

Project Number: 38426-023  
Loan/Grant Number: 2796/0267  
January 2015

# Final Report of the Special Project Facilitator Nepal: Decentralized Rural Infrastructure and Livelihood Project (Additional Financing)

(Complaint Received: 2 December 2014)

This document is being disclosed to the public in accordance with ADB's Public Communications Policy 2011.

**Asian Development Bank**

**In preparing any country program or strategy, financing any project, or by making any designation of or reference to a particular territory or geographic area in this document, the Asian Development Bank does not intend to make any judgments as to the legal or other status of any territory or area.**

## ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
CDC	Compensation Determination Committee
CISC	central implementation support consultant
CRO	complaint receiving officer
DOLIDAR	Department of Local Infrastructure Development and Agriculture Roads
DPO	district project officer
DRCC	District Roads Coordination Committee
DRILP	Decentralized Rural Infrastructure and Livelihood Project
DRILP (AF)	Decentralized Rural Infrastructure and Livelihood Project (Additional Financing)
DTO	district technical officer
GRC	Grievance Redress Committee
GRSC	Grievance Redress Sub Committee
ha	hectare
km	kilometer
NGO	nongovernment organization
NRM	Nepal Resident Mission
LDO	local development officer
OSPF	Office of the Special Project Facilitator
PCU	project coordination unit
ROW	right-of-way
RP	resettlement plan
SARD	South Asia Department
TOR	terms of reference

## CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
I BACKGROUND	1
A. The Project	1
B. The Complaint	1
C. Determination of Eligibility	1
II REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT	2
A. Objectives and Methodologies	2
B. Identification of Stakeholders	2
C. Assessment of Issues	2
III COURSE OF ACTION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SCHEDULE	3
A. Course of Action and Recommendations	3
B. Proposed Schedule	6
IV CONCLUSION	6
APPENDIX 1 Complaint Letter Sent to ADB	7
APPENDIX 2 Community Concerns Registry	9
APPENDIX 3 DRILP (AF) Action Plan	12

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since 2004, the Government of Nepal has been implementing the Decentralized Rural Infrastructure and Livelihood Project (DRILP) with the aim of increasing economic and financial capital as well as social services for the poor and disadvantaged. The DRILP-Additional Financing is being implemented by district authorities in 18 remote areas to build rural roads with intensive involvement of local population, investments in community infrastructure, and capacity development of all stakeholders.

The Office of the Special Project Facilitator (OSPF) received a complaint from one family (the complainants) on 2 December 2014 and declared it eligible on 15 December 2014. The complainants were concerned that consultations regarding voluntary land donation for the project had been lacking and that affected people consenting to donation may have been coerced.

A review and assessment mission was held in Nepal from 12 to 16 January 2015; it included (i) documentation review; (ii) group meetings with the government, affected people, the Grievance Redress Committee, and one nongovernment organization participating in the project; and (iii) one-on-one interviews with the complainants and other affected people.

Voluntary land donation is a tradition in Nepal wherein communities donate a part of their assets for public/community use if it provides direct benefits to them. However, the assumption that affected people were most likely to donate land for this project led to a compromised consultation process wherein affected people were not fully informed of their options for land acquisition and were therefore not able to make informed decisions.

The lack of consultation, added to other factors in project implementation, led to genuine concerns raised by the affected people concerning the project's impacts. The OSPF review and assessment mission provided an unexpected opportunity for the stakeholders to consult each other; get information; and provide inputs to project staff about their issues and concerns, questions, and suggestions for the project to consider and respond to. Through group meetings and one-on-one interviews with affected people, the project was able to address all concerns and find solutions agreeable to the affected people.

Based on lessons learned during the OSPF problem-solving process, the project has prepared an action plan to improve project implementation and monitoring. The complainants are satisfied with the result of the OSPF intervention and consider this complaint closed.

## I. BACKGROUND

### A. The Project

1. The Asian Development Bank (ADB) has been supporting road construction and maintenance in 18 remote and mountainous districts in Nepal, with supplementary investments to enhance the livelihoods of local people, since 2004. The Decentralized Rural Infrastructure and Livelihood Project (DRILP) aims at poverty reduction through improved rural infrastructure—roads and other social infrastructure such as trail bridges, ropeways, and rural market centers. This will result in increased access to goods, services, facilities, and employment opportunities leading to increased household incomes, better access to development opportunities, reduced vulnerability, and social inclusion. DRILP continues to show good performance and has also contributed to peace building through increased social and economic opportunities for the poor in remote districts.

2. The current project scope under additional financing will scale up the project, addressing many lessons learned from implementing past and ongoing rural roads. These include undertaking an innovative road maintenance program, improving the access of the rural poor to microfinance, promoting the use of building groups, restructuring skills training, and sharpening the focus on national and district capacity. The project also follows a community-driven approach, which gives the communities control over planning and project implementation.

3. The current project has prepared and designed a pipeline of additional rural road subprojects for implementation. The provision of additional financing for the current project will build on this established pipeline of road subprojects to move rapidly toward implementation.

4. This report refers specifically to the 3.0-kilometer (km) section implemented in the first phase of the Beni-Pakhapani Road subproject, which is located in Myagdi District in the Western Region of Nepal. The total length of the road is 19.5 km. The initial 3-km section was undertaken during DRILP with the purpose of making the road all-weather standard. With the additional financing of the project, the road is proposed for upgrading to gravel standard.

### B. The Complaint

5. The complaint was sent to the complaint receiving officer (CRO) through email on 10 November 2014. In a subsequent email sent to the CRO on 25 November 2014, and in response to the CRO's request to accomplish the Accountability Mechanism's complaint form, the complainants confirmed their wish to go through the problem-solving process. The CRO subsequently forwarded the complaint letter to OSPF on 2 December 2014. The complaint is attached as Appendix 1.

6. The complainants alleged that no consultation was held with the landowner regarding the project and the options for land acquisition. The project did not consult or get the landowner's consent for voluntary land donation or compensation. Instead, the project accepted and prepared the land donation agreement with the father. The complainants also alleged coercion by project staff to have the father sign the consent.

### C. Determination of Eligibility

7. The Office of the Special Project Facilitator (OSPF) did a desk review of the project and held telephone discussions with the complainants and ADB Nepal Resident Mission staff about

the complaint. The complaint met OSPF's eligibility requirements and was declared eligible on 15 December 2014.

## **II. REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT**

### **A. Objectives and Methodologies**

8. A review and assessment mission was held in Nepal from 12 to 16 January 2015. The objectives of the review and assessment were to confirm the key stakeholders, identify the main issues of the complaint, explore the stakeholders' readiness for joint problem solving, and recommend a course of action. The review and assessment included (i) documentation review; (ii) group meetings with the government, affected people, the Grievance Redress Committee (GRC), the Grievance Redress Sub Committee (GRSC), and one nongovernment organization (NGO) participating in the project; and (iii) one-on-one interviews with the complainants and other affected people.

### **B. Identification of Stakeholders**

9. The formal complainants are the three signatories to the complaint letter: the mother, son, and daughter-in-law from the affected area of the project. Other stakeholders identified and met included (i) staff from the project implementing agencies including the District Development Committee, Project Coordination Unit (PCU), District Road Coordination Committee (DRCC), Compensation Determination Committee (CDC), and GRC; (ii) affected people; and (iii) the Himalayan Grassroots Women Natural Resources Management Association.

### **C. Assessment of Issues**

10. The upgrading of the road requires an 8-meter right-of-way (ROW) throughout the alignment. As a direct consequence, the subproject requires 2.4 hectares (ha) of land, of which 1.14 ha is privately owned. A resettlement plan (RP) to address land acquisition was prepared in 2011. The resettlement framework includes provisions for accepting land donations for small parcels of land. The RP also includes a process and safeguards built into the donation procedure to ensure that land donation is not forced and that the affected household is not further impoverished by the donation. Voluntary land donation is to be confirmed through a written record, which includes a "no-coercion" clause verified by an independent third party, which is an NGO in this case.

11. Since the project focuses on a community-driven approach, there seems to be an assumption that affected people would be likely to donate land. This could have compromised the consultation process, and the option of compensation to affected people was not made clear. While OSPF could not find any evidence of coercion related to voluntary land donation, consultations with the affected people confirmed that they were not given the option of compensation upfront.

12. An NGO was engaged to be the third party involved to verify "no coercion" relating to voluntary land donation. When interviewed, members of the NGO explained that they were also involved in a campaign to raise the awareness of the community about the project and encourage their participation. In addition, they were also present during the process of signing the land agreements between the landowners and the project. Though the affected people were not coerced into land donation, the role of the NGO in awareness raising upfront could have influenced the decision of the affected people. Furthermore, due to the absence of the terms of

reference (TOR) for the service, the NGO did not have a structured process to determine if land donation was based on the full, free, and informed decision making of the affected people.

13. The RP prepared in 2011 identified a total of 38 affected households. Of these 38 households, 33 owners signed the land donation agreement at that time. No land ownership verification took place when the project signed the agreements for donation. It was only during the land transfer process (April 2014) that it was discovered the project had accepted and signed an agreement for land donation with the father, who is not the legal owner. The legal owner is the mother. Even with this discovery, the project had not taken any action to consult with the landowner and seek her consent for donation.

14. The land transfer process required a new cadastral survey to verify the land area and identify newly affected households. Based on the re-cadastral survey in April 2014, 44 affected households have been identified in the affected area, with 20 new owners (due to old owners selling their land) and 24 old owners from the previous survey. Of the 24 old owners, 4 are absentees, and it has not been possible to consult them about the project.

15. The project had already started construction in the affected area ahead of the land transfer, which further complicates the situation. This has brought about grievances from the affected people. Several of the affected people requested realignment of the road to avoid fragmentation of their land, which would render parts of their land economically nonviable. Others were concerned that the road construction would damage other structures on their land. The project had initiated a study to assess the technical feasibility of the realignment with recommendations of alternatives based on environmental and financial impacts. The study, which was completed only at the time of the OSPF mission, concluded that major realignment was technically not possible, but some minor realignment was possible and was agreed to by the DRCC.

16. The project has set up a GRC in the district and a Grievance Redress Sub Committee (GRSC) at the village level to hear complaints. A meeting with GRC and GRSC members revealed that, while grievances had been reported, records of the grievances, action taken, and feedback to the affected people were not well documented. The GRC and project were in the midst of reviewing some of the complaints (total of 13 recorded ones) during the OSPF mission. Of the 13 cases, 7 had been reviewed and decisions had been taken by the DRCC and CDC. However, the landowners had not yet been informed about the decisions.

17. More effort could have been put into ensuring that the institutional responsibilities were clear and that the technical capacity was in place to provide continuity in dealing with resettlement issues. In addition, the same effort should have ensured that affected households were sufficiently informed about the status of the project and the resettlement plan and that their concerns and grievances were addressed through adequate channels of communication.

### **III. COURSE OF ACTION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SCHEDULE**

#### **A. Course of Action and Recommendations**

18. OSPF organized two separate meetings with the affected people—one for the new landowners and another for the old landowners. The purpose of the consultations was to revisit the land acquisition procedure with the government, and to clearly explain the options available to the owners. While all the “old” landowners were still happy to donate their land, they had other concerns they wanted addressed. The project and OSPF agreed to use this opportunity to



address these concerns. One-on-one interviews were therefore organized for affected landowners to discuss their grievances and find appropriate solutions.

19. A one-on-one interview was organized with one of the complainants (the mother—the landowner affected by the project). OSPF also met with the father separately. The meeting with the father revealed that he had indeed signed the consent for voluntary land donation. As head of the household, he had assumed the decision making regarding the land and failed to consult with his wife. The father wished to participate in the project but requested realignment and compensation for the land. The interview with the landowner confirmed that she was not consulted by the project at all; after presenting the project and options for land acquisition she decided not to participate in the road upgrade. With this, the project agreed to stop any works on her land and restore it to its former state.

20. OSPF consulted with the DRCC and PCU regarding the complainant's decision to ensure that her nonparticipation in the project would not have any implications on the road upgrade. While the formation width of the upgraded road would have a total ROW of 8 meters, the section belonging to the complainant will remain at 4 meters only. This will have no technical or environmental impact on the road.

21. OSPF met and interviewed an additional 21 landowners. Eight of them reported concerns during OSPF's visit, and 13 had registered their concerns with the GRC earlier. The concerns raised in these cases were related to (i) compensation for their land or structures to be destroyed by the project, (ii) the project providing retaining structures to protect the land from landslides, and (iii) realignment of the road to avoid fragmentation of land. Seven cases had already been decided upon by the DRCC and CDC, which was not to demolish main buildings found in the affected area, and to compensate landowners for temporary structures. In collaboration with OSPF, the remaining 14 cases were resolved with the affected landowners' agreement to the solutions. For those who requested realignment, which is not possible, the project agreed to compensate them for the areas of their land that will become economically nonviable. The case notes are presented in Appendix 2.

22. In terms of project implementation, OSPF made the following recommendations, which the project has agreed to implement:

**23. Updated RP.** With the cadastral map now finalized, the project will need to prepare an updated RP with details, i.e., total number of affected households, total landholding of the affected households, their socioeconomic status, objectives, and entitlements of the project, among others.

**24. Consultation to disclose the updated RP.** The updated resettlement plan should be shared with the affected people in a participatory and consultative manner. Both ADB and project staff should present the plan and seek endorsement by the affected people of the entitlements. The project should plan these consultations carefully using experienced facilitators to enable dialogue with the affected people.

**25. Land transfer process.** The project is advised to continue and complete the land transfer process as soon as possible to avoid delays in project implementation. The project will make the necessary arrangements required for completion of such activities within a time frame.

**26. Budget for compensation.** Since there are new households that will require compensation, e.g., for portions of their land rendered economically nonviable, and those who

have more than 10% of their land affected, the project is advised to allocate sufficient budget for these expenses. Compensation payments must also be scheduled in a timely fashion.

**27. Construction.** Due to the complaint, civil works were discontinued. The project should not have started works prior to the completion of the land transfer and compensation payments to the affected people. However, seeing that the community is eager for the project to continue, civil works may continue but only in public land areas and areas that have completed the deed transfers. No construction should take place in areas that are pending the deed transfer.

**28. Absentee owners.** Four of the affected people are absentees and have not met with the project. The project is advised to exert extra effort in contacting the absentee owners and informing them of the project and their options for compensation or land donation. Escrow accounts will be set up for compensation deposits while awaiting the final decisions of the absentees.

**29. Grievance records.** OSPF has provided the project with a recording template to encourage the GRC and GRSC to document grievances, actions taken, and feedback to the complainants. These records are essential so the project is aware of concerns and can take specific actions to resolve the problems. Records can help the project act in a timely fashion and build trust and rapport with the affected people.

**30. Capacity development in grievance redress and meaningful consultation.** The project will organize capacity development for its staff in conducting meaningful consultation and improved grievance redress to enhance its capability in project implementation. The training will be organized in close coordination with and under the guidance of OSPF and ADB's South Asian Department.

**31. TOR for participating NGO as third party verifier.** While engaging NGOs to verify that no coercion takes place when donating land, the project needs to ensure the capacity of the chosen agency for the assignment. Key to this is the TOR presenting the purpose and scope of the verification process, the methods to be used, the standard against which performance is to be assessed or analyses are to be conducted, the resources and time allocated, and the reporting requirements. This is important for credibility of the process and standardizing good practice for consistent application at scale.

**32. Adequate staff resources.** ADB should assign the necessary staff resources to address resettlement issues and continuously to provide support to the government as needed and to ensure the implementation of the updated resettlement plan consistent with the time frame of construction work.

**33. Update project implementation procedures.** The project implementation procedures which provide guidance for the processes required for the project should be updated. The revised procedures should ensure that, besides the institutional arrangements, the analysis of alternatives for land acquisition, compensation, livelihood restoration, information and communication, and grievance redress receive priority. In addition it must ensure ample consultation and participation of affected people; and include specific monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to ensure the accountability of all parties involved.

**B. Proposed Schedule**

34. In consultation with OSPF, the project has developed a plan of action plan seen in Appendix 3, with specific activities and timelines for activities to be implemented based on OSPF's recommendations.

**IV. CONCLUSION**

35. While OSPF was supposed to conduct only a review and assessment of the complaint, the opportunity presented itself for handling other grievances. Thanks to the willingness of all stakeholders to participate in problem solving. OSPF was able to assist in resolving all the cases, including the initial complaint. Having learned from the brief OSPF experience, the project team is confident that they can continue to implement and monitor the project activities from here on. OSPF will continue to guide the project team as required in an advisory capacity.

36. OSPF consulted with the complainants and determined that they were satisfied with OSPF's intervention to resolve their concerns. OSPF therefore considers the complaint closed.

## APPENDIX 1: Complaint Letter Sent to ADB

----- Forwarded by Integrity/OAI/ADB on 10/11/2014 07:04 AM -----

From: AB Bhandari <abbhandari@hotmail.com>  
To: "sts@eda.admin.ch" <sts@eda.admin.ch>, "priv-immu@eda.admin.ch" <priv-immu@eda.admin.ch>, "info@deza.admin.ch" <info@deza.admin.ch>,  
Cc: "southasia@eda.admin.ch" <southasia@eda.admin.ch>  
Date: 08/11/2014 04:05 PM  
Subject: Request to stop/investigate corruption and terrorizing of my family and neighbors to acquire land for road construction by DRILP under ADB-SDC funded project in Nepal

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Ammar, a resident of Pulachaur V.D.C, Myagdi, Dhaulagiri, Nepal. I would like to complain about the falsification of report and forceful activities of DRILP: Decentralized Rural Infrastructure and Livelihood Project to acquire land from local people to extend the road development project in Myagdi District. The project was named Short Resettlement Plan of BeniPakhapani Road Subproject (0+0003+000 section).

My family members (dad and mom) were put on a intense pressure from the local community leaders and project staffs to donate the land for road construction and expansion. The real owner of the land is my mother. However the project staff and local party leaders forced my dad to sign the paper without my mother's consent. Recently, the local leaders and the project people are encroaching our more land stating we are supposed to donate them as much as land the project required. I just saw the report online (here-within attached) which said that all the affected persons (APs) in the road section were interviewed/surveyed which is completely false. My mother who is the real owner of the land have never been contacted by the project staff or local leaders.

Also, in page 6 of this report it clearly states,

- Donation is unforced and not is not the result of community pressure
- Donated land shall be less than 10 percent of total land holdings

But my family were put under immense pressure by both the community leaders and DRILP staffs working in the region and they have encroached our approximately 35-40% of total land without providing any compensation or other options taking advantage of my father 's and mother's illiteracy since I was and still I am outside of Nepal for my graduate study. Therefore, on behalf of my mother (who is unable to read/write) I would like to report and request you to investigate the report legitimacy, bias and accuracy, and any wrongdoing as well as to stop this project without expanding the road construction as it is severely affecting my family as my mother's and father's health is affected severely because of the psychological effect and pressure this project's people had put on them.

At last but not the least, I heartily request you to do an investigation to see either there had been any corruptions in this project (since I already mentioned they have not asked my mother a single time but had reported all the APs were surveyed and none of their >10% land was occupied) if not why the field staffs had submitted the false/fake report? Also, I kindly request you to stop this road expansion project for the sake of my family and other affected persons (since other land owners were also forced to donate their land based on my phone talk with

the neighbor) and would like to let you know that our family (with neighbors) are planning to hire a attorney and file a case against DRILP, ADB, SDC and their staff we are directly or indirectly involved in forceful scarp/looting of our land without ours agreement if this project is not scrutinized again.

Since, I believe that both the Asian Development Bank and Swiss Development Agency's mission is to help poor people around the globe and not to let them suffer and terrorize by any means. So, I hope that you will take necessary step to stop the act of corruption and fake reporting as well as terrorizing people by local leaders and the staff of DRILP to acquire land. Please, help those affected families in this project including mine, they are desperately seeking help.

God bless you.

Please feel free to contact me if you have further questions.

Thanks

With Regards,  
Ammar

## APPENDIX 2: Community Concerns Registry

Name	Registration date	Concern	Action Taken
Ambi Kumari	14 Jan 2015	Requested for a retaining structure to protect his house, which is vulnerable to landslide due to the project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did technical survey to determine risk.</li> <li>• Endorsed retaining structure.</li> <li>• Approval from DRCC for retaining structure.</li> <li>• Agreement signed with affected person (AP) on 16 Jan 2015.</li> </ul>
Ramesh Rana	14 January 2015	Is a new owner of a plot in the project area. Was not informed of entitlements and requested for compensation for land affected by project and also to assist with his mortgage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informed AP of entitlements.</li> <li>• Informed AP that his land will be totally affected so he will be compensated.</li> <li>• Explained replacement cost as basis for compensation and determination by CDC.</li> <li>• Explained project process for assisting with mortgage.</li> <li>• Agreement signed on 16 Jan 2015.</li> </ul>
Devandra Kami	14 January 2015	Total land will be affected by project and wants compensation. Wanted to know exact amount of compensation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informed AP of entitlements.</li> <li>• Informed AP that his land will be totally affected so he will be compensated.</li> <li>• Explained replacement cost as basis for compensation and determination by CDC.</li> <li>• Told AP to wait for amended resettlement plan to be published shortly with estimate of compensation.</li> <li>• Explained appeal process if AP is not satisfied with compensation.</li> </ul>
Hari Kala	14 January 2015	Requested compensation for land loss.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to cadastral map, house will not be affected.</li> <li>• AP informed.</li> </ul>
Nagendra Bahadar Khatri	14 January 2015	Informed project that he has three plots in project area but	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project to meet with Khatri to sign documents.</li> </ul>

		only signed off on voluntary donation for two.	
Chandra Prd Shresta	14 January 2015	Road will divide land into three parts, rendering two nonviable. AP requested for realignment to save useable land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical assessment carried out and rendered realignment not possible.</li> <li>• DRCC consulted to discuss possibility of compensation for nonviable land. DRCC agreed to compensation.</li> <li>• AP informed about the impossibility of realignment and offered compensation.</li> <li>• Agreement signed by AP.</li> </ul>
Ratna Kumari Shresta	16 January 2015	Concerned about loss of house due to project alignment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ADB safeguard policy explained to AP.</li> <li>• AP assured that house will not be destroyed</li> </ul>
Gore Shahi	14 January 2015	AP requested for cadastral survey to assess how much of his land will be affected. He believes project is taking more than the survey indicates.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRCC consulted regarding the option for compensation, as drainage outlet may be on AP's land.</li> <li>• DRCC agreed to compensation if AP wants this.</li> <li>• LDO will contact AP to explain updates.</li> </ul>
REEK NGO		Requested that their office not be demolished.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRCC met to discuss and agreed not to demolish permanent structure.</li> </ul>
Narmati Bhandari	December 2013	Was not consulted regarding project and requirements. Husband had signed without her consent for voluntary donation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met with AP to explain project and entitlements.</li> <li>• AP decided not to provide any land for the project.</li> <li>• DRCC consulted regarding AP's decision and agreed that road on APs land will remain within 4 meters (as donated in Phase 1).</li> <li>• Agreement prepared and waiting for AP's signature</li> </ul>
Yam Bahadur (Man Bahadur Malla) + Sunita Molla	14 January 2015	AP's wife was concerned regarding loss of property due to municipality's criteria on ROW. Is concerned that her structure will be affected.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project agreed with municipality that structures under the project will not be affected by the</li> </ul>

			<p>municipality's criteria.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AP was given a copy of the project's letter to the municipality.</li> </ul>
Hari GC		Requested not to demolish house, which is in ROW.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRCC was consulted, and decision was taken not to demolish the house.</li> </ul>
Tek Bahadur Gharti		Requested not to demolish house, which is in ROW.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRCC was consulted, and decision was taken not to demolish the house.</li> </ul>
Padam Bahadur Gharti		Requested that religious structure in front of his house will not be destroyed due to construction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project agreed that machines will not be used for works in front of the religious structure.</li> </ul>
Beni Water Supply and Sanitation Users Association		Requested compensation for pipes to be damaged due to construction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project to present request to DRCC.</li> </ul>
Joint Land Owners Demand		Requested walkway to be preserved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project to protect the walkway.</li> </ul>
Tek Bahadur Kharti		Requested compensation for a tree.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compensation to be determined by CDC.</li> </ul>
Kahdga Mari Upadhyayani		Requested to protect potato and wheat fields.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Damage will occur to crops and should be compensated accordingly.</li> </ul>
Mahendra Daniya		Requested compensation for damage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estimate for retaining wall to protect the home done.</li> <li>• Compensation to be paid for damage to the house.</li> </ul>
Dirgha Bahadur Hamar		Compensation for a tree and bamboo.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compensation to be paid accordingly.</li> </ul>
Ramji Paudel		Request for protection of land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate structure to be constructed.</li> </ul>
Community Tap		Requires renovation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estimate has been done 25,000 rupees</li> </ul>



## APPENDIX 3: DRILP (AF) Action Plan

S. No.	Activity	Date Agreed Upon	Responsible	Remarks
1.	Prepare draft updated RP	30 Jan 2015	ADB NRM/PCU/CISC	All information has been collected regarding total holding and other socioeconomic information. The social mobilization coordinator will send socioeconomic information of newly identified 2 owners by 19 Jan. Compensation Determination Committee (CDC) meeting will be conducted in the week of 26 January 2015.
2.	Endorse updated RP	4 Feb 2015	DTO/DPO	District team will review the draft and provide supplementary information if needed. The team will also send official endorsement of the draft. Draft RP will also be shared with SARD to review.
3.	Disclose draft RP	12 Feb 2015	ADB NRM/ PCU/ DPO	For this case, NRM safeguards officer will visit the district for disclosure of the draft RP to get final endorsement on entitlement proposed in updated RP from the APs. The copies of draft RP will be made available for APs, Executive summary and proposed entitlement will be translated into Nepali language, consultation meeting will be carried out with APs to discuss the entitlement during 10-12 Feb.
4.	Resume construction work only on public land where transfer of deed of ownership is not an issue	20 Jan 2015	DDC/DPO	ADB NRM will write a letter in this regard by 16 Jan 2015.
5.	Approve updated RP	17 Feb 2015	ADB	After approval, the RP will be updated on the ADB website and project website.
6.	Complete compensation payment to APs	15 March 2015	DDC/DTO	A longer time may be required to complete the compensation process in order to follow procedures specified in the Land Acquisition Act 1977.
7.	Complete deed transfer of all plots	20 March 2015	DDC/DTO	ADB will allow resumption of work only in sections where all deeds have been transferred.

S. No.	Activity	Date Agreed Upon	Responsible	Remarks
8.	Continue effort to get connected with absentee owner	10 Feb 2015	DDC/DPO	DDC will send a letter to absentee owner informing that they will be consulted once they are in the district to discuss project modality and their choice for compensation or land donation. Absentee's families and landowner's permission will be taken to continue construction work on their land. Compensation amount required to pay for affected plot will be deposited in escrow account to ensure that APs will get compensation on time, in case they opt for compensation.
9.	Establish escrow account	20 Feb 2015	DDC	To ensure compensation amount will be readily available in case of absentee owner.
10.	Prepare field verification on implementation of updated RP	20 March 2015	PCU/CISC	To ensure that all activities regarding land compensation and deed transfer were completed on time with due process of consultation.
11.	Prepare matrix of complaints including matrix prepared by the technical team	16 Jan 2015	OSPF/ADB	The matrix includes both complaints registered in OSPF and reported in the report submitted by the technical team.
12.	Agree with PCU to allocate budget for compensation payment	26 Jan 2015	ADB NRM/ PCU	ADB's NRM will discuss with PCU and DOLIDAR to allocate sufficient budget.
13.	Improve GRC's record-keeping system	30 Jan 2015	PCU/DDC	The GRC logbook needs to be improved. GRC/GRSC must keep all records of grievances submitted either verbally or in writing in a simple format showing name, plot, grievance, and decision.
14.	Undertake capacity development training on grievance handling mechanism and consultation	31 July 2015	OSPF/SARD/NRM ADB	The training will be organized to strengthen capacity of project staff on grievance redress mechanism and in carrying out meaningful consultation with affected people and beneficiaries.