LIBERIA ACCELERATED ELECTRICITY EXPANSION PROJECT (LACEEP)

PAYNESVILLE – KAKATA ELECTRIC CIRCUIT LINE CORRIDOR RESETTLEMENT ACTION PLAN – (RAP)
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Government of Liberia (GOL) has intensified its commitment to the provision of energy services through the recent development of a National Energy Policy (NEP) and supportive legislation, which calls for universal and sustainable access to affordable and reliable energy supplies in order to foster the economic, political, and social development of Liberia. LEC has expanded its facilities to more than 11,000 users, and the MLME has announced an ambitious plan to expand services to 70% of the population of Monrovia and 35% of the population country wide by 2030.

The build-out of the transmission and distribution system is underway based on plans to best utilize the available and committed generation within the constraints of the originally committed funding.

Against this background, the World Bank’s engagement in the energy sector, as reflected in its Country Assistance Strategy (CAS, 2009), targets rural energy and urban energy as well as regional interconnections through WAPP. The World Bank has been working very closely with the Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy (MLME) and with the Liberia Electricity Corporation (LEC) to rehabilitate and extend the network and expand electricity services in the country. Following up on this work that started with the LESEP and Additional Financing, the Bank is now financing a third project that will continue this support to LEC and to the development of the electricity sector in general, the Liberia Accelerated Electricity Expansion Project (LACEEP). For this project, an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) and a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) have been prepared to guide the preparation of the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) and this Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) as the physical footprint of the project and subsequent impacts have been identified. This RAP addresses the negative social impacts from (i) the construction of the 66-kV sub-transmission line between the Paynesville substation in Monrovia and the town of Kakata; (ii) the construction of a 66/33-kV substation in Kakata; and (iii) the construction of both 22-kV and low voltage distribution lines, including the connection of new consumers along the Monrovia-No. 15 Gate section of the Paynesville-Kakata corridor.
Purpose of the RAP

The intention of the RAP is to clear the entire corridor in a careful and peaceful manner in order to catalogue all affected properties within the line corridor such as shade trees, land, food and cash crops.

A successful and sensitive redress of problems which may arise will reduce delays, disputes, and will create positive community relationship in the project area for a very low overall project cost.

The project intends to seek ways of promoting understanding, cooperation, and create stability with line corridor communities in order to contribute positively to community needs and aspirations in terms of project overall benefits.

Objectives of the RAP

The objectives of the RAP are:

- To consider involuntary resettlement and related compensation as an integral part of project preparation and implementation, and deal with resettlement issues from the earliest stages of the project preparation;
- To consult with project affected persons PAPs in a meaningful manner, and to provide opportunity for their participation in the planning and execution of resettlement programs;
- To assist PAPs in proportion to impact, recognizing the special needs of vulnerable populations;
- To compensate PAPs fully and fairly for all affected assets and to make timely payment of full replacement value prior to construction;
- To ensure that PAPS who lose income generating resources are assisted in their efforts to improve their livelihoods and standard of living or at least restore them in real term, to pre-project level

Resettlement Policy Framework

This project has to meet the environmental requirements of the rules and regulations governing the protection of the environment in Liberia.
“The objectives of the National Environmental Policy of Liberia are to ensure the improvement of the physical environment, improve the physical quality of life of the people and ensure reconciliation and coordination between economic development and growth with sustainable management of natural resources”.

“It seeks to develop and implement systems and guidelines for assessing environmental impacts of development economic activities and to increase environmental education and public awareness”. Other goals include developing capacity for environmental management, empowering local communities in the management of natural resources through community participation, and involving the private sector non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in all aspects of management of their natural resources and the environment”.

**Project Description**

The project comprises the construction of one substation in the City of Kakata and the rehabilitation of the Paynesville substation. The construction of the substation, rehabilitation and the running of the high tension electric transmission lines from Kakata to Monrovia (Paynesville Substation) cuts across six communities (Morris Farm, Cooper Farm, Kingville Community, Careysburg Mt. Barclay Community and Bernard Farm) in Montserrado County.

The new substation to be constructed in Kakata covers approximately 40,000 square meters. This substation will connect the Paynesville substation which is 43 miles (69km) from Kakata. Activities associated with the construction of the transmission line in a 20-meter wide corridor will include clearing of right of way (ROW), erection of towers and the connection of transmission lines (see activities). The project will be carried out within a narrow corridor of 20 meters (this figure 20 meters was given to CEDA by the officials of the Ministry of Land, Mines, and Energy).

In the alignment of the transmission line, the proponent and the consultant have ensured that environmentally sensitive areas (grave yards, poro and sandy bush, cultural heritage sites, etc.) were avoided. Efforts were made to avoid as many villages and properties as possible.
Project Location
The project as an electric line corridor is located in two counties; Montserrado and Margibi Counties. The line corridor is about 43 miles (69 km) from Kakata to Paynesville sub-station in Monrovia.

The major activities of the project within the line corridor (about 90%) are located in Montserrado County. No town/village or community in Margibi is affected. All communities affected are located in Montserrado County. The last tower which is in Kakata, Margibi County is about 150 meters from the boundary between Montserrado and Margibi counties. So far, our survey ended at the last tower located behind BWI where the substation in Kakata, Margibi County is located.

Project Activities
Major activities to be carried out are within the three (3) major phases of the project. These phases are; the pre-construction phase, construction phase, and the operational phase. Each phase has its activities to be completed in order to make the project a success.

Table ES1: Key Project Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Proposed Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre Construction</td>
<td>- Project planning</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Line route survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Public consultations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Collection of socio-economic baseline data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Preparation and submission of Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) for the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>acquisition of Environmental Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately 15 months.</td>
<td>LEC to give the exact dates and time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clearing of line corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Operational Phase | - Routine running maintenance  
|                  |  
|                  | - Foot patrol  
|                  | - Security patrol  
|                  | - Tower auditing and repair  
|                  | - Major maintenance  
|                  | - Replacement – insulation of section of the transmission line  
|                  | - Treatment of tower components  
|                  | - Replacement of corroded towers and transmission line component  
|                  | - Replacement of conventional bolts and fasteners on older line sections  
|                  | - Rehabilitation of access roads and tracts  
|                  | - Emergency maintenance  

**Overall Social Impacts**

Both the development and operation of the project will indeed have some positive and negative impacts in the project area.

The positive impact relates to the provision of electricity to the people of the project area. These include payment of electricity bills to LEC, employment opportunities, training, cash
compensation for trees and crops to affected persons, and some corporate social benefits. There will also be an improvement in local community infrastructural facilities.

The negative impact include, as a result of land acquisition the involuntary cutting down of economic trees such as mango, coconut, golden plum, bread fruit trees that are providing substantial income for the inhabitants located within the line corridor. Social life will be disturbed for those who reserve their shade trees for meeting places and place to relax during leisure time. The RAP has provided ways and means how these negative impacts will be mitigated.

**Stakeholders’ Engagement**

Stakeholder engagement plays an important role establishing a good rapport between the implementer LEC) and the local and national level stakeholders. These engagements facilities the disclosure of relevant information about the project, and the participation of affected parties enable the understanding of impacts of affected people. Stakeholder engagement must continue during the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of payment, physical resettlement and livelihood restoration activities to achieve sustainable outcomes that are consistent with the objectives of the project.

**Objectives**

Stakeholder consultations have the following objectives:

1. Provide information about project; as well as the RAP objectives, processes and intended outcomes.
2. Establish government regulations and procedures required for the RAP development.
3. Solicit opinions and development and implementation of the RAP from government, traditional authorities and project affected people.
4. Manage expectations and misconceptions with regards to the project and the outcomes of the RAP
5. Identify and where possible, address potential conflicts and/or risks that may arise,
6. Negotiated and agree on RAP entitlements and compensation options for inclusion in the RAP and address associated issues such as livelihood restoration.
Stakeholders’ Identification

Stakeholders identified are as follows:

1. Parties directly affected
2. Affected property owners within the line twenty (20) meters wide line corridor with properties such as shade trees and land.
3. Affected owners of economic trees and crops within the twenty (20) meters wide line corridor
4. Affected communities with PAPs as a result of the line corridor passing through the community. Since the line is passing through these communities, they are considered as affected communities and not PAPs.

Eligibility and Entitlements

For the preparation of the RAP addresses of the owners and assets falling within the corridor were recorded during the survey.

Affected Communities

The establishment of the twenty (20) meter wide corridor was technically done with the following below communities affected. The affected communities are communities in which the 20-meter wide line corridor is passing. Here the document is referring to communities and not PAPs.

Table ES2: Affected Communities (see statement above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris Farm</td>
<td>6,016</td>
<td>6,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper Farm</td>
<td>2,568</td>
<td>2,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kingsville</td>
<td>5,178</td>
<td>5,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Careysburg City</td>
<td>5,315</td>
<td>5,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mount Barclay</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bernard Farm</td>
<td>3,297</td>
<td>3,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,167</td>
<td>23,808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table ES3: Summary of Dependents of PAPs by Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris Farm</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper farm</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kingville Community</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Careysburg community</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mount Barclay</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bernard Farm</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>530</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>1,254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table ES4: Summary of PAPs by Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris Farm</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper farm</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kingville Community</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Careysburg community</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mount Barclay</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 All of the project-affected communities and project-affected parties (PAPs) are located in Montserrado County while only the 66/33-kV substation is located near BWI campus in Kakata, Margibi County; therefore, there is no county-by-county report but community-by-community reports only for Montserrado County. No structures (houses, buildings, huts, etc) but land, shade trees, food and cash crops are affected in the communities listed in table ES4 above.

The PAPs are referred to as heads of household. Each head of household (PAPs) including his/her dependents are referred to as one household. An average household in Liberia is about six (6) persons.

For a better understanding of the breakdown of PAPs and their dependents, see Appendix 2 -- Project Affected Communities and PAPs and Appendix 3 -- List of Property-Affected Households and Dependents by Community.

Twelve (12) tower spots are affected all of which are located on farm land. LEC usually negotiates with owners of tower spots. The impact of these twelve tower spots is very low and will not at all adversely affect the livelihood of the farmers involved.
Table ES5: Summary of Trees and Crops by Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Mature</th>
<th>Immature</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris’ Farm</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper Farm</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Firestone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kingsville</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Careysburg</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mount Barclay</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bernard Farm</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,897</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,460</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,357</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table ES6: Summary of trees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Crops/Trees</th>
<th>Mature</th>
<th>Immature</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mango</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kola</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crusoe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shade</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Avocado</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Coconut</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Golden Plum</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Breadfruit</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sour Sap</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Guava</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pawpaw</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rubber</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>1,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Oil Palm</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Breadnuts</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Banana Stocks</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Lime</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Almond</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lemon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Monkeynuts</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cocoa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Maringa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Plantain</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,897</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>4,357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table ES7: Summary cost of trees by Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Cost (USD$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris’ Farm</td>
<td>923.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper Farm</td>
<td>2,032.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Firestone</td>
<td>2,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kingsville</td>
<td>4,332.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Careysburg</td>
<td>6,198.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mount Barclay</td>
<td>2,273.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,041.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Categories of Affected People and Assistance Required

According to the World Bank Safeguard Policy on Involuntary Resettlement O.P. 4.12, the following are categories of affected group(s) and individual(s):

(i) Those who have formal legal rights (including customary and traditional rights recognized under the laws of the Republic of Liberia);

(ii) Those who do not have formal legal right to land at the time the census begins but have a claim to such land or assets—provided that such claims are recognized under the laws of the country or become recognized through a process identified in the resettlement plan.

(iii) Those who have no recognizable legal right or claim to the land they are occupying.

Those covered above in i) and ii) will be provided compensation for the land they lose, and other assistance in accordance with the policy. Persons covered under (iii) above will be provided with resettlement assistance in lieu of compensation for the land they occupy, and other assistance, as necessary, to achieve the objectives set out in this policy, if they occupy the project area prior to a cut-off date established by the implementers in close consultation with the potential Project Affected Persons (PAPs) and local officials. All persons included above are provided compensation for loss of assets other than land.

All persons included in the categories above are to be provided with compensation for loss of assets other than land. All project affected persons irrespective of their status or whether they have formal titles, legal rights or not, squatters or otherwise encroaching illegally on land, are eligible for some kind of assistance if they occupied the land before the cut-off date.

The project’s cut-off date refers to the time when the assessment of persons and their property in the identified project areas are carried out. That is the time when the project beneficiaries have identified the land sites they would need and when the socio-economic impact study is taking place. Thereafter, no new cases of affected people will be considered. Persons who encroach on the area after the cut-off date are not entitled to compensation or any other form of resettlement assistance. The establishment of a cut-
off date is required to prevent invasions/rush migration into the chosen land thereby posing a major risk to the project. Therefore, establishment of a cut-off date is of critical importance.

After the evaluation of the assets of the affected groups, the Project Team will declare the cut-off date which shall be the date during which the affected groups have been duly informed of their dues and the same information made public in a meeting attended by at least 50% of the beneficiaries of the proposed projects. The cut-off date will also be displayed in public areas.

**Eligibility Criteria for Affected Groups or Individuals**

According to the World Bank safeguard policies, eligible individual(s) are those who are directly affected socially and economically through the implementation of projects caused by:

(a) The involuntary taking of land and other assets resulting in (i) Relocation or loss of shelter, (ii) Loss of assets or access to assets, or (iii) Loss of income sources or means of livelihood whether or not the affected persons must move to another location.

(b) The involuntary denial of access to legally designated social or economic services in adverse impacts on livelihood of the displaced individuals.

**Organizational Structure**

The Proposed Organizational Structure (National Committee) for Rap Implementation

**National Level**

Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ministry/agency</th>
<th>No. of Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance and Development Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ministry of Internal Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Liberia Electricity Cooperation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Center for Environment and Development in Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The terms of reference for this committee is being prepared including payment terms and arrangement for PAPs. All will be worked out for the committee at the national level.

The LACEEP PIU (indicated in the diagram below) will spearhead the RAP compensation scheme in collaboration with the committee mentioned above.

At the Community Level

The proposed structure discussed with community people and agreed upon is indicated below.

The formation of a community-based committee for the implementation of the RAP was discussed and agreed upon by all communities visited during consultations as follows:

1. The committee should comprise odd numbers such as 9, 11, 13, 15 members.
2. The community leader (Commissioner or Chief) should serve as head or member.
3. The committee should comprise at least two (2) females.
4. The committee should comprise at least two (2) project-affected persons.
5. The committee should select a Community Liaison Officer who should be a literate person assisted by two community persons preferably literate persons. During payment of compensation, these three persons will attend meetings with the National Committee and carry similar communication to the community. They will serve as mediators between the national level and the community level.
Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)

This RAP establishes a grievance procedure and mechanism to ensure that affected parties and communities have the opportunity to lodge complaints and concerns regarding compensation and restoration of livelihoods. The Grievance Procedure will establish a recourse mechanism designed to resolve disputes in an impartial manner. It provides claimants with the assurance that their grievances will be resolved timely and satisfactory without cost to the claimant. This grievance procedure will also assist in the effective transfer of resettlement entitlements to intended beneficiaries.

The Grievance Procedure will not replace any existing legal processes available to affected parties, and will not infringe on complainants’ right to access existing legal
procedures. It will seek to resolve issues promptly and fairly in order to expedite the receipt of entitlements and assistance, without resorting to expensive and time-consuming legal actions. The Grievance Procedure will be in place at least until such time that the RAP Completion Audit has been finalized.

A grievance for the purposes of the RAP is defined as any concern or complaint that is directly related to physical resettlement, compensation and restoration of livelihoods under the RAP and its entitlements. All non-RAP related concerns/complaints will be redirected to the appropriate department. They will ensure that RAP affected communities are duly informed about the grievance mechanisms, the location of the grievance facility and grievance procedures to be followed.

The proposed Grievance Management Section (GMS) to be located at LEC will have overall responsibility for addressing all resettlement grievances. While it may be possible to verbally resolve some grievances, these must still be recorded on the grievance log form for recordkeeping purposes. Where the GMS cannot resolve grievances directly, these will be forwarded to the Proposed National Committee. Where grievances are still unresolved, the Proposed National Committee will establish a senior grievance committee, member which may require the involvement of the General Manager of LEC. If grievances are still unresolved, the GMS will provide information to the affected party on the mechanisms for addressing complaints via legal redress.

Monitoring and Evaluation

A RAP monitoring and evaluation mechanism will be established to assess the effectiveness of RAP implementation. In particular, the monitoring program will assess the success of livelihood restoration project activities and assistance to vulnerable groups. The monitoring program will include monitoring criteria, and the resources needed to carry out the monitoring. The project management will be responsible for
providing the necessary funds and human resources required for the monitoring programs.

**Performance Monitoring**

Performance monitoring is an internal management function based on physical progress against milestones as established in the RAP. Performance monitoring will include the following aspects:

- Community consultations completed and on-going;
- Grievance redress procedures in place and functioning;
- Compensation payments completed in a timely manner according to list of identified PAPs;
- Income restoration and development facilities such as health and educational facilities, water supplies, market facilities, etc.
- Monitoring and evaluation reports submission.

An appropriate monitoring program will be established and will include activity, target date for completion, progress to date, progress in the previous month, target for current month, reasons for delay, and actions to be taken. Impact monitoring will be conducted by RSC and independent external body. EPA will also participate in the monitoring exercises.

**Impact monitoring**

Impact monitoring will be conducted by (RSC) and an independent external body. The overall objective of the impact monitoring is to gauge the effectiveness of the RAP and its implementation in meeting the needs of affected people. The purpose of impact monitoring is to:

- Provide management with an assessment of the compensation effects;
- Verify internal performance monitoring; and
- Identify adjustments in the implementation of the RAP, if required.

**Implementation Schedule**
The schedule for the RAP implementation will be determined by the Ministry of Land, Mines & Energy (MLM&E), the Liberia Electricity Corporation (LEC). However, it is necessary for the RAP implementation structures to be established by MLM&E and LEC administrations. In addition, arrangements have to be made for the necessary and required capacity building of the RAP implementation structure in order to ensure that all stakeholders expected to be part of the implementation structure understand the requirements of the implementation schedule.

Payment for compensations will be completed prior to the commencement of the construction phase. Further discussion of the implementation schedule will require both MLM&E and LEC to meet and conclude the aspect of implementation.

**Costs and Budget**

This report provides an indication of the cost associated with the RAP implementation. Costs are based on the eligibility considerations and entitlement measures as indicated in the RAP report. The preliminary RAP implementation cost is calculated as US $53,841.00. See table ES8 below.

**Table ES8: Cost for Implementation of Resettlement Action Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>US$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>COMPENSATION ISSUES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Compensation for land (12 tower spots) x $400.00</td>
<td>4,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Compensation for food crops</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Compensation for trees</td>
<td>19,041.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Contingency allowances to cater for the effects of Probable increases in property values</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>53,841.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Result of joint consultative meeting**

On January 16, 2015, a joint team comprising LEC representative, MLME representative, and two representatives from CEDA travelled to Kakata for the following objectives:
(1) To technically view, observe, and conclude on five (5) structures not within the line corridor but closer to the line corridor. They are (a) five (5) storey building near Joe Bar approximately 300-400 meters to the Paynesville substation (b) a twin building near Police Academy junction and (c) two (2) storey buildings and a gas station at Lower Careysburg.

(2) To finally identify the Kakata Substation.

There were two alternatives the joint team determined:

Alternative 1:

That the previous coordinates should remain unchanged and that the five (5) structures in question be considered affected and paid for accordingly. Total estimated cost of alternative 1 would be **US $ 403,841.00**.

Alternatives 2:

That the previous coordinates should be adjusted in order to avoid demolishing the five structures.

**Table ES 9: Previous and recommended coordinates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Previous Coordinates</th>
<th>Recommended Coordinates</th>
<th>Location of Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Five - storey building</td>
<td>X 0312725 Y 0693508</td>
<td>X 0312727 Y 0693505</td>
<td>Near Joe Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Twin building</td>
<td>X 0312837 Y 0694541</td>
<td>X 0312835 Y 0694549</td>
<td>Police Academy Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Three structures at Lower Careysburg</td>
<td>X 0321665 Y 0704718</td>
<td>X 0321668 Y 0704721</td>
<td>Lower Careysburg District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to by-pass the three structures in Lower Careysburg, the line corridor was adjusted as follows: previous coordinates of T083: X 0321665 Y 0704718 to T084: X 0321668 Y 0704721 and T084 to T085: X 0321825 Y 0704778. Alternative 2 of no demolition was chosen, that is, the five structures were avoided. Consequently, the total
estimated cost of the implementation of the Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) was reduced to **US $ 53,841.00**.

With reference to the Kakata substation, the team met the Authority of the Booker Washington Institute (BWI) and together identified and selected the site, approximately 200-300 meters from the BWI main campus: coordinates, X 0348636 Y 0722287.

**Table ES10: Compensation costs of trees and crops**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree / Crop/Plant</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>MATURE (RATE US$)</th>
<th>IMMATURE (RATE US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rubber Tree</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocoa Tree</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Tree</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Palm Tree</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kola Tree</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread Fruit Tree</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Tree</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantain Group</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banana Group</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Tree</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lime Tree</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mango Tree</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconut Tree</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawpaw Tree</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassava Acre</td>
<td>Acre</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugarcane Acre</td>
<td>Acre</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pineapple Head</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avocado Tree</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Permanent Claims Commission, 2004 (MOA)
1.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction/Background

The Government of President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf took office in mid-January 2006 facing severe challenges. Fourteen years of civil war had destroyed much of Liberia’s physical and human capital and severely damaged its institutions. The new government endorsed programs aimed at improving governance, building capacity, and managing post conflict recovery through establishing policies to stabilize the economy and support economic reconstruction. Although progress has been substantial (broad price stability, and accomplished structural reforms to reinforce public financial management), the government still faces numerous challenges. Per capita GDP was estimated at US$195 in 2007, still below prewar levels, ranking Liberia among the poorest countries in the world; in current circumstances, the nation is unlikely to achieve any of the MDGs by 2015. According to the nation’s Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS), 64% of the population lives below the poverty line, and about 48% live below the extreme poverty line. Of these, 73% reside in rural areas.

Prior to the civil conflict in 1989, LEC’s generation for Monrovia and surrounding areas consisted of about 195.55 MW (64 MW Hydro Turbines, 68 MW Gas Turbines, 40.5 MW Heavy Fuel Oil (HFO), 10 MW Medium Speed Diesel (MSD), and 13.05 Rural Electrification Systemn (RES). At that time, Monrovia’s actual peak demand was about 73 MW and the annual energy demand was about 448 GWh. The Mt. Coffee hydroelectric project was used to supply as much energy as possible. However, higher cost HFO and diesel fuelled thermal generation was used for peaking and during the dry season when the output from Mt. Coffee could be very low. All of the generation facilities were destroyed in the subsequent years of conflict in Liberia leaving LEC with no capacity to supply Monrovia.

Since the election of the new government into office in 2006, developments in Liberia’s energy sector have included:

- **Emergency Power**: diesels units totaling 10 MW across four sub-stations have been installed with the assistance of multilateral cooperation (Ghana, EU, and USAID) and a small portion of the distribution network in Monrovia has been rehabilitated to provide street lighting, and commercial and residential connections. Additional diesel-based generation has been installed
bringing now the installed capacity to 22MW of which 16-18 MW are currently available. Three 10-MW HFO-fired plants are expected to come into operation in about two year times, which will be financed by the World Bank, Liberian Government and JICA.

- **Monrovia Management Contract:** IFC was contracted by the Government of Liberia to attract the private sector into a management contract to provide power services in Monrovia, under a contract funded by the Norwegian Government. In 2010, a five year management contract for LEC was assigned to Manitoba Hydro International (MHI). In conjunction with this contract, additional funding was committed for further expansion of LEC’s generation capacity as well as for build-out of the distribution system. An initial Master Plan for generation expansion and build-out of the transmission and distribution system has been prepared. This plan recognizes that, as a result of the very large unserved demand in Monrovia, the rate of load growth in the near term will be constrained by the ability to finance the rebuilding of LEC’s generation, transmission and distribution systems.

The rehabilitation of the hydroelectric Plant in Mt. Coffee, and the development of HFO-fired power plants will be complemented by purchases of electricity from the WAPP once the WAPP-CLSG transmission line become operational, which is expected to happen in 2017.

The Government of Liberia (GOL) has further intensified its commitment to the provision of energy services through the recent development of a National Energy Policy (NEP) and supportive legislation, which calls for universal and sustainable access to affordable and reliable energy supplies in order to foster the economic, political, and social development of Liberia. LEC has expanded its to more than 24,000 users, and the MLME has announced an ambitious plan to expand services to 70% of the population of Monrovia and 35% of the population country wide by 2030.

The build-out of the transmission and distribution system is underway based on plans to best utilize the available and committed generation within the constraints of the originally committed funding.

Against this background, the World Bank’s engagement in the energy sector, as reflected in its Country Assistance Strategy (CAS, 2009), targets rural energy and urban energy as well as regional interconnections through WAPP. The World Bank has been working very closely with the Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy (MLME) and with the Liberia Electricity Corporation.
(LEC) to rehabilitate and extend the network and expand electricity services in the country. Following up on this work that started with the LESEP and LESEP Additional Financing, the Bank is now financing a third project that will continue this support to LEC and to the development of the electricity sector in general, the Liberia Accelerated Electricity Expansion For this project, an Environmental and Social Framework (ESMF) and a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) were prepared and they now guide the preparation of the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) and this Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) as the physical footprint of the project and subsequent impacts have been identified. This RAP addressed the negative social impacts from (i) the construction of the 66-kV sub-transmission line between the Paynesville substation in Monrovia and the town of Kakata; (ii) the construction of a 66/33-kV substation in Kakata; and (iii) the construction of both 22-kV and low voltage distribution lines, including the connection of new consumers along the Monrovia-No. 15 Gate section.

1.2 Project Location

The project corridor traversed Montserrado and Margibi Counties. The line length is about 43 miles (69 km) from Kakata to Paynesville sub-station in Monrovia.

The major activities of the project within the line corridor (about 90%) are located in Montserrado County. No town/village or community in Margibi is affected. All communities affected are located in Montserrado County. The last tower which is in Kakata, Margibi County is about 150 meters from the boundary between Montserrado and Margibi counties. So far, our survey ended at the last tower located behind BWI where the Kakata substation.

1.3 Overall Social Impacts

Both the development and operation of the project will indeed have some positive and negative impacts in the project area.
The positive impact relates to the provision of electricity to the people of the project area. These include payment of electricity bills to LEC, employment opportunities, training, cash compensation for trees and crops to affected persons, and compensation for selected sites. The negative impact include the involuntary cutting down of economic trees such as mango, coconut, golden plum, bread fruit trees that are providing substantial income for the inhabitants located within the line corridor. Social life will be disturbed for those who reserve their shade trees for meeting places and place to relax during leisure time.

1.4 Objectives of the Resettlement Action Plan

The project management (LEC) will conduct its activities in a manner that will promote sustainable development and social welfare of its area of operation. The rights of community people will be protected during construction and operation phases including the protection of the environment. The management of LEC will design, develop and operate its facilities with caution so as to reduce
the impact of its operation by assessing the health, safety and environmental effects of its activities in order to integrate those in its planning, design and operation decisions.

The objectives of the RAP are as follows:

- To consider involuntary compensation as an integral part of project design, and deal with resettlement issues from the earliest stages of project preparation;
- To consult with project-affected persons (PAPs) in a meaningful manner, and to provide opportunity for their participation in the planning and execution of resettlement programs;
- To assist PAPs in proportion to impact, recognizing the special needs of vulnerable populations;
- To compensate PAPs fully and fairly for all assets lost permanently or temporarily, this means timely payment of full replacement value prior to construction;
- To ensure that all PAPs who lose residences or businesses are provided acceptable alternative accommodations before construction;
- To ensure that PAPs who lose income-generating resources are assisted in their efforts to improve their livelihoods and standards of living or at least restore them, in real terms, to pre-project levels

This further includes the following:

1. Undertake resettlement activities in partnership with the affected parties;
2. Develop and implement appropriate grievance procedures and mechanism;
3. Ensure consistency in implementing resettlement and compensation activities;
4. Develop and implement a fair, transport and negotiated resettlement agreement to which all stakeholders and affected parties can subscribe;
5. Formulate suitable management structures and system for RAP implementation;
6. Disclose the RAP to affected property by hosting consultation meetings;
7. Put in place an effective RAP monitoring and evaluation system;
8. Locate and identify vulnerable people in order to incorporate them into the livelihood restoration program.
1.5 Scope of Resettlement Action Plan

The RAP has been prepared in line with the form and format of the World Bank’s Operational Policy 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement and provides information on the following essential elements:

- Description of the Project
- Project Area of Influence
- Project Impacts that gives rise to resettlement
- Objectives of the RAP
- Socio-economic information of the population to be affected
- Legal framework including mechanism for resolution of conflicts and appeals procedures
- Institutional framework
- Eligibility, criteria, and cut-off date
- Valuation & Compensation Loss
- Resettlement Measures, involving compensation packages and special assistance to vulnerable
- Infrastructure and social services
- Environmental protection and management
- Community participation and integration with host population, including methods and scope of consultation with PAPs on the compensation issues
- Integration with host populations
- Grievance procedures
- Organizational responsibilities
- Implementation schedule
- Costs & Budget
- Monitoring & Evaluation

The preparation of this Resettlement Action Plan provides the census and identification of project-affected persons (PAPs), the valuation of the cost of affected properties and the replacement of lost private lands and property.
2.0 IMPACTS THAT GIVE RISE TO RESETTLEMENT

The principal activities identified may have impacts on both the environment and the community people within the project area. These impacts require compensation for affected properties.

1. Right-of-Way (RoW) Selection

The selection of the Right-of-Way requires survey of the land, setting up of angle points, cutting through virgin and secondary forests, all of which cause disturbances to human settlements, flora and fauna.

The line follows the existing transport infrastructure in order to provide closer access to facilitate construction and maintenance activities in the future.

2. Clearing of Right-of-Way (RoW)

The construction and operational activities of the 20 meters line corridor will cause impacts. These include clearing of vegetation within the 20-meter wide corridor, destruction of farms, cash crops and food crops, encroachment on private land, etc.

3. Clearing of the site for the construction of a substation in Kakata which covers a total land area of 40,000 m² (200m x 200m).

4. The erection of towers and stringing of transmission line.

These activities require the construction of track roads to transport equipments to construction sites. These may cause destruction of vegetations, food and cash crops. Also, the erection of towers will impact land and shade trees that may require compensation.

5. Compensation ans Resettlement

The consultant with the support of LEC has conducted a survey of all area of land take, cash and food crops, shade trees, all located within the line corridor that have to be compensated. All Property Affected Persons (PAPs) have been identified and issues of compensation and involuntary resettlement appropriately addressed.
### Major Project Activities (matrix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mitigation measures</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pre-Construction</td>
<td>1. Line route survey. Destruction of vegetation food and cash crops the path/line during clearing of vegetation resulting in loss of income for affected farmers.</td>
<td>- Property affected persons should be briefed on grievance procedure.</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Selection of tower spots.</td>
<td>- Farmers/land owners should be briefed on the project activities and procedures for payments of properties loss.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Construction</td>
<td>1. Construction of access tracks. Clearing of access tracks would lead to loss of crops, land and loss of income.</td>
<td>- The process of land acquisition should be carried out with due consultations with all stakeholders and in line with the national policy, which requires that all land owners under various forms of traditional or customary tenure are compensated for loss of the land</td>
<td>Approximately 15 months. LEC to give the exact dates and time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of the line route study is to examine and determine the optimum line route for the Project and to prepare maps and drawings for the selected line route. The previous LEC line route was used.

In order to secure the 20-meter wide line corridor which is the Right-of-Way (RoW), citizen crops, trees, including structures will have to be affected. Therefore, the route has been designed to be as direct as possible to existing communities in order to make future electrification feasible. The line also follows existing transport infrastructure so as to aide future construction and

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– destruction of vegetation, land acquisition.</td>
<td>Washington Institute (BWI) in order to conclude discussion for the Kakata substation. Loss of land by private individuals who may plan other developmental activities on their respective land. Compensation for land should be timely discussed with land owners/land affected persons in order to reach a general concession with owners of the private land affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Erection of towers and stringing of transmission lines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. operational</td>
<td>Maintenance and security</td>
<td>Private individuals will not be permitted to use the 20-meter corridor. Affected persons should be made to understand clearly that they no more own properties within the line corridor. Some PAPs might attempt to re-claim properties within the corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will be determined by Lec.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
maintenance activities. In order to select the optimal line route, the existing environmental data were evaluated using information from field trips, topographical maps, and data collection activities.

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 LIBERIA ELECTRICITY CORPORATION (LEC)

The Liberia Electricity Corporation (LEC), was established by an act of National Legislature on July 12, 1973, as a Public Corporation solely owned by the Government of Liberia (GOL) with a mandate to produce and supply economic and reliable electric power to the entire Nation.

Prior to the civil war, the total installed electricity capacity in Liberia was estimated at 412 MW. LEC had a total installed electricity capacity of 195.55 MW (Mt. Coffee hydro and Bushrod Island thermal plants), industrial concessionaires produced 212 MW and a rural electrification system provided 13.05 MW. In 2006, after fourteen years of civil war during which time LEC facilities (mainly the Mt. Coffee Hydro Power Plant) were severely damaged or destroyed, donor agencies funded programs to support the LEC.

The Mount Coffee Hydropower Plant is located on the St. Paul River, approximately 27 km (17 miles) northeast of Monrovia in Montserrado County, Liberia. It exploits a loop of the river. It is connected to Monrovia through 4 feeder lines, operating at 66 kV. During the period of civil unrest in Liberia, opposition forces took over the hydropower facility, eventually shutting it down. Also the transmission lines to Monrovia went out of operation and degraded.

Substantial investment is being made in the Mining Sector of Liberia. Mital Steel, a world leader in the steel industry is investing about a billion US dollars in mining iron ore in Liberia. The previously mine had a total power demand of 60 MW. Other iron ore mines that will be commissioned within the next five (5) years are: Bong mines, the Western Cluster that includes, Bomi Hills, Mano River, Bear Moutain mines. The power demand for these mines will form the base load demand for sales.
The Agriculture Sector with high demand for electric power is natural rubber processing. The Firestone Plantation Company (FPCO), the Liberia Agriculture Company (LAC), Guthrie Rubber Plantation have all resumed operations in Liberia culminating in a demand by this sector in excess of 10 MW.

The project comprises the construction of one substation in the City of Kakata and the rehabilitation of the Paynesville substation. The construction of the substation, rehabilitation and the running of the high tension electric transmission lines from Kakata to Monrovia (Paynesville Substation) is indeed cutting across six communities (Morris Farm, Cooper Farm, Kingville Community, Careysburg Mt. Barclay Community and Bernard Farm) all in Montserrado County.

The project will be carried out within a narrow corridor of 20 meters covering a distance of approximately 43 miles (69 km) from Monrovia to Kakata. The project is a linear one with affected persons only within the line corridor referred to as the project area.

In the alignment of the transmission line, the proponent and the consultant have strived to avoid environmentally and culturally sensitive areas (grave yards, Poro and Sande bushes, cultural heritage sites, etc.). Efforts were made to avoid as many villages and properties as possible.

The Kakata substation site has been selected. It is at the footprint of Booker Washington Institute (BWI) campus. Booker Washington Institute is a government-run institution. The BWI Authority agreed to offer the substation site free of charge to the Government of Liberia. The size of the substation site selected is 200mx200m (40,000m²).

The construction of the transmission line follows a 20-meter wide line corridor within which construction activities such clearing of Right-of-Way (RoW), erection of towers, and the connection of transmission line will take place (see project activities, table 1).

### 3.2 Project Activities

Major activities to be carried out are within the three (3) phases of the project. These phases are; the pre – construction phase, construction phase, and the operational phase.

#### Table1: Key Project Phase
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre – Construction</td>
<td>- Project planning</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>- Line route survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Public consultations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Collection of socio-economic baseline data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Preparation and submission of Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) for the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>acquisition of Environmental Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implementing RAP prior to construction.</td>
<td>Approximately 15 months, LEC to give the exact dates and time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clearing of line corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clearing and excavation of tower base and foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tower spotting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction of access and tower corridor tracts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Storage and transportation of equipment and materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Erection of towers and stringing of transmission lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Phase</td>
<td>- Routine running maintenance</td>
<td>To continue after the construction phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Foot patrol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Security patrol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tower auditing and repair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Project Schedule

The project schedule is divided into time periods: The pre – construction phase, construction and the operational phase.

The pre–construction phase comprises planning, design and preparation of environmental documents approximately nine months.

The construction phase comprises clearing of twenty (20) meters corridor, tower spotting, corridor connection, approximately eighteen months. (This period of eighteen months was given by LEC). Operational phase will commence the third quarter of 2015. (by LEC)

4.0 LEGAL, REGULATORY AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

This RAP has been prepared to comply with the requirements of the Constitution of Liberia, Environmental Protection Agency management law of Liberia and also the World Bank OP 4.12
Involuntary Resettlement Policy. The most relevant ones of the various policies, laws, and regulations are discussed below.

4.1 Liberian Constitution
The constitutional basis for environmental law is found in Article 7 of the 1986 constitution of Liberia, which provides for public participation of all citizens in the protection and management of the environment and natural resources in Liberia. The clause embraces environmental protection as a fundamental rule according to which the country must be governed. It binds state institutions in particular the legislative and executive to adopt and activate environmental policy and to formulate national development plans that are environmentally sustainable.

4.2 Conservation of the forest of Liberia Act of 1953
Early legislation establishing forest reserves and conservation area were included in the Conservation of the Forests of the Republic of Liberia Act of 1953. This Act and a supplementary Act for the Conservation of the Forest of 1957 provided the framework for the use of forests and wildlife resources and allowed for the creation of government reserves, native authority reserves, Communal Forests, National Parks, and Wildlife.

4.3 Forestry Development Authority Act of 1976
In 1976, the Act that created the Forestry Development Authority established and defined the responsibilities of the Forest Development Authority, outlined offences and penalties in connection with the Act, made provisions for an Advisory Conservation Committee and Specified power of forest officers with regard to trees in reserve areas.

4.4 The National Resources Law of 1979
The National Resources Law of 1979 includes chapters on forests, fish, wildlife, soil, water and minerals. The Law gave the FDA the mandate to create and establish government forest reserves and national parks where logging hunting or mining are strictly prohibited. The law also covered matters such as the control and prevention of soil erosion, reserving and improving soil fertility, adequate use of water resources and controlling pollution of public and private waters from industrial or agricultural wastes.
4.5 The Wildlife and National Parks Act of 1988
The Wildlife and National Parks Act of 1988 identified a number of protected areas and specified policies and objectives regarding wildlife conservation in the country. Regulations to be declared by the FDA under the new Act concerning wildlife and protected area conservation have been drafted and it cover hunting, internal and international trade, and procedures for establishing new protected areas. The FDA is re-establishing its protection program for the National Forests.

4.6 The Enactment of the Forestry Law of 2000
The enactment of the Forestry Law of 2000 also provides for environmental protection. It states in chapter 8 that “all forestry operations and activities shall be conducted so as to avoid waste and loss of biological resources and to protect natural biological resources against damage, as well as to prevent pollution and combination of the environment. The Law provides for the establishment of protected areas, research in the conservation of forest resources, reforestation and afforestation programs, and the conduct of education and awareness programs on forest resources conservation and management. A provision in the Forestry Law also prohibits the waste of forest resources.

4.7 The Public Health Act
The public Health Act contains provisions for the protection of the sources of drinking water and the inspection of potential sources of pollution. The law has limitations in terms of its enforcements. The Act does not address the total management aspect of water resources. In 1981, with the assistance of UNDP, the Government of Liberia, through the Liberian Hydrological Service Bureau of the Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy prepared a draft water law. The law laid down a complete framework for water resources management in Liberia, but was not enacted.

4.8 The Environmental Protection Agency Act of 2002
The 2002 Environmental Protection Agency Act established the Environment Protection Agency (EPA) and the institutional arrangement that support the Agency. The main bodies created under the Act are the Policy Council, the Agency, the Board of Directors, and County and County Environmental Committees. It also provides for the formulation and periodic update of a National Environment Action Plan, which will incorporate county and county environmental action plans.
The National Environment Action Plan (NEAP) is intended to be an integral part of the National Plan for Sustainable Economic Development in Liberia. In addition, the act mandates the institution for enforcing the law and provides the tools through which the environment will be managed. It provides for an Environmental Administrative Court to hear cases from aggrieved parties. It requires that environmental impact assessment (EIAs) be carried out for all activities and projects likely to have an adverse impact on the environment. It provides for a mechanism for ordering a person responsible to restore degraded environment. The act requires that formulation of environmental protection standards, guidelines and procedures; and economic incentives to encourage environment-friendly using practices. The Environmental Court has the provision to meet in counties capitals and in Monrovia. The act also foresees the establishment of a national environment fund for revenues received by the Agency, such as fees for permits, fines, contributions and donations.

4.9 The Environment Protection and Management Law
The Environment Protection and Management Law is a parallel bill to the Environmental Protection Agency Act. The Environment Protection and Management Law enable the EPA to protect the environment through implementing the law. The EPA is responsible to ensure that all sectoral laws confirm to the framework law.

The Environment Protection and Management arrange the rules, regulations and procedures for environmental impact assessment, auditing and monitoring. It establishes regulations for environmental quality standards; pollution control and licensing; guidelines and standards for the management of the environment and natural resources. It also addresses the protection of biodiversity, national heritage and the ozone layer. Other areas covered include environmental restoration orders; inspections; international obligations; and information access; education and public awareness. Several subjects comprised in the Environmental Protection and Management Law anticipated stand-alone, sector-specific statutes, rules and regulations that may be required to facilitate implementation of this law.
In 2003, the Government of Liberia signed three new laws aimed at protecting Liberia’s forests from deforestation, fragmentation and degradation. These laws- the protected Forest Area Network Law, the Sapo National Park Act and the Nimba Nature Reserve Act – has come into force. Preparation of the laws was led by Fauna Flora International with technical input from many Liberian and international partners, and financial support from the European Commission, the Critical Ecosystems partnership fund and the patron Trust.

The third law creates the Nimba Nature Reserve. It is approximately 13,400 hectares. This mountainous reserve is contiguous with the Nimba Nature Reserves of Guinea and Cote d ‘Ivoire, which together were declared a Nature World Heritage site by UNESCO in 1981.

4.10 Land Act 1856
Prior to independence, land acquisition and distribution was done on the basis of relationship and class system. Opposition to this system of land tenure led to the establishment of a set of rules known as the "digest of law to govern the affairs of the settlers in terms of land distribution." This later culminated into the Land Distribution Act of 1856 which removed the restriction to land distribution based on citizenship. This Act was repealed by the 1950 Land Act which restricted land ownership to citizens and naturalized citizens especially those of Negro decent.

4.11 County Act 1969
This Act officially distributed and demarcated land boundaries in Liberia. Prior to the Act, counties were created through political means. For instance the four oldest counties in Liberia - Montserrado, Sinoe, Grand Bassa and Maryland were all products of political events.

4.12 Land Acquisition Act 1929
The Act lays down the procedure for obtaining rights to any piece of land in Liberia through purchase. The Act distinguishes land in Liberia into two categories namely: the Hinterland, and the County area.
4.13 Policy Framework

Liberia has been operating fragmented environmental policies before 2000. Each public agency governed its own policies it had set. Under the auspices of the National Environmental Commission of Liberia (NECOLIB), established in 1999, a National Environmental Policy of the Republic of Liberia was prepared and submitted to the office of the President in August 2001. The document was approved in November 2002.

The objectives of the National Environmental Policy of Liberia are to ensure the improvement of the physical environment, improve the quality of life of the people and ensure reconciliation and coordination between economic development and growth with sustainable management of natural reserves.

The policy focuses on the following areas:

- Socio-economic dimensions and cross-cutting issues;
- Sustainable management of sectoral systems;
- Working with and through people; and
- Policy implementation

In order to promote effective implementation of sectoral environmental policies and strategies, the National Environmental Policy, among other things, calls for the strengthening of institutional mechanisms and reviewing and where necessary formulating environmental legislation. It also calls for establishing a national environmental council and an autonomous government agency. It seeks to develop and implement systems and guidelines for assessing environmental impacts of development economic activities and to increase environmental education and public awareness. Other goals include developing capacity for environmental management, empowering local communities in the management of natural resources through community participation, and involving the private sector and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in all aspects of management of their natural resources and the environment.

The Environmental Policy defines policy goals, objectives and principles for sustainable development, but does not include measures and actions to address the priority problems. Liberia is a party to Convention of Biological Diversity, the Cartagena Protocol on Bio-safety and the
Abidjan Convention for the protection and development of the Coastal and Marine Environment. The EPA is mandated to function as focal point for conventions on the environment. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) formerly the National Environmental Commission of Liberia (NECOLIB) has participated in the Development of a Collaborative Institutional Data Framework for Integrated Environmental Assessment and Reporting for West Africa and with the assistance of UNDP and UNEP prepared a State of the Environment Report in November 2002, which has been approved and published.

Besides these environmental policy documents, other strategies and plans that address environmental protection include National Energy Strategy (1984), the Ten-year Forestry Sector Development Program, policies in the agricultural sector, the mining/mineral resources sector and the National Plan of Action for the protection of the Coastal and Marine Environment from Land and sea-based activities (2005).

Liberia has an environmental agenda and has therefore signed a number of Multilateral Environmental Agreements and Conventions. The obligation of the Government of Liberia to the CBD (Convention on Biological Diversity) and CITES (Convention on the International Trade of Endangered Species) Conventions requires the proponent to respect the principles of sustainable environmental management in its construction and maintenance undertakings of the transmission line. The principles of these MEAs and the World Bank OP 4.12 (as revised in April, 2004) are applicable to this project. Due consideration has been taken of them in the preparation of this document. In selecting the line route, the over-riding consideration has been the avoidance of environmentally sensitive areas and settlements and the minimization of the destruction of property and farms.

4.14 International Requirements


The main focus of this operational guideline is to seek to avoid project affected people experiencing negative effects associated with the project such as loss of security, loss of land or assets on land, or being put into a detrimental life situation due to a Bank supported development project.
The World Bank policy requires screening of all projects proposed for World Bank financing to ensure that these projects are environmentally and socially sound and sustainable. In the process of project preparation, it was found that the implementation of the Project would result in the physical or economic displacement of the Project Affect People (PAP).

The PAPs comprise those people who are directly affected both socially and economically by the World Bank-assisted investment Project, as a result of the involuntary taking of land and other assets resulting in:

- Relocation or loss of housing.
- Loss of assets or access to assets.
- Loss of income or means of livelihood.

**Objectives of the Project Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF)**

The purpose of the RPF is to set out the policies and procedures for the delivery of entitlements, implementation process, grievance redress mechanisms and arrangements for independent monitoring for land acquisition and resettlement that may occur as the result of the Project.

The objective of the framework is to restore the livelihood of PAPs at least pre-project level. The following issues covered are:

- Policy principles and objectives governing resettlement preparation and implementation.
- A description of the process for preparing and approving resettlement plans.
- Categories of PAPs and the estimated numbers of dependents.
- Eligibility criteria for defining various categories of the PAPs.
- A legal framework comparing the Borrower laws and regulations and World Bank policy requirements and measures to bridge any gaps between them.
- Methods of valuing affected assets.
- Description of arrangements for funding resettlement, including the flow of funds and contingency arrangements.
- Organizational procedures for delivery of entitlements.
• A description of mechanisms for consulting with, and participation of PAPs in planning, implementation, and monitoring.

• Arrangements for monitoring by the implementing agency (LEC) and other independent monitors.

The RAP provides a package of compensation and rehabilitation measures eligible for PAPs, as defined by the RPF and World Bank OP 4.12 relating to land take and other related assets can take place only after all compensation and rehabilitation measures, defined in the relevant RAP, have been provided to eligible PAPs. In the event that some PAPs need to be physically relocated, particular attention will be paid so their needs can be incorporated in developing compensation and rehabilitation measures to ensure their livelihood are at least restored to the pre-project level. Particular attention will be paid to the needs of vulnerable groups, especially those living below the poverty line, the landless, the elderly, women and children, or other displaced persons who may not be protected through national legislative measures.

5.0 INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

Various institutions have been established in Liberia to have either direct or indirect responsibilities for compulsory acquisition of properties in line with the Liberian Constitution. This is to ensure that property affected persons are provided with prompt, fair and adequate compensation and that they are not worse off following the implementation of any project. The following institutions enumerated below would have various roles to play in the implementation of the Resettlement Action Plan for the project. Many of these are considered major stakeholders in the implementation of the RAP.

5.1 Ministry of Public Works

This Ministry has the responsibility for the design, construction and maintenance of roads, highways, bridges, storm sewers, public buildings and other civil works. Other functions include urban and town planning, provision of architectural and engineering of infrastructure required for Government. The Ministry has a Special Implementation Unit (now working as an Infrastructure Implementation Unit) charged with the implementation of both urban and rural infrastructure works on behalf of the Ministry.
5.2 Ministry of Finance and Development Planning
This Ministry is responsible for national development planning, project preparation and coordination. It provides technical guidance to all governmental agencies in preparation of development programs and projects.

5.3 Ministry of Health and Social Welfare
The Department of Environmental and Occupational Health in this Ministry handles matters relating to water and sanitation. It conducts sanitary inspections in public eating places including drinking water surveillance; construction and/or supervision of water wells and pit latrines and the promotion of community health education. The Department of social welfare handles repatriation and resettlement of internal and external displaced people in Liberia.

5.4 Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy
The Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy supervises the development and management of water resources and conducts scientific and technical investigations required for environmental assessments. The implementation of water and sanitation activities is done through the Department of Mineral and Environmental Research. The Ministry’s mandate dictates that it must be involved in Special projects on the evaluation of urban sanitation, particularly the provision of guidance for geotechnical investigation of solid wastes landfill disposal sites. The Bureau of Land Survey of this Ministry is the technical section of the Government that handles land demarcation and land survey.

5.5 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
The EPA is mandated to set environmental quality standards and ensure compliance with pollution control. If is responsible for the provision of guidelines for the preparation of Environmental Assessments and Audits, and the evaluation of environmental permits. These may include certification procedures for landfill and other activities potentially dangerous to the environment.
5.6 National Resettlement Advisory Body

Prior to the commencement of operation of the project the relevant grievances mechanism should be put in place such as the National Resettlement Advisory Body that will be mandated to approve and endorse compensations and other transactions that may occur between the project administration and the local people. This set-up will serve as the representative of both the Government of Liberia and the local people. (This body has been proposed by the Liberian Government but has not been established and functional. The composition is unknown).

5.7 Town Level Arrangements

The Resettlement Action Plan activities including compensation for the Project Affected persons’ loss will be mainly carried out by the Proposed National Committee. However it is necessary for Proposed National Committee to work closely together with Community Liaison Officer (CLO) in terms of land conflict, compensation, security of the citizens along the line route corridor, employment opportunities, and negotiation with relevant agencies during project preparation, construction and operational phases. The Community Liaison Officer will assist the implementation of the plan in each community. The responsibilities’ of CLO include

- Ensuring that all project affected people obtain their compensation
- Investigating and solve land conflict between community people and between communities that arise during project construction and operational phases.
- Serving as liaison officer between the Proposed National Committee and the communities in terms of community development

In order to support smooth implementation of the land acquisition and compensation and mitigation measures, the CLO will establish integration and coordination with the Office of the, Clan and Town Chiefs and elders in which the affected area lies.

During consultations with community people, the consultatant requested that each affected community establish a community-based committee comprises a community liaison officer, elders, chiefs, etc. as a local base committee for the smooth implementation of the RAP.

---

Footnote: This body has been in existence for long.
5.8 Land Commission

Two land and property rights issues need to be addressed as Liberia proceeds with post conflict reconstruction. The first is the issue of the legal status of customary land rights, and the second is the issue of ownership of trees and other forest resources on community forest lands. Reforms undertaken by the Liberian Government put it on the right track to resolving these issues, namely the cancellation of all existing forest concessions; the review of rubber concessions (2006); the establishment of the Land Commission (2009) to settle the question of customary land rights; and enactment of the 2009 Community Rights Law, which returns ownership of forest resources to communities.

Liberia Land Commission was established by an Act of the Legislature in August 2009 as an autonomous government body comprising seven commissioners, each from a different county, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. It has a life-span of 5 years and a Technical and Administrative Secretariat

Mandate and Purpose

The Commission is to propose, advocate and coordinate reforms of land policy, laws and programs in Liberia. It does not have adjudicatory or implementation role.

Primary objectives are to promote:

- equitable and productive access to the nation's land, both public and private;
- security of tenure in land and the rule of law with respect to landholding and dealings in land;
- effective land administration and management; and ,
- investment in and development of the nation's land resources.

The Land Commission and Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS)

The goal of the Commission is to develop comprehensive national land tenure and land use system that will provide equitable access to land and security of tenure so as to facilitate inclusive,
sustained growth and development, ensure peace and security, and provide sustainable management of the environment.

The Functions of the Commission are:

• To undertake fact-finding studies and public consultations on land;
• To recommend actions, programs, and reforms of land policy and law;
• To call together Government Ministries, Agencies and other entities to consider complex issues relating to land, including the creation of task forces;
• To propose to the President actions to deal with urgent problems; and,
• To propose legislation and to supervise its drafting, including amendment to the Constitution of the Republic of Liberia.

Technical and Financial Support
The Land Commission is supported by the Government of Liberia and other donor agencies including USAID, World Bank, UN-Habitat, Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), etc.

6.0 OVERVIEW OF THE ECONOMY

Liberia’s economy is recovering from the global economic downturn. Growth in 2010 was estimated at 6.1 percent, up from 4.6 percent in 2009, driven by an increase in exports and foreign direct investment (FDI). Growth was projected to reach 7.3 percent in 2011 and 8.9 percent in 2012. The rise in exports was due to an increase in commodity prices, particularly rubber, palm oil and minerals (AfDB et al, 2011).

Liberia’s economy is dominated by natural resources. These are mainly agriculture, forestry and fishing which are described further below. While this is a drop of four percent from 2005, it highlights the weaknesses of other sectors due to decades of civil war and economic mismanagement. This is followed by general government services at 10 percent, up from 8.4 percent in 2005 (AfDB et al, 2011).

A dramatic increase is predicted in the mining and quarrying sector with a jump from 0.1 percent in 2005 to 1.1 in 2010. This was largely due to the government starting to receive royalty payments.
(of USD 1.57 million) as from 2010 from the extractive industries sector. These royalties were projected to grow to USD 30 million by 2015 (AfDB et al, 2011).

The construction sector was predicted to double its contribution to GDP from 2 percent in 2005 to 4.1 percent in 2010. This was partly due to the reconstruction of the country’s infrastructure such as health and education facilities, as well as roads. China is Liberia’s largest public donor, contributing an estimated USD 20 million annually to construction (AFDB et al, 2011).

The manufacturing sector has remained small at 5.3 percent in 2010 down from 7.2 percent 2005. These are generally small-scale industrial activities such as the manufacture of cement, bricks, tiles and wooden and metal furniture. There are few opportunities to expand the manufacturing sector to support investment in the extractive industry and road and railway construction. Growth of the sector is restricted due to the smallness of the domestic market, lack of purchasing power and limited public consumption (AfDB et al, 2011).

7.0 SOCIO-ECONOMIC BASELINE

7.1 Introduction

The civil war in Liberia (1990-2003) destroyed most of the country’s national census data. It was impossible to undertake population monitoring activities during that time. It was only after approximately five years after the civil war that Liberia was able to conduct a census. With financial and technical support from the international aid community, Liberia was able to re-establish its national research competency, including a census in 2008, which was the first since 1984.

The section below describes the socio-economic environment in which the project is situated. It highlights the current status of demographic and socio-economic conditions, as well as the relevant political and traditional structures. Desktop information was collected in order to support the research. Data sources included government reports, international aid agency reports, population census results, and project reports. There is very little information available at district level, while
information at village level and town levels were obtained from CEDA household questionnaire survey.

7.2 Political Environment

The Republic of Liberia, which was established in 1820, has been plagued by civil wars from the late 1980s until 2003. The war led to over 200,000 deaths and approximately a million Liberians being displaced as refugees to neighboring countries. What has been described as one of Africa’s bloodiest civil war had left the country almost non-functional. The country’s Gross Domestic Product declined by 90%. Infrastructure was severely damaged, especially transport routes. This resulted in increases in food prices and the cost of living. It is estimated that about three quarters of educational infrastructure became unusable while health facilities had capacity to serve only 10% of the population (Golder, 2011). Young boys were forced to become soldiers, with an estimated 21 000 of the 50 000 former combatants in Liberia under the age of 18.

“Lift Liberia” is a broad-scale initiative that seeks to re-establish a country that was torn apart by the bloody civil war. The Government of Liberia has devised programs and strategies to rebuild the country with support from international aid agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The government’s Poverty Reduction Strategy seeks to rebuild peace and national security, revitalize the economy, re-institute systems of governance and the rule of law, and rebuild infrastructure and basic service delivery.

7.3 Administrative Structure

The Liberian government consists of the Chief of State, currently President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, the Vice President, Joseph Boakai, a National Assembly comprising a 73-seat House of Representatives (the Lower House), and a 30-seat Senate (or Upper House). Presidential elections are held every six years, and the results are decided through popular vote.

Senators and representatives are also elected by popular vote. Two senators are chosen from each of Liberia’s counties. The senators with the highest number of votes in each of the counties are senior senators, serving nine-year terms in office, while the senators with the next highest number
of votes are junior senators serving six-year terms. In the House of Representatives, members serve six-year terms. Source: UNDP, 2007

There are currently 15 counties and 74 political districts in Liberia. Counties fall directly under national government and are the largest sub-national political division. Counties are headed by a county superintendent who is supported by a deputy or assistant superintendent for development. Below the counties there are (in some instances) statutory districts, headed by a statutory superintendent. Each county is further subdivided into administrative districts which are headed by district commissioners. The district is the lowest administrative level at which the central government operates. Below the districts are chiefdoms, clans and cities or towns (UNDP, 2007).

The county superintendents, statutory superintendents, district commissioners and township commissioners, are all appointed by the President rather than elected. They are accountable to the President through the Ministry of Internal Affairs. Sector Ministries second officials to the county and district level (although many have not been deployed to their destinations). These officials are accountable to their line ministries (UNDP, 2007). Traditional leaders or elders are drawn from the counties, forming traditional representation at the national level in parallel to the statutory system of superintendents and commissioners (Golder, 2011).

The Liberian Constitution does not clearly define the powers of counties, nor provide for a constitutionally guaranteed functional relationship between central and local government. It calls for elections of municipal heads and chiefs but may debate continuously over how and when such elections might be held. Counties and districts do not have budgets at the local level from which to operate. All budgets are centrally controlled. Similarly, counties do not have the authority to collect and manage revenue. All revenue collected is reported directly to Monrovia.

Due to the lack of clarity in the Constitution and in the rules and regulations governing local government, there are overlapping roles and/or functions both within local government and between local government and central government. Most lines of reporting are vertical, from line ministries to their central ministries, leaving the superintendent with no clear authority to define and coordinate a development agenda for the county (UNDP, 2007).
In its efforts to strengthen governance and management, the Government of Liberia has implemented the “Liberian National Decentralization and Local Development Program”. With the support of the UN Capital Development Fund and the Development Program, this government program will set up a capital investment and local development fund to reverse the country’s historic tendencies towards centralization. The program aims to strengthen policy and strategy development, as well as general systems and institutional development, while promoting local sector-specific investments. It is hoped that this initiative will ensure the effective management of Liberia’s attempts at restoring local government (Government of Liberia, 2007).

Another government support program is the County Support Team Initiative, which is a mechanism that UN in Liberia has developed to combine its capacities, knowledge, expertise and resources in support of strengthening local government to take more responsibility at the county level (UNDP, 2007).

7.4 Socio-Economic Environment

7.4.1 Introduction

The impact of civil war in Liberia is far reaching across the socio-economic landscape of the country. Majority of families who were displaced by the war have returned to rebuild their homes and find some means of livelihood. However, the collapse of infrastructure and services and the uprooting of a subsistence lifestyle have made it difficult for most households to re-establish themselves, thereby the rate of poverty.

Lack of development and employment opportunities have encouraged many of the youth to leave agricultural-based villages in search of greener pasture and livelihood opportunities, often in Monrovia.

With the onset of instability, the economy, which was heavily reliant on agricultural produce and natural resource exports, had virtually collapsed. Gross Domestic Product (GDP) fell by almost 90 percent between 1987 and 1995. Per capita GDP in 2006 was US$195.50, down from US$1,269
in 1980 (Ministry of Planning, 2008). Liberia has a huge external debt burden of US$3.7 billion as of mid-2005, equivalent to 800 percent of GDP, and 3,000 percent of export value. Unemployment has reached 85 percent in 2008 (Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, 2009).

Since stability returned in 2003 and governance improved from 2006, there has been some progress. Economic growth for 2007 was estimated at nine percent, while domestic and foreign direct investment has improved. Many schools and health facilities are being rebuilt, human resources trained, and there have been important gains in terms of primary healthcare service provision and road rebuilding. Nevertheless, the challenges that remain are enormous, and it will take decades to recover from the damage done (Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, 2009).

7.4.2 Population Distribution

According to the 2008 Population Census, Liberia has a total population of 3,476,608 with 24 percent living in the capital city of Monrovia. There is a relatively even split between males and females.

7.4.3 Population Growth

The percentage of the Liberian population living in urban areas, which prior to the conflict was already high by African standards, rose even further to reach 45 percent in 2000. The average population growth rate in Liberia fell from 3.3 percent in 1980–1987 to 2.5 percent in 1990–2000 and two percent in 2002. Infant and under-five mortality rates in Liberia were estimated in 1999 at around 134 per 1000 live births and in 2000 at 235 per 1000 live births. Average life expectancy is 48 years. Women are expected to bear an average of 6.2 children (UNEP, 2004).

7.4.4 Population Density

The county’s population concentration can be described as moderate (50 to 99 persons per square mile). It generally has large land masses and high population totals. Other counties in this category include Bong, Lofa and Grand Bassa. Conditions that favor people living in these areas are generally local alluvial diamond and gold mining, fertile arable lands for farming, moderate transport and communication facilities and local trade.
In 2008, the population density of Liberia was 93 persons per square mile. This represents a 66 percent rise since 1984 when there were 56 persons per square mile. Compared with some Sub-Saharan nations, population density in Liberia is moderate. The majority of the population (75 percent) lives across six counties, namely, Montserrado, Nimba, Bong, Lofa, Grand Bassa and Margibi. These counties are known as the ‘big six’. On the other hand, 10 percent of the population lives across the ‘small five’, namely Grand Kru, RiverCess, River Gee, Bomi and Gbarpolu counties. In 1984, these counties held approximately 12 percent of the population, indicating a trend toward living in the larger, more urbanized centers of Liberia (LISGIS, 2008).

7.4.5 Household Size and Dependency

Population growth has been on par with the national average of two percent per annum. At a national level household size declined substantially from 6.2 to 5.1. In the same period, the population grew by 2.1 percent annually. The dependency ratio for Liberia is 1.37.

7.4.6 Ethnicity and Language

Liberia’s population can be roughly divided into two major categories, indigenous Liberians and Americo-Liberians. Indigenous Liberians are descendants of African ethnic groups who already inhabited the area when the first African American settlers arrived. Americo-Liberians are largely made up of the descendants of three groups, namely: 19th-century African American settlers who founded Liberia, freed Afro-Caribbean slaves who came to Liberia in the mid-1800s, and Africans captured on slave ships by the United States of America (USA) Navy (enforcing a USA law against the importation of slaves), and sent to Liberia (Dunn-Marcos et al, 2005).

Americo-Liberians may also include some members of two other groups: the children of marriages and informal liaisons between Americo-Liberians and indigenous Liberians, and indigenous Liberian children raised by Americo-Liberian families (a system that is known as ‘wardship’). The overwhelming majority (97 percent) of Liberia’s population is indigenous; Americo-Liberians make up the remaining three percent (Dunn-Marcos et al, 2005).
There are 16 ethnic groups that make up Liberia's indigenous population. The Kpelle in central and western Liberia is the largest ethnic group. While English is the official language, it is only spoken by 20 percent of the population. The remaining 80 percent speak some 20 ethnic group languages.

7.5.7 The Economic, Social and Cultural Impacts and Causes of Ebola in Liberia

Economic Impact

The economy of Liberia suffered a devastating impact as a result of the Ebola Virus Disease (EVD) outbreak in Liberia. All the major parts of the Liberian economy suffered as a result of Ebola which started in early March 2014. The health sector suffers the most, because the health sector was already striving to recover from the devastation it suffers during the fifteen years of civil unrest which took place in Liberia; with the outbreak of the virus, which seems strange in Liberia, matter got worse for the health sector.

During the outbreak, most hospitals and clinics were closed to the public, because of insufficient trained man-power coupled with shortage of requisite drugs to cope with the magnitude at which the virus was spreading in Liberia. This led to the death of many persons from Ebola and non-Ebola related diseases. Doctors, nurses, children, pregnant women, and the elderly were the worst affected.

Ebola also had an impact on the educational sector of Liberia; the government was compelled to suspend all school related activities in the country which lasted for up to seven months, this action was necessary to contain the further spread of the virus in the country. The outbreak also affected projects that were on-going prior to the outbreak; these include the Mt. Coffee Hydro power plant rehabilitation project, the Paynesville –Kakata electric line route construction project, the CLSG project, etc. Foreign investors were compelled to leave the country for fear of losing their lives. Companies in the country had to reduce their work-force likewise the Government of Liberia. Other sectors that were affected include: agriculture, transport, foreign relation, etc.
The Ebola epidemic continues to cripple the economy of Liberia; as a result, there is a flat or negative income growth creating large fiscal needs in Liberia.

“This update presents the World Bank’s most recent analysis of the economic effects of the Ebola epidemic on Liberia. Liberia had been growing rapidly in recent years, and into the first half of 2014. But GDP growth estimates for 2014 have been revised sharply downward since pre-crisis estimates. Projected 2014 growth in Liberia is now 2.2 percent (versus 5.9 percent before the crisis and 2.5 percent in October).

As the epidemic continues, the economy of Liberia will face a difficult year in 2015, as second-round effects kick in and investor aversion takes a further toll. 2015 growth estimates are 3.0 percent in Liberia. In Liberia, the epidemic may be abating and there are some signs of economic activity picking up, the 2015 estimate is an increase on October’s (1.0 percent).

Combining the effects on revenue and spending with cuts made to public investment to finance the response, the total fiscal impact is well over half a billion dollars in 2014 alone. Liberia has been hardest hit fiscally. Relative to pre-Ebola forecasts, revenues are down $86 million while public spending has increased $62 million, a combined impact of more than 6 percent of GDP. Although the resulting fiscal deficits in Liberia have so far been financed by inflows from development partners, government have also cut down public investment damaging future growth prospects”.

**Social Impact**

Ebola also affected the social aspect of Liberia. Before the outbreak, Liberians were known for gathering together and merry making, but during the outbreak all Liberians were strongly advised by the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare to abstain from all public gatherings. A ban was placed on public gathering of more than fifty persons. No shaking of hands, no hugging, no kissing, no sexual intercourse with strange persons, etc, were all measures announced by the Ministry which affected all Liberians socially, but these measures were necessary to contain the spread of the virus.
With all these measures in place, collecting the Socio-economic data from the field was extremely challenging as everyone was unwilling to welcome a stranger/visitor into his/her home. In some instances, people ran away when they noticed our team of surveyors approaching their homes; therefore, we adopted the “distance approach method”- that means we would be at a distance somewhere in the yard and call the property owner, introduce ourselves and request the information(s) we need from him/her. We did this with caution, as we ourselves were aware of the virus and very much afraid.

**Cultural Impact**
Liberians were obliged to change some of their cultural behaviors mainly relating to burial. Prior to the outbreak, Liberians were accustomed to the culture of shaking hands and touching the dead bodies of their dead loved ones, but because the virus could spread from one person to another through contact with an affected person, Liberians were advised to avoid their practices. The cultural impact of relatives not receiving the bodies of their dead love ones was a major cultural blow to all Liberians.

**Causes that Led to the Spread of the Ebola Virus**
1. The insensitivity of the government to close her borders with Sierra Leone and Guinea after Guinea reported the first case in her territory on February 19, 2014. It is reported that petty traders were still trading along the Liberian-Guinean border up to July 2014.
2. The state of denial. Many Liberians were denying that the virus did exist.
3. Poor health and inadequate health facilities. The health system was in a poor state to rapidly respond to such a strange virus.
4. Lack of sufficient information on the virus. Liberians knew little or nothing about the Ebola virus before it struck; as a result, it spread rapidly throughout the country within a few months.

**7.6 Land Use and Ownership**
Liberia is rich in natural resources, such as valuable timber species, significant biodiversity, as well as mineral resources such as iron ore, gold and diamonds. Agriculture provides a livelihood for the majority of the population, with most farming carried out on relatively small landholdings; however there are also a number of large commercial plantations.
Liberia’s population is stratified between the urban-based elite – mostly descendants of freed slaves from the USA and Caribbean - and the indigenous Africans living in rural areas (the majority of the population). The land-tenure system reflects this division of the population.

Throughout coastal Liberia, urban elites use a Western statutory system of land ownership based on individual fee simple titles. In the Liberian hinterland, indigenous Africans use their own customary systems, which are based on community or collective ownership of discrete territories (USAID, 2011).

State policy initially recognized customary ownership as full ownership rights, whether or not formally titled. It now recognizes usufruct rights of possession and use of undocumented customary claims. This policy has permitted the state to grant concessions for vast tracks of customary lands, as well as to create national parks and reserves. It has also contributed to conflict, as indigenous communities lost their food and livelihood source and the foundations to their cultural heritage. In addition, during the civil war, a new national forestry law was passed, decreeing that forest resources (trees), as distinguished from forest lands, belong to the state. This effectively took away community access to forest resources even when these were on the community‘s own lands (USAID, 2011).

The causes of Liberia’s recently concluded 14-year civil war were multiple, but central to the war was conflict over land and natural resource rights. While key sector reforms have been introduced in the post-conflict period, there is still more work to be done about land policy reform, land dispute resolution, legal recognition of customary rights and the promotion of community forestry development (USAID, 2011).

A key requirement of almost all investments in export production is land. The UN Country Profile of Liberia described land as the focal point for human survival and economic development as it provides diverse functions in support of ecosystem processes, livelihoods and food security. As such, security of tenure is vital for survival of subsistence based households and growing national/international businesses.
Complications in land history have resulted in tensions relating to land ownership. Current legislation bars land ownership by foreigners and even longstanding communities of non-African origin who include some of the most active local investors. The World Bank has highlighted the insecurity of land tenure in Liberia and the need to review the legal situation and provisions of civil law that continues to reflect colonial perspectives.

Such land insecurities are also evident when it comes to civil and customary law of land. The customary land tenure system is based on the oral history of families and a council of elders, providing households with a small amount of land for cultivation for agricultural purposes and prohibiting the direct sale of land as an economic resource. The civil land law introduced by the Anglo-Americans is a deed system where land is formally surveyed for public and private ownership. The American Colonization Society, among others, purchased land from tribes along the coast to distribute to settlers as land grants from the 1820s onwards, later deeming all land to be public by right of conquest before distributing it to settlers.

Under the Liberian civil land law, all land is considered property of the state and is subject to the land registration system introduced in 1973. This system aims to register all land in the national archives. However, it has not effectively taken over from the earlier deed registration system and many records remain damaged or lost as a result of the civil war, leading to fraud and malpractice in land transactions. Consequently, land disputes are common, which is caused by inefficiencies in land rights documentation and insufficient capacity to manage land policy and administration. The high levels of population displacement and mostly illegal land occupations during the civil war, combined with poor documentation of customary land laws, complicate matters, resulting in most court cases being related to land disputes.

7.7 Human Rights

Important advances have been made towards improving institutional protection of human rights in the Liberian criminal justice system. The Government engaged in the development of strategic plans for the Ministry of Justice, Judiciary and Corrections sector. Government has continued its efforts to gradually address the shortage of qualified staff in the criminal justice system as well as in the education, health and security sectors (UN, 2009).
There are still significant gaps in human rights protection due to major capacity and resource constraints across the legal, judicial and corrections sectors. The protection of children in particular remains inadequate, as children continue to suffer various forms of violence at home, at school or in the community. The welfare of children in many orphanages is dire, and cases of children in conflict with the law continue to be addressed inappropriately due to the absence of a functional juvenile justice system (UN, 2009).

Cases of rape and other sexual crimes remain prevalent. Relevant legislation is either poorly implemented. This could be attributed to a general lack of awareness about how to seek protection, which is further compounded by the problems associated with access to justice, health facilities and effective law enforcement. Harmful traditional practices, including female genital mutilation and adjudication of disputes through trials by ordeal, are entrenched and continue to be widely practiced with impunity. Relevant legislation is not compliant with international standards and thus does not provide for appropriate action (UN, 2009).

Progress in the implementation of the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) has been slow. As such, a large percentage of the population still face significant obstacles to the enjoyment of their economic and social rights as access to basic services such as health care, education and safe drinking water is limited. The PRS contains comprehensive benchmarks linking legal empowerment and rule of law to development (UN, 2009).

**7.8 Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV)**

Sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) is an enormous challenge in the country and takes the form of sexual exploitation and abuse, domestic violence such as woman and child beating, female genital mutilation, rape and sexual assault. Some domestic violence is the result of cultural beliefs. Women and girls in particular experienced severe violence during the civil war and are still experiencing this level of violence during post-conflict Liberia.

In 2007 about 38 percent of protection cases reported by the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR) monitors were related to GBV, while reports from 2008 showed a similar trend. Domestic violence
is endemic, accounting for 26 percent of all reported protection cases. In addition, the country has among the highest rates of teenage pregnancy in the world.

The destruction of education institutions during the war has further disempowered women and girls. Women and girls continue to have limited access to education, health services and judicial services, and this has severely curtailed their participation in the formal economy. Women and girls have missed out on opportunities to participate in the management and decision-making levels of the society. Although Liberian law recognizes equality of both sexes, customary law infringes on the rights of women, including the right to own property. These trends have contributed to the feminization of poverty in the Country.

7.9 Vulnerability

The collapse of Liberia’s national economy and the consequent destruction of the rural economy have led to an increase in poverty, especially in the rural areas. An estimated 64 percent of the population lives in poverty, of which 48 percent live in absolute poverty. It is particularly high in rural areas, where two-thirds of the population live in poverty. Children are especially vulnerable with many of them living outside of the family, in trouble with the law, heading households, and falling prey to trafficking.

Between 1993 and 2002 the number of people living below the minimum level of dietary energy consumption in Liberia doubled from approximately 700,000 to 1.4 million. Only nine percent of Liberian households are food secure, while 11 percent are food insecure and 40 percent are highly vulnerable to food insecurity. The most food-insecure households are located in Lofa, Bomi, Grand Kru and River Gee. Factors contributing to food insecurity include low agricultural productivity resulting from limited access to inputs and credit, low income generating opportunities, and limited market access due to poor road networks.

Rural livelihoods were particularly affected by the civil war. Inputs required re-establishing livelihoods are lacking and so are agricultural implements, seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, finance, roads and markets. Overcoming poverty is severely constrained by the following:
• The collapse of infrastructure;
• The constrained economic situation; and
• The lack of skilled human resources that could assist recovery.

According to a Poverty Profile study conducted in Liberia during 2007, three-quarters of the north-western region is classified as poor. Liberia’s Human Development Index value for 2010 was 0.300, which ranks it 162nd out of 169 countries. Sixty-eight percent of Liberians live below the poverty line and 38 percent of the population is undernourished.

7.9.1. Vulnerable Population of the Study Area
The vulnerable population of the study area is referred to as population aged 0-15 and population aged 69-90 (see below table).

Table 2: Population Age 0 – 15 (Project Area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris Farm</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper Farm</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>KingvilleCommunity</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Careysburg community</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mount Barclay</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bernard Farm</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>282</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Population Age 69-90 (Project Area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris Farm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper Farm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>KingvilleCommunity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Careysburg community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mount Barclay</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bernard Farm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.10 Socio-economic Conditions of Affected Counties
The project affects two counties: Montserrado and Margibi counties.

7.10.1 Margibi County

Geography
The county is ideally situated along the Atlantic Ocean in the south and neighbors Montserrado County on the east, Bong County on the north and Northeast, and Grand Bassa County on the west. The total land area of the county is approximately 2866.67 squares miles, with an estimated 118,000 acres of this total being utilized by rubber plantations, namely Firestone and Salala, to name but two.

Climate
The climate of Margibi is hot and humid, with an average annual temperature of 80°F (27°C). There are two major seasons in Liberia, dry and rainy. The dry season lasts from December to March in the coastal areas and for a longer period in the inland areas. Annual rainfall along the coast averages 200 inches (510cm). Inland areas receive about 85 inches (220cm) of rain per year.

Topography and Drainages
A narrow coastal plan extends inland from the coastline, and the land gradually rises to the high Bong Range in the northwest, and Gibi Mountain in the north, bordering Grand Bassa County. Margibi County’s most important rivers are the Farmington, which forms the border with Grand Bassa County, and the Du River, which forms the border with Montserrado County. Both rivers have the potential for hydroelectric power generation.

Geology and Soil
The soil is excellent for agricultural production and many cash crops. The soil in the lower part is mostly sandy clay loam, with an abundance of nutrients, and that of Upper Margibi is characteristic of highland soils.
Vegetation
High-elevation regions have forests of evergreen and deciduous trees, including ironwood and mahogany. Mangrove swamps are found mainly in the coastal areas.

Population
The total population of Margibi is 240,996 of which the female population dominate 53.34%. Detailed information is shown in the table as below.

Table 4: Population Data Gender Distribution, Margibi County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory District</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Population by Gender</th>
<th>Population Gender Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firestone area</td>
<td>41,681</td>
<td>19,639</td>
<td>22,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibi</td>
<td>24,184</td>
<td>11,823</td>
<td>12,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakata</td>
<td>101,903</td>
<td>48,142</td>
<td>53,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mambah-Kaba</td>
<td>73,228</td>
<td>32,840</td>
<td>40,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>240,996</td>
<td>112,444</td>
<td>128,552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LISGIS 2008

Ethnic Composition
The Bassa (48%) is the dominant ethnic group, though all or nearly all of Liberia’s tribes are represented in the County. Kpellleh (44%) is the second dominant ethnic group in Margibi.

Religion
About 90% of the county’s population is Christians, with roughly 5% Muslims and 5% Animists.

Tourism
No Tourism site is found in the county.

Agriculture
The agriculture productive capacity in the county is below average for Liberia. About 80 percent of farming is subsistence farming. Food crops production is not as widespread in this county as other counties in Liberia. Only about every second household has access to agricultural land, according to the CFSNS. In 2005, rice was only produced by 33% of farming households. The
main crops cultivated in 2005 included cassava (79%), Rice (33%) and Corn (12%). This is in part explained by the local preference for the traditional dumboy dish, which is more commonly consumed than rice.

Commercial or cash crops produced in the county included rubber, produced by 52% of households; cocoa, produced by 10% of households; coconuts, produced by (14%) of households; sugarcane and pineapple, each produced by (14%); plantain/banana, produced by (34%); palm nuts, produced by (14%); and cola nuts, produced by 3%. One percent of households surveyed owned goats, another 6% owned pigs, 6% owned ducks and 39% owned chickens.

The constraints to agricultural growth are many, as shown in the below table. Chief among them is a lack of capital for purchase of the various inputs that are missing. Because the population does not have access to credit and savings products, there is little possibility for communities to increase production to match their potential.

In spite of constrains, agriculture is a major component of economic revitalization and poverty alleviation in Liberia and Margibi County. With a population annual growth estimated at about 2.5%, the realistic objective of doubling per-capita incomes within ten years would require an average annual growth rate of close to 10% per annum. With 50% of the county’s GDP coming from agriculture, achieving this objective will require a similar rate of growth in agriculture. Strong and sustained growth in agriculture is particularly important since it can create employment for many low-skilled people, as a major engine of the rural and overall economy for many multiplier shifting workers to manufacturing and services. Strong agricultural growth is achievable during the early stages of the country’s reconstruction efforts, supported by the resettlement of displaced populations and the quick recovery of very depressed agricultural production, in particular food crops. Experience in other post-conflict countries indicates that agricultural growth is a major factor in early economic recovery, reaching 4% two years after the end of conflict and accelerating to an average of nearly 8% in years 3 through 5 after the crisis before setting down to about 4% in years 6 through 10, which is a more typical long-run growth rate for agriculture in most developing countries.
Health
Besides the Firestone medical facilities, which receive approximately 9,000 patients visits a month and at time buttresses other facilities by helping to provide storage and some medical equipment, there are two main functional government hospitals serving the county; C.H. Rennie Hospital, a referral site in Kakata; and the Mike M. Baydoun Health Center in Marshall City. Both facilities badly need ambulances, renovation and supplies for full operation. Apart from the two hospitals, the government owns 19 clinics among the 36 functioning health facilities in the county. The most prominent among them may be the Dolo Town Community Clinic that was built by the US Embassy. All the government medical employees are on the government payroll and treatment is provided free of charge with drugs provided by government and INGOs. Firestone Liberia actively participate to vaccination campaigns for the eradication of childhood diseases.

Water, Energy and Sanitation
Water and electricity are still a wish for many communities. As typical rural Liberian county, Margibi does not have access to public power. All individuals and organizations in need of electricity, including the local authorities, have to operate their own generators. A survey has just been conducted for connection of Kakata and Marshall to the Emergency Power Program already operational in Monrovia. Prior to the war, most parts of Margibi County had a water and sewage system that has since broken down, leaving the population even in the cities without improved water and sanitation facilities. With 146 hand pumps in use in the county, an average of 1650 people are making use of each pump. Some 1685 people share each available latrine, as there are only 143 latrines in use in the county.

Roads and Bridges
Communities living in 305 villages located in remote areas such as Worhn in Gibi District and Marshall City, Larkayta and Lloydsville Townships are completely inaccessible by road during rainy season. Thus, fishing boats remain the only alternative used to cross many rivers into some parts of Lower Margibi.
Education
Margibi County is well known for its concentration of outstanding educational institutions. The most prominent among them is the Booker Washington Institute (BWI), which awards diplomas and is known for its vocational/technical training courses. The county also boasts of the Harbel Multilateral High School, where the University of Liberia is operating up to 2nd year of studies; the extension of the Gbarnga-based Cuttington University College; the Kakata Rural Teacher Training Institute, in charge of training and reactivation of teachers; and the Konola Academy, a co-educational institution and prestigious upper secondary school; among others.

The Firestone School System, owned and operated by the Firestone Rubber Company, caters to over 15,000 children within the concession area. This school system is well-organized and effective, as not only do they have appropriate facilities and educative materials, but also boast a science laboratory at the Firestone Senior High School.

50 educational facilities among the 290 recorded by the Norwegian Refugee Council are fully functional. The government through the Ministry of Education runs several of them at primary and junior schools level, while faith-based communities and private organizations run the others.

Despite the many well-known schools, many children in remote areas of Margibi County still lack access to education because of bad road conditions, damaged facilities, and a lack of qualified teachers. Like many LNP and other civil servants, teachers are often reluctant to settle in far-flung areas because of the hardship and low salary. Some informal education targeting over-aged students and adults is also organized by women’s groups as a means of skills improvement and reducing illiteracy.

Communications, Postal Services and Telecommunications
Postal services are functioning in the county, notably in Harbel. Newspapers are only found in Kakata and Harbel. There is very good cellular telephone coverage from Lonestar, Cellcom, LiberCell and Comium. Besides Radio Veritas, Liberian Broadcasting Corporation, and UNMIL Radio coverage, Margibi is also covered by two community Radio Stations (in Harbel and Kakata) that were created with support from Mercy Corps.
7.10.2 Montserrado County

Geography
Montserrado is one of the smallest counties in Liberia. Its relative location is the Atlantic Ocean on the south, on the north by Bong County, Bomi County on the west and Margibi County on the east.

Montserrado comprises of 2 statutory districts, 2 chiefdoms, 7 cities, 21 townships, and 1 borough. A statutory district is headed by a superintendent while an administrative district is headed by a commissioner. A statutory district comprises two or more administrative districts.

Climate
As a small territory of Liberia, Montserrado has a tropical climate with 2 seasons-rainy and dry seasons. Average temperature falls between 21 and 36 degrees Celsius while average rainfall is about 75 inches.

Topography / Drainage
The County consists of hills and valleys in the interior and lowlands along the Coast. With direct access to the sea, the county has many rivers including St. Paul River and Mesurado River.

Vegetation
The lowlands along the coast are covered with savanna grasses, mangrove woodlands and scattered palm trees. Inward are Water-logged swamps, and patches of secondary forest.

Population

Table 5: Population by District, Montserrado County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caresburg District</td>
<td>15,048</td>
<td>14,664</td>
<td>29,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Wealth</td>
<td>5,752</td>
<td>6,124</td>
<td>11,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul River (Hotel Africa area inclusive)</td>
<td>34,981</td>
<td>36,850</td>
<td>71,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todee</td>
<td>17,479</td>
<td>16,519</td>
<td>31,998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ethnic Composition

At the time of its founding, Montserrado County was composed of three main tribes: the Deygbo or Dey on the coast, and Kpelle and Gola in the north. These groups were joined by the formerly enslaved people from America in 1821. Eventually all of Liberia’s 16 tribes came to populate the County, so that today Montserrado, and particularly Greater Monrovia, is considered highly diverse and representative of the population of Liberia as a whole. Bassa- and Kpelle-speaking peoples are in the majority, making up 21% and 52% of the County’s population respectively, but every other Liberian language and dialect can also be found. The population of a few ethnic groups does not reach the 1 percent mark, including the Sapo, Krahn and Mandingo. However, the 0% notation should not be interpreted as having no presence in the County.

Religion

An estimated 68.2% of the population is Christian, while 31.8% is Muslim, according to the County Superintendent’s office.

Tourism

No Tourism site is found in the county.

Agriculture

The population is mostly engaged in subsistence agriculture. Only about 40% have access to agricultural land. The main crops cultivated include Cassava (90%), rice (16%), vegetables (18%), sweet potatoes/eddoes (8%), plantain/banana (8%), corn (16%) and pulses (1%).

Fishing

3 Greater Monrovia is not under the political jurisdiction of the administration of Montserrado County although it is located in the region.
There are seven (7) artisanal fishing communities located along the beaches of Montserrado. Those directly and indirectly engaged in fishing activities earn their livelihood from the sector. Majority of those indirectly involved are market women who buy, smoke, and sell fish on a retail basis.

**Health**
Currently the majority of the rural population has to walk for hours or days to access a Clinic. The county suffers shortage of health facilities; as a result, health is considered one of the needy facilities in the county. Both the facilities and the services are inadequate to meet the urgent needs of the citizens. Health is one of the priorities of the county.

**Water and Sanitation**
In most part of rural Montserrado access to sanitation facilities is non-existent, and locals still use the bushes to attend nature. Those along the coastal areas often use the beaches. The majority of the populations are without pipe borne water. There are hand pumps but they are not regularly maintained, as a result, there are frequent outbreaks of water-borne diseases. There is a need for maintenance to be considered in both planning and budgeting. In Montserrado there is an average of 3,014 persons to one latrine and in Careysburg District 766 per latrine, in St. Paul 1,777 per latrine.

**Education**
The Ministry of Education in 2006 report, reported 252 schools in St. Paul River, 52 in Todee and 35 in Careysburg. However, many children are still forced to walk for several hours to reach the nearest educational facilities where at time they receive sub-standard education in often dilapidated buildings.

**Economic Activities**
Owing to the lack of factories and industries in the county, production is predominantly subsistent.
7.11 Infrastructure and Services (Project Area)

7.11.1 Introduction

Infrastructure and services play a major role in fostering productive activities and development in general. However, many of these infrastructure and services were severely damaged during the war. These have constrained the growth of the economy due to Government inability to provide these basic services to her population.

7.11.2 Road

The project area is a line corridor along the Monrovia - Kakata High-way which indeed facilitates the travel of citizens within these areas to the bigger markets – Monrovia and Kakata. The major transportation problems many of them expressed is intra-regional travel where the farm – to market roads that were built prior to the war are impassable, thus creating problem of movement of people.

As for the availability of transport means within the project area approximately 61% of the people use taxi or motorbikes to transport themselves and other goods (see below table).

Table 6: Mode of Transport (Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Motorbike</th>
<th>Taxi</th>
<th>Taxi &amp; Motorbike</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris Farm</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper Farm</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>38 (20%)</td>
<td>38 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kingsville</td>
<td>12 (6%)</td>
<td>11 (6%)</td>
<td>20 (10%)</td>
<td>43 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Upper Careysburg</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>14 (7%)</td>
<td>25 (12.8%)</td>
<td>41 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lower Careysburg</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>16 (8%)</td>
<td>23 (11.7%)</td>
<td>39 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mt. Barclay</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>11 (6%)</td>
<td>9 (4.6%)</td>
<td>22 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bernard Farm</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td>7 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 (9%)</td>
<td>57 (29%)</td>
<td>120 (61%)</td>
<td>195 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small businesses and few households in the wider project area use these services mainly to travel to Monrovia or Kakata. In the absence of sufficient services or the means to travel and obtain
externally sourced goods, the majority likewise the population within the line corridor remains reliant on local, natural resources.

The physical damage to roads and bridges, particularly following the rainy seasons, continues to limit the ability of humanitarian services to provide critical support, and it obstructs access to markets, thereby impeding economic productivity and self-sufficiency.

### 7.11.3 Electricity

There is no public provision of electricity in the project area. Only a few private individuals can afford to own and operate their own generators. The main source of energy for lighting is battery, and for cooking and heating, wood or charcoal. This is an indication that the need for rural electrification to boast economic development is indeed critical.

### 7.11.4 Water and Sanitation

Most rural settlement depends on rivers, creeks and streams for daily household water supply. Statistics in 2004 shows that only four percent of the rural population in Liberia have access to safe drinking water and over half taking at least 10 minutes to access the nearest water source. (Golden, 2011).

Only few communities within the project area have access to water facilities. CEDA research shows that about 47% and 41% of PAPs have access to hand pumps and well with cover respectively (see table 7 below). The poor quality of water and sanitation has contributed immensely to the poor health of the inhabitants within the project area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Open Well</th>
<th>Hand pump</th>
<th>Well with Cover</th>
<th>Creek -0-</th>
<th>None at all</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris Farm</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper Farm</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>30 16%</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>34 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kingsville</td>
<td>7 (4%)</td>
<td>20 (10%)</td>
<td>14 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>47 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Upper Careysburg</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>23 (11.7%)</td>
<td>9 (5%)</td>
<td>3 11.5%</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>39 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Liberian Government in collaboration with some NGOs has been constructing and rehabilitating hand pumps, wells and latrine in various communities across the country. However, according to CEDA field survey, 46% of PAPs use open field (“first fly”) to defecate while only 38% have access to latrine facilities (see table8 below).

Table 8: Latrine Facilities (Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>First Fly</th>
<th>Private latrine</th>
<th>Inside Bathroom</th>
<th>Public Latrine</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris Farm</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper Farm</td>
<td>30 (15%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>31 (15.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kingsville</td>
<td>27 (13.8%)</td>
<td>14 (7%)</td>
<td>7 (4%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>48 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Upper Careysburg</td>
<td>11 (6%)</td>
<td>25 (12.8%)</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td>43 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lower Careysburg</td>
<td>11 (6%)</td>
<td>18 (19%)</td>
<td>9 (5%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>38 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mt. Barclay</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>14 (7%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>22 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bernard Farm</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>89 (46%)</td>
<td>75 (38%)</td>
<td>30 (15%)</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td>195 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.11.5 Educational Facilities

Within the project area, educational facilities available to the people are in adequate. There are major challenges in providing quality education:

- Poor conditions of service for teachers;
- Insufficient schools and textbooks;
- Ineffective curricula;
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- Lack of accommodation for teachers; and
- Lack of vocational and technical institutions.

Only a fraction of school classroom seems to be in good conditions. In many cases furniture, functioning latrines and textbooks are scare. With educational levels low and youth unemployment on the increase, young people lack the necessary tools to make productive contributions to the social and economic development of the country. Within the project area, only 6% of PAPs interviewed are college graduate while 26% are high school (see table9 below). This could be unavailability of the facilities within the project area.

Table 9: Educational Level (Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Junior High</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Illiterate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris Farm</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper Farm</td>
<td>5 (2.5%)</td>
<td>7 (3.5%)</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>18 (9%)</td>
<td>38 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kingsville</td>
<td>7 (3.5%)</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
<td>14 (7%)</td>
<td>5 (2.5%)</td>
<td>7 (3.5%)</td>
<td>43 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Upper Careysburg</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
<td>13 (6.5%)</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
<td>44 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lower Careysburg</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
<td>9 (4.5%)</td>
<td>9 (4.5%)</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td>11 (5.5%)</td>
<td>38 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mt. Barclay</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>5 (2.5%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
<td>15 (7.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bernard Farm</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (.6%)</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>7 (3.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>35 (18%)</td>
<td>45 (23%)</td>
<td>52 (26%)</td>
<td>12 (6%)</td>
<td>54 (27%)</td>
<td>198 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10: Educational Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th></th>
<th>Junior High School</th>
<th></th>
<th>High School</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris Farm</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper Farm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kingsville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Upper Careysburg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lower Careysburg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mt. Barclay</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bernard Farm</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, only Benard Farm has 3 private high schools, and one public high school. Kingsville has one and upper and lower Careysburg have one high school each. The rest of the communities have no high school. Of the seven communities affected, only four have public elementary schools (see table10 below), which indicates the inadequacy of basic educational facilities within the project area.

7.11.6 Health

The Liberian healthcare system has suffered severely from chronic underfunding, lack of management capacity and training. It is estimated that less than 10 percent of Liberians have access to health care (UNEP, 2004).

The health sector reforms are guided by the Nation Health policy and Plan. The main challenge is the transition from an emergency relief model of healthcare delivery, which focuses on short-term medical relief, to a functional, sustainable decentralized health system that can provide basic healthcare services (AFDB, 2011).
Health services are affected by access constraints and the availability of resources. Lack of available health services leads to the spread of communicable diseases such as malaria, acute respiratory infections, measles and diarrhea.

The seven affected communities have access to public health facilities and some with private health facilities (see table 11 below). However, it is not only the availability of the facilities but the services provided to the citizens should be constant and quality services. These facilities are also inadequate and services need to be improved in order to cater to the health needs of the people.

Table 11: Health Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Public Clinic</th>
<th>Private Clinic</th>
<th>Drug Store</th>
<th>None at all</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris Farm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper Farm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kingsville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Upper Careysburg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lower Careysburg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mt. Barclay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bernard Farm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.11.7 Agriculture

Access to land is closely associated with food supply and nutrition. About 91% of the people interviewed in the project area have access to land (see table 12 below). However, how this figure relates to production is another thing. One of the factors of production is land and with the availability of land our survey shows that about 48% of PAPs interviewed are engaged in farming activities as their main occupation.
Table 12: Land Ownership (Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Communal</th>
<th>Friendship</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris Farm</td>
<td>5 (2.7%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>5 (2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper Farm</td>
<td>22 (12%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>7 (3.8%)</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td>30 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kingsville</td>
<td>38 (21%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>3 (1.6%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>41 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Upper Careysburg</td>
<td>39 (20%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>43 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lower Careysburg</td>
<td>36 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>37 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mt. Barclay</td>
<td>19 (10%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>19 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bernard Farm</td>
<td>7 (3.8%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>7 (3.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crops are grown for household consumption and as cash crops. The most common crops show is the staple food cassava planted by approximately one quarter of households, followed by rice and pepper. They also plant okra, beans, greens, eggplant. Some household also plant banana, pineapple, plantain, potatoes and bitter-ball. Households are dependent on their home grown produce for the majority of their food supply.

7.11.8 Market

The project area is along the road of Kakata – Monrovia highway; therefore, majority of those engaged in petty trade such as waiter market, front porch market, etc usually travel to either Kakata or Monrovia to obtain wholesale commodities.

Majority of the affected communities have periodic markets, only Careysburg has a daily market structure. As a result, the communities closer to Kakata buy from Kakata and those closer to Monrovia buy from Red Light market in Monrovia. However, the bulk of the affected communities (71%) buy from Red Light Market in Monrovia while only (24%) buy from Kakata the two busiest markets (see table 13 blow)
Table 13: Market (Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Kakata Market</th>
<th>Red Light Market</th>
<th># 7 Market</th>
<th>Careysburg Market</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris Farm</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper Farm</td>
<td>36 (19%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>39 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kingsville</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
<td>28 (14%)</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>39 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Upper Careysburg</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>39 (20%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>42 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lower Careysburg</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>37 (19%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td>38 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mt. Barclay</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>23 (12%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>23 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bernard Farm</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>46 (24%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>137 (71%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7 (4%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 (2%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>194 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Price of imported goods usually increased as one leaves from Monrovia, the major sea port where more than 90% of imported goods are received. As a result, prices in the project area are a bit higher than those in Monrovia concerning additional transport cost incurred.

8.0 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENTS

Stakeholder engagement plays an important role in establishing a good rapport between the implementer LEC and the local and national level stakeholders. These engagements will facilitate the disclosure of relevant information and the participation of affected parties which should continue during the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of payment, physical resettlement and livelihood restoration activities to achieve outcomes that are consistent with the objectives of the project.

8.1 Objectives

Stakeholder consultations have the following objectives:

1. Provide information about the RAP objectives, processes and intended outcomes.

2. Establish government regulations and procedures required for the RAP development.
3. Solicit opinions and development and implementation of the RAP from government, traditional authorities and project affected people.

4. Manage expectations and misconceptions with regards the outcomes of the RAP

5. Identify and where possible, address potential conflicts and/or risks that may arise,

6. Negotiated and agree on RAP entitlements and compensation options for inclusion in the RAP and address associated issues such as livelihood restoration.

8.2. Stakeholders Identification

Stakeholders identified are as follows:

1. Parties directly affected

2. Affected property owners within the line twenty (20) meters wide line corridor such as owners of buildings, structures, huts, etc.

3. Affected owners of economic trees and crops within the twenty (20) meters wide line corridor

4. Affected communities with PAPs as a result of the line corridor passing through the communities affecting shade trees, land, food and cash crops.

Regional Level

The regional level includes Superintendent, City Mayors of Montserrado County with authority over the line corridor and Superintendent, City Mayors of Margibi County with authority over the line corridor.

National Level

LEC : Liberia Electricity Corporation
EPA : Environmental Protection Agency
MOA : Ministry of Agriculture
MFDP : Ministry of Finance and Development Planning
MLME : Ministry of Land, Mines and Energy
8.3 Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder engagement process for preparation of the Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) commenced in March at which time mobilization meetings were held with various community affected by the line route.

In April, mobilization workshop was held in Careysburg, Montserrado County.

Relevant government authorities were consulted on a number of occasions by the RAP study team (CEDA). Consultations included meetings with representatives and government officers as well as invitations to attend community consultation meetings (see consultation meeting report).

8.4 Affected Communities

The establishment of the twenty (20) meter wide corridor was technically done with the following below communities affected:

Table 14: Population of affected communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris’ Farm</td>
<td>6,016</td>
<td>6,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper Farm</td>
<td>2,568</td>
<td>2,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kingsville</td>
<td>5,178</td>
<td>5,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Careysburg</td>
<td>5,315</td>
<td>5,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mount Barclay</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bernard Farm</td>
<td>3,297</td>
<td>3,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23,167</td>
<td>23,808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LISGIS 2008
9.0 ELIGIBILITY AND ENTITLEMENTS
For the preparation of the RAP addresses of the owners and assets falling within the corridor were recorded during the survey. The following tables present property owners, properties, and classification of properties.

9.1 Cut-Off Date for Eligibility
Prior to the start of the RAP asset surveys, public consultation meetings were held to inform interested and affected parties of the surveys and announce a cut-off date for eligibility under the RAP.

It was widely announced that the cut-off date for eligibility would be October 20, 2014, which was the ending date of the asset survey. No new claims are to be accepted after the cut-off date. The information was passed on to the affected community themselves verbally since the majority of affected community people do not have access to print media and radio to listen to radio announcement.

9.2 Survey Methodology
CEDA undertook a comprehensive assessment survey from July to August 2014 to identify persons and assets affected by the project, and to determine who will be eligible for compensation assistance.

Interviews were conducted with the rightful owners of affected assets. The assets survey was administered by means of a detailed questionnaire (see appendix), which included questions pertaining to the compensation of affected property owners.

During the asset survey, the properties identified were recorded, with the requisite GPS coordinates taken for each property. All affected property owners were asked to sign field CEDA form to make sure that the property belongs to the persons. No photos of property owners were taken. During payment the chiefs and elders of the communities will be contacted to again recognize PAPs to attest to properties.
The finding of the survey report provided the information necessary for determining the categories of affected people and categories of properties that are eligible for compensation.

9.3 Loss of Property and Ownership Issues

The acquisition of the 20 meters line corridor of 43 miles (69 km) has affected a number of assets. Structures affected are limited due to the understanding that the towers will be high enough in order for the line to be more than 7 meters from structures.

With reference to towers, about 98% of the towers are within the required range of 75 feet (23 meters) from the center of the motor road which is considered by the Government of Liberia as (GOL) land.

The preceding tables show the numbers of people and the types of properties that are affected by the project. Considering the heads of the household to be the rightful owners, the persons with ownership of the properties that are affected by the project is 252; and the total number of their respective dependents is 1,254. These persons have been referred to as project affected persons (PAPs) in this report. The affected properties have been categorized in the table by the types of properties.

9.3.1 Project-Affected Parties (PAPs)

Summary of Dependents of PAPs by Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris Farm</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper farm</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kingville Community</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Careysburg community</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mount Barclay</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bernard Farm</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>1,254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of PAPs by Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morris Farm</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cooper farm</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kingville Community</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Careysburg community</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mount Barclay</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bernard Farm</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Project-Affected Parties or Persons (PAPs) include persons that the LEC and the Consultant identified to be affected by the transmission line during the inventory. PAPs include:

- Persons whose property is partly or wholly affected (permanently or temporarily) by the project such as shade trees, land, food and cash crops.
- Persons whose premises or agricultural land is in part or totally affected (permanently or temporarily) by the Project

4 All of the project-affected communities and project-affected parties (PAPs) are located in Montserrado County while only the 66/33-kV substation is located near BWI campus in Kakata, Margibi County; therefore, there is no county-by-county report but community-by-community reports only for Montserrado County. No structures (houses, buildings, huts, etc) but land, shade trees, food and cash crops are affected in the communities listed in table ES4 above.

The PAPs are referred to as heads of household. Each head of household (PAPs) including his/her dependents are referred to as one household. An average household in Liberia is about six (6) persons.

For a better understanding of the breakdown of PAPs and their dependents, see Appendix 2 -- Project Affected Communities and PAPs and Appendix 3 -- List of Property-Affected Households and Dependents by Community.

Twelve (12) tower spots are affected all of which are located on farm land. LEC usually negotiates for tower spots. The impact of these twelve tower spots is very low and will not at all adversely affect the livelihood of the farmers involved.
Persons whose crops (annual and perennial) and trees are affected partly or totally by the Project.

9.4 VALUATION AND COMPENSATION FOR LOSS

Upon identification of the need for involuntary resettlement in the project, the consultant carried out a census to identify the persons affected by the project to determine who will be eligible for assistance, and to discourage inflow of people ineligible for assistance. LEC and the consultant have also developed a procedure, which is in line with the WB’s OP 4.12, for establishing the criteria by which affected persons will be deemed eligible for compensation and other assistance. The procedure includes provisions for meaningful consultations with affected persons and villages, local authorities, and it specifies grievance mechanisms.

The LEC Resettlement Policy Framework outlines considered/applied similarity between World Bank’s policy requirement and that of the Liberia Government.

Despite the similarities and to ensure best practices, LEC and the consultant have adopted the principles outlined in the World Bank’s Operational Policy 4.12 and this has been the basis for preparing this Action Plan. In this regard, the following principles and objectives are applied:

- Acquisition of land and other assets will be minimized as much as possible.
- All PAPs will be entitled to be provided with compensation sufficient to assist them to improve or at least maintain their pre-project living standards, income earning capacity and production levels.
- Compensation will be made to the PAPs who have legal ownership or can prove their ownership. According to Worldbank OP 4.12 on eligibility, there are three categories of eligibility:
  1. “Those who have formal legal rights to land (including customary and traditional rights)
  2. Those who do not have formal legal rights to land at the time the census begins but have a claim to such land or assets (a recognized claim in the country)
  3. Those that have no recognizable legal right or claim to the land that they are occupying,
- Persons under 1 and 2 are provided compensation for the land and other assistance,
- Persons under 3 are provided resettlement assistance to achieve the objectives of the policy”.
The compensation to be provided is at replacement cost (market value) for building, agricultural crops, trees and land. Plans for acquisition of land and provision of compensation will be carried out in consultation with PAPs to ensure minimal disturbance. Entitlements will be provided to PAPs no later than one month prior to expected startup of works at respective project site.

9.5. Resettlement Procedure
The procedures to be used by LEC to ensure that all persons affected by the transmission line project are catered for in line with World Bank’s Operational Directive 4.12 are as outlined below:

- Referencing of all properties, both crops and buildings, by officers of the Property Valuation Section (PVS) in the Ministry of Finance to be supervised by LEC.
- Assessment of the values should be done by the PVS and the valuation advice forwarded to LEC.
- The assessed report should be vetted and corrections made where necessary to ensure that the amounts are accurate to the Authority. These would then be processed for payment.
- Offers would be made to the claimants on the basis of the PVS’s advice.
- Claimants dissatisfied with the offer have a right to petition for reconsideration. In this regard, such claimants are required to submit counter proposals supported by valuation prepared by private property valuers of their choice.
- The private valuers’ reports are considered by LEC in conjunction with the PVS to ensure that claimants are treated fairly.
- Where necessary any agitated person would be invited to negotiate and arrive at acceptable figures.
- Where the parties, after all the negotiations, are not satisfied then they can seek redress at the court.
9.6. Valuation of Crops
The Consultant with the support of the LEC used the ‘investment method’ which essentially tailors the compensation to the productive life of assets by observing the maturity and immaturity of trees and structures involved. LEC and the Consultant used a tree count within an area and multiply the count by a standard unit value for that type of tree crop published by the Ministry of Agriculture (see agriculture price list of 2013). In both methods, calculation of the unit value is based on production techniques, yield and farm gate price information collected regionally by the Ministry of Agriculture.

9.7. Strategies for Payment of Compensation
In line with the laws and statutes in Liberia and in conformity with International Standards, all properties such as buildings, lands, and crops shall be duly compensated for, in accordance with the provisions of the regulation, at the appropriate replacement values in line with the LEC/Property Valuation procedures, in addition to its compliance with the related Funding Agencies’ standards on involuntary resettlement.

Based on the assessment of the values as indicated above, LEC will undertake compensation for the loss of properties. The PAPs also have the right, to engage private valuation consultants to advice on the values of their affected properties.

9.7.1 Landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, marginalization, food insecurity and loss of basic resources
As opposed to the construction of other infrastructures such as thermal power plants or hydro power plants, transmission line is a linear project which involves in only limited and localized resettlement. Given that the affected lands area are small and are communally owned and cultivated, the adverse impact on farming activities will not be significant. However, social impacts of poverty risks in minor resettlement will be taken into consideration before implementing compensation and resettlement. According to ADB’s Risks Assessment and Management in Involuntary Resettlement by Michael Cernea, poverty risks in resettlement comprise of Landlessness, Joblessness, Homelessness, Marginalization, Food Insecurity and Loss of Access to Common Property Resources. They are briefly defined below:
Landlessness: Expropriation of land removes the main foundation on which many people build productive systems, commercial activities, and livelihoods. Often land is lost forever, sometimes it is partially replaced, and seldom is it fully replaced or fully compensated. This is the main form of decapitalization and pauperization of the people who are displaced. Both natural and man-made capital is lost.

Joblessness: Loss of wage employment occurs both in rural and urban displacement. People losing jobs may be landless agricultural laborers, service workers, or artisans. The unemployment or underemployment among resettlers may linger long after physical relocation. Creating new jobs for them is difficult: it requires substantial investment, new creative approaches, and more reliance upon sharing project benefits with the resettlers.

Homelessness: Loss of housing and shelter may be only temporary for many people, but for some it remains a chronic condition and is felt as loss of identity and cultural impoverishment. If neighboring households belonging to the same kinship group get scattered, loss of dwelling may have consequences for family cohesion and mutual help patterns. Group relocation of related people and neighbors is therefore preferable to dispersed relocation.

Marginalization: Marginalization occurs when relocated families lose economic power and slide down toward lower socioeconomic positions: middle-income farm households become small landholders; small shopkeepers and craftspeople lose their businesses and fall below poverty thresholds, and so on.

Food insecurity: Forced uprooting diminishes self-sufficiency, dismantles local arrangements for food supply, and thus increases the risk that people will fall into chronic food insecurity. This is defined as calorie-protein intake levels below the minimum necessary for normal growth and work.

Loss of access to common property: Poor farmers, particularly those without assets, suffer a loss of access to the common property goods belonging to communities that are relocated: forests, water bodies, grazing lands, etc. This represents a form of income loss and livelihood deterioration that is typically overlooked by planners and therefore usually uncompensated.
As mitigation measures for these poverty risks in resettlement, development of a program with a people-centered focus rather than a property-compensation approach is needed.

Proceeding from what has been said above, it is apparent that constructive and pro-poor support activities should be implemented at the project level as below:

- from landlessness to land-based resettlement,
- from joblessness to reemployment,
- from homelessness to house reconstruction,
- from marginalization to social inclusion,
- from food insecurity to adequate nutrition, and
- from loss of access to restoration of community assets and services.

Beyond measures at the project level, however, there are also government policy measures to reduce resettlement risks. This suggests that the risks of resettlement can also be diminished through better demand-management policies.

**10.0 ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

The Proposed Organizational Structure (National Committee) for Rap Implementation

**National Level**

**Composition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>No. of Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance and Development Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ministry of Internal Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Liberia Electricity Cooperation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Center for Environment and Development in Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The terms of reference for this committee is being prepared including payment terms and arrangement for PAPs. All will be worked out for the committee at the national level.

**At the Community Level**

The proposed structure discussed with community people and agreed upon is indicated below.

The formation of a community-based committee for the implementation of the RAP was discussed and agreed upon by all communities visited during consultations as follows:

1. The committee should comprise odd numbers such as 9, 11, 13, 15 members.
2. The community leader (Commissioner or Chief) should serve as head or member.
3. The committee should comprise at least two (2) females.
4. The committee should comprise at least two (2) project-affected persons.
5. The committee should select a Community Liaison Officer who should be a literate person assisted by two community persons preferably literate persons. During payment of compensation, these three persons will attend meetings with the National Committee and carry similar communication to the community. They will serve as mediators between the national level and the community level.

**10.2 Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)**

This RAP establishes a grievance procedure and mechanism to ensure that affected parties and communities have the opportunity to lodge complaints and concerns regarding compensation and restoration of livelihoods. The Grievance Procedure will establish a recourse mechanism designed to resolve disputes in an impartial manner. It provides claimants with the assurance that their grievances will be resolved timely and satisfactory without cost to the claimant. This grievance procedure will also assist in the effective transfer of resettlement entitlements to intended beneficiaries.

The Grievance Procedure will not replace any existing legal processes available to affected parties, and will not infringe on complainants’ right to access existing legal procedures. It will seek to resolve issues promptly and fairly in order to expedite the receipt of entitlements and assistance, without resorting to expensive and time-consuming legal actions. The Grievance
Procedure will be in place at least until such time that the RAP Completion Audit has been finalized.

A grievance for the purposes of the RAP is defined as any concern or complaint that is directly related to physical resettlement, compensation and restoration of livelihoods under the RAP and its entitlements. All non-RAP related concerns/complaints will be redirected to the appropriate department. They will ensure that RAP affected communities are duly informed about the grievance mechanisms, the location of the grievance facility and grievance procedures to be followed.

The proposed Grievance Management Section (GMS) to be located at LEC will have overall responsibility for addressing all resettlement grievances. While it may be possible to verbally resolve some grievances, these must still be recorded on the grievance log form for recordkeeping purposes. Where the GMS cannot resolve grievances directly, these will be forwarded to the Proposed National Committee. Where grievances are still unresolved, the Proposed National Committee will establish a senior grievance committee, member which may require the involvement of the General Manager of LEC. If grievances are still unresolved, the GMS will provide information to the affected party on the mechanisms for addressing complaints via legal redress.

10.2.1 Step 1: Lodging a grievance

A formal grievance can be lodged at the office of the proposed Grievance Management Section (GMS) to be located at LEC. The complainant will be required to complete a grievance form with the assistance of the GMS personnel, who will record the grievance in a grievance log according to the category of grievances (for example compensation payments and livelihood restoration issues). A grievance can also be lodged by sending a grievance form or written complaint directly to project management. All grievances will be logged in a grievance log file.
10.2.2 Step 2: Acknowledgement

The GMS will acknowledge receipt of the grievance in writing within seven working days. The letter will specify the name of the project responsible person and process that will be followed in addressing the complaint. The letter will also provide a reference number and a probable date for resolving the grievance. Those who cannot read or write (illiterates) will be assisted by the Community Liaison Officer (CLO) of the community assisted by relevant community leaders (chiefs, elders, etc).

10.2.3 Step 3: Investigation

The GMS will consider and prioritize the grievance received. Where applicable, the GMS will take photographs and/or interview any bona fide witnesses. If the GMS is unable to resolve the grievance, he/she will forward the grievance to the Proposed National Committee based on the actions required. Where possible, grievances will be finalized within 30 days of receipt. The complainant might be contacted during this time to clarify issues.

10.2.4 Step 4: Resolution and sign-off

Once a complaint has been investigated, a letter will be sent to the complainant, explaining the outcome of the investigation and the proposed course of action to resolve the grievance. The GMS will contact the complainant in person if this is required and explain the results of the investigation and the proposed course of action. If the complainant is satisfied that the complaint has been resolved, he/she will be required to sign a statement confirming that the complaint has been resolved. Again, for illiterate person, the Community Liaison Officer will be with the illiterate person to affix his/her finger print to the document if required.

If the complaint has not been resolved by mutual agreement, a re-assessment may be undertaken if new information becomes available in support of the claim/complaint. If the complainant is still not satisfied with the resolution, the grievance will then go into mediation. If applicable, the Proposed National Committee will monitor the implementation of the resolution and the claimant’s satisfaction with this implementation.
10.2.5 Step 5: Mediation
Unresolved grievances will be investigated by a grievance committee, which will include members of senior management. This committee will only meet to resolve problems which cannot be resolved during steps one to four. The project will provide for an independent arbitrator if grievances cannot be resolved internally.

11.0 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

11.1 Introduction
A RAP monitoring and evaluation mechanism will be established to assess the effectiveness of RAP implementation. In particular, the monitoring program will assess the success of livelihood restoration project activities and assistance to vulnerable groups. The monitoring program will include monitoring criteria, and the resources needed to carry out the monitoring. The project management will be responsible for providing the necessary funds and human resources required for the monitoring programs.

11.2 Performance monitoring
Performance monitoring is an internal management function based on physical progress against milestones as established in the RAP. Performance monitoring will include the following aspects:

- Community consultations completed and on-going;
- Grievance redress procedures in place and functioning;
- Compensation payments;
- Income restoration and development activities initiated; and
- Monitoring and evaluation reports submission.

An appropriate monitoring program will be established and will include activity, target date for completion, progress to date, progress in the previous month, target for current month, reasons for delay, and actions to be taken.
11.3 Impact monitoring

Impact monitoring will be conducted by (RSC) and an independent external body. The overall objective of the impact monitoring is to gauge the effectiveness of the RAP and its implementation in meeting the needs of affected people. The purpose of impact monitoring is to:

· Provide management with an assessment of the compensation effects;
· Verify internal performance monitoring; and
· Identify adjustments in the implementation of the RAP, if required.

11.4 Completion Audit

A RAP Completion Audit will be undertaken to assess if the outcomes of the RAP comply with IFC requirements, specifically regarding the restoration of livelihoods and overall living standards of the affected communities. The completion audit will involve external evaluation after RAP inputs have been completed, but in time to allow corrective action to take place.

11.5 Socio-economic Baseline Review

A review of all affected communities will be conducted annually for three years. The review will involve collecting baseline household data, which could then be used to monitor and assess improvement of standard of living of the affected communities and vulnerable households.

11.6 Reporting

The PCU will submit regular (six monthly) and comprehensive monitoring reports with key findings to the management of LEC and MLM&E.

12.0 IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

The schedule for the RAP implementation will be determined by the Ministry of Land, Mines & Energy (MLM&E), the Liberia Electricity Corporation (LEC) and the funding agencies such as
World Bank. However, it is necessary for the RAP implementation structures to be established and well planned by MLM&E and LEC administrations. In addition, arrangements have to be made for the necessary and required capacity building of the RAP implementation structure in order to ensure that all stakeholders expected to be part of the implementation structure understand the requirements of the implementation schedule.

It is expected or envisaged that payment for compensations will be made and completed prior to the commencement of the construction phase. Further discussion of the implementation schedule will require both MLM&E and LEC to meet and conclude the aspect of implementation.

13.0 Costs and Budget

This report provides a preliminary indication of the cost associated with the RAP implementation. Costs are based on the eligibility considerations and entitlement measures as indicated in the RAP report. The RAP implementation cost is calculated as $53,841.00.

Table 31: Cost for Implementation of Resettlement Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>US$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>COMPENSATION ISSUES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Compensation for land (12 tower spots) X $400.00</td>
<td>4,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Compensation for food crops</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Compensation for trees</td>
<td>19,041.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Contingency Allowances to cater for the effects of Probable increases in property values</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>53,841.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.1 Result of Joint Consultative Meeting

On January 16, 2015, a joint team comprising LEC representative, MLME representative, and two representatives from CEDA travelled to Kakata for the following objectives:

(1) To technically view, observe, and conclude on five (5) structures not within the line corridor but closer to the line corridor. They are (a) five (5) storey building near Joe Bar approximately
300-400 meters to the Paynesville substation (b) a twin building near Police Academy junction and (c) two (2) storey buildings and a gas station at Lower Careysburg.

(2) To finally identify the Kakata Substation.

There were two alternatives the joint team concluded:

Alternative 1:

That the previous coordinates should remain unchanged and that the five (5) structures in question be considered affected and paid for accordingly.

Alternatives 2:

That the previous coordinates should be adjusted in order to avoid affecting the five structures.

**Table 32: Previous and recommended Coordinates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Previous Coordinates</th>
<th>Recommended Coordinates</th>
<th>Location of Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Five - storey building</td>
<td>X 0312725 Y 0693508</td>
<td>X 0312727 Y 0693505</td>
<td>Near Joe Bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Twin building</td>
<td>X 0312837 Y 0694541</td>
<td>X 0312835 Y 0694549</td>
<td>Police Academy Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Three structures at Lower Careysburg</td>
<td>X 0321665 Y 0704718</td>
<td>X 0321668 Y 0704721</td>
<td>Lower Careysburg District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X 0321668 Y 0704721</td>
<td>X 0321825 Y 0704778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to by-pass the three structures at Lower Careysburg, the line corridor was adjusted as follows: previous coordinates of T083: X 0321665 Y 0704718 to T084: X 0321668 Y 0704721 and T084 to T085: X 0321825 Y 0704778.
Reference to the kakata Substation, the team met the Authority of the Booker Washington Institute (BWI). The substation site was identified approximately 400-500 meters from the BWI main campus: coordinates, X 0348636 Y 0722287.

Alternative 1: keep the previous coordinates and remove the five structures affected. If in case alternative 1 is accepted then the total cost would be US$ 403,841.00

Alternative 2: Accept the recommended adjustment and coordinates allow the five structures to be considered non-affected structures. If in case alternative 2 is accepted then the total cost is US$ 53,841.00. The team concluded that alternative 2 should be accepted.

Appendix 1: Public Consultations with Affected Communities

Public Consultation, Kingsville Township

County: Montserrado
Location: Kingsville
Date: October 21, 2014

Minutes of the meeting: The Commissioner of the Township of Kingsville, Hon. Victoria B. Washington opened the meeting at 4:30 PM. Welcome remarks were made followed by the introduction of all those present.

Immediately, after the opening protocol, CEDA management was welcomed by the commissioner to address the citizens. CEDA briefly presented the objectives of the project to the participants and list of affected persons. The presentation was then followed by discussion of the project activities.
Questions Raised During the Meeting:

1. Mr. Moses Tokpa, observed that although his name appeared on the list but he has reservation that some of his properties within the corridor were left out and therefore he request that CEDA surveyor should return to his premises. They left out 10 banana stock, 1 saur sap, 1 mango and 1 kola tree.
   Ans: “Mr. Tokpa, not all your properties are to be recorded; only those properties within the corridor were recorded”.

2. Mr. Foyah Varney observed that CEDA surveyors recorded his name and properties but to his surprise his name was not on the list presented.
   Ans: “Mr. Varney, CEDA surveyors visited your properties twice but met you absent. Your son (age 26) gave us the information. Your son gave his name as the owner of the property”.

3. Mr. Ezekiel Tamba argued that the statistics given to the field surveyors were given by a boy in his yard and not himself; therefore, he wants CEDA field surveyors to return to his compound in order to re-count his properties involved.
   Ans: “Mr. Tamba, your son (age 32) told us that you travelled to Lofa County and you would return within 3 weeks. He then gave your name and participated in the recording with approval”.

Participants at Kingsville public consultation meeting
Public Consultation, Kakata City

County: Margibi
Location: Kakata City Hall
Date: October 21, 2014

Minutes of the meeting: The meeting at Kakata City was delayed for 30 minutes due to bad road condition and Ebola prevention formalities. However, the meeting was well attended by heads of various communities and other interesting citizen. Kakata does no not have PAPs that is no properties are affected. Hon. Eddie Z. Murphy, the City Mayor of Kakata City welcomed all those present including CEDA management.

As usual, after the welcomed remarks CEDA management was invited to explain the mission of the visit. Briefly CEDA expressed thanks and appreciations to the citizens and asked that they should fully give their respective cooperation to the implementation of the project since Kakata is earmarked for the erection of the substation. The City Mayor promised that he himself will work with LEC technicians to identify a suitable spot for the substation since at present almost all land in Kakata is privately owned.

Participants at Kakata public consultation meeting
Questions Raised During the Meeting:

1. Mr. Edward Carter, a retired employee of LEC cautions CEDA that during construction and operation of the project all technicians should not come from Monrovia. Those in Kakata City and some parts of Margibi are also qualified to man positions during the two phases of the project construction and operational phases.
   Ans: “Mr. Carter, thanks very much for your concern; we will inform LEC to consider your concern during recruitment of both skilled and unskilled laborers”.

2. Mr. Daniel Hne Harris wanted to know when construction will commence and where construction will begin.
   Ans: “We cannot give precisely when and where but LEC representing the Government of Liberia will decide and prepare appropriate construction timetable”.

3. Mr. D. Baby Sirleaf, wanted to know whether everything within the line corridor will be cleared. Would citizens be allowed to live within the line corridor?
   Ans: “Mr. Sirleaf, not everything within the corridor will be cleared, only those structures, trees, and other objects that the engineers consider obstacles to the line in the future”. “Yes, citizen will be allowed within the corridor but with caution”.

Public Consultation Careysburg City

County: Montserrado
Location: Careysburg Public School
Date: October 22, 2014

Meeting at Careysburg City was held at the Careysburg High School compound precisely at 11:00 AM under a very good atmosphere. The city mayor Hon. Anna Urey Philips conducted the meeting. She welcomed citizens many of whom came from many parts (lower and upper Careysburg) of Careysburg that are affected by the project. Project Affected Persons (PAPs) as well as interesting Citizens attended the meeting. Immediately, after the welcome formalities, CEDA management was given the opportunity to explain her mission. As usual, the objectives of
the project as well as the list of affected persons from the entire Careysburg were presented to the participants.

Participants at Careysburg public consultation meeting

Questions Raised During the Meeting:

1. Mr. E. Yanto Qetubie raised the question of the possibility of an error during the survey, because his properties are affected but his name was not recorded.
   Ans: “CEDA management promised to investigate and later found out that the properties referred to were all out of the line corridor”.

2. Mr. Joseph Dennis wanted to know whether his private land on which one of the towers is planned to be erected will be paid for and by whom?
   Ans: “Mr. Dennis, LEC representing the Government of Liberia will as usual negotiate with you for the tower spot”.

3. Mr. Kolleh Kollie, argued that some of his trees and crops were left out, they were not recorded.
   Ans: “Mr. Kollie, our team of surveyors did not make an error, not all trees or crops own by you should be recorded; only those within the line corridor, and that has been done by the surveyors”.
4. S. Borbor Sackie raised the issue concerning his neighbour, S. Borbor Jackson whose trees and crops according to him were not recorded; they therefore wanted CEDA to investigate. Ans: “Mr. Sackie, not because your trees and crops were recorded that all neighbour properties should also be recorded. Your neighbour’s properties are not within the line corridor.

Public Consultation Morris Farm
County: Montserrado
Location: Morris Farm Palava Hut
Date: October 21, 2014

Minutes of the meeting: At Morris Farm the citizens gathered at 1:30 PM precisely for the meeting. The town chief Hon. Jackson B. Tuor made a welcome remark and then turned the floor over to the guests – CEDA delegation.

CEDA management also welcomed the citizens. The management explained the objectives of the project and later presented the list of project-affected persons (PAPs) within the Morris Farm area.
Questions Raised During the Meeting:

1. Teedee Varney wanted to know when the project will commence, because many teams from Monrovia have presented projects to them and up to present there is no project.
   Ans: “Madam Varney, the appropriate government entity LEC will inform all stakeholders when the project will commence and it will not be like other project referred to”.

2. Mr. Kawala Howard, he argued that his rubber nursery is in the line corridor but was not recorded. He insisted that the nursery should be recorded and paid for.
   Ans: “Mr. Howard, your rubber nursery will be removed and not grow to disturb the line; this is why it was not recorded. It is not a farm”.

3. Edwin Y. Kollie, presented his observation too that he has rubber nursery of about 300 trees and they were not recorded.
   Ans: (same as Mr. Howard case).

4. Mr. William P. Tolpah, complained that he has some sporadic rubber trees among his rubber nursery but was left out by CEDA surveyors.
   Ans: “Mr. Tolpah, CEDA surveyors only found nursery and not a farm within the corridor”.

5. Kawala Howard, presented a problem that it seems that one Hawa Flomo falsely recorded her name for his properties within the corridor. The town chief and other elders promised to resolve the conflict and will later inform CEDA team.
   Ans: Later the town chief investigated and informed CEDA that Hawa Flomo was falsely recorded; therefore, her name should be replaced by Kawala Howard.

Public Consultation, Cooper Farm

County: Montserrado
Location: Cooper Farm Palava Hut
Date: October 21, 2014

Minutes of the meetings: The meeting at Cooper Farm was successfully held under the leadership of the young town chief Hon. James Fallah, who quickly gathered his fellow citizens for the meeting. He welcomed his citizens and the guests (CEDA Management) as well.

The usual formalities were carried out after which CEDA management took the floor to present the objectives of the project and the list of property owners who properties are affected.
Participants at Cooper Farm public consultation meeting

Questions Raised During the Meeting:

1. Hawa Davis, the daughter of Ma Sophie Davis observed that her mother, Ma Sophie Davis properties were not recorded. Her argument was based on the fact that those who property closer to her Ma properties were recorded but her Ma properties were left out.
   Ans: “Miss Davis, your mother’s property were not in the line corridor, this is why they were not recorded; not all properties are recorded, only those within the line corridor”.

2. Mr. Nelson B. Nah observed that the filed surveyor left a rubber tree out over his kitchen. That tree should be recorded. He also observed that his neighbors; Tommy Suah Kollie and Mary Yahn names were left out of the list; their properties should be re-checked within the assistance of the town chief.
   Ans: (Same as Miss Davis)

3. Mr. David Watson wanted to know whether the project will recruit skilled and unskilled laborers, because the youths need employment.
   Ans: Yes, indeed but the recruitment lies within LEC, the implementing agency of government.
Appendix 4: Ministry of Agriculture Price List (2013)
PUBLIC NOTICE FOR RELEASE DECEMBER 16, 2013

COMPENSATION COSTS OF TREES AND CROPS


THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE REITERATES THAT IN ALL INSTANCES, THE TREES AND CROPS COMPENSATION PRICE LIST REFERS TO CROPS (RUBBER, FRUIT TREES, COFFEE, COCOA, AND OIL PALM ETC) ON PUBLIC OR PRIVATE LAND THAT WERE ACTUALLY PLANTED BY FARMERS ON THEIR FARMS OR BY OWNERS AROUND THEIR HOME STEADS.

FOR BETTER CLARIFICATION, TREES AND CROPS FOR ECONOMIC COMPENSATION REFER TO THOSE PLANTS THAT ARE PLANTED AND CULTIVATED BY THE FARMER, CARED FOR UNDER HIS OWN CONTROL, AND REGULARLY MAINTAINED AND HARVESTED IN LINE WITH GOOD FARMING PRACTICES TO SERVE AS A POTENTIAL SOURCE OF ECONOMIC INCOME GENERATION.

IT HAS COME TO OUR ATTENTION THAT FARMERS AND OTHER LAND HOLDERS AROUND THE COUNTRY ARE INSISTING THAT CONCESSIONAIRES AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS PAY THEM FOR WILD OIL PALM AND OTHER PLANTS THAT GROW FROM SEEDS DROPPED BY BIRDS, BATS AND OTHER ANIMALS OR SCATTERED BY THE WIND.
WE WANT TO MAKE IT CLEAR TO ALL (FARMERS, NGO PARTNERS, AND COUNTY OFFICIALS AROUND THE COUNTRY) THAT WILD PLANTS ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE CROP COMPENSATION PLAN.

IN ORDER TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT CROPS FOR COMPENSATION WERE ACTUALLY PLANTED BY FARMERS, THE MINISTRY HEREBY PROPOSES THAT THIS DETERMINATION BE MADE BY A TEAM COMPRISING THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, THE MINISTRY OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS AND THE LAND COMMISSION IN CONSULTATION WITH THE LOCAL LEADERS, FARMERS AND OTHER LAND OWNERS.

OUR GOVERNMENT HAS WORKED VERY HARD TO ENCOURAGE INVESTORS TO COME TO OUR COUNTRY WITH PROJECTS THAT WILL CREATE JOBS AND CONTRIBUTE TO OVERALL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. NO INVESTOR WILL PAY FOR USE OF OUR LAND IF THEY HAVE TO COMPENSATE US FOR WILD PLANTS.

THOUSANDS OF JOBS HAVE ALREADY BEEN CREATED. HUNDREDS OF OUR CITIZENS ARE LIVING IN MODERN HOMES. THOUSANDS OF OUR CHILDREN ARE ABLE TO GO TO SCHOOL AND BENEFIT FROM HEALTH CARE PROVIDED BY THE DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS. PLEASE LET US WORK TOGETHER TO KEEP THESE PARTNERS HERE AND ENCOURAGE OTHERS TO COME TO LIBERIA.
**COMPENSATION COSTS OF TREES AND CROPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Tree Crops/Plant</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Mature (Rate USS)</th>
<th>Immature (Rate USS)</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rubber</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Cocoa</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Oil Palm</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Kola</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Bread Fruit</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Plantain</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Banana</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Lemon</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Lime</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Mango</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Coconut</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Pawpaw</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Cassava</td>
<td>Acre</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Sugarcane</td>
<td>Acre</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Pineapple</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Avocado</td>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Tree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Permanent Claims Commission, 2004

APPROVED: MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

July 18, 2013