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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Asian Development Bank (ADB) is working with the Royal Government of Cambodia and other aid partners to rehabilitate the national railway in Cambodia. The Resettlement Department of the Ministry of Economy and Finance, with guidance from an Inter-Ministerial Resettlement Committee, is responsible for the implementation of the resettlement plan of the project.

On 21 November 2011, the Office of the Special Project Facilitator (OSPF) received a complaint about the Rehabilitation of the Railway in Cambodia Project. OSPF acknowledged receipt and registered the complaint on 23 November 2011. The complainants raised concerns regarding their compensation for relocating and about the poor infrastructure at the relocation sites. On 11 January 2012, OSPF determined the compliant eligible and conducted a review and assessment.

The complaint initially had 155 signatories, but after verification in the field and withdrawal of a few, total complainants went down to 116. The Cambodian Government provided compensation at replacement cost for the loss of their houses or any of their property, allowances to help families through the relocation transition, and support to restore people’s ability to earn an income. The Government will also provide a plot of land to some affected families, and these families will formally receive land title after living there for 5 years. Resettled communities were provided with access to basic services, like safe drinking water and electricity, and support to retrain and start small businesses to earn a new living. Despite this, the complainants alleged that compensation was inadequate, which forced them into debt. In addition, the resettled people were still living in hardship due to inadequate basic services. All complainants alleged that they were worse off because of the project.

The proposed course of action suggested four activities to address the concerns of the complainants. In a workshop held on 22 August 2012, the activities were planned out and roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders were determined in the implementation and monitoring of the course of action. Monitoring activities consisted of (i) five OSPF missions in 2012 and two in 2013; (ii) regular communication with the complainants through the OSPF consultant working on the ground; and (iii) Southeast Asia Department and Cambodia Resident Mission safeguards specialists’ communication and visits during the regular safeguard missions to the project.

On 3–12 February 2014, OSPF conducted its final mission to ensure that all agreed-upon activities under the course of action had been implemented and to close the complaint. OSPF, in consultation with the complainants, reviewed all activities and concluded that all outstanding issues had been completed. While the ownership of basic services and operation and maintenance issues remain a challenge, the complainants felt that they could continue these discussions on their own with the Government and ADB. With this, the complainants consider this complaint closed.
I. BACKGROUND

A. The Project

1. The Rehabilitation of the Railway in Cambodia Project aims to restore Cambodia’s railway infrastructure by rehabilitating existing railway tracks and associated structures, reconstructing the destroyed railway line to Thailand, and constructing a direct railway access to the container terminal in the port of Sihanoukville. The railway consists of two lines: the Southern Line, which connects Phnom Penh to Sihanoukville, and the Northern Line, which links Phnom Penh with Battambang in northwestern Cambodia and with Poipet on the border with Thailand, where it will connect with the railway in Thailand. The Ministry of Public Works and Transport (MPWT) is the executing agency and is also implementing the project through a project implementation team set up within MPWT. The Inter-Ministerial Resettlement Committee (IRC) is responsible for the implementation of the resettlement plan. The Asian Development Bank (ADB) is supporting the project through a loan, a supplementary loan, and the administration of a grant and technical assistance grant by the Southeast Asia Department’s (SERD) Transport and Communications Division (SETC). The governments of Australia and Malaysia and the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries Fund for International Development are cofinancing the project.1

B. The Complaint

2. On 21 November 2011, the Office of the Special Project Facilitator (OSPF) received a complaint from people affected by the project. A nongovernment organization (NGO), Bridges Across Borders Cambodia (BABC),2 submitted the complaint which comprised a letter in English with a list of complainants; another letter describing concerns and seeking solutions, and a final letter authorizing staff from BABC as their representative; a list with 140 signatories in Khmer; 15 individual complaint letters;3 and several other attachments, some in English, some in Khmer. All material in Khmer was translated into English. The complainants raised concerns related to resettlement, compensation, indebtedness, public services at relocation sites, lack of information, and consultation. OSPF acknowledged receipt and registered the complaint on 23 November 2011.

C. Determination of Eligibility

3. OSPF discussed the complaint with the director general of SERD; the director, the project officer, and the resettlement team of SETC; the country director of the Cambodia

1 ADB 2006. Report and Recommendation of the President to the Board of Directors: Proposed Loan and Administration of Loan to the Kingdom of Cambodia for the Greater Mekong Subregion Rehabilitation of the Railway in Cambodia Project. Manila (Loan 2288 for $42 million, approved on 13 December.) ADB 2009. Report and Recommendation of the President to the Board of Directors: Proposed Supplementary Loan, and Administration of Grant and Technical Assistance Grant to the Kingdom of Cambodia Greater Mekong Subregion Rehabilitation of the Railway in Cambodia Project. Manila (Supplementary Loan 2602 for $42 million, approved on 15 December). Public documents related to the loans and technical assistant activities are at: http://www.adb.org/projects/project.asp?id=37269

2 BABC is a not-for-profit NGO registered in the United States and Cambodia. On 18 May 2012, BABC officially transferred its operations to Equitable Cambodia, a Cambodian national organization that was registered in March 2012.

3 The 155 complainants include 82 females, 71 males, and two complaint letters that were signed by husband and wife jointly.
Resident Mission (CARM); and other staff and consultants previously or currently involved in the project. OSPF reviewed documentation and held two initial meetings, one via Skype with BABC and the other by videoconference with members of the IRC and MPWT, the SETC project team, and the director and country director to explain the OSPF consultation process and to introduce the local OSPF consultant. Between 21 December 2011 and 4 January 2012, the OSPF consultant visited 57 complainants along the railway tracks or in relocation sites and talked to an additional 25 signatories of the complaint by telephone. He confirmed the complainants’ contact details, recorded the nature of their individual and relocation site-related grievances, and took note of the resolutions they suggested.

4. On 5 January 2012, OSPF fielded a mission to Cambodia to meet with the NGO representatives, the project team members from CARM, Australian Aid, and some complainants to validate the consultant’s results.

5. After checking the various exclusions of the Accountability Mechanism Policy and reviewing the eligibility requirements of the Problem-Solving Phase, the mission ascertained that OSPF’s involvement would be useful. The mission determined the complaint to be eligible on 11 January 2012, and informed all the stakeholders.

II. REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT

A. Objectives and Methodology

6. The review and assessment of the complaint started on 12 January 2012. The objectives of the review and assessment were to (i) explore the history of the complaint, (ii) confirm the key stakeholders, (iii) identify the key issues of the complaint, (iv) explore the stakeholders’ readiness for joint problem solving, and (v) recommend a course of action.

7. The review and assessment report (RAR) included (i) a desk-based review of project documents, including the report and recommendation of the President, the supplementary loan and administration of grant and technical assistance grant documents, the resettlement plan, its addendum, updated resettlement plans, minutes of meetings, and e-mail communications; (ii) individual interviews with ADB staff involved in the project; (iii) individual interviews with Australian Aid staff in Cambodia; (iv) individual interviews and conversations with the director, deputy director, and staff of the Resettlement Department; (v) meetings with ADB and IRC consultants; (vi) meetings with NGOs involved in monitoring the project; and (vii) an extensive field-based assessment consisting of site visits to all the relocation sites; 118 individual interviews with signatories of the complaint and their family members, 3 of whom substituted for 3 signatories who were not available; and discussions with representatives and NGO focal points and with local authorities. The interviews followed a strict protocol and were conducted using semistructured questionnaires. In addition, small focus group discussions were conducted in relocation sites or along the railway tracks. The team, led by OSPF, included a local facilitator and a cofacilitator, both highly skilled conflict-resolution specialists, and excellent interpreters.

---

4 Formerly known as the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), which was the Australian Government agency responsible for managing Australia's overseas aid program until 31 October 2013, when it ceased to be an executive agency and was integrated into the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

5 Individual interviews are necessary to allow people to speak out freely without having their opinions inhibited by others. These interviews encourage interviewees to consider their situation and to reflect on their options. They are confidential and provide OSPF with a better sense of prevailing perceptions and opinions.
B. Identification of Stakeholders

1. The Complainants

8. The formal complainants were the 140 signatories to the complaint letter (79 females and 61 males). OSPF also included the 15 individual complainants who had not signed the complaint. It conducted individual interviews and small group discussions to understand complainants' issues. OSPF learned from the one-on-one interviews that, of the 140 signatories, most interviewees were affected persons (APs), whereas other persons who had provided their thumbprints were local representatives or NGO representatives, but not themselves affected by the project. On 24 May 2013, 20 of the complainants decided to withdraw. In July 2013, after extensive checking of the complainants, it was concluded that there were only 116 official complaints.

9. The majority of the complainants live in Phnom Penh, either along the railway tracks or at the relocation site. A smaller number of complainants live in Poipet, Battambang, or Sihanoukville. The distances from their previous locations to the relocation sites vary between a few hundred meters and around 20 kilometers. Before their relocation, the women reported that they engaged in a variety of economic activities like small-scale trading, preparing and selling food, tailoring, doing laundry, or, in some areas, agricultural labor. Men worked as motorcycle taxi drivers, porters, or agricultural laborers; raised chicken or pigs; repaired bicycles and motorbikes; or worked on fishing boats owned by others. Some went—and are still going—to Thailand for work. Wherever possible both husbands and wives, and even children, contributed to the family income. Where possible, complainants in relocation sites are maintaining their previous occupations. Some have started new income-generation activities, self-initiated or initiated with support from the project’s income-restoration program.

10. Representation. In the joint letter to OSPF, the complainants expressed their wish to be represented by BABC. In the one-on-one interviews, the majority explained that their expectation was only for BABC to submit the complaint letter to OSPF. Many of them said that they wanted to represent themselves or assign or request support from a local representative to discuss their personal and individual issues. A few requested a representative from BABC to support them.

11. Confidentiality. A majority of complainants had no problems in disclosing their names during consultations. They were aware that they were known to local authorities, since they had already complained to the commune and/or higher levels. They had also confirmed that there would be no others representing them, which meant that they had to disclose their identities.

12. The complainants raised a wide range of individual issues reflecting their life situations and the situation in the relocation sites. Overall, they were concerned with

(i) securing enough income to feed their families;
(ii) receiving adequate compensation to build a house in the relocation site;
(iii) protecting the house against flooding;
(iv) being able to repay the debts they incurred;

6 However, OSPF still needs to establish whether some of the signatories really qualify as APs. There are a few specific cases that will require OSPF to undertake additional inquiries and consult with specialists.
7 These local representatives are sometimes APs themselves. Sometimes they have already been working with the communities for a number of years as NGO representatives. In some of the locations, they helped APs file complaints to local authorities, and they also support problem solving through the local authorities.
(v) receiving income opportunities;
(vi) ensuring safe access to schools and health centers;
(vii) securing access to and maintenance of utilities in the relocation site (water, electricity, and drainage);
(viii) making the access to the highway safe and usable throughout the year;
(ix) obtaining adequate information about the project;
(x) having a transparent local structure, with a village chief based at the relocation site;
(xi) being consulted on issues that affect them and their families (e.g., the type of income generation they can undertake);\(^8\) and
(xii) ensuring a conducive and safe environment in consultations.

13. Some complainants were concerned with

(i) continuing their lives between the railway tracks and a walled plot of land,
(ii) protecting their houses from erosion,
(iii) receiving compensation for construction-related damage, and
(iv) obtaining information about the drainage system that is supposed to be installed.

14. Most complainants interviewed were willing to contribute time and effort to addressing the issues and solving problems.\(^9\) Some indicated that they had already complained to local authorities, and a few mentioned that they had received information about their concerns being addressed. Views of the complainants about their needs not being met included

(i) anger, disappointment, and despair among the people;
(ii) approaching NGOs to help explore other solutions;
(iii) continue filing of complaints and asking for more information;
(iv) moving the complaint up to higher levels; and
(v) holding demonstrations.

2. The Complainants’ Representatives and Other Nongovernment Organizations

15. BABC facilitated the complaint, sent it to OSPF, and also explained how it sees its role and responsibilities. Overall, about eight NGOs (including BABC) monitored sections of the project.\(^10\) Some of them are based in Phnom Penh, others in the provinces. They provide training and advice to APs, help them prepare complaints, and support them in finding solutions to complaints - as much as possible with local authorities. Their major concerns were related to

(i) ensuring that adequate information is available in Khmer to stakeholders, in particular the APs;
(ii) establishing and maintaining collaborative relationships with the government, with ADB, and among each other;
(iii) ensuring that APs understand the resettlement activities, including the detailed measurement survey and the categorization of their houses, and that they are paid appropriate compensation;

---

\(^8\) One complainant said: “I want to be included in the decision on whether they give us cows, pigs, chickens, or ducks for raising, or provide us with space for raising fish.”

\(^9\) Another complainant said: “I can participate and welcome all processes to find solutions.”

\(^10\) From the information provided by different NGOs, OSPF understands that there exist a Resettlement Action Network and also two working groups dealing with resettlement issues on the railway rehabilitation project.
(iv) protecting APs’ rights, including—among other things—the right to appropriate compensation and housing and the right to complain;
(v) ensuring that the resettlement plan is implemented in compliance with ADB policy;
(vi) making sure that APs are enabled to reestablish similar or better living conditions;
(vii) ensuring that APs outside the corridor of impact, but within the right of way, will not be affected negatively; and
(viii) exploring ways to get involved in collaborative problem solving.

3. **Government and Related Agencies**

16. A number of government agencies and entities were involved in making decisions and/or providing inputs and expertise on issues related to the complaint: (i) IRC, (ii) MPWT, and (iii) local authorities.

17. Concerns expressed by the government representatives included

(i) ensuring that consultations with APs prior to each step in the resettlement process were comprehensive and appropriate;
(ii) making sure that APs understood the activities;
(iii) ensuring fairness and equal treatment of all APs, and avoiding jealousies;
(iv) clarifying misunderstandings with NGOs;
(v) establishing regular mechanisms (monthly, quarterly, and external monitoring) to elaborate on issues and find solutions;
(vi) cooperating with other ministries for public services in relocation sites;
(vii) ensuring compliance with ADB policies and Cambodian laws;
(viii) staying within budget; and
(ix) ensuring that the resettlement activities are completed in a timely way.

4. **Consultants**

18. Resettlement consultants, the external monitor, and consultants responsible for the implementation of the income-restoration program were also interviewed. Their responsibilities vary but included (i) provision of capacity development to local authorities, (ii) assistance in resolving APs’ grievances, (iii) updating the grievance data base, and (iv) mapping and monitoring of the relocation sites. In addition, they support the Government and SETC in the implementation of the resettlement activities and help monitor that the project is in compliance with the ADB Resettlement Policy.

5. **Australian Aid**

19. The Government of Australia provides joint cofinancing and financing for technical assistance for the project. Australian Aid is closely involved in the project; participates in field missions, consultations, and meetings; and shares its observations with ADB and the Government in the spirit of working collaboratively to respond to issues.

20. Australian Aid’s primary concerns were

(i) ensuring a workable, constructive environment for the implementation of resettlement activities, including the income restoration program;
(ii) focusing on what APs need and on realistic expectations within the ADB policies;
(iii) ensuring that AusAID money is used appropriately;
(iv) ensuring that the resettlement process is transparent, fair, and equitable; and
(v) ensuring that the grievance redress mechanisms are functioning and that complaints get resolved as much as possible at the local level.

6. Southeast Asia Department’s Transport and Communications Division and Cambodia Resident Mission

21. SETC is responsible for the administration of the project. The project officer was out-posted to CARM. One international and one local resettlement specialist based in CARM monitor the project and provide advice and guidance to the IRC. Another international resettlement specialist based in SETC has been involved in the project since its design stage and regularly monitors the implementation of resettlement activities. SETC/CARM mentioned that information provided to them by NGOs over the past years has helped them identify issues and action for improvements to be made in the implementation of the project.

22. SETC/CARM’s primary concerns were related to

(i) securing APs’ livelihoods;
(ii) ensuring that the APs and their concerns are the focus of implementation activities;
(iii) ensuring that APs receive comprehensive and timely information about resettlement activities and that consultations are appropriate and help APs make decisions;
(iv) establishing and maintaining constructive relationships with all stakeholders, including NGOs;
(v) guiding and supporting the Government in implementing the resettlement activities;
(vi) making sure that the project is compliant with ADB policies; and
(vii) making sure that the relocation process is completed within the next 6–12 months.

C. Findings and Recommendations

23. Based on conversations with stakeholders, most specifically with the complainants, OSPF concluded that the complaint could be resolved through a problem-solving process. Complainants were willing to consult and find solutions. At the time, there were already signs in some of the relocation sites that the communities were restoring their livelihoods and were committed to making a life in the new site. Many were appreciative of the fact that they would own a plot of land by relocating. All stakeholders agreed that efforts should focus on the APs and their common interests in valuing their new living conditions. Trust and willingness to engage were necessary to jointly resolve problems.

24. There was broad acknowledgement that the complaint issues were legitimate and should be addressed. All stakeholders interviewed for the review and assessment were willing to participate in meetings or other forums with other stakeholders to address issues and solve problems. All stakeholders understood and recognized that resettlement is a highly complex undertaking, and that there are challenges that would require joint efforts from all partners to implement it well.

25. In March 2013, OSPF received confirmation that the complainants had received the RAR and had agreed to continue with the problem-solving process.
D. Proposed Course of Action

26. The proposed course of action was based on stakeholders' suggestions to address the complaint. A multistakeholder workshop was organized on 22 August 2012 to finalize the course of action and determine a timetable for its implementation.

27. The course of action recommended four activities with specific objectives as follows:

- **Capacity development on problem-solving** for local level actors (complainants and their chosen representatives; and local authorities, including the IRC person responsible for interaction at the local level). Sessions were developed based on participants’ needs and were conducted at the local level. The objectives of the sessions were to help participants (i) understand the practice of a collaborative approach; (ii) understand the practice of effective representation and responsibilities; (iii) acquire skills related to consultation, feedback, information, and communication; and (iv) understand the grievance redress mechanism at the local level. Activity (iv) included persons responsible for construction, e.g., contractors, supervision consultant’s staff, etc., to ensure that construction-related impacts could be reported and dealt with expeditiously.

- **Consultation workshops at relocation sites** involving complainants and their chosen representatives, other APs, village chiefs, local authorities, consultants for the Expanded Income-Restoration Program (EIRP) as resource persons, IRC, SERD, and Australian Aid representatives. The objectives of these workshops were to (i) inform the complainants and other APs about the EIRP, (ii) provide complainants and other APs an opportunity to raise their concerns and interests in the program, and (iii) agree on the development of plans that would include APs’ interests and needs.

- **Planning workshops** for the stakeholders at the relocation sites to process and integrate inputs from the previous consultations toward relocation site-specific development plans. These workshops were organized and facilitated in close cooperation with local authorities and the consultants responsible for the EIRP. The objective was to agree on a plan including activities, responsibilities, and time frames, to be signed by representatives from each stakeholder group.

- **Individual mediation sessions** with complainants, their chosen representatives, and the authorities responsible for the implementation of the resettlement activities to arrive at specific solutions focusing on complainants’ individual concerns, interests, and needs, with agreements to be signed by the parties and monitored by OSPF.

III. COURSE OF ACTION

28. From August to October 2012, OSPF set out to implement capacity-development workshops in Poipet, Battambang, Sihanoukville, and Phnom Penh. These workshops were organized in each area and aimed at assisting all stakeholders to understand problem solving and how each party could contribute in resolving issues.

29. The 1-day Capacity-Development Workshop on Problem Solving was designed to orient and equip all parties, specially the APs, with targeted skills to prepare them for the one-on-one sessions and at the same time to instill the importance of collaborative problem solving. The workshop was divided into five key components: (i) importance of working together, (ii) briefing on the one-on-one session, (iii) assertive communication skills, (iv) styles of conflict management, and (v) creative problem solving.
30. One-on-one sessions with APs followed the capacity-development workshop on problem solving. The purpose of the one-on-one session was to resolve the individual concerns of APs lodged in the complaint. The complaints of the APs varied from disagreement on the compensation received, dissatisfaction with the facilities provided at relocation sites, to indebtedness, among others. In each session, APs were given the opportunity to voice their complaints. Through mediation, OSPF facilitated a dialogue among APs, IRC, ADB, and Australian Aid. In cases where the complaint involved a disagreement on compensation, IRC, ADB, and Australian Aid walked the APs through their agreements/contracts. This helped APs to understand the policy regarding compensation, and how their compensation was calculated based on the size and type of their home. There were instances when discrepancies were found in the contracts. IRC corrected these, which resulted in additional compensation for many APs. There were also instances wherein APs were not entitled to any additional compensation. In each session, an agreement was signed by the AP, IRC, and OSPF to underline the agreement made and that the problem had been resolved.

31. OSPF reviewed 116 individual complaints regarding compensation (see table). The review resulted in agreements with a total of 88 affected households that would receive additional compensation. 13 of these households have been given the option to relocate with additional compensation. However, relocation of these households requires an addendum resettlement plan which is in the process of finalization. IRC and ADB will address the 13 cases upon approval of the addendum resettlement plan.

### Results of One-on-One Sessions to Resolve Issues Regarding Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resettlement Site</th>
<th>With Additional Compensation</th>
<th>Rejected Offer</th>
<th>Move to Resettlement Site</th>
<th>Correct Compensation</th>
<th>Samroang To Be Decided Later</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poipet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battambang</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sihanoukville</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samroang</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>116</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Complaints were also made about the infrastructure and services provided at the relocation sites. OSPF held assessment workshops from November 2012 through January 2013 to investigate these problems and resolve them through a multistakeholder problem-solving process. In Poipet, complaints were related to water and roads, while in Battambang they were only about water. In Poipet, water supply through pumps is provided for the community. However, the complaints related to drainage, as pipes are constantly clogged, which leads to flooding. Roads are badly damaged, making them inaccessible during rainy season. In Battambang, APs complained about access to water, as the water system provided by the project is too far from their homes. During the collaborative problem-solving discussion in both areas, solutions were discussed and agreed upon.

33. In all sites, APs, local government, IRC, and ADB agreed that each stakeholder should play its role in resolving the problems. In each site, for example, a water-user group or
maintenance group was established to organize the community to collect and pay for operation and maintenance (O&M) of their water systems and/or roads. In Battambang, the local government and the project assisted in construction of household connections. Households pay for their connections and water use. The tariff for water was agreed upon by the community through a village meeting led by the water-user group. The water-user group to date is responsible for O&M of the water system and the collection of water fees from the households.

34. The ADB project was designed to include income restoration for relocated APs. These programs the Income-Restoration Program led by IRC, and the EIRP led by ADB are designed to help the relocated community to (i) be trained in new skills; (ii) have access to savings, and loans to assist them build their homes or start new businesses; and (iii) have access to the social safety net fund to cover emergency costs, among others. A workshop on the IRP and EIRP was organized for APs to encourage their active participation. Through membership in these programs, APs would have access to loans and savings, which they will manage themselves. These programs offer a tremendous opportunity for APs to restore and improve their lives in the new relocation sites, in addition to helping with current debts.

35. By February 2013, committees were established in all relocation sites, and calls for proposals made to local contractors for the small infrastructure works required. In some relocation sites, the communities had already contributed financially for these works. OSPF, in discussion with Australian Aid, agreed that, while communities in relocation sites would share costs in these works, Australian Aid would finance most part of the infrastructure works. Australian Aid funding would also be used to engage an engineer to oversee these works. In May 2013, a memorandum of understanding was signed between Australian Aid and SETC, through OSPF, for the financing of the small infrastructure works required at each relocation site.

36. After the elections in Cambodia, monitoring activities resumed in August 2013. Discussions with APs at each site were held, focusing on the small infrastructure works identified. The newly engaged engineer further discussed the technical options and costing of the small infrastructure works, and decisions were made and implemented as follows:

- **Battambang**: Construction of an overhead water reservoir and piping to permit household water connections. The current water provision comes from a pond with a filtration system. A water committee was established with the responsibility for operating and maintaining the water system. Household water connections each have a meter to calculate water usage, and payment of each household for O&M. The village and Sangkat chief participate as members of the committee to facilitate the relationship with the local authorities for future assistance related to the water system.

- **Sihanoukville**: Construction of a deep well and repair of the main access road in the relocation site. The APs had water provision through shallow wells. However, this water is insufficient during the dry season and is contaminated. A deep well now secures access to water throughout the year. The access road to the relocation site was damaged due to poor drainage and flooding during the rainy season. A laterite road with proper drainage was provided. The O&M of the well and road will be the responsibility of the water committee established. Local authorities are also active

---

11 Each of Cambodia's 23 provinces is divided into districts. In Phnom Penh, the districts are called Khan, and their subdivisions called Sangkat.
and participate as members of the committee. Community members contributed towards the repairs of the road, and this fund will be used for its future maintenance.

- **Poipet:** The drainage system and roads in the relocation site were severely damaged due to various factors, e.g., heavy trucks coming into the relocation site for construction of houses, bad drainage, etc. Evaluation of the site by the engineer resulted in a recommendation to reconstruct the drainage system and repair the roads. Due to the high costs required for the repairs, OSPF referred the problem to the project. ADB, Australian Aid, and IRC will look into the funding requirements for the work. In the meantime, OSPF funded the grading of the roads to enable easy access. The grading of the roads provides only a temporary solution. The project will therefore need to work on a permanent solution as soon as possible. A study of the new drainage system and costing was provided to ADB, Australian Aid, and IRC by the engineer for reference.

To prevent clogging of the drains, a clean environment campaign was held to encourage the community to collect and dispose of their garbage regularly. OSPF provided the community with large garbage bins. The local authorities signed a contract with a private company for collection of the garbage. The campaign was led by the vice governor and a committee established to assist with O&M of the drainage, road, and garbage collection. The committee will also be responsible for collecting a small fee from each household for the garbage collection.

A new school was constructed by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports at the site. There is, however, a pond near the school that could endanger children. OSPF constructed a fence around the pond and filled the area around the school fence with soil to raise the ground level and close gaps in the fence.

- **Trapeang Anh Chanh:** The APs at the relocation site seem to be well settled and progressing well with their livelihoods. The project’s effort in restoring livelihoods is having some impact, as the APs are happy and well organized. No urgent infrastructure needs were identified. OSPF did notice, however, that the environment around the community could be further improved in terms of cleanliness. Garbage collection was seen as a problem, and OSPF conducted a clean environment campaign here to encourage the community to regularly collect and dispose of their garbage. Garbage bins were provided and placed along a route for easy collection and disposal. The village chief provided a truck to collect and dispose of the garbage. A minimal fee was collected from each household for the weekly collection and disposal. A committee was established to collect the money and encourage the community members to use the garbage bins. It must be noted that after two collections and disposal runs, many people stopped using the garbage bins. Aside from the fact that the community does not want to pay for their garbage collection, not having a dumping site close to or within the community is worrisome. Transporting the garbage to a distant dumping site is costly. The need for a more sustainable solution to garbage collection and dumping has been shared with the project.

From September 2013 to February 2014, infrastructure works were carried out at all the relocation sites. Regular monitoring visits by OSPF and the local consultant were carried out. A final monitoring visit was held on 4–12 February 2014 to inspect all infrastructure work and close the complaint. Visits to all relocation sites were made, and workshops
were held with APs to confirm that all activities under the course of action were completed. In all relocation sites, the community was appreciative of the improved infrastructure and knowledge gained from the OSPF process.
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