

**FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ETHIOPIA**  
**URBAN WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION PROJECTS:**  
**ADDIS ABABA WATER SUUPLY AND SANITATION PROJECT**  
**AND**  
**MEKELE WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION PROJECT**



Mekelle (*Chinferes*)



Addis Ababa (*Salo Gora*)

**RAP SOCIAL AUDIT**

**Assefa Tolera Sori (PhD)**

**March 2012**

## Table of Contents

Acronyms.....	3
Acknowledgement .....	4
1. Social Audit for Addis Ababa and Mekelle Water Supply and Sanitation Projects .....	5
1.1. Background .....	5
1.2. Legal Framework for Expropriation and Compensation.....	6
1.3. Objective of the Social Audit.....	8
1.4. Expected Output.....	9
1.5. Methods of Data Collection .....	9
2. Field Report .....	9
2.1. Mekelle Water Supply and Sanitation Project.....	9
2.1.1    Land Expropriation/Acquisition .....	9
2.1.2.    Loss of Any Other Assets.....	11
2.1.3.    Types of Compensations Provided.....	12
2.1.4.    Satisfaction with Compensation Packages.....	12
2.1.5.    Consultations and Grievance Management Mechanisms .....	12
2.1.6.    Adverse Impact on Livelihood.....	13
2.1.7.    Adverse Social Impacts .....	13
2.1.8.    Lessons Learned .....	13
2.2. Addis Ababa Water Supply and Sanitation Project (AAWSSP).....	14
2.2.1.    Land Expropriation/Acquisition .....	14
2.2.2.    Loss of Any other Assets .....	14
2.2.3.    Compensations Provided .....	14
2.2.4.    Satisfaction with Compensation Packages.....	14

2.2.5.	Consultations and Grievance Redress Mechanisms .....	15
2.2.6.	Adverse Impact on Livelihood.....	15
2.2.7.	Adverse Social Impacts .....	16
2.2.8.	Lessons Learned.....	16
3.	Key Findings.....	17
4.	Recommendations.....	19
	References.....	20
	Annexes:.....	22

## **Acronyms**

AA	Addis Ababa
AAWSSP	Addis Ababa Water Supply and Sanitation Project
ESIAS	Environmental and Social Impact Assessments
ESMF	Environmental and Social Management Framework
FDRE	Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GoE	Government of Ethiopia
MWSSO	Mekelle Water Supply and Sanitation Office
MWSSP	Mekelle Water Supply and Sanitation Project
PAPs	Project Affected Persons
RAP	Resettlement Action Plan
RPF	Resettlement Policy Framework
UWSSP	Urban Water Supply and Sanitation Project
WSSO	Water Supply and Sanitation Office
WSSP	Water Supply and Sanitation Project

## **Acknowledgement**

Many people have contributed to the timely completion of this study. First of all, I would like to express my indebtedness to project affected persons for their time and openness, and the Mekelle WSSO Head Ato Gidena Abebe and his colleagues Ato Zeferu and Ato Tsehaye and Ato Fekadu Asrat, senior socio-economic consultant for the Addis Ababa WSSP for their all-rounded support and prompt responses to my queries.

Finally, I would like to thank Ato Yitbarek Tessema and Ato Yohannes Fiseha of the World Bank country office for providing me project documents and facilitation of the field visits.

# **1. Social Audit for Addis Ababa and Mekelle Water Supply and Sanitation Projects**

## ***1.1. Background***

The World Bank is currently supporting the Government of Ethiopia in the implementation of Urban Water Supply and Sanitation Project (UWSSP) in Addis Ababa and four secondary cities in Ethiopia. The development objectives are: (i) to reduce the supply and demand gap for potable water; (ii) to improve access to improved sanitation; and (iii) to improve the performance of selected urban water and sewer utilities through sector reform and increases private sector participation in selected urban areas of Ethiopia (RPF, 2007:a). The cities selected for the first phase financing are: Addis Ababa, Hawassa, Jimma, Mekelle, Gonder and Dire Dawa.

The cities included in this social audit are Addis Ababa and Mekelle, and it is fair to provide brief project introduction for both cities before proceeding to the details related to the social audit report.

Addis Ababa, the capital of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, with an estimated population size of 3.2 million has a critical shortage of water supply (currently 200,000m<sup>3</sup>/day) for both domestic and commercial use (ESIA, 2009:1). The following conditions necessitated the launching of the current project: (i) only 60% of its population has access to clean water (the remaining 40% uses water from nearby rivers heavily polluted from municipal and industrial wastes); (ii) sanitary coverage of the city is less than 3%; (iii) 24% of the households have no any form of toilet facilities and 63% of households use private and shared pit latrines; (iv) 25% of the city's solid waste is left unattended; (v) the use of ground water in and around the city is expected to partially augment the increasing water supply demand f the city ((ESIA, 2009:1). In view of these facts, the Addis Ababa Water Supply and Sanitation Development and Rehabilitation Project Office of the Addis Ababa Water and Sewerage Authority has launched a project to assess the ground water potential of the aquifers in and around the city by drilling ten test wells. The purposes of drilling the test wells are to determine the ground water potential that can be safely utilized by supplementing the existing water supply

system and to construct the necessary infrastructure to supply water to the city's water supply network.

The Mekelle Water Supply and Sanitation Project (WSSP) is another component of the UWSSP supported by the World Bank. The Mekelle sub-project is aimed at improving the severe shortage of water supply that is prevailing in the city. Its objective is to "improve the critical shortage of water supply in the city in the short term" (ESIA, 2011:11). In order to realize the set objectives, the project undertakes the drilling of five boreholes, build five reservoirs of different capacities, two booster stations, a collection chamber, installation of a total of 35kms of transmission pipes, build a pump house, guard house and generator houses in each of the borehole sites (ibid.:11).

The drilling of test wells and boreholes and subsequent construction activities involve varying degrees of impact on the lives of the communities in the project areas of the two cities. Among the major impacts are included acquisition of land for drilling of the test wells and boreholes, construction of reservoirs, booster stations (in the case of Mekelle), collection chambers, transmission pipes, building of pump, generator and guard houses, and access roads and power lines. Acquisition of land by a project often causes loss of livelihood or income. In view of these, proper assessment of the impacts and designing mitigation measures play a twin role of addressing the adverse impacts of the project on the local people and ensuring the sustainability of the proposed development project. Accordingly, an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) has been developed. Its objectives include:

- ◆ Describe the existing bio-physical and socio-cultural features of the proposed project;
- ◆ Assess the potential positive and negative effects; and
- ◆ Recommend appropriate mitigation measures that will avoid or minimize any undesirable effects that may result from the construction and operation activities of the project.

## ***1.2. Legal Framework for Expropriation and Compensation***

In Ethiopia, resettlement and rehabilitation are recognized civic rights in the Ethiopian legislation. The 1995 Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia states:

*“The right to ownership of rural and urban land, as well as of all natural resources, is exclusively vested in the State and in the peoples of Ethiopia...”*(Article 40, sub article 3).

The right to develop immovable property on the land one occupies and the right to commensurate compensation when the right of use expires are recognized by the Constitution (Article 40, sub-article 7). It is also constitutional for the government to expropriate private property for public purposes upon the payment of commensurate compensation (Art. 8).

Subsequent proclamations and directives have become the instruments to implement the provisions of the Federal Constitution pertaining to land. Accordingly, Proclamation No. 455/2005 provides that ‘a *woreda* or an urban administration’ has the power to expropriate land holdings, in urban or rural areas for public purposes (Article 3, sub article 1).

Displacement compensation for rural landholdings is governed by the provision of Article 8, sub article 3 of the proclamation:

*“A rural landholder whose land has been permanently expropriated shall, in addition to the compensation payable under article 7 of this proclamation, be paid displacement compensation which shall be equivalent to ten times the average annual income he secured during the five years preceding the expropriation of the land.”*

The above legal provisions constitute the basis for the expropriation of landholdings and commensurate compensations for all lands expropriated for public purposes. The Urban Water Supply and Sanitations Project (UWSSP), implemented in Addis Ababa and four secondary cities, is governed by these legal provisions. In view of this, the ***Resettlement Policy Framework*** (January 2007) for the UWSSP proposes “permanent loss of land” will be compensated with “*replacement by a similar piece of land (...) OR cash compensation at replacement value...*” (p. d). In line with the aforementioned legal provisions and the ***Resettlement Policy Framework*** (2007) of the UWSSP, the regional/city administrations determine the value of the property affected by the project and set the rate at which the damage will be compensated. Variables taken into account when compensations are calculated for the expropriated landholdings include production per hectare, market price of a particular crop produced on the land, nature of expropriation (permanent or temporary), and if temporary number of years for which it will be acquired, and size of land expropriated.

### **1.3. Objective of the Social Audit**

The objective of this social audit is to validate the extent of impact of the following four sub-projects under UWSSP on land and /or people (land acquisition, resettlement, and livelihood restoration of the affected people) as detailed in the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment reports for the respective sub-projects:

1. Test Wells in and around the city of Addis Ababa;
2. Mekele Water Supply and Sanitation sub-project;
3. Jimma Water Supply and Sanitation sub-project; and
4. Ambowuha Spring Development at Hawassa Water Supply and Sanitation project.

And to confirm and corroborate whether farmers and other households have had land acquired, been resettled and, if so, have been compensated duly for the loss of land or other assets (trees, fences, damage to housing, etc.), per the requirements of the World Bank OP 4.12. The audit should also determine if the project affected people's livelihoods have been adversely affected or not and, again, determine if they have been compensated per OP 4.12. In cases where compensation payments have not happened or the livelihoods of the affected people have been adversely affected, the audit would recommend specific actions and mechanisms to redress the situation. Specifically the audit will establish:

- ◆ What compensations and livelihood restoration packages were provided to all affected persons including the farmers and other households whose land has been acquired;
- ◆ What percentage of land was acquired from each of the farmers or households;
- ◆ Was there loss of any other assets such as trees, fences, damage to houses, water source, grazing land, etc.?
- ◆ Were any of the farmers or other households' tenants or businesses and, if so, what assets have been lost and have they received compensation for these assets?
- ◆ Whether farmers or other households were satisfied with the compensation packages offered (with particular focus on female headed households and other vulnerable groups);
- ◆ Whether farmers or other households were consulted in the process of determining the compensations;

- ◆ Whether grievance mechanisms and procedures are put in place and project affected persons are adequately aware of them;
- ◆ Whether there have been adverse impacts on livelihood of farmers and other households as a result of the land acquisition; and
- ◆ Whether there are other potential adverse social impacts that could be caused by the project.

#### **1.4. *Expected Output***

A report of key findings regarding the points outlined above, key lessons learned and recommendations for corrective actions to be taken by each of the three town water supply utilities (Jimma, Mekele and Hawassa), AAWSA in Addis Ababa, and the Project Management Unit – UWSSP at the Ministry of Water and Energy. Corrective actions have been implemented and duly reported in the Additional Financing submitted to the Executive Directors of the World Bank for approval.

#### **1.5. *Methods of Data Collection***

The study on which this report basis itself used both secondary and primary sources, with focus on the latter as the nature of the study, namely *social audit*, necessitates. Therefore, secondary sources such as ESMF and RPF, ESIA, and primary methods such as brief structured and semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, in-depth interviews, and site observations were used to generate data as per the scope and objectives of the social audit outlined in the terms of reference (TOR).

## **2. Field Report**

### **2.1. *Mekelle Water Supply and Sanitation Project***

#### **2.1.1 Land Expropriation/Acquisition**

Land expropriation was of two types, namely permanent and temporary. Project activities such as borehole drilling, pump house, reservoir construction, booster stations, and guard houses necessitated permanent expropriation. The discussion we had with members of the local community in Mahiberegenet *Kebele* of Chinferes site of the project is presented as follows:

1. The land used for the drilling of Borehole 1 (BH1) in Chinferes area was government land, was the Mesobo Cement Factory quarry site until it was handed over to the Mekelle Water Supply and Sanitation Office following the instruction by the Regional Government in view of the urgency of providing sustainable water supply to Mekelle city. Therefore, no expropriation of individual holdings.
2. The 625.96 sq. meter land where the 500m<sup>3</sup> reservoir, a booster station and a guard house are built within 500 meters distance from BH1 was expropriated from a certain farmer and compensation was paid as per the legal provisions and the rate set by the relevant regional bureaus.
3. The construction of transmission pipes has affected about 250 households, and because the impact was only for one season and the work was done during the dry season, when there is neither a crop nor a farming activity on the fields, compensation was not paid. We were able to see some of these plots on which the farmers are growing crops.

In Dandera village of Mai Tsedo *kebele* the project has affected three households. These are of two types, namely two households whose irrigation farmlands were temporarily affected during the construction of the transmission pipes and compensation was paid for one season harvest loss and one household (a family of three) whose farmland (169.5 sq. meter) was permanently expropriated for drilling the well, building generator house, guard house and access road. The latter, a 22 year old young man, told the consultant that he was given the land by the *kebele* administration in 2009, and in 2010 government people came and erected a pump on an already existing small cement structure (which he saw from day one of his possession of the land but did not know what it was) and a guard house next to it. Later he learned that the ‘cement structure’ was a test well dug, sealed and left almost abandoned for few years.

The young man claims (but the Head of the Makelle Water Supply and Sanitation Office disputes his claim) that he did not know he was entitled to compensation for the expropriated farmland as it was normal for the government to acquire individual household plots for development purposes. In 2010 he was told he should have been compensated for the permanent expropriation of the 169.5 sq. meter land by a certain visitor to the site (one informant told us he

was a World Bank man from Addis Ababa) and in September 2010 he was denied access by the Mekelle Water Supply and Sanitation Office (MWSSO) staff to the site (his wheat farm plot) when they came to replace the old pump, which was out of order, with a new one. When this was reported to the MWSSO head, the latter told the young man that he will be compensated for the land acquired for the project so that he should not obstruct the work. The MWSSO head also promised to initiate and facilitate the process of the compensation payment by formally requesting the Enderta *Woreda* Office of Agriculture. Accordingly, the young man was paid Birr 2874.72 in compensation for the permanent expropriation of 169.50 sq. meter land. He, however, emphasized that he was not compensated for the crop damaged on the field in September 2010 during the replacement of the old pump with the new one. If his claim that he had a crop on that particular site at the time and the crop was damaged during the pump replacement was true, his claim for compensation is valid because the document which he signed to collect the compensation money shows only the permanent expropriation of the 169.5 sq. meter farmland was computed. Before we departed from the site, the staff of the MWSSO who had been with the consultant at the time advised the young man to submit his complaint in writing so that the Office reviews his case. The MWSSO has communicated with the young man to review his case, if he submits a written formal complaint to the Office.

In Adi Kolakul village across Ilala River houses which could have been partially or completely demolished to make way for the construction of the transmission pipes were saved because the MWSSO deliberately adopted a zigzag rather than a straight line construction. The consultant confirmed this from the local people during the field visit (25<sup>th</sup> February). The Air Force Terminal site has two reservoirs of 100m<sup>3</sup> each, and the concerned household was compensated for permanent expropriation of 259 sq. meter farmland.

### **2.1.2. Loss of Any Other Assets**

Some of the interviewed PAPs reported loss of trees and they have been compensated for the loss.

### **2.1.3. Types of Compensations Provided**

In all cases the compensation provided was cash for the land expropriated permanently or for the temporary disruption of means of livelihood (mostly for farmlands), and for cutting of trees.

### **2.1.4. Satisfaction with Compensation Packages**

The 22 year old young man from Dandera village believes the amount of money he was given in compensation for the permanent expropriation of 169.5 sq. meter farmland is not enough. Similarly, when asked if the compensation paid to the household whose 625.96 sq. meter land was expropriated for the construction of the 5000m<sup>3</sup> reservoir and related facilities, a *kebele* chairman from Chinferes area said (in Tigrigna) “*bi mengisti ziteqoretset idis darga zela*” (literally, a hand cut by the state is seen as normal). This shows that people accept government decisions because there is very little they can do to change the situation. It also means, community consultations are not the norm. Despite their complaint that the compensation paid was “not enough”, all evidences indicate that the measurement and valuation of the assets affected were done in line with the provisions of the RPF approved for this project.

### **2.1.5. Consultations and Grievance Management Mechanisms**

Practices vary from village to village in terms of consultation with the local community about the projects. In the case of Mekele Water Supply and Sanitation project, there is no evidence of community consultation at the initial stage of the project. At later stages, however, meetings were organized and the local community was told about the project and its possible impact on the people and their livelihoods. As was discussed above, the case of a 22 year old young man of Dandera village is a good example of lack of systematic routine consultation with the PAPs.

Though the need for grievance management mechanisms did not arise in relation to the Mekelle Water Supply and Sanitation project, informants reported that they have never heard of its existence. The Head of Mekelle Water Supply and Sanitation Office told the consultant that complaints about the procedures, measurement and rates of compensation are addressed to his office, which are referred to experts for review, and if the complainants are not satisfied, the case is referred to the *Woreda* Office of Agriculture, which has a team of experts to closely examine

the case, including site visits, and final decisions are made based the report of these team of experts. He recalled a couple of cases in which complaints received by his office on measurement errors were examined and rectified by the Mekelle WSSO.

#### **2.1.6. Adverse Impact on Livelihood**

Most of the time new projects have some adverse impacts (sometimes anticipated, but often unforeseen) on the livelihood of the targeted beneficiaries. In this particular project, however, adverse impacts are almost non-existent because the project did not involve significant land expropriation or loss of other means of livelihood. According to the Mekelle WSSO Head, where permanent land expropriation was involved it did not exceed 10% of the farmlands, and other PAPs experienced only temporary disturbances in their farm works, and others lost eucalyptus trees and perennial crops (banana and guava trees) for all of which they have been compensated as per the rates set by the relevant *woreda* offices and the requirements of the RPF. In fact, some have used the compensation money to buy livestock, including oxen to enhance sustainability of their livelihoods.

#### **2.1.7. Adverse Social Impacts**

This project did not involve displacement of people and there is no observed adverse social impact. In fact, if the local communities of the project areas are made to access water through communal taps, the local community will immensely benefit because it saves time that will be spent fetching water from tiny and unclean sources (often very far from the villages), and more importantly access to clean water is a reliable protection against diseases, and healthy citizens are the backbone of any development endeavor.

#### **2.1.8. Lessons Learned**

Any human endeavor is a learning process. The Head of Mekelle WSSO believes his office has drawn lessons on matters of community consultations, which he believes were not satisfactory during the first phase, and on follow up in social and environmental issues which were not given the attention they deserve.

## **2.2. Addis Ababa Water Supply and Sanitation Project (AAWSSP)**

### **2.2.1. Land Expropriation/Acquisition**

The World Bank supported AAWSSP activities include drilling of test wells and the construction related facilities such as pump houses, generator houses, transmission pipes, and guard houses. In almost all cases land expropriation was of a permanent nature and all PAPs were compensated for the loss of land as per the existing legal provisions and the rates determined by the respective regional administrations, namely Addis Ababa City Administration and Oromia National Regional State. In all the sites visited and the PAPs interviewed it was confirmed that compensations have been paid as per the provisions made in the UWSSP RPF, which states compensation is made in “*replacement by a similar piece of land (...) OR cash compensation at replacement value...*” (p. d). Since land belongs to the State, “land usage is not an entitlement to monetary compensation”. Therefore, “*cash compensation at replacement value*”, in this context refers only to developments (such as trees, crops and structures) on the land (RPF, 2007:8).

### **2.2.2. Loss of Any other Assets**

Some PAPs reported loss of assets such as eucalyptus trees, for which they have been compensated.

### **2.2.3. Compensations Provided**

All interviewed PAPs and FGD participants reported that compensation for land expropriated was cash payment. Although some would have liked ‘land for land’ compensation, that was not the case and they understand very well why ‘land for land’ compensation was not an option, namely there is no unoccupied land in their respective *kebeles*. This is in agreement with the mitigation measures proposed in the RPF (p. d).

### **2.2.4. Satisfaction with Compensation Packages**

As mentioned above, compensation for land expropriation and loss of other assets was paid in cash. PAPs from the Addis Ababa City Administration reported that the rate at which their compensation was calculated was lower than the rate used for their fellow PAPs in neighboring *kebeles* in Oromia, and in their view that was unfair. However, informants were

unanimous that the compensation handling procedures followed the GoE legal provisions and the rate determined by the Addis Ababa City Administration.

### **2.2.5. Consultations and Grievance Redress Mechanisms**

Consultations with the local community were of two types, namely proper consultation with the people at a meetings called for the same purpose and in other cases often took the form of information sharing at a meetings organized by the *kebele* administration for other purposes. Salo Gora *Kebele* of Akaki Kality Sub-city in Addis Ababa is a good example of the former type, where the local community elected people into the committees which were responsible for identification of boundaries and measurement of lands to be expropriated. Finally, the PAPs checked the information and signed the documents which were finally used for compensation payment. Informants were unanimous that measurement of the lands to be expropriated and trees to be cut were done in almost all cases in the presence of the concerned PAPs or their representatives. According to informants, there was very little need to have a grievance management mechanism apart from the *kebele* or *woreda* administration structures, which are happy to listen to their complaints and in consultation with the project coordinator from the AAWSSP address their concerns.

### **2.2.6. Adverse Impact on Livelihood**

All the PAPs interviewed and FGD participants reported that the compensation paid helped them to improve their livelihood. Most mentioned they bought oxen, cows, and agricultural inputs such as fertilizer and improved seeds, many mentioned investing in vegetable irrigation farms (bought motor pumps and longer hoses to water their fields), and few more mentioned building or renovating corrugated iron roof houses. Those who invested in either crop or vegetable farms are very much optimistic that their lives will change for better in the next few years and are happy that they had this opportunity. All the PAPs who were given cash compensation for the affected assets used the money to enhance sustainability of their livelihoods and this is in line with the provisions of the UWSSP Resettlement Policy Framework.

On the other hand, many informants complained that most of the hand-dug water wells they had in their homestead or villages (some communal) for many years dried up following the drilling of the test wells and the subsequent planting of the pumps, construction of transmission

pipes and channeling of water to the reservoirs. We were shown one of these dried up 15 meters deep wells and no sign of water could be seen. Although we cannot comment on the connection between the drilling of water from 500 meters deep wells and the drying up of the old hand-dug 15 meters deep wells (because of lack of competence), it was true the latter were abandoned and one could see only layers of a spider web not a water. (See photo below)



**Figure 1:** Dried and abandoned hand-dug well (Salo Gora)

### 2.2.7. Adverse Social Impacts

The project did not register any adverse social impact so far and none is envisaged as things stand now.

### 2.2.8. Lessons Learned

Development projects that bring on board the community from the very beginning in terms of planning, implementation and targeting them as principal beneficiaries win their support and are, therefore, sustainable. According to Ato Fekadu, senior socio-economic consultant for the AAWSSP, if convinced of its objectives and their role in the process, people stand as strong advocates of the project. Moreover, development works that pay little attention to social and environmental issues risk marginalizing the beneficiaries of the development projects and are

less likely to last as sustainable projects. Ato Fekadu argues that even engineers who often tend to focus on the physical aspects of development projects have now realized that recognition of social and environmental issues as core components of development programming and implementation makes a huge difference.

### **3. Key Findings**

The UWSSP is being implemented in Addis Ababa and four secondary cities. The Project is financially supported by the World Bank and implemented by the GoE through water supply and sanitation offices of the respective city administrations within the framework of the GoE of legal provisions and the World Bank policies, which are the bases for the Resettlement Policy Framework (2007) of the project.

As shown in the table on entitlement matrix and compensation paid attached herewith (Annex), the compensations paid were in compliance with the provisions of the RPF. All PAPs were given compensations in cash as was provided in the RPF, and as the land belongs to the State and none of the land acquisitions resulted in ‘physical displacement’ of households, land expropriation (permanent and temporary) did not result in ‘land for land’ compensation.

Moreover, since the lands acquired were very small proportions of the land possessed by the respective PAPs, there is no risk to the sustainability of the livelihoods of the PAPs and their families. In fact, as was discussed above, the cash compensation paid were used by the PAPs to enhance their sustainable livelihood strategies by buying livestock (plough oxen and cows) and by diversifying their production (e.g., vegetable irrigation farms in Heechu and Salo Gora *Kebeles*).

As regards consultations, the RPF provides for the “presentation of the executive summary of the draft RPF to towns concerned by the Project (RPF, 2007:24). Information sharing and consultations with the potentially affected people “on the project, resettlement and compensation principles” (RPF, 2007:24) take place only in projects which require the preparation of RAPs and ARPs. Since, RAPs and ARPs were not prepared for UWSSP, detail consultations were, therefore, limited to ESIA preparation study period.

As discussed under sections 2.1.5 and 2.2.5, grievance redress mechanisms were not institutionalized, rather ad hoc. Despite lack of institutionalized grievance registration and redress mechanisms, we would like to emphasize that no grievance reported to the implementing agencies remained unresolved or unaddressed.

It is important to note that in both the Addis Ababa WSSP and Mekelle WSSP, PAPs were not displaced from their homes and this was due largely to the nature of the projects which did not necessitate relocation of the inhabited dwellings of the people and partly to the conscious and deliberate rerouting of some components of project activities as was observed in the construction of transmission pipes in Adi Kolakul village of the Mekelle WSSP, which is in compliance with the World Bank's **OP 4.12**, paragraph 2(a) and the RPF approved for this project (p.11).

The communal water development we observed in Heechu *kebele* of the Addis Ababa WSSP is an exemplary work, which should be emulated by other *kebeles/woredas* of the Addis Ababa WSS project and similar water projects financed through UWSSP in other cities. Members of the local community at Dandera village challenge the fairness of the water supply project which provides clean water to Mekelle city when their village, the source of that water, does not even have a communal tap.

Akaki Well Field 1 (AWF1) changed to an alternate site, because as was mentioned in the ESIA report, it is the Gada ritual site for the Oromo people where every seven [eight] years people meet at that particular site and celebrate the Gada ritual and amend the existing laws and propose new laws (ESIA 2009:55). During the site visit for the purpose of this social audit, we were able to see the land still untouched and used only as grazing land (see photo below). It is worth noting that the Addis Ababa WSSP has observed the World Bank's **OP 4.11** (Physical Cultural Resources) which aims at preserving and avoiding elimination of cultural properties.



**Figure 2:** The Gada ritual site saved due to change of the AWF I to an alternate site

#### 4. Recommendations

From this social audit, the consultant learned that consultation with the local community was not institutionalized and routinely practiced. It is, therefore, strongly recommended that there should be enough consultation with the PAPs and others from very early stages of the project life.

It was also observed that proper and systematized grievance registration and redress mechanisms were not put in place in all the projects visited for this social audit. Even when the likelihood of grievance to arise is low, the existence of such a mechanism and people's knowledge of its existence boosts confidence in the system and forges support for the project. It is, therefore, recommended that grievance registration and redress mechanisms are well integrated into development projects such as this one and grievance Mediation Committees should include representatives of the local PAPs as proposed in the RPF (2007: 26).

As was discussed in the foregoing paragraphs, Addis Ababa WSSP acquired land for laying transmission pipes permanently and paid full compensation per the requirements of the RPF. Their argument is that the transmission pipes are installed parallel the access roads and also in the event of the need for maintenance of the pipes, they do not want to enter into another processes of land acquisition and compensation payment. In their view, it is therefore wise to

permanently acquire land wide enough for the construction of access road, transmission pipes and ditches. The Mekelle WSSP has a different practice, whereby they compensate only for one season crop loss if there were crops on the field or if the cropping season was disrupted because of transmission pipes construction activities. It is suggested that there is a need for serious discussion on the plausibility of these different practices, and if possible to adopt a *modus operandi* that may apply in different cities of similar projects.

Fairness in the distribution of development dividends should be a working principle. Providing clean water to the cities is something we all cherish. Equally important is to ensure that the rural communities who give away their lands, critical source of their livelihood, for the development of water projects should not be left out as was observed in many of the villages visited during this social audit. Therefore, it is recommended that future water development projects financed through UWSSP also share the development dividends with the local PAPs.

## References

- Addis Ababa Water and Sewerage Authority, 2007. *Environmental and Social Management Framework*. Draft report for the Urban Water Supply and Sanitation Project.
- Addis Ababa Water and Sewerage Authority, 2007. *Resettlement Policy Framework*. Draft report for the Urban Water Supply and Sanitation Project. F. Giovannetti, 6 Rue F. Mauriac, 8400 Avignon, France.
- Addis Ababa Water and Sewerage Authority, 2009. *Environmental and Social Impact Assessment of the Test Wells in and around the City of Addis Ababa*. Final Report for the Urban Water Supply and Sanitation Project. By Tequam Tesfamariam.
- Mekelle Water Supply and Sanitation Office, 2011. *Environmental and Social Impact Assessment of the Mekelle Water Supply and Sanitation Project*. By MTS Consulting Engineers PLC, Addis Ababa.
- World Bank, OP 4.12. *Involuntary Resettlement*.

World Bank, OP 4.11. *Physical Cultural Resources*.

FDRE, 1995. *Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa.

FDRE, 2005. .... Proclamation No. 455/2005

Council of Ministers Regulations No. 135/2007, on *The Payment of Compensation for Property Situated on Landholdings Expropriated for Public Purposes*.

## **Annexes:**