

ELECTRICITY OF VIETNAM
TRUNG SON HYDROPOWER PROJECT

**CONSTRUCTION – OPERATION ROAD
TRUNG SON HYDROPOWER PLANT**

REPORT
ON
Independent Resettlement Monitoring
(Mission I)

Monitored and reported by:
Centre for Community Development Studies (CECODES)
Independent Monitoring Organization -IMO

Ha Noi, August 2009

Table of Contents

PART I. INTRODUCTION	5
1. Project overview	5
1.1. <i>Project objective</i>	<i>5</i>
1.2 <i>Construction – operation road</i>	<i>6</i>
2. Scope and level of impacts by the road alignment	6
2.1 <i>Number of AHs</i>	<i>6</i>
2.2 <i>Area of land acquired</i>	<i>7</i>
2.3 <i>Other assets affected.....</i>	<i>7</i>
3. Natural, socioeconomic conditions in the project area	8
3.1 <i>Natural conditions</i>	<i>8</i>
3.2 <i>Population characteristics.....</i>	<i>8</i>
3.3 <i>Characteristics of affected groups of ethnic minority</i>	<i>8</i>
3.4 <i>Family structure</i>	<i>9</i>
3.5 <i>Relations between Thai, Muong and Kinh groups</i>	<i>9</i>
4. Living conditions of local people.....	10
5. Status of land-use of AHs	10
PART II. OBJECTIVES AND TASKS OF RP INDEPENDENT MONITORING	10
2. Detailed tasks	11
2.1 <i>Verifying RP internal monitoring results</i>	<i>11</i>
2.2 <i>Site monitoring</i>	<i>11</i>
2.3 <i>Reporting</i>	<i>11</i>
PART III. MONITORING METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH	11
1. Monitoring approach	11
2. Methodology	11
3. Monitoring methods.....	12
3.1. <i>Quantitative method</i>	<i>12</i>
3.2. <i>Qualitative method</i>	<i>12</i>
4. Implementation arrangement	12
PART IV. MONITORING RESULTS	13
1. Appraising internal reports and RPs	13
2. Site monitoring results	13
2.1 <i>Information dissemination and AHs consultation</i>	<i>13</i>
2.2 <i>DMS of affected assets.....</i>	<i>15</i>
2.3 <i>Compensation plan.....</i>	<i>16</i>
2.4 <i>Compensation payment.....</i>	<i>20</i>
2.5 <i>Life and livelihood recovery of AHs</i>	<i>22</i>
2.6 <i>Land acquisition and resettlement.....</i>	<i>24</i>
2.7 <i>Complaints and grievance redress mechanism</i>	<i>25</i>
2.8 <i>Allocation of counterpart fund for compensation.....</i>	<i>25</i>
2.9 <i>Satisfaction of AHs</i>	<i>26</i>
2.10 <i>Compliance with the resettlement progress and civil works schedule</i>	<i>26</i>
3. Pending issues	27

PART V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	27
1. Conclusions	27
2. Recommendations	28
Appendix	

Abbreviation

AP	Affected people
CECODES	Centre for Community Support Development Studies
CPC	Commune People's Committee
DMS	Detailed Measurement Survey
DPC	District People's Committee
EVN	Electricity of Vietnam
FS	Feasibility Study
GoV	Government of Vietnam
HH	Household
RC	Resettlement Committee
IMO	Independent Monitoring Organization
PMB	Project Management Unit
PPC	Provincial People's Committee
RF	Resettlement Frameworks
RP	Resettlement Plan

PART I. INTRODUCTION

1. Centre for Community Support Development Studies (CECODES) was selected to be the Independent monitoring organization for Resettlement Implementation of constructing access and operation road to Trung Son Hydropower Project as stated in the Contract No. 04.1/2009/HĐTV-TĐTS-P2, signed on February 20th 2009 by and between CECODES and the Project Management Unit of Trung Son Hydropower Project (Trung Son PMB) under Electricity of Vietnam (EVN). In accordance with the Contract, CECODES shall undertake two missions of monitoring the resettlement implementation in the Construction – Operation road of Trung Son hydropower plant from February 2009 to May 2010.

2. Following the resettlement implementation progress carried out by the Resettlement Committees (RC) of districts in the Correspondence No. 953 TĐTS_P3 dated July 28th 2009, Trung Son PMB requested CECODES to mobilize consultants for the first monitoring mission in this road. The monitoring results are presented in the report in compliance with the outline: Part I. Introduction to Trung Son Hydropower project and the Construction – Operation road to Trung Son hydropower plant; Part II: Objectives and tasks of Independent monitoring; Part III: Monitoring methodology and method; Part IV: Monitoring results; Part V: Conclusions and recommendations for bettering RP implementation. The Report also includes Appendixes.

1. Project overview

1.1. Project objective

3. As shown on the Master Plan of Ma River which was approved by Ministry of Industry (now Ministry of Trade and Industry) in Decision No. 1195/QĐ-NLDC dated 31/3/2005, Trung Son hydropower project would be built on Ma river in Uon village, Trung Son commune, Quan Hoa district in Thanh Hoa province. The location is 195 km from Thanh Hoa city to the northwest. The catchment responding to the dam alignment is about 12,175 m² and the reservoir is about 9.5 km from Vietnam-Laos boundary in the Vietnam territory. The Project feasibility study (FS) was approved by Prime Minister of GoV in Decision No. 865/TTg-CN.

4. Trung Son is a multi-purpose project of which the main purpose is to generate electricity and upload to the national grid with a capacity of 260 MW. In addition, other purposes of the project are: (i) to control floods with a capacity of 112 million m³ for the downstream; (ii) to supply irrigation water for the downstream of Ma river and (iii) to prevent and control saline water intrusion in dry season.

5. The project was designed in compliance with Vietnamese standard - TCVN 285/2002 and applied with relevant international standards. The main components of the project are: (i) one 88 m high dam, (ii) one reservoir with NWL at 160m (Option of Alignment 4) and flood peak responding to flood probability of 100 years; Water level at dead storage is at 150 m and dead storage of 236.40 x 10⁶ m³; (iii) 6-gated spillway at elevation 145m; (iv) the energy alignment (intake 235.5 m long with 5.5 m diameter; (v) operation house of the hydropower plant is on the left side of the dam;

(vi): access road, spillway, O&M road; (vii) discharge channel: 80 m long, 70 m wide (bottom width); (viii) transmission line; and (ix) quarry, construction camps, etc.

1.2 Construction – operation road

6. As stated in FS (equivalent to Investment Report), the construction – operation road on the left side is the only road connecting to the National road No. 15A, crossing the National Road 15A at Co Luong T-junction. Materials, machines (including super-length, super-load) for the construction of Trung Son hydropower plant are all transferred and transported on this road. This road abbreviated as Co Luong – Co Me road, comprising of (1) Co Luong bridge (one road end connecting to National Road 15A); (2) Co Me bridge (one road end connecting with the construction site of the Hydropower plant); and one road connecting Co Luong bridge with Co Me bridge, the total length of the road alignment is 22 km.

7. Presently this road is a small and narrow earth-road without bridges at the both ends therefore, it does not meet the transportation requirements for materials and machines (particularly super-length, super-load). Thus, it is necessary to build up this road in advance in order to facilitate the transportation and construction in general of Trung Son hydropower plant.

8. The construction of road and bridges shall affect the life and production of households living along the road in 15 villages in 5 communes (Trung Son, Thanh Son, Phu Thanh communes of Quan Hoa district, Thanh Hoa province, and Mai Hich and Van Mai commune of Mai Chau district, Hoa Binh province). The survey, RP preparation, land acquisition and resettlement and compensation for affected households are done by PMB and RCs of Quan Hoa and Mai Chau districts.

2. Scope and level of impacts by the road alignment

2.1 Number of AHs

9. As DMS data collected by Quan Hoa and Mai Chau RCs in the approved RP and updated RP for the road, the road alignment affected a total of 480 HHs, of which 355 AHs are in Quan Hoa and 125 AHs are in Mai Chau. There were 79 AHs identified as severely affected households, of which 66 HHs were affected houses and had to relocate and 13 AHs were lost more than 25% of total agricultural landholdings. Two groups of ethnic minorities who are affected are Thai and Muong. Compared with the number of AHs mentioned in RP as 451 AHs, AHs in the actual survey increases to 29 HHs. These AHs mainly affected with tombs. However, actual relocation AHs reduce 19 HHs (in RP, relocation AHs totals 85 HHs). The difference is that when RP was prepared, the affected area was identified on the base of preliminary design of the road, and while DMS was done on the land-marked for acquisition defined in the detailed design of the road. Details of affected HHs are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Classification of HHs affected by the road

Province	Number of AHs						
	Severe AHs (relocation, losing shops or losing >25% of total landholdings)				Marginal AHs (losing <25% of total land holdings)	Total AHs and APs	
	Relocation AHs	AHs losing shops	AHs losing > 25% total landholdings	Total number		AHs	APs
Thanh Hoa	57	18	0	57	298	355	na

<i>Hoa Binh</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>125</i>	<i>na</i>
Total	66	19	13	79	401	480	

Note: Some AHs affected house, shop and land.

Source: DMS data provided by PMB and RCs .

2.2 Area of land acquired

10. The area of land acquired for constructing the road in two districts totals 350,921.74m² (about 35.09 ha), including temporary and permanent acquisition. The area of land actually acquired is reduced by 24.8 ha compared with the area estimated in RP. This is explained that DMS was based on the landmark for land acquisition and cadastral map of each AH meanwhile the data in RP was only estimated. Details are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Classification of land affected by the road

<i>Land acquired</i>						
<i>Area of land acquired</i>						<i>Total (ha)</i>
<i>Province</i>	<i>Residential land (ha)</i>	<i>Garden land (ha)</i>	<i>Forestry land (ha)</i>	<i>Aqua. land (ha)</i>	<i>Other land (ha)</i>	
<i>Thanh Hoa</i>	<i>1.8</i>	<i>0.6</i>	<i>26.3</i>	<i>0.02</i>	<i>0.4</i>	<i>29.12</i>
<i>Hoa Binh</i>	<i>0.43</i>	<i>1.93</i>	<i>2.97</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0.69</i>	<i>6.02</i>
Total	2.23	2.53	29.27	0.02	1.09	35.14

Source: DMS data provided by PMB and RCs .

2.3 Other assets affected

11. Other assets of AHs in two districts total 6,465m² of houses in all types, 617m² of animal sheds, 622m³ of house foundation, 469.4 m² of shop, 18,348 m² of vegetables and crops, and 46,125 trees. Details are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Classification of affected assets by the road

<i>Other assets affected</i>				
<i>Province</i>	<i>House (m²)</i>	<i>Shops (m²)</i>	<i>Crops, vegetables (m²)</i>	<i>Trees (tree)</i>
<i>Thanh Hoa</i>	<i>5,068m² houses and kitchens; 617m² of animal sheds, temporary stores; 146m³ foundation of houses, yards</i>	<i>450.25</i>	<i>11,985.8</i>	<i>73,005.00</i>
<i>Hoa Binh</i>	<i>1,397.58m² house; 476.7m³ foundation of rock and brick masonry</i>	<i>19.2</i>	<i>6,362.23</i>	<i>24,649 (trees) different trees; 21,476.16 (m²/canopy) different trees;</i>
Total	6,465	469.4	18,348	24,649

Source: DMS data provided by PMB and RCs .

3. Natural and socioeconomic conditions in the project area

3.1 Natural conditions

12. The project area locates in communes in the mountainous areas in northwestern part of Hoa Binh province and in the northern part of Thanh Hoa province, about 80 km from Hoa Binh city. The project area geophysically locates in coordinate of 20°24' to 20°45' of northern latitude and 104°31' to 105°16' eastern longitude.

13. Though these mountainous communes of the two provinces are far from provincial towns and transportation and travel are difficult the project area has an importation position in socioeconomic development of two provinces, with an economic exchange market with Son La neighboring province. Because the project is in gate of the northwestern region so in future upon the completion of Trung Son hydropower plant many advantages shall be brought to the regional socioeconomic development.

3.2 Population characteristics

14. The territory of the five project communes affected by the access road and bridges has 2,988 households (HHs) with 13,130 people (statistics in 2007), and average family size of 4.4 people. The natural population growth rate in this region is 3% per year. This is a quite high rate compared with other localities in Thanh Hoa and Hoa Binh provinces.

15. Population of labour age totals 6,052 people (making up 46% of total population), of which agricultural labor makes up approximately 98% and only 2% are non-agricultural workers. This should be given due attention to when the production or income recovery measures are prepared for AHs in order to ensure that these are suitable with their jobs.

16. Key ethnic groups living in the project area are Thái, Mường, and Kinh. They lived there for many years. Although each ethnic group has distinct cultural identity, they are always solidarity and help each other in their life and production.

3.3 Characteristics of affected groups of ethnic minority

a) Thái group

17. Thái group live focally in Lai Chau, Son La, Hoa Binh, Thanh Hoa and Nghe An provinces. The project area is a long-time residential area of Thai group, probably 400 - 500 years of history. Family names of Thái ethnics mainly are ~~ab~~ Bể, Bua, Bun, Cà (Hà, Kha, Mào, Sa), Cầm, Chầu, Chiêu, Đèo, Điều, Hà, Hoàng, Khảm Leo, Lèo, Lềm (Lâm, Lịm), Lý, Lũ (Lụ, La), Lộc, Lự, Lượng (Lương), Manh, Mè, Nam, Nông, Ngàn, Nguru, Nho, Nhật, Panh, Pha, Phia, Quàng (Hoàng, Vàng), Quảng, Sầm, Tạ, Tày, Tao (Đào), Tạo, Vang, Vỡ (Vi), Xa (Sa), Xin, etc. Thái people speak the original Tai language of Tai – Kadai linguistic family.

18. Thái people have rich experiences in making weirs and small dams, digging canals and making suspended chutes to get water for irrigation. Paddy rice is the main food, particularly sticky rice. Thai people also cultivate rice, vegetables and other crops on terrain fields. In addition, they raise cattle, poultry, do handicrafts such as knitting, weaving brocades, and some of them make pottery. Well-known products of Thai are brocades with unique colorful patterns which are long-lasting and beautiful.

b) Mường group

19. Mường people, also named Mol, Mual, Moi, Moi bi, Au tổ, Ao tổ, is an ethnic group living in mountainous area in northern part of Vietnam and they live most densely in Hoa Binh province and mountainous districts of Thanh Hoa province. Mường people live and cultivate permanently in areas where productive land is available, close to roads and convenient to work and travel.

20. Mường people are by tradition farmers and paddy rice is their main food crop. Significant secondary income of Muong families is exploiting forestry products such as agaric, cat's ear, bastard cardamom, sticklac, cinnamon, honey, timber, bamboo, rattan, etc. Typical handicrafts of Muong are weaving, knitting, reeling silkworms, etc. Many Muong women do weaving with quite sophisticated skills.

3.4 Family structure

21. The family structure of ethnic minorities in the project of the road and bridges now has significantly changed. Regardless of whether they are of Thai or Muong group, now, there are few traditional families with three or four generations living together (extensive family), comprising of some nuclear families living under one roof. Various reasons are attributed to explain this fact, but firstly, it is usually explained with one economic reason: now land is owned by the State and the State assigns land-use rights to family households. Therefore, each large family, if it splits into small or nuclear families has opportunities to receive more land than they can assemble as one large family. In addition, splitting into nuclear families facilitates the economic development of each family to be more active and autonomous compared with being dependent within a large family.

3.5 Relations between Thai, Muong and Kinh groups

22. Thái and Mường groups in the area of the access road and bridges as well as in other areas in Vietnam live together and have good relations with Kinh groups. In project communes, Thai, Muong and Kinh people reside intermingled and get on well together, learning each other about production experiences. In fact, there is no bar to marriage between ethnic groups and male and female of different ethnic groups intermarry. This reflects the increasing integration among ethnic groups in the area of the access road and bridges specifically and in the country in general. Although there is different customs and habits, Kinh and minority groups in the project area are solidarity and without conflict of culture or minority groups. This is advantage in

making resettlement arrangements in the project, helping to make the integration between settlers and host communities easier and faster.

4. Living conditions of local people

23. In general, living conditions of people in communes of Mai Chau district (Hoa Binh) are better than those of communes in Quan Hoa district (Thanh Hoa). HHs in affected communes of Mai Chau district have access to national electric grid, meanwhile in Quan Hoa districts, affected communes do not have access to national electric grid, some HHs use electricity from small hydropower sources that they invested or built themselves and some of them use oil lamps.

24. Most of surveyed HHs have quite good stilt houses, some remaining HHs have houses graded 3 or 4. Most of HHs use water for domestic activities by taking water from stream to the village by gravity, only a few of them use dug-well water. About 60% of them have simple toilets made of bamboo or thatch; the remaining 40% do not have toilets.

25. Main income sources of HHs are foods, about 338 kg/person/year on average. In addition, HHs also gain other incomes from garden, husbandry and forestry economy such as planting production forests. On average, each HH gains 6-15 million VND/year, of which the income from agriculture makes up 3-5 million VND/year and 3-10 million VND/year from forestry. Severely affected poor HHs in the five communes affected by the the access road and bridges total 16 (12 AHs in Thanh Hoa and 4 AHs in Hoa Binh). Results of the monitoring (interview and observation) showed that there was not much difference of economic aspect between ethnic minority people and Kinh people affected by the access road and bridges .

5. Status of land-use of AHs

26. The land acquired from AHs comprises of residential land (housing land and garden land), agricultural land for annual and perennial crops, aquaculture land and productive forestry land. Most of AHs have LURCs (Red book). There is no case of land conflict between HHs or of public land encroachment. Because, these communes are on high and far mountains so there is no land trade or speculation. Therefore, there is no change of land price in the project area. This facilitates the application of compensation unit rate for land affected.

PART II. OBJECTIVES AND TASKS OF RP INDEPENDENT MONITORING

1. Independent monitoring objectives

27. Monitoring the implementation of land acquisition, resettlement, compensation and assistance in the Project aims at (i) verifying RP internal monitoring results; (ii) checking whether the resettlement, compensation and rehabilitation of life of AHs are in compliance with RPs and are equal to or better than

the pre-project conditions; (iii) evaluating the effectiveness, impacts and sustainability of the resettlement; and (iv) recommending necessary adjustments to the land acquisition, resettlement and compensation for other project components.

2. Detailed tasks

2.1 Verifying RP internal monitoring results

28. Reviewing RP internal monitoring results, appraising RPs and other related documents to the project in order to check and verify whether the RP implementation is compliant with the objectives, requirements and tasks specified in the RP. These documents are provided by PMB and District RCs .

2.2 Site monitoring

29. Checking at site the information dissemination, DMS, compensation payment, relocation, land acquisition, livelihood restoration, grievance redress mechanism and consultation with AHs, particularly with the affected ethnic people, and the compliance with the RP implementation progress with the construction schedule in order to determine whether these comply with the RP provisions.

30. Evaluating whether RP objectives are achieved, particularly the recovery of livelihood, income and life conditions of AHs. Evaluating level of satisfaction of AHs on the compensation and resettlement, difficulties and actions taken in RP implementation process that are encountered by PMB and RCs.

2.3 Reporting

31. The data and information collected from the site visits are processed and stored in the resettlement database providing a base for future monitoring and evaluation. IMO shall prepare a full report on independent monitoring of RP implementation as well as on solutions recommended to overcome pending issues.

PART III. MONITORING METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH

1. Monitoring approach

32. The participatory approach was applied in the monitoring. Accordingly, AHs participated in the monitoring process by answering questions and group discussion, and by monitoring staff visiting affected areas. Representatives of the PMB, district RCs , CPCs of affected communes also participated in the monitoring process by being interviewed, and having group discussion with the monitoring specialists.

2. Methodology

33. The monitoring was carried out by combination of various methods, such as document analysis, quantitative method (sampling surveys, interviews with

questionnaires) and qualitative method (in-depth interview, group discussion with key officials and AHs). The monitoring team prepared a set of questionnaires and guidelines on in-depth interviews, group discussion to collect information. The data and information collection on resettlement was mainly carried out at PMB , RCs (Quan Hoa and Mai Chau districts), CPCs at 5 affected communes, and APs. The verifying results were checked and compared with the site monitoring results.

3. Monitoring methods

3.1. Quantitative method

34. The monitoring team carried out a survey to take samples for collecting information and evaluating the resettlement and compensation implemented in the road component. According to the Terms of Reference (TOR), 100% of severe AHs and 20% of marginal AHs (selected at random) in 5 affected communes in 2 districts (Quan Hoa and Mai Chau) were interviewed with questionnaires. From the list of AHs provided by PMB , the monitoring team selected 201 AHs to interview, of which 66 AHs were severely affected (equal to 83.5% of AHs) and 135 marginal AHs. The distribution of sampling surveys is presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Number of interviewed AHs in communes

Commune	Interviewed AHs		
	Total	Severe AHs	Marginal AHs
Trung Son (Quan Hoa)	76	25	51
Thanh Son (Quan Hoa)	69	25	44
Phu Thanh (Quan Hoa)	13	7	6
Van Mai (Mai Chau)	32	7	25
Mai Hich (Mai Chau)	11	2	9
Total	201	66	135

Source: Surveyed data in August 2009

3.2. Qualitative method

35. The monitoring specialists from CECODES organized a meeting with leaderships and resettlement specialists of PMB to discuss and collect information and documents related. The leaders of CPCs in 5 affected communes and chiefs of 15 villages were interviewed to collect information. The indepth-interviews with AHs were integrated in the interviews with questionnaires. There were 5 group discussions with 66 severely APs in the five communes (including representatives of some poor AHs, relocation AHs, AHs losing shops and ethnic AHs). In addition, the monitoring team also visited some locations along the road and two ends of road where the land acquisition was made and also visited some AHs who had relocated to new living areas in Thanh Mai commune (Co Luong), and Trung Son commune (Co Me), where many AHs had to relocate. Pictures on land acquisition and resettlement were also taken as materials for the RP monitoring in the project.

4. Implementation arrangement

36. Pursuant to Correspondence No. 353/TDTS-P3 dated July 28th 2009 mobilizing the RP independent monitoring issued by PMB, CECODES assigned one Monitoring team which comprised four specialists, including the Team leader with overall instruction to undertake the monitoring tasks. The preparation for monitoring was commenced upon the receipt of the notification for mobilization from PMB . At the CECODES office, the monitoring team members prepared the monitoring tools, including questionnaires, instructions for in-depth interviews and group discussion, and studying project documents. The site monitoring started from August 10th 2009.

37. Upon the completion of the site monitoring, the monitoring team, with the assistance from the office-backup team, consolidated quickly pending issues that the monitoring team had collected at site and organized a meeting with PMB on August 25th 2009 in Thanh Hoa. In this meeting, the Monitoring Team leader presented opinions of AHs and pending issues to be solved (details are presented in “Pending issues in Appendix 1”).

PART IV. MONITORING RESULTS

1. Appraising internal reports and RPs

38. PMB coordinated with RCs in Mai Chau and Quan Hoa districts to implement the land acquisition and resettlement and compensation in this road component. In general, the RP implementation process was carried out in compliance with provisions specified in Decree 84/2007/NĐ-CP and the Project RP. DMS data, compensation data and records were kept at PMB in paper and in e-files. DMS records contained sufficient signatures of related parties and AH owners. Detailed RPs were prepared for each AH and approved by DPCs in Quan Hoa and Mai Chau districts (Decisions are attached).

39. PMB assigned one Deputy Director to directly be in charge of the land acquisition and resettlement and one resettlement division in charge of resettlement was set up to implement the land acquisition, resettlement and compensation for this project other than letting the district RCs be in charge as similar to general practices in other projects. Thanks to this way of working, PMB takes initiatives in the land acquisition and resettlement, timely solve up problems and issues that may affect the RP implementation process and well as the project compensation policies.

2. Site monitoring results

40. As mentioned above, the minority ethnic groups have been living in the access road and bridges area for many years, and there is not much different culture between these ethnic groups and Kinh groups. Only Thai people have a custom that they did not exhume and move the remains of died people to other place after 3 years of burying as Kinh did but they only practiced ‘the revived death’ (grave house and grave abandoning ceremony). Therefore, the monitoring team integrated the affected ethnic groups into the survey with monitoring results as below.

2.1 Information dissemination and AHs consultation

41. The main objectives of the public information dissemination and AHs consultation are to (i) provide AHs with information about the project and the project implementation plan; (ii) collect information on needs and priorities of AHs and affected communities; (iii) offer opportunities for AHs to participate in implementing the project, particularly in land acquisition, resettlement and compensation process, in order to make sure that AHs could have right choices to matters that have direct impacts on their life and livelihoods; and (iv) to ensure the transparency in all activities related to the compensation and life rehabilitation of AHs.

42. With the exceptions noted in paragraphs 42 (i) – (iii), the project information dissemination to local people was carried out by PMB and RCs in compliance with the dissemination procedures described in the Project RP. PMB sent a correspondence to DPCs in Quan Hoa and Mai Chau districts regulating the information dissemination to the communities who were affected by the construction of the road. Meanwhile, PMB also coordinated with RCs in Quan Hoa and Mai Chau districts, and affected CPCs to meet with representatives of AHs to announce the project information, compensation and resettlement policies, compensation unit rates, and grievance redress mechanism to AHs. In addition to the information dissemination, the public consultation was also carried out from January 2008 to April 2009 in villages in 5 affected communes. Almost all interviewed APs (95%) confirmed that they had attended and heard the information about the road construction such as land acquisition, removal of houses, tombs, compensation and resettlement policies, compensation unit rates for land and other assets affected (94%), measures for livelihood rehabilitation, grievance redress mechanism and procedures (64%), land acquisition progress and schedule, etc.

43. Important documents such as Decision No. 1048/QĐ-UBND issued by Thanh Hoa PPC on April 22nd 2008 regulating the compensation policies and compensation unit rates for assets affected to be applied in land acquisition and resettlement in Thanh Hoa province; Decision no. 16/2009/QĐ-UBND dated March 24th 2009 by Hoa Binh PPC promulgating the “Set of compensation unit prices applicable to assets to be affected when the State appropriate lands” in Hoa Binh province; Decision approving the Basic Design of Construction – Operation road of Trung Son hydropower plant were all disseminated to AHs. Some communes having louder-speaker systems had broadcasted this notification to all people. The project information was also broadcasted on Provincial Television in Thanh Hoa and Hoa Binh provinces. However, the information dissemination proved some restrictions as below:

(i) Time disseminating was short (only half a day for one commune) so people did not have much time to discuss and be explained issues related to the resettlement and compensation policies that they did care about.

(ii) The information dissemination was mainly done in one-way, i.e. AHs did not have many opportunities to discuss, exchange views with the project owner and

the governments at various levels. Therefore, the information absorption by AHs was limited.

(iii) The project information and compensation policies was not prepared in form of pamphlet but informed verbally in meetings so some people did not remember details, particularly the ethnic people of whom the education level was low.

44. Information dissemination is an important chain in the project implementation in general and in the resettlement in particular, and this should be carried out throughout the project process. Therefore, in order to improve the effects of information dissemination, PMB and district RCs should coordinate with CPCs to disseminate more frequently in various forms (pamphlet, broadcasting on TV or radio system, public meeting, post on public places) so AHs could access and receive information easily. In public meetings, AHs should be given more opportunities to discuss, exchange views and opinions about issues that they are concerned, particularly about compensation unit rates, livelihood recovery and resettlement plan, etc. Details are:

(i) The contents of information should be presented in form of questions and answers, presented succinctly, easy to understand and suitable to education level of AHs, particularly of the ethnic minorities, so they could understand and acquire easily.

(ii) The expected project objectives and benefits could be more adequately provided to AHs so people understand advantages of the project, create concurrence among people, particularly among AHs who had to locate houses or tombs.

(iii) During the project implementation, any changes, either subjective or objective, related to land acquisition and resettlement should be informed in a timely way to the people. This is necessary and should be done throughout the project process, from the project commencement till the project completion.

(iv) It is necessary to coordinate with social organizations and associations in the locality such as the Vietnamese Fatherland Front, Farmer's association, Woman's union, youth union, Veteran's union, Village patriarchs, Village chiefs, and honored people in the community in order to propagandize, encourage and persuade AHs to facilitate and help timely project implementation.

2.2 DMS of affected assets

45. On April 21st 2008, Quan Hoa DPC (Thanh Hoa province) issued Decision No. s205/QĐ-UBND and on April 22nd 2008, Mai Chau DPC (Hoa Binh province) issued Decision no. 263/QĐ-UBND establishing RCs in 2 districts which were chaired by one Vice Chairman of DPCs and deputed by Heads of Planning and Finance division, Natural Resources and Environment division. The RC's members were leaders of Trade and Industry Division, officials of Natural Resources and Environment division, Officials of Agriculture and Rural Development division, Officials of Planning and Finance Division, Chief of Resettlement unit of Trung Son hydropower PMB, Chairman or Vice Chairman of CPCs, and Chiefs of villages

where AHs lived. The tasks of DMS team was to measure, numerate and classify assets affected of AHs, coordinated with PMB to prepare RPs to be submitted to DPCs for approval.

46. The DMS of assets affected of HHs affected by the construction – operation road of Trung Son hydropower plant from Km 0+284.32 (Co Luong bridge in Van Mai commune, Mai Chau, Hoa Binh) to Km 20+408.08 (Co Me bridge, Trung Son commune, Quan Hoa, Thanh Hoa) was completed in October 2008. Before the DMS, RCs distributed to AHs a record form for them to list their assets to be affected in and guided them to fill in. The interview of AHs indicated that most of them (92%) were pleased with DMS results. However, some AHs complained that RC numerated insufficiently their land or assets (Details are in Appendix 1). These problems were reflected by the monitoring team to the PMB and district RCs. PMB and RCs would verify and numerate additionally if these complaints were correct.

47. Almost all (97%) interviewed APs confirmed that their HH representatives participated in DMS process and signed on DMS records. However, a copy of the DMS record was not offered to one AH after the completion of DMS process. The monitoring team discussed this matter with PMB. In late August 2009, PMB did give this AH one copy of DMS record recording their assets affected. This lesson was learnt for other work items in the project.

2.3 Compensation plan

Compensation rates

48. Thanh Hoa PPC issued Decision 1048/QĐ-UBND dated April 22nd 2008 and Hoa Binh PPC issued Decision 16/2009/QĐ-UBND dated March 24th 2009 promulgating the Set of Compensation unit rates applicable to assets affected when the State acquired land for the construction of the construction – operation road of Trung Son Hydropower plant in the territory of the respective province. These Decisions were applied for compensation and resettlement in the territory of Thanh Hoa and Hoa Binh. On March 24th 2009, Hoa Binh PPC issued Decision no. 16/2009/QĐ-UBND promulgating the “Set of compensation unit rates for assets affected when the State acquires land in Hoa Binh province” which replaced the Decision 23/2008/QĐ-UBND dated September 9th 2008 promulgating the “Set of compensation unit rates for assets affected when the State acquires land” and Decision no. 27/2008/QĐ-UBND dated October 6th 2008 by PPC amending and supplementing some provisions promulgated by Decision No. 23/2008/QĐ-UBND dated September 9th 2008 by the PPC.

49. IMO commented on these Decisions as below: in general, these Decisions detailed Decree No. 197/2004/NĐ-CP dated December 3rd 2004 of the Government regulating the compensation, support and resettlement when the State acquired land based on the specific conditions in each province. On the other hand, these Decisions updated and included the contents of Decree No. 17/2006/NĐ-CP dated May 25th 2007 of the Government supplementing the issuance of LURCs, land acquisition, execution of land-use rights, order and procedures for compensation and support, resettlement when the State acquired land and grievance redress over land. Attached

to these decisions were regulations on the compensation policies and unit rates. In addition, Thanh Hoa and Hoa Binh PPCs also issued Decisions approving overall RPs for compensation, support and resettlement applied when the State acquired land, and the Decision regulating the land acquisition and allocation to the construction of the Construction-operation road of Trung Son Hydropower plant.

Procedures on promulgating land prices of the province

50. According to Decree 188/2004/NĐ-CP dated November 16th 2004 regulating methods on evaluating land prices and pricing frame of land categories, and Decree no. 123/2007/NĐ-CP dated July 27th 2007 amending and supplementing provisions of Decree No. 188, prices of land were determined based on location, natural conditions in the region, infrastructures, and profitability of the land. On the other hand, pursuant to the Land Law in 2003, PPC had to publicly announce the land prices applicable to the province on January 1st every year which provided a base for compensation when land was acquired and land-use tax was collected. Within the year, if there was a major change on land prices in normal conditions, PPC would consider and adjust land prices suitably (according to Decree 17/2006/NĐ-CP amending and supplementing provisions of Decree No. 197).

51. The monitoring team learnt the procedures on promulgating annual land-prices applied by Thanh Hoa and Hoa Binh PPCs. Details are:

(i) In July every year, the PPC assigns Provincial Department of Finance to establish the Land Pricing Board (LPB) which is directed by DoF to make surveying land prices in the whole province. The Land Pricing Board comprises of representatives from DOC, DONRE, and Provincial RC. LPB instructs RCs in communes and wards to survey land prices on the territory of commune and ward and then submit to LPB the recommended cost norm for land prices. The determination of land prices complies with Decree 188/2004/ND-CP, Decree 123/2007/NĐ-CP was also referred to land-transaction prices in the locality.

(ii) The cost norms of land categories are reviewed and verified by LPB, then submitted to relevant agencies for their comments and endorsement. At the commune/ward level, CPCs organized meetings with people to discuss about prices of land categories in the territory of the commune/ward. The discussion outcomes are consolidated and reported to LPB. A draft of the cost norms of land categories based on the survey done by the commune/ward is finalized by LPB and submitted to relevant agencies, including DOF, DOC, Taxation authority, Department of Justice (DOJ), and DONRE for their comments. A workshop is organized with participation from the aforementioned agencies to discuss about the recommended prices for land in the province.

(iii) After the workshop, the final draft on recommended prices for land is submitted to DOJ for appraisal. If this final draft is endorsed by DOJ, it is officially submitted to Provincial People Council for clearance in the annual meeting session of the Council, then it is approved by chairman of the PPC and announced on January 1st. In the year, if any change to the land prices incurred in the locality, the PPC verifies and adjusts to reflect the actual condition.

52. Therefore, the procedure on promulgating prices for land categories undertaken by PPC ensures that the issued land prices were close to the actual transaction prices. Because, the five affected communes are mountainous rural communes in the far and remote areas where transportation is difficult and infrastructures is poor, there are few transactions and little speculation on land. Therefore, there was no change to land prices here. RCs applied compensation rates for land as stated in the cost norms issued by PPC.

53. For houses and architectural works, compensation prices were the prices to renovate houses/architectural works with similar structure without deduction or depreciation of materials salvaged. For crops and trees, the compensation prices were local market prices.

54. During the monitoring process, the Monitoring team carried out a survey on replacement price by quick-interviews with some AHs and non-AHs about transaction prices of land in the locality. The interviewed indicated that they did not know any one who had purchased or sold land in the commune so they did not know what the land price was. However, they confirmed that upon the construction of the road and when their commune was connected to the national electric grid, probably, price for land in the locality would be high.

55. The monitoring indicated that most of AHs accepted the compensation prices for land and assets affected. Some AHs in Quan Hoa district locating in the boundary of Mai Chau district complained about that their compensation unit rates for land were lower than the compensation unit rates for land applied in Hoa Binh province. The reason was that Thanh Hoa PPC issued the prices for land categories lower than those issued by Hoa Binh PPC. This situation is often seen in projects where the impacts covered more than one province. However, in order to ensure the equity in compensation, according to IMO, PMB should recommend EVN and PPCs in the project area issuing a separate compensation policy for this project of which there was no difference in prices for land in boundary areas between districts, provinces. In addition, some relocation AHs complained that the support for ground leveling was not enough to their actual payment. PMB explained that this support would be calculated based on actual check and acceptance of AHs. Maximum support for ground leveling would not exceed 7,000,000 VND/AH. Some AHs who have to cut down their Luong trees (bamboos) expected to be compensated for Luong trees with higher price (compensated price was 5,000 - 7,000 VND/one tree). Through interview of AHs and observation of Luong affected, the monitoring team knew that Luong of AHs has been harvested first time. The second time is going to be harvested with lower productivity. However, the RC still compensated with the price of 7,000VND/one tree, equal to average purchased price in the locality. On the other hand, the AHs could harvest affected Luong and sell with price of 5,000 – 7,000VND/one tree. Therefore, the AHs could get 12.000 – 14.000VND/one tree including both selling and compensating prices, much higher than market price of Luong.



Affected Luong (Bamboos)

Compensation plan

56. Compensation plans were based on legal documents of the Government and State and other Decisions of Thanh Hoa and Hoa Binh PPCs regulating the land acquisition and compensation, as well as on the RP of the Construction-operation Road, including:

- Law on Land in 2003.
- Decree 197/2004/NĐ-CP regulating the compensation, support and resettlement when the State acquiring land.
- Decree 17/2006/NĐ-CP supplementing and amending some provisions of Decrees 181, 182, 197 and 198.
- Decision no. 603/QĐ-EVN of Electricity of Vietnam dated August 4th 2008 approving the basic design of Construction – operation road of Trung Son hydropower plant in Thanh Hoa province.
- Decision 1048/QĐ-UBND of Thanh Hoa PPC dated April 22nd 2008 promulgating compensation unit rates for assets affected in the land acquisition process in Thanh Hoa province.
- Decision 16/2009/QĐ-UBND of Hoa Binh PPC dated March 24th 2009 regulating the replacement of Decision 23/2008/QĐ-UBND dated September 9th 2008 promulgating the ‘set of compensation unit rates for assets affected when the State acquired land’ in Hoa Binh province and Decision 27/2008/QĐ-UBND dated October 6th 2008 of Hoa Binh PPC amending, supplementing some provisions issued by Decision 23/2008/QĐ-UBND dated September 9th 2008 of PPC.
- Decision 205/QĐ-UBND dated April 21st 2008 by the Chairman of Quan Hoa DPC, Thanh Hoa province regulating the establishment of the RC for Trung Son hydropower project.

-
- Decision 263/QĐ-UBND dated April 22nd 2008 by the Chairman of Mai Chau DPC, Hoa Binh province regulating the establishment of the RC for Trung Son hydropower project.
 - Policies specified in RP of the construction - operation road under Trung Son hydropower plant.

57. Based on DMS results and policies as well as compensation unit rates of the provinces, PMB applied the compensation unit rates for assets affected of AHs. Allowances or supports for AHs being relocated such as life subsistence allowance, removal allowance, ground-leveling allowance, business support, bonus for relocation on time, and support to poor AHs were all included in the compensation plan. After monitoring mission 1 of IMO, PMB and RCs determined 13 AHs losing more than 25% total productive landholding and considered as severely affected households, raising total severely APs to 79 HHs. PMB and RCs have made additional allowances according to project policy (Table 5).

58. According to the RP, only poor AHs who are severely affected by the project will be supported with a rate of 900,000 VND/person/year for 6 years. However, the RP did not define what AH was considered as poor and severely affected HH but only distinguished AHs who lost over or less than 25% of total landholdings. Therefore, AHs being relocated were not considered as severely affected. IMO has discussed this issue with the PMB and the PMB has clearly defined that “severely affected poor households include households who have to be relocated or lose more than 25% of total agricultural landholding” and updated to the RP. The PMB has re-checked all poor AHs to identify severely poor AHs based on these criteria to deliver additional support in September 2009. According to Decree 17/2006/NĐ-CP all poor HHs of whom the land was acquired would be given an allowance no less than 3 years but not exceeding 10 years to help them be beyond the poverty line. If RP was followed, none poor AH would be given this allowance. According to IMO, poor and ethnic minority AHs would be in vulnerable group and should be supported, regardless of whether the level of impacts was severe or not.

59. In general, the compensation plans were all prepared in details, presented fully name of AHs, numbers of assets affected in each AH, compensation unit prices, compensation amounts, types of support (allowances) for life rehabilitation and livelihood recovery. However, PMB and RCs should prepare a record on price application for each AH and send to AH for comments before submitting it to the competent authorized level for approval. Any complaint raised by AH would be reviewed, explained and adjusted by RC before being submitted to review and appraisal. This action would avoid the case that when the compensation plan was approved and the compensation was paid but AH did not agree with number of assets affected or with compensation unit prices, resulting to additional adjustment or re-approval, wasting time and affecting the project progress.

2.4 Compensation payment

60. Upon the approval for the compensation plan, the PMB in combination with Investment and Development Bank of Thanh Hoa carried out payment for AHs in the

Office of communes or villages, at the same time the bank also accepted savings deposits from any AHs who wanted to deposit their compensation in the bank. This action was strongly supported by AHs because it helped them avoid any potential risks bringing money themselves to the bank. Payment was carried out in CPC Offices in January (phase 1) and May (phase 2) 2009 for APs of Quan Hoa district and in July for APs of Mai Chau district. The last payment for APs will be completed end of September 2009.

61. The monitoring indicated that all AHs had been informed of the date, time and location of the compensation payment. The payment was made precisely, fast and conveniently to AHs. This action was strongly supported by AHs because it helped them avoid any potential risks when they would bring money themselves to the bank. However, AHs complained about the late payment. Relocation AHs were paid compensation three times. At the monitoring time, every relocation AH was paid 70% of total compensation and the remaining (30%) would be paid upon the completion of the relocation and hand-over of land to the project. As explained by PMB, they had to do so because they want to avoid the risk that AHs due to in some projects many ethnic AHs, after having received the compensation, used the money for other purposes but did neither remove nor hand-over land.

62. For easy following, each AH was provided by the PMB one log that tracked the compensation payment process, in which the amount of compensation paid in each delivery would be noted. The PMB noted clearly each item of compensation but not detail in allowances, so APs did not know about what allowance they were entitled to receive. The monitoring team will check payments actually made with entitlements of each AH in next monitoring, after completion of payment for AHs.

Bảng ghi chép chi phí bồi thường				
Tổng giá trị	Phần bù về đất	Phần bù về cây	Phần bù về cây ăn quả	Chênh lệch hỗ trợ
3.220.000	2	2	4	8
1.000.000				1.000.000

Số lượng vật tư	Loại 1	Loại 2	Loại 3
Phần bù về đất			
Phần bù về cây ăn quả			
Phần bù về cây ăn quả			
Chênh lệch hỗ trợ	1.220.000		
Cộng	1.220.000		
Chi phí			
Ký nhận			
Cán bộ quản lý			

Payment log of AH

63. In Nam Thanh village of Thanh Son commune, some AHs complained that the compensation amount they received was less than the amount they had been informed without any explanation (Appendix 1). In discussions with the resettlement staff of PMB, the monitoring team understood that when appraising the compensation plan, verification committee included these cases fit to the rate-frame issued by PPC. When

the compensation payment was made, the PMB already had explained in individual cases but AHs did not pay due attention so they complained. According to IMO, it is better if the PMB inform APs by document, not orally.

64. During the monitoring, relocation AHs who had received 70% of the compensation were removing houses or building new houses or leveling grounds for new houses and ready to handover their land to the project. IMO requested the PMB to check and accept as soon as possible and have a plan to pay all the compensation to these AHs. Meanwhile, the bonus for relocation on time would be applied in order to encourage AHs to hand-over the land to the project. By July 31st 20008, a total of 480 AHs had been compensated in two phases with the total amount of 7,968,220,874 VND (referred to Table 5). The amount remaining 3,260,462,851 VND would be paid fully in phase 3 in late September 2009.

Table 5: Number of AHs receiving the compensation and Number of compensation paid

<i>Nr</i>	<i>Affected district</i>	<i>AHs</i>	<i>AHs receiving the compensation</i>	<i>Total compensation to be paid</i>	<i>Total compensation paid.</i>
	<i>Mai Chau</i>	<i>125</i>	<i>125</i>	<i>4,757,975,700</i>	<i>2,704,912,530</i>
	<i>Quan Hoa</i>	<i>355</i>	<i>355</i>	<i>6,470,708,025</i>	<i>5,263,308,344</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>480</i>	<i>480</i>	<i>11,228,683,725</i>	<i>7,968,220,874</i>

Source: PMB

65. Some AHs had not accepted the compensation for land because they had not submitted papers or documents verifying their eligibility to the land affected such as LURCs, document verifying the right to land, or they did not have identity card.

66. Total fund for compensation and support/ allowances in accordance with DMS results is **11,228,683,725 VND** of which Mai Chau had 4,757,975,700 VND and Quan Hoa had 6,470,708,025 VND. The compensation and allowance estimated in RP totaled **21,531,600,000 VND** (excluding RP implementation cost and contingency). Therefore, the actual payment was 10,302,916,257 VND lower than the estimated. This difference was mainly in Quan Hoa district, because when RP was prepared, the DMS data was not correct because detailed design was not available then. In addition, the PMB applied all highest rates for assets affected as price contingency purpose so when the compensation payment was made, if the compensation rate increased, they would not have to submit for re-approving the total cost estimated (refer to the comparison of budget in Appendix 2).

2.5 Life and livelihood recovery of AHs

67. As no economic differences between ethnic minority group and Kinh group affected by the project, so there was no special allowance policy for them. Among severely AHs, 13 AHs were affected more than 25% of total productive landholdings, so the allowance for livelihood recovery and subsistence was additionally applied. Allowances for life habilitation for relocation AHs were paid (Table 6). The PMB had included these allowances in the compensation plan of Quan Hoa district and paid to AHs, meanwhile in Mai Chau district, these allowances had been supplemented in

the compensation plan and would be paid in the 3rd payment. Allowances for poor AHs and AHs benefiting from social policies were also being paid by DRCs. The PMB and RCs would explain clearly to AHs about what allowances they would be entitled to.

68. In addition to the allowances in cash, the PMB and RCs should work with CPCs in affected communes about prioritizing AHs from whom land was acquired to participate in agricultural extension programs free-of-charge, have access to credits or funds with reduced interest rate from funds so they could be able to develop the production and stabilize their life. On the other hand, the PMB would prioritize AHs to participate in suitable jobs created by the project in order to help them improve their incomes.

Table 6: Allowances to AHs

	Mai Chau district (Hoa Binh)	Level of assistance (VND)
1	Allowance for business stability	Providing an allowance equal to 30% of 01 annual net income in rate of the averaged income gained in the last 3 years for AHs with business permit, and for AHs who did not register for business permit were only supported with an allowance of 100,000 VND.
2	Relocation poor AHs	900,000 VND/person/year for 3 years.
3	AHs losing >25% total agricultural landholding	An allowance equivalent 30kg of rice/person/month for 3 months. Vocational training allowance of 3million VND/labor
4	Life subsistence allowance	Relocation AHs were provided with allowance in cash equal to 30 kg of paddy per person in 6 months.
5	Allowance for ground leveling	Allowance equal to the quantity checked and accepted
6	Transportation allowance for relocation AHs	3,000,000 VND/AH (relocation within the same province) 5,000,000 VND/ AH (relocation outside the province)
7	Transportation allowance for relocation of tomb	800,000 VND/tomb
	Quan Hoa district (Thanh Hoa)	
1	Allowance for business stability	Providing an allowance equal to 30% of 01 annual net income in rate of the averaged income gained in the last 3 years for AHs with business permit, and for AHs who did not register for business permit were only supported with an allowance of 100,000 VND.
2	Subsistent allowance for life and production	Relocation AHs were provided with allowance in cash equal to 30 kg of paddy per person in 6 months.
3	Relocation poor AHs.	900,000 VND/person/year for 3 years.
4	AHs losing >25% total agricultural landholding	An allowance equivalent 30kg of rice/person/month for 3 months. Vocational training allowance of 3million VND/labor
5	Allowance for ground leveling	Allowance equal to the quantity checked and accepted
6	Transportation allowance for relocation AHs	3,000,000 VND/AH (relocation within Thanh Hoa province) 5,000,000 VND/ AH (relocation outside Thanh Hoa province)
7	Transportation allowance for relocation of tomb	800,000 VND/tomb

Source: PMB

2.6 Land acquisition and resettlement

69. All relocation AHs in two districts selected the option as local relocation in order to benefit from the project and life was less disturbed. This solution also helped them reduce costs for resettlement in new living area and quickly stabilize their life.

70. According to the plan of the PMB, the commencement of the road construction would be in November 2009. However, most of interviewed AHs did not know about the time they had to hand-over the land to the project. RCs said that the land acquisition schedule was disseminated to AHs when the compensation payment was made but the information dissemination was made long time ago so AHs did not remember. According to the PMB, in September 2009, the PMB would make the final payment to AHs. IMO requested the PMB and RCs to inform the plan on hand-over of land and construction schedule of road to AHs. Any AHs who handed over the land on time would be entitled to a bonus in cash.

71. One pressing issue in the land acquisition of the road was to relocate tombs of AHs in villages Pao, Chieng, Co Me, Xuoc (in Trung Son commune) and Uon village (Phu Thanh commune). According to compensation plan, each AH of whom tombs had to relocate would be entitled to an allowance of 800,000 VND per tomb buried over 3 years and 3,600,000 VND/tomb buried less than 3 years for removing tombs into a cemetery. the PMB already paid this allowance to AHs however, during the monitoring, only 1/3 of AHs removed tombs. The remaining AHs said that the allowance provided by the project was not sufficient for them to finance spiritual costs for removal of tombs. As studied by the monitoring team, Thai people did not exhumate and move the remains to other place after 3 years of burying as Kinh did but they only practiced 'the revived death' (grave house and grave abandoning ceremony). However, their grave abandoning ceremony was quite costly and even if the allowance was higher than the rate paid by the project, after the ceremony many of AHs would not remove graves. In Pao village where many AHs had to remove tombs, a public meeting was organized with the PMB representatives. The PMB representatives expressed that in addition to the allowance of 800,000 VND per tomb, the project would offer sacrifices for the whole village before tombs were removed, provide them with earthenware containers and remove tombs for them and AHs would rebury the tombs. According to IMO, because of this custom of Thai group, this request was the best solution for the PMB to be active in removing tombs and clearing the land, avoiding to affect their spiritual life.

72. By the time of monitoring, AHs who had received 70% of compensation were all clear land themselves such as cutting trees, leveling house grounds, moving and building new houses in order to hand-over land to the project, except for AH of Mrs. Toan in Thanh Mai village in Van Mai commune (Mai Chau) who had to relocate her house and a workshop. This AH requested the PMB and Mai Chau RC to level the ground, issue LURC before she removed and handed over land to the project. Presently, Mai Chau RC was in process of allocating land and preparing cost estimate for ground leveling for AH Toan.



New house of relocation AH

73. Relocation AHs expressed that prices of construction materials as well as labour for building houses all increased much higher than the compensation rates so the PMB was requested to consider and give them more support so they could stabilize their life, particularly poor AHs as soon as possible.

74. In general, the land acquisition in this road would not cause major impacts if the PMB and RCs met expectations of AHs for whom tombs had to remove. However, regardless of expectation, while waiting for the solution, they all followed the land acquisition schedule in order to hand-over land to the project on time.

2.7 Complaints and grievance redress mechanism

75. Though RP did not introduce a grievance redress mechanism, the PMB and RCs established a 4 stepped grievance redress mechanism and disseminated publicly to AHs. However, the grievance redress should have close coordination between relevant agencies and it would be best to have good information dissemination, propagandas, and encourage AHs to understand the project and comply with the project policies.

76. During the monitoring, some complaints of AHs about missing assets counted, support for ground leveling, relocation of tombs, compensation unit rates, etc. (as presented in Appendix 1) had been reviewed and solved by the PMB, RCs and relevant agencies. IMO had a meeting and discussion with the PMB about opinions of AHs and the PMB already responded.

77. One issue that the PMB and RCs should pay attention to was potential impacts which may happen in the construction process that were expressed by AHs such as heightening the road in some sections might cause rainwater to run into houses of some HHs living close to the road and access to the road would be difficult unless steps were provided.

2.8 Allocation of counterpart fund for compensation

78. In 2008, EVN issued Decision 603/QĐ/EVN dated April 8th 2008 approving the Design of the construction – operation road of Trung Son hydropower plant and

Decision no. 158/QĐ-TĐTS dated October 27th 2008 approving the Technical design and Construction drawings of the construction – operation road of Trung Son hydropower plant with a total cost estimated per bid price of 196,384,000,000 VND. The fund for compensation would be allocated by EVN from the counterpart fund.

79. In case, the payment was above the approved cost estimate, the PMB would submit to higher authorize level for advancing the fund allocation in 2009 in order to meet the actual payment demand. In fact, the compensation budget allocated in 2008 met the compensation payment demand.

80. Upon the approval of the compensation plans by authorized agencies, the PMB would withdraw the compensation budget from State Treasury to pay AHs. The withdrawal was made in installments. Any surplus after the payment in each installment would be returned to the Bank after the payment was completed.

2.9 Satisfaction of AHs

81. AHs were all aware of the importance and benefits that the construction and operation road of Trung Son hydropower plant would bring. They considered that once the road was completed, people in the region would have convenient opportunity to exchange culture and economy with the delta region, their agricultural and forestry products would be sold with higher prices rather than relying on prices fixed by merchants. Particularly, once the hydropower plant was completed, communes in the project area would use electricity from the national grid, realizing their thousand-year dreams. Therefore, AHs and non-AHs all supported the policy of the Government on building up this works.

82. Most AHs (92%) were pleased with DMS results, compensation prices and life rehabilitation polices. Some AHs in Quan Hoa district adjoining to Mai Chau district (Hoa Binh province) considered that the compensation unit prices for land in Thanh Hoa province were lower than those in Hoa Binh province. AHs who had to remove tombs in Trung Son and Phu Thanh communes in Quan Hoa district requested the project to give more support for the general rites before removing tombs, earthenware containers, and labour cost for removal of tombs, while the reburying would be done by AHs. The PMB and RCs were in the process of reviewing this request by AHs and submitted to authorized agency for solutions.

2.10 Compliance with the resettlement progress and civil works schedule

83. At the time of monitoring, the technical design, construction drawings and cost estimates of the construction and operation road of Trung Son hydropower plant had been approved by EVN. According to the PMB, the construction of the road is planned to start in November 2009. In September, the PMB would pay all compensation to AHs, and AHs hand over affected land in October. Therefore, the compensation payment would be completed before the construction started. However, the land acquisition of the entire road would not be completed before the construction if removal of tombs is not solved up. However, this matter would not affect to the construction schedule because the removal of tombs mainly focused in Pao village,

and the road alignment was 22 km long and many AHs had handed over land to the project. The PMB and DRCs are now positively solving up this problem before 25th Oct. 2009.

3. Pending issues

84. As mentioned above, the pending issues in the land acquisition and resettlement in this package are:

(i) The project information dissemination to AHs was not regularly carried out as propaganda, the dissemination duration was short so there was not much time for AHs to discuss and exchange views about issues they were concerned with. The information dissemination was only one-sided.

(ii) AHs were not given a copy of DMS record after the completion of DMS process.

(iii) Life rehabilitation measures were not given due attention to the vulnerable group (the poor, ethnic minorities, woman-headed HHs, etc.).

(iv) Solution for removal of graves for AHs was slower compared with the schedule.

(v) DMS miscounted some assets of AHs.

85. After the site monitoring, the Monitoring team had consolidated pending issues and worked with the PMB and RCs in a meeting held in Thanh Hoa. The PMB and RCs had reviewed and proposed actions to be taken for these issues as presented in Appendix 1.

PART V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Conclusions

86. Substantially, the PMB and RCs have implemented in compliance with the land acquisition, resettlement and compensation process as stated in the project RP and in Decree 84/2007/NĐ-CP of the Government. The information dissemination, DMS, compensation payment processes are all participated and monitored by AHs and relevant sectors and agencies. The grievance and complaints of AHs were received, heard by the PMB and authorized agencies and solved up positively. The internal monitoring was also adequately and regularly carried out by the PMB. The PMB set up one office in Mai Chau district and assigned the office in charge of resettlement from the PMB there in order to solve up problems of AHs and issues raised during the project implementation process.

87. RP internal monitoring reports were prepared adequately with issues needing monitored and reflected RP implementation progress as well as issues raised.

Resettlement and compensation data was kept at the PMB on paper and in e-files for reporting and management purposes. the PMB assigned one Deputy Director to be in charge of the resettlement and also set up one unit specializing in resettlement which would coordinate with RCs to undertake the land acquisition, resettlement and compensation for the road in specific and for the whole project in general.

88. In general, the immediate objectives of resettlement have been achieved, particularly the concurrence of AHs about the construction of works. In order to achieve this result, the PMB has grasped the policy on protecting rights and entitlements of AHs. However, the land acquisition, resettlement, and compensation was sensitive and complicated so it hardly avoided all potential shortcomings during its implementation. On the other hand, the regulations of Thanh Hoa and Hoa Binh provinces on the land acquisition, resettlement and compensation still remained restrictions, particularly compensation prices for land, and resulted in complaints of some AHs.

89. During the monitoring, the PMB fully completed the compensation in 2nd payment for AHs. The 3rd payment would be delivered in late September 2009. Among 66 relocation AHs in two districts, 57 AHs had leveled and prepared the ground and 35 of them had built houses, 8 remaining AHs prepared to level the ground for housing. AHs with crops and trees affected already cut trees to hand-over land to the project.

90. All pending issues that the monitoring team had reflected and discussed with the PMB and RCs were all verified and reviewed. The PMB and RCs made a plan to solve up actively the pending issues in order to ensure the land acquisition, resettlement and compensation progress and the construction schedule of the road.

91. In conclusion, the pending issue that might delay the land acquisition, resettlement and compensation progress was the removal of affected tombs. However, if the PMB accepts the request by AHs as providing them with earthenware containers, excavation and removal, the land acquisition issue would not cause a major bar. The PMB has been actively to coordinate with governments at various levels to work with AHs who had not accepted the compensation and AHs who had to remove tombs in order to achieve the planned progress of land clearance. IMO would continue monitoring the solution for the mentioned pending issues.

2. Recommendations

92. In order to undertake well the land acquisition, resettlement and compensation, ensure interests and entitlements of AHs and help them quickly stabilize their life, production, meanwhile to facilitate the construction of works as scheduled, IMO would like to make the following recommendations:

(1) The project information dissemination to AHs would be continuously carried out and complied with the 2003 Land Law (90 days before the land acquisition in case of agricultural land and 180 days in case of residential land). The dissemination can be done in various forms such as public meetings, pamphlet,

television, audio, etc. and are easy for people to receive and the contents should be easy to understand particularly for the ethnic minorities. It should create opportunities for AHs to participate in discussion, raise questions and hear answers about issues they are concerned. In order to do so, the information dissemination duration should be lengthened and information should be repeatedly disseminated during the project implementation process.

(2) One copy of DMS records with all signatures of participated people should be given to AHs upon the completion of DMS process which will provide a base for AHs to compare when the compensation is paid. According to Decree 197/NĐ-CP, DMS results and compensation application should be posted publicly in the locality for AHs to access to.

(3) RCs should inform AHs about the time of compensation payment. The payment plan should clearly indicate the date, time, and who would monitor or supervise in order to verify that AHs hand-over the land on time and a bonus for on-time removal should be awarded to AHs.

(4) Poor AHs should be supported and assisted in compliance with Decree 17/2006/NĐ-CP other than only poor severe AHs do as specified in the RP.

(5) Actively reviewing and handling on time complaints and questions raised by AHs as presented in Appendix 1.

(6) The PMB should work with PPCs and relevant agencies to make necessary adjustments to the compensation plan (the compensation unit rates and support policies), particularly compensation prices for land in boundary areas adjoining two provinces.

(7) Implementing the land acquisition, resettlement and compensation for AHs, the life stability and sustainable livelihood for AHs is essential. Main livelihood of AHs in Quan Hoa and Mai Chau districts relies on land and key crops are Luong bamboo and other fruit trees. Losing land shall probably affect their income while in the immediate future they can not benefit any thing from the project. Therefore, it is necessary to give priorities to AHs in participating in programs on agricultural extension, forestry extension, small credits for household economic developments in the locality. On the other hand, the PMB should give priorities to AHs to participate in relevant works of the project.

(8) The PMB should strengthen the construction supervision in order to make sure that any adverse impacts to the local people in the construction phase should be noted, measured and compensated in compliance with the Project policies.

APPENDIX

Appendix 1: Opinions expressed by AHs and actions taken by PMB and RCs

<i>Issue</i>	<i>Opinions of AHs</i>	<i>Opinions of PMB and RCs</i>	<i>Responsible agencies</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
<i>1. Information dissemination and DMS process</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to AHs, after DMS process, DMS records were not given to AHs for tracking but they were only given for AHs to see and sign on. Then, being asked about what types of assets affected, AHs did not clearly know. - AHs also were not given 01 copy of detailed application of compensation prices of each AH for them to check against with the compensation payment. - AHs considered that they had been disseminated with compensation prices for assets affected but this was only formal information other than being discussed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In case of DMS record and record on price application, District LARCB and PMB would send to AHs in August 2009. - DMS process was participated by AHs, village management board, and local government; when DMS was completed, LARCB posted the DMS results in village for AHs to check and compared with DMS results. - After applying with prices, LARCB posted publicly as provided for. When the time of posting was over, a meeting with AHs was hold at village chief's. In the meeting, LARCB and PMB heard questions and opinions of AHs and explained, answered and clarified issues in the meeting. 	<i>RCs and PMB</i>	<i>Before 1/9/2009</i>
<i>2. DMS and identification of land area affected</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some AHs expressed that land-marks posted by RCs changed as compared with original posts. AHs were worried that houses could be affected by the construction because land-marks were posted close to their houses; - Some AHs were affected with main houses and got compensated. Their auxiliary houses, though were not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the basic design and alignment identification, the identification of relocation was impossibly correct. After the demarcation was corrected and with the availability of construction drawings, identifying relocation AHs would be correct and normally reduce from the preliminary survey. Minimization of involuntary resettlement and land acquisition is a 	<i>RCs and PMB</i>	<i>Before 1/9/2009</i>

affected, could not be used so AHs had to relocate. The project was requested to have a plan to help them.

principle on resettlement of GoV as well as of WB.
- DMS, application of compensation prices could only be doen after the demarcation for land acquired was completed. Some land-demarks were positioned close to houses but in fact the construction is about 3 m far from the demark, so it would not affect their houses. RCs had explained this server times to AHs.
- Some AHs had land-marks positioned close to the houses but the land was only affected temporarily for construction purposes so these AHs were subject to compensation for temporpary affected land other than to permanent land acquisition. Assets associated to the land temporarily affected were enttled to the compensation. PMB would have measures to monitor construction contractors in order to ensure the safety of and environmental protection for AHs.
- AHs of whom main houses had to remove to new living places, in addition to the compensation for house and architectural structures associated to the land acquired would be compensated for the remaining artchitectural structures outside the area acquired. If the house could be built on the remaining land, auxiliary house was not affected and could be

	<i>still in use and did not affect the original land, they were not entitled to compensation.</i>		
<i>Mr. Pham Ba Su (Nam Thanh village, Thanh Son): Complained because the land was measured inadequately. This AH had 530m² of forestry land acquired but this AH was not included in the compensation portfolio. The project was requested to review and check this.</i>	<i>LARCB and PMB would check the site as requested by the AH.</i>		
<i>Mr Ha Van Duyen (Thanh Tan village) complained that DMS committee measured and missed 1,000 m² of land of this AH.</i>	<i>LARCB, PMB and land-management officer of commune checked this land area and identified that this land area belonged to the village's management other than belonged to Mr. Duyen HH. Therefore, this AH was not entitled to the compensation for land but for assets associated on that land.</i>	<i>RCs and PMB explained to the AH</i>	
<i>Mr. Dinh Van Meu (Son Thanh village, Thanh Son): Planting cassavas on the land of Mr. Ha Van Hiep in Tan Huong village but these cassavas were not yet measured for compensation.</i>	<i>Mr. Meu planted cassavas on the land belonging to Mr. Ha Van Hiep (Tan Huong village). In the DMS process, Mr. Meu agreed with Mr. Hiep that the compensation document would share and be named after Mr. Hiep, and Mr. Meu would be entitled to compensation for assets on land and Mr. Hiep would be entitled to compensation for land. Because Mr. Hiep had not yet submitted LURC so LARCB was not yet paid the 2nd compensation to Mr. Hiep. Because Mr. Hiep had not yet received</i>	<i>RCs and PMB</i>	<i>Before 10/9/2009</i>

<p><i>Mr. Pham Ba Xoa (Nam Thanh village) The demarcation post was placed under his floor why he was not compensated?</i></p>	<p><i>the compensation so the compensation for cassava affected was not yet paid to Mr. Meu. In late August, mr. Ha Van Hiep submitted LURC to LARCB, so the remaining compensation would be paid to mr. Hiep in late September 2009. Mr. Meu and Mr. Hiep agreed with the payment to these AHs in this payment delivery. The demarcation post was placed at the edge of HH Pham Ba Xoa's house. From the post to the road (3m) was the area for temporary land acquisition so Mr. Xoa did not have to remove the house. Therefore, he was entitled to the allowance for temporary land acquired other than the compensation for land.</i></p>	<p><i>RCs and PMB explained to the AH</i></p>
<p><i>Mr. Phan Ba Thiem (Son Thanh village): This AH complained that AH only received the compensation for Luong bamboo other than the compensation for land.</i></p>	<p><i>According to LARCB, the compensation was paid to the person who was named on the compensation document and on the LURC. In this case, AH Pham Ba Thiem planted Luong bamboo on the land owned by AH Quy. Thus, the compensation for assets affected on that land was paid to Mr. Thiem and the comepsantion for land was paid to Mr. Quy. LARCB also requested Mr. Thiem and Mr. Quy to agree with each other about the compensation and get the village and CPC certification on the compensation received of each AH.</i></p>	<p><i>AHs self- negotiation and agreement</i></p>

<i>Mr. Pham Ba Giam (Son Thanh village): The area planting luong bamboo was originally measured at 274 m², but the compensation received was only for 74m².</i>	<i>RC and PMB checked the site and prepared a record which was signed to certify by the village management board, CPC, and AH owner. The area of land plot on map sheet 15, land plot 26 has an area of permanent acquisition of 74 m² and temporary acquisition of 58.9m². The compensation rate was applied in compliance with the structure of stall and the compensation unit price issued by Thanh Hoa PPC in 2008. On the other hand, AH Ha Van Thieu set up the stall on the productive forestry land, i.e. not right for the land-use purpose, so AH was entitled to the compensation for assets affected other than any allowance.</i>	<i>RCs and PMB explained to the AH</i>	<i>Pay allowance on 15/9/2009</i>
<i>Mr. Ha Van Thieu (Nam Thanh village, Thanh Son): Having a 24 m² stall and a 06 m² kitchen to be removed. The compensation rate for these assets was low so he wondered in addition to the compensation would AH be entitled to any allowance for relocation?</i>	<i>In DMS, compensation price application process, the total land acquired on cadastral map sheet #10, plot 39 was 332.8m² and was declared by AH and temporarily calculated as residential land. When LARCB received LURC and identified that the residential land stated on LURC was 130 m². Therefore, LARCB adjusted the application of compensation price for as 130 m² of residential land and the remaining 202.8m² as garden land (this was certified by CPC).</i>	<i>RCs and PMB explained to the AH</i>	
<i>Mr. Ha Van sDung (Nam Thanh village, Thanh Son): Complained that the affected land area applied with the compensation unit price was different from the area for which the compensation was made to AH.</i>	<i>AH Tieng entrusted 35 luong bamboos to AH Pham Thi Toan and got</i>	<i>RCs and PMB explained to</i>	

<p><i>number of Luong bamboo owned by himself and of Mr. Tieng (in the same village) was not clear.</i></p>	<p><i>the compensation together with AH Toan, other than entrusted his affected bamboos to AH Quang. Therefore, Mr. Quang had no responsibility to repay the compensation for such bamboos to AH Tieng.</i> <i>As checked by LARCB, AH Pham Thi Toan had paid all the compensation amount for 35 luong bamboos to AH Tieng. Because mr. Tieng kept requesting Mr. Quang for the compensation payment to these 35 bamboos and this led to the misunderstanding and complaint from Mr. Quang. LARCD and PMB had clarified this matter with these three AHs.</i></p>	<p><i>the AH</i></p>
<p><i>Mr. Ha Van Tham (Son Thanh village): Questioning that his family was acquired for garden land but got the compensation for frosty land, but neighbouring AH (AH Pham Ba Dem) lost the land similar to his but that AH was compensated with the unit price for garden land.</i></p>	<p><i>- AH Ha Van Tham had a total area of 295.2 m² acquired permanently, comprising of: Map sheet #15, plot 24b: 168.3m²; and Map sheet #14, plot 22: 126.9 m². As stated in LURCs, all these areas were productive forestry land.</i> <i>- AH Pham Ba Dem had a total area of 1,627m² acquired permanently, comprising of: Map sheet #15, plot 24d: 1,090m² as productive forestry land; Map sheet #15, plot 24: 537m², of which as verified with the land-use by Thanh Son CPC (on March 6th 2009) 300m² was stated as garden land and 237m² was stated as land for perennial crops.</i></p>	<p><i>RCs and PMB explained to the AH</i></p>
<p><i>Mrs. Nguyen Thi Mai</i></p>	<p><i>Mrs. Nguyen Thi Mai</i></p>	<p><i>RCs and</i></p>

<p>(Choi village):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On the same land plot of over 500m² but 41 m² was compensated as forestry land. Why? - She was informed that 88 affected bead trees were applied with the rate of 20000 VND/tree but the compensation received was only for 10,000 VND/tree. She asked Mr. Quang – the resettlement specialist but was not satisfied with this explanation about the compensation price. 	<p>had 2 land plots acquired. One plot was 461m², because this plot located together with residential land plot so it was compensated with the compensation price for garden land and was supported with an allowance with a rate applied for garden-land adjoining to residential land. The 2nd plot had 41.2 m² acquired of which the land was splited before DMS was taken place, so it was not considered as garden land and this area was compensated with the rate applied for land of perennial crops other than for forestry land as reflecd by the AH owner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annoucement on application of prices for 88 bead-trees: The compensation rate for timber trees was determined with the dimater of tree. In case of bead-trees, if diameter was =< 3cm it would be compensated with a unit rate of 10,000 VND/tree. LARCB wrongly applied the rate of 20,000 VND/tree (applied for trees with larger diameter) for her 88 bead-trees. When the compensation application was posted and in the meetings with AHs, AH Do (the neighour of Mrs. Mai) said that his HH also planted the same type and at the same time of bead-trees planted by Mrs. Mai, why trees of Mrs Mai were applied with a higher rate? 	<p>PMB explained to the AH</p>
--	--	--------------------------------

		<p><i>Therefore LARCB checked at site and identified that the diameter of bead-trees of Mrs Mai and of Mr Do was less than 3 cm, and this was responsive to the compensation rate of 10,000 VND/tree. Thus the compensation was adjusted to the right unit rate as specified. LARCB and PMB had explained many times to Mrs. Mai but she was not satisfied.</i></p>	
<p>3. Compensation prices and allowance</p>	<p>- AHs in Quan Hoa district living in the boundary with Mai Chau district did not agree with the compensation for land price. They considered that the compensation price for land in Thanh Hoa province (5,000 VND/m²) was low.</p> <p>- Allowance for ground leveling: as specified, each AH was provided with an allowance of 7,000,000 VND to level the ground. AHs complained that the single price applied for all AHs was not reasonable because some AHs had to level the ground on lowerland, they had to spend more on labour, and even AH had to level the ground for a workshop, so it was very costly, even to dozens of million VND, but they were applied with the same amount of allowance as other AHs received.</p> <p>- AH complained that they were not supported</p>	<p>- The payment to the productive forestry was complied with the compensation unit rate issued by Thanh Hoa PPC in 2008. This unit price was applied for productive forestry land category 1 in the mountainous area all over the province. The entire road alignment did not affect more than 25% of total landholdings of any AH therefore there was no significant impact to the sustainable livelihood of AHs.</p> <p>- For allowance for ground leveling: In order to ensure the equality between AHs who had relocate and level the ground, LARCB would check the actual excavated and filled work quantity of each AH and give the allowance based on that check. The maximum allowance for ground leveling was 7,000,000 VND/plot/HH. The site-check indicated that basically AHs paid the</p>	<p>RCs and PMB explained to the AH</p>

<p><i>with an allowance for reclaiming temporary land acquired.</i></p> <p><i>- AHs of whom the land was acquired temporarily complained that the project did not have specific commitment with them.</i></p> <p><i>- AHs said that there was a difference between the compensation price that was informed initially and the compensation price that they received the compensation.</i></p>	<p><i>ground-leveling not exceeding 7,000,000 VND.</i></p> <p><i>- AHs of whom the land was acquired temporarily: LARCB and PMB had an agreement signed directly with individual AH which was certified by the village management board and the local government.</i></p> <p><i>- Regarding to the compensation prices, there was no difference from the compensation prices applied for the payment. In process of documenting for compensation, AHs did not submit all necessary LURCs, so when applying compensation unit rates, LARCB applied the rate (temporarily) in compliance with the declaration of AHs but this was not paid to AHs unless AHs submitted documents verifying the origin of land-use. With the availability of documents, LARCB would review and adjust the compensation rate accordingly. Thus, there would have a difference in value of compensation in the price application phase and in the compensation payment phase.</i></p>
---	--

Mr Lo Van Ton (Pao village, Trung Son):

- AH had 02 stalls that had to relocate but the compensation was made for stalls only, not for land.

- AH was compensated for 2 stalls a total

In accordance with DMS, price application and decision approving the compensation cost estimated, AH Lo Van Ton was measured, applied with compensation price and paid fully for 2 stalls,

RCs and PMB explained to the AH

Paid in phase 1 on 27/8/2009

amount of 09 million VND but the neighbour was compensated with 11 million VND.

i.e.:
Stall 1: $14.8m^2 \times 102,000VND/m^2 = 1,509,600 VND$
Stall 2: $35.3m^2 \times 102,000VND/m^2 = 3,600,600 VND$
- For residential land: Map sheet#2, plot 22 (where the stalls were on) was compensated with $46.5m^2 \times 40,000VND/m^2 = 1,860,000 VND$; and the allowance for temporary acquisition for $44m^2$.
- The difference between the compensation for stalls of Mr. Ton and his neighbor's because the structure of stalls was different so the compensation rate differed (the structure of red-tiles on cement-paved ground, and fibre cement roof on earth ground).

Mr. Nguyen Tien Bay (Nam Dien village)
- Why did we receive only the compensation amount of 72 million VND but the initial price application was 89 million VND? AHs should be informed of any changes in details.

Because this AH did not show LURC, LARCB applied (temporarily) for all area of $936.2 m^2$ with a compensation price for garden land and an allowance for $936.2 m^2$ as the garden land adjoining residential land.
When the compensation plan was posted, AH submitted LURC showing the land-use and the LURC clearly stated that the area of garden land was $680m^2$.
Therefore, LARCB applied the allowance for $680m^2$ (43,520,000 VND) for garden land adjoining residential land other than for $936m^2$ (59,916,800 VND)

RCs and PMB explained to the AH

During AP meetings and payment

<p>Mr. Ha Van Thanh (Bo village) His land affected was applied with the compensation price for residential land but the payment was made with price for forestry land. AH requested to be compensated with the initial application of compensation price but the project said that the compensation was made based on the type of land.</p>	<p>as it was initially estimated. This adjustment resulted in reducing the compensation amount compared with the original estimate.</p> <p>- LARCB and PMB explained clearly to AH that the application of compensation price for land was based on the origine type of land-use and based on the LURCs.</p> <p>- Because AH Thanh had built a house for his offspring on the area of productive forest land (as stated in LURC), LARCB adjusted to apply the compensation rate responding to the LURC of AH Thanh.</p>	
<p>Mr. Nguyen Van Kiem (Nam Dien village) - Requested to check the compensation rate for 2 rooms of brick-house with tiled roof. The first application was 111 million VND but the payment was made only 95 million VND.</p>	<p>Because mistaking in applying compensation prices, when appraising the compensation plan, the Appaisal mission in Mai Chau district recorred the compensation unit rate as provided for, so the compensation amount was reduced compared with the intial application.</p>	<p>RCs and PMB explained to the AH</p>
<p>Mr. Nguyen Xuan Hoe (Nam Dien village) - This AH trades refreshment and groceries along the road. The AH requested to be provided with subsistence allowance because they could not do business when the construction was taken place, and AH also requested to have environment protected for HHs living along the road during the</p>	<p>The construction would not affect this AH's business. In contrast, his business could be better because more labours would come to work in the locality.</p>	

	<p>construction time.</p> <p>Mr. Dinh Cong Dinh (Bo village, Thanh Son commune)</p> <p>- AH had a land plot of 2,000m² and this was acquired by the project for a dumping area. However, AH was not compensated for land but for trees only. The project was requested to compensate his land lost.</p>	<p>- The area of 2,000m² of AH Dinh was planned as a dumping area in course of the construction. According to the status of land-use, this was a low-lyign land close to the river, not profitable for cultivation. When it was used as dumping area, all the land plot would be heightened and flatly and the value would probably be higher. This area was only acquired temporarily in couse of construction and would be returned upon the construction completed. Thus, AH was only compensated for assets associated to the land.</p>
4. Removal of houses, tombs, architectural works	<p>- In villages of 3 communes: Trung Son, Thanh Son, and Phu Thanh of Quan Hoa district, a total of 293 tombs had to remove (including additional 21 tombs), of which Pao village had 146 tombs, Chieng: 58 tombs, Co Me: 39 tombs, Uon: 21 tombs, Xuoc: 15 tombs, Po: 05 tombs, Tan Huong: 4 tombs and Son Thanh: 2 tombs. By the monitoring misson, only 1/3 of them had been removed, though all AHs had received the compensation for relocation of tombs (the rate was at 800,000 VND/ tomb that was buried more than 3 years, and 3,600,000 VND/tomb that was buried less than 3 years). The restriction</p>	<p>- The allowance for moving tombs was applied with the compensation unit price for tomb removal issued by Thanh Hoa PPC in 2008.</p> <p>- the cost for tomb removal was approved was suitable and was not lower than that in other similar projects in Thanh Hoa province and other provinces in the region.</p> <p>- Recently, LARCB in Quan Hoa district and PMB staffs had made great efforts in explaining, propagandizing the policies and encouraged AHs to remove tombs when they had received the compensation. In the process, meetings were held with AHs in villages where tombs had to remove, AHs all</p>

was the custom of Thai group, i.e. they do not re-bury the remainings as Kinh people do but they only make a grave-abodance ceremoby. So now, being requested to remove, people were not quite pleased with this policy.

- Accoridng to AHs, the cost for removal of a tomb was high because they had to pay for a wizard to conjure the spirits of the dead, 300,000-500,000 VND per the dead, 2 chickens, 2 pigs and other sacrifices. Meanwhile, they had to have a feast to invite their relatives and neighbours. On average, this ceremony usually costs 3 to 4 million VND.

- In the village, some tombs had to relocoate and some HHs had organized this ceremony and costed 4 million VND/ceremony including sacrifices and feast, even up to 10 million VND. This made other AH worried so they had not moved their tombs yet.

- Some AHs (Pao village) in the Village meeting held on March 15th 2009 proposed that in addition to an allowance of 800,000 VND for AHs to make sacrifices, the project should support for labour to excavate and remove tombs and provide one earthenware container per each tomb.

recommended that LARCB would support more fund to organize the sacrifices. Responding to their recommendation, Quan Hoa LARCB was collecting proposals from AHs in order to report to DPC and PMB for their consideration and decision.

<p>Mr. Pham Ba Tuyet (Chief of Chieng village):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requesting the project to support for making a road access to the new cemetery in order to facilitate people to remove tombs there. 	<p>LARC carried out additional DMS to support the labour to clear the way to the new cemetery of Chieng village. This support would be approved by September 10th.</p>
<p>Mr. Ha Van Tham (Chieng Yen, Thanh Son):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Initially AH had a land plot in the acquisition area and after DMS the HH lost a small part of land. Currently, the demarcation mark was placed close to the house and it was unable to live in the remaining part. Requesting the project to allow AH to move or relocate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AH Ha Van Tham was not ranked as a relocation AH. Currently, the demarcation mark was not placed on his land.
<p>Mr. Ha Van Sang (Thanh Tan village):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Having a 40m² housing land plot, was not compensated for ground leveling, but AH Luong Van Om in the same village was compensated by the project. Thus, the project was requested to review the case. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AH Ha Van Sang was not ranked as a relocation AH. This family leveled the ground and built a house themselves, and this HH was not entitled to an allowance for ground leveling. - HH Luong Van Om was also not ranked as a relocation AH so this AH was also not entitled to an allowance for ground leveling.
<p>Mr. Nguyen Xuan Tin (Nam Dien):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Two rooms of the main house were compensated, I had no complain about that, but two rooms of auxiliary house locating on the same land plot, with the same size but were not compensated for ground-leveling. 	<p>The construction of road only affected the temporarily land acquired area and partially affected one room of auxiliary house of AH Tin. LARCB did prepare documents for compensating all 2 rooms of this auxiliary house. When the construction completed,</p>

	<p><i>Therefore, this AH had not yet removed.</i></p> <p><i>Mr Nguyen Ba Tinh (Don village):</i> <i>- His house is 40 m long close to the road. When the road was constructed, road surface would be higher than his house and might cause esion or land slide. On the other hand, demarcation remark was placed in front of the house door (only 1 m away). These made the passing of his family and safety of the house difficult.</i></p> <p><i>Mr Le Van Thuc (Nam Dien village)</i> <i>- Already appealed a claim for the ground leveling cost 60 million VND (the compensation was 7 million VND); Requesting for an allowance for leveling land for production purpose, allowance for losing income due to suspended production in course of the construction.</i></p>	<p><i>AH would rebuild the house, so AH Tin was not entitled to an allowance for ground leveling.</i></p> <p><i>In case of AH Tinh, in the construction process, PMB would supervise and request construction contractors to ensrue the safety and environment of this AH. Proposed measures were making a negative talus rock masonry and creating steps to make an access road this AH.</i></p> <p><i>According to the design, the road alignment did not affect the area that this AH had leveled for production purposes. During the construction, this road would not affect the production or suspend the production of mr. Thuc. Therefore Mr Thuc was not entitled to allowance for income lost.</i></p>
<i>Allowances</i>	<p><i>AHs expressed that they did not know what allowances they were entitled to, so they requested to be informed in details.</i></p>	<p><i>For allowances, LARCB now is in process of preparing the document, applying compensation prices or rates. The budget would be approved by September 10th 2009.</i></p> <p><i>The project RP was distributed to all chiefs of villages and the chiefs of villages all organized meetings and announced the support policies.</i></p>

Appendix 2: Summary and comparison of compensation costs of RP and DMS

a) Mai Chau district, Hoa Binh

Nr	Items	Unit	By RP			Actual DMS			Remarks
			Quantity	Prices	Amount	Quantity	Prices	Amount	
I	Land compensation				3 729 011 720				
1	Compensation for land and crops	m2			2 969 991 720				
	1.1 Compensation for lands				2 624 569 400			1 784 914 700	
	Compensation for residential land	m2	22,408.5	128000; 25000	1,862,441,500	3,989.2		331,501,440	From 40.000 - 128.000VND/m2
	Compensation for annual crops land	m2	748.1	27,000	20,198,700	12,448.8	25,000	311,220,000	
	Compensation for perennial land	m2	5,381.8	25,000	134,545,000	6,116.6	38,000	221,562,860	
	Compensation for productive forest land	m2	41,750.3	14,000	584,504,200	30,558.6	14,000	427,820,400	
	Compensation for aquacultural land	m2	4,149.1		-				
	Compensation for public land	m2	653.8	22,000; 35,000	22,880,000				
	Compensation for garden land	m2				19,712.4	25,000	492,810,000	
	1.2 Compensation for trees/crops				345 422 320			794 853 900	including temporary acquisition
	- Annual crops		748.1	1,200	897,720	7476.93m2 và 421 cây		31,623,600	From 2000 - 20.000VND
	- Perennial trees		538.0	70,000	37,660,000	18,839.6m2/tán và 422 cây		612,369,200	From 4500 - 40.000VND
	- Bamboo		43,837.8	7,000	306,864,600	15,385.0		110,128,100	Bamboo prices: D<5cm: 5000VND; 5<D<7: 7000đ và 7<D<10: 8000VND

Center for community development studies
Independent resettlement monitoring organization

	- Wooden trees					1,648.0	Giá từ 10,000 - 100,000đ	40,733,000	
	2. Compensation for public assets		190	998,000	194,620,000				
	2.1 Compensation for structures		190	998,000	189,620,000				
	Primary school	m ²	40		41,000,000	44	956,000	41,968,400	
	Kindergarten	m ²	125.0	998,000	124,750,000				
	Meeting room	m ²	65.0	998,000	64,870,000				
	2.2 Compensation for				2,900,000				
	2.3 Crops/trees on public land				2,100,000				
	3. Compensation for assets of affected HHs		714.2		564,400,000			1,262,937,900	
	3.1. House	m ²	609.2		478,500,000	593.08		579,591,088	Different prices
	3.2. Auxiliary house	m ²	105.0		49,500,000	393.91m3 và 1508.77m2		673,139,812	Different prices
	3.3 Other auxiliary structures				11,700,000	990.7m2		10,207,000	
	3.4 Tombs				-				
	3.5 Annual tree on residential land								
	3.6 Perennial tree on residential land				23,400,000				
	3.7 Wooden tree on residential land				1,300,000				
	II. Temporary acquisition				1,176,500,000			867,753,000	
	Tree/crops				58,500,000				
	Others								

Center for community development studies
Independent resettlement monitoring organization

					1,049,200,000				
	Allowances	m2			68,800,000	42554.7		867,753,000	including allowances for annual tree land, productive forestry land, garden land, temporary acquisition of residential land and garden land adjoining with residential land.
	III. Resettlement Allowances		65.0		181,000,000				Not done
	1. House leveling	HH	10.0	7,000,000	70,000,000				
	2. Transportation allowance	HH	10.0	3,000,000	30,000,000				
	3. Subsistent allowance (6 months)	person	45.0		81,000,000				
	4. Allowance for losing > 25%	person	0.0						
	5. Vocational training allowance	person	0.0						
	6. Allowance for poor AHs (900.000/person/6 years)	person	0.0						
	Sum (I+II+III)		5,446.8		5,086,511,720			4,710,459,500	4,757,975,700
	Verification cost							3,000,000	
	Implementation cost							104,510,000	
	Total			Not include allowances				4,865,485,700	

b) Quan Hoa district, Thanh Hoa

Nr.	Items	Unit	By RP			by DMS			Remarks
			Quantity	Prices	Amount	Quantity	Prices	Amount	
I	Compensation		311,467.2		12,355,651,123				
1	Compensation for land and crops	m2	308,154.2						

Center for community development studies
Independent resettlement monitoring organization

					10,091,051,123				
	1.1 Land		308,154.2		8,150,317,870	290,769		2,213,684,450	
	Residential land		42,027.0	130 000	5,463,510,000	17,649	40,000	705,940,000	
	Garden land					6,203	27,000	167,467,500	
	Annual crops/trees		8,257.5	16 200	133,771,500			-	
	Perennial crops/trees		1,469.5	5 500	8,082,250	4,133	8,000	33,060,800	
	Productive forestry land		254,297.2	9 600	2,441,253,120	262,545	5,000	1,312,724,000	
	Aqua. land		549.9	5 000	2,749,500	229	8,000	1,829,600	
	Rice land					12	15,000	184,500	
	Public land		1,553.1	65 000	100,951,500				
	1.2 Compensation for crops/trees				1,940,733,253			693,582,827	include temporary acquisition, not include wooden trees
	Annual crops/trees		8,257.5	6 780	55,985,850	10419.4m2 và 3053 cây	Từ 3319đ - 35958đ	90,065,224	
	Perennial trees		147.0	106 549	15,662,703	2,113	Từ 7680đ - 251720đ	168,960,918	
	Young bamboo					26,313	7,190	189,190,470	
	Harvesting bamboo		267,012.1	7 000	1,869,084,700	38,666	5,063	195,765,958	
	* Compensation for assets and structures				3,826,100,000			3,315,900,928	include temporary acquisition
	2. Compensation for public assets		40.0		41,000,000				
	2.1 Compensation for structures		40.0		41,000,000				
	Primary school	m ²	40.0		41,000,000	44	956,000	41,968,400	
	Kindergartent	m ²	0.0						

Center for community development studies
Independent resettlement monitoring organization

	Meeting room	m ²	0.0						
	2.2 Auxiliary works								
	2.3 Crops/tree on public land								
	3. Compensation for assets of affected household		3,273.0		2,223,600,000				
	3.1. Houses	m ²	2,354.0		1,694,800,000	4325.4 m2	Từ 381,000 - 750,000đ	2,759,585,550	
	3.2. Auxiliary works	m ²	919.0		67,000,000	926	Từ 68,000đ - 750,000đ	397,229,797	
	3.3 Other auxiliary works				21,800,000		Từ 24,000đ - 261,000đ	124,686,361	
	3.4 Tombs				368,900,000	272	800,000	247,540,000	not included in 21 additional tombs
	3.5 Annual tree on residential land				100,000				not included in crops and trees compensation
	3.6 Perennial tree on residential land				66,300,000				
	3.7 Wooden tree on residential land				4,800,000	5,134	từ 3,194 - 59,640	48,948,129	
	II. Temporary acquisition				2,700,900,000				
	Compensation for crops/trees				601,000,000				included in crops and trees compensation
	Compensation for other assets				1,561,500,000				
	Allowances				538,400,000				Ongoing
	III. Resettlement allowances		382.0		1,388,400,000				
	1. House leveling allowance	HH	42.0	7,000,000	294,000,000	57	From 0 - 7,000,000	233,311,672	
	2. Transportation allowance	HH	42.0	3,000,000	126,000,000	57	3,000,000	171,000,000	These allowances are being prepared
	3. Subsistent allowance (6 months)	person	178.0		320,400,000	230		273,780,000	

Center for community development studies
Independent resettlement monitoring organization

	4. Allowance for losing > 25%	person	0.0			-			
	5. Vocational training allowance	person	0.0			-			
	6. Allowance for poor HHs (900.000/person/6 years)	person	120.0		648,000,000				
	Cộng (I+II+III)	Tr.đồng	311,849		16,444,951,123			6,470,708,205	
	Chi thăm định							15,529,700	
	Dự phòng (5%)							323,535,410	
	Tổng cộng							6,809,773,315	Giá trị phê duyệt

Appendix 3: Number of AHs and interviewees

b) Mai Chau district, Hoa Binh

Nr.	Village/commune	Affected land	Relocation	Affected Tomb	Ethnic	Remarks
I	NAM ĐIEN VILLAGE					
1	Nguyễn Xuân Hoè	X				
2	Nguyễn Thị Huê	X				
3	Nguyễn Văn Thuấn	X				
4	Đào Thị Kim	X	X			
5	Nguyễn Xuân Tín	X				
6	Nguyễn Thị Hào	X				
7	Bùi Văn Thịnh	X				
8	Bùi Ngọc Quang	X				
9	Nguyễn Bá Giới	X				
10	Vũ Đình Thành	X				
11	Lê Văn Thực	X				
12	Nguyễn Văn Mạnh	X				
13	Nguyễn Tiến Bẩy (Hà)	X				
14	Hà Xuân Tiệp	X				
15	Nguyễn Văn Chín	X				
16	Nguyễn Văn Kiện	X				
17	Đỗ Viết Hải	X				
18	Bùi Văn Chương	X				
19	Nguyễn Diên Nghĩa	X				
20	Hà Văn Sinh	X				
21	Nguyễn Văn Tư	X				
22	Trịnh Thị Dương	X				
23	Nguyễn Văn Năm	X				
24	Nguyễn Xuân Định	X				
25	Đặng Đình Đôn	X				
26	Đặng Viết Chiến	X				
27	Khà Văn Phích	X				
28	Hà Thị Thuyết	X				
29	Khà Văn Phúc	X				
30	Lương Văn Chiêu	X				
31	Nguyễn Văn Duy-Ng Văn Quang	X				
32	Nguyễn Đức Thịnh	X				
33	Nguyễn Văn Nghê	X				
34	Đặng Thị Tý (Xuân)	X				

35	Trịnh Thị Hương	X				
II	DÒN HAMLET					
36	Nguyễn Doãn Chữ	X				
37	Lê Quang Vượng	X				
38	Nguyễn Văn Soạn	X				
39	Nguyễn Thị Thắng	X				
40	Đỗ Văn Tân	X				
41	Nguyễn Văn Kỳ	X				
42	Lê Văn Thư	X				
43	Tường Văn Nghị	X				
44	Nguyễn Văn Soi	X				
45	Đào Huy Sơn	X				
46	Đào Huy Tư	X				
47	Nguyễn Văn Tường	X				
48	Lê Văn Thông (Minh)	X				
49	Đào Huy Hoa (Cúc)	X				
50	Nguyễn Văn Luyến	X				
51	Nguyễn Quang Vinh	X				
52	Nguyễn Thị Đông	X				
53	Nguyễn Thị Phương	X				
54	Nguyễn Thị Hoa	X				
55	Đào Thị Từ	X				
56	Nguyễn Văn Đoàn	X				
57	Nguyễn Văn Tuân	X				
58	Nguyễn Văn Phụng	X				
59	Lại Văn Nghị (Su)	X				
60	Đỗ Văn Thực	X				
61	Nguyễn Thị Trà	X				
62	Lại Văn Đạt	X				
63	Lại Văn Tuyên	X	X			
64	Nguyễn Bá Vinh	X				
65	Đào Huy Miên	X				
66	Nguyễn Bá Tính	X				
67	Nguyễn Văn Cảnh	X	X			
68	Trịnh Văn Viết	X				
69	Lê Tuấn Duệ (Nhàn)	X				
70	Hoàng Văn Lĩnh	X				
71	Lại Văn Nhụ	X				
72	Lê Thị Oanh	X				
73	Đỗ Văn Cường	X				
74	Lê Văn Tuệ (Năm)	X				
75	Đỗ Thị Nhọt	X				

76	Đỗ Văn Dậu	X				
77	Đào Thị Thắm	X	X			
78	Nguyễn Viết Hiền	X				
79	Đào Thị Khuyên(Ng Văn Đích)	X	X			
80	Nguyễn Văn Thành	X	X			
81	Lê Thanh Huệ	X				
82	Nhà văn hoá xóm Dồn	X				
83	Nguyễn Thị Phụng	X				
84	Chi nhánh điện Mai Châu	X				
III	THANH MAI HAMLET					
85	Nguyễn Bá Truyền	X				
86	Nguyễn Đức Nam	X				
87	Lê Văn Sơn	X				
88	Phan Văn Thắng	X				
89	Nguyễn Đức Việt	X				
90	Nguyễn Văn Cự	X				
91	Đào Thị Thường-Ng Văn Thành	X				
92	Nguyễn Doãn Trờ	X				
93	Nguyễn Thị Toan	X	X			
IV	CHÓI HAMLET					
94	Phạm Văn Lịch	X				
95	Phạm Văn Định	X				
96	Nguyễn Doãn Khắc	X	X			Di chuyển ngoại tỉnh
97	Đỗ Đình Tuất	X				
98	Bùi Văn Ba	X				
99	Vũ Thị Dung	X				
100	Phạm Văn Nhuận	X				
101	Vũ Văn Thanh	X				
102	Phạm Văn Thuận	X				
103	Hoàng Bích Công	X				
104	Nguyễn Văn Bằng	X				
105	Hà Văn Long	X				
106	Đỗ Xuân Tình (Thiệt)	X				
107	Phạm Văn Độ	X				
108	Cao Thị Bẩy	X				
109	Hà Minh Khuyển	X				
110	Trịnh Văn Tô	X				
111	Nguyễn Văn Thuận	X				
112	Nguyễn Văn Chiến	X				
113	Phạm Văn Tiệp	X				
114	Hoàng Thị Sáu	X				

115	Hoàng Đức Dương	X				
116	Nguyễn Văn Hải	X	X			Di chuyển ngoại tỉnh
117	Nguyễn Đình Tiễn	X				
118	Trịnh Thị Lan (Thu)	X				
119	Lê Tuấn Cảnh	X				
120	Tương Thị Kiến	X				
121	Hoàng Đức Quảng	X				
122	Nguyễn Thị Mai	X				
123	Nguyễn Văn Phẩm	X				
124	Cao Văn Nguyễn	X				
125	Đỗ Xuân Tuyền	X				
126	Hợp tác xã Xóm Chói	X				

b) Quan Hoa district, Thanh Hoa

Nr.	Name of AHs	Afected land	Relocation	Afected tomb	Ethnic	Remarks
I	CHIỀNG YÊN HAMLET					
1	Đinh Ngọc Siêng	X				
2	Hà Văn Ngâm	X				
3	Hà Văn Thâm	X				
4	Hà Văn Chữ		X			
5	Trường Học cấp 1	X				
6	Tào thị Loan	X				
7	Định Văn Biễn		X			
8	Đinh Văn Nhậm	X				
9	Đinh Tiến Nhậm	X				
10	Lương Văn Toàn	X				
11	Lương Văn Luyến	X				
12	Lương Văn Dự	X				
13	Hà Văn Ấng	X				
14	Lương Văn Hùng	X	X			
15	Hà Văn Thâm	X				
16	Đinh Văn Sùng	X				
17	Tài Sản Của Bản	X				
II	NAM THÀNH HAMLET					
18	Hà văn Cháp	X				
19	Phạm Bá Thật	X				
20	Hà Văn Tiễn	X				
21	Hà Văn Thiệu	X				
22	Lò Văn Diễm	X	X			

23	Lương Văn Tuyên	X				
24	Hà Văn Cẩm	X				
25	Hà Văn Được	X				
26	Hà Văn Dân	X				
27	Hà Văn Thảo	X				
28	Lương Văn Tình	X				
29	Đinh Văn Thoa	X	X			
30	Phạm bá Xoà	X				
31	Đinh Văn Thật	X				
32	Lương văn Tựa	X				
33	Hà Đức Sảng	X	X			
34	Phạm Bá sư	X				
35	Hà Văn Tuấn	X				
36	Lương văn thu	X				
37	Hà Văn Thương	X				
38	Hà Công Trọng	X				
39	Hà thị Thuý	X				
40	Đinh Văn Thoa	X				
41	Hà Văn Dũng	X	X			
42	Lò Văn Chắc	X				
43	Đinh Văn Soán	X				
44	Hà Văn Quế:	X				
45	Phạm Bá Tiệp	X	X			
46	Hà Công Ninh	X	X			
47	Lương Văn Thần	X				
48	Hà Công Chùng	X				
49	Hà Văn Quảng	X				
50	Hà văn Thự	X				
51	Lương Thị Tính	X				
III	TÂN HƯƠNG HAMLET					
52	Đinh Công Doãn	X				
53	Hà Văn Thái	X				
54	Hà Văn Thọ	X				
55	Hà Công Yên	X				
56	Đinh Công Mệnh	X				
57	Lương Văn Sáng	X				
58	Phạm Văn Thôn	X				
59	Phạm Văn Hằng	X				
60	Phạm Văn Đú	X				
61	Hà Công Vinh	X	X			
62	Hà Văn Nội	X				
63	Hà Văn Đuống	X				

64	<i>Lương Thị Xuyên</i>	X	X			
65	<i>Phạm Bá ngót</i>	X				
66	Hà Văn Kiềm	X				
67	<i>Hà công Thương</i>	X				
68	<i>Phạm Văn Huy</i>	X				
69	Đinh Công Tám	X				
70	<i>Phạm Văn Tấn</i>	X				
71	Phạm Thị Tính	X				
72	<i>Đinh Công Dương</i>	X				
73	Hà Văn Tuyên	X				
74	<i>Hà Công Bích</i>	X				
75	Hà Công Bường	X				
76	<i>Phạm Bá Thức</i>	X				
77	Phạm Văn Hồng	X				
78	<i>Hà Văn Hiệp</i>	X				
79	Phạm Bá Hạnh	X				
80	<i>Phạm Bá Sại</i>	X				
81	Phạm Văn Hoà	X				
82	<i>Hà Công Phúc</i>	X				
83	Lương Văn Xiềng	X				
84	Đinh Công Mùi	X				
85	Lương Văn Sỹ	X				
86	BQL Thôn Bản	X				
87	Phạm Bá Thoán	X				
88	<i>Hà Văn Thế</i>	X				
IV	THÀNH TÂN HAMLET					
89	Hà Thi Chòn	X				
90	Lương Văn Quang	X				
91	<i>Lương Văn Quý</i>	X				
92	<i>Ngân Thị Hồng</i>	X	X			
93	Ngân Văn Xiề	X				
94	<i>Hà Văn Ngòi</i>	X				
95	<i>Hà Văn Hiệp</i>	X				
96	<i>Ngân Văn Duyên</i>	X	X			
97	Lò Văn Chính	X				
98	<i>Hà Văn Hiến</i>	X				
99	<i>Lò Văn Mậu</i>	X				
100	<i>Ngân Văn Lương</i>	X	X			
101	Hà Văn Đà	X				
102	Lò Văn Chính	X				
103	<i>Hà Văn Phẩm</i>	X				
104	<i>Hà Văn Chức</i>	X				

105	Hà Văn Trần	X	X			
106	Hà Văn Khuyên	X	X			
107	Hà Văn Niên	X	X			
108	Ngân Văn Thù (Đều)	X				
109	Hà Văn Thông	X				
110	Lương Văn Lếu	X	X			
111	Hà Thị Chúc	X				
112	Lò Văn Kéo	X				
113	Lò Văn Số	X				
114	Hà Văn Thu	X	X			
115	Hà Văn Duyên	X	X			
116	Ngân Văn Đợi (Xiền)	X	X			
117	Lương Thị Cùng	X	X			
118	Ngân Văn Kiện	X				
119	Ngân Văn Làn	X				
120	Lộc Văn Nguyên (Hạnh)	X	X			
121	Ngân Văn Dương	X				
122	Lộc Văn Vũ (òn)	X	X			
123	Lương Văn Òm	X				
124	Ngân Văn Tính	X				
125	Hà Văn Thần	X				
126	Hà Văn Làn	X				
127	Hà Văn Hoàn	X				
128	Hà Văn Khuê	X				
129	Hà Văn Hằng	X				
130	Lương Văn Ót	X				
131	Hà Văn Hưng	X				
V	SƠN THÀNH HAMLET					
132	Phạm Bá Quý	X				
133	Hà Công Chải	X				
134	Phạm Văn Thiêm	X				
135	Đinh Xuân Soạn	X				
136	Đinh Xuân Doanh	X				
137	Phạm Thị Toán	X				
138	Hà Văn Thám	X				
139	Phạm Bá Thật	X				
140	Đinh Văn Mêu	X				
141	Đinh Xuân Xuân	X				
142	Phạm Bá Đếm	X				
143	Lục Thị Chúc	X				
144	Hà Văn Quang	X				

145	Phạm Văn Dồn	X				
146	Hà Văn Nộ	X				
147	Phạm Văn Chót	X				
148	Đinh Văn Thờ	X				
149	Phạm Bá Giám	X				
150	Phạm Thị Dừa	X				
151	Phạm Văn Giàng	X				
152	Lương Văn Súi	X				
153	Hà Văn Chiều	X				
154	Phạm Văn Khảm	X				
155	Phạm Bá Duyên	X				
156	Hà Văn Tuyền	X				
157	Hà Văn Bảo		X			
158	UBND xã	X				
159	Lộc Văn thức	X				
160	Phạm Bá Ích	X				
VI	ẠO HAMLET					
161	Phạm Bá Nốt	X				
162	Lương Văn Cợn	X				
163	Phạm Bá Niềm			X		
164	Hà Văn Bạ			X		
165	Lương Văn Nghách			X		
166	Lương Văn Nhô			X		
167	Lương Minh Thạch			X		
168	Lương văn Lai			X		
169	Lương Ngọc Thuần			X		
170	Phạm Bá Ngóc			X		
171	Hà Cao Bằng			X		
172	Hà Văn Tập			X		
173	Hà Văn Hồng			X		
174	Phạm Bá Đào			X		
175	Ngân Văn Tiến			X		
176	Phạm Bá Đồng			X		
177	Phạm Bá Lòng			X		
178	Hà Văn Thanh			X		
179	Lương Văn Mạch			X		
180	Lương Xuân Mới			X		
181	Hà Văn Hùng			X		
182	Ngân Văn Khoáy			X		
183	Phạm Bá Luyến			X		
184	Lương Văn Sạch			X		
185	Hà Văn Thêm			X		

Center for community development studies
Independent resettlement monitoring organization

186	Lương văn Quyền			X		
187	Lương Văn Thái			X		
188	Hà Văn Khảm			X		
189	Hà Văn Hoạt			X		
190	Lương Văn Thông			X		
191	Lương Văn Thái			X		
192	Nguyễn Quang Trung			X		
193	Hoàng Quốc Ngọc			X		
194	Phạm Bá Luyến			X		
195	Hà Văn Tà			X		
196	Hà Văn Phiến			X		
197	Phạm Thị Nẫu			X		
198	Phạm Bá Chìm			X		
199	Phạm Thị Mẫn			X		
200	Hà Văn Hưng			X		
201	Lương Thành Đô			X		
202	Ban Quản lý Bản			X		
203	Phạm Bá Nốt			X		
204	Lương Văn Cọn			X		
205	Hà Văn Thưng			X		
206	Ngân Công Phúc			X		
207	Phạm Minh Chấn			X		
208	Lương Văn Nhức			X		
209	Lò Văn Thự			X		
210	Phạm Bá Đạt	X				
211	Hà Văn Thưng	X	X			
212	Ngân Công Phúc	X	X			
213	Lò Văn Nùng	X	X			
214	Phạm Bá Khuyến	X	X			
215	Phạm Minh Chấn	X	X			
216	Phạm Bá Cừ	X				
217	Hà Văn Thịnh	X	X			
218	Ngân Văn Nguyên	X				
219	Phạm Bá Chờ	X				
220	Phạm Bá Tuyết	X	X			
221	Lương Văn Lúc	X	X			
222	Lò Văn Thự	X				
223	Hoàng Quốc Ngọc	X				
224	Phạm Minh Thơ	X				
225	Lò Văn Tồn	X				
226	Vi Hồng Hạnh	X				
227	Trương Cấp I	X				

Center for community development studies
Independent resettlement monitoring organization

228	Phạm Hoàng Long	X				
229	<i>Phạm Bá Thịnh</i>	X	X	X		
230	Phạm Thị Hoè	X	X	X		
231	<i>Hà Văn Chức</i>	X		X		
232	Phạm Bá Xuân	X				
233	Phạm Bá Khoa	X	X			
234	<i>Phạm Bá Diệp</i>	X		X		
235	Đinh Thị Thương	X	X			
236	Phạm Đức Xuyên	X	X	X		
237	Lò Văn Mộng	X	X	X		
238	Phạm Bá Hoàng	X	X			
239	Hà Thị Tuyết	X	X			
240	<i>Lò Văn Miên</i>	X		X		
241	Phạm Bá Nhiệm	X				
242	Lương Xuân Uý	X				
243	Lương Thanh Xuân	X				
244	Lương Văn Hữu	X		X		
245	Ngân Văn Khai	X				
246	Hà Văn Nôm	X				
247	Lương thị Lĩnh	X	X			
248	Phạm Bá Xóm	X		X		
249	Phạm Bá Sach	X				
250	Lò Văn Úi	X				
251	Lương Văn Tuyển	X				
252	<i>Lương Văn Nhó</i>	X				
253	Phạm Bá Trần	X				
VII	PÓ HAMLET					
254	Hà Văn Nho	X				
255	<i>Lương văn Phục</i>	X				
256	<i>Hà văn Lợi</i>	X	X			
257	Hà văn Thới	X				
258	<i>Phạm Bá Chón</i>	X	X			
259	<i>Hà thị Dừng</i>	X				
260	<i>Đinh công Định</i>	X				
261	Hà văn Tăng	X				
262	<i>Phạm bá Chín</i>	X				
263	<i>Phạm bá Chénh</i>	X	X			
264	<i>Phạm bá Thiệu</i>	X				
265	Đinh công Thúc	X				
266	Hà văn Đạt	X				
267	<i>Lò văn Thuận</i>	X	X			
268	<i>Hà văn Thành</i>	X	X			

269	Hà văn Thía	X				
270	Hà văn Tâm	X				
271	Lò văn Đàn	X				
272	Hà văn Dừng	X	X			
273	Hà văn Hung	X				
274	Hà văn Huy	X				
275	Hà văn Hoan	X	X			
276	Thôn bản	X				
277	Đình công Đủ	X				
278	Hà văn Hồng	X				
279	Đình Công Đâu	X	X			
280	Lương thị Quế	X				
281	Hà văn Hạt	X				
282	Hà văn Thuật	X				
283	Lương văn Khăng	X				
284	Hà văn Thơ	X				
285	Lương Xuân Tiên	X				
VIII	UÔN HAMLET					
286	Lương Xuân Hiệp	X	X			
287	Hà Thị Thiết	X				
288	Lương Văn Thực	X	X			
289	Lương Thanh Xuân	X	X			
290	Lương Thị Vương	X				
291	Phạm Thị Lương	X				
292	Đình Thị Kiên	X				
293	Lương Văn Thuận	X				
294	Lương Văn Thăm	X				
295	Lương Duy Nhất	X				
296	Hà Thị Thoa	X	X			
297	Hà Thị Thuê	X	X			
298	Lương Hồng Phong	X				
299	Lương Văn Quyền	X				
300	Lương Văn Quang	X	X			
301	Lương Văn Xuyên	X				
302	Lương Văn Minh (Thân)	X	X			
303	Lương Văn Thoan	X				
304	Trương Văn Bảy	X				
305	Lương Minh Huân	X				
306	Lương Văn Thật	X				
307	Lương Xuân Thao	X				
308	Lương Văn Khảm	X				

Center for community development studies
Independent resettlement monitoring organization

309	Lương Văn Thanh	X				
310	Lương Văn Thâm	X				
311	Lương Văn Thi	X				
312	<i>Lương Văn Thương</i>	X				
313	Lương Văn Thịnh	X				
314	<i>Lương Văn Phương</i>	X				
315	Lương Văn Núng	X				
316	<i>Lương Xuân Hiệp</i>	X				
317	Tài Sản Của Bản	X				
318	Lương văn Nương	X				
319	Lương Thị Oanh	X				
IX	CHIỀNG HAMLET					
320	<i>Phạm Bá Đài</i>			X		
321	Phạm Bá Xiềng			X		
322	<i>Phạm Ngọc Ân</i>			X		
323	Lương thị Sún			X		
324	<i>Phạm Hùng Bích</i>			X		
325	Vị Hồng Ngự			X		
326	<i>Lương Văn Trọng</i>			X		
327	Phạm Bá Vịnh			X		
328	<i>Phạm Bá Bồng</i>			X		
329	Hà Thị Lướm			X		
330	<i>Phạm Thị Dần</i>			X		
331	Phạm Bá Huân			X		
332	<i>Hà thị Hòa</i>			X		
333	Phạm Bá Tức			X		
334	<i>Lương Văn Mai</i>			X		
335	Lương Thị Dù			X		
336	Lữ Đình Càn			X		
337	Lương Văn Òm			X		
338	<i>Phạm Bá Tuyền</i>			X		
339	Hà Văn Nôm			X		
340	<i>Phạm Ngọc Thương</i>			X		
341	Phạm Ngọc Huân			X		
342	<i>Lương Thị Phím</i>			X		
343	Hà Văn Minh			X		
344	<i>Lương Văn Quỳnh</i>			X		
345	Lộc Văn Bình			X		
346	Lương Văn Đề			X		
X	CO ME HAMLET					
347	<i>Hà Văn Dũng</i>			X		
348	<i>Phạm Bá Chiến</i>			X		

Center for community development studies
Independent resettlement monitoring organization

349	<i>Ngân Văn Thiệu</i>			X		
350	<i>Phạm Mạnh Hưng</i>			X		
351	<i>Lương Văn Sòng</i>			X		
352	Lương văn Thúy			X		
353	<i>Len Thị Sâu</i>			X		
354	Lương Văn Dành			X		
355	<i>Lương Văn Khấn</i>			X		
356	Hà Văn Thi			X		
357	Hà Văn Thông			X		
358	Phạm Anh Hoán			X		
359	Hà Văn Việt			X		
360	Lương Văn Thi			X		
361	<i>Lương Văn Thơ</i>			X		
XI	XUỐC HAMLET					
362	Phạm Minh Thêu			X		
363	Ngân Văn Quân			X		
364	Lương Văn Thỏi			X		
365	Lương Văn Ngợi			X		
366	Hà Văn Thiện			X		
367	Lương Văn Thàn			X		

Notes: Names in italic are interviewed