subgroup are engaged in both farming and other non-farm activities. Out of the total people in the Core Zone, 164 persons are identified as having some kind of vulnerability. Of which 26 persons are reported as having physical disability and 138 persons are elderly persons. Among the people relocated in 2009, a total of 58 vulnerable persons are identified, of which 52 are elderly persons and 6 are persons with disability. In a similar fashion, 22 vulnerable persons are identified from the host farmers which comprise 20 elderly and 2 disabled persons.

The result of the housing survey indicated that more than 60 percent of the houses are more than 20 years old, 34 percent have private water meter connection in their compound and 32 percent have tap water from shared connection within their compound and the rest 34 percent have tap water outside their compound. Almost 61 percent of the housing units in the Core Zone did not have any kind of toilet at all. This validates the extent of the impact of the residents in littering the open spaces in the Core Zone. Regarding the type of lighting, 88 percent of the houses are electrified and 12 percent use lantern with kerosene. About 42 percent of the housing units have no kitchen of any kind; and 98 percent of the houses did not have any bathing facility.

The method of property and asset valuation is based on survey of quantities of construction, and unit rates provided by the Northern Wollo Zone Industry and Urban Development Office. The unit rates are updated every time to reflect the current price of construction items and labor. Thus, the unit rate
provided by the zone administration was proved to be reasonably reflecting the market value for all
construction components. The monetary compensation is based on the cost replacement method with no
application of depreciation. The categories of assets considered for compensation include buildings for
various uses, fences, septic tank, water tank and trees. In the case of farmers, farmers’ homesteads, farm
land, grazing land, perennial crops and trees were considered.

All the houses and plots in the Core Zone were measured, their specifications and bill of quantities
prepared based on the unit rate provided by the Zone administration. As part of the property valuation
process, the measurement of structures and other assets was verified in two rounds. The first was
carried out under the supervision of the Resettlement Committee by randomly drawing a sample of 10
percent of the homes to be relocated. The second round verification was conducted in a full scale, at
which time the measurements and inventory of assets was verified and signed by property owners under
the inspection of the Resettlement Committee. The estimated cost of compensation for private house
owners in the three Core Zone localities as of January 2011 is about thirty five million Birr (about USD
2,187,850). The compensation for loss of farmland is estimated to be about five million Birr (about USD
312,500).

Restoration of Livelihood for the impacted communities forms a major component of the RAP. The
beneficiaries of the livelihood and income restoration support are those groups and individuals who are
and would be at risk of losing their jobs and income due to relocation, loss of customers, the
unemployed and the vulnerable. Hence, the beneficiaries encompass petty traders, peasant farmers,
unemployed and vulnerable persons. The households who were relocated from Mikael Ghibi and the
host community are also incorporated as integral part of the livelihood and income restoration plan.
Based on the socio-economic situation assessment possible engagement areas of beneficiaries were
identified in consultation with the PAPs, possible businesses sectors were identified based on
assessment of the local economy of Lalibela Town. The tourist attraction potential of the cultural and
historic sites in and around Lalibela was considered in the identification of business sectors for
development. Accordingly, six major industrial/enterprise groups are identified comprising of 54 types
of economic activities where a total of 222 business establishments are proposed to absorb as many as
868 target beneficiaries.

The beneficiaries of livelihood and income restoration support were identified through the socio-
-economic survey and individual discussions with the affected persons. Parameters for the identification
of beneficiaries were developed and applied consistently. The main groups of beneficiaries include:
project affected women; Petty traders, farmers, the unemployed and persons identified as vulnerable are
included as beneficiaries. A total of 868 persons (268 male and 600 female) are identified as direct
target beneficiaries of the livelihood restoration program. In order to materialize this program a total of
about Birr 16 million (about one million USD) is budgeted to establish Micro and Small Enterprises
(MSEs) operations, technical training, as well as seed capital to start businesses.

The RAP also presents the spatial organization of the new neighbourhood of the resettlement areas. It
dealt with site selection criteria, standards for plots, Physical infrastructure and social facilities
provisions, and approaches for the subdivision of blocks into parcels. Two sites were selected in
consultation with the Office of Municipal Services and the persons affected by the resettlement project.
The resettlement sites are located in Kurakur on both sides of the asphalted road leading from
Neakutoleab to the town centre of Lalibela. Private house owners will be allocated plots proportional to
their former plot while tenants in Kebele houses will be allocated the minimum size plot provided by
the Structure Plan of Lalibela or alternatively similar substitute rental kebele homes will be provided. A
total of 713 plots are provided in the two sites; however not more than 450 plots will be required by the
displaced person. The neighbourhood plan presents infrastructure design (water and power supply, road
network, drainage, solid and liquid waste management). Engineering cost estimate for infrastructure
development is also provided.

The impacts of infrastructure developments and that of persons who will not be relocated from the Core
Zone (the church school and the monastery) are presented in detail. The church school and the
monastery are considered part of the living cultural heritage, hence will not be relocated outside the
Core Zone. The assessment indicated that the main impact on the environment by this group is from
solid and liquid waste generated by the residents. Proper mitigation measures are designed to address the possible impacts. The analysis of the new resettlement site indicated that there are no appreciable fauna and flora nor cultural heritage artefacts which require conservation. The would-be relocated and the host community are households of nearly similar culture and the displacement being only about three kilometres, the social impact was found to be minimal.

Finally – the RAP consists of appendices as evidence for the RAP study and documents to assist implementation. This includes the copy of receipts indicating the amount of compensation disbursed to each home owners relocated from Mikael Ghibi; the document demonstrating the measurement and inventory of assets verified and signed by property owners with their respective photographs; the attendance sheets for the different consultative meetings, lists of persons by category of entitlements, and other documents used for the study are presented in this volume. The Bill of Quantities and specifications is presented in a separate soft copy as it contains list of property owners with the amount of compensation and mechanisms for adjusting the amount based on the unit rates at the time of disbursement of compensation.

The implementation of the RAP will commence as soon as the implementation schedule is shared in a workshop with the impacted communities. The full copy of the Resettlement Action Plan is disclosed at the ESTDP Lalibela Site Management Unit located at Geterge Locality in front of Alief Paradise Hotel. For additional information please contact:

Ato Zelalem Fenta Resettlement Specialist
Cell phone: 0911982845
Office Telephone: 0333360998
E-mail: zelalem@estdp.gov.et or zelalem_fenta@yahoo.com
P.O. Box 182 Lalibela
Ethiopia
1. Introduction to ESTDP and the rationale for RAP

1.1 The Ethiopian Sustainable Tourism Development Project

The ESTDP is intended to address poverty and development issues in Ethiopia, using the rich tourism resources as a vehicle for generating tourist expenditure on goods and services provided by Ethiopians. This approach is consistent with the tourism development objectives outlined in the PASDEP and the draft tourism policy of Ethiopia. The Bank is well placed to add value through its national and international experience and association with small scale infrastructure and SME development projects, national cultural heritage protection approaches which support local economic development.

The Ethiopian Sustainable Tourism Development Project (ESTDP) encompasses four main components.

- Component 1: Destination Development
- Component 2: Market Development,
- Component 3: Institutional Development and Capacity Building, and
- Component 4: Implementation Support and Results Monitoring

Component One supports the objective that historic and cultural sites need to become productive sources of jobs, income and economic growth. This will be achieved through the development and implementation of integrated destination development plans (IDDP) for three key destinations in Ethiopia; namely, Lalibela, Axum, and Addis Ababa and environs. The activities will be carried out in two phases: Project development and implementation phases. This study forms part of the implementation phase.

The second component aims to promote strong market presence and goes hand-in-hand with product development activities of Component One. The third component aims to provide technical assistance in various areas of tourism strategy development, policy and planning, marketing and promotion, and other tourism related development activities.

Component Four provides financial management, procurement; result monitoring and evaluation support to the project.

These components are interlinked and need to be carried out as integral parts of the tourism development program. Studies for IDDP were launched in early December 2008 one of the studies being the RPF study. Project agreement was signed between WB and the GOE in 2010. Preparation of a resettlement action plan was demanded by the RPF and this RAP is designed to deal with all issues related resettlement of persons affected by the Lalibela tourist destination site development.

1.2 The rationale for RAP

Lalibela is in the forefront of the historic and cultural sites in Ethiopia that are registered by UNESCO. The historic and cultural sites form the central part of Lalibela Town. Over the centuries since the establishment of the churches, people have settled at various distances from the churches. The current settlement situation in the town has been recognised as detrimental to the physical environment of the historic and cultural heritages and contrary to the belief system that upholds separation of mundane and spiritual activities in close proximity to each other. Therefore, it is necessary to reorganise the use of land in and around the historic and cultural sites to mitigate environmental degradation, to address conflicts of use and to facilitate the creation of a conducive environment for the enjoyment of the historic and cultural sites for
posterity. The delineation of the boundary of the historic and cultural sites has been carried out in close consultation with all stakeholders during the structure plan study in 2009-2010.

Reorganisation of land use requires acquisition of land for purposes other than it was being used for, restricting the enjoyment of rights for some groups with the aim of opening up the sites for tourists or for the development of infrastructures that promote tourism. The tourism development plan and the structure plan of Lalibela Town\(^1\) encompass major interventions in the Core Zone.

This resettlement action plan (RAP) is a strategy to safeguard the rights of all persons who have had access to privately owned and/or community resources but will lose their rights as a result of developments that aim to enhance the upkeep of historic and cultural sites and the promotion of these sites as tourist attraction areas.

For the purpose of clarity, the affected persons were grouped into three major categories in the socio-economic study: 1) households resettled in 2009; 2) households to be resettled from the Core Zone and other ESTDP intervention sites, and 3) the host community.

**1.3 Objectives of the RAP study**

The main objective of the RAP is to provide legally proper, socially acceptable and environmentally sustainable guidance system for the implementation of tourism development projects in Lalibela. The RAP study aims at laying out procedures to be followed in the event land is acquired, or access to a resource is denied, and the affected persons need to be relocated. The RAP is also planned to detail the screening process on how to determine eligible persons for compensation.

The RAP specifically will enable the ESTDP office to:

1. Safeguard the rights of persons affected by new tourism-oriented development projects
2. Resettle affected persons without undermining their livelihood
3. Create for affected persons a neighbourhood that has social facilities and appropriate infrastructure
4. Gain clear site in the Core Zone for planned intervention, and
5. Identify and prepare mitigation plan for the potential environmental impacts of the resettlement activity

**1.4 Scope of the RAP study**

Scope of the study for the RAP could be categorised into five main components according to the objectives of the study.

1) Assessment of the situation of persons affected by the ESTDP in Lalibela (i.e. establishing a baseline data),
2) Preparation of Compensation plan,
3) Preparation of Resettlement plan and
4) Preparation of Livelihood restoration plan, and
5) Producing Environmental Impact assessment and mitigation plan

These five components are presented separately. This RAP report is a framework and a synthesis of the four components. The tasks dealt with in the four components are presented in Table 1.

---

\(^1\) A new structure plan was studied in 2009/2010 for Lalibela. The plan categorized the area around the historic and cultural sites into Core and buffer zones. The Core Zone was designated historic and cultural site where residential function is prohibited.

Prepared by WUB Consult
### Table 1: Components of the RAP preparation project for Lalibela

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol.</th>
<th>Description of tasks</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Resettlement Action Plan</td>
<td>Vol. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A detailed guide for the activities related to the relocation of affected persons. It provides basis for administering compensation, the preparation of the neighbourhood plan, and the livelihood restoration projects.</td>
<td>This RAP report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assessment of the Situation of affected persons</td>
<td>Vol. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collection and analysis of data on socio-economic situation of residents in the Core Zone, households who were relocated in 2009 and the host community where the persons from the Core Zone will be relocated.</td>
<td>Situation analysis report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Property valuation and Preparation of Compensation plan</td>
<td>Vol. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inventory of immovable assets of persons to be relocated, analysis of entitlements, detailed analysis of bill of quantities and specifications of building structures, preparation of valuation report.</td>
<td>Valuation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Preparation of Livelihood restoration plan</td>
<td>Vol. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of economic situation of persons affected by the ESTDP, analysis of local economic development potentials, preparation of projects, categorisation of persons by project type.</td>
<td>Livelihood Restoration plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Preparation of neighbourhood plan</td>
<td>Vol. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setting criteria for site selection, Detailed analysis of relocation site, analysis of planning standards for plots, communal facilities, environmental aspects, and infrastructures.</td>
<td>Local Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment</td>
<td>Vol. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of the impact of the resettlement on the environment and mitigation measures</td>
<td>EIA report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Various annexes</td>
<td>Vol. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The annexes consist of attendance sheets of consultation workshops, lists of PAPs by category, list of entitlements,</td>
<td>Appendices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.5 Methodical approaches of the RAP study

The study was conducted by gathering primary and secondary data from all relevant stakeholders in Lalibela Town. The study involved intensive consultation and interaction with the staff of the ESTDP, Lalibela Site Management Unit (ESTDP-LSMU), different offices of the Lalibela Municipal administration (the Mayor's office, offices of Culture and Tourism, Agriculture office, Municipal Services Department, Kebele 01 and Kebele 02 administration), St. Lalibela Churches administration, would-be displaced persons in different sites: Adishade, Chifrgoch, Bete Gebriel area, persons who were relocated prior to the launch of the ESTDP in Lalibela, and the host community. Furthermore, physical observation of the historic and cultural sites was conducted to clearly understand the physical setting and the extent of displacement needed to safeguard the historic and cultural artefacts and to enhance the environmental condition of tourist attraction sites. Socio-economic situation of the different groups who are affected by the ESTDP is presented separately in Report 3.

The study aimed at understanding the socio-economic condition of the affected persons, their assets/properties, and processes of relocation and responsibilities of the parties involved in the resettlement project. The main data gathering methods used in the study include the following:
a. Questionnaires tailored for the different category of persons to be relocated were administered by a team of carefully selected and trained high school teachers from Lalibela Town and supervised by the RAP project professionals,

b. General discussions with the different category of affected persons were conducted in separate sessions,

c. Focus group discussions with selected members of the affected persons were conducted by the study team,

d. Interviews with staffs of the different stakeholder offices for the ESTDP and selected persons from the affected community were conducted by the study team.

e. Observation and mapping was conducted of the physical structures which form part of the assets/properties of the affected persons. Measuring tapes were used to measure houses and compounds; houses were measured and drawn by a team comprised of an architect a civil engineer/ property valuation expert and construction management expert. The general environmental situation including unique structures (mostly Lasta houses) were photographed by a digital camera.

f. Review of documents was carried out extensively. The documents reviewed dealt with the following issues: laws and regulations on compensation, valuation procedures followed by the Lalibela Municipal administration; unit rates by the North Wollo Zone administration, structure plan of Lalibela, the RPF for the ESTDP triggered relocations, ESTDP’s tourism development plan of Lalibela.

g. The draft documents will be discussed in workshops with stakeholders in Lalibela in the presence of relevant stakeholders. Comments will be incorporated in the final draft of the RAP.

h. Topographic survey of the resettlement site was conducted with a total station to determine the specific location of residences of the host community.

Details of specific methods of data gathering and analysis are presented in the various study reports which form part of this Resettlement Action plan.
1.6 Organisation of the RAP report

This report is organised into sections dealing with the scope of services. Section 1 dealt with introduction to the RAP study, its objectives and methods of the study. Section 2 deals with a summary of the project description which brought about the relocation of persons from the Core Zone of Lalibela. Section 3 deals with resettlement policy where federal and regional legal frameworks that govern and guide resettlement actions such as entitlements, and property valuation methods are reviewed.

Section 4 deals with neighbourhood planning and livelihood restoration projects. The neighbourhood planning project comprises site selection, determination of social and physical infrastructure, standards for plots, and overall planning of the resettlement site. Detailed description of the project and graphical presentation of the neighbourhood is presented in a separate volume. Similarly the main issues for the restoration of income and livelihood are discussed leaving the details for the livelihood and income restoration plan which is presented in a separate volume. The livelihood and income restoration plan is based on the socio-economic situation assessment of the PAPs.

Section 5 deals with a summary of the environmental impact assessment of the resettlement project. The detailed assessment and mitigation measures designed to deal with the impacts is presented in a separate volume.

Finally, Section 6 deals with the RAP schedule, grievance redressing mechanisms, institutional responsibilities; monitoring & evaluation, and RAP audit mechanisms. Annexes that support the issues dealt in the different sections are attached at the end.

2.0 Description of ESTDP Lalibela project

2.1 Projects that triggered the relocation

The ESTDP Lalibela project has many components which are designed to improve the tourist attraction capacity of Lalibela town and its surrounding areas. The projects could be
categorised into those that require land acquisition and others that have softer components which do not require land acquisition. Twenty two projects were identified in the Tourism Heritage Plan of Lalibela\(^2\) (Annex 1). The project that requires relocation of persons and the concern of the RAP for Lalibela is “CS.1 Enhancing and Redevelopment of the UNESCO World Heritage Site”. Some of the projects do not need physical construction, others are implemented within the existing urban setting, and still others are projects outside Lalibela proper.

**CS.1 Enhancing and Redevelopment of the UNESCO World Heritage Site** involves the development of the Core Zone where the churches are located. Currently this site accommodates not only the churches but also residential, administrative and commercial activities. According to the socio-economic and physical survey done for the preparation of the RAP, there are 562 households living and working in the Core Zone. The Core Zone was first demarcated and fenced in 1984. This zone occupies about 25 hectares; out of this area about 40% is occupied by non-church related functions.

Although Lalibela has been a settlement for over eight centuries it was given municipal status only recently in 2007 (2000 EC.). Now it has an elected council and a mayor. Currently Lalibela Town consists of two urban and three rural kebeles or Peasant Administrations (PA). The PAs around Lalibela were brought under the jurisdiction of the town recently. The administrative autonomy and the enlargement of the town’s boundary could facilitate relocation of people and allocation of land.

The first master plan of Lalibela was prepared in 1999. Since the enactment of the master plan in 1999, the municipal administration strictly adheres to its provisions. This has raised several inconveniences for some residents and property holders, specifically for those in the Core Zone and in the buffer zones. Property holders in the Core and in the buffer zones are not allowed to improve their houses except for minor maintenances. They cannot request and get new municipal services (such as electricity, water, and sanitation). An estimated 60% of Lalibela proper was reserved or treated as buffer zone. This has prompted residents to resort to informal developments. Though not formally requested, most residents in the Core Zone and the formerly designated buffer zones have expressed their desire for relocation to proper sites where they can fully develop and utilise their property. The 2009-2010 structure plan study was a response to the need to develop Lalibela Town in general and to respond to the two decade long moratorium on development in the central area of the town in particular.

During the 2009-2010 structural plan study intensive consultations were made with the municipal administration and the residents in the historic and cultural site area. The findings indicated that the residents want conservation of the historic and cultural sites from religious and economic point of view. The boundary of the Core Zone was redefined through consultation and was enlarged from the 1984 size. The boundary and definition of the buffer zone was also modified (Map1). According to the 2010 Structure Plan of the Town and the Tourism Heritage Plan of Lalibela (ESTDP document), the allowable activities are limited to religious functions and those other functions which do not pose environmental degradation to the historic and cultural site.

In the demarcation of the Core Zone care was taken to limit its size and also to maximise allowable functions so that current functions will not be displaced. The consultations with all stakeholders made it clear that the Core Zone has to be dedicated as historic and cultural site only as the rock hewn churches and the different artefacts (subterranean tunnels, the approach

---

\(^2\) The Tourism Heritage Plan for Lalibela is the project document for the ESTDP Lalibela project. The study was done in December 2008.
routes, etc.) have become fragile. The UNESCO initiated and financed construction of shades for the churches was cited as a clear example of the need to curb activities which undermine the longevity of the heritages. The shades were described as scars on the Lalibela landscape and any additional damage has to be controlled. This meant relocation of all residents and operators from the Core Zone and curbing types of developments in the buffer zone.

2.2 Reasons for relocation in Lalibela

Lalibela Town is a religious site worthy of visiting at least once in a life time for most Orthodox Christians in Ethiopia. The traditional church setting demands sites around the compound of churches to be clean, free from worldly activities, such as normal married life, musical performances that incite sexual behaviour, drinking and getting intoxicated, and so on. The increase in the number of residents and tourists has meant the proliferation of traditional drinking houses, musical performances, and possibly brothels. These functions are incompatible with religious functions.

According to the elders of the town and the church administration, during the early days the church compound was demarcated by olive trees. Tradition demands that anyone entering a church compound should dismount from horseback, keep animals out of the compound, take off his/her shoes, and hats. In the earlier periods, this was done at the proper location but as time passed the church compound was encroached to an extent where residential houses came very near and pilgrims had to observe two activities at the same time. This is contrary to the Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahdo Church (EOTC) tradition of church space organisation.

Hence, the activities of the residents within the Core Zone are observed to cause serious cultural and environmental concerns. Some of the houses are even built on archaeological sites. In some parts the trenches that are necessary to drain the site and are also parts of the rock hewn churches are occupied.

Another reason for the need to clear the Core Zone is the improperness of the drainage and sanitation system and the crisscrossing of footpaths. Residents use on-site sanitation; most of it is even open sanitation system. This has made the church compound unclean. The occupation of lands higher than the historic and cultural sites funnels runoff water to the church compound. This is visibly causing erosion and the washing down of rock surfaces. The presence of through accesses within the historic and cultural sites might be a positive aspect, but this is affecting the historic site in two main ways.

- The surface is getting eroded due to continued use. The footpaths have created depressions due to wear and tear and this gives way for surface water to run along the depression causing erosion.
- The footpath is a wide clearing which is vividly visible from the southern part. It has created a visual division between the churches. This site is planned for the development of amphitheatre for religious function and tourism development product

Discussion with residents within the Core Zone indicated that they are subjected to slow eviction as no relocation scheme is in view while the moratorium on development has been in operation for more than two decades. They unanimously support the church compound to be respected in the traditional way and agree to settle in proper locations and to be given due compensations for their property and lost opportunities. The municipality is also developing a system to closely monitor the historical site and ensure that further encroachment does not take place.
2.3 Potential Impacts of the Project

The Core Zone (Refer Map 1) is subdivided into four localities. Adishadie is located in the northern part of the Core Zone on a higher ground relative to the churches, whereas Michael Ghibi is the area within the walled compound of the churches south of Bete Mikael. Chifrgoch is the area in the south-western part of the churches between the Saturday Market and Bete Giorgis, and Gebriel sefer is the area around Bete Gebriel. These areas were identified as part of the Core Zone which is planned for total redevelopment. Therefore, the extent of displacement in these areas is full relocation. Residents of Mikael Ghibi were already resettled in 2009.

The ESTDP-Lalibela project will displace persons living in the Core Zone. The reasons for the displacement are described in Section 2.2 above. The socio-economic profile of people living in the Core Zone and their assets were surveyed in August 2010. These surveys indicated that the number of households living in the three localities (Adishadie, Chifrgoch and Gebriel sefer) is 562 having a total of 2025 household members living in 430 housing units. According to the socio-economic survey of these three localities about 59 percent of the housing units were occupied by structure owners, 42 percent by tenants and 2 percent by non-rent payers. Majority of the residents are employed informally.

Socio-economic survey indicated that the majority of the households in the three localities are female-headed (54 percent); this is unique in that the average for urban areas in ANRS is 38 percent. This also indicates the level of vulnerability of the residents. The majority (63 percent) of the residents have lived in the locality since birth while additional 23 percent have lived in the locality for over ten years. This indicates the social ties to the locality and among the residents. About 94 percent of the households are members of Idir which owns communal property such as tents, chairs, tables, and cooking utensils. During the discussion with the residents, they expressed the need for resettling them near to each other so that their social ties remain unaffected.

Table 1: Number of structures and households affected by the project in the Core Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Adishade</th>
<th>Chifrgoch</th>
<th>Gebriel sefer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No. of private residential houses</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>48 (+1)</td>
<td>300 (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Non-residential private buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No. of Kebele owned Residential houses</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Non-residential kebele houses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total residential buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Total Non-residential buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No. of Owner-occupier households</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tenants renting from private owners</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Total No. of households</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total Kebele tenants</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUMMARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of households</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of plots and houses a) Private b) Kebele</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>300 (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 There are 300 privately owned houses but 301 plots. One plot holder claimed her house was burned down but could not reconstruct it owing to the moratorium on improvements in the Core Zone. However, the claimant has paid property tax up to now. Refer the breakdown of properties and households in Table 1.

4 *Idir* is a mutual benefit association mostly used for funeral management.
The socio-economic situation of residents in Mikael Ghibi who were relocated in 2009 was also studied to identify the salient features of the households for planning livelihood restoration projects and to assess the level of compliance by authorities with rules and regulations regarding relocation. According to the survey of relocated persons from Mikael Ghibi, there were 98 property holders and 40 kebele tenants. The property holders were given plots of land to construct new houses in Kurakur, a locality about 3 km away from the town centre in the Neakuto Leab direction designated as expansion area by the 2010 structure plan. Some owners have constructed their new houses while others have not yet started. The modality of plot allocation was found to have favoured small plot holder persons as the municipality gave property owners larger plots for all who own less than 100m$^2$. Owing to limitations set by law, few persons who had large plots (more than 500m$^2$) did not get equivalent plots to their former holdings. The 40 kebele tenants were provided accommodation near the new bus station (locally known as Menahariya).

The planned relocation site (known as Kurakur) is mainly an open farm land with homesteads here and there. Some of the farm owners live in central Lalibela and in Neakutoleab; which means they will not be displaced but lose part of their means of income and livelihood. Some persons claimed to have bought land for house construction but have no legal title to it. The municipal administration has measured farm plots and paid compensation based on productivity of the farms as set by law. The legal holders of the farmlands have collected the full compensation; hence informal plot purchasers had to deal with the farmers who have sold farm land for them. Land in the jurisdiction of municipal administration cannot be sold nor its function changed without the consent of the municipal administration.

The detailed socio-economic situation analysis of persons affected by the project (such as age category, educational level attained; their employment status, religion, student population, and disability status and results of the discussions with the PAPs and Lalibela Municipal administration) is presented in a separate volume$^5$.

The assets of the project affected persons in the three localities of the Core Zone were surveyed by measuring all housing units. The survey revealed that housing units are composed of main house and ancillary structures for cooking, storing or keeping small ruminants (mostly goats and sheep). All structures owned and lived in by households relocated in 2009 (the residents of Michael Ghibi) were demolished in 2009; so no survey of property was conducted by the current study. The survey of housing units in the other three localities showed that there are 300 private housing units. Property valuation was conducted for all structures declared private. During the property valuation the size and construction type of the housing units was considered seriously. In most cases the housing units are very old and dilapidated owing to the moratorium imposed on the owners not to maintain the houses. No reduction in value due to depreciation was considered in the analysis. The unit rate provided by the Zone administration was used for most components; however, the directive for the unit rate did not cover some aspects of the existing housing units. The unit rate for such components was determined in consultation with the municipal department of Lalibela Town. Detailed analysis of the specifications and bill of quantity of the private housing units and the value of housing units is presented separately$^6$.

---

$^5$ Vol. 2: Socio-economic situation assessment of persons affected by tourism development projects in Lalibela

$^6$ Volume Three: "Property Valuation of Housing Units in the Core Zone of Lalibela"
2.4 Land Acquisition

The Ethiopian land policy and legal framework provides security of tenure to both urban and rural land holders. Land holding has been limited to usufruct since 1975. Rural land can be used for farming and grazing by the holders, it can also be bequeathed to children who will farm the land (Proc. No.31/1975). Absentee landlordism was abolished and land to the tiller was enshrined by the law. Similarly, the nationalisation of urban land and extra houses (Proc.47/1975) provided security of tenure to the owner-dweller while confiscating extra houses and plots. The size of individual land holding was also limited. The situation has been the same since 1975 except some changes in the modality of access to land. Since 1994 land can be accessed through lease from the government.

The modalities through which land acquisition could occur is also regulated. Similar to all nations, the government has eminent domain over land; it can take over land for purposes that serve the interests of the majority of people against payment of appropriate compensation. In all cases, the design of infrastructure or design that triggers change of land use has to consider alternative solutions to avoid or at least to minimise relocation. However, these days it has become near impossible to get land not used for some purpose by individual holders either legally or informally. Therefore, if an area has to be redeveloped it is clear there will be relocation; the issue then becomes whether or not there is need for land use change and if that is agreed upon, then the issue is about proper compensation for the eligible land holders and property owners.

In the case of Lalibela, the relocation is triggered by the need to reclaim the historic and cultural heritage site and restore as well as redevelop it into a site where the heritage is safe, and the environment is conducive for pilgrims and casual visitors. The cause of the relocation has been debated for decades and agreed upon recently through the structure plan. Urban development plans are laws and directives for urban land use and phase of developments within the jurisdiction of municipalities. Lalibela was given a municipal status in 2008 by the inclusion of several traditionally rural kebeles under its jurisdiction. Currently it has five kebels\(^7\), three urban and two rural. Urban laws apply in kebeles; this means even the rural kebele residents are required to get building permit for the improvement and/or building of new structures.

In principle the municipal administration has to conduct inventory of all constructions to ascertain what properties exist under its jurisdiction and who owns it' i.e. establish a cadastre where all properties are registered relative to their location. This is a complex task but something that needs to be done to guide development properly and to curtail informal development as well as to safeguard the rights of eligible property owners. This has not been done by Lalibela municipal administration so far. That is why there is need to conduct inventory of assets of persons to be relocated from the Core Zone.

Therefore, land acquisition became necessary as a result of the collective decision of Lalibela Town residents, the Lalibela Municipal administration, the Lalibela Churches Administration, the regional and federal culture and tourism offices, and UNESCO to restore the cultural and historic site to its former condition and promote tourism for the benefit of all residents of Lalibela Town primarily and for all Ethiopians and the world at large consequently.

---
\(^7\) The urban kebeles are Kebele 01-Central Lalibela proper, Kebele 02-Southern Lalibela proper and the immediate expansion areas; Kebele 03-Neakutoleab township, Kebele 04-\textit{Shumsha}, mainly rural area with the airport; and Kebele 05-\textit{Medage}, a rural area in the northern part of central Lalibela.
Map1: The Core Zone consisting of the historic and cultural sites of Lalibela

2.5 Public Participation and Consultation

2.5.1 Stakeholders for consultation
The stakeholders for the resettlement project are households who are affected by the ESTDP triggered projects, different offices of the municipal administration, governmental offices which are responsible for the provision of facilities. The PAPs could be divided into groups by locality, by year of relocation (those relocated in 2009 and those to be relocated) and relation to the resettlement project. The main categories of stakeholders of the resettlement project are the following:

**Category A: Project affected persons**
(i) Households to be relocated: Adishade, Chifrgoch, and Gebriel Sefer
(ii) Households resettled in 2009: residents of Mikael Ghibi who were relocated at Kurakur (private house owners) and at the new bus station area (kebeel tenants)
(iii) Host community-residents in Kurakur, site selected for resettlement
(iv) Special groups: a) Church schools-which still occupy *lasta houses* in the Core Zone and b) Nuns and hermits-living in the Monastery near Bete Amanuel and Bete Medhanealem

**Category B: Lalibela Town Administration**
(i) The Mayor's office
(ii) Office of Municipal Services
(iii) Office of Culture and Tourism
(iv) Office of Agriculture
(v) Kebele administrations (Kebele 01 and 02)

**Category C: Others**
(i) Church administration
(ii) Electric Power corporation
(iii) Water supply Office
(iv) Telecommunication office
(v) NGOs

---

8 *Lasta house* is a house type typical to Lasta district. It is built of stone walls and thatch roofed. It is usually round and storied, the upper floor is usually approached through external steps.
2.5.2. Socio-economic assessment

2.5.2.1. Population Characteristics of the Three Localities to Be Resettled

2.5.2.1.1. Distribution of Project Affected Persons (PAPs) by Sex and Households

The total number of households within the three localities (Sefer) in the core area, that are yet to be resettled in the second edition of the resettlement program was 560, out of which 359 (63.7%) were in Adishade, 134 (23.8%) from Chifrgoch and 70 (12.5%) from Gebriel Sefer. The detailed list of household heads by tenure status is provided in a separate volume on property valuation.

In terms of population size, the total number of PAPs was 2024 at the time of the Census in mid August 2010 and was estimated to make up over 10 percent of the total population of Lalibela town. In Adishade, the total number was 1219, accounting for more than 60 percent of the total PAP population, 532 (26.3%) in Chifrgoch and 273 (13.5%) in Gebriel Sefer.

On aggregate, it can be observed that the number females far exceeds those of males and consequently the sex ratio was found to be 82, which means that there were 82 males for every 100 females. The corresponding ratio, from the 2007 Population and Housing Census of Ethiopia, for Lalibela Town was about 88, implying that the number of women compared to men was more in these localities than in Lalibela Town as a whole. In Adishade, by far the biggest of the three localities, the sex ratio was even more pronounced and was only 77. Although, in Gebriel Sefer, males were slightly higher, it can be regarded as an outlier.

2.5.2.1.2. Distribution by Broad Age-Group

When the population of the three localities is classified by broad age-groups, children under the age of 14 constituted a little over 25 percent with adults or productive age category comprising more than 66 percent and the elderly age group claiming about 9 percent. Therefore, a low Total Dependency Ratio (a ratio of the young+old age categories to that of the adult age group) of about 51 shows a significant percentage of the population is in the productive age category. With 8.6 percent of the total population, the old age category seems to be slightly higher than is usually expected in Ethiopia.

2.5.2.1.3. Distribution by Religion and Ethnicity

9 See Volume 4 for more details
Analysis of the Census further revealed that all of the affected households/persons in the three localities belong to the Amhara ethnic group and 99.9 percent profess Orthodox Christianity. The dominance of one religion or even ethnic affiliation in urban areas of Ethiopia, to such an extent, is not common. In the case of Lalibela, however, it might not be that strange, given the foundation of the town in the 12th century with the carving of the eleven churches from rock formations and its consequent role as a place of pilgrimage which has continued to this day. In a survey undertaken in February 2009 for the whole Town of Lalibela by WUB Consult, about 96 percent reported to be followers of the Orthodox faith.

2.5.2.1.4. Distribution by Number of Years Continuously Lived in Town

A question about the number of years each member of the household continuously lived in Lalibela Town was asked. Results of the analysis show that 63 percent of the residents of the localities were born in Lalibela Town and no doubt many of them in their respective localities. These three areas are among the earliest settlements in the town. Only 11.6 percent reported to have lived in these areas for less than five years.

2.5.2.1.5. Distribution by Educational Status

The RAP Census also sought information on the educational status or the highest grade completed of all persons, ten years and over who were not attending school at the time of the census.

On aggregate, about 45 percent of the residents of the three localities were illiterate. When educational status was further cross classified by locality, the illiterates in Chifrgoch and in Gebriel Sefer constituted more than 48 and 39 percent respectively. In a similar survey for the town, conducted during the preparation of the Structure Plan, in 2009, the illiteracy rate was found to be only 28 percent. The wide gap is a further indication of a lower welfare level for residents of the three localities when compared to the Town as a whole. More than 62 percent were below the high school level and 3.4 percent had religious/traditional education (in a priest school). Only 1.5 percent had college degrees, many of whom are probably teachers from elsewhere, but living in the Town.

2.5.2.1.6. Students Currently Attending School

In the three localities of Adishade, Chifrgoch and Gebriel Sefer, 728 students were identified as attending schools at the time of the census. There were 157 students at primary first cycle level, 256 at primary second cycle and 204 at secondary level. A total of 34 students did not state their grade level. It is also interesting to note that females outnumber males at all levels of primary and secondary education. It can be assumed that most or perhaps many of the students attending above the grade 12 level were likely to be outside of Lalibela Town. At any rate, it can also be assumed that the resettlement is not likely to affect the attendance of students at higher levels. Any likely impact on attendance of the rest of the student population, arising out of the relocation, would be discussed in a subsequent section.

2.5.2.1.7. Disability Status and Vulnerable Groups

According to a UN definition, and adopted by various Ethiopian censuses, a disabled person is one who, due to physical or mental injuries, cannot fully perform what other healthy persons can do and hence results in a decrease or loss of ability to discharge various social and/or economic functions (OPHCC, 1991). In concordance with that, therefore, information on disability status was sought under seven categories and a total of 33 persons were reported as disabled. As far as aggregate number goes, disability seems to be divided equally between the sexes. However, more women were affected by blindness and sight problems while more men by amputation and mental disorder.
Resettlement is a traumatic and difficult experience to anyone involved; even more so for the already disadvantaged/vulnerable people, including disabled persons. One other dimension of vulnerability is age. Many elderly people, because of reasons like lack of health or loss of income, have difficulties fending for themselves. Their plight is likely to get even worse during the resettlement program. It is, therefore, important to take some measures to mitigate the likely additional hardship befalling them.

In this regard, in addition to the disabled persons identified earlier, elderly people of both sexes, over 65 years of age would need some special assistance. Some 125 persons (46 males and 79 females) older than 65 years of age were identified. Six of those identified as over 65 years were also disabled. Therefore, taking both age and disability into account, 152 vulnerable persons were identified, to be targeted for some additional assistance.

Although in many similar situations, households headed by females or widowed women are regarded as vulnerable groups and therefore candidates for special assistance, in this situation where women-headed households by far outnumber those headed by men, most people would be entitled to benefits meant to help only a fraction of the population. This is because of resource limitations. Under the circumstances therefore, it would seem fair to consider only the disabled and the elderly for the envisaged additional benefits. However, by far most of the households selected for livelihood restoration plan are those headed by women.

2.5.2.1.8. Idir and Equib

These are very important social support and saving organizations formed by the free will of households and are mostly found in urban areas. Idir is a mutual help association of households established primarily for the purpose of helping a member during mournings. Besides comforting the bereaved, the Idir itself provide monetary assistance for the funeral and other expenses. Moreover, it avails articles necessary for the occasion like benches, tents and utensil. Nowadays, some Idirs are even engaged in developmental activities and assist members in times of distress. Equib on the other hand is a form of saving whereby each member of the Equib contributes some fixed amount of money within a specified period, usually a week or a month; after which someone is chosen by a lot. The process continues until every member gets his/her turn. About 59 percent of the households belong to Idir only. However, many people belong to both the Idir and Equib. Taking this into account, therefore, 94 percent of the households in the three localities belonged to at least one Idir and about 38 percent were members of Equib.

From the foregoing, it can be realized that Idir has become such a useful social support mechanism that very few households in urban areas do not belong to at least one. In fact, many belong to more than one. That was why during the various consultation meetings, one of the main issues raised during the discussions was about the Idirs. People were literally pleading to be relocated together, to the same neighbourhood so that they would not be disconnected from their respective Idirs which they jointly belong and own. Most of the Idirs own properties like tents, kitchen utensils, and other articles, in many cases, accumulated over several years. Often, the items are rented for weddings and other ceremonies from which the Idirs augment their income from periodic contributions.
2.5.2.2. Access to Social Services

2.5.2.2.1. Education
At the new resettlement site, there is one new Full Primary School (*Mesqel Kibra Primary*) which started operation in the current academic year. It has adequate capacity to absorb new students. The new school is just a stone’s throw away from the new resettlement site, in fact, much closer than the schools in the settlements to be vacated. A big number of students come from neighbouring settlements of *Work Dingay*, the Bus Station etc. The distance of the High School from the new settlement is not any further either. However, the distance of the Preparatory to the new settlement would be longer, but still much less than the recommended limit of five kilometres. The same can be said of the Technical and Vocational School. Therefore, all said and done, the resettlement is not likely to have a disruptive effect on the education of the children to be resettled. However, a place has been reserved for a KG.

2.5.2.2.2. Health Service
One Hospital, one Health Center and six clinics of different levels were found in the town proper. At present, there is no any health institution in the new resettlement site, except a Mother and Child Health (MCH) clinic which is under construction. Hopefully, this clinic would be completed sooner and provide its badly needed services. Just recently a female health extension worker has been assigned in *Work Dingay*, part of the Town adjacent to the resettlement site. Therefore, in consultation with Health Office of Lalibela Town, a place has been reserved in the Neighbourhood Plan for one Health Post at the site. Until then, people may use the existing Health Post in Neakutoleab for primary health services. For more serious cases, it is inevitable to go to the Health Center or the Hospital. According to the standard, one Health Center is required to serve 25,000 people and another cannot be built at such close proximity. After all, the resettlement site was designated by the Structure Plan as the immediate expansion area of the Town.

2.5.2.2.3. Church Service
All the churches in Lalibela are congregated, more or less, in one area. Moreover, all religious services are provided by these same historical churches that were constructed centuries ago. For a long time now, the church administration has banned the construction of any new worship place, including a church in the vicinity of the Town. The new resettlement site can be considered far from the churches for many people, especially the elderly who frequently visit the church. This has remained a knotty issue in the case of Lalibela. If the Church Administration had not disallowed the construction of worship places in the town and its vicinity, providing worship places in the new settlement area would have gone a long way in addressing the concern of many or perhaps most PAPs.

2.5.2.2.4. The General Market
The general market, which stands once a week, every Saturday, is near the church area. Not only is it in close proximity to the old villages that have been and would be evacuated, but many households had been winning their livelihood from activities related to the market, like petty trading. In this regard, the new resettlement location is too far from the general market to continue their previous activities and this has been considered in the livelihood restoration plan. For other consumers though, it may not be difficult to go once a week because others come to the weekly market from even further away.
2.5.2.3. Distribution of Housing Units by Tenure

A housing unit is usually defined as a separate and independent place of living, either intended for habitation or not, but was occupied as a living quarter by a household at the time of the census. However, in this report a little deviation in the definition was necessary because of the property and asset valuation involved. Therefore some of the housing units rented to households by private owners were regarded as part of the house/property of the owner. In any case, this does not pose much problem in analysis. In accordance with the definition adopted in the foregoing, the total number of (residential) housing units in the three localities of Adishade, Chidrgoch and Gebriel Sefer was found to be 429 within which 562 households live. This is because some of the housing units either had more than one structure or more rooms which were rented to other households as a source of additional income to structure owners. In effect, therefore, the number of dwelling structures was higher than indicated. Over 51 percent of the housing units were occupied by owner households, 30.5 percent are rented from Kebeles and 18.1 percent rented from private owners. According to earlier studies during the preparation of the Structure Plan for Lalibela, most of the houses in these localities were reported to be in bad conditions as a result of mainly two reinforcing factors. The primary reason was that they were old and the second reason being that for a long time, renovation and maintenance had been prohibited because of the impending relocation. A related analysis also revealed that female-headed households constituted 54 percent of all the households while male-headed households comprise the balance of 46 percent. According to the 2007 national census, in urban areas of the Amhara Region, for example, female-headed households made up just 38 percent. In a patriarchal society like the northern part of Ethiopia, the dominance of female-headed households in the three localities is another indication of the vulnerability of these families.

2.5.2.3.2. Purpose and Age of Housing Units

68.3 percent of the housing units were used for residence only while 31.7 percent were used for both residential and commercial purposes at the time of the census. When we look at the age of More than 86 percent of the houses were older than 20 years. In an earlier survey for the whole town of Lalibela, the corresponding figure was only 36 percent showing that these three localities were among the oldest settlements.

2.5.2.3.3. Source of Drinking Water

Households living in 34.4 percent of the housing units got their drinking water from outside the compound they live in, which means from water vendors. Under such condition water is not easily accessible at least for two reasons-first, it is more expensive and also one has to travel longer distances which is additional hardship to women and children. No household, however, reported protected or unprotected well as a source of drinking water.

2.5.2.3.4. Type of Lighting

Eighty-eight percent of the housing units have electric line installed in them. However, households in a significant percentage of about 10 percent (9.8%) of the houses still use kerosene lamps which are dangerous to health, not to mention of the fire hazard.

2.5.2.3.5. Toilet, Kitchen and Bathing Facilities

More than 61 percent of the housing units did not have any kind of toilet. Only one housing unit had a flush toilet. In an earlier sample survey for the whole town in 2009, the corresponding figure was 53.4. About 42 percent of the housing units had no kitchen of any kind which is also much higher than for the town average which was found to be 27.2 percent.
in an earlier survey. If we exclude many of those who reported improvised plastic structures as private kitchens, the number would go up even further. Almost all or 97.6 percent of the houses did not have any bathing facility. Only one housing unit was reported to have a bathtub. In general, the housing conditions in the three localities were extremely bad, worse than the state of housing in the Town, which in itself was very low.

2.5.2.3.6. Availability of Consumer Durables

Only 16.3 percent of the housing units had fixed telephone lines and only 22.4 percent had TV sets.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it can be said that the deplorable housing situations and the low level of distribution of consumer durables together with the low level of social and economic conditions are clear indications of the low level of welfare and a broader marginalization of the population in the three localities.

2.5.2.4. Population Characteristics of Persons Relocated in 2009

Persons affected by the first round settlement in 2009 were living in what is called Mikael Ghibi, located within the Church compound. They were of two types; structure owners and tenants.

According to the RAP census, the number of owner households removed from the Church compound, was 96. At the time of the Census, however, it was difficult to trace each of the owner households as they had already been displaced from their earlier settlement. Some had already started settling at the new site, some were still at different stages of construction. Therefore, messages were sent to structure owners, through the Kebeles, to assemble at the new site for a consultative meeting. After the meeting had been over, a census questionnaire was filled for each of the 96 households.

On the other hand, 40 tenant households, who were living in rented houses, from the same area, were relocated to an area near the new bus station. They were accommodated in forty (4 meters by 6 meters) uniform housing units, built by some humanitarian organization. Each household was required to pay a rent of 10 Birr. There was no problem of locating these tenant households as all of them had been living in the same neighbourhood. Hence information regarding them was promptly obtained, both from the questionnaires filled about each household and its members as well as from the consultations held with them.

2.5.2.4.1. Distribution by Sex and Tenure Status

The total number of people affected in 2009 was 612 out of which 478 (78.1 percent) were members of owner households while 134 (constituting 21.9 percent) were that of tenant households. It may be observed that females far outnumber males and consequently the overall Sex Ratio was found to be 75; which means that there were 75 males for every 100 females. The Ratio for the tenant households was, in fact, only 61. This is much lower than for Lalibela Town as a whole, which according to the Population and Housing Census of 2007 was 88, which in itself is low. Another striking feature of the 2009 PAPs was the extent of dominance of female-headed households, which was even more pronounced than we had already seen for the population that would be affected in the second round.

When both owners and tenant of 2009 PAPs are taken together, about 60 percent of the households were female-headed. For the tenants only, the corresponding figure was more than 85 percent. As pointed out earlier, according to the 2007 national census, in urban areas of the Amhara Region, female-headed households made up just 38 percent. In a male dominated
society, this is incredibly high. Moreover, the average household size for the tenant households was found to be 3.3 while for the owners it was 5.3.

**2.5.2.4.2. Distribution by Educational Status**

In the Census instrument, a question about the educational status or the highest grade completed was asked from each person 10 years and over who was not attending school at the time of the survey. Over 41 percent of the 2009 PAPs could not read or write (illiterates) and over 6 percent had a religious education. Moreover, about 10 percent had a primary level and about 26 percent had reached a broad category of secondary education.

**2.5.2.4.3. Distribution by Broad Age-Group**

When the population was categorized into broad age groups, it can be observed that the preponderant majority was adult population in the productive age bracket. Children under the age of 14 comprised about 22 percent and the elderly a little over 10 percent.

**2.5.2.4.4. Disability and vulnerability**

In accordance with the definition of disability adopted earlier, eight disabled persons were identified from the 2009 PAPs; one blind, two deaf, one whose leg was amputated, three retarded, one blind and one with mental disorder. In terms of gender, five are females and three males. Except one, who reported as having basic education, the rest were illiterate.

Age can be regarded as one dimension of vulnerability. Often, the elderly, especially those without support and care from immediate family members, are likely to face difficulties. During relocation, the plight of the elderly would likely be exacerbated. This makes them candidates for special assistance. Some 54 persons, more than 65 years of age, were identified, of whom only nine were males. All of them reported their educational status as illiterate and two were reported as disabled.

It is often the case that households headed by women are usually identified as vulnerable. However, among the displaced 40 tenant households, only six (14.6 percent) were male-headed while the rest 34 (85.4 percent) were headed by females. If all women households were to be entitled for special assistance, this poses the danger that it would be beyond the limited budget slotted for the support of only a fraction of the PAPs. Therefore, eight disabled persons and 52 elderly or a total of 60 people were identified for special assistance. However, by far most of the households selected for livelihood restoration plan were those headed by women.

**2.5.2.5. The Host Community**

The host community at Kurakur is not a big community, as might be expected. The number of farming households who actually live in the village were 75. On the other hand, a total of 42 households, in two separate places, were required to cede their plots for the resettlement. Another 8 households might similarly be affected. Many of the other farmers who accepted the compensations were regular dwellers of the town proper and they were not living, but had plots at the settlement site. They number 35. Both the first and second round PAPs have been and would be relocated to the same community of small number of farmer that would inevitably be inundated by the settlers.

Although it is still a farmland, the site at Kurakur is not far from the Town. According to the recently prepared Structural Plan, it was, in fact, designated for the immediate expansion area. It is also located in between the Lalibela Town and another satellite town, Neakuto Leab, which is also part of the Lalibela Town administration.
A consultation meeting, with household heads of the host community, was arranged through village elders. The meeting took place at a hilly open area, near the village and the salient features of the meeting are dealt with elsewhere in this report. Many of the farmers at Kurakur expressed their displeasure about the amount of compensation paid to them and the way it was computed, which they believed was not uniform. Moreover, some claimed that the Municipality prevented them from building additional houses with the compensation money in the remaining plots. To redress for what happened, they asked to be given additional plots along commercial areas where they and their children could engage in petty trade and sustain their livelihood.

The census questionnaire was filled for all the affected farming households in the village. As can be expected in a rural farming community, the sex ratio which was 98, is balanced. Moreover, analysis also revealed that 75 percent of the households were headed by males and female-headed households constituted only 25 percent. This is in keeping with rural character of the settlement and is in sharp contrast to what we saw for the earlier two communities, where female-headed households dominated.

2.5.2.5. 1. Host Community PAPs by Broad Age Group

When the affected community of farmers was categorized by broad age groups, about 65 percent belonged to the adult or productive age group and 31 percent were children, below the age of 14 years. Old people above the age of 65 years constituted only 3.6 percent.

Furthermore, when asked about the number of years continuously lived in the locality by each member of the household, out of those who responded, about 96 percent stated that they lived in the area since they were born. Eight persons were reported to be older than 65 years of age and two persons were also reported to be disabled (one leg amputated and another with a sight problem). The personal details of the individuals in question are available for any special assistance.

2.5.2.6. The Monastery and Church Schools

There is one monastery within the church compound and is called Bete Amanuel Women’s Monastery. It mainly consists of eleven caves hewn from rocks, just like the churches. Some 16 nuns dwell in these caves mainly living off proceeds from activities like weaving, embroidery, handicrafts, traditional paintings etc.

Although the place is called a women’s monastery, seven monks also live in the compound, but in a separately built huts. Only three of them were active, engaged in traditional painting, weaving and the like. One of the four conducts prayers and the rest three were frail and were cared for by the younger nuns. In the Ethiopian Orthodox Church (EOC), only men conduct most of the religious services including daily prayers. That is why monks live in monasteries for women. Two of the huts were owned by monks and the third was owned by a nun.

Apart from the Amanuel Monastery, other five monks called Bahtawians (means those who dedicated their lives only to praying for humanity) lived in dilapidated huts on another part of the compound, near the Bete Medhanialem Church. There was a plan to relocate the five monks.

On the other hand, according to information obtained from church officials, there were about 500 children receiving religious education scattered in small groups in the built-up area of the Town. The children came from the surrounding areas and education was given in the compound of the residence of each instructor called Merigeta. The instructions mainly consist of rote learning by repeating after the instructor and were given during the day as well as...
mainly during the night. After a compulsory course on Zema, which is a form of hymn, all other religious courses are elective.

This is the kind of process most of the clergy in the EOC went through. The system consists of a series of modules like Digua, Kine, Akuakuam, Kidase, Zimare and lessons in New and Old Testaments.

However, since recent times, problems have been cropping up regarding the religious education. There has been growing complaints from some residents in town about the loud chanting from the children during the night. In addition, partly because of their sheer size, the students are facing difficulties in obtaining food from the public. The traditional practice was that since students came from far off places, they were required to get their food from the public which was regarded as a religious duty and hence willingly provided.

Currently nine of the vacated Lasta huts, within the church compound, are used for religious instructions during the day time only.

The church administration as well as the clergy was in favour of keeping both the monastery and church schools within the church compound as they were considered part of the heritage.

2.5.2.7. Economic characteristics of PAPs

2.5.2.7.1. Economic Characteristics of People to be Relocated

This section presents and discusses the census result pertaining to economic characteristics of people to be relocated in terms of working status, occupational and income profiles aggregately for the whole affected people to be relocated from the core zone and dis-aggregately across the three affected localities: Adishade, Chiferigoch and Gebriel Sefer. Further a gender based analysis is carried out to examine the patterns and proportion of men and women in terms of the stated economic variables.

2.5.2.7.1.1. Working status of People to be relocated

The census result shows that among the total population of people to be relocated from the core zone (Adishade, Chiferigoch and Gebriel Sefer) nearly 1089 persons are found to be economically active, and out of that 784 persons (72 %) are reported to have engaged in some kind of productive or economic activities. The rest, 28 %, are jobless or unemployed during the census. Thus, the average rate of unemployment in the core zone is nearly 28 % that is lower than the average rate of unemployment of people relocated in 2009 from the Michel Gibi (which is about 34 %) but much higher compared with the average unemployment rate of the town (Lalibela) in general and the average urban unemployment rate of the country, which were 11 % in 2008 and 17.6 % in 2007 respectively.

On the other hand, the level of unemployment rate shows small variations across the localities that Gebriel Sefer is relatively constitute the largest percent of unemployment rate (34 %) although Adishade is with large number of unemployed persons (61%) as it also composes 60 % of the economic active population of the people to be relocated.

Looking at the working status across the gender revealed that largest number of unemployed females is observed than the male counterparts, and this proportion is relatively higher in

\[10\] Master Plan Revision study undertaken by WUB CONSULT (2008) indicates the unemployment rate for Lalibela town was about 11 % in the 2008

\[11\] Census of Central Statistical Authority, 2007, indicates that the urban average unemployment rate of the country is around 17.6 % in 2007
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Adishade locality where 70% of the unemployed are women. In general it shows that unemployment is one of the pressing socio-economic problems of the people to be relocated from the core than particularly for the affected women. In general the situation of the working status indicates that livelihood enhancement intervention measures should consider the jobless persons as to bring sustainable community development of people to be relocated.

2.5.2.7. 1.2. **Occupational Profile of People to be relocated from the core zone**

Data on occupational profile intended to indicate, in addition to, the extent to which project affected people are engaged in different economic activities, how many of affected persons would lose their source of income and job as a result of relocation and should be a base for the livelihood restoration and mitigation plan. Thus, data on occupational trend was collected for persons who have reported to have been engaged in some productive activities or employed, in both formal and informal sectors.

Information on the occupational profile was mainly categorized as civil servant, petty trading (includes making local beverages, informal local trading (Gullit), small Kiosks, etc), labourer, handcrafting, holding formal business activities (which includes Kiosks, readymade cloth shops, Hotels, Bars, Restaurants, Pensions, small catering services, cafes, Tej houses, souvenir shops, beauty salons, home economic products, grain, butter and honey trade, and other trading activities), etc. The occupation classification, with intent, was tailored to be synchronized with the prevailing main economic activities of the local economy.

The census result shows, out of the total employed persons among the people to be relocated, 20% are labourers, and government employment and petty trading absorb equally 18% and near to 13% are engaged in farming and as some as 10% of the people engaged in formal business activities either as self employed in their owned business or family businesses.

Apart from stated economic activities, as much as 19% of the people also reported that they are involved in other unstated economic activities which mainly encompass seasonal and temporarily private and government employed Priesthood, Deaconates, Tourist Guides, employed in family businesses, etc. There are slight variations of occupational trends across the localities. Larger proportion of persons in Adishade reported to be labourers, while petty trading is the leading activities in Chifergoch, and government employment is the main employment absorbing sector around Gebriel Sefer.

From gender point of view, a significant occupational disparity is observed. In all of the localities almost all petty trading activities and larger proportion of formal commercial/business activities are owned and operated by females. While the male counterpart holds the largest proportion of government employment and casual works. To conclude, the data on occupational profile above reflects that activities like petty trading and formal commercial activities would be interrupted due to relocation and should cause lose of job and income for those whose livelihood is dependent on these activities. Hence livelihood restoration and enhancement interventions should mitigate the expected relocation negative impacts.

2.5.2.7. 1.3. **Distribution of Households by Income Level of People to be relocated**

The annual income level of the project affected households was also examined based on the information on household’s monthly income estimates obtained from the census. The income profile assessment basis on broad income categories is supposed to be provides supportive information about the economic status and livelihood situation of the project affected community.

Unlike working status and occupational profile, the data and analysis on income profile of project affected people are limited to household levels. In other words the assessment does not
include all family members. The income profile was also examined across the three affected localities of people to be relocated in addition to the group as a whole. The analysis revealed that the average income level in the group is worse off since nearly two-thirds of households are earning below one dollar per day.

The distribution of households by income categories exhibited significant variations across the localities. Households in Adishade are relatively worse off since it consists larger proportion (78%) of households who earn below one dollar per day. Whereas households around Gebriel Sefer found to be relatively better off since only near to half of the households fall below the income poverty line or threshold.

Generally, low level of income along with significant number of jobless persons and engagement in informal employment that is unreliable income source and that would be disrupted during relocation magnify the degree of poverty among the people to be relocated.

2.5.2.7.1.4. Vulnerable Groups

As discussed in the demographic characteristics of the project affected people, persons with disability and elderly persons who aged 65 years above are identified as vulnerable groups. Thus, among the persons to be relocated a total of 164 persons identified as vulnerable. Of which 26 persons are reported as having disability and 138 persons are elderly persons. Across the localities 98 persons are from Adishade, 36 are from Chiferigoch and 30 are from Gebriel Sefer.

Vulnerable persons were asked whether they are engaged in some economic activities or not and also examined the occupational patterns if employed. The observation shows that some of the elderly persons are mainly engaged in agricultural activities, petty trading and labourer. Hence, most of the vulnerable persons are at risk to be more exposed for destitute situations due to relocation since most of them earning their lives from farming and petty trading as many of them are females, in addition to being vulnerable they are supposed to be incapable of engaging in productive activities due to their age and disability. On the other hand, the assessment also suggests that there is a possibility of involving few of the vulnerable persons in productive activities based on their preferences after providing trainings and other business development services.

2.5.2.7.1.5. Concluding Remarks

The following points should be drawn as concluding remarks from the situational analysis of economic characteristics of people to be relocated:

- Unemployment is the pressing problem of people to be relocated and women constitute the largest proportion of unemployed group.
- Most employed women are engaged in petty trading activities that made the sub sector the main source of livelihoods for the majority of affected female households. The sector is thus the most exposed due to lose of customers as result of displacement.
- The farming community also faces complete lose of livelihood due to the takeover of farmland for resettlement.
- Near to three-fourth of project affected households are found to be below the standard poverty threshold level or income poverty line.
- There are significant number of elderly persons and persons with disability who will be at risk due to relocation and in need of special supports.
In general, the economy of the affected communities are characterized by high incidence of poverty reflected by the prevalence of high rate of unemployment, dominancy of informal sector engagement, lower level of income and large number of vulnerable persons; that all entail the need of intervention to mitigate and enhance the livelihood of the project affected persons and the communities in general parallel with, and separate from, any property related compensations and displacement (disturbance) allowances.

2.5.3. The consultation process

The study method adopted for the preparation of the RAP has placed special emphasis on participation of stakeholders in identifying key areas of concern and possible solutions to the problems. The public forums for consultation were divided mainly into two: discussions with project affected persons in public forums (Category A stakeholders) and the municipal administration (Category B stakeholders). Category C stakeholders were consulted in their offices.

Discussions were conducted with staffs of the Mayor’s office, the Office of Municipal Services (the Town Manager and the head of Land Administration), Office of Culture and Tourism, and the Office of Agriculture. These offices are sources of information, responsible to coordinate the consultation process with all other stakeholders, and later on to implement the resettlement project. The municipal administration has expressed its commitment to implementing the resettlement project but had various constraints. More specifically, the OMS has capacity limitations to implement the resettlement project.

As there is neither focal institution nor a focal person for the resettlement project, it was difficult to coordinate the participation of PAPs, and different municipal administration offices. The ESTDP-LSMU office, especially the resettlement specialist, was seen to be responsible for all coordination but has no power over the different offices. Although the Office of Culture and Tourism was initially designated as the focal institution responsible to coordinate all resettlement related activities, however, it did not work out well. At later stage the Office of Municipal Services and the kebele administrations became the proper offices responsible for coordinating all offices.

The discussion with the municipal administration focussed on project components, determination of boundaries of the project, ways to facilitate discussions with the project affected households, and policy and legal frameworks for relocation related issues. The mayor (sometimes his representative) chaired such discussions. As the issues related to the demarcation of the Core Zone were discussed several times during the preparation of the structure plan and agreed upon by all stakeholders, the boundary was communicated to the consultant as a decision not as a point of discussion. The consultant is well aware of the discussions for the demarcation of the Core Zone; hence further discussion was not conducted on boundaries of the Core Zone and the allowable functions within it.

Further detailed discussions were made with the Office of Municipal Services, a core institution entrusted to handle entitlements, valuation of properties, land administration, and administering the payment of compensation. Discussions were made on methods used in property valuation, directives for compensation of land for private real property owners.

---

12 WUB Consult was commissioned to prepare the structure plan of Lalibela (2009/2010). One of the key issues in the preparation of the structure plan was the demarcation of the Core Zone. Several discussions were held with the community (separate sessions for residents within the historic and cultural sites and for all town residents), regional and federal level stakeholders and with UNESCO. The structure plan is a law by now; hence land uses have to be regulated according to its provisions.

Prepared by WUB Consult
procedures for locating individual plots during allocation. The processes and procedures used for the relocation of households from Mikael Ghibi in 2009 were also discussed.

In consultation with the municipal administration, a programme for public consultation was drawn and the information was communicated through the Kebele administration offices. The kebele administrators and/or their representatives (Kebele 01 and 02) together with a representative of the Office of Municipal Services were present during the discussions with the projected affected households. Their presence has had important relevance to facilitate attendance and to transmit the concerns of project affected households to the town administration directly.

The PAPs were grouped separately into locality to attain focus for the discussion. Attendance was registered as participants came to the meeting hall. The hall at Kebele 02 administration was used for all the meetings during the August 2010 consultation while the large municipal hall was used during Workshop 1 held in October 2010 and Workshop 2 in February 2011. The municipal administration has established a system where community representatives are elected to represent them on discussions and to transmit information back to the community. Such representatives were instrumental for disseminating information to the community to attend the meetings as well to communicate the concerns of the PAPs to the town administration, ESTDP-LMSU and to the consultant.

The discussions with the PAPs focussed on why relocation is necessary, compensation related issues, relocation sites and ways of facilitating relocation, livelihood restoration issues, and means of maintaining social networks. Some participants have raised questions if there were ways to minimise relocation; however, as the boundary of the Core Zone was decided in consultation with the public (which included representatives from different parts of Lalibela), the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, and UNESCO, the issue of boundary was not open for discussion at this stage. The allowable functions within the Core Zone did not include residences; hence residents in the Core Zone had to be relocated elsewhere. The main findings of the discussions with the different stakeholders are presented in detail in Volume Two of the RAP report.

The church administration, offices of service delivering institutions, such as telecommunication, water supply and electric power supply were visited to collect relevant information related to their offices. The Lalibela Churches Administration is excited about the planned rehabilitation of the historic and cultural site. The administration has expressed its desire to repossess the religious sites but the municipal administration and all tiers of the culture and tourism offices have unequivocally communicated to the administration that the historic and cultural site is not a church property; it is not even the sole property of the Ethiopian people alone as the GoE has accepted registration of Lalibela Rock Hewn Churches and its sites by UNESCO. Households who had to be relocated were concerned that their property will be reallocated to others; but this concern was solved when they saw the commitment of the municipal administration clearing Mikael Ghibi of the Core Zone.

The offices of water supply and electric power supply were consulted on their planned service delivery to the new relocation site. They operate on request basis; they confirmed that the LMA has requested supply of infrastructure and they have earmarked Kurakur expansion area as a priority project area.

---

13 Municipal administration refers to government tier similar to district which is responsible for all administrative issues of towns designated municipality by the regional state. Lalibela Town was designated as municipality in 2008. Kebele administration is the lowest tier of government.
2.5.3 Mechanisms for continuing consultation

The kebele administration is a key institution for ensuring public participation. The mechanism which is in place to reach the community is also commendable. Kebeles are divided into zones and the community within the zone elects a representative. This system could be made more useful by allowing the community to elect or disown its representative when they do not feel the representation was not proper. Furthermore, it would be good practice if female representatives are included too. Community representatives were elected during Workshop 14 which was held from 24-28 October 2010. List of representatives for the different localities is annexed (Annex 2A).

The lack of assembly hall is evident when many people congregate for public discussion. It may be advisable to reduce the number of participants to suit hall sizes; i.e. currently to about 150 persons at a time. The other issue is the need to adhering to scheduled times; hours are spent waiting for participants. It is possible to influence attendance and timeliness if the number of participants for a meeting is limited. The election of representatives will solve this problem.

It is necessary to discuss and agree on the interval for consultation with the relocated households. Intervals can be time-lined based on critical stages of the relocation and development of the new resettlement area. It may also be on normal calendar basis, say every quarter. The consultation has to be at shorter intervals (proposed every month) at the early stages of the resettlement project while consultations may be conducted at longer intervals at later stages (proposed every three months).

2.5.4 Main results of the discussions with PAPs

The main categories of project affected persons are the ones relocated in 2009; those to be relocated from the Core Zone and the host community. The main issues raised by these groups are presented below. Mechanisms for redressing issues are dealt with in the relevant sections of the RAP.

Category 1: Persons relocated in 2009 from Mikael Ghibi

The persons relocated from Mikael Ghibi were consulted about the process of property valuation, new resettlement planning; and support during relocation. It was difficult to get all PAPs from Mikael Ghibi as the majority of property owners had not resettled in the new neighbourhood. However, the majority have attended the different discussions. The critical points raised during the different meetings include the following:

1. The relocated persons complained that eviction was unnecessarily hustled without the provision of any infrastructure, including running water and electric power, in the new resettlement area.
2. Plot area allocated now and the holding in the previous locality are not proportional.
3. Kebele house tenants seem reasonably satisfied about their new accommodation; its location is central (near bus station), reasonably near the center. However, some complained the size of the houses is small compared to their household size and the rent is very high.
4. The procedure which prohibited relocated persons from getting building permit and payment for building permit was a point of complaint by the majority of relocated property owners.
5. No actions were taken to restore their livelihood after they were relocated. They reported that many of them were involved in petty trade in their former location.

---

14 It was conducted from 24-27 October 2010 in Lalibela. All households in the different localities were invited for a hearing separately on the results of the socio-economic assessment, the planned livelihood restoration projects, the first draft of the new resettlement area, and the different entitlements.
6. The new settlement area for persons relocated from Mikael Ghibi has no open space for important communal functions.

7. The promise made by the Municipality to cover the cost of the installation of piped water for tukul (traditional Lasta houses) owners that are not demolished was not honoured.

Explanations were given for issues which were unclear; furthermore, issues which need to be addressed were identified and agreed upon. The audit report and remedial measures for persons relocated from Mikael Ghibi is presented in Section 4.2.

Category 2: Persons to be relocated from the Core Zone

The residents of Adishade, Chifrgoch and Geberiel sefer raised several issues regarding the relocation. The most important issues were the following.

1. The PAPs are aware that the area will be vacated but complained that the process took more than two decades. They complained that they are prohibited from improving their property. “We want the relocation to happen sooner than later as we are losing out opportunities” complained the PAPs.

2. Nearly all residents are members of Idir and other social ties, it is necessary to resettle in the same locality.

3. In the Core Zone there is no open space for children; they wanted communal open space in the new resettlement area.

4. Based on the experience from previous payments, complained that compensation being paid is too small to build a standard house that the municipality itself prescribes.

5. Basic infrastructure should be in place before relocation.

6. There are cases where plots had to be shared by inheritors of property; why not give separate plots?

7. The case of people who have inherited property and those who have bought houses but have not received title deeds in their names should be considered seriously.

8. Compensation should include money for transporting goods and salvaged materials.

9. The moratorium on improving properties for over two decades has affected all; hence the current property valuation should not be about just the existing structures but also compensation for lost times and opportunities.

10. It is advisable to resettle kebele tenants in the same place, if possible together with the property owners so that the social ties continue.

11. It is necessary to consider the current means of livelihood in the allocation of plots (for example, road side plot for those who have shops).

12. The time of valuation of properties and the payment of compensation had to be similar; or value of properties should the value at the time of payment.

Issues raised due to misunderstanding of the legal frameworks were explained. The property valuation will consider properties that exist but not lost opportunities due to the moratorium on building/modifications. Properties that are considered one based on legal documents cannot entitle more plots based on number of inheritors. All other concerns raised were found to be proper and are considered in the design of the compensation, resettlement plan, and livelihood restoration plan.

Category 3: the Host community

The host community raised the following issues about entitlements and the implementation process.

1. Livelihood restoration is not considered; “what do we do after we have given our land?” was a question most asked. They requested to be given at least one plot along the main road to start some business.

2. Children who are mature deserve to get land to build their own houses.
3. Structures owned by farmers were declared not up to the standard to get building permit as town house. The farmers requested to be given building permit for their houses as is and also to get water and electricity supplies.

4. Some persons complained that their request to get legal title for the land they bought from farmers was not considered. This group complained that farmers who sold the land are benefiting twice by getting compensation for the land they have sold years back.

The legal owners of land have title deed for their holding. The demand of this group was very clear. They were promised that to the extent possible their residence will not be demolished due to infrastructure layout design, that they will be given proper compensation for the land they handover to the town administration and also they will be included in the livelihood restoration schemes. The neighbourhood plan prepared required the demolition of only one house; all others have to be regularised and given building permit as well as access to services.

![Sample title deed of farmers at Kurakur (given as remedial measure)](image)

The persons who claimed to have bought land from farmers have not built houses and moved to the locality as residents. It was not possible to verify their claims objectively. However, although the sale and purchase of farmland is illegal, it is common to observe the existence of such acts. The case of these claimants requires verification of the act of purchase and sale; size of land bought, amount of money involved, acceptance of the act by farmers who sold land, the amount of compensation they received for the land they sold; etc. This verification process requires long time as well the willingness all parties to provide information. It is recommended here that the Grievance Hearing Committee should verify the persons who bought land. Those persons who are verified for having bought land before the cut-off date of August 2010 could be given the minimum plot of 120m² in the locality.

### 3.0 Review of Resettlement policy

#### 3.1 Policy and Legal Framework

The Constitution of FDRE provides for payment of compensation for lost assets at commensurate rate to the value of the lost asset. Federal and regional laws pertaining to compensation have to be in line with the provisions of the Constitution. Art. 52(d) provides for power of regional governments to administer land and natural resources. Hence, expropriation of land and payment of compensation for projects initiated by regional states have to be regulated through laws that emanate from this provision.

People are affected by development in different ways. Land use regulations change the rights of individuals over land, channel resources in ways that may be different had there not been planning regulation, or persons who enjoy relatively full rights over land may be denied access to it. The Ethiopian government's legal framework does not cover gains and losses that come about due to planning unless there is direct takeover or denial of access to a resource. In some cases land use planning may bring very large benefits to former holders. There is no regulation which allows to catch planning gains directly by the government. In the same way, there is no direct mechanism to claim planning loses by property holders or residents. Direct takeover of land or denial of access to a resource
is what is accounted for in the laws and regulations about compensation. This seems to be fair as assessment of loss and gain from indirect activities cannot be established objectively.

**Diag. 1. Tiers of Policy and Legal Frameworks**

The Ethiopian legal framework has tiers commensurate to the federal system. There are also office practices that may be unique to a ministry. The Federal constitution is the mother of laws; policies are developed and adopted to provide focus to intended development directions by a government. Laws (mostly promulgated as proclamations in Ethiopia) are enacted by the federal parliament. There is usually a provision which allows regional states to enact laws on the basis of the federal law. Regulations, directives, and manuals provide for local situations and enable consistency of application of the law during implementation. The main tiers of laws in Ethiopia applicable in most cases are depicted in *Diagram 1*.

The applicable laws to resettlement planning and the attendant issues of compensation at federal and regional level (ANRS) are reviewed in the next sections.

### 3.2 Review of federal laws on resettlement

**The Ethiopian Civil Code**

Rights of property holders are enshrined in the Ethiopian Civil Code of 1952. If there is any takeover by the government for public purpose, the owners have to be compensated commensurate to the loss, including for good name in case of business establishments.

**Proc. No. 31/1975 nationalisation of rural land**

This law provides for the expropriation of all land related property and realign ownership of land to the government while providing use right to the resident tiller. This is the law which abolished the feudal system in Ethiopia. Since February 1975, farmers have had use right over their land. A system of reallocation of land existed until recently; but now all lawful holders of land have the right to use land in ways they saw it fit (for crop farming, agro-forestry, grazing) except mining. Special rights are necessary to extract mines and other natural resources, such as water, for commercial purpose.

**Proc. No. 47/1975 Nationalisation of urban land and extra houses**

Since the nationalisation of urban land and extra houses in 1975 (Proc. No.47/1975), urban land in principle belongs to the state and the peoples of Ethiopia. Residents are given use rights only. All urban centres are required to take inventory of land, plan the use of land and allocate it in manners that promote sustainable use of land. An urban resident is allowed to get one plot for the purpose of
constructing a house for own use in principle in one locality/town in Ethiopia. The main provisions applicable to the resettlement project are the power to allocate land, the size of land, and the power to regulate land use. Any land holder prior to the nationalisation of urban land has the right to hold and use it. New occupation of land for any purposes is allowed only when the municipal administration approves a request.

Occupation of land within a municipal jurisdiction without the approval of the administration is declared illegal act. The maximum size for residential use is limited to 500m² for new allocation, but former land holders were not requested to relinquish the extra land. Municipalities have developed different sizes of plots ranging from as low as 72m² (in the case of Addis Ababa) to 150-200m² in regional towns. The trend is towards vertical growth where plot sizes are diminishing and consolidation of plots is promoted. The construction of condominium blocks in most urban centres in Ethiopia is a testimony to the direction of urban land usage and housing typology promoted by the Ministry of Works and Urban Development, a key ministry entrusted to guide and regulate urban development.

The structure plan for Lalibela has adopted 120m² as the lowest allowable plot. New allocation can opt for plots starting from this minimum size to the maximum allowable by law; i.e. 500m². In fact for a town like Lalibela where buildable land is scarce, plots have to be small; on the other hand for sites that have steep slope it is advisable also to have larger size plots. A compromise has to be made between these two competing conditions. The recommended minimum size in the case of the current resettlement is 150m² for two reasons: 1) the slope anywhere in Lalibela is modest to steep; hence there is need to enlarge the size of plots. 2) the minimum size that residents relocated in 2009 were allocated is 150m²; hence it is necessary to adopt similar policy for all persons from the same site due to similar cause.

**Proc. No. 80/1993 Leasehold policy of urban land**

The leasehold policy of urban land (Proc.No. 80/1993) is an amendment as how to access urban land while keeping the main thrust of Proc. No. 47/1975 which made land government property. According to this law individuals and companies can get access to urban land through auction, allocation or lottery system for a specified period of time. The public auction defines the price of land while municipalities retain the power to regulate land use and intensity of use. Allocation is a system where municipal administrations allocate on a priority basis for projects deemed worthy of incentives (schools, hospitals, etc.). The lottery system is a sub-category of the allocation system where individuals request land for house construction and the municipal administration allocates land but the plot for individuals (or cooperatives) is determined through a lottery system.

The situation in small towns like Lalibela was to allocate land based on registration of applicants for land. Now Lalibela has been declared a leasehold-applicable town; hence it has to adhere to the provisions of the national and the regional leasehold policy of land.

**Proc. No.455/2005 “Expropriation of land for public purposes and payment of compensation proclamation”**

This law provides for the compensation of displaced persons for their lost assets and to restore their livelihoods. The general condition for which land and property could be expropriated is for "public purpose" which is defined as the use of land defined by the decision of the appropriate body in conformity with urban structure plan or development plan in order to ensure the interest of citizens to acquire direct or indirect benefits from the use of the land and to consolidate sustainable socio-economic development.

The law demands that expropriation order has to be given before relocation. Such order shall not be less than 90 days before relocation; however, if there is no crop or perennial plant, farm land could be expropriated within 30 days of receipt of expropriation order. The law also regulates that compensation has to be paid before relocation.

According to this proclamation valuation of fair compensation required to replace utility lines owned by governmental or parastatal organisations is determined by the utility provider institution itself. Valuation has to be done within 30 days after receipt of expropriation order and the land has to be vacated within 60 days after compensation is paid.
The most critical articles for our case are Article 7 and Article 8 of the proclamation. Art. 7 provides for the basis for compensation and amount of compensation while Art.8 provides for displacement compensation.

The salient provisions applicable to the case of Lalibela from Art.7 are the following:

- The entitlement covers property situated on the land and for permanent improvements made to such land. The amount of compensation for property situated on the expropriated land is to be determined on the basis of replacement cost of the property.
- Where the compensation is payable to an urban dweller, it may not, in any way, be less than the current cost of constructing a single room low cost house in accordance with the standard set by the concerned region.
- Compensation for permanent improvement to land shall be equal to the value of capital and labour expended on the land.
- The cost of removal, transportation and erection shall be paid as compensation for a property that could be relocated and continue its service as before.

The salient provisions applicable to the case of Lalibela from Art.8 are the following:

- A rural landholder whose landholding has been permanently expropriated shall, in addition to the compensation payable for property situated on the land and for permanent improvements made to such land be paid displacement compensation which shall be equivalent to ten times the average annual income he secured during the five years preceding the expropriation of the land.
- Where substitute land which can be easily ploughed and generate comparable income is available for the land holder, the compensation to be paid shall only be equivalent to the average annual income secured during the five years preceding the expropriation of the land.
- An urban landholder whose landholding has been expropriated shall be provided with a plot of urban land, (the size of which shall be determined by the urban administration), to be used for the construction of a dwelling house; and be paid a displacement compensation equivalent to the estimated annual rent of the demolished dwelling house or be allowed to reside, free of charge, for one year in a comparable dwelling house owned by the urban administration.
- Where the house demolished is a business house, provisions for dwelling house stated above mutatis mutandis apply.
- When an urban land lease holding is expropriated prior to its expiry date, the lease holder shall, in addition to the compensation for property situated on the land and for permanent improvements made to such land, be provided with a similar plot of land to use it for the remaining lease period or collect the remaining rent.

The proclamation has sufficient safeguards for expropriated persons; however, some of the provisions have to be qualified. Especially the displacement compensation (Art.8) requires some depth of explanations. Displacement compensation is not compensation for lost property but rather an act for livelihood restoration. Property owners should be provided land to reconstruct dwelling/business house and paid compensation money to replace the lost property in good time (stipulated about a year ahead of the relocation). If the time between payment of compensation and relocation is less than one year, it is necessary to provide rent-free residence/business house or pay displacement compensation equivalent to the estimated annual rent of the demolished dwelling/business house.

In the case of rural landholder, if they lose their farmland permanently, then they are entitled to livelihood restoration scheme. The livelihood restoration scheme, even if not named as such in this proclamation, is payment of ten years yield. However, as the displacement is permanent, compensation for ten years yield does not guarantee lifelong income. Therefore, it is necessary to consider farmers in the livelihood restoration plan in addition to the displacement compensation to be paid for farm land.

The proclamation does not cover non-formal holders of land and tenants in private and kebele owned houses. The law presumes there is no tenant in rural areas as absentee landlordism has been abolished in 1975. Tenancy for residence has no link with ownership; hence is not provided for in this proclamation whose main thrust is expropriation of land and compensation for property. Therefore, the arrangement to provide rental accommodation for kebele house residents is an extension of the law, not an explicit provision.
Regulation No.135/2007 “Payment of compensation for property situated on landholding expropriated for public purposes Council of Ministers Regulation”

This Regulation deals in detail about compensation for loss of property. Although Proc. No.455/2005 stipulates assisting displaced persons to restore their livelihood, this regulation does not deal with this issue. The Regulation determines the payment of compensation for assets based on current cost, cost of demolishing, lifting, and reinstalling where applicable, and the provision of replacement of land. The compensation categories include the following.

- Compensation for building
  All components of building structures will be considered and current cost per square meter will be used to calculate amount of compensation.

- Compensation for crops
  This category is sub-divided into crops and perennial crops. In both cases the amount of compensation is calculated based on yield per square meter of land multiplied by current price per kilogram.

- Trees
  Trees could be cut and used by owner plus payment of compensation for loss of continued income.

- Permanent improvement of land
  The cost of machinery, labour for improvement, and any infrastructure built as part of the improvement have to be compensated based current cost.

- Property relocation
  Amount of compensation for any property that could be relocated and used again without being damaged is calculated based on cost to relocate the property.

- Protected grass
  Amount of compensation for loss of land that is used for grazing or production of grass is based on area of land and the current price per square meter.

Proc. No.456/2005 “FDRE Rural land administration and land use proclamation”

This proclamation regulates the use and administration rural land and provides for registration of land, the obligation to pay compensation to land holders if the holder is displaced or to provide replacement with compensation for lost assets. The proclamation decrees that rural land holders expropriated for federal projects have to be compensated based on federal compensation laws or if displaced for regional projects they have to be compensated according to regional regulations.

Proc. No. 574/2008 “Proclamation to provide for Urban Plans”

This proclamation provides procedures to be followed in the preparation of urban plans. It requires payment of compensation for expropriated property. It also defines public interest that warrants expropriation as measure that benefits a large segment of people.

3.3 Compensation and resettlement laws and regulations of the Amhara National Regional State (ANRS)

Regional governments enact laws on the basis of federal laws. Structure plans of towns are laws for the towns; such plans are approved by the regional government. The ANRS has adopted policies, enacted laws, rules and regulations to deal with expropriation of land in urban and rural areas. These rules and regulations are consistent with federal proclamations dealing with the same issues. The main provisions of these rules and regulations are reviewed here.

Proc. No.133/2006 “A Proclamation to provide for the revised rural land administration and use in the Amhara National Regional State”

- The proclamation provides for the rights of rural land holders, minimum holding, transfer modalities, expropriation issues, and obligations of rural land holders to utilise land properly.
Expropriation of land for public service is allowed (Art. 28). However, it should be done by paying compensation in advance, similar to the federal law.

Before land is expropriated, kebele residents shall discuss and agree to the proposed expropriation.

The amount of compensation and the modality of calculation is determined by regulation.

Regulation No.51/2007 “The Amhara National Regional State Rural land Administration and Use system implementation, Council of Regional Government Regulation”

- The Regulation deals with the issues enacted by ANRS in Proc.No. 133/2006.
- It deals with registration of land, modalities of transfer of rights over rural land, obligations of land users, and expropriation issues.
- Expropriation may take place only upon prior determination of lack of alternative site, if then decided, prior payment of compensation is required.
- The Regulation determines the assets to be considered for compensation as follows:
  - Non-movable user-developed assets
  - Expenses for permanent improvement of land
  - Compensation for lost income from crop cultivation based on an average of the previous five consecutive years and a compensation for ten years based on the average.
- Mechanism for grievance addressing is provided; The land holder has the right to complain and the relevant authority is obliged to organise a “compensation grievance review committee”; if any party is not satisfied with the decision of the committee, the case may be referred to the High Court.


- The directive follows the Federal Proclamation No.455/2005 and Reg. No.135/2007 in determining compensation rates, types of assets to be considered, and manners of addressing grievances.
- Assets to be considered for compensation include: all built structures (houses, septic tank, water tank, pavement, fences); crops, income generating trees and perennial plants; permanent improvement on land,
- It provides for the establishment of valuation committee
- It defines formula for calculating amount of compensation.
- It defines method of redressing grievances

Directive No.7/2002 "Regulation of ANRS to provide for establishment of Appeals Court to deal with urban land expropriation Issues”

- The Directive provides for the expeditious decision making system with regard to expropriation of urban land;
- It provides for the composition of the jury members: Members are legal and justice office as chair person, two residents of the town where the land is located, two representatives of government offices.
- The decision of the Appeals Court regarding basic land expropriation issues is final; however, an appellant could take cases related to amount of compensation, delays in payment or similar cases to the High Court.

Zikre Hig Proclamation No.91/2004 "Proclamation to provide for the establishment, reorganisation and to limit the powers and duties of towns in the Amhara national region”

- The proclamation provides for the reorganisation of towns, delimitation of powers and duties of municipal administrations,
- It provides for the need to prepare plans and manners of plan approval;
- The proclamation also established different organs to deal with urban issues.
Zikre Hig Regulation No.6/2002 “ANRS Revised Regulation on lease holding of urban land”

- The regulation provides for the lease holding of urban land for a specified period of time
- It regulates the lease period for different functions, grade of land and payment of lease,
- It regulates manners of expropriation of land. It regulates that land could be expropriated for public use against payment of compensation

3.4 Summary of policy and legal frameworks on resettlement

3.4.1 Summary of GoE policy and legal frameworks

The federal as well as regional laws on expropriation of property and the methods of payment of compensation are clear. The following points are noted as the main issues provided for in the laws and regulations:

1. The law requires town administrations to consult PAPs on planned developments which will cause relocation;
2. expropriation orders have to be given in advance,
3. inventory of movable and immovable assets has to be carried out by professional valuators where this service exists and by a committee where professional assessors are not available,
4. that ones relocation is deemed necessary by the relevant authority in consultation with the community, land holders and property owners cannot refuse to vacate from the land but can only present grievances about compensation,
5. compensation is provided for property on land and permanent improvements on land
6. compensation is based on cost replacement method
7. minimum payment for dwelling house has to be sufficient to construct the minimum one-room standard low cost house applicable in the town concerned
8. displacement compensation is paid for lost opportunities and restoration of income as well as for transporting and re-erecting re-usable components of property which will not entitle compensation
9. compensation for land to re-construct dwelling/business houses has to consider minimum plot applicable in the town under consideration but cannot be more than 500m².

The law is consistent in all aspects and also fair in the valuation of property as well as restoration of income. The only exception is the land policy which does not consider land as a commodity. The public ownership of land distorts property value; compensation does not include location value. The laws does not deal with persons who may be relocated but have no legal title to land and property. However, the practice provides for the replacement of rental house for those legal tenants in government (kebele) houses.

3.4.2 Comparison of WB and the GOE policies on resettlement

The GoE laws dealing with resettlement at federal, regional and town level are, in most cases, in line with the policies of the WB. The points where there are mismatches or differences in emphasis are tabulated below. WB policies referred here are policies on involuntary resettlement as listed in OP 4.12.

Table 2: Comparison of policies on resettlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>WB policy</th>
<th>GOE policy</th>
<th>RAP Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>- assist to improve or at least to restore the livelihood of displaced persons to pre-displacement levels - resettlement activities should be conceived and executed as sustainable development programs</td>
<td>- Demands compensation commensurate to loss of assets, - In practice replacement of land does not consider location value - Residents not entitled to compensation, (such as tenants in government houses) are taken care of, - Relocation is for public purpose to ensure the interest of citizens to acquire direct or indirect benefits from the use of the</td>
<td>Livelihood and income restoration projects planned for all displaced persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>WB policy</td>
<td>GOE policy</td>
<td>RAP Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2   | • Involuntary relocation defined as "actions that may be taken without the displaced person’s informed consent or power of choice", is what deserves compensation. | • Is similar in most cases.  
• law requires displaced persons to be consulted and notified about relocation in advance  
• Provides for compensation even if people agree to a resettlement action; | Relocation may be voluntary but owing to economic loss and inability to sustain livelihood, the government will pay compensation commensurate to the loss. |
| 3   | • Para. 8 describes need to consider vulnerable groups during resettlement. | • The laws do not differentiate between displaced groups;  
• The economy does not allow providing social security to all disadvantaged citizens; kinship and other social networks cater for such needs. | -Special mechanisms to address the needs of the vulnerable are designed in the livelihood restoration scheme.  
- The OMS is required to assist in house construction for property owners; and to provide kebele house for kebele tenants who cannot build houses |
| 4   | • Para.11 requires that the preferred way of compensation for land based livelihood is to provide replacement land. | • The laws stipulate this type of compensation for rural areas; for urban areas it is difficult to fulfill this requirement as land use changes are inevitable. | -It is not possible to replace land for agricultural purpose within Lalibela jurisdiction; Farmers will be trained in urban agriculture and other non-agricultural trades |
| 5   | • Para.16 requires quasi-legal title holders to be provided compensation and those with no recognizable legal rights who occupy land to be given resettlement assistance. | • Quasi-legal titles (such as customary rights over land, tenants in government houses) are recognised and catered for  
• Persons with no legal right are not eligible for any form of compensation by law. | All displaced persons irrespective of their legal status will be included in the livelihood restoration projects |
| 6   | Para 6 c (i) Offers support for a transition period based on a reasonable estimate of the time likely to be needed to restore the livelihood and standards of living | Support for a transition period is not indicated | Transitional allowance is considered/incorporated in the RAP |

![a) Resettlement Committee at work](image1)

![b) One of the PAPs photographed](image2)
4.0 Entitlements of project affected persons

4.1 Eligibility policy and eligibility criteria for compensation

Policy on eligibility

The constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) and the laws that emanated from it decree that involuntarily displaced persons\(^{15}\) have to be compensated commensurate to their loss. Regional administrations and municipalities are given the power to determine who is eligible, types of assets to consider, and the level of compensation for lost assets. All persons with legal title (written or otherwise) are eligible for compensation and livelihood restoration measures while all persons who are affected by a project that causes involuntary resettlement are entitled to different forms of compensations as described in Section 3 above. The eligibility and entitlement of displaced persons and those to be displaced due to the ESTDP-Lalibela project are described in detail as follows.

Eligibility criteria

The criteria for determining rights for compensation are based on the legal frameworks reviewed in the previous section. There are at least two groups with regard to eligibility: the fully legal and the extra-legal (informal) group. The fully legal get compensation according to a pre-determined mode of property/asset valuation method and/or tenancy agreements. On the other hand the extra-legal groups (informal settlers, tenants in private houses) get assistance based on assessment of level of vulnerability.

Criteria for determination of categories for compensation/entitlement

The evidences for being legal proprietor maybe categorised into two: strong evidences and weak evidences. However, both would entitle similar benefits once the evidence is accepted.

Strong evidences:

1. Proof of ownership of house/building (title deed for land, receipts for building tax, proof of building permit)
2. Proof of ownership of land or use rights (receipts for land tax payment, lease contract)
3. Authenticated document of inheritance by a notary office for a legally held property
4. Proof of legally residing in a government house (receipts for rent, valid tenancy contract agreement)

Weak evidences:

1. Human evidence/witness that a property belongs to a person,
2. Non-appearance of other claimants and proof that it does not belong to the government

---

\(^{15}\) Displaced person is defined as anyone who is physically relocated from his/her place of abode or who is denied access to a resource which he/she had legal rights or extra-legal rights (informal) over the resource
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Criteria for determination of quasi-legal groups

1. Verification, by Kebele administration, of having resided in a particular location within the project area prior to the cut of date (this is set at 15 August 2010, the first data collection period for the RAP)
2. Proof of being supported by a recognised agency (religious or government) - presence on the list of names of persons being assisted by the supporting agency.

The situation in Lalibela requires the municipal administration to verify entitlements for most of the residents based on weak evidences as the town has not given title deed for land holding and building permit for house construction in the Core Zone. Houses are not numbered; hence it is difficult to identify persons by location. The inventory of property was conducted mostly on declaration of the residents and, where available, proof of payment of property tax. On the other hand, the Core Zone is a closely knit community whose members have lived in the locality lifelong; hence all know each other. Therefore, it may not be difficult to establish ownership before payment of compensation. A detailed description of the process of verification of property ownership and measurements is provided elsewhere. Moreover, detailed entitlement matrix and eligibility criteria according to the Ethiopian law and WB’s directive on forced resettlement are provided in Annex 3.

4.2 Resettlement measures

The packages of administrative arrangements and compensation and supplementary resettlement measures designed for eligible displaced persons include those who were displaced from a) Mikael Ghibi, b) those to be relocated from different localities of the Core Zone, and c) the host community. The compensation and supplementary resettlement measures for the three distinct groups are described below.

4.2.1 Audit of Compensation measures for residents relocated from Mikael Ghibi

This group of residents was displaced from Mikael Ghibi (which is part of the Core Zone) in 2009. Mikael Ghibi is central to the Core Zone and the resettlement of the residents was planned and executed by the Lalibela Town Administration with financial assistance from the regional government prior to the official commencement of the ESTDP. All valuation works were done in 2008-2009 and most compensation was paid in 2009 (i.e. 2001-2002 EC budget years). The operation was carried out by the OMS. The consultant did not find details of the property measurement and property valuation documents for the Mikael Ghibi residents. However, the process of property valuation and resettlement process was reviewed from various sources. The analysis of documents and information from the displaced persons revealed that there are irregularities. Audit of the process leading to resettlement and mitigation measures to compensate for the irregularities are described below.

Mikael Ghibi residents are composed of property owners and kebele tenants. The property owners were found to be 98 households and the kebele tenants were 40 households. It was not possible to establish if there were co-dwellers in kebele houses and private residences. The overall process of property valuation and resettlement actions included the following:

1. Consultations were made about the purpose of relocation and general consensus was reached between the town administration and the resettles about the need for relocation.
2. Property owners and kebele tenants were identified by a study team from the OMS.
3. Properties of the private homeowners were measured,
4. The value of properties was determined based on size and type of construction and the unit rate as provided by the Zone administration.

The process of verification is described in Vol.3 Property valuation of private houses in the Core Zone of Lalibela.
5. There was a grievance addressing mechanism. However, the grievance addressing institution was not an institution established to deal with grievances associated with resettlement issues alone; rather it was a multi-tasked institution that entertained complaints on the various administrative issues.

6. Payment of compensation was made by the OMS; the majority accepted the payment while few complained and their case was considered by a law court. Some claimants reported to have received additional compensation money.

7. A resettlement site was identified by the OMS, subdivided into plots and allocated to legal property owners. Plot allocation for similar groups was through a lottery system.

8. Property owners were given the chance to demolish and collect the salvaged materials. However, very few houses were retained as historical heritage buildings.

9. Transport service was given by the OMS for the majority of relocated persons. One person complained for not getting the service, but it was determined that the service was available to all.

10. Standard plans were given to those who got plots. However, contrary to the directive, property owners were charged fees for plan approval and title deed certificates.

11. Mikael Ghibi residents were displaced prior to the provision of basic infrastructure in the new resettlement neighbourhood: there was no water supply and electric power; the access roads were simple right-of-way reservations with no treatment of surface (just beaten earth).

12. Kebele tenants were relocated to the new bus station area which is located in Worq Dingay locality. The houses were built before the relocation project started (before 2008) by a philanthropist.

13. All 40 kebele tenants have received accommodation. However, the houses are uniform without any consideration for family size and size of former residence.

The majority of persons relocated from Mikael Ghibi (both kebele tenants and private homeowners) are satisfied with the location of their new neighbourhood. Construction of housing had to be completed within a certain timeframe, usually 18 months; those not opting to live at the new resettlement could sell their plots and move elsewhere. The majority of homeowners are satisfied with the plot size they received. All plot holders of areas less than 150m², which account for about 80% of property owners, received plots of 150m². All others received plots of proportional size to their holding up to the allowable maximum. The only complaint about plot size was by those who had to share a common property and those who have large sizes in excess of 500m² and those whose plot description on property tax receipts are less than their actual holdings. There were complaints during the various consultative meetings on various aspects of the resettlement actions too. Lack of transparency of the process of resettlement planning was critically commented on by all. The grievances of the PAPs from Mikael Ghibi and the host community at Kurakur and recommended mitigation/redressing measures are tabulated in Table 3.

After discussion with the persons relocated from Mikael Ghibi and the town administration, the following remedial actions were agreed upon to redress the inconveniences sustained by the relocated persons.

**Table 3: Remedial measures for PAPs from Mikael Ghibi and the host community**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Complaints/rights not fully considered</th>
<th>Remedial measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Common complaints by kebele tenants and property owners in Mikael Ghibi | **1.1** Some persons complained that transportation support was not given to take goods to the new resettlement sites  
The overwhelming majority have received transport facility except those who missed due to their own personal problems. This was confirmed in the presence of the municipal administration and persons relocated from Mikael Ghibi.  
| 1.2 | Relocated persons did not receive any livelihood and income restoration supports. | All eligible persons are included in the livelihood and income restoration scheme of the present RAP.  
| 1.3 | There is no transport facility to the town centre and to the churches. | The new relocation sites are within 3 km distance from the town center and the churches. The municipal administration can encourage private transport providers to include Kurakur in their service route. We envisage as the inhabitants of the area increase in number, the private sector will be interested to provide services.  
| 2   | Complaints specific to private property owners | **2.1** Rate of compensation being low and some structures not considered for compensation  
There is no mechanism to verify claims. The unit rate was according to the Zone directive, but measurement of size and inclusion of all structures for compensation could not be verified.  
| 2.2 | No disturbance allowance was paid to compensate for house rent during the relocation | The owners were given 3 months notice to demolish after compensation was paid. Three months is not enough to construct houses. We recommend all private house owners to receive 150 Birr per month for 3 months to compensate for their loss due to payment of rent before house construction.  
| 2.3 | Illegally obliged to pay for title deed and building permit process fee | All payments made by private house owners who paid for title deed and building permit should refunded by producing their receipts.  
| 2.4 | Building permit withheld due to failure to meet the standard size of new house and plot size | The OMS shall allow displaced persons to construct with an expandable (evolutive type) house plans with a minimum of 12m². All settlers who have built houses shall be given building permit including those with plot size of 75m².  
| 2.5 | Some households complained that the plot area they occupied earlier and the one they are allocated are not proportional. | This was found to be due to the size indicated on the land tax payment receipt being small than the actual land holding. As the extra land which is not indicated in the receipt is considered informally held, their no legal ground to consider such holdings. Moreover, for most property owners, the minimum plot size (150m²) is much higher than the actual holding. Thus, the complaint has no strong standing.  
| 2.6 | In the new settlement area, there is no open area for communal use; for example, there is no place for Demera ceremony. | With the addition of more plots, the new resettlement is provided with a communal open space.  
| 3   | Complaints specific to Kebele house tenants | **3** |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Complaints/rights not fully considered</th>
<th>Remedial measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Some complained the size of the houses is small compared to their household size</td>
<td>The size of the new houses was not constructed specifically for the households who now occupy the new houses. However, as the majority of kebele tenants are satisfied with their new housing environment, this complaint is considered minor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>The rent of the new houses is very high (Birr 10 per month) compared to the former rent (mostly 1-3 Birr/month)</td>
<td>The rental level is much lower than the market price. In fact, we do not think the rent is high enough to keep the houses maintained. We suggest the town administration should reduce the rent to the level of the former rent for medium, term but consider other practical measures for the long term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4 Complaints specific to the host community

| 4.1 | No livelihood restoration provided to those whose land was taken over for resettlement | All eligible for livelihood restoration will be included in the new projects for support. |
| 4.2 | The households residing in Kurakur were not allowed to get water and electric supply, nor titled deed and building permit | All houses that are not demolished due to road layout will be provided water and electricity. Title deed will be provided to all; building permit will be provided upon presentation of building plan for the existing house. The MSO has already initiated this process and has given title deed for one household in Kurakur area integrated recently as urban dweller (Fig. 2) |
| 4.3 | The host community requested to get one additional plot in addition to the 500m² they will retain from their former holding. The additional plot was for establishing a business or for a son/daughter | The host community (only farmers living in Kurakur) whose farm land was taken over for the resettlement will get 500 m² plot plus one additional plot of 150m². Farmers living outside Kurakur (hence their formal residence is not affected by the resettlement project) will be provided one plot of 150m² only. |

Source: Analysis by WUB Consult

The overwhelming majority of the impacted private home owners have already constructed their homes and started living in the resettlement site. However, there are still some resettles who have not yet started to build their homes. Thus, the Municipal Service Office shall urge the resettles to construct their houses taking advantage of the remedial measures pertinent to adjusted building and plot standards. Construction of housing had to be completed within a certain timeframe, usually 18 months; those not opting to live at the new resettlement could sell their houses/plots and move elsewhere.

**Fig. 4: Mikael Ghibi now (front part of left) and the new relocation site at Kurakur (right)**
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4.2.2 Compensation and supplementary resettlement measures for the Core Zone residents

The localities identified as Core Zone are Adishade, Chifrgoch, and Gebriel sefer. The residents of this group are divided into a) Real property owners, b) Kebele house tenants, and c) tenants in private houses. Group A is entitled for compensation for loss of property and assets (mostly dwelling houses, business premises, fruit bearing trees and other timber), and for the loss of income and livelihood. Group B is entitled to replacement house or plot of land for house construction while Group C is entitled to a disturbance allowance as stated in Annex 3.

4.2.2.1 Property owners to be relocated from the Core Zone

The socio-economic situation of the residents in the three localities was surveyed and a detailed report is produced separately. The entitlements of property owners and the mitigation measures for their losses are presented as follows.

1. There are 300 residence owners who will be compensated for their houses based on the type of construction and size and number of building units they own. One person had property tax receipt but the house does not exist on the plot. The owner claimed it was burned down but the OMS did not allow them to reconstruct it. The detailed property measurement of properties by owner and by locality is presented in a separate report17.
2. 146 private house owners have trees in their compounds in the Core Zone; these trees were counted and the numbers were verified by each owner. The valuation of the trees was done by the Office of Agriculture (Refer Annex in V.3)
3. Disturbance/adjustment allowance shall be paid as temporary house rent for the period between house demolition and the construction of the new house. This payment is estimated at a flat rate of 150 Birr per month per owners for three months.
4. All who are eligible for livelihood restoration are included in the list of beneficiaries. The detailed study and proposed livelihood and income restoration plan is presented separately18.
5. All property holders relocated from the Core Zone to the new resettlement neighbourhood will be provided transport. The Resettlement Coordination Unit (RCU) will arrange transport for all at scheduled times during relocation or pay each household Birr 400 as transport allowance.

4.2.2.2 Kebele tenants to be relocated from the Core Zone

Tenants in government houses are entitled for replacement house or to an allocation of plot where they could construct a dwelling house. The practice in Lalibela has been to provide rental house but it is observed that the administration has limitations of budget and capacity to construct decent houses. There is a practice within the ANRS where residents were provided plots in lieu of rental house. This is a recommended practice as the policy of the federal government is to do away with government rental housing in the future. The majority of kebele house tenants prefer to get a plot instead of rental house. However, it may be necessary to provide rental housing for tenants who may not be able to construct their own houses. About 150 plots are subdivided for allocation to kebele house tenants.

Two of the localities in the Core Zone (Adishade and Chifrgoch) have kebele houses while Gebriel sefer has none. There are a total of 139 kebele houses in the two localities. According to the property verification study, the distribution of functions in kebele houses is shown in Table 4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Adishade</th>
<th>Chifrgoch</th>
<th>Gebriel sefer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residence only</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Enterprises (cooperative offices, consumer association office, MSE training center)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 Vol.3 Property valuation of private houses in the Core Zone of Lalibela
18 Vol.4: Livelihood restoration plan for persons affected by tourism development projects in Lalibela
Out of the 139 kebele houses only 130 houses are occupied by households; out of the remaining 9 kebele houses two houses are not occupied, five houses are office of civil societies and two houses are shops. Therefore, 130 households need replacement house or residential plots from the Core Zone. The rental arrangement of the shops could be terminated with a notice of not less than 3 months. Four of the five enterprises do not pay rent, while one of them pays one Birr per month. It is clear that the rental support was made possible due to the low rent; therefore, the OMS may not be obliged to continue its support if it does not have unoccupied house.

4.2.2.3 Tenants in private houses in the Core Zone

According to the socio-economic survey of residents of the Core Zone in August 2010, and the verification made in March 2011, there are 209 households who were tenants in private houses. According to the Ethiopian law, tenants in private houses are not entitled to any form of compensation. This is so because, it is difficult to establish their number as there is no record of tenancy; most private house owners sub-let partially to supplement their income but do not pay tax on rental income, hence they do not declare presence of tenants.

A peculiar aspect in Lalibela is the lack of property transfer service by the OMS for the Core Zone residents for last three decades. This has impact on the number of property holders. The legal owner is the person who has paid yearly land and property tax. This situation has created virtual property owners (deceased persons) and many heirs. In cases where the heirs have registered their inheritance with a notary office and have subdivided the property, they are registered in the property valuation as legal property owners and are entitled to all entitlements of a private holder. On the other hand, some heirs have not registered their rights with a notary office and have not subdivided the property they inherited. In such cases, compensation will be paid for the existing property for the heirs as one property; one plot will be given to be shared between the heirs regardless of the number of heirs; and all households will be considered as tenants in a private house and receive disturbance allowances. Therefore, at a risk of over-committing the government to pay disturbance allowance, the number of tenants is the number of households residing in such houses at the cut-off date during the August 2010 survey.

It is common to terminate tenancy agreement in private houses by giving three months prior notice. The practice being this, these tenants should be given such notices plus a one month rent of Birr 150 for each tenant household head residing in a private house.

4.2.2.4 Compensation and supplementary resettlement measures for Business owners and petty traders in the Core Zone

There are persons who are engaged in petty trade and formal business. These persons will lose income due to the relocation. The income of the formal business operators was checked from data in the Revenue Office whereas the income of the petty traders was identified based on their own claim. It is necessary to compensate for their temporary loss. It is assumed that the operators will be given at least six months time for relocation. Therefore, if they are given a compensation for three months income they can re-establish themselves.

1. There are 43 residents who own registered business premises. These owners will be compensated for loss of the buildings. These owners shall receive disturbance allowance for loss of income for a period of three months (a quarter of their annual income) based on their monthly income as evidenced by the Revenue Office for 30 operators (the income of the other 13 operators was not verified). The operators who are owners of private

---

The assumption is that at least three months notice will be given after compensation is paid. in six months time after compensation is paid, the owners can start to earn income from their business.
2. There are 155 residents who earn their living through informal petty trade. These households are proposed to receive equivalent of three months income as transition/disturbance allowance. The amount of payment will be as declared by the petty traders themselves (Ref. Annex. in V.3).

4.2.3 Compensation and supplementary resettlement measures for the host Community

The site selected for resettlement is Kurakur, located about 3 km away from the Core Zone. Currently the host community is of two types: those who are farmers residing on the land selected for resettlement and people who live in the urban centre and other adjoining rural kebeles but whose farm land will be taken for the resettlement of displaced persons.

The compensation for the first group of the host community includes compensation for property on the land (i.e. for their built structures if they are displaced to another location due to infrastructure development) plus displacement compensation (for farm land, grazing land, and perennial crops and trees, etc.). To the extent possible, farmers' homesteads will not be demolished; the houses will be regularised to comply with the new resettlement plan and conserved for possible upgrading in the future. There are 50 farmers who live in Kurakur whose farm land has been taken over for resettlement. Out of these farmers, only one household will be relocated as the house has to be demolished due to the new subdivision plan. Most of these farmers have already collected the compensation for their land. The measurement of structures to be demolished and trees in their compound are included in the property valuation report (V.3). On the other hand there are 35 persons whose farm land is taken over for the new resettlement but they reside elsewhere. Apart from the farmers whose land was taken over in 2009 and 2010, currently there are 66 farmers whose land will be taken over for the resettlement project. The total farmland measured is 31.1768ha and the total compensation is Birr 5,065,170 (Refer Annex in V. 3).

**Fig.5: Kurakur site south of the asphalt road (left) and East of the asphalt road (right)**

The compensation for the second group of the host community is limited to compensation based on the average yield of land they hold plus inclusion in the livelihood restoration projects. Compensation for farm land was calculated by the Office of Agriculture and some have already collected their compensation. The list of persons from the host community (both who reside in Kurakur and those who reside elsewhere) who would benefit from the livelihood restoration projects is included in the Livelihood and income restoration projects (Report V.4).

Kurakur is part of the immediate urban expansion area, hence, it will be acquired to meet the increasingly growing demand of space for expansion, even without the resettlement project scenario. Under the current Ethiopian expropriation proclamation, the provisions for expropriated farmers did not go beyond compensation. However, due to the involvement of the ESTDP project the host community will receive additional benefits like livelihood and income restoration support; and their homes will be serviced by different infrastructures (piped water, electricity, access road, storm water drainage, etc.). Thus, the host farmers can be considered fortunate to be expropriated under the project scenario rather than without the project circumstances.
4.2.4 Compensation & supplementary resettlement measures for special groups

There are special groups of persons who are affected by the ESTDP triggered project for the Core Zone. These include the vulnerable, the church school group, the residents of the monastery and informal groups who claim to have bought land in the new resettlement site. The compensation and supplementary resettlement measures for these groups are presented next.

4.2.4.1 Vulnerable groups

There are several vulnerable groups from the socio-economic point of view. Single mothers and/or female-headed households are considered vulnerable in most projects and measures are designed to support them. However, the case of Lalibela seems unique in that female-headed households are the norm rather than the exception. Therefore, it may be beyond the capacity of the municipal administration to provide support for all female-headed households. Furthermore, the aged and persons with disability are the other vulnerable groups. Again the national economy does not provide social security for people without income regardless of the level of vulnerability. Therefore, the only measures designed to address vulnerable groups in this ESTDP Lalibela site is inclusion in income generating projects specifically designed for such groups. These measures are presented in detail in the "Livelihood and income restoration plan" prepared for the purpose.

Vulnerability related to affected women is almost entirely addressed by absorbing the majority of economically active but unemployed affected women in the proposed income generating schemes. The rest women who live with disability and the elderly are embraced in the vulnerable group. The vulnerable persons constituting 262 individuals, who are treated separately in the proposal, are those persons who live with disability (44 persons) and elderly persons aged 65 years above (218 persons), of which women still constitute 59% of the subgroup.

Some of the vulnerable persons with disability and the elderly are willing and capable to be engaged in some productive activities; for example, leg amputated persons will be trained and involved in handicraft works and those with sight problem, blind persons and elderly persons could be engaged in some trade activities as well as in urban farming activities particularly in sheep fattening and raising milk cows. Hence the implementing body should scrutinize individual willingness and aspiration of the vulnerable persons through individual and group discussion to opt for sustainable safeguarding options among the recommended options discussed below. Accordingly the following options are recommended towards safeguarding the vulnerable group.

i) The first option is identifying whether or not a vulnerable person is willing and capable of being involved in some productive works among the identified income generating schemes and economic activities.
ii) If a vulnerable person is not willing and or not capable, embrace one of the family member or kin in the proposed economic activities, in favour of the vulnerable person (who is not already included in the intended target beneficiaries and to be assigned by the concerned vulnerable person), and to take responsibility to cover the means of subsistence of the concerned vulnerable person.
iii) The other option is organizing a local social security fund under the City Administration to run some income generating activities managed by Trust Fund Administration Board (that will be composed from delegated persons from Governmental and Non-Governmental Organizations, community representatives, Civil Societies and the vulnerable persons) and run by hired labors and distribute the returns to the vulnerable persons at regular basis.
iv) Or, invite Civil and Humanitarian Non Governmental local organization (e.g. Ethiopian Orthodox Church Development and Aid organization) having the role of involving in some
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income generating and development activities like urban farming in the city to generate income and safeguarding the lives of vulnerable groups using the fund that would be allocated for the vulnerable group from the livelihood restoration project.

v) If the above options are not viable and or not preferred by the vulnerable persons the last resort will be to apply direct cash transfer program that is handing out the cash to the concerned vulnerable person just once and request them to find their own preferred means of livelihood.

As mentioned above, to implement one of the options or to find out other possibility, it is recommended that the implementing body will carry out further discussion and consultation with the identified vulnerable persons at individually and group level to decide what is best for them.

To apply one or the other options, however, the estimated financial requirement is computed based on individual basis and presented in the cost estimate and financial plan part of the document.

Apart from the above provisions, the municipal administration will assist persons with disability to manage house construction. The list of vulnerable households to be considered for the special support during the construction and relocation is annexed (Annex 4).

4.2.4.2 Residents of the monastery and the church school

It is proposed not to relocate the nuns and hermits who live within the monastery outside the Core Zone as monastic life is considered part of the cultural heritage worthy of conservation and controlled tourist visit. However, it is proposed here to relocate the monastery within the Core Zone in the lower parts of the Bete Gebriel area where the environmental and cultural impact of the residents would be minimal for the heritage. The current monastery is a cave near Bete Amanuel which should be renovated and conserved through the site development component of ESTDP-Lalibela project. The relocation of the monastery is proposed to be part of the historic and cultural heritage site development project too. Therefore, there is no compensation for the nuns and hermits on individual basis as they do not own the structures; rather a replacement of the living quarter and livelihood restoration project is proposed in relation to the monastery. Cost estimation for the development of the new monastery is provided in Report Vol.3.

The church schools occupy Lasta houses within the Core Zone. This service should continue within the Core Zone. However, rehabilitation of the premises should be part of the site development project.

4.2.4.3 Informal groups

Informality in urban areas is of two kinds: partially informality and total informality. Partial informality may exist in the form of house expansion on a legally held land whereas total informality exists where individuals may not have legal title for land (formal or customary right) and have no building permit for the property constructed. The inventory of property conducted for the RAP did not consider legality of construction (legal/quasi-legal/illegal) mainly due to the lack of building permit for any of the houses in the Core Zone. Therefore, the recommended approach is to consider all constructions on legally held land to be legal and provide compensation for all; i.e. there is no partial informality.

Total informality was observed in the new resettlement area at Kurakur. Some groups of people who claim to have bought land from farmers (an illegal act) requested to be included in the list of host community and be entitled to the benefits of being expropriated. It was not possible to establish any rudimentary legality for their claim (payment of land tax, inclusion in the list of residents in the area, authentication of transfer of rights on the land/property by a notary office, nor inclusion in the list of residents of that kebele as they do not reside there). The farmers who may have sold part of their land to such groups have received the full compensation for the land to which they have legal right. It was not possible to establish whether or not transaction was carried out in the first place. It seemed impossible to reverse the situation and provide any form of entitlement for such virtual land holders. The persons...
who claim such ownership do not reside on the site they claim to own. Therefore, it is recommended that the town administration should consider the case of such persons case by case and settle the issue. This could be done through the Grievance Hearing Committee or any social pressure group. The aim is to recover any money transferred from those who claim to have bought land from the farmers. Thus, this group is not considered eligible for any form of compensation.

Another sub-group of informality is the construction of structures by the legal owners of farmlands outside their compound, allegedly for transfer to their children who have no household of their own. The structures are rudimentary, unfinished, un-lived in, scattered here and there, and clearly built in rush (some after August 2010, the cut-off date for data collection) to get undue compensation. In the preparation of the neighbourhood plan, care was taken not to demolish even such structures. Apart from providing one additional plot for the legal owner of farm land, the shades constructed here and there for compensation purposes are not considered eligible for any form of compensation.

5.0 Valuation of property and compensation for losses

5.1 Property valuation method for built up structures

Detailed discussions were made with the Office of Municipal Services (OMS), a core institution entrusted to determine entitlements, valuation of properties, land administration, and administering the payment of compensation. The discussions revealed that method of valuation is based on survey of quantities of construction, and unit rates provided by the zone. The monetary compensation is based on the cost replacement method with no application of depreciation. The OMS allows property owners to demolish the houses and take the salvaged materials. This seemed fair as the salvaged materials, in most cases, are very old and their value does not exceed cost of demolition. On the other hand the owners are happy to take the materials at no cost and to retain identity with the components they have known for long.

The main principles of the cost replacement method include the following:
1. Costs could be reflected through unit rates for components
2. If unit rates are estimated according to market value it is possible to reconstruct a similar structure with the compensation money.
3. Movable components (such as household goods, movable decorations, etc.) which could be re-erected and used are not valued; Transportation allowance is considered to compensate for such costs.
4. This method does not take into consideration opportunity costs or location value

Therefore, according to this method the accuracy of the cost estimate depends on the quality of surveying and the capacity of the unit rate to simulate the market. The accuracy of measurement of all built structures was verified by the owners. The unit rates provided by the Zone administration were found to be fairly accurate to simulate current rates. Therefore, compensation based on such valuation will be sufficient to construct a similar structure in the new resettlement area without any contribution of any kind from the owner (labour, or finance) as the rate is based on contractor-based construction.

The categories of assets considered for compensation include buildings for various uses, fences, septic tank, and water tank, perennial crops and other trees. In the case of farmers, farm land, grazing land and fruit bearing trees and plants having economic value (perennial plants) were be considered. The value of the built structures was valued by the consultant, but the level of compensation for farmers was calculated by the Office of Agriculture. Furthermore, in resettlement projects the loss is not limited to immovable property alone; displaced persons loose means of livelihoods too. Therefore, such persons are included in livelihood restoration projects.

The process of valuation

The survey of structures revealed that most structures are very old, some have dilapidated beyond repair. The study team did reconnaissance study of the localities to understand the whole situation before conducting the survey. The measurement of works required professional expertise; hence an
architect and a construction technologist supported by assistants did all the measuring and sketches of the built up structures. A general guideline was developed for the specification of construction components based on the specification from the Zone administration for such purposes and general engineering practice for property valuation.

The method used for the assessment of the value of properties followed standard quantity surveying method. All built up structures were measured and based on the measurement of components of constructions, sections were drawn and materials of construction were noted. The drawn plans and sections were then used to quantify the different components of the constructions

The quality of the quantity surveying was assured as house to house survey was done and all structures were measured reasonably accurately\(^\text{21}\). Some of the components could not be measured or accurately represented as the houses do not have engineering plans before construction. Such components include depth of foundations, under-base construction of floors, gauges of corrugated iron sheet roofs, and depth and construction materials of dry pit latrines. In all cases procedures which ensured advantages of the owners were adopted.

The unit rate provided by the zone administration was found to reflect reasonably the market value for all construction components. However, the unit rate directive does not cover all construction components. The items not covered by the directive were estimated through market research. These items are very few covering thatch roof, chicka wall and metal sheet structures.

All built up structures were measured using a new 50 meter steel measuring tape. One civil engineer, one architect and one logistics coordinator did the measurement of all structures. The individual rooms/structures were measured and a sketch was prepared on site for reference. Plots were measured where there was clear boundary. Owners were also requested to produce title deed if any, or receipts of land tax payment. Both the measured size and the size indicated on the receipt were registered.

The accuracy of the measurements of houses were checked and verified in two rounds. The first was conducted under the supervision of the Resettlement Committee. The Resettlement Committee\(^\text{22}\) has nine members who represented the project affected persons, the LCA, the town residents, the town administration, and the OMS (Annex 2B). A 10% sample of houses were selected randomly and checked for the accuracy of the measurements. In all cases the measurements and the number of blocks in the compound which should be measured were found to be accurate. The second round verification was conducted in a full scale. At this time the measurements and inventory of all assets in all localities was verified and signed by property owners themselves under the witness of the Resettlement Committee.

Once the quantity surveying was finished and verified by the owners a unit rate was applied for construction components. The unit rate provided by the zone administration was found to reflect reasonably well the market value for the constructions. However, the unit rate directive does not cover some construction components. The items not covered by the directive were estimated through market research. The items not covered by the directive are very few covering thatch roof, chicka wall and metal sheet structures.

Plot sizes were also measured where possible. There is no clear plot demarcation in most cases. The residents knew differences in rights over seemingly common open spaces. Such subtle rights are difficult to ascertain. Therefore, measurement of plots was done only in situations where there is clear

\(^{21}\) The measurement of structures was done by a new 50 meter long measuring tape. The houses are not orthogonal (rectangular or clear shaped) and do not have uniform wall thickness. Moreover, there are additions over a long period of time which made sketching of the units difficult. However, for all practical purposes, all structures were measured fairly accurately. The measurement was checked and verified by each owner and found to be accurate.

\(^{22}\) The Resettlement Committee comprised 9 members at a time with three as alternative members for different localities. The alternative members are the representatives for the Core Zone and the host community. The members were drawn from the Mayor’s Office (1 member), representatives of PAPs (3 members), municipal office technicians (2 members); Office of Culture and Tourism (1 member); Lalibela Church administration (1 member) and a town elder, not affected by the resettlement (1 member).
plot demarcation; and in situations where the residents/owners agree on boundaries. In other cases, the majority of houses in the Core Zone, especially in Adishade, have very little open space; hence, the house area itself was taken as a plot as there was no private open space.

The plot sizes of holdings were measured and also recorded from receipts of property tax payment. The consultant has, therefore, recorded two measurements for plot sizes: 1) plot size as measured and 2) plot size as indicated on property tax receipt. In most cases the plot size as measured is bigger than the plot size as indicated on property tax receipt. The discrepancy is due to informal expansion, deliberately downsizing the area of the holdings by owners to evade land holding tax, or lack of proper measurement by the municipality. Generally, there is no as such considerable material loss for the owners due to the ambiguity on plot size; because compensation for land is not given on a one-to-one basis. In practice, plots are standardised and allocated on approximate area method. Standard plots adopted by the OMS provide wide benefit for small plot holders (those plots which are less than 150m$^2$) and near equal for large plot holders up to the allowable maximum size of 500m$^2$.

The process of validation of valuation

The valuation process was validated through several steps of participatory processes. The validation process included the following steps:

1. The properties were measured by professionals in the presence of the owner/s;
2. The measurement was drawn on standard format, perennial crops and other trees were counted and listed;
3. After the measurement of all properties was completed, about 10% of sample of houses (40 houses) were randomly selected and checked for the accuracy of the measurements under the supervision of the Resettlement Committee. In all cases the measurements and the number of structures in the compound which should be measured were found to be accurate.
4. The detailed measurement and list of assets was verified by going house-to-house in full scale, re-measuring plot size and houses and counting trees deemed eligible for compensation in the presence of the owner and the Resettlement Committee.
5. The valuation document was then validated/verified by the signature of the owner or a representative of the owner/s.
6. Procedure was established who should sign. A legal owner was defined as one who has a document, however rudimentary that might be, showing the property belongs to her/him. The Resettlement Committee supplemented by acting as witness to the truthfulness of claims.
7. Where disputes arose, sufficient time (more than two weeks) was given to property owners to resolve disputes among the claimants themselves, to settle legal matters, and to get papers from the town administration after they paid arrear of property tax.
8. Property owners were photographed and their documents were cross-linked with the valuation document through unique numbers to ease the implementation process.
9. Property owners were given ID cards with their signature and the signature of the consultant’s valuator and the consultant’s seal. A copy of the same document was kept with the consultant for handing over to the town administration (and/or the ESTDP)
10. Few property owners (just three) could not agree between themselves as who should collect compensation. In such cases the measurement and valuation was verified by the Resettlement Committee. These people are advised to settle their matters as soon as they can, well before the disbursement of compensation and further explained that their compensation money, otherwise, will end up in escrow account until they resolve their disputes.
11. One property owner—was not willing to verify and sign the valuation document at all. The reason was stated as unwillingness to accept the relocation measure in its entirety. In this particular case the measurement of property and the valuation was verified by the Resettlement Committee.

5.2 Results of the valuation

The total number of houses in each locality was surveyed and measurements were verified. However, the verification of ownership for some houses was very difficult. Some claim the kebele administration allowed them to renovate and live without rent (hence claim the house belongs to them); other claim they themselves built it while the kebele claims they are tenants (even if they do not pay rent); some
others say the house formerly belongs to their parents and it was confiscated by the Derg illegally. Verification of ownership is basically the task of the municipal administration and if there are disputes, the law court is the final arbiter. The consultant has tried to verify ownership of most houses; however few remain to be resolved. The main effect of the ambiguity on ownership status is on the number of housing units.

There are a total of 439 houses in the three localities of the Core Zone. Out of the 439 housing units\(^{23}\), 300 houses are privately owned and 139 are kebele houses. Some property owners have as many as eight independent structures; these were measured separately. In some cases determination of ownership status proved difficult. For example, in Adishade: partial/sectional ownership was claimed- Ground floor was Kebele owned but First floor claimed by occupant (eg. A062). In Chifrgoch one house was claimed self-built, but Kebele administration claimed it is a rent-free house\(^{24}\). Such cases need legal measures by a competent court; the verification of contested ownership was left for the concerned parties. One owner in Gebriel Sefer\(^{25}\) claimed that her house was burned down due to fire accident years ago but was not rebuilt for various reasons.

The majority of houses have no sanitary facilities. Bill of quantity and specification for a standard dry pit latrine was developed and applied for all houses which have sanitary facility in the form of dry pit latrine.

Kebele houses belong to the government, in such cases, valuation of property was limited to measuring and recording the houses and the plots they occupy. The number of households who reside in kebele houses was surveyed to establish eligible tenants for house replacement or other resettlement measures. In the case of kebele houses, all structures occupied by a legal tenant that has rental contract with the kebele is considered one house. According to the physical survey, there are 139 kebele owned houses in Adishade and Chifrgoch localities; there is no kebele owned house in Gebriel Sefer. The distribution of houses by ownership is shown in Table 5.

The built up structures of the majority of the host community were conserved; there are only two houses for demolition. One of the houses is a ruin while the other is a lived-in house. The valuation of one property was done. The compensation for farm land was calculated by the Office of Agriculture and paid by the OMS. The consultant has discussed the methods used to valuate loss of income from farm land, grazing land, perennial crops and trees and any other income generating improvements on land. The method used complies with the legal provisions for valuation of displacement compensation for farmers. The only complaint the farmers have is the limit on plot allocation to the household head alone. Through discussions with all stakeholders, it was agreed to provide all farmers who lost farm lands one additional plot of 150m\(^2\) to one of their family member.

The audit of functions of houses in the core zone is as follows:

- Out of a total of 300 privately owned houses, 43 owners have formal trade licence. These owners will get compensation for loss of income commensurate with their loss for three months.
- Out of a total of 139 kebele owned houses, 2 houses were unoccupied, while 7 houses were occupied by functions other than residential (civil society office, consumer association office, etc.)
- There are 155 informal petty traders in all three localities; they will be provided with compensation for loss of income for three months commensurate with the declared income per month.

\(^{23}\) A house unit is defined here as a structure owned by individuals. The structure may not be independently standing (could be strata ownership where one person owns the ground floor and the other owns the upper floor).

\(^{24}\) The case of Kasaw Terefe

\(^{25}\) G049-who is still paying property tax
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The cost estimate of the 300 private houses in Adishade, Chifrgoch and Gebriel sefer localities is about 35 million Birr at January 2011 rate. The summary sheet for property valuation work is presented in Volume 3 while a separate report (soft copy) dealing with bill of quantities and specifications is provided for management purposes so that the unit rate is adjusted according to the time of payment of compensation. It is to be noted here that the task of updating should be done by a competent and reliable body.

5.3 Plot allocation measures

The plot areas of private house owners were categorised so that all property holders received proper replacement. According to the physical survey, over two-third of the privately owned houses (68.3%) have plots that are less than 150m², about 15.7% have areas ranging between 151-300m², 8.3% of owners have plots with areas ranging from 301-500m²; and only 7.7% of the owners have plots that are more than 500m². The law has a ceiling of 500m² for residential function whereas municipalities could determine the smallest plot size according to the local context.

In recognition of the scarcity of land for expansion, the new structure plan limited the minimum plot in Lalibela to be 120 m². However, the smallest standard plot for allocation to the property holders in this case is 150m². 150m² plot size was adopted for allocation based on the former practice for the Mikael Ghibi residents displaced in 2009. Therefore, all property holders whose compounds have areas less or equal to this size will get 150m². All others will be allocated plots proportional to their holdings.

The consultant recommends allocation of 120 m² for all kebele tenants. The tenants were very much interested in the idea of plot allocation. However, the Lalibela Town administration has not decided whether or not it will allocate plots or build kebele houses. The consultant has provided sufficient number of plots for each category, including kebele tenants.

The legal procedure is to compensate plots based on legal ownership documents. However, if this procedure is followed, there are a substantial number of property owners who will get smaller plot sizes than they occupy now whereas those who have not paid property tax are rewarded as they will get plots based on measurement. The recommended practice would be for all property owners to be allocated based on measured size or size according to property tax receipt, whichever is the greater. In cases where the measured size is greater than the size as paid for in the property tax receipt, property owners need to pay tax based on the measurement.

The proposed replacement for plots is as follows:

1. Provide 150m² for all plot holders who have equal or less than 150m²
2. Provide standard plots that are near equal to the existing plots for holders of land between 150-500m².
3. Provide one plot of 500m² and one additional plot of 150m² for all plot holders who have more than 600m². This includes the host community who live in Kurakur.
4. For those who have a common house on different floors on a common plot which has an area of less or equal to 150m², provide separate plots of 120m² (the new minimum standard plot size adopted by the structure plan).
5. For common property holders whose holding is large (more than 150m²), the area shall be divided by the number of owners and new plots of sizes near equal to their portion shall be provided. In all cases no plot shall be less than the minimum standard plot size. To avoid unnecessary claims, only properties that are already subdivided and registered by the OMS shall be considered for independent plot allocation.

For a more detailed description refer Vol 3.
6. If a farmer who resides in the new resettlement area is displaced due to the new subdivision plan, he/she shall be given one plot of 500m$^2$ and one additional plot of 150m$^2$ similar to all plot holders who have more than 500m$^2$.

7. The compound of farmers (members of the host community) shall be reduced to 500m$^2$ and regularised to comply with subdivision plans of the area. In such cases, the land which is over and above the 500 m$^2$ limit shall be considered for calculation of compensation.

8. For all farmers who relinquish all their farmland for the resettlement but live elsewhere in Lalibela without any private residence plot, provide one plot of 150m$^2$ in addition to the compensation for farmland.

9. In the case of legal tenants of kebele houses, it is proposed to provide the minimum plot of 120m$^2$. For those who have no capacity to build private house, replacement of rental house shall be provided.

10. In all cases the new plots shall be contiguous to the extent possible to allow the continuation of social ties among the relocated persons.

6.0 Livelihood and income restoration plan

The ESTDP Lalibela project will displace households from the Core Zone for the purpose of rehabilitating and redeveloping the historic and cultural heritage sites as described in previous sections. The study undertaken to understand the socio-economic situation of households in these sites has the sole purpose of safeguarding the property rights and wellbeing of the displaced persons. The following sections provide summary of the projects designed to resettle the displaced persons and the manner of restoring their livelihoods and incomes.

In the planning of the livelihood and income restoration projects, consultations were conducted with the PAPs and all other stakeholders to identify potential development opportunities in and around Lalibela; and the desired economic engagements, experiences and potentials of the affected groups. After identifying the target groups and possible job and income generating opportunities, possible socio-economic groups that would best fit in each enterprise was identified. Subsequently, the number of persons to be engaged in each type of enterprise was also identified. The livelihood restoration plan was communicated to the general PAP’s and especially to the beneficiaries. Finally cost estimates and financing plan was prepared for enterprise development including financing training requirement and finance to safeguard the livelihood of the vulnerable.

6.1 Project beneficiaries

The livelihood and income restoration plan encompasses the households relocated from Mikael Ghibbi in 2009, households to be relocated from the three localities of the Core Zone and the host community. On the basis of the analysis of census results, among the total project affected groups and individuals, those whose livelihood are and will be at risk are identified to be the direct target beneficiaries of the livelihood restoration plan including the vulnerable group. Identification of target beneficiaries is, therefore, mainly based on social, economic and gender analysis, including vulnerability. Consequently four beneficiary groups are identified based on their socio-economic characteristics. The rationales of identifying these beneficiaries are explained below.

- Affected women have given priority in livelihood and income restoration program because of their socio-economic situations. Above all women constitute the majority of the affected people and the largest numbers of the affected households are female headed. Further among women

27 Detailed project descriptions are presented in Volume 3: Livelihood and income restoration plan of relocated persons in Lalibela.
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who are engaged in productive activities, the majority are involved in petty trading that is the informal sector and eventually affected by relocation. Moreover, as quantified below, women constitute the largest numbers of the unemployed and vulnerable groups.

- From occupational perspective, petty trading activities, as indicated above, are largely dependent on location factors where relocation results in ultimate loss of market and customers due to change of location. Agricultural activities, on the other hand, will be definitely affected due to loss of farmland for resettlement. Thus affected persons engaged in petty trading and agricultural activities are intended to be one of the main target beneficiaries of the livelihood restoration plan.

- Unemployment and poverty are the prevailing socio-economic problems in the project affected communities. Among economically active persons in the project affected communities, near to 30% of all affected persons are unemployed. The census further shows that among the unemployed, near to 70% are women. Hence, involving the unemployed in the livelihood restoration program through the provision of short term technical, operational and business skill training and financial and technical support to enable them engaging in some productive activities is indispensable to improve the social and economic status of the affected communities.

- Persons who are identified as vulnerable group, who constitute about 8% of the total project affected population, on the other hand, are apparent that they are the most economically and socially disadvantaged group and will be more destitute when relocated. Further, 59% of the vulnerable persons are still women. Thus vulnerable persons are one of the target beneficiaries to benefit from one or more safeguarding options recommended that will ensure the inclusiveness of the livelihood restoration plan to address marginality and vulnerability issues.

Accordingly, based on the above rationales the following project affected individuals and groups are intended to be direct target beneficiaries.

- 165 persons who are/were engaged in petty trading (excluding vulnerable persons who are/were engaged in petty trading)
- 45 persons who are/were primarily engaged in agriculture (excluding vulnerable persons who are/were engaged in agriculture and the unemployed persons who are in the host community)
- 396 unemployed persons (excluding vulnerable persons who are unemployed and including the unemployed who are in the host community)
- 262 vulnerable persons (of which 44 persons with disability and 218 elderly persons aged 65 years above, including vulnerable persons from the host community). Totally 868 people (268 male and 600 female) are intended as direct target beneficiaries of the livelihood restoration program.

As shown above, women constitute the largest number of direct target beneficiaries by comprising more than 69% and this male-female proportion is almost similar across the subgroups, i.e. People relocated in 2009, people to be relocated and the host community

On the other hand, the distribution of the intended target beneficiaries across the affected subgroups and localities indicates that the majority of the intended beneficiaries are from people to be relocated which accounts for 64% of the total intended direct beneficiaries. When looking across the localities, beneficiaries from Adishade constitutes the largest proportion, accounting for 40% of the total intended target beneficiaries.
Intended beneficiaries from the Host Community

The number of households who gave up and will give up their farmland for resettlement program are much more than the number of beneficiaries identified from the host community. This is because, despite loss of farmland, some of these called the “host community” residing outside the proposed resettlement location (Kurakur and Dereq - Wenz). These persons are not mainly engaged in farming; instead they are involved in other off-farm activities. So beneficiaries identified from those who lost farmland are those persons who are mainly engaged in farming.

In addition, like wise other subgroups, unemployed and vulnerable persons from the host are included to be among the intended beneficiaries. Accordingly a total of 139 persons are identified as target beneficiaries from Kurakur, Dereq Wenz, and persons residing outside these specific locations but lost or will lose farmland around Kurakur and Derk - Wenz for resettlement.

6.2 Business ventures identified for livelihood restoration

Possible project opportunities were identified based on critical analysis of the preferences of the project affected persons, analysis of the local economic development potential of Lalibela Town, discussions with the town’s MSE office and all other available sources of information. The majority of the project affected persons preferred to engage in commercial activities (62%) and in an individual set up (94%). However, the study indicated that it is not possible to include such a large proportion of the project beneficiaries in commercial activities. Moreover, some of the identified livelihood restoration projects require inputs which cannot be sustainable with individual set up.

Identified Business Activities

Households’ Preference towards Business Types

Most of project affected households have expressed a willingness to work or otherwise productively engage in some economic activities if given financial and technical support and skill development training and retraining as well as plots for working and marketing premises.

Data on the type of economic activities desired by the households was collected and analyzed in order to examine the possible business activities the project affected households would be engaged in, if they lose their current occupation and income as a result of the resettlement program. Accordingly the majority of the households (62 %) respond that they prefer to be engaged in commercial activities, while 27 % of households expressed to retain their current occupation.

Households’ Preference towards Forms of Business Ownership

Besides to desired economic activities, information was also gathered to examine the preferable forms of business ownership that the affected households should operate if supported to engage in some economic activities. Accordingly, more than 94 % of the respondents explained they prefer to own and run businesses individually. While only less than 5 % agreed to engage in cooperative owned or joint venture forms of businesses.

Similar interest with the above census results was also reflected during consultations with the affected communities that most of the affected persons explained their preference to engage in commercial activities and own and run businesses individually.
However, it is impossible and easier said than done to set aside the majority of the beneficiaries only in commercial activities and own and run businesses individually. To mention some of the reasons:

- From point of view of specialization, it is not economically viable and feasible if the majority are to be engage in commercial activities with less emphasis given to be engaged in production activities.
- It is deemed necessary to diversify economic employment and sector engagement to broaden the economic base of the town and unlock and utilize tourism related economic potential of the locality as well as creating economic integration among the different sectors.
- On the other hand, involving all or the majority of target beneficiaries in individually owned business will require a large size and number of plots that is unaffordable in Lalibela situation where land is very scarce, as well as skill and capital are limited. Thus, attaining economies of scale and running sustainable business through efficient use of limited resources require pooling of these resources through joint ventures like cooperative businesses.
- Further, the existing government regulation towards promoting and supporting micro and small enterprise development show that due emphasis is given to establish as many as 70% of MSEs into cooperative societies.
- This fact is supplemented by periodic reports that revealed sufficient achievements gained through aforesaid forms of businesses organizations throughout the urban centers of the country, including Lalibela.

A number of business types and economic activities are identified by extensive consultation with relevant stakeholders (the project affected communities, the target beneficiaries, City Micro and Small Enterprise Development and Agricultural Development office). Further market survey has also carried out parallel with informal consultation with experienced persons and enterprises engaged in the local businesses and small scale productive activities.

**Market surveys**

Market survey was conducted to get additional information to devise and propose viable business activities. The data was collected by interviewing businessmen working in the town particularly owners and managers of tourist standard Hotels, owners of big souvenir shops, wholesalers and construction engineers and construction managers engaged in construction works in the town.

The survey result supposed to support the proposal to ensure the feasibility of proposed business activities. The result suggests that there is a huge market demand for most of goods and services which are now in short of supply or supplied from other cities. Additionally, the survey provides additional business types for which the businessmen experienced there are high demand.

In addition, exhaustive assessment of studies conducted on the town economy (such as local economic development study as part of the town master plan revision) was reviewed to support identification of potential and feasible business opportunities.

Based on the analysis of pertinent data, six major industrial/enterprise groups were identified to comprise 41 types of economic activities under them to organize a total of 161 business establishments and to absorb more than 800 target beneficiaries. The proposal also suggests the possible number of persons and socio-economic groups who will be best fit to the corresponding activities and enterprise. The Small and Micro Enterprise Development Office in collaboration with ESTDP-LSMU (Livelihood and Income Restoration expert), will organise the beneficiaries into cooperatives based on their skills and wishes.

The main Industrial/Enterprise groups are:
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6.3 Safeguard to vulnerable groups

The proportion of vulnerable groups in the project areas is very high compared to other parts of Lalibela Town. This is may be due to the fact that the Core Zone is the first settled part of Lalibela and the churches being the attraction spots, they have attracted the elderly and the handicapped. As presented in the socio-economic study, women constitute the majority; there are persons who are 65 years and above; and those who have physical handicaps. The preferences of the vulnerable groups were identified, possibilities were then explored, and projects were designed to benefit these groups. However, it is recommended to consult the beneficiaries at the time of implementation too as there could be change of preference based on better knowledge of the different sectors. The details are explained in the Livelihood and income restoration project plan.

6.4 Persons who claimed for inclusion to the project in April 2011

Some persons claimed to have been not included in the livelihood restoration scheme and requested to be beneficiaries of the scheme. The socio-economic data collection was conducted in August, October and December 2010. The community had a very wide opportunity to provide data for the study. However, during the verification process in April 2011 some people complained for not being listed as beneficiary on two grounds. First, and the majority, they claimed their status has changed since the last socio-economic data collection time. Some were employed, or were students by then but in April 2010, they were unemployed. Few others claimed they never gave data about themselves. The study team tried to verify these claims but it was difficult to ascertain the status of the claimants. Therefore, it is recommended that the claims of the persons have to be verified if they are residents of Lalibela in the first place. For those whose status is changed since the last data collection, the implementing agency may accommodate them in consultation with the ESTDP-LSMU and the Kebele administration. The list of such persons is annexed in the relevant sections of Volume 4.

6.5 Livelihood and income restoration project financing

The financial requirement of the different enterprises was estimated based current prices. The cost items include trainings, construction of work stations, purchase of equipments, and working capital. A total of about 16 million Birr is needed to establish and run the proposed business enterprises and income generating activities, skill development trainings and safeguarding the lives of the vulnerable. The source of this fund is the ESTDP. The detailed cost breakdown of costs is provided in V.4.

7.0 The Resettlement neighbourhood plan and infrastructure design

7.1 Site selection criteria

The households displaced from the Core Zone were consulted on possible relocation sites. They provided the basic criteria for site selection. The following points are the core principles used for the selection of the site for the new resettlement neighbourhood.

Table 5: Site selection criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Site selection criteria</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Displaced persons have to be resettled in close proximity to each other so as to maintain</td>
<td>92% of the displaced households are members of at least one Idir, they also have equb, and other non-formal ties which they wanted to retain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 A detailed resettlement plan which shows the different land uses and plot subdivisions is presented separately as Vol.5: Neighbourhood plans for persons relocated from the Core Zone of Lalibela
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<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>social ties</td>
<td>The site has to be the nearest possible site to the Core Zone</td>
<td>The households claim that if justice be done, no one other than themselves should be the nearest to the churches. They complain that site should have been reserved for them when relocation was thought of two decades ago. However, some of the actions cannot be reversed. Based on this argument, the immediate expansion area has to be targeted for the new resettlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The site has to be reasonably gentle slope to minimise cut and fill during construction</td>
<td>The houses and the plots they occupy are mostly small; hence the majority will be allocated the smallest standard plots. It is advisable to choose a site with gentle slopes to reduce construction cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The land use of the site has to be compatible to the proposed land use on the structure plan</td>
<td>The structure plan is a law when it comes to land development; hence the new sites have to comply with the land use plan. This means the new resettlement neighbourhood has to be developed on a site reserved for residence or mixed use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The new site has to be an area where there will be few to be displaced as a result of the relocation of households from the Core Zone</td>
<td>To minimise the number of relocates the new site has to be an area where the host community are few and/ or it is possible to conserve their residence within the new subdivision plan. Where possible, a site with large farmland holdings should be selected as it minimises the number of host community members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Situation analysis by WUB Consult*

The five criteria listed above emanated from the displaced persons and from planning consideration. The PAPs argue that they have lived in the Core Zone for many years and have established social and economic ties which should be retained; hence they want to be resettled close to each other. These criteria were over-riding principles which the consultant and the town administration considered in site selection. The request to maintain the relative location of households to the churches cannot be fulfilled as new settlements have been developed in the last two decades. Vacant sites located at different distances from the churches were considered and finally the nearest possible sites which could accommodate all households were selected.

![Existing situation of the new resettlement site at Kurakur](image_url)
Map 2. Location of the new resettlement site at Kurakur

The town administration has already started to resettle households in Kurakur locality; hence this site was scrutinised if it fulfils the above criteria. The site is part of the immediate expansion area; it has asphalted road access, the farthest plot will be only 500m away from the asphalted road. The consultant has ascertained that there is no other expansion site with sufficient area that is nearer to the churches to resettle the whole displaced households in one locality. The only alternative to this site which fulfils all criteria except the distance from churches (Criteria No.2) would be Simeno. However, this is very far from the churches and does not fall within the immediate expansion zone of the town. Therefore, the chosen relocation site is Kurakur on both sides of the asphalted road with Mesqel Kibra Primary School as a center.

7.2 Description the site

Dereq Wenz and Kurakur are sites in the eastern part of the town centre. The sites are located about three kms away from the churches. The site between the churches and Kurakur (Abay Wuha and Work Dingay) accommodates mostly residences perched to the steep slope, a high school, and the town's bus station. In fact had the town not been Lalibela where the foci is the churches, Kurakur would have been the most sought after site to own a property. Kurakur is part of the immediate expansion area of Lalibela.

Site 1 and 2 are dissected by the asphalt road leading to Neakutoleab and Shumsha. The area to the East of the asphalt road has one access road which connects Work Dingay to Kurakur. The site is bounded by two semi-dry streams in the North and the South side, by the steep slopes in the East and by the Lalibela-Shumsha asphalt in the West. The current function of the site is residential and farming.

The area West of the asphalt road has gentle slopes. The site is used as farmland and residence for the farmers. Some of the farmers have already been expropriated for the development of a large hotel. A new primary school (Mesqel Kibra) which was built by an international NGO, was opened and became operational in September 2010. This new school is within the new neighbourhood. The site beside the school is a hill which may be developed into a recreation centre. The site is dissected by a small dry stream. The banks of the stream would be conserved as green area to give open space for the residents. The south-eastern part of the site falls steeply to join the valley of a small river. This area has a fantastic view toward Selamge-a plateau planned as a pilgrims camp in the new structure plan.

7.3 Characteristics of the new neighbourhood

The neighbourhood is mainly residential with social services necessary for the number of people to be accommodated there. Relocated persons will receive free building permits. The plot size distribution follows the results of the survey of the Core Zone. Blocks are grouped according to area of plots. The smallest plots are laid on a gentler slope than the bigger plots. The reason behind this is that owners of big plots have more chance to adjust buildings to the terrain much easily than the owners of small plots. Once the new site is cleared, roads laid, and plots are defined and allocated to the relocated persons, it is possible for property owners to hire contractors to build their residences.

The standard road width is 10 m throughout the settlement; however, a 15 m width road also passes through the site. The roads are laid in such a way that they follow the contour of the site. The plots are also arranged in a manner which minimises cut and fill. Once the new site is cleared, roads laid, and plots are defined and allocated to the relocated persons, it is possible for property owners to hire contractors to build their residences. The relocated persons will receive building permits and title deed free of charges.

7.4 Social and physical facilities

There is a primary school within the resettlement site. Moreover, there is a site reserved for kindergarten. The site along the existing asphalt road is reserved for commercial purposes by the structure plan. When developed, it will provide job opportunities as well as different kinds of facilities
to the Kurakur community. Different hotels and restaurants are already under construction around the site of the resettled households from Mikael Ghibi.

Open ditch drainage is planned along the roads. As the site has good slope there will not be problem of water stagnation, rather the drainage ditch is designed to avoid formation of gullies due to soil erosion. Water supply line also runs along the roads. Communal water points will be provided from the outset within a radius of 100m; however, anyone who can pay the private connection fees can get the service. The neighbourhood is also planned to have electric power for which households and farmers will also have to pay for a connection fee. The line will run along the road and anyone who pays the required fee for private connection could get the service. Detailed analysis of infrastructure and design thereof including cost estimate is provided in Volume 5.

8.0 Implementation methods

The development of the resettlement neighbourhood and the launching of the livelihood restoration projects require close follow up. The activities which are expected to be performed could be grouped into three major categories:

1. Payment of compensation,
2. Development of infrastructure, and
3. Launching of livelihood restoration projects.

These activities are inter-related requiring an integrated approach. This section provides guidance on how to organise phased development, the management organisation and the required budgets for implementation.

8.1 Phased Resettlement Implementation

The resettlement project affects over 2000 people and requires the reorganisation of a large part of Lalibela Town. Therefore, it is necessary to carry out project activities in such a manner where the transition for the would-be relocated households is smooth. To achieve smooth transition it is necessary to implement activities phase by phase. The priority of activities for resettlement implementation will be presented in detail here.

Task 1: Preliminary activities

The RAP has to be approved and following its approval, the GoE has to allocate budget for the resettlement project. Once budget is approved recruitment of the staff members of the Resettlement Coordination Unit will be conducted. Thereafter all other activities of the resettlement project will be implemented. This task may take a month; however, this is a preparatory task which will not be considered as project time.

Task 2: Land acquisition for resettlement

The Lalibela Town administration has to conduct a continuous assessment of land requirement and convert land into development site. For the current resettlement project land in the identified sites has been taken over by the town administration. Therefore, the laying out of roads, subdivision of the plots according to the neighbourhood plan are the priority actions. These actions could be taken immediately after approval the RAP study and securing the necessary budget. The budget for this phase includes: land measurement cost, and compensation for farmland for those not yet paid. The estimated time requirement for this activity is one month. It is advisable to pay the compensation and acquire the land before the rains come and farmers are engaged in farm preparations.

Task 3: Parcellation, Infrastructure development and plot allocation
Once land is acquired for the resettlement, the site has to be surveyed for subdividing plots and the laying out of access roads. There is already base map with contour; the task will be simple layout survey. Once the land is parcelled out, it is necessary to allocate the plots for all eligible persons at the same time. The infrastructure development tasks include: construction of access roads, installation of water supply lines, and electric power supply lines. The surveying and road construction tasks could be performed successfully by outsourcing to competent firms. The water supply line could also be outsourced. The power supply line is usually installed by EEPCO. Therefore, the OMS or its designate has to prepare Terms of References and bid documents for outsourcing activities to private contractors.

The preparation of bid documents, announcement of bid, bid evaluation and award of contract could take 45 days. The development of the infrastructure may take up to four months.

**Task 4: Launching livelihood and income restoration projects**

The livelihood and income restoration project activities should be started early before relocation. The beneficiaries for the different enterprises could get together and form cooperatives (where needed), start training as well as start construction of operation stations. The activities and the time frame for the livelihood and income restoration projects include:

1. Formation of groups/cooperatives: One month
2. Conducting training: three months
3. Site preparation and allocation to beneficiaries: two months
4. Construction of shades and operation premises: three months
5. Allocation of fund for the start of business: on-going

This component of the resettlement project is estimated to take at least 6 six months time. The estimated cost of the income restoration projects is about sixteen million Birr. The source of finance for this component is the ESTDP-LSMU.

**Task 5: Payment of compensation**

Once the resettlement site is ready for house construction, compensation could be paid to property owners. The resettlement site is declared fit for house construction when plot subdivision has been completed, access roads are in place (even if not completed at least made accessible for material supply), and water supply line is in place (as it is necessary for house construction). Hence it may not be necessary to wait until all road construction, water and power supply is finished to start payment of compensation and construction of houses. The critical aspect is to pay compensation at the right time for the start of house construction.

Therefore, if all relocation site is subdivided, then all persons who are entitled to monetary compensation could be paid and requested to start construction. However, if all relocation site is not prepared, the priority of relocation would be as follows: Adishade; Chifrgoch; and Gebriel Sefer. It is recommended to pay compensation and resettle the residents of a locality at the same time. This way complaint about differences in unit rate application and choice of relocation site will be avoided.

The persons to be relocated should be given 12 months to construct houses after compensation is paid and plot is given. If they are not given time to construct houses, it may be necessary to provide them with money for house rent or accommodated in a temporary shelter. However, as it would be difficult to get rental housing in Lalibela at such large scale it is advisable to give time for the construction of houses. The rental level to apply per month per household for those who opt to accommodate themselves is 150 Birr for all households (private house owners, kebele tenants and tenants in private houses).

**Task 6: Building permit acquisition and house construction**

Once the plot subdivision is finished and individuals have known their plots, standard house plan with building permit should be given to property owners and kebele tenants who are given plots. The OMS and the Resettlement Coordination Unit should monitor the setting out of houses and quality of main
construction components. Although individuals are responsible for the construction of their own houses, it is possible to organise construction brigades to expedite implementation as well as to promote job creation. It is necessary to provide title deed and building permit to the host community who are incorporated in the resettlement plan.

**Task 7: Assistance to get temporary accommodation**

If PAPs have to be displaced before house construction is completed it is necessary to look for rental accommodation. Rapid assessment of the availability of rental accommodation in Lalibela indicated that there may not be sufficient accommodation to absorb all households to be relocated from the Core Zone. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct phased resettlement and/or construction of temporary accommodation. Temporary accommodation is usually built from corrugate iron sheet. Households are provided one private room and a communal facility for cooking and sanitation. This option is expensive and also socially not recommended. It requires space with infrastructure, which is scarce in Lalibela.

It is better to provide assistance to all property holders to construct temporary shelter in lieu of rent. If the property holders accommodate themselves, the available rental houses from the private sector may absorb the other groups. In this case property holders can use the salvaged materials for the construction of temporary shelters on their new plot. This way they may also be obliged to expedite the construction of the main house. It is recommended to provide about Birr 1,800, in addition to the salvaged materials, for each property holder to compensate for the construction of temporary shelter. If chosen, this payment replaces the payment for rent.

*Fig. 6: Discussion with the host community (top) and survey of location of farmers houses (bottom)*
### Table 6: Action plan for resettlement project activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>No. of months</th>
<th>Implementing agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td>7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preliminary activities</strong></td>
<td>13 14 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Approval of RAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>ANRS, MoCT, WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Allocation of budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Assigning RCU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Task 1: Land acquisition for resettlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Approval of RAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Allocation of budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Assigning RCU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Task 2: Infrastructure development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Land acquisition for resettlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Infrastructure development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Task 3: Launching livelihood and income restoration projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Formation of groups/cooperatives: one month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Conducting training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Site preparation and allocation to beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Construction of shades and operation premises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Allocation of fund for the start of business: on-going</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Task 4: Payment of compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lalibela Town Administration, RCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Task 5: Building permit acquisition and house construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Task 6: Assistance to get temporary accommodation (Alternatively considered if the houses demolished prior to completing their homes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** that the start date for project activities depends on decisions on critical components of the project. Land acquisition is the most critical to start the RAP activities. It is immoral and culturally unacceptable to destroy planted fields and start construction. Therefore, takeover of resettlement site has to be carried out before the rainy season or immediately after harvest.

Prepared by WUB Consult
8.2 Dispute resolution and grievance redressing procedures

Mechanisms for dispute resolution have to consider the possible disputes that may arise as a result of the relocation activities. The relocation activities involve determination of property ownership, valuation of properties, determination of sizes of plots, payment modalities for compensation, plot allocation procedures, and infrastructure provision. The disputes between households on proportion of ownership (in the case of joint ownership) have to be settled in a law court but disputes on procedures could be resolved by a committee established for this purpose. The categories of grievances, principles and organisational arrangement of redressing grievances are explored below.

8.2.1 Principles for redressing grievances

Grievance redressing mechanisms have to be designed in view of the activities which may upset the existing balance in society. The resettlement project will touch upon property issues, means of livelihood, organisation of social and spatial aspects that influence proximity to a set of environmental, economic, social, and spiritual assets. Therefore, the grievance redressing system has to be designed in such a way that it functions in a flexible manner. The persons handling grievance cases have to be elected in a transparent manner, and the implementing agency has to incline to a pro-poor approach in all its decisions. The Grievance Hearing Committee (GHC)\(^29\) has to report its findings to the Mayor. Cases which are resolved amicably between aggrieved parties through the intermediation of the GHC could be implemented directly. However, if the resolution of a case requires additional payment or any form of reallocation of resources, the report shall be sent to the Mayor for consideration. If the Mayor agrees to the recommendation, he/she shall instruct the RCU to implement the amended provision; on the other hand if the recommendation of the GHC is such that it upsets legal frameworks, the aggrieved party may be advised to pursue the case in a normal law court.

8.2.2 Organisation of grievance redressing method

The expected grievances that may arise in project preparation and implementation are assessed so as to determine who should be included in the Grievance Hearing Committee (GHC). The summary of the analysis is summarised in Table 7.

Table 7: Analysis of grievance categories and persons affiliated with the grievances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Category of grievance</th>
<th>Persons raising grievance</th>
<th>Possible cause for grievance</th>
<th>Responsible institution to resolve grievance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Pre-displacement period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Designation of displacement area</td>
<td>-Residents -EOTC</td>
<td>-misunderstanding between UNESCO, the Town administration and residents and EOTC</td>
<td>-LTA -EOTC -BoCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Consultation arrangements</td>
<td>-Residents</td>
<td>-lack of proper timing -not informing</td>
<td>-OMS &amp; kebele admin. -BoCT -LTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Property ownership verification related issues</td>
<td>-Residents -Kebele administration -EOTC</td>
<td>-application of wrong procedures -lack of documents -misunderstanding of legal provisions</td>
<td>-LTA -Consultant -Resettlement Committee (RC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Measurement/inventory</td>
<td>-Private property</td>
<td>-misunderstanding of procedures</td>
<td>-LTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{29}\) GHC is proposed to be composed of 7 members drawn from the different localities of the PAPs (2 members), town elders not affected by the resettlement (1 member), the town administration (2 member), municipal office (1 member) and the church administration (1 member).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Category of grievance</th>
<th>Persons raising grievance</th>
<th>Possible cause for grievance</th>
<th>Responsible institution to resolve grievance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Categorisations for entitlements</td>
<td>Residents in the Core Zone -Kebele admin. -EOTC</td>
<td>Application of wrong procedures</td>
<td>LTA -Resettlement Committee (RS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Resettlement Committee (RC) -Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of assets</td>
<td>owners -Kebele Admin. -EOTC</td>
<td>-lack of documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.0 Resettlement development period

| 2.1   | Disbursement of entitlements | -displaced persons -OMS | -lack of fund -lack of timely response by staff | LTA -OMS                                   |
| 2.2   | Allocation of entitlements  | -Displaced persons       | -non-transparent plot allocation -Application of wrong procedures | LTA -OMS                                  |
| 2.3   | Development of the resettlement | Displaced persons         | -Lack of construction materials -lack of technical expertise -improper supervision | Federal/Regional administration -LTA       |
| 2.4   | Interim accommodation and livelihood | Displaced persons | -improper timing of relocation -lack of means of livelihood during construction of new dwelling | LTA                                       |

3.0 Relocation and resettling period

| 3.1   | Time of relocation | -Displaced persons | -untimely demand for relocation | OMS -ESTDP-LSMU |
| 3.2   | Support during relocation | -Displaced persons | -lack of support for transport | LTA |
| 3.3   | Post-relocation livelihood issues | -displaced and resettled persons | -lack of rehabilitation measures | ESTDP-LSMU -LTA |
| 3.4   | Infrastructure development | -Relocated persons -Municipal administration | -lack of basic infrastructure -improper design | LTA ESTDP-LSMU |
| 3.5   | Post-relocation space use of vacated area | -EOTC -Former residents | -Improper control of development -improper allocation of use rights | LTA -EOTC -BoCT |

The matrix on possible grievances and their causes indicates who could be responsible to solve the problems. It is proposed here that a 7-person Grievance Hearing Committee (GHC) consisting of two representatives from the Lalibela Town Administration, one representative from the OMS, two representatives from the displaced persons, one representative from town elders other than the displaced persons and one representative from the church administration could form the GHC. However, if any person is dissatisfied by the decision of the GHC, they could recourse a case to the Appeals Court at Zone level on grounds of legal procedures.

8.3 Resettlement Management Organisation

The resettlement project has multitudes of activities which should be coordinated, guided and monitored for smooth implementation and ensuring positive impact. In normal conditions, where the households to be displaced are few, all resettlement activities are managed by the OMS. This has been the case during the relocation of households from Mikael Ghibi in 2009. However, the current scale of relocation is huge whereas the capacity of the OMS is very limited. Therefore, it is recommended to set up a separate unit/focal person to manage the resettlement activities.

---

30 About 10% the town population is affected by the resettlement project.
Two professionals who will be responsible to coordinate the implementation of the RAP together with the ESTDP-LSMU should be employed by the OMS for close follow up and implementation of resettlement activities. The monthly salaries of the two experts will be covered by ESTDP as part of capacitating the Lalibela Town Administration in implementing the RAP. The *Resettlement Coordination Unit*, which comprises the two professional, need to have expertise in a) urban planning, infrastructure development, urban management, a professional who is capable of understanding the complexities of resettlement, urban development, and human resource management; preferably be an engineer, or urban planner; and the other b) a professional in community development works, community mobilisation, and communications. The two professionals should be directly responsible to the Mayor and shall also report to ESTDP-LSMU. This will not duplicate the activities of departments which are already in place within the OMS and elsewhere. Rather, it is proposed to coordinate the activities of departments responsible for the implementation of various components of the resettlement project. The Resettlement Coordination Unit is proposed to be a counter-part of the ESTDP-LSMU from the side of the town administration and closely monitored by ESTDP-LSMU. The resettlement activities and the departments responsible to implement the activities are listed in Table 8 below.

As could be observed the OMS is the focal institution which will carry the burden of implementing most resettlement project activities. Currently, the OMS does not have a manager, nor there are staff who could manage land development and management. The office of the OMS is within the Core Zone; hence it will be part of the structures to be demolished. Therefore, it is necessary to build the capacity of this institution too. The necessary capacities include recruitment of new staff to manage technical components of municipal functions, training of existing staffs, and arrangement for appropriate working space.

**Table 8: Task allocation for resettlement project implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Responsible institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Land acquisition for resettlement</td>
<td>-RCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-land measurement</td>
<td>-Office of Agriculture,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-valuation of land productivity and compensation</td>
<td>-OMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-determination of rightful land holders/owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Approval of neighbourhood plan</td>
<td>---OMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Checking compliance with the structure plan</td>
<td>-Mayor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Checking plot size regulations</td>
<td>-RCU and OMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-allocation of plots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Infrastructure development:</td>
<td>-RCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-surveying and laying out access roads</td>
<td>-OMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-subdivision of blocks into plots</td>
<td>-Private contractors,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-floating bids for construction of access roads, drainage,</td>
<td>-Para-statal organisations (water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Construction of water supply lines, and public water points</td>
<td>supply office and EEPCO), and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Installation of power supply lines</td>
<td>-labour-based contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Payment of compensation</td>
<td>-OMS and kebele administrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Verification of ownership status</td>
<td>-Finance and Economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Notification of phases of compensation payment including adjustment to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount of compensation due to changes in unite rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Disbursement of compensation money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Clearing the Core Zone</td>
<td>-OCT, OMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Designation of heritage buildings for retention</td>
<td>-Individual house owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Supervision of demolishing and clearing site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Launching livelihood and income restoration projects</td>
<td>-RCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Preparation of land for operators</td>
<td>-MSE office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Construction of operation premises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The RCU staff members should be employed as soon as possible. It should be placed together with the OMS in the new premise. Furthermore, there is need to employ a livelihood restoration expert. The expert should be placed under the ESTDP-LSMU and paid for by the project.

8.4 Monitoring & Evaluation

The ESTDP in Lalibela encompasses various activities, one of them being the resettlement project. It is obvious projects that have multiple components need close monitoring. All stakeholders have to monitor their specific concerns timely. The following mechanisms will be used to monitor and evaluate the progress of the resettlement project.

8.4.1 Monitoring method

Progress and compliance to project principles will be monitored by ESTDP-LSMU, the Lalibela Town administration, the ANRS Bureau of Culture and Tourism and the regional Urban Planning Institute. External monitoring agencies, such as urban planning consultants, are proposed to be engaged to monitor resettlement plan implementation. The ESTDP is proposed to initiate and pay for external monitoring and evaluation services.

The components of the resettlement project could be subdivided into two main categories to streamline monitoring. The first category encompasses payment of compensation and house building, and the second one encompasses all other project activities (construction of infrastructure, facilities, and livelihood restoration projects). The RCU is the key implementer of the resettlement projects.

### Table 9: Monitoring plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Resettlement project component</th>
<th>Implementing institution</th>
<th>Monitoring institution - internal</th>
<th>Monitoring institution - external</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Estimate budget In USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intra month</td>
<td>Ext. month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Payment of compensation</td>
<td>RCU</td>
<td>- OMS</td>
<td>- ESTDP-LSMU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plot allocation</td>
<td>OMS</td>
<td>Mayor’s office</td>
<td>- ESTDP-LSMU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Construction of houses</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>OMS</td>
<td>- Regional BUDW</td>
<td>week</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Construction of access roads</td>
<td>RCU/contractor</td>
<td>- Mayor’s office</td>
<td>- Regional BUDW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- OMS</td>
<td>- External consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Construction of water supply line</td>
<td>RCU/contractor</td>
<td>- RCU</td>
<td>- Regional BUDW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- OMS</td>
<td>- External consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Installation of power supply line</td>
<td>EEPCO</td>
<td>- RCU</td>
<td>- Regional BUDW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- OMS</td>
<td>- External consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Installation of ETC</td>
<td>ETC</td>
<td>- RCU</td>
<td>- Regional BUDW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Resettlement project component</td>
<td>Implementing institution</td>
<td>Monitoring institution(internal)</td>
<td>Monitoring institution/external</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Estimate budget In USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>telecommunication line</td>
<td>-OMS</td>
<td>-External consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Construction of KG OMS/contractor</td>
<td>-RCU -OMS</td>
<td>-Regional BUDW -External consultant -Education office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Construction of community center OMS/contractor</td>
<td>-RCU -OMS</td>
<td>-Mayor’s office -Regional BUDW -External consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Construction of operating shades MSE office/individuals</td>
<td>-RCU -OMS</td>
<td>Office of Trade and Industry</td>
<td>week</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Establishment of MSEs as livelihood restoration scheme MSE office</td>
<td>-RCU -OMS -SME</td>
<td>-OMS Office of Trade and Industry</td>
<td>week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that:* the estimated budget is for monitoring by the institutions indicated here.

The Office of Municipal Services will be responsible to monitor adherence of house construction and infrastructure development to applicable standards and to town plans. The regional Bureau of Urban Development and Works and external consultants should be involved in the monitoring and evaluation of the works before final acceptance.

### 8.4.2 Evaluation method

#### Evaluation criteria

The performance of the resettlement project components shall be evaluated periodically by the ESTDP and the WB. The ESTDP-LSMU shall evaluate the resettlement project activities every month in the initial stages of the project and every three months after the first group of persons are paid compensation and have started house construction. The issues to be considered in the evaluation depend on components of the resettlement project. However, the following points shall be considered in all evaluations.

1. Compliance with project directives
2. Compliance with action plan for the completion of components as agreed between responsible institution and contractor
3. Appropriateness of fund disbursement
4. Quality of performance
5. Satisfaction of project affected persons
6. Capacity of the implementing unit

#### Reporting

The RCU shall prepare monthly report of activities and submit to the Mayor’s Office, and the regional BoCT and ESTDP-LSMU. The ESTDP-LSMU should also prepare monthly report of activities to the National Project Coordination Office (NPCO). The resettlement project will be part of the total tourism development programme; hence the report dealing with resettlement project may be just a part of the overall project report. External evaluators maybe employed to assess project performance at year one of the project (i.e. end of resettlement period). A quarterly report shall be sent to the WB. Project appraisal will be done yearly and the plan
adjusted accordingly. The reporting period is similar to the monitoring schedule as shown in Table 9 above.

### 8.5 Resettlement Budget & Financing Plan

The budget need of the resettlement is the sum total of all activities which require financial input. These activities are already described in detail in the various sections of this RAP report and the detailed reports which form part of this study. The activities related to the resettlement project requiring fund and the cost estimate by category of activities is indicated in **Table 10** below.

**Table 10: Required budget and proposed sources of finance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Description of component</th>
<th>Cost in ETB ('000)</th>
<th>Cost in USD ('000)</th>
<th>Implementing agency</th>
<th>Proposed source of fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Ground surveying work and Construction of infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Ground surveying work</td>
<td>119.00</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>RCU</td>
<td>GOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Construction of about 9.96km all weather gravel roads with stone lined drainage ditches of 4.3km, drainage line considered separately</td>
<td>9322.591</td>
<td>582.66</td>
<td>RCU, LTA</td>
<td>GOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Stone lined drainage ditch of 4.3 km</td>
<td>1057.952</td>
<td>66.12</td>
<td>RCU, LTA</td>
<td>GOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Construction of Water supply lines with one reservoir,</td>
<td>1725.253</td>
<td>107.83</td>
<td>RCU, LTA</td>
<td>GOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Electric power supply lines including street lighting</td>
<td>712.218</td>
<td>44.51</td>
<td>EEPCO</td>
<td>GOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Service charges for electric meter reinstallation for the households who have had meter connection before relocation (181hhs x1000Birr)</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>GOE/ANRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Communication networks mainly telephone lines</td>
<td>Individual cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>ETC</td>
<td>GOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Construction of community facilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Construction of a Kindergarten;</td>
<td>640.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>RCU, LTA</td>
<td>GOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Construction of community centre with health post, and pharmacy,</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>RCU, LTA</td>
<td>GOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Compensation for private property owners (core zone only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Compensation for loss of private houses including trees in the compound (based on property valuation study)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adishade -houses Trees</td>
<td>19,840,721</td>
<td></td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>GOE/ANRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>147,980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chifrgoch - houses Tree</td>
<td>9,788,083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>154,130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.No.</td>
<td>Description of component</td>
<td>Cost in ETB (’000)</td>
<td>Cost in USD (’000)</td>
<td>Implementing agency</td>
<td>Proposed source of fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gebriel - houses</td>
<td>4,874,229</td>
<td>278,952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total for Core Zone</td>
<td>35,084.095</td>
<td>2,192.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Disturbance allowance for transportation services for all households in the Core Zone (400 Birr x 562 hhlds)</td>
<td>224.80</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>GOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Disturbance allowance to allow for rent if required to demolish before house construction (Birr 150@month x 3 months x 300 hhlds)</td>
<td>135.0</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>GOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td><strong>Kebele tenants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>Construction of kebele houses for legal tenants If the LTA going to built for all 130 tenants (20m²/hhld at Birr 1,200/ m²) If plot is given, this cost will not be incurred by the GOE</td>
<td>3120.00</td>
<td>195.00</td>
<td>LTA / OMS</td>
<td>GOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td><strong>Private house tenants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.1</td>
<td>A one month rent Birr 150 (150Birr x 210hhs) to be paid as adjustment allowance</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>GOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td><strong>Host community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6.1</td>
<td>Compensation for loss of agricultural fields (based on Office of Agriculture; most part paid, remaining only)</td>
<td>5,065.17</td>
<td>316.57</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>GOE/ANRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6.2</td>
<td>Compensation for house demolished due to new road layout (two residents only)</td>
<td>97.00</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>GOE/ANRS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td><strong>Fund for livelihood and income restoration projects for all PAPs</strong></td>
<td>16,076.896</td>
<td>1004.81</td>
<td>LTA, ESTDP</td>
<td>ESTDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Disturbance allowance to compensate for loss of income for formal petty traders and business establishments for three months</td>
<td>368,026</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>GOE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Disturbance allowance to compensate for loss of income for informal petty traders and business establishments for three months</td>
<td>140,595</td>
<td>8.787</td>
<td>GOE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td><strong>Resettlement Project implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Salary of RCU group for 12 months</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>ESTDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Livelihood restoration expert</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>ESTDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Running costs for 12 months</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>LTA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td><strong>Relocation of Monastery and rehabilitation of church school</strong></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>ESTDP-LSMU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Construction of residence and rehabilitation of working space as</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 This task and the corresponding cost may be considered during post-relocation site development intervention in the core zone including landscaping and construction of walking routes and signage’s.
According to the budget estimate indicated in Table 10, the part to be covered through World Bank loan accounts for only 24% of the required fund for the resettlement project. Therefore, the GOE has to plan ahead and allocate sufficient fund for resettlement projects.

9.0 Environmental Impacts of the resettlement project

The environmental impacts of the resettlement project were assessed by sub-dividing the tasks into Core Zone and the new resettlement area. The Core Zone was assessed basically to understand the social situation and its possible impacts on the environment on the new resettlement areas whereas the social and biophysical aspects of the new resettlement areas were assessed to understand sensitive components for change and to design possible mitigation measures. The salient features of the study are summarised here while the detailed analysis and description of mitigation measures is presented separately.

9.1. The Core Zone

The boundaries of the Core Zone were defined prior to the resettlement project; hence, this study does not deal with boundary issues nor try to review environmental aspects which will not exist once the resettlement project is implemented. The environmental situations in the Core Zone are assessed for components which are proposed to remain within the Core Zone.

The residents of the Core Zone include 1) households in the three localities, 2) the handicapped who are needy people living in the LCA built shade 3) church school attendants, and 4) the monastery residents. The first two groups will be relocated permanently outside the Core Zone, hence assessment of their impact on the Core Zone is not necessary. The church school and the monastery are proposed to be maintained within the Core Zone; hence the waste generation potential and possible disposal mechanisms are investigated. The first mitigation

---

32 A detailed EIA study report entitled Vol.6 “Environmental impact assessment of and mitigation measures for the resettlement project in Lalibela” is presented separately.
measure is to select proper site for the monastery within the Core Zone where the impact would be minimal and secondly, to provide appropriate solid and liquid waste disposal means that recognise the special situation of the churches and the geo-physical context of the surrounding areas.

9.2 New resettlement areas

The bio-physical situation of the new resettlement area was assessed to understand the sensitivity of the sites for changes. The sites were found to have generally steep to moderate slope, no wild life and natural flora worthy of conservation as the site is a farmland. There is no also historic and or cultural heritage site that needs conservation within the resettlement area. The steep slopes that characterise Lalibela as a whole pose difficulty for constructing roads. Most roads have to be laid along the contour lines to minimise cut and fill and to reduce runoff water. The gullies on site have to be treated carefully so as to reduce surface erosion. Proper ran-off water drainage system is designed for the purpose.

The relocation of residents from the Core Zone obviously disturbs the balance in the social and physical environment. The host community will become minorities while those who are relocated may lose their neighbours. However, as the relocation site is not far from the town centre, the relocated persons will not face completely unknown areas nor people of a different culture. The farmers will not also be subjected to households of a different culture. In fact there are some farmers who live in the town centre but practice farming as a business and some farmers who live on their farmland have daily contact with the town people. However, it may be necessary to assist the resettled community to re-launch their idirs. If there are variations in place of residence due to the relocation, the OMS together with the ESTDP could facilitate the peaceful settlement of issues by covering minor expenses for newly established idirs.

In conclusion, the potential environmental impact of the resettlement project is minimal on the redevelopment site, the site to be vacated, and on sites outside the project area. Therefore, the environmental impacts are minimal to moderate. No natural habitat is exposed to danger as a result of the resettlement actions.

1. The impact on the physical setting of the new resettlement site is that of transformation of agricultural land to urban. This action is already on process as the land has been designated in the structure plan as part of Lalibela Town’s expansion area. The change to urban setting will bring attention to the existing soil erosion as there will be proper road and drainage system. The new site has formal green areas designed as children playground. The old site will be rehabilitated to a natural setting with trees and terraces. The problem from on-site sanitation will be avoided and decent church setting will be in place.

2. The social impact of the project is minimal and, if any, could be addressed through mitigation measures.
   - The resettlement site is not far from the existing settlement;
   - all people move to same locality, hence social ties remain similar;
   - relocated persons and the host community are of the same ethnic and religious group, hence there will be minimal friction between the two;
   - The Idir will remain similar

3. The economic impact of the resettlement project is also minimal as no property goes without compensation. The existing settlement is such a dilapidated area that it requires redevelopment; hence this is a very good opportunity for the residents. The new resettlement area will provide better assets and enable property owners to capture
potential opportunities from the development of the town and tourism development by far in better ways than in the existing Core Zone.
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## ANNEXES

### Annex 1 Proposed projects for the Lalibela destination development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project description</th>
<th>Project description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church Site Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Product Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS.1 Enhancing and Redevelopment of the UNESCO World Heritage Site</td>
<td>P.1 Development of Tourism Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 2 Buffer Zone Upgrading – Awareness Creation</td>
<td>P.2 Handicraft Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 3 Strengthening and Improvement of Yemrehanna Krestos Site</td>
<td>P.3 The World Heritage Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS.4 Development of Satellite Sites: Model Development</td>
<td>P.4 Events and Festivals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS.5 Identification of World Heritage Site Boundaries</td>
<td>P.5 Vernacular Architectural, Heritage Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of Roads</strong></td>
<td><strong>Economic Linkage Creation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.1 Urban Roads and Traffic</td>
<td>E.1 Agricultural Production, Linkages – Model/experimental Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing</strong></td>
<td>E.2 Support to Farm Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.1 Marketing and Promotion, Material including Website</td>
<td>E.3 Micro-finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training and Capability</strong></td>
<td><strong>Water and sanitation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.1 Vocational Training; Guides, Hotel and Restaurant Staff</td>
<td>W.1 Water and sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.2 Institutional and System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: “Tourism Heritage Plan for Lalibela”, project document for the ESTDP Lalibela project. The study was done in December 2008.
### Annex 2A: List of community representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name of representatives</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Tenure ship</th>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name of representatives</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Tenure ship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adishade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ato Kibret Mezemr</td>
<td>Kebele</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ato Eyase Geremew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ato Moges Abate</td>
<td>Kebele</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ato Negusie Terefe</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D/n Tamene Mengaw</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ao Dinheru Endashaw</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A/D/n Tirusew Birle</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>W/o Abebaw Asfaw</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>W/o Worksh Ali</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>W/o genet Demsew</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ato Belay Beza</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>W/o Setbelay Adnew</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ato Abay Biresaw</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>W/o Desta Arage</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ato Mekonen Alemu</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ato G/mariam DagneW</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>W/o Muluye Gete</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>W/o Endayahu Bistegn</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Shamb Kassa Haile</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ato Dinkayahu AyanaW</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>W/o Setechigne Ejigu</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>W/o Birtchiquo Anberbr</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ato Abebe Demelash</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ato Maereg Adunbr</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>W/o Demegu Abera</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chifragoch and Gebrel sefer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ato Abrham Aligaz</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>W/o Menbere Abebe</td>
<td>Keb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ato Belete Asefa</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ato Besfat Dilu</td>
<td>Keb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ato Asefa Girmay</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ato Genanaw Wendie</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>W/o Mulu Fente</td>
<td>Kebele</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ato Sefiw Birle</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ato Melese Geremw</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ato Salew Sileshi</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>W/o Kassaye Sisay</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>W/o Etenat Fente</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>W/o Zemed Asfaw</td>
<td>Keb</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>W/o Debrarohe Alegn</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ato Kasaw Terefe</td>
<td>Keb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikael Ghibi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ato Mekonnen Gusa</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ato Birara Assefa</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>W/o Kassa Wale</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>W/o Sefi Bayu</td>
<td>Keb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diakon Alebachew Askale</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>W/o Tesfa Mamo</td>
<td>Keb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ato Asnake Bayu</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>W/o Tobia Zewdu</td>
<td>Keb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Diakon Destaw Zewde</td>
<td>pvt</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>W/o Tesfa Demile</td>
<td>Keb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ato Tadesse Kassaw</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ato Worku Kass</td>
<td>Keb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurakur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ato Mekonnen Legas</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ato Tesfaye Kass</td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Host Community)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ato Wudu Fetene</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kes Abebe Sissay</td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ato Estete Gedamu</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kes Zelalem Sisay</td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kes Desalegn Ayalew</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>W/o Tringo Aydagne</td>
<td>Pvt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>W/o Emagne Kassaw</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ato Aweke Mekonnen</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2 B: List of members of the Resettlement Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Name of member</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ato Desale Miseganaw</td>
<td>Mayor’s Office, Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ato Moges Abate</td>
<td>Adishade residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ato Genaew Wendie</td>
<td>Gebriel Sefer residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kegngeta Belay Anawet</td>
<td>DLCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ato Moges Tefera</td>
<td>Office of Culture and Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ato Asefa Girmay</td>
<td>Chifrgoch residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ato Bogale Alemu</td>
<td>Lalibela Town dwellers (Shimbrema)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ato Getahun Zewdu</td>
<td>OMS technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>W/t Marta Kassahun</td>
<td>OMS Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kes Besifat Ayalew</td>
<td>Kurakur residents (host community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ato Wudu Fetene</td>
<td>Kurakur residents (host community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kes Muluye Goshe</td>
<td>Kurakur residents (host community)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 3: Entitlement matrix and eligibility criteria for PAPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Description of category</th>
<th>Entitlement</th>
<th>Required proof</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Private house owners (non-farming urban residents)</td>
<td>• Compensation for house, fence, septic tank, water tank, trees&lt;br&gt;• Adjustment/disturbance allowance&lt;br&gt;• Land for house construction based on size of current holding (max. 500m²)&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Contract document and/or receipts for rent payment up to the time of displacement, or&lt;br&gt;Proof of decision by a competent authority to allow stay without rent payment</td>
<td>• Title deed&lt;br&gt;• Receipts for property tax&lt;br&gt;• Evidence from Notary office (if inherited property)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tenants in Kebele houses</td>
<td>• Replacement of rental house in another area (if the displaced person chooses this option and if rental house is available)&lt;br&gt;• Land for house construction (max.120m²)</td>
<td>• Compensation for structures and plot allocation will be provided only if the farmer’s residence is demolished&lt;br&gt;• Receipts for property tax or land certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>• Compensation for house, fence, cattle kraal, cereal store (gotera), (water well, septic tank, water tank if any), perennial plants,&lt;br&gt;• Adjustment/disturbance allowance&lt;br&gt;• Land for house construction, max. 500m² plus one plot of 150 m² size&lt;br&gt;• Compensation for farm land, grazing land, fruit-bearing trees or income generating permanent plants based on regional formulae.</td>
<td>• The welfare institute is recognised by the town administration&lt;br&gt;• Residents/beneficiaries of the scheme are identified by the church administration&lt;br&gt;• Construction of residences and working space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Welfare Agency (Church supported agency)</td>
<td>• Land for house and workshop construction&lt;br&gt;• Replacement of houses and workshop in another area</td>
<td>• Proof of being tenant in a private house starting at least one year prior to the cut of date&lt;br&gt;• Registration as tenant at the cut-off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tenants in private residences</td>
<td>• No entitlement according to the Ethiopian law. However, the WB directive demands these groups to be supported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vulnerable groups</td>
<td>Illegal settlers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6 | • Provide Birr 150 as a three months rent as adjustment allowance | • Targeted support based on the vulnerability type  
• Inclusion in a relevant livelihood and income restoration scheme  
• Proof of no other support by the kebele administration  
• Identification of vulnerability by project study |
| 7 | 6 | Illegal settlers | • No entitlement by law but required to safeguard the livelihood of households  
• Based on individual basis, one could be provided chance for inclusion in cooperative societies for livelihood restoration,  
• Kebele administration has to verify existence on site before the cut-off date  
• Provide minimum sizes plot based on verification |