

Social Monitoring Report

Project Number: 43319-033
Loan 2983-CAM (COL), Loan 8265-CAM (SCF)
Grant 0334-CAM (UEIF), Grant 0335-CAM (SCF)
Semestral Monitoring Report (January to June 2021)
January 2022

Cambodia: Greater Mekong Subregion Southern Economic Corridor Towns Development Project

Prepared by the General Department of Resettlement of the Ministry of Economy and Finance
for the Asian Development Bank.

This social monitoring report is a document of the borrower. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent those of ADB's Board of Directors, Management, or staff, and may be preliminary in nature.

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



**Kingdom of Cambodia
Nation Religion King**

Third Semi - Annual Monitoring Report

**For SOUTHERN ECONOMIC CORRIDOR TOWNS
DEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

**ADB Loan No. 2983-CAM (SF)/Loan 8265-CAM (SCF), Grant 0334CAM
(UEIF)/Grant 0335-CAM (SCF)**

EXTERNAL MONITORING FOR RESETTLEMENT PLAN IMPLEMENTATION



January to June 2021

Submitted to the
Inter-Ministerial Resettlement Committee
Through the General Department of Resettlement of
Ministry of Economy and Finance

This Semi-Annual Report is of the Borrower prepared for General Department of Resettlement by the external monitoring consultant for the Royal Government of Cambodia.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	: Asian Development Bank
AH	: Affected Household
AP	: Affected Person
DMS	: Detailed Measurement Survey
DRP	: Detailed Resettlement Plan
GDR	: General Department of Resettlement
IRC	: Inter-ministerial Resettlement Committee
PIB	: Project Information Booklet
PRSC	: Provincial Resettlement Sub-Committee
RP	: Resettlement Plan
RGC	: Royal Government of Cambodia
WG	: Working Group

CONTENTS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
I. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Project Background.....	1
1.2 Subproject Description.....	2
II. Resettlement Impacts and Status of Implementation of DRPs	5
III. Semi-Annual Finding (From January to June 2021).....	13
3.1 Household Accessibility by EMO.....	13
3.2 Monitoring of Consultation and Information Disclosure.....	14
3.3 AHs received IRP program for Neak Loeung Sub-project only.....	15
3.4 Compensation of Payment Progress.....	24
3.5 Income Level of Affected Household.....	24
3.6 Grievances Redress Mechanism.....	25
IV. CONCLUSION.....	29
ANNEX B: External Monitoring Questionnaire.....	39
ANNEX C: Picture of Site Visit and field Survey.....	47

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The Southern Economic Corridor Towns Development Project covers Mekong sub-region of three countries including Cambodia, Lao, and Vietnam. In Cambodia, the Project activities are located in Battambang, Banteay Meanchey, and Svay Reang Provinces.

2. Regarding the Project will transform the corridor towns of Battambang, Bavet, and Poi Pet into economic hubs by improving the urban-environmental infrastructure and strengthen institutional capacity of provinces and local authorities through the implementation of the following subprojects in each town. In Battambang town, Battambang province, the subproject components include Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage), Flood Control, and Materials Recovery Facility. In Bavet town, Svay Reang province, the subproject components include Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage), Materials Recovery Facility, and Upgrading of Urban Roads. In Poi Pet Town, Banteay Meanchey province, the subproject components include Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage), Poi Pet Solid Waste Landfill and Material Recovery Facility.

3. The Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) subproject in Battambang is located in 3 communes namely Anlong Vil in Sangke District, Prek Preah Sdach and Rattanak both are in Battambang municipality. The Battambang Storm Drainage component of Wastewater Treatment Subproject have been constructed at East side of the town, located at Rattanak and Prek Preah Sdach Communes. The total length of Storm Drain is approximately 13.093km. The Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) subproject in Poi Pet involves the construction of four lines of storm drains in Poi Pet Town. All these storm drains will start from the north of National Road No. 5, crossing the road and will end up at the stream border. The total length of the storm drain is approximately 2km. The Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) Subproject in Bavet Town, consists of the construction of three storm drainage lines of approximately 5km all starting or crossing the National Road No.1 (NR1) and discharge into the existing drains constructed along the NR1. The Urban Roads Subproject in Bavet. It is in three (3) Communes namely (i) Ba Ti, (ii) Bavet and (iii) Chhak Mtess in Bavet town. The subproject will improve and widen 6km of NR1 from chainage 159km to 165km in Bavet town. The last subproject is Flood Control Subproject in Neak Loeung which include the construction of (i) a flood protection dike with an access road on top; (ii) central storm drainage; (iii) a detention pond; and (iv) a pumping station. The total length of the dike will be 4.4km, and the length of the earthen central drainage channel will be about 1.5km. The detention pond will have a storage capacity of 200,813m³.

4. This third semi-annual monitoring report (SMR) covers the period from January to June 2021, summarizing the analysis of accomplished result under the implementation of the updated resettlement plan (URP) and detailed resettlement plans (DRPs) of the subprojects in Battambang, Banteay Meanchey, Svay Reang and Prey Veng Provinces. In this monitoring period, the subproject in Battambang indicates that the survey on AHs remained the decrease at 1% this SMR monitoring reports. The Neak Loeung subproject is included in this SMR where 87 AHs (22%) have been interviewed. In total of 283 out of 1,298 or 22% of AHs were randomly selected for interviews and data collection for this monitoring.

Table I: Summary of URP/DRP implementation status

No. (1)	Subproject Name (2)	Planned in the URP			Actual as implemented			Missing AHs in RPs (9)	Number of AHs with pending compensation (10)	Vulnerable AHs with pending compensation (11)
		No. AHs (3)	Incl. vulnerable AHs (4)	Compensation and entitlements in USD (5)	AHs received compensati on (6)	Incl. vulnerable AHs (7)	Compensation and entitlements in USD (8)			
1	Poipet Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage)	65	7	790,064.57	64	7	793,513.74	1 AH in Actual implementation decrease then Planned URP	None	None
2	Battambang Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage)	258	22	249,390.71	258	23	175,808.58	1 AH in Actual implementation increase then Planned URP	None	None
3	Battambang Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) - Trapezoidal Earth Canal-Additional Scope)	11	None	7,205.50	11	None	10,349.60	The same	None	None
4	Bavet Urban Road	445	45	408,722.80	445	45	393,082.99	The same	None	None
5	Bavet Storm Drainage	134	1	301,683.18	134	1	187,469.36	The same	None	None
6	Neak Loeung Flood Protection	385	81	2,208,426.52	351	66	1,663,813.52	Still on the progress	The compensation still on progress	The compensation still on progress
	Total	1,298	156	3,965,493.28	1,263	142	3,224,037.79	2 AHs		

As for three sub-projects at Bavet, Poipet and Battambang already received the compensation 100%. As by discussed and checked with GDR by compared the compensation budget for AHs to receive the compensation, the actual implemented is lower than planned in URP because of

1. For Poipet Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage)

1. The actual amount of AH in the implementation is less than in URP plan for 1 AH, since 1 AH was not impacted by the sub-project.

2. According to the first line showing the total number of AHs are 27 AHs (528,461.81\$) will be able to receive the compensation in URP plan. However, the actual number was only 26 AHs (528,170.93\$), so this cause the actual amount of compensation is less about 290.88\$.
3. Regarding to the third line showing the budget for URP is 10,590.46\$ while the actual amount of implementation is 120,332.18\$. Therefore, the actual amount of this compensation is less about 109,741.72\$.
4. To sum up, total AHs in URP Plan showing that there is 1 AH less than the number of AH in actual implementation. In addition, the compensation budget in URP Plan is 790,064.57\$ which is less than the actual implementation budget about 3,449.17\$, while the actual one is 793,513.74\$.

2. For Battambang Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage), According to the reality of affected target showing that the amount of affected assets cost is higher than the replacement cost. For instance, Wastewater treatment (Storm Drainage) base in Battambang showing the cost of floor concrete in URP is about 60\$/m²; however, based on the exact calculated amount paid in DMS as it's only 12\$/m². This caused the total amount of compensation completely different from URP and in the actual implementation. Likewise, the total vulnerable AH are 22 AHs yet as in the actual implementation showing one more AH who need to receive the extra 100\$. As a result, the total vulnerable AH in the actual implementation increase to 23AHs. On the other hand, the actual number of AHs who may receive the special support of business-affected income is less than the number in URP plan. Hence, the total compensation budget in URP is 249,390.71\$ while the total compensation budget in the actual implementation is 175,808.58\$. Therefore, it's showing the less amount of 73,582.13\$ between these. Regarding the differences in the compensated amount between URP of the calculation in the affected floor concrete in URP which was about 60\$/m² while the amount in the actual implementation calculated based on the counting in DMS contract.

3. For Battambang Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) - Trapezoidal Earth Canal- Additional Scope, according to actual implementation compensated budget (7,205.50\$) is higher than in URP plan (10,349.60\$) because of DMS PGRCs' members did not include the drainage affected budget into this, that's why it's showing the higher amount of 3,144.10\$ between these. The reason of the different amount due to the affected secondary structure in URP is lower price than URP since we need to calculate in total base on the exact counting in DMS contract (11 AHs)

4. For Bavet Urban Road, the total amount in URP Plan is 408,722.80\$ while the amount in the actual implementation is 393,082.99\$. It's showing the amount in URP is higher than the amount of actual implementation for 15,639.81\$. The reasons of these different amount (15,639.81\$) are listed as follow:

1. Affected Main Structures, Affected Stores and Temporary Structures in planning are 300,76.77m² (369,328.30\$) which it is different from actual affected size is 29,773.67m² (365,219.00\$) so total difference is 303.10m² (4,109.30\$).

2. Impact on Trees in planning 227 but in actual is 229 which it is increase 2 trees. Therefore, planning compensation is 7,644.50\$ different from actual 5,604.99\$. It is different about 2,039.51\$ because while in planning, the affected trees were counted up to 5 years that's why compensation is higher than actual compensation. Base on reality affected tree in counting into 3 columns of calculation which are (from 1 year to 3 years, from 3 years to 5 years and more than 5 years)

3. According to the Allowances in planning, it costs 13,209.00\$ which is higher than actual compensation for about 2,900\$. This happens because the actual implementation was based on the distance of affected household, who should receive the special support accordingly 33\$, 40\$ and 50\$.

5. For Bavet Storm Drainage, the amount in URP plan is 301,683.18\$ while the amount in the actual implementation is 144,213.82\$. It's illustrating that the amount in URP plan is higher than the amount of actual implementation for 187,469.36\$. The cause of this higher amount due to the confusion of the calculation in the compensation for steel doors which the study cost is between 270\$ to 380\$ per set, yet the compensation in URP is about 300\$/m² (A set between 10 to 15m²). For the total amount to support those who loss the income, such as vulnerable AHs, and AHs with the significant impact for one-time cash assistance and there will be the allowance for rental fee that they can receive it as set in URP and plan. So, the different amount mostly for affected main structure, affected secondary structure and affected store which total affected side in planning 3,866.58m² but base on the reality affected structure is only 3,439.74m² that's the reason the amount of compensation is different 114,213.82\$.

6. For Flooded control in Neak Loeung subproject, the total amount in URP Plan is 2,208,426.52\$ while the amount in the actual implementation is 1,663,813.52\$. It is showing the amount in URP is higher than the amount of actual implementation for 544,613.00\$. The reason of these different amount such as the Land Compensation in planning are 184,860.86m² (1,946,957.08\$) which it is different from actual affected land size is 140,418.10m² (1,538,525.81\$) so different amount side are 44,442.81m² (408,431.27\$). For Affected Main Structures, Affected Stores and Temporary Structures are different about 89,486.15\$. As affected trees and crops belong for 310 AHs, but in actual is only 280 AHs. There are still 30AHs will received the compensation in future. Moreover, one-time Cash Assistance compensation provide in planning are 54,900.00\$ but in actual only 45,700.00\$ which it is different about 9,200.00\$ because the compensation progress is still in the process for next semi-annual.

7. Under Neak Loeung Flood Protection Subproject, GDR provided GRM the training to the members of PGRC from 6th to 11th, December 2019. In addition, the IRC-WG had conducted the DMS from December 2019 to April 2020. For this second semi-annual progress, as on 15th July, 2020, PGRC had the public consultation about IRP program which there were 79 AHs who are in valuable groups can make the decision to choose the vocational program or will choose to receive the cash 500\$ instead. As by result, 73 AHs or 92% out of 79 AHs chose to get 500\$ because of their reason such as need money to support daily living condition, pay for health treatment, support more business and their children already have jobs. For the other 6 AHs have not yet chosen the option because they were absent during the consultation. As by

next semi-annual, we will meet and further discuss with them for their final decision. For this third semi-annual report have been implementation by provide the compensation to 351 AHs by March 04th-06th and June 14th-16th 2021. For this compensation provided progressing, most of AHs are satisfied to receive the budget as well as agree to construct their affected asset.

8. The total survey of 283 AHs, 28% comprised vulnerable AHs and the remaining 72% non-vulnerable AHs. Regarding the AHs' financial situation, found in data of income analysis shows the income of the 283 AHs was assessed. It is found that 10 AHs earn decrease income less than \$ 80.00 per month and are poor. Data on income analysis showed the income bracket of \$70-\$200 accounted for 70 AHs compared to 80 AHs in the last annual- a decrease of 10 AHs. The medium to high level of monthly income between \$231-\$500 and, \$570-\$792 was for 164 AHs or 58%, showing that the income level decreased 4% during the monitoring period compared to previous quarter. However, the higher levels of monthly income bracket \$1,500-\$4,500 slightly changed by about 3% from the last quarter. The project information booklet was distributed to 300 AHs, which equates to 78% of AHs. In terms of monitoring on subproject implementation, the AHs' 28% or 78 AHs confirmed "Very Satisfied" with the improvement of the infrastructure as it illustrates that the measurement on asset was done correctly. A total of 82 AHs reported that, they were satisfied, and 78 AHs reported on their average satisfaction. In contrast, there only 1% of 3 AHs are unsatisfied

9. During the monitoring period, there were 23 AHs raised complaints for resolutions (Table 10) and they had been followed-up by IRC-WG for discussions with the aggrieved AHs. Resolutions were provided to 20 cases and for the remaining 3 cases discussion have been held with AHs and resolutions will be documented in the next EMO report. The EMO joined the IRC-WG to investigate the complaints and fully understand them and found that they have been resolved. Moreover, the EMO team found that most of PGRC's work complied with the updated and detailed resettlement plan, national legal and regulatory requirements and ADB Safeguard Policy Statement (SPS). The EMO team also found that compensation payments were paid to all AHs for their affected assets including the vulnerable AHs who were paid special one-time cash assistance as per their entitlements. The resolutions to complaints about the aggrieved AHs were adequately address and the aggrieved AHs fully understood the resolutions.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. **External Monitoring.** Resettlement Monitoring is an integral part of the resettlement process which entails monitoring of preparation and implementation of detail resettlement plans (DRPs) on Land Acquisition and Involuntary Resettlement (LAR), as laid down in the ADB's Safeguard Policy Statement (SPS) 2009, and the Royal Government of Cambodia's (RGC) LAR on Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) 2018. The objective of monitoring is to review and verify the implementation of URPs/DRPs and validate the (i) implementation of LAR activities; (ii) payment to affected persons (APs), livelihood restoration, any changes occurred in their living standards, and the achievement of resettlement objectives have been met; (iii) effectiveness and adequacy of compensation entitlements of the APs under the URPs/DRPs of the subprojects; (iv) the remedial measurement to address any issue related to payments and implementation of LAR activities; (v) institutional arrangements; (vi) and the effective functions of the grievance redress mechanism. Thus, the monitoring enables the General Department of Resettlement (GDR) to make timely decision on any corrective measures needed to implement DRPs effectively and apply the lessons in the formulation and planning of future RPs/DRPs.

2. **External Monitoring Report:** This External Monitoring Report (EMR) is prepared for five subprojects namely:

- (i) Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) Subproject in Battambang;
- (ii) Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) Subproject in Poi Pet;
- (iii) Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) Subproject in Bavet;
- (iv) Urban Roads Subproject in Bavet; and
- (v) Flood Control Subproject at Neak Loeung

3. The EMR presents the review and validation of URP/DRPs implemented which reflects their overall progress from December 2019 to June 2020. The EMR also offers the review and the analysis of the implementation of URP/DRPs, compensation payment of the APs by category of the impacts including the allowances and makes recommendations to address the issues that were identified. During the monitoring period, four DRPs for subprojects (i) to (iv) were under implementation while the DRP for subproject (v) was under preparation.

1.1 Project Background

4. The RGC has obtained a loan and grant from Asian Development Bank (ADB) to finance the Greater Mekong Corridor Sub-Region Southern Economic Corridor Town Development Project (the Project). The Project will enhance the competitiveness of town along the Southern Economic Corridor. In addition, the project will also transform the corridor town of Battambang, Bavet, and Poi Pet into economic hubs by improving the urban-environmental infrastructure and strengthen the institutional capacity of provincial and local authorities through the implementation of the following subprojects in each town:

- **Battambang Town:** Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage), flood control, and materials recovery facility;
- **Bavet Town:** Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage), material recovery facility, and urban roads; and
- **Poi Pet Town:** Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage), Poi Pet solid waste landfill and material recovery facility

- **Neak Loeung Town: Flood Control**

5. The Project has been classified as Category A for involuntary resettlement. Therefore, an External Monitoring Organization (EMO) is required to prepare the EMR every six months. The Inter-ministerial Resettlement Committee (IRC) through its Working Group (IRC-WG) represent the RGC in the implementation of the updated resettlement plan (URP) and detailed resettlement plans (DRPs). The IRC-WG is assisted by the provincial resettlement subcommittee working groups (PRSC-WG) in the implementation of the URP/DRPs. The General Department of Resettlement (GDR) of the Ministry of Economy and Finance is the lead agency directly responsible for the preparation, implementation, monitoring and reporting of the URP/DRPs. For the URP/DRPs under this Project, the Resettlement Department 2 of GDR assisted by the IRC-WG and PRSC-WG is responsible for the implementation of the LAR activities under the URP/DRPs.

6. The IRC through GDR has engaged with EMO to prepare the EMR every six months under the terms of reference agreed between ADB and IRC. The EMO activities will run through the period of one year and six months (18 months) on a quarterly basis. The quarterly external monitoring report will summarize the findings, including (a) progress of URP/DRP implementation, including any deviations from the provisions of the URP/DRP; (b) identification of problems and recommended solutions to resolve the issues in a timely manner; (c) identification of issues of vulnerable people as relevant; and (d) report the progress of the followed-up issues and problems identified in the previous EMR.

7. Documents listed below were made available to the IED team without delay to avoid subsequent delay in the monitoring process. These documents were reviewed to understand the project and subproject's background, nature of subprojects, the impact, and to support the preparation of External Monitoring Tools.

- Resettlement Plan
- Updated Resettlement Plan/Detailed Resettlement Plans
(More detail and explanation about the project progress (project start, do DMS, make contract and the step of provide compensation) to affected people and target side authorities)
- Compensation Agreement
- Review the official complaints in any level (GDR, province, district and contractor)
- Loan and Grant Agreements
- ADB Safeguard Policy Statement, June 2009.
- RGC SOP and Expropriation Law 2010.


1.2 Subproject Description

1.2.1 Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) subproject in Battambang

8. The subproject was allocated in 3 communes which are: i.) Anlong Vil in Sangke District, ii.) Prek Preah Sdach and iii.) Rattanak in Battambang municipality. The Battambang Storm Drain component of Wastewater Treatment Subproject will be constructed at East side of the town, located in Rattanak and Prek Preah Sdach Communes. Total length of Storm Drain is approximately 13.093km which consist of Pipe culvert diameter from 800mm to 1500mm and box culvert sizes from 1.75m with x 1.50m depth to 2.25m with x 1.75m depth, and including catch basin, manhole etc. Furthermore, the subproject will be constructed the open earth canal length approximately 1.371km and pipe culvert and box culvert crossing to the properties. The designed storm drain is to be laid along unimproved large walkway and in the middle of existing roads to minimize the

impact and reduce the construction cost. The alignment of the storm drain is along the ROW. Figure 1 illustrates the map of the Wastewater Treatment Subproject in Battambang


Figure 1: Map of Wastewater Treatment Facilities in Battambang



1.2.2 Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) subproject in Poi Pet

9. The subproject involves the construction of 4 lines of storm drains in Poi Pet Town. All of these storm drains will start from north of National Road No. 5, crossing the road and will end up at the stream border. Total length of the storm drain is approximately 2km. Their sizes are 2.0m x 1.5m and 3.0m x 2.0m made up of reinforced concrete box culverts. Construction of this storm drains will collect rainwater from the catchment area, north of the town and discharge into the O' Chrov Stream to avoid incident of flooding that occurs annually. Thus, protecting business and the other properties from the damages caused by the flash floods. Figure 2 illustrates the Map of the Wastewater Treatment Subproject in Poi Pet.


Figure 2: Map of Wastewater Treatment Facilities in Poi Pet



1.2.3 Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) Subproject in Bavet

10. The subproject consists of the construction of three storm drainage lines which approximately 5km all starting or crossing the National Road No.1 (NR1) and discharge into the existing drains constructed along the NR1. Based on the detailed engineering design (DED), the storm drainage structure will be constructed under the existing road consist of (i) box culverts ranging from 1.50m width x 1.50m deep to 3.00m width x 1.50m deep, (ii) trapezoidal concrete channels ranging from 2.00m width x 1.25m deep and 2.50m width x 1.25m deep, and (iii) trapezoidal earth canals. Manholes, water catch basins and drainage inlets will also be constructed. The inner width of the storm drains varies from 1.50m to 3.00m, and the COI varies from 3.80m to 10.30m. Figure 3 illustrates the Map of the Wastewater Treatment Subproject in Bavet

Figure 3: Map of Wastewater Treatment Facilities in Bavet



1.2.4 Urban Roads Subproject in Bavet

11. This subproject is in three (3) Communes namely (i) Ba Ti, (ii) Bavet and (iii) Chhak Mtess in Bavet town. The subproject will improve and widen 6km of National Highway No. 01 from chainage 159km to 165km in Bavet town. The existing two lanes road will be widened and upgraded to four lanes with a median constructed in the center for streetlight installation. Pedestrian walkway and footpaths will be constructed along the upgraded length of the road. Figure 4 illustrates the layout map of the urban road subproject in Bavet town.


Figure 4: Layout Map of the Urban Roads Subproject



1.2.5 Flood Protection of subproject at Neak Loeung

12. The Neak Loeung Flood Protection include the following components: (i) Flood Protection Dike with total length of 4.5 kilometers covering an area of 363 hectares; (ii) Access from the road to the top of the dike 6 meters wide (iii) Water Gate (Box culvert) with control valves (2 vertical sluice valves); (iv) pump station for storm water from the enclosed area, to be pumped to the natural stream outside the protection dikes. The Neak Loeung Flood Control is proposed for funding from ADB and therefore it needs to comply with ADB's safeguard policies.

Figure 5: Flood Protection of Neak Loeung Subproject



II. Resettlement Impacts and Status of Implementation of DRPs

13. Tables 1-6 summarize the scope of resettlement impacts under each subproject and the status of the implementation land acquisition and involuntary resettlement (LAR) activities under them. During the monitoring period, the URP for Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) subproject in Poi Pet town and the DRPs for Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) subproject in Battambang, Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) subprojects in Poipet town and Battambang were approved on 25 Jan 2019 and

subprojects in Bavet were approved on 25 Jul 2019. As well as DRPs for Neak Loeung Flood Protection subproject was implemented in November 23th 2020. Therefore, the actions taken under the UPP/DRPs on the LAR activities were initiated and their progress of the implementation have been quantified and summarized in Tables 1-6 below. In summary the compensation payments under the URP and the three (3) DRPs are 100% completed.

14. As per Neak Loeung flood protection subproject, the GRM training for PGRC members was conducted by IRC-WG from 6th to 11th, December 2019. In addition, the DMS and RCS was conducted from December 2019 to April 2020. For last annual progress, as on 15th July, 2020, PGRC had the public consultation about IRP program which there were 79 AHs who are valuable groups can make the decision to choose the vocational program or will choose to receive the money 500\$ instead. As by result, 73 AHs or 92% out of 79 AHs have been chosen to get 500\$. For this third semi-annual report have been implemented by provide the compensation to 351 AHs by March 04th -06th and June 14th-16th 2021. For this progress of provide the compensation, most of AHs are very happy to receive the budget as well as agree to allow their affected assets to further construct.

15. The total of AHs interviewed were 283 or 22% out of 1,298 AHs. Only 23 AHs or 8% (283 AHs) raised complaints for resolutions (Table 10). The IRC-WG and the EMO handled their complaints by holding discussions with the AHs and resolving 20 of them. All the 1,298 AHs were pleased with the explanations provided by the IRC-WG and assisted by EMO. And the other 3 AHs requested for compensation as soon as possible for Neak Loeung floor protection subproject.

1. For Poipet Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage)

1. The actual amount of AH in the implementation is less than in URP plan for 1 AH, since 1 AH was not impacted by the sub-project.
2. According to the first line showing the total number of AHs are 27 AHs (528,461.81\$) will be able to receive the compensation in URP plan. However, the actual number was only 26 AHS (528,170.93\$), so this cause the actual amount of compensation is less about 290.88\$.
3. Regarding to the third line showing the budget for URP is 10,590.46\$ while the actual amount of implementation is 120,332.18\$. Therefore, the actual amount of this compensation is less about 109,741.72\$.
4. To sum up, total AHs in URP Plan showing that there is 1 AH less than the number of AH in actual implementation. In addition, the compensation budget in URP Plan is 790,064.57\$ which is less than the actual implementation budget about 3,449.17\$, while the actual one is 793,513.74\$.

2. For Battambang Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage), According to the reality of affected target showing that the amount of affected assets cost is higher than the replacement cost. For instance, Wastewater treatment (Storm Drainage) base in Battambang showing the cost of floor concrete in URP is about 60\$/m²; however, based on the exact calculated amount paid in DMS as it's only 12\$/m². This caused the total amount of compensation completely different from URP and in the actual implementation. Likewise, the total vulnerable AH are 22 AHs yet as in the actual implementation showing one more AH who need to receive the extra 100\$. As a result, the total vulnerable AH in the actual implementation increase to 23AHs. On the other hand, the actual number of AHs who may receive the special support of business-affected income is less than the number in URP plan. Hence, the total compensation budget in URP is 249,390.71\$ while the total compensation budget in the actual implementation is 175,808.58\$. Therefore, it's showing the less amount of 73,582.13\$ between these. Regarding the differences in the compensate amount between URP of the calculation in the affected floor concrete in URP which was about 60\$/m² while the amount in the actual implementation calculated based on the counting in DMS contract.

3. For Battambang Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) - Trapezoidal Earth Canal- Additional Scope), according to actual implementation compensation (7,205.50\$) is higher budget than in URP plan (10,349.60\$) because of DMS PGRCs' members did not include the drainage affected budget into this, that's why it's showing the higher amount of 3,144.10\$ between these. The reason of the different

amount due to the affected secondary structure in URP is lower price than URP since we need to calculate in total base on the exact counting in DMS contract (11 AHs)

4. For Bavet Urban Road, the total amount in URP Plan is 408,722.80\$ while the amount in the actual implementation is 393,082.99\$. It's showing the amount in URP is higher than the amount of actual implementation for 15,639.81\$. The reason of these different amount 15,639.81\$ such as affected Main Structures, Affected Stores and Temporary Structures in planning are 300,76.77m² (369,328.30\$) which it is different from actual affected side is 29,773.67m² (365,219.00\$) so totally different is 303.10m² (4,109.30\$). For Impact on Trees in planning 227 but in actual is 229 which it is increase 2 trees. Therefore, planning compensation is 7,644.50\$ different from actual 5,604.99\$. It is different about 2,039.51\$ because while in planning, the affected trees were counted up to 5 years that's why compensation is higher than actual compensation. Base on reality affected trees are counting into 3 columns of calculation which are (from 1 year to 3 years, from 3 years to 5 years and more than 5 years). And for Allowances in planning is 13,209.00\$ which is different from actual compensation about 2,900\$ because the actual implementation was based on the distance of affected household, who should receive the special support different such as 33\$, 40\$ and 50\$

5. For Bavet Storm Drainage, the amount in URP plan is 301,683.18\$ while the amount in the actual implementation is 144,213.82\$. It's illustrating that the amount in URP plan is higher than the amount of actual implementation for 187,469.36\$. The cause of this higher amount due to the confusion of the calculation in the compensation for steel doors which the study cost is between 270\$ to 380\$ per set, yet the compensation in URP is about 300\$/m² (A set between 10 to 15m²). For the total amount to support those who loss the income, such as vulnerable AHs, and AHs with the significant impact for one-time cash assistance and there will be the allowance for rental fee that they can receive it as set in URP and plan. So, the different amount mostly for affected main structure, affected secondary structure and affected store which total affected side in planning 3,866.58m² but base on the reality affected structure is only 3,439.74m² that's the reason the amount of compensation is different 114,213.82\$.

6. Flooded for Neak Loeung subproject, the total amount in URP Plan is 2,208,426.52\$ while the amount in the actual implementation is 1,663,813.52\$. It's showing the amount in URP is higher than the amount of actual implementation for 544,613.00\$. The reason of these different amount such as the Land Compensation in planning are 184,860.86m² (1,946,957.08\$) which it is different from actual affected land side is 140,418.10m² (1,538,525.81\$) so different amount side are 44,442.81m² (408,431.27\$). For Affected Main Structures, Affected Stores and Temporary Structures are different about 89,486.15\$. As affected trees and crops belong for 310 AHs, but in actual is only 280 AHs. There are still 30AHs will received the compensation in future. Moreover, one-time Cash Assistance compensation provide in planning are 54,900.00\$ but in actual only 45,700.00\$ which it is different about 9,200.00\$ because the compensation progress is still in the process for next semi-annual.

15. Under the Poipet Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) Subproject, all the 64 out of 65 AHs or 98.5% satisfactorily received their compensation as per the URP. However, under the Poipet Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) Subproject one (1) AH is not impacted by the subproject because that one AH's location side is nearly the alignment which it is not affected (as per confirmation from GDR and check in DMS). On the other hand, under the Battambang Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) an additional AH in the vulnerable category was impacted due to the change in scope. Therefore, number of vulnerable AHs increased from 22 to 23. All the AHs received their compensation. Under the Bavet Urban Road and Bavet Storm Drainage Subprojects all AHs received their compensation.

16. Under the Neak Loeung Flood Protection Subproject, GDR provided GRM the training to the members of PGRC from 6th to 11th, December 2019. In addition, the IRC-WG had conducted the DMS from December 2019 to April 2020. For this second semi-annual progress, as on 15th July, 2020, PGRC had the public consultation about IRP program which there were 79 AHs who are in valuable groups can make the decision to choose the vocational program or will choose to receive the cash 500\$ instead. As by result, 73 AHs or 92% out of 79 AHs chose to get 500\$ because of their reason such as need money to support daily living condition, can pay for medical health and treatment, support more business plan and most of valuable groups' children already have their own job. For the other 6 AHs have not yet chosen the option because they were absent during the consultation. As by next semi-annual, we will meet and further discuss with them for their final decision. For this third semi-annual report have been implementation by provide the compensation to 351 AHs by March 04th- 06th and June 14th-16th 2021. For this progress of providing the compensation, most of AHs are very happy to receive the budget as well as agree construct theirs affected assets.

17. During the monitoring period, there were 23 AHs raised complaints for resolutions (Table 10) and they followed-up by IRC-WG with discussions with the aggrieved AHs. Resolutions were provided for 20 cases and for the remaining 3 cases discussion have been held with AHs and resolutions will be documented in the next EMO report. The EMO joined the IRC-WG to investigate the complaints and fully understand them and found that they have been resolved. For the EMO team found that most of PGRC's work complied with the updated and detailed resettlement plan, national legal and regulatory requirements and ADB Safeguard Policy Statement (SPS). The EMO team also found that compensation payments were paid to all AHs for their affected assets including the vulnerable AHs who were paid special one-time cash assistance as per their entitlements. The resolutions to complaints about the aggrieved AHs were adequately address and the aggrieved AHs fully understood the resolutions.

Table 1: Summary of Implementation Status of LAR under URP for Wastewater Treatment (Storm Damage) Subproject in Battambang

No.	Impact as in URP	Numbers and Quantities Impacted			Implementation Status (January – June 2021)				Remarks on the <u>Compensation</u> <u>progress</u>
		Qty (m²) or Trees	Total No. AHs	Payable Payment (\$)	Payment Made		Balance		
					No. of AHs	Amount	No. of AHs	Amount	
Draft URP Section II									
1	Land Impacts								
	Land Compensation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No impact
2	Non-land Impacts								
	Affected Houses	39.29	3	233,430.81	3	161,128.58	0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
	Affected Stores cum Living Quarters	128.53	9		9		0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
	Affected Stores	497.85	22		21		0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
	Affected Secondary Structures	11,478.84					0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
	Affected Crops	876	2	3,327.90	2	2,995	0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
	Affected Trees	82					0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
3	Loss of Income								
	Temporary Loss of Business Income from Small Stores and Stores cum Living Quarters		31	12,632	31	11,685	0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
4	Impact on Vulnerable AHs and AHs with Significant Impacts		22		23		0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
5	One-time Cash Assistance								
	Stores, Stores cum Living Quarters and Main Houses to be rebuilt.		34		34		0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
6	Allowances								
	Resettlement (shifting back house, store cum living quarters and stores.		34		34		0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
Total				249,390.71		175,808.58			

Table 2: Summary of Implementation Status of LAR under URP for Wastewater Treatment (Storm Damage) Subproject in Battambang (Trapezoidal Earth Canal- Additional Scope)

No.	Impact as in URP	Numbers and Quantities Impacted			Implementation Status (January – June 2021)				Remarks on the Compensation progress
		Qty (m ²) or Trees	Total No. AHs	Payable Payment (\$)	Payment Made		Balance		
					No. of AHs	Amount	No. of AHs	Amount	
Draft URP Section II									
1	Land Impacts								
	Land Compensation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No impact
2	Non-land Impacts								
	Productive Rice land inside ROW	1,550	2	232.50	2	232.50			
	Affected Houses	0	0	5,798.00	0	9,026.50	0	0.00	Compensated fully provided
	Affected Stores cum Living Quarters	0	0		0		0	0.00	Compensated fully provided
	Affected Secondary Structures	330.55	3		3		0	0.00	Compensated fully provided
	Affected Crops	44	6	1,175.00	6	1,090.60	0	0.00	Compensated fully provided
	Affected Trees	2					0	0.00	Compensated fully provided
3	Loss of Income								
	Temporary Loss of Business Income from Small Stores and Stores cum Living Quarters		None	0.00	None	0.00	0	0.00	None
4	Impact on Vulnerable AHs and AHs with Significant Impacts						0	0.00	
5	One-time Cash Assistance						0	0.00	
	Stores, Stores cum Living Quarters and Main Houses to be rebuilt.						0	0.00	
6	Allowances								
	Resettlement (shifting back house, store cum living quarters and stores.						0	0.00	
Total			11	7,205.50	11	10,349.60			

Table 3: Summary of Implementation Status of LAR under DRP for Wastewater Treatment (Storm Damage) Subproject in Poi Pet

No.	Impact as in DRP	Numbers and Quantities Impacted			Implementation Status (January – June 2021)				Remarks	
		Qty (m ²) or Nos.	Total No. AHs	Payable Payment (\$)	Payment Made		Balance		<u>Remarks on the Compensation progress</u>	
					No. of AHs	Amount (\$)	No. of AHs	Amount (\$)		
DRP Section II										
1	Land Impacts	1,874.72	7	783,714.57						
	Residential Land Compensation	1,874.72	7		7	785,364.74	0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided	
2	Non-land Impacts									
	Main structures	747.88	15		15		0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided	
	Stores	243.34	1		1		0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided	
	Secondary Structures	2,766.62	62		60	0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided		
3	Affected Crops and Trees									
	Affected Crops	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	No impact	
	Affected Trees	43	8	991.00	8	991.00	0	0.00		
4	Impact on Livelihood								Compensation was fully provided	
	Temporary loss of Income from Small Businesses		16	5,359	16	7,158	0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided	
5	Vulnerable AHs and AHs with significant impacts		7		7		0	0.00		
6	One-time Cash Assistance								Compensation was fully provided	
	Structures <60m ²		13		13		0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided	
	Structures >60m ²		5		5		0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided	
	Relocation		1		1		0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided	
7	Allowances									
	Transport Allowance		19		19		0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided	
	Disruption Allowance		19		19		0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided	
8	Income Restoration Program		1		1		0	0.00	Compensation was fully provided	
Total				790,064.57		793,513.74				

Table 4: Summary of Implementation Status of LAR under DRP for Wastewater Treatment (Storm Damage) Subproject in Bavet

No.	Impact as in DRP	Numbers and Quantities Impacted			Implementation Status (January – June 2021)				Remarks on the Compensation progress
		Qty (m ²) or Nos.	Total No. AHs	Payable Payment (\$)	Payment Made		Balance		
					No. of AHs	Amount (\$)	No. of AHs	Amount (\$)	
Draft DRP Section II									
1	Land Impacts								
	Residential Land Compensation	448.81	5	140,647.8	5	140,647.8	0.00	0.00	100% completed
2	Non-land Impacts								
	Affected Main Structures	139.20	1	150,963.38	1	36,749.56	0.00	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
	Affected Secondary Structures	3,701.88	121		121		0.00	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
	Affected Stores	25.500	3		3		0.00	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
3	Impact on Crops and Trees								
	Crops	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	No impact
	Trees	192	69	5,342.00	69	5,342.00	0.00	0.00	100% completed
4	One-time Cash Assistance								
	Vulnerable AH		1	599.00	1	599.00	0.00	0.00	100% completed
	Rebuild Main Structure		1		1		0.00	0.00	100% completed
	Rebuild Store		3		3		0.00	0.00	100% completed
	Temporary Loss of Income		4		4		0.00	0.00	100% completed
5	Allowances								
	Dismantle Main Structure		1	3,171.00	1	3,171.00	0.00	0.00	100% complete
	Transport		4		4		0.00	0.00	100% complete
	Temporary Disruption to Business		30		30		0.00	0.00	100% complete
	One Month Profit Loss		1		1		0.00	0.00	100% complete
	Loss of Rental Income		1		1		0.00	0.00	100% complete
6	Allowances for Rental AHs								
	Transport		6	960.00	6	960.00	0.00	0.00	100% complete
	Disruption		6		6		0.00	0.00	100% complete
Total				301,683.18		187,469.36			

For Bavet Storm Drainage, the amount in URP plan is 301,683.18\$ while the amount in the actual implementation is 187,469.36\$. It's illustrating that the amount in URP plan is higher than the amount of actual implementation for 114,213.82\$. The amount in URP plan is 301,683.18\$ while the amount in the actual implementation is 144,213.82\$. It's illustrating that the amount in URP plan is higher than the amount of actual implementation for 187,469.36\$. The cause of this higher amount due to the confusion of the calculation in the compensation for steel doors which the study cost is between 270\$ to 380\$ per set, yet the compensation in URP is about 300\$/m² (A set between 10 to 15m²). For the total amount to support those who loss the income, such as vulnerable AHs, and AHs with the significant impact for one-time cash assistance and there will be the allowance for rental fee that they can receive it as set in URP and plan. So, the different amount mostly for affected main structure, affected secondary structure and affected store which total affected side in planning 3,866.58m² but base on the reality affected structure are only 3,439.74m² that's why the amount of compensation is different 114,213.82\$.

Table 5: Summary of Implementation Status of LAR under DRP for Urban Roads Subproject in Bavet

No.	Impact as in DRP	Numbers and Quantities Impacted			Implementation Status (January - June 2021)				<u>Remarks on the Compensation progress</u>
		Qty (m ²) or Nos.	Total No. AHs	Payable Payment (\$)	Payment Made		Balance		
					No. of AHs	Amount	No. of AHs	Amount (\$)	
Draft DRP Section II									
1	Land Impacts	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0	
	Land Compensation	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00	No impact
2	Non-land Impacts								
	Affected Main Structures	103.50	7	369,328.30	7	365,219.00	0.00	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
	Affected Stores	910.51	73		73		0.00	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
	Temporary Structures	29,062.76	429		429		0.00	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
3	Impact on Crops and Trees								
	Crops	0	0	0	0	0			No impact
	Trees	227	114	7,644.50	114	5,604.99			Compensation was fully provided
4	One-time Cash Assistance								
	Vulnerable AHs		45	11,950.00	45	11,950.00	0.00	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
	Rebuild Partially Affected Structures		33		33		0.00	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
	Rebuild Stores cum Living Quarters and Stores		83		83		0.00	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
5	Allowances								
	Dismantle		83	13,209.00	83	10,309.00	0.00	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
	Temporary Loss of Income		73		73		0.00	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
	Disruption		80		80		0.00	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
	Shifting		83		83		0.00	0.00	Compensation was fully provided
Total				408,722.80		393,082.99			

For Bavet Urban Road, the total amount in URP Plan is 408,722.80\$ while the amount in the actual implementation is 393,082.99\$. It's showing the amount in URP is higher than the amount of actual implementation for 15,639.81\$. The reason of these different amount 15,639.81\$ such as

1. Affected Main Structures, Affected Stores and Temporary Structures in planning are 300,76.77m² (369,328.30\$) which it is different from actual affected side is 29,773.67m² (365,219.00\$) so totally different is 303.10m² (4,109.30\$).
2. Impact on Trees in planning 227 but in actual is 229 which it is increase 2 trees. Therefore, planning compensation is 7,644.50\$ different from actual 5,604.99\$. it is different about 2,039.51\$ because while in planning, affected trees were counted up to 5 years that's why compensation is higher than actual compensation. Base on reality affected trees are counting into 3 columns of calculation which are (from 1 year to 3 years, from 3 years to 5 years and more than 5 years)
3. And for Allowances in planning is 13,209.00\$ which is different from actual compensation about 2,900\$ because the actual implementation was based on the distance of affected household, who should receive the special support different such as 33\$, 40\$ and 50\$.

Table 6: Summary of Implementation Status of LAR under DRP for Flooded for Neak Loeung sub-project

No.	Impact as in DRP	Numbers and Quantities Impacted			Implementation Status (January –June 2021)				<u>Remarks</u> Compensation progress
		Qty (m²) or Nos.	Total No. AHs	Payable Payment (\$)	Payment Made		Balance		
					No. of AHs	Amount	No. of AHs	Amount (\$)	
Draft DRP Section II									
1	Land Impacts								
	Land Compensation	184,860.86	338	1,946,957.08	349	1,538,525.81		408,737.27	Compensation still on going
2	Non-land Impacts								
	Affected Main Structures	105.06	1	118,095.94	0	28,609.79	1	89,486.15	AHs have not yet received compensation as they still complaint at provincial sector
	Affected Stores and Temporary Structures	1,148.18							AHs have not yet received compensation as they still complaint at provincial sector
3	Impact on Crops and Trees								
	Crops	115,453.52	312	88,167.50	280	50,977.92	30	37,189.58	Compensation still on going
	Trees	9,385							
4	One-time Cash Assistance								
	Temporary loss of income		2	54,900.00	0	45,700.00	2	9,200.00	Compensation still on going
	Vulnerable AHs		9		5		4		Compensation still on going
	AHs experiencing major impacts		72		61		11		Compensation still on going
	Income restoration		79		66		13		
5	Allowances								
	Shifting allowance for main structure to be moved and rebuild		1	306.00	1	0.00	1	306.00	Compensation still on going
	Shifting allowance for motor repair shop to be moved		2		2		2		Compensation still on going
	Transport allowance for main structure to move and rebuild in adjacent land		1		1		1		Compensation still on going
	Transport allowance for roof of store and one motor repair shop to move		2		2		2		Compensation still on going
Total				2,208,426.52		1,663,813.52		544,613.00	

For Flooded control in Neak Loeung subproject, the total amount in URP Plan is 2,208,426.52\$ while the amount in the actual implementation is 1,663,813.52\$. It's showing the amount in URP is higher than the amount of actual implementation for 544,613.00\$. The reason of these different amount such as

1. The Land Compensation in planning is 184,860.86m² (1,946,957.08\$) which is different from actual affected land size 140,418.10m² (1,538,525.81\$) so different size is 44,442.81m² (408,431.27\$). The reason of 11 AHs in actual implementation increase due to a few lands have been divided from one landownership to 4 or 5 land plot owners.

2. Affected Main Structures, Affected Stores and Temporary Structure in planning are 118,095.94\$ which it is different from actual affected side is 28,609.79\$ so totally different is 89,486.15\$). Moreover, this amount has not been provided to AHs because they are still making official complaints to provincial sector.

3. The affected trees and crops belong to 310 AHs, but in actual is only 280 AHs. There are still 30AHs will received the compensation in future. Therefore, planning compensation is 88,167.50\$ different from actual 50,977.92\$. it is different about 37,189.58\$ because while in planning, affected trees were counted up to 5 years that's why compensation is higher than actual compensation. Base on reality affected tree in counting into 3 columns of calculation which are (from 1 year to 3 years, from 3 years to 5 years and more than 5 years)

4. For One-time Cash Assistance compensation provide in planning are 54,900.00\$ but in actual only 45,700.00\$ which it is different about 9,200.00\$ because the progress of compensation is still in process for next semi-annual. As well as for Allowances also need to 306\$ to AHs too.

III. Semi-Annual Finding (From January to June 2021)

3.1 Household Accessibility by EMO

18. The monitoring survey for the Poi Pet subproject town was conducted for 20% of the total AHs, which was 2% decrease than the previous annual. For the Battambang subproject, the survey was conducted for 21% of the AHs which it is decrease 9% compare to 2nd annual, while the Bavet subprojects, it is increase 5% in 3rd annual. As for Neak Loeung subproject, the survey was conducted for a total of 87 AHs or 22%. Overall, the random sample survey was conducted for 22% of AHs or 283/1,298 AHs under the URP/DRPs. Table 7 summarizes comparison of AHs surveys between the 2nd to 3rd Annual Monitoring Surveys.

Table 7-AH Number and Percentage Comparison between 2nd to 3rd Annual Monitoring Survey

<i>Province</i>	<i>Cities</i>	<i>AHs/DRP</i>	<i>2nd AH Annual</i>	<i>3rd AH Annual</i>	<i>2nd Annual % of Total</i>	<i>3rd Annual % of Total</i>
<i>B. Meanchey</i>	Poi Pet	65	12	13	18%	20%
<i>Battambang</i>	Battambang	269	80	57	30%	21%
<i>Svay Reang</i>	Bavet	579	100	126	17%	22%
<i>Prey Veng</i>	Neak Loeung	385	105	87	27%	22%
<i>Grand Total</i>		1,298	297	283	23%	22%

19. During the monitoring survey, the EMO met the head of the AHs as the main focal point. A total of 283 AHs out of 1,298 AHs or 22% were randomly interviewed during the monitoring period compared to 185 AHs during this annual. The interviews with the spouses were for 45 AHs compared to 46 AHs during last annual - the decrease of 1 AH from the previous annual. The interviews conducted during the annual were with (i) 13 housewives the same previous annual, (ii) 13 children decrease 2 AHs in the previous annual, (iii) 9 sister-in-laws/brother-in-laws compared to 7 in the previous annual, (iv) 16 parents compared to 14 and (vi) 8 Nephews/Nieces compared to 6 in the previous annual. Overall, the surveyed and data monitoring decreased from 297 AHs to 283 AHs because 4 DRPs were implemented during this annual progress (Table 6).

Table 8-Summarizes the comparison of relationship monitoring during the 2nd Annual to 3rd Annual

Household Relationship	<i>Number of AHs 2nd Annual</i>	Number of AHs 3rd Annual	<i>% of AHs 2nd Annual</i>	<i>% of AHs 3rd Annual</i>
Head of AHs	190	185	64%	65%
Spouse	46	45	15%	16%
Housewife	13	13	4%	5%
Children	15	13	5%	5%
Sister or Brother	9	7	3%	2%
Parents	16	14	5%	5%
Nephew/Niece	8	6	3%	2%
Grand Total	297	283		

Table 9-AHs Condition Classification bases on Vulnerable and Non-vulnerable Groups

AHs Condition	Percentage of AHs Condition
Vulnerable Group	28%
Non-vulnerable Group	72%

3.2 Monitoring of Consultation and Information Disclosure for Compensation and construction progress

20. A total of 283 AHs participated in public consultation meetings. In addition, they also joint to do the DMS and those who are in vulnerable group was entitle to be included in the income restoration program. The information gathered from the consultation meetings, the AHs fully understood on the impact of resettlement, compensation payments, and details of their entitlement for compensation provided in their contracts. Moreover, after received the compensation all 4 subprojects, AHs fully understand and agree to allow to construct their affected lands.

21. On the PIB information, AHs reported that they were able to understand the following:

1. The information on the Project and subproject
2. The scope of land acquisition and resettlement under the subproject, the cut-off-date, for eligibility, entitlements and compensation.
3. The DMS measurements for loss of assets and other resettlement assistance.
4. Compensation to be calculated from the rates in the Replacement Cost of Study Report
5. Then IRC-WC will make the official contract of their affected assets (need to be calculated it into cashes)
6. The date to receive the compensation, of the affected house, shop, store, land and other structures, including crops, fruit and non-fruit trees, allowances and income restoration programs.
7. Time (approximately one month) needed to vacate the land to be given to contractor to start the construction.
8. The GRM Stages of resolving complaints from villages chief to PGRC and then to court.

22. The AHs raised no complaints on the DMS, however; the AHs request to speed up the process of construction works as it will affect to their business and daily income as they also got the lower income impact by Covid-19 virus.

During consultations, the AHs proposed the following:

- Accelerate the process of town's development and construction to minimize or avoid the loss of business income
- Regularly grade the road pavement to remove bumps/roughness or to fill up the potholes to avoid water collection. Spray the road regularly during construction to minimize dust.

3.3 AHs received IRP program and compensation for Neak Loeung Sub-project only


23. All the AHs surveyed confirmed that they would closely work with the IRC and PRSC working groups to conduct the DMS. For this semi-annual progress, as on 15th July, 2020, PGRC had the public consultation about IRP program which there were 79 AHs who are valuable groups can make the decision to choose the vocational program or will choose to receive the money 500\$ instead. As by result, 73 AHs or 92% out of 79 AHs have been chosen to get 500\$ because of their reason such as:

1. Need money to support daily living condition
2. Can pay for medical, health treatment
3. Support more business plan
4. Most of valuable groups' children already have their own job without vocational training anymore.

Therefore, the other 6 AHs have not yet chosen the option because they were absent during the consultation. As by next quarter, we will meet and further discuss with them for their final decision. For this third semi-annual report have been implementation by provide the compensation to 351AHs by March 04th- 06th and June 14th-16th 2021. For this compensation provided progressing, most of AHs are very happy to receive the budget as well as to agree to give their affected assets to constructors.

24. Regarding the satisfaction by 4 subprojects implementation of the AHs' 28% or 78 AHs confirmed "Very Satisfied" with the improvement of the infrastructure as it illustrates that the measurement on asset was done correctly. A total of 82 AHs reported that, they were satisfied, and 78 AHs reported on their average satisfaction. In contrast, there only 1% of 3 AHs are unsatisfied. They indicated that they would wait to see the progress of the subproject and the construction of the dyke to protect over 300 hectares agricultural land from floods. Figure 6 illustrates the overall satisfaction of the 4 Subprojects implementation survey field.

Figure 6- Satisfaction of AHs for Public consultation and Compensation providing



25. During the monitoring period, a total of 283 AHs or 22% out of 1,298 AHs were surveyed. All the AHs confirmed that they will work closely with the IRC and PRSC working groups to participate in the public consultations.

26. In regard to 283 AHs' satisfaction under the five other subprojects, 65 AHs at Battambang, Neak Loeung and Bavet confirmed "Very Satisfied" with the improvement of the infrastructure as AHs will benefit immensely to improve their socio-economic status. A total of 29% of AHs reported that, they were satisfied. Amongst this 38 AHs feedback was gathered in Bavet, 20 AHs in Battambang, 20 AHs in Neak Loeung and 4 AHs in Poi Pet. A total of 35 AHs from Bavet, 30 AHs from Battambang, 45 AHs in Neak Loeung and 10 AHs from Poi Pet reported on their average satisfaction. However, 1% or 3AHs from Neak Loeung expressed dissatisfaction due compensation progress and their businesses mostly affected by this. However, their grievances were resolved after they were delivered to the chief of village. While the AHs from Bavet complained about the slow progress of the construction, but they registered high satisfaction on the improvement of the infrastructure later. They indicated that they were glad to have received compensation payments.

27. While there has been good cooperation between EMO, GDR, MPWT/PMU and contractor, the AHs have raised complaints for further improvements as follows:

1. Provide more detail and explanation on subproject progress (subproject start date, date of conducting DMS, preparing contracts and steps leading to compensation payments) to affected people and targeted authorities
2. Respond to the complaints of delayed compensation by speeding up the preparation of the contracts
3. MPWT/PMU need to check on the quality of construction by the contractor.

As follow up by quarter to semi-annual report, there are 23 Cases already dealt but the other 3 AHs are still in the progress because they request for the compensation in Neak Loeung Flood Protection subproject.

Table 10: The summary table 10 of AHs' Grievance complaints

Number	Date grievance received	Address	Name of AHs	Grievance	Resolution	GRC member	Remark
1. Poi Pet Subproject: Wastewater Treatment Subproject "Storm Drainage"							
1.	11 February 2019	Poi Pet village, Poi Pet commune, Poi Pet city, B. Mean Chey province	Chea Lyna (Female)	She requested \$600 as the compensation for loss of her concrete floor	Her case was accepted by IRC-WG and the solution has been provided with the positive feedback. The EMO followed-up in this quarter and found that she didn't accept \$300 as the compensation her concrete floor, even though the IRC-WG provided detailed calculations and explanations of the compensation amount. The EMO team interviewed her and family members and found out that even though she wanted the compensation of affected floor as \$600, she nevertheless was happy and agree to accept t\$300 as explained by the IRC-WG. She was also advised of the benefits she will gain from the subproject completion.	GDR	Complaint resolved
2.	05 March 2019	Ou Chrov village commune, Poi Pet city, B. Mean Chey province	Som Sameth (Male)	Request contractor to speed up the progress as fast as possible	He was informed that that all AHs affected by the subproject in Poi Pet have been informed that the IRC-WG have discussed with the contractor to expedite the construction works. For this quarter, the construction progress has improved and the AH has no further issues.	IRC-WC	Complaint resolved

3.	23 April 2019	Poi Pet village, Poi Pet commune, Poi Pet city, B. Mean Chey province	Khim Saveoun (Female)	She is not satisfied with the compensation for her affected shop. She also didn't get the compensation for the loss of income from the impact on her business. Her average income from her business was approximately \$320 per month.	The AH was not satisfied compensation amount offered as she did not agree to the amount based on the measurements. The IRC-WG explained her how the measurements were taken and how the rate from the RCS was applied to arrive at the compensated amount. The EMO also joined the IRC-WG and visited the affected shop to get a better understanding about the affected shop. In the end, the AH was satisfied with explanation provided by the IRC-WG.	IRC-WC	Complaint resolved
Bavet Subproject: Bavet Urban Road Subproject							
4.	21 February 2019	Ta Boeb village, Bavet commune, Bavet city, Svay Rieng province	Teb Vanna (Male)	The progress of construction is taking long and is affecting his business. He suggested to speed up the construction work and spray water regularly to minimize dust.	The IRC-WG and EMO team met with him and informed about the construction schedule. He was also informed that the contractor has been advised to regularly spray water to minimize dust. As follow-up in this quarter, there is no further complaint from the AH.	IRC-WC	Complaints resolved

5.	20 February 2019	Bavet Kandal village, Bavet commune, Bavet city, Svay Rieng province	Chhun Saroeun (Female)	The construction progress is taking too long, which is affecting her business.	So, she suggested us to speed up the progress as fast as possible and requested to provide her the compensation as early as possible. She was informed by IRC-WG that compensation will be made to all AHs and she will be informed one week in advance. The IRC-WG has made compensation payment to all AHs. Therefore, there is no more complaint from her anymore.	IRC-WC	Complaint resolved
6.	26 March 2019	Ta Pov village, Bavet commune, Bavet city, Svay Rieng province	Sok Chanthy (Male)	He did not receive compensation payment and copy of Updated PIB.	He was advised that after the approval of the DRP by ADB and the budget by IRC/MEF, the compensation payment would be made. He was assured that a copy of the Updated PIB would be provided prior or during the consultation for the contract offer. The EMO joined IRC-WG to understand the real issue and have noticed that the complaint has been resolved.	GDR	Solved
7.	26 March 2019	Ta Boeb village, Bavet commune, Bavet city, Svay Rieng province	Prom Sophal (Male)	Sewage drainage box culvert is constructed in front of his house and is higher than road	This complaint was referred to civil works contractor and MPWT for technical review. After the technical review, MPWT explained to the AH on the location of the sewage drainage box culvert as it will have no health threats and the AH fully understood. Therefore, this case was already solved.	MPWT and contractor	Complaint resolved

8.	08 September 2019	Ta Boeb village, Bavet commune, Bavet city, Svay Rieng province	Yin Davy (Female)	Request to speed up the construction with good quality of asphalt pavement road	His request was accepted by IRC-WG. The EMO during this monitoring period noticed that the speed, the construction has been improved and the AH is satisfied with the construction progress.	IRC-WC	Complaint resolved
9.	15 January 2020	Ta Boeb village, Bavet commune, Bavet city, Svay Rieng province	So Phalla (Female)	Request for construction to work faster with good quality of asphalt pavement road	Her request was accepted by IRC-WG. The EMO during this monitoring period noticed that the speed of construction have been improved and the AHs is satisfied with the construction progress.	IRC-WC	Complaint resolved
10.	26 May 2020	Ta Pov village, Bavet commune, Bavet city, Svay Rieng province	Penh Sophon (Male)	Request to change the alignment of sewage so that it does not affect to his house.	His case accepted by IRC-WG which was beyond the Commune and PGRC to find a solution. A consultation meeting was held between the PGRC, IRC-WG, EMO and AH's family to explain the complications associated if the sewage was realigned to which the family agreed. Therefore, the AH agreed to receive the compensation amount as in the contract.	IRC-WC	Complaint resolved
Battambang Subproject: Wastewater Treatment (Storm Damage)							
11.	14 February 2019	Beak Chan Thmey village, Prek Presdach commune, Battambang town, Battambang province	Kur Bunyen (Male)	The slow progress of building the sewage system. The quality of the new concrete floor constructed by the contractor is not the same to the previous one.	His case was accepted by IRC-WG. The IRC-WG met and explained him on the schedule of construction of the sewage system. He fully understood. He indicated that he was waiting for the compensation payment and then he will rebuild the concrete floor by himself. The EMO joined the IRC-WG to	IRC-WG	Complaint resolved

					understand the complaint and noticed that the complaint was solved. The EMO assessed the construction progress in this monitoring period and found that it has improved. There are no further complaints from the AHs and he is satisfied on the construction progress.		
12.	14 February 2019	Beak Chan Thmey village, Prek Presdach commune, Battambang town, Battambang province	Heang Hong (Male)	Delay in the progress of the sewage system. There is no side gate for access to his shop which results in losing his customers.	His discussions with the EMO, he suggested to expedite construction works. The IRC-WG met him and explained the construction schedule of the sewage system and he fully understood. The EMO joined IRC-WG to understand the complaints and noticed that the complaint has been resolved.	MPWT and contractor	Complaint resolved
13.	18 October 2019	Beak Chan Thmey village, Prek Presdach commune, Battambang town, Battambang province	Ly Meng (Male)	Speed up the construction of the sewage system. In addition, the re-built of concrete floor is not good as to his previous one.	The AH requested for the payment of the compensation as soon as possible. The IRC-WG team met him and explained the construction schedule of the sewage system and he fully understood. He informed that the contractor's workmen tried to improve the workmanship of the concrete floor as soon as he complained. The EMO investigated the complaint and found out that it was resolved.	IRC-WG	Complaint resolved
14.	11 November 2019	Romchek Ben village, Rattanak commune, Battambang town, Battambang province	Srey Mum (Female)	Requested to speed up the construction with good quality of asphalt paved road.	Her request was accepted by IRC-WG, the construction schedule of the asphalt paving of the road was explained, and she fully understood them. The EMO investigated the case and found it was resolved.	IRC-WG	Complaint resolved

15.	23 December 2019	Romchek Ben village, Rattanak commune, Battambang town, Battambang province	Kek Siyara (Female)	Request for the construction team to speed up the activities with the good quality of asphalt pavement road	Her request was accepted by IRC-WG, the construction schedule of the asphalt paving of the road was explained, and she fully understood them. The EMO investigated the case and found it was resolved.	IRC-WG	Complaint resolved
Neak Leoung Subproject: Flood Protection							
16.	15 July 2020	Phum 1, Preak Ksay Kor commune, Pemro district, Prey Veng province	Pey Piseyroth (Male)	Request to change the Alignment of sewage which this may not affected to his house asset anymore	Noticed that, his residence (Villa) will be affected by the construction. So, he did appeal to the commune and district level. After his complaint, there were already public meeting in district, which there are no any solution deal. Then he suggests his complaint more to province sector. So, his case has been accepted by IRC and will further discuss.	IRC-WC	In Progress
17.	15 January 2021	Phum Neak Loeung, Neak Loeung commune Pemro district, Prey Veng province	Keo Sreynoun (Female)	Requested to check her lose size of Dam land	Her request was accepted by IRC-WG. As result he should receive the compensation budget after check his affected land from IRC-WG. The EMO investigated the case and found it was resolved.	IRC-WC	Complaint resolved
18.	15 January 2021	Phum 1, Preak Ksay Kor commune, Pemro district, Prey Veng province	An Sokphol (male)	Requested to check his common land and lose size of Dam land	His request was accepted by IRC-WG. As result he should receive the compensation budget after check his affected land from IRC-WG. The EMO investigated the case and found it was resolved.	IRC-WC	Complaint resolved
19.	18 January 2021	Phum Neak Loeung, Neak Loeung commune Pemro district, Prey Veng province	Sok Ny (Male)	Requested to check her lose size of Dam land	His request was accepted by IRC-WG. As result he should receive the compensation budget after check his affected land from IRC-WG. The EMO	IRC-WC	Complaint resolved

					investigated the case and found it was resolved.		
20.	19 January 2021	Prey Ta Sor village, Neak Loeung commune, Pemro district, Prey Veng province	Yorng Kheang (Male)	Complaint to receive the experiencing major impacts	His request was accepted by IRC-WG. As result he should receive the compensation budget after check his affected land from IRC-WG. The EMO investigated the case and found it was resolved.	IRC-WC	Complaint resolved
21.	20 January 20210	Phum Steng Slot, Neak Loeung commune, Pemro district, Prey Veng province	Mung Sone (Male)	His complaint that cost of land, fence and bathroom cannot be accepted.	The request was accepted by IRC-WG and discussed with the Ah. Resolution is pending but will be provided in the next monitoring report.	IRC-WC	In Progress
22.	18 February 2021	Phum Neak Loeung, Neak Loeung commune Pemro district, Prey Veng province	Chhun Lork (Male)	His complaint that cost of his child's stupa cannot be accepted.	His request was accepted by IRC-WG. As result, after explain from IRC-WG, he could accept the cost offered. And the EMO investigated the case and found it was resolved.	IRC-WC	Complaint resolved
23.	18 February 2021	Phum 1, Preak Ksay Kor commune, Pemro district, Prey Veng province	Som Norn (Male)	His complaint that cost of land, fence and drainage cannot be accepted	The request was accepted by IRC-WG and discussed with the AH. Resolution is pending in the distrust sector but will be provided in the next monitoring report.	IRC-WC	In Progress

3.4 Compensation of Payment Progress

28. Compensation payments and construction progress are under DRPs have been completed (Tables 1-6) which most of AHs are really happy to receive it as well as the national roads had been improved.

3.5 Income Level of Affected Household

29. During the monitoring period, the income of the 283 AHs was assessed (Figure 7). It is found that 10 AHs earn decrease income less than \$ 80.00 per month and are poor. Data on income analysis showed the income bracket of \$70-\$200 accounted for 70 AHs compared to 80 AHs in the last annual- a decrease of 10 AHs. The medium to high level of monthly income between \$231-\$500 and, \$570-\$792 was for 164 AHs or 58%, showing that the income level decreased 4% during the monitoring period compared to previous quarter. However, the higher levels of monthly income bracket \$1,500-\$4,500 slightly changed about 3% from the last quarter.

Figure 7 – Income Classification





Table 11-Average Income by each Income Sources for 6 months Comparison progress

Source of Income	Average Income 2 nd annual (\$/month)	Average Income 3 rd annual (\$/month)	Variance (\$/month)
Wages/Salary	355	280	-75
Child Support	220	200	-20
Trading	788	670	-68
Agriculture	1200	1100	-118
Manufacture	790	612	-178
Remittance	670	600	-70
Transportation	580	400	-180
Others	708	680	-28

30. The EMO analyzed the average income per month by visiting source of income and compared with the source of income of the last annual (Table 8). There is significant decrease all the income of AHs were due to the impact of Covid-19 virus.

Base on the targeted AHs interview income from year II 2020 (average 220\$ to 1,400\$ per month but for half year III 2021, we found out the average income of AHs 200\$ to 1,100\$). Therefore, it shows that standard living of AHs and vulnerable AH have decreased for this half year 2021 because Cambodia was due to the impact of Covid-19.

Figure 8 - Comparation of AHs' Income in Year II and Year III



3.6 Grievances Redress Mechanism

31. The provincial grievance redress committee (PGRC) was established in Battambang, Banteay Meanchey, Svay Rieng and Prey Veng provinces to address the complaints from AHs/APs through the grievance redress mechanism process outlined in the URP/DRPs. During the monitoring period a total of 23 AHs raised up the complaints for resolutions (Table 10). A total of 20 cases were resolved with positive feedback and there are 3 remaining cases that are pending for resolution but has been accepted and discussed with the AHs. As the result, monitoring team will follow up these three cases in the next survey. From EMO's observation, most of the official and unofficial complaints from AHs lodged to the PGRC, contractor and EMO were resolved as in accordance with processes outlined in the URP/DRPs. Moreover, there is continuity of all GRC members and none of them have been replaced. Therefore, the grievances are resolved in a timely manner.

32. Regarding the complaints from aggrieved AHs in this annual showed that 1% or 3AHs in Neak Loeung expressed dissatisfaction due to the compensation progress. In addition, their businesses were affected by the construction start. Moreover, after EMO received a few unofficial complaints, then survey team informed the contractor to explain to the AHs about the technical aspects of construction and the progress made for their understanding. As the result, there were no more complaints after the construction was completed within the 6 month-period.

33. According to the records kept at Commune on GRM, the EMO has noticed that the chief of commune and clerk jointly heard the complaints and recorded. A further review of the records in the complaint book at the commune level of 3 subprojects at Poi Pet, Battambang and Bavet, showed no complaints were recorded as the complaints by the aggrieved AHs were made directly to PGRC members for resolving. But for Neak Loeung flood control had been recorded in complaint book kept in commune level as well as the other 3 cases that not yet solved are now progress to provincial sector.

34. As per discussion with GDR and check for RP documents, EMO found out there were composition of Police representative in PRSC. However, based on the reality, the present of two police officers was only to secure the environment in public meeting as well as to protect the Covid 19 spreading to AHs by arranging the social distancing during the meeting.

Below is the composition of PGRCs' members joint the EMO Corridor Towns

**1. Composition of PGRCs' members for Wastewater Treatment (Storm Damage)
Subproject in Battambang**

No	Name	Position	Agency	Contact Number
1	Mr. Sam Sophol	Provincial Governor	Battambang, BTB	098 275 443
2	Mr. Nhorn Sokhara	Provincial Governor	Battambang, BTB	None
3	Mr. Hok Samnang	Provincial Governor	Battambang, BTB	None
4	Mr. Song Soeng	Chief office of Municipal	Battambang, BTB	012 975 250
5	Mr. Norn Chek	Chief Office of land Urban Management	Battambang, BTB	None

**2. Composition of PGRCs' members for Wastewater Treatment (Storm Damage)
Subproject in Poi Pet**

No	Name	Position	Agency	Contact Number
1	Mr. Chann Kokuong	Working group	MLMUPC, Poipet, BMC	None
2	Mr. Min Synaka	Working group	MLMUPC, Poipet, BMC	None
3	Mr.Vong Rada	Working group	MPWT	None
4	Mr. Chea Sophanet	Working group	MPWT	None
5	Mr. Ly Sary	Head (Vice Governor)	Poipet, BMC	None
6	Mr. Boeung Kimseung	Director of PDEF	Poipet, BMC	None
7	Mr. Chea Sovanthuon	Deputy Director of DPWT	Poipet, BMC	None
8	Mr. Prakpolin	Director of LMUPC	Poipet, BMC	None
9	Mr. Ngan Chinda	Provincial Police	Poipet, BMC	None
10	Mr. Keo Raksmei	Provincial Hall	Poipet, BMC	None
11	Mr. Khatt Thea	Poipet Hall	Poipet, BMC	061 975 545
12	Mr. Im Sothearoek	Police officer	Poipet, BMC	None

**3. Composition of PGRCs' members for Wastewater Treatment (Storm Damage) and
Urban Roads Subprojects in Bavet**

No	Name	Position	Agency	Contact Number
1	Mr. Chou Sokny	Representative of Provincial Governor	Bavet, Svay Rieng	017 617 878
2	Mr. Sok Sophol	Chief, Bavet Municipal office	Bavet, Svay Rieng	097 751 63 64
3	Mr. Ung Sa	PIU	Bavet, Svay Rieng	097 626 22 82
4	Mr. Sorm Kosal	PISCD	Bavet, Svay Rieng	077 97 13 88
5	Mr. Keo Sarang	Coordinator Bavet Municipal	Bavet, Svay Rieng	088 644 05 44

4. Composition of PGRCs' members for Neak Loeung Flood Protection subproject at Prey Veng

No	Name	Position	Agency	Contact Number
1	H.E Soun Somaly	Deputy Director of Provincial	Neak Loeung, Prey Veng	097 8888 766
2	Mr. Chheng Sovanara	Admin Deputy director of Provincial	Neak Loeung, Prey Veng	088 256 2619
3	Mr. Uon Sothear	Director of DPWT	Neak Loeung, Prey Veng	088 244 3333
4	Mr. Noun Sokun	Director of Financial and Economic Department of Provincial	Neak Loeung, Prey Veng	012 964 009
5	Mr. Prum Senthor	Provincial Police Commissioner	Neak Loeung, Prey Veng	077 900 999

IV. CONCLUSION

35. The third semi-annual external monitoring survey of 22% of the AHs under Battambang, Bavet, Poi Pet and Neak Loeung subprojects URP/DRPs has been conducted to determine whether the objectives of the URP/DRPs are being met. During this monitoring period, the survey was conducted for 283 AHs through direct interviews and face-to-face discussions. Results showed that the monitoring survey was conducted in Poi Pet subproject town was conducted for 20% of the total AHs, which was 2% decrease than the previous annual. For the Battambang subproject, the survey was conducted for 21% of the AHs which it is decrease 9% compare to 2nd annual, while the Bavet subprojects, it is increase 5% in 3rd annual. As for Neak Loeung subproject, the survey was conducted for a total of 87 AHs or 22%. Overall, the random sample survey was conducted for 22% of AHs or 283/1,298 AHs under the URP/DRPs.

36. During the monitoring period, the income of the 283 AHs was assessed (Figure 7). It is found that 10 AHs earn decrease income less than \$ 80.00 per month and are poor. Data on income analysis showed the income bracket of \$70-\$200 accounted for 70 AHs compared to 80 AHs in the last annual- a decrease of 10 AHs. The medium to high level of monthly income between \$231-\$500 and, \$570-\$792 was for 164 AHs or 58%, showing that the income level decreased 4% during the monitoring period compared to previous quarter. However, the higher levels of monthly income bracket \$1,500-\$4,500 slightly changed by about 3% from the last quarter.

37. During the monitoring period, 23 AHs raised the complaints for resolutions (Table 10) and IRC-WC accepted the complaints and discussed them with the aggrieved AHs. Resolutions were provided for 20 cases while for 3 cases discussions have been held with the aggrieved AHs but resolutions will provide in the next monitoring report. The EMO joined IRC-WG to investigate the complaints and fund their status had been resolved. There only 3 requests related to the compensation payments among the 23 complaints need to be speeded up the progress.

38. In terms of the construction progress, 5 subprojects in Poi Pet, Bavet and Battambang (Wastewater Treatment Subproject "Storm Drainage") are under construction. Construction under the Neak Loeung Flood Control sub-project is yet to commence although the detail design, DMS and DRP are complete. for preparation as well as provide the compensation to 351AHs. The IRC-WG provided the training on GRM to PGRC members and the GRM is fully functional and operationalized.

39. In this semi-annual progress for Neak Loeung subproject, as on 15th July, 2020, PGRC had the public consultation about IRP program which there were 79 AHs who are valuable groups can make the decision to choose the vocational program or will choose to receive the money 500\$ instead. As by result, 73 AHs or 92% out of 79 AHs have been chosen to get 500\$ because of need money to support family, pay for medical health and treatment, support more business planning and most of valuable group's children already have their own job which no need to get the vocational training. For this third semi-annual report have been implementation by provide the compensation to 351AHs by March 04th- 06th and June 14th-16th 2021. For this compensation provided progressing, most of AHs are very happy to receive the budget as well as approve their affected assets to be under our construction.

Summary of URP implementation status

No. (1)	Subproject Name (2)	Planned in the URP			Actual as implemented			Missing AHs in RPs (9)	Number of AHs with pending compensation (10)	Vulnerable AHs with pending compensation (11)
		No. AHs (3)	Incl. vulnerable AHs (4)	Compensation and entitlements in USD (5)	AHs received compensati on (6)	Incl. vulnerable AHs (7)	Compensation and entitlements in USD (8)			
1	Poipet Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage)	65	7	790,064.57	64	7	793,513.74	1 AH in Actual implementation decrease then Planned URP	None	None
2	Battambang Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage)	258	22	249,390.71	258	23	175,808.58	1 AH in Actual implementation decrease then Planned URP	None	None
3	Battambang Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) - Trapezoidal Earth Canal-Additional Scope)	11	None	7,205.50	11	None	10,349.60	The same	None	None
4	Bavet Urban Road	445	45	408,722.80	445	45	393,082.99	The same	None	None
5	Bavet Storm Drainage	134	1	301,683.18	134	1	187,469.36	The same	None	None
6	Neak Loeung Flood Protection	385	81	2,208,426.52	351	66	1,663,813.52	Still on the progress	The compensation still in progress	The compensation still in progress
	Total	1,298	156	3,965,493.28	1,263	142	3,224,037.79	2 AHs		

As for three sub-projects at Bavet, Poipet and Battambang already received the compensation 100%. As by discussed and checked with GDR by compared the compensation budget for AHs to receive the compensation, the actual implemented is lower than planned in URP because of

40. For Poipet Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage)

1. The actual amount of AH in the implementation is less than in URP plan for 1 AH, since 1 AH was not impacted by the sub-project. According to the first line showing the total number of AHs are 27 AHs (528,461.81\$) will be able to receive the compensation in URP plan. However, the actual number was only 26 AHS (528,170.93\$), so this cause the actual amount of compensation is less about 290.88\$.

2. Regarding to the third line showing the budget for URP is 10,590.46\$ while the actual amount of implementation is 120,332.18\$. Therefore, the actual amount of this compensation is less about 109,741.72\$. To sum up, total AHs in URP Plan showing that there is 1 AH less than the number of AH in actual implementation. In addition, the compensation budget in URP Plan is 790,064.57\$ which is less than the actual implementation budget about 3,449.17\$, while the actual one is 793,513.74\$.

41. For Battambang Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage), According to the reality of affected target showing that the amount of affected assets cost is higher than the replacement cost. For instance, Wastewater treatment (Storm Drainage) base in Battambang showing the cost of floor concrete in URP is about 60\$/m²; however, based on the exact calculated amount paid in DMS as it's only 12\$/m². This caused the total amount of compensation completely different from URP and in the actual implementation. Likewise, the total vulnerable AH are 22 AHs yet as in the actual implementation showing one more AH who need to receive the extra 100\$. As a result, the total vulnerable AH in the actual implementation increase to 23AHs. On the other hand, the actual number of AHs who may receive the special support of business-affected income is less than the number in URP plan. Hence, the total compensation budget in URP is 256,596.21\$ while the total compensation budget in the actual implementation is 186,158.18\$. Therefore, it's showing the less amount of 70,438.03\$ between these.

42. For Battambang Wastewater Treatment (Storm Drainage) - Trapezoidal Earth Canal- Additional Scope, according to actual implementation compensation budget (10,349.60\$) is higher than in URP plan (7,205.50\$) because of DMS PGRCs' members did not include the drainage affected budget into this, that's why it's showing the higher amount of 3,144.10\$ between these.

43. For Bavet Urban Road, the amount in URP Plan is 408,722.80\$ while the amount in the actual implementation is (393,082.99\$). It's showing the amount in URP is higher than the amount of actual implementation for 15,639.81\$. The reason is because of the affected trees/crops is low price, since the compensation was calculated more than 5 years. However, it was divided into 3 columns of calculation which are (from 1 year to 3 years, from 3 years to 5 years and more than 5 years). Thus, the amount in URP is higher than budget of actual implementation. Those AHs included with who loss of income, allowance, vulnerable AHs and AHs with the significant impacts one-time Cash Assistance and allowance for rental fee.

44. For Bavet Storm Drainage, the amount in URP plan is 301,683.18\$ while the amount in the actual implementation is 144,213.82\$. It's illustrating that the amount in URP plan is higher than the amount of actual implementation for 187,469.36\$. The cause of this higher amount due to the confusion of the calculation in the compensation for steel doors which the study cost is between 270\$ to 380\$ per set, yet the compensation in URP is about 300\$/m² (A set between 10 to 15m²).

45. Flooded for Neak Loeung subproject, the total amount in URP Plan is 2,208,426.52\$ while the amount in the actual implementation is 1,663,813.52\$. It's showing the amount in URP is higher than the amount of actual implementation for 544,613.00\$. The reason of these different amount such as the Land Compensation in planning are 184,860.86m² (1,946,957.08\$) which it is different from actual affected land side is 140,418.10m² (1,538,525.81\$) so different amount side are 44,442.81m² (408,431.27\$). For the other budget on still for the next compensation provided in the next semi-annual report.

RECOMMENDATION

46. Lesson from the AHs to request for improvements both construction and compensation progress:

- Accelerate the construction process to avoid or minimize the impacts toward the business.
- Accelerate the process to pay the compensation to AHs under the URP/DRPs once the budget is approved.

47. The present of two police officers was only to secure the situation in public meeting as well as to protect the Covid 19 spreading to AHs by arranging the social distancing during the meeting.

ANNEX A: List of Target Sides for Interviewing in 2021

No	HH Name	Village	Commune	District	Province
1	Sok Vorng	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
2	Mung Orn	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
3	Lorng Rachna	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
4	Yorn Lmorm	Romchek Pi	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
5	Ye Kea	Romchek Pi	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
6	Chot Cholyda	Romchek Pi	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
7	Soev Saek	Romchek Pi	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
8	Heang Khon	Romchek Pi	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
9	Sok Yaen	Romchek Pi	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
10	Orm Phol	Romchek Bey	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
11	Thorn Sarith	Romchek Bey	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
12	Ty Born	Romchek Bey	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
13	Ket Dara	Romchek Bey	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
14	Heang Phalla	Romchek Bey	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
15	Teb Chanoek	Romchek Bey	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
16	Choe Sok	Romchek Bey	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
17	Sok Kimsorn	Romchek Bey	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
18	Sorn Volthoeun	Romchek Bey	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
19	Ly Phonpav	Romchek Bey	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
20	Ou Kimla	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
21	Am Phal	Romchek Pi	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
22	Ou Kimla	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
23	Puv Sophy	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
24	Heng Phalla	Romchek Bey	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
25	Meoun Nou	Romchek Pi	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
26	Heng Cheng	Romchek Pi	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
27	Heng Kun	Romchek Pi	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
28	Veong Sody	Romchek Pi	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
29	Ly Thean Pao	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
30	Cheout Rouet	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
31	Srey Mum	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
32	Sok Sophun	Romchek Bey	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
33	Sim Bengkim	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
34	Seav Chi	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
35	Reav Visal	Preak Pre Sdach	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
36	Kab Puon	Preak Pre Sdach	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
37	Ty Bun	Romchek Bey	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
38	Sor Sinat	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
39	Chhun Saroeun	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
40	Preab Sarin	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
41	Vong Samphors	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
42	Sors Sitra	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng

43	So Chun	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
44	Sok Sophy	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
45	Chat Sarun	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
46	Khem Leab	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
47	Yung Chansung	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
48	Yim Morng	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
49	Son Yon	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
50	Moeung Sokha	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
51	Korng Ser	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
52	Por Sam An	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
53	So Kimsea	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
54	Nguon Seoung	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
55	Por Sam An	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
56	Sorn Kosal	Ou Chrev	Poi Pet	Poi Pet	Banteay Meanchey
57	Sem Maryneat	Ou Chrev	Poi Pet	Poi Pet	Banteay Meanchey
58	Ven Kemren	Ou Chrev	Poi Pet	Poi Pet	Banteay Meanchey
59	Bon Loavdy	Poi Pet	Poi Pet	Poi Pet	Banteay Meanchey
60	Moer Siej	Poi Pet	Poi Pet	Poi Pet	Banteay Meanchey
61	Tem Vannreth	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
62	Meon Vibol	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
63	Oem Hout	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
64	Yong Huch	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
65	Koang Sunny	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
66	Chhun Kimly	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
67	Uy Sennai	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
68	Sok Saoun	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
69	Seak Sreymom	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
70	Kong Sovy	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
71	Morn Sokva	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
72	Yen Phola	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
73	Hen Synal	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
74	Neth Ty	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
75	Yorng Channa	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
76	So Sambo	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
77	Kong Salov	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
78	Kong Sarouen	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
79	Kvan Naya	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
80	Yung Chansi	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
81	Sy Sophol	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
82	Kem Che Bunthoeun	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
83	Chhun Sony	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
84	Prum Sophol	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
85	Houy Saphan	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
86	So Sakhorn	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
87	Yok Sophea	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
88	Surn Samoat	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng

89	Pov Dara	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
90	Tor Chamroeun	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
91	Da Sarith	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
92	Mou Neath	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
93	Surn Samoat	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
94	Kea Phalla	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
95	Sou Syna	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
96	Ty Heang	Preak Pre Sdach	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
97	Cheng Seanghoeuy	Preak Pre Sdach	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
98	Chea Sokheon	Preak Pre Sdach	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
99	Kim Saoreth	Preak Pre Sdach	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
100	Choab Soksam	Preak Pre Sdach	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
101	Yung Chansorn	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
102	Pen Daeb	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
103	Him Mouy	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
104	Sem Sophol	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
105	Sy Tyra	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
106	So Phalla	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
107	Orn Saray	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
108	Cheas Phaly	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
109	Noun Soriya	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
110	Phoen Kunthea	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
111	Kong Samnang	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
112	So Vonthai	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
113	Yin Davy	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
114	Siv Sary	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
115	So Ouk	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
116	Hout Sarim	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
117	Hout Manith	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
118	Nhem Savath	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
119	Pho Saorn	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
120	Teb Vanna	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
121	Khun Oeth	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
122	Kheng Meng	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
123	Soam Saorem	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
124	Phek Sophol	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
125	Sors Phally	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
126	Vorng Reth	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
127	Sok Sophea	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
128	Prom Chenda	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
129	Chan Rotha	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
130	Torn Phul	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
131	Phorth Sopheap	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
132	Phon Symorn	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
133	Sok Chheang	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
134	Sov Rattana	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng

135	Pen Saorn	Bavet Kandal	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
136	Sors Bora	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
137	Sor Syda	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
138	Sok Vorng	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
139	Mung Orn	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
140	Tem Vannreth	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
141	Meon Vibol	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
142	Oem Hout	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
143	Yong Huch	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
144	Koang Sunny	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
145	Chhun Kimly	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
146	Uy Sennai	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
147	Sok Saoun	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
148	Seak Sreymom	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
149	Kong Sovy	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
150	Morn Sokva	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
151	Yen Phola	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
152	Hen Synal	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
153	Neth Ty	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
154	Thach Kaeng	Tapouv	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
155	So Sambo	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
156	Kong Salov	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
157	Kong Sarouen	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
158	Kvan Naya	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
159	Yung Chansi	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
160	Chhon Roeth	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
161	Ou Kimla	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
162	Puv Sophy	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
163	Phong Bunthern	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
164	Teb Ry	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
165	Yem Try	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
166	Srey Mom	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
167	Sok Khoen	13 Makara	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
168	Keat Ty	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
169	Sy Tera	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
170	Yim Moeung	Taboeb	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
171	Sov Rattank	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
172	Mul Ratha	Bavet Ler	Bavet	Bavet	Svay Rieng
173	Vel Naroun	Romchek Bey	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
174	Nul Chhorn	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
175	Hor Hout	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
176	Bon Pina	Romchek Bey	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
177	Morn Phary	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
178	Kim So Phaey	Ou Chrev	Poi Pet	Poi Pet	Banteay Meanchey
179	Khon Makara	Ou Chrev	Poi Pet	Poi Pet	Banteay Meanchey
180	Meas Bros	Ou Chrev	Poi Pet	Poi Pet	Banteay Meanchey
181	Souy Vithy	Ou Chrev	Poi Pet	Poi Pet	Banteay Meanchey
182	Yim Rina	Ou Chrev	Poi Pet	Poi Pet	Banteay Meanchey

183	Veth Sovannara	Poi Pet	Poi Pet	Poi Pet	Banteay Meanchey
184	Eam Neang	Poi Pet	Poi Pet	Poi Pet	Banteay Meanchey
185	Sang Viraek	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
186	Sok Then	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
187	Chin Kong	Bek Chan Thmey	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
188	Am Bunat	Preak Pre Sdach	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
189	Reav Visal	Preak Pre Sdach	Preak Pre Sdach	Battambang	Battambang
190	Keout Dara	Romchek Bey	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
191	Cheout Rouet	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
192	Ou Kimla	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
193	Chad Chorlyda	Romchek Pi	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
194	Sao Sek	Romchek Pi	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
195	Thorn Narith	Romchek Bon	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
196	Ty Bun	Romchek Pi	Rattanak	Battambang	Battambang
197	Heng Bontheong	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
198	Peng Reat	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
199	Veang Samoet	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
200	Sory Noeun	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
201	Tim Tony	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
202	Svay Ny	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
203	Chea Vannak	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
204	Chea Sora	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
205	Hor Chanthy	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
206	Soum Soerng	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
207	Svay Reay	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
208	Svay Sara	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
209	Nhob Proeng	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
210	Chhum Phutheary	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
211	Hov Im	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
212	Kroung Sorng Hen	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
213	Vor Sina	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
214	Chun Louk	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
215	Oun Soeng	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
216	Nuy Seong	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
217	Chrong Kema	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
218	Noun Sophon	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
219	Orn Samoret	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
220	Meas Doung	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
221	Mout Horn	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
222	Sor Sokhun	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
223	Chea Saoret	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
224	Chea Heng	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
225	Orm Nhok	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
226	Kvok Meon	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
227	Heng Ry	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
228	Chob Savon	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
229	Ros Sreyleak	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
230	So Rung	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
231	Nov Leang	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
232	Tong Saorn	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
233	Bon Sreymoev	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng

234	Pho Samoret	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
235	Nov Leang	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
236	Srun Vimean	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
237	Im Orek	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
238	Som Channa	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
239	Sok Phalla	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
240	Sorn Rith	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
241	Cheng Sophea	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
242	Cheath Reksmey	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
243	Heng Sambo	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
244	Vorng Saorn	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
245	Ben Somaly	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
246	Try Seyha	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
247	Chea Kimphea	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
248	Phung Chenda	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
249	Ham Vin	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
250	Thum Samorng	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
251	Keo Sophea	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
252	Pov Savy	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
253	Ly Moret	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
254	Chan Phearom	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
255	Soun Sok	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
256	Sok Channa	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
257	Kvov Lay	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
258	Sok Pholy	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
259	Horng Ry	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
260	Phy Saoret	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
261	Kvov Meung	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
262	Chev Saoet	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
263	Keo Sorn	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
264	Kong Saroet	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
265	Em Channoeun	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
266	Chhom Chantha	Steng Slot	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
267	Kong Lay	Steng Slot	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
268	Bun Neang	Steng Slot	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
269	Van Saron	Phum 6	Prey Ksay Kor	Poemro	Prey Veng
270	Som Mob	Phum 6	Prey Ksay Kor	Poemro	Prey Veng
271	Chean Saroet	Phum 6	Prey Ksay Kor	Poemro	Prey Veng
272	Ter Tola	Phum 2	Prey Ksay Kor	Poemro	Prey Veng
273	Kong Ty	Phum 2	Prey Ksay Kor	Poemro	Prey Veng
274	Run Layheng	Phum 2	Prey Ksay Kor	Poemro	Prey Veng
275	Choung Savin	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
276	Snon Sreytouch	Prey Tasor	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
277	Phum Chantha	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
278	Sok Phally	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
279	Chhom Sophea	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
280	Heng Sambo	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
281	Boen Somaly	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
282	Meon Kimly	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng
283	Try Seyharoth	Neak Loeung	Neak Loeung	Poemro	Prey Veng

ANNEX B: External Monitoring Questionnaire

កម្រងសំណួរ

Questionnaires for Compensation & Construction Progress

External Monitoring EMO Corridor Town at Bavet, Poipet, Neak Loeung
and Battambang Province

លេខបញ្ជីសំណួរ/ Questionnaire No:

កាលបរិច្ឆេទ/Date:/...../ 2021

PK# :

ស្រុក /District:

ភូមិ/Village :

ខេត្ត/Province:

ឃុំ/Commune :

អ្នកសម្ភាសន៍/Interviewer:

I. ព័ត៌មានអំពីអ្នកដែលត្រូវរុះរើ គ្រួសារដែលរងផលប៉ះពាល់ (Identification of the Displaced Person (DP) / Affected Household (AH))

[1]. ឈ្មោះមេគ្រួសារ(Name of head of household):

[2]. ឈ្មោះអ្នកផ្តល់សម្ភាសន៍(Name of Respondent):

[3]. តើអ្នកមានទំនាក់ទំនងអ្វីជាមួយមេគ្រួសារ? What is your relationship to the household head?

1. ☐ មេគ្រួសារ (household head)

6. ☐ ឪពុកម្តាយ (parent)

2. ☐ ប្តី/ប្រពន្ធ (spouse)

7. ☐ ឪពុកម្តាយក្មេក (parent-in-law)

3. ☐ មេផ្ទះ (housewife)

8. ☐ បងស្រី/បងប្រុសថ្លៃ(brother/sister-in-law)

4. ☐ កូន (children)

9. ☐ ក្មួយប្រុស/ក្មួយស្រី(nephew/niece)

5. ☐ បងស្រី/បងប្រុស (sister or brother in-law)

10. ☐ ក្មួយប្រុស/ក្មួយស្រីថ្លៃ (nephew/niece-in-law)

[4]. លេខទូរស័ព្ទរបស់មេគ្រួសារ ឬ សមាជិក (Contact Number):

[5]. អាយុមេគ្រួសារ (Age):

[6]. ភេទមេគ្រួសារ (Sex): 1. ☐ ប្រុស (male) 2. ☐ ស្រី (female)

[7]. ស្ថានភាពអាពាហ៍ពិពាហ៍មេគ្រួសារ/Marital Status:

1. ☐ រៀបការ/Married 2. ☐ នៅលីវ/Single
3. ☐ លែងលះ/Divorced 4. ☐ មេម៉ាយ/ពោះម៉ាយ/Widow/Widower

[8]. ការអប់រំ(កម្រិតសិក្សា) របស់មេគ្រួសារ (Education of the household head):

1. ☐ បឋមសិក្សា/elementary 2. ☐ អនុវិទ្យាល័យ/ Secondary school
3. ☐ វិទ្យាល័យ/high school 3. ☐ មហាវិទ្យាល័យ/college
4. ☐ វិជ្ជាជីវៈ/vocational 5. ☐ មិនបានចូលរៀន/No schooling
6. ☐ ផ្សេងៗ (Other, specify): _____

[9]. ជនជាតិ(Ethnicity): 1. ☐ ខ្មែរ/Khmer 2. ☐ ចាម/Cham
3. ☐ វៀតណាម/Vietnamese 4. ☐ ផ្សេងៗ/Other, specify) : _____

[10]. តើស្ថានភាពរបស់មេគ្រួសារមានលក្ខណៈយ៉ាងដូចម្តេច? (What is the condition of household head?)

- ☐ 1. ពិការ(Disable); ☐ 2. ចាស់ជរា (Elderly)
☐ 3. មេម៉ាយ/ពោះម៉ាយ/Widow/er ☐ 4. មានប័ណ្ណក្រីក្រ (Poor ID)
☐ 5. គ្មានដី (Landless) ☐ 6. ប្រាក់ចំណូលក្រោមបន្ទាត់ភាពក្រីក្រ (Income below poverty line)
☐ 7. សុខភាពធម្មតា(normal health) ☐ 8. ផ្សេងៗ (Other).....

II. ព័ត៌មានស្តីពីប្រាក់ចំណូល (Income information)

[11]. តើប្រភពប្រាក់ចំណូលសំខាន់ របស់គ្រួសារអ្នកបានពីអ្វីខ្លះ? What is main income source of your family?

Source of incomes	មុនពេលគំរោងទៅដល់		ពេលគំរោងទៅដល់		បាត់បង់ចំណូលអ្វីខ្លះ ពេលគំរោងទៅដល់
		Income in Riel		Income in Riel	Income in Riel
ប្រាក់បៀវត្ស (Wages/Salary)					
ជួញដូរ (Trading)					
ផលិតផលកសិកម្ម (Agricultural product)					

សេវាផ្សេងៗ (Other services)					
ផលិតកម្ម (Manufacture)					
នេសាទ (Fishing)					
ប្រាក់បញ្ញើ (Remittance)					
ចិញ្ចឹមសត្វ (Livestock)					
ដឹកជញ្ជូន (Transportation)					
បរបាញ់ (Hunting)					
ជាងជួសជុល (Technician)					
ផ្សេងៗ (Other, Specify).....					

[12]. តើក្នុងមួយខែជាមធ្យមគ្រួសាររបស់អ្នកប្រាក់ចំណូលបានប៉ុន្មាន? (What is the average monthly income of your household?)

មុនពេលគំរាងទៅដល់	ពេលគំរាងទៅដល់

[13]. តើប្រភពសំខាន់នៃការចំណាយ របស់គ្រួសារអ្នកមានអ្វីខ្លះ? What is main source of cash expense in your family?

Source of Expense	មុនពេលគំរាងទៅដល់		ពេលគំរាងទៅដល់		បាត់បង់ការចំណាយអ្វីខ្លះពេលគំរាងទៅដល់	
		Expense in Riel		Expense in Riel		Expense in Riel
អង្ករ (Rice)						
អាហារ (Food)						
ប្រេងឥន្ធនៈ (Fuel)						
គ្រឿងសំអាង (Cosmetics)						
សុខភាព (Health)						
ដឹកជញ្ជូន (Transportation)						
ភ្លើង (Electricity)						
ទឹក (Water)						
សំលៀកបំពាក់ (Clothes)						
ការអប់រំ (Education)						
ការរៀបចំពិធីផ្សេងៗ (Ceremony or wedding)						

សង្ហារឹម (Furniture)						
ការកំសាន្ត (Entertainment)						
ផ្សេងៗ (Other, Specify).....						

[14]. តើក្នុងមួយខែជាមធ្យមគ្រួសាររបស់អ្នកចំណាយអស់ប៉ុន្មាន? (What is the average monthly expense of your household?)

មុនពេលគំរោងទៅដល់	ពេលគំរោងទៅដល់

II. ទ្រព្យសម្បត្តិដែលរងផលប៉ះពាល់និង ការវាស់វែង (Affected Assets and Measurement)

[15]. តើគ្រួសាររបស់អ្នកមានទទួលរងនូវផលប៉ះពាល់ទ្រព្យសម្បត្តិដោយសារគម្រោងរបៀងក្រុងបារិត ប៉ោយប៉ែត និងបាត់ដំបងដែរឬទេ?/Has your family been affected by Corridor Town at Bavet, Poypoit and Battambang project?

☐ 1. មាន/Yes; ☐ 2. មិនមាន/No

[16]. តើគ្រួសាររបស់អ្នកទទួលបានទទួលសំណងជាក់ស្តែងនូវទ្រព្យសម្បត្តិ ដែលទទួលរងនូវផលប៉ះពាល់នៃគម្រោងរបៀងក្រុងបារិត ប៉ោយប៉ែត និងបាត់ដំបងហើយឬនៅ?/Has your family been receive the compensation by Corridor Town at Bavet, Poypoit and Battambang project?

☐ 1. បាន/Yes ☐ 2. មិនបាន/No

[17]. ប្រសិនបើអ្នកមិនបានទទួលតើមូលហេតុអ្វី? (If "No" what is the reason?)

.....

[18]. តើអ្នកបានចូលរួមប្រជុំសាធារណៈលំអិតពីការទទួលសំណងដែរឬទេ?/ Did you attend public meeting of receive the compensation?)

☐ 1. បាន/Yes ☐ 2. មិនបាន/No

[19]. ប្រសិនបើអ្នកមិនបានចូលរួមប្រជុំសាធារណៈតើមូលហេតុអ្វី? (If “No” what is the reason?)

.....

.....

.....

[20]. តើអ្នកបានទទួលព័ត៌មានអ្វីខ្លះពីការប្រជុំជាសាធារណៈ? (What information have you got during public meeting?)

.....

.....

.....

[21]. តើទ្រព្យសម្បត្តិអ្វីខ្លះ ដែលគ្រួសាររបស់អ្នករងផលប៉ះពាល់ពីគម្រោង?(What are your household assets affected by the project?)

Code	ទ្រព្យសម្បត្តិប៉ះពាល់/Affected Assets	Tick
1	ដីស្រែ/Farmland	
2	ដីលំនៅឋាន/Residential land	
3	ដីពាណិជ្ជកម្ម/Commercial land	
4	ផ្ទះ/House	
5	តូបលក់/Store	
6	ផ្ទះ និងតូបលក់/House – Store	
7	សំយាបផ្ទះ/Yard	
8	ផ្ទះបាយ/Kitchen	
9	របង/Fence	
10	សាបស៊ីម៉ង់មុខផ្ទះ/Concrete pavement	
11	ផ្លូវចូលផ្ទះ/Box culvert (driveway)	
12	ដំណាំ/ដើមឈើ/Tree/Crop	
13	ល្អិត /Sewage	
14	អណ្តូង ឬ ស្រះទឹក / Cistern or pond	
15	ផ្សេងៗ បញ្ជាក់/Other (Specify)_____	

[22]. តើទ្រព្យសម្បត្តិដែលគ្រួសាររបស់អ្នករងផលប៉ះពាល់ពីគម្រោងមានទំហំសរុបប៉ុន្មានម៉ែត្រការ៉េ?

(What is the size of your affected assets?)

Code	ទ្រព្យសម្បត្តិប៉ះពាល់/Affected Assets	ទំហំ/Size (m ²)/L/n
1	ដីស្រែ/Farmland	
2	ដីលំនៅឋាន/Residential land	
3	ដីពាណិជ្ជកម្ម/Commercial land	
4	ផ្ទះ/House	
5	តូបលក់ដូរ/Store	
6	ផ្ទះ និងតូបលក់/House – Store	
7	សំយាបផ្ទះ/Yard	
8	ផ្ទះបាយ/Kitchen	
9	រំបង/Fence	
10	សាបស៊ីម៉ង់ត៍មុខផ្ទះ/Concrete pavement	
11	ផ្លូវចូលផ្ទះ/Box culvert (driveway)	
12	ដំណាំ/ដើមឈើ/Tree/Crop	
13	ល្ប/sewage	
14	អណ្តូង ឬ ស្រះទឹក / Cistern or pond	
15	ផ្សេងៗ បញ្ជាក់/Other (Specify)_____	

[23]. តើអ្នក/គ្រួសាររបស់អ្នកពេញចិត្តចំពោះលើទ្រព្យសម្បត្តិដែលរងផលប៉ះពាល់ទាំងនោះយ៉ាងណាដែរ?

/ How are you/your family satisfied with the affected assets?

1	ពេញចិត្តខ្លាំង/Very satisfied	
2	ពេញចិត្ត/Satisfied	
3	មធ្យម/Average	
4	មិនពេញចិត្ត/Unsatisfied	
5	មិនពេញចិត្តទាល់តែសោះ/Very unsatisfied	
6	មិនដឹង/Don't know	

[24]. បើមិនពេញចិត្តឬមិនពេញចិត្តទាល់តែសោះ, តើអ្នកមានមូលហេតុចម្លងអ្វីដែរ?/If unsatisfied or very unsatisfied, what is your main reason?

.....

.....

.....

IV. ការតវ៉ា និងមតិយោបល់អ្នករងផលប៉ះពាល់ (APs' Comments)

[25]. តើគ្រួសាររបស់អ្នកធ្លាប់មានការតវ៉ាផ្សេងៗពីបញ្ហាសំណងលើទ្រព្យសម្បត្តិដែលរងប៉ះពាល់នៅគម្រោងរបៀងក្រុងបារិត ប៉ោយប៉ែត និងបាត់ដំបងឬទេ? (Have your family ever complained about compensation on the affected assets by Corridor Town at Bavet, Poypoit and Battambang project?)

☐ 1. ធ្លាប់(Yes) when; ☐ 2. មិនធ្លាប់(No) ☐ 3.មិនដឹង(Don't know)

[26]. បើធ្លាប់, តើតវ៉ាអំពីបញ្ហាអ្វី? (If YES, what was the complaint about?)

.....

.....

.....

[27]. តើអ្នកធ្លាប់បានដឹងឮដោយផ្ទាល់អំពីការតវ៉ាផ្សេងៗដែលកើតមានក្នុងតំបន់របស់អ្នកពីការសំណងលើទ្រព្យសម្បត្តិដែលរងប៉ះពាល់នៅគម្រោងគម្រោងរបៀងក្រុងបារិត ប៉ោយប៉ែត និងបាត់ដំបងដែរឬទេ? (Have your family ever known or heard any complained about the compensation on the affected assets by Corridor Town at Bavet, Poypoit and Battambang project?)

☐ 1. ធ្លាប់(Yes); ☐ 2. មិនធ្លាប់(No) ☐ 3.មិនដឹង(Don't know)

[28]. បើធ្លាប់, តើតវ៉ាអំពីបញ្ហាអ្វី? (If YES, what was the complaint about?)

.....

.....

.....

[29]. ប្រសិនបើមានការតវ៉ា, តើមានដំណោះស្រាយកើតឡើងដែរឬទេ?

(In case there is a complaint (s), is there any solution happened?

☐ 1. មាន(Yes) WHEN ; ☐ 2. គ្មាន(No)

[30]. បើមានការតវ៉ាផ្សេងៗ កើតឡើងទាក់ទងនឹងបញ្ហាគម្រោងគម្រោងរៀងក្នុងបារីត ប៉ោយប៉ែត និងបាត់ដំបង, តើអ្នក ឬ អ្នកភូមិរបស់អ្នកធ្វើការតវ៉ាតាមរយៈអ្នកណា? (If there are any in relation the Corridor Town at Bavet, Poypoit and Battambang project, who have you or your villagers filed a complaint to?)

1	អាជ្ញាធរមូលដ្ឋាន (Local authorities)	
2	អាជ្ញាធរស្រុក (District authorities)	
3	អនុគណៈកម្មការ (sub-committee)	
4	គណៈកម្មការអន្តរក្រសួង(IRC)	
5	មិនដឹង (Don't know)	

[31]. តើអ្នកមានមតិយោបល់អ្វីបន្ថែមចំពោះការវាស់វែងលើទ្រព្យសម្បត្តិដែលរងប៉ះពាល់នៅគម្រោងគម្រោងរៀងក្នុងបារីត ប៉ោយប៉ែត និងបាត់ដំបងដែរឬទេ? (Do you have any comments/suggestions about measurement on the affected assets by Corridor Town at Bavet, Poypoit and Battambang project?)

.....

.....

.....

.....

[32]. កំណត់ចំណាំ (Note)

.....

.....

.....

.....

Name and Signature of Interviewer

Name and Signature of Respondent

(ឈ្មោះ និង ហត្ថលេខារបស់អ្នកតបសម្ភាសន៍)

(ឈ្មោះនិង ហត្ថលេខារបស់អ្នកធ្វើសម្ភាសន៍)

ANNEX C: Picture of Site Visit and field Survey (Public meeting, Public Consultation, Compensation providing, construction progress and the Roads improvement)



Picture 1 to 3: Road development of Bavet subproject



Picture 4 to 5: Wastewater Treatment system (Storm Damage) for Subproject in Battambang



**Picture 6 to 7: Poi Pet Subproject: Wastewater Treatment Subproject “Storm Drainage”
(The Road and Drainage system are under construction)**



Picture 8 to 10: Improvement Road of Flood protect Neak Loeung subproject

Corridor Towns and their attendance list

40

- Approve the URP and endorsing URP for the approval of ADB.
- Initiate the establishment Provincial Grievance Redress Committee (PGRC).
- Provide overall guidance on implementing rules and regulations for LAR and propose updates as necessary.

D. General Department of Resettlement

104. The GDR is the permanent technical secretariat of the IRC and is the lead agency for the planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting of URP in accordance with LAR-related laws and implementing rules and procedures and this URP. The GDR has assigned the responsibility for the implementation of URP to Department of Resettlement No. 2 (DR2). The monitoring of the implementation of the URP and the management of the GRM will be carried out by the Department of Internal Monitoring and Data Management (DIMDM). In addition, the DIMDM will record and review all complaints and grievances submitted by the APs, investigate them and make recommendations on compliance to the Director General of GDR.

E. IRC-Working Group (IRC-WG)

105. The IRC-WG will carry out the day to day LAR activities under the URP which will be led by the Deputy Director of DR2 of the GDR and comprise of technical PMU staff of the MPWT/PDMPWT, staff of the DR2, and staff of the Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction. The IRC-WG is responsible for all the field work under the supervision of the Director of the DR2 and overall guidance and direction of the Director General of the GDR. The composition of the IRC-WG for this URP is in Table 10-1 below.

Table 10-1: Composition of IRC-WG for Storm Drains Subproject

No.	Name	Position	Agency
1	SUN Sokny	Deputy Director	DR2, GDR
2	SENG Hay	Team Leader	DR2, GDR
3	KHEN Sovathara	Vice Team Leader	MLMUPC
4	CHANN KoiUong	Working Group	MLMUPC
5	MIN Synaka	Working Group	MLMUPC
6	Try Vann Tho	Working Group	MPWT
7	VONG Rada	Working Group	MPWT
8	POU Manth	Working Group	MPWT
9	LY Sothong	Working Group	MPWT
10	PAL Piseth	Working Group	MPWT
11	CHEA Sophant	Working Group	MPWT
12	CHANN Rith	Working Group	MPWT

F. Provincial Resettlement Sub-Committee (PRSC)

106. The PRSC has been established by the Provincial Governor at the request of the IRC for the storm drains subproject. The composition of the PRSC is shown in the Table 10-2 below.

Table 10-2: Composition of PRSC for Storm Drains Subproject

No.	Position/Title	Name of Representative
1	Head (Vice Governor)	LY Sary
2	Director of PDEF	BOEUNG Kimseung
3	Deputy Director of DPWT	CHEA SovanThoun
4	Director of MLMUPC	PrakPolin

100

Appendix E. Regulation on GRC's Establishment

Kingdom of Cambodia
Nation Religion King

Svay Rieng Provincial Office
N°: 160 SSR

Decision
Establishment of Grievance Redress Committee
of Bavet Development Project, Svay Rieng Province

Governor of Svay Rieng Province

- Having seen the Reach Kret N° NS/RKM/0508/017 Dated on May 24, 2008 promulgating Law on Administrative Management of the Capital, Provinces, Municipalities, Districts and Khans
- Having seen Royal Decree N° NS/RKT/0413/362, dated on April 14, 2013 on the appointment of Svay Rieng Provincial Council.
- Having seen sub-decree N° 216 ONK/BK, dated on December 14, 2009 on roles and involvement of Provincial Council, Municipal Council, District Council.
- Reference letter N° 3055 SHV dated on May 09, 2013 of Ministry of Economic and Finance.
- According to the necessity of the provincial office.

Decide

Article 1: The Provincial Grievance Redress Committee of Bavet Development Project, Svay Rieng Province is established with the following members.

1.	H.E Men Vibol	Provincial Deputy Governor	Director
2.	Mr. Som Savuth	Director of DPWT	Deputy
3.	Mr. Chen Sathean	Admin Deputy Director of Pro. Office	Member
4.	Mr. Chou Sothy	Director of DEF	Member
5.	Mr. Kim Piath	Director of DLMUPC	Member
6.	Mr. Tach Ratana	Director of DAFF	Member
7.	Mr. Loek Chamroen	Deputy Provincial Police Commissioner	Member
8.	Mr. Nuth Nun	Deputy Commander of Provincial PM	Member
9.	Mr. Neb Saron	Deputy Governor of Bavet Town	Member

80

Date: 14 November 2018
Starting Time: 2:30 PM
Ending Time: 4:45 pm
Venue: Municipal Office, Battambang

I. Participants/Facilitators

Mr. Seng Haiy Team Leader IRC-WG/GDR from MEF
Mr. An Disan IRC Working Group from GDR/MEF
Mr. Sam Sopha Provincial Governor
Mr. Nhom Sokhara Provincial Governor
Mr. Hok Samnang Provincial Governor
Mr. Song Soeng Chief Office of Municipal
Mr. Nom Chek Chief Office of Land Urban Management
Mr. Seang Bora National Resettlement Specialist, PISCD

II. Highlights of the Consultation

Project Overview: Mr. Seng Hai
The Southern Economic Corridor Towns Development Project is designed to facilitate the transformation of transport corridors into economic corridors to spur economic growth and sustained development through provision of adequate urban and infrastructure and essential services to facilitate growth and increase urbanization in the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS). The project will implement a number of environmental improvement subprojects in three towns Battambang, Poipet and Bavet: (i) urban road improvements, including drainage, (ii) flood control, (iii) wastewater treatment; and (iv) solid waste management. Consultation with vulnerable group is important because these are the most affected group of direct stakeholders of the project and the resettlement policy indicates that their socio-economic conditions at pre-project levels must be restored or better. There are structures owned and incomes to be affected thus, there is a need to consult with them their issues and concerns as well as their suggestions to be considered in resettlement planning and implementation.

Furthermore, Mr. Seng Hai welcomed all participants such as the Provincial Governor and his key staffs, representatives and local authorities. He thanked them for their efforts in organizing the meeting and in inviting vulnerable group to participate in the meeting where they are identified based on the DMS results for Storm Drainage of Wastewater Treatment subproject. As per DMS data, there are 22 AHs classified as vulnerable Group comprised of 0 FHH whose main houses will be entirely affected and to be relocated outside of the subproject area, 2 elderly AHs and 20 AHs (2 of which are among the 2) whose monthly household income is US\$33 per capita and below.

Objectives of the Consultation:

- To identify an appropriate income restoration/alternative livelihood for Vulnerable Group affected by Resettlement impacts.
- To identify all vulnerable group and the types of income disruption during construction stage such from business/other occupations before, during and after construction.
- To inform all vulnerable Group about their entitlement as per entitlement matrix to receive cash assistant
- Entitlement Matrix for 5 Landless AHs to be relocated

ប្រការ១.- ត្រូវបានកែសម្រួល សមាសភាព គណៈកម្មការខេត្ត និងក្រុមការងារដើម្បីសហការជាមួយ គណៈកម្មការ អន្តរ
ក្រសួង ដើម្បីព្យុះពិនិត្យអង្កេត វាស់វែង និងវាយតម្លៃផលប៉ះពាល់ ដោយសារគម្រោងអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ សេដ្ឋកិច្ចក្រុង
របៀងខាងត្បូង ដែលមានសមាសភាព ដូចខាងក្រោម៖

១-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	អភិបាលខេត្ត	ប្រធាន
២-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	នាយករង្វេងខេត្ត	អនុប្រធាន
៣-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	ប្រធានមន្ទីរសាធារណការនិងដឹកជញ្ជូនខេត្ត	អនុប្រធាន
៤-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	ប្រធានមន្ទីរសេដ្ឋកិច្ច និងហិរញ្ញវត្ថុខេត្ត	អនុប្រធាន
៥-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	ស្នងការនគរបាលខេត្ត	សមាជិក
៦-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	មេបញ្ជាការឯកភូមិភាគខេត្ត	សមាជិក
៧-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	អភិបាលស្រុកតាមរក្ស	សមាជិក
៨-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	នាយករង្វេងខេត្ត	សមាជិក
៩-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	ប្រធានមន្ទីរព័ត៌មាននិងស្ថាប័នស្ថាប័នស្ថាប័ន	សមាជិក
១០-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	ប្រធានមន្ទីរសិក្សាប្រាជ្ញា និងនេសាទខេត្ត	សមាជិក
១១-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	ប្រធានមន្ទីរធនធានទឹក និងឧតុនិយមខេត្ត	សមាជិក
១២-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	ប្រធានមន្ទីរបរិស្ថានខេត្ត	សមាជិក
១៣-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	នាយកទីតាំងការអនុវត្តវិស័យសាធារណៈ	សមាជិក

ប្រការ២.- គណៈកម្មការនេះមានភារកិច្ចដូចខាងក្រោម៖

- សហការ សម្របសម្រួលជាមួយគណៈកម្មការអន្តរក្រសួង និងអង្គការពាក់ព័ន្ធ សំដៅបម្រើឲ្យដំណើរការនៃការព្យុះពិនិត្យអង្កេត វាស់វែង និងវាយតម្លៃផលប៉ះពាល់ ដោយសារគម្រោងអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ សេដ្ឋកិច្ចក្រុងរបៀងខាងត្បូង ទទួលបានជោគជ័យ ។
- ទទួល និងដោះស្រាយបញ្ហាបណ្តឹងតំបន់ប្រជាពលរដ្ឋ ដែលទទួលផលប៉ះពាល់ដោយសារគម្រោងអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ សេដ្ឋកិច្ចក្រុងរបៀងខាងត្បូង។
- ត្រួតពិនិត្យ និងផ្ទៀងផ្ទាត់ជាមួយគណៈកម្មការនេះដោយស្របតាមផលប៉ះពាល់ ដើម្បីធានាបាននូវគុណប្រយោជន៍ និងតម្លាភាព ធ្វើការបញ្ចប់និងកម្រិត និងសំណើរបស់ប្រជាពលរដ្ឋផលប៉ះពាល់។
- សហការ សម្របសម្រួល និងអនុវត្តសកម្មភាពពាក់ព័ន្ធផ្សេងៗទៀតឲ្យបានល្អ។
- ធ្វើរបាយការណ៍ជូន ឯកឧត្តម អភិបាលខេត្ត អំពីលទ្ធផលនៃការអនុវត្តការងារ និងដំណើរការពាក់ព័ន្ធនានា។

ប្រការ៣.- ត្រូវបានកែសម្រួលសមាសភាពក្រុមការងារជាដំបូងក្រុមការងារគណៈកម្មការខេត្តដែលមានដូចខាងក្រោម៖

១-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	នាយករង្វេងខេត្ត	ប្រធាន
២-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	នាយកទីតាំងការអនុវត្តវិស័យ	អនុប្រធាន
៣-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	អភិបាលស្រុកតាមរក្ស	សមាជិក
៤-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	ប្រធានការិយាល័យស្ថាប័នស្ថាប័នស្ថាប័ន	សមាជិក
៥-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	ប្រធានការិយាល័យ មន្ទីរសេដ្ឋកិច្ច និងហិរញ្ញវត្ថុខេត្ត	សមាជិក
៦-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	ប្រធានការិយាល័យ មន្ទីរសាធារណការនិងដឹកជញ្ជូនខេត្ត	សមាជិក
៧-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	មេបញ្ជាការមូលដ្ឋានក្នុងភូមិភាគខេត្ត	សមាជិក
៨-ឯកឧត្តម	សុខ សុផានី	អភិបាលស្រុកតាមរក្ស	សមាជិក

**** Field work activities photo both Public consultation for compensation in Neak Loeung and under construction for the other 3 subprojects**









Public consultation to deal cases by provide the IRP budget to AHs at commune level which it successful completed

[illegible]57