STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

PRE COMPENSATION ACTIVITIES AND EARLIER STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS (2016)

The Ethiopian Constitution makes reference to the right of the public and communities to full consultation and participation as well as to the expression of their views in the planning and implementation of projects that would affect them. The Ethiopian EIA Guidance also identifies that all interested and affected parties have the opportunity to participate meaningfully in the ESIA processes. The AfDB Operating Safeguards set out their requirements and provide guidance with respect to Stakeholder Engagement. A summary of these requirements is presented in Table 0-2 and Table 0-3 below.

Initial engagement with PAPs was undertaken by the IPDC with the introduction of the project and initial survey of the households. This process was undertaken in 2016. These meetings are listed in Table below.

Table 0-1 : Initial Engagement by IPDC for the Amhara Bure Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Meeting</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 28, 2016</td>
<td>People were provided an explanation about the project and what it might involve.</td>
<td>PAPs ranging from 300 to 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep. 22, 2016</td>
<td>People were provided an explanation about the project and what it might involve.</td>
<td>PAPs ranging from 300 to 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 8, 2016</td>
<td>Project information and progress, compensation and resettlement land options</td>
<td>PAPs ranging from 300 to 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 21, 2016</td>
<td>Project information and progress, compensation and resettlement land options</td>
<td>PAPs ranging from 300 to 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 21, 2016</td>
<td>Once the affected people were identified, the PAPs were gathered and provided an explanation on how the resettlement process will work and how and when they will be compensated.</td>
<td>All the 325 PAPs were present on the meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 30, 2016</td>
<td>Once the affected people were identified, the PAPs were gathered and provided an explanation on how the resettlement process will work and how and when they will be compensated.</td>
<td>All the 325 PAPs were present on the meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 29, 2017</td>
<td>Once the affected people were identified, the PAPs were gathered and provided an explanation on how the resettlement process will work and how and when they will be compensated.</td>
<td>All the 325 PAPs were present on the meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During 2017, meetings with key stakeholders were carried out by the ESIA field team and provided an opportunity for further information disclosure on the details and the programme of the proposed survey.

Key issues and concerns raised during the consultation were taken into account during the ESIA preparation and will be addressed in the environmental and social management plan. A summary of the stakeholder consultation is provided below in the following sections.
Stakeholder engagement process is guided by AfDB ISS1 and ISS 2 outlined below:

**Operation Safeguard 1:** Sets out the AfDB’s overarching requirements for the IPDC to identify, assess and manage the potential environmental and social risks and impacts of the proposed project. Specifically, with regard to stakeholder engagement the following is required:

### Table 0-2: Operation Safeguard 1 requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AfDB requirement</th>
<th>Where this has been addressed in the ESIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify and assess the environmental and social impacts and risks, including those related to gender, climate change and vulnerability of proposed project</td>
<td>A socio-economic assessment has been completed. The ESIA provides a summary of the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts associated with gender, climate change and vulnerability of the proposed project. The potential for these impacts were discussed at the Scoping Phase consultation community meetings held in August. At the ESIA community meeting similar issues were discussed in more detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid or, if avoidance is not possible, minimise, mitigate and compensate for adverse impacts on the environment and on affected communities</td>
<td>Mitigation measures are detailed within the ESMP which is included as Chapter 11 of the ESIA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for stakeholders participation during the consultation process so that affected communities and stakeholders have timely access to information in suitable forms about the proposed project, and are consulted meaningfully about issues that may affect them</td>
<td>Chapter 7 of the ESIA provides details on all the Stakeholder Engagement undertaken. Minutes of all meetings are included in Appendix C. At each of the meetings information was provided to the community, the proposed masterplan was explained and discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the effective management of environmental and social risks in project during and after implementation</td>
<td>All impacts were considered for construction and operation. Mitigation measures were identified for all phases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operational Safeguard 2:** Involuntary Resettlement: Land Acquisition, Population Displacement and Compensation

Seeks to ensure that when people must be displaced they are treated fairly, equitably, and in a socially and culturally sensitive manner; that they receive compensation and resettlement assistance do that their standards of living, income-earning capacity, production levels and overall means of livelihood are improved; and that they share in the benefits of the project that involves their resettlement.

Ensure that people which will be displaced are meaningfully consulted and given opportunities to participate in the planning and implementation of resettlement programmes. For the IAIP projects resettlement and compensation of Project Affected Persons remains under the government’s mandate. Ensure open and inclusive consultations with stakeholders and community members on the RAP exercise. These consultations must be guided by AfDB consultation and participation guidelines to ensure:

### Table 0-3: Stakeholder Engagement Guidelines for consultation and participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AfDB requirement</th>
<th>Where this has been addressed in the ESIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate notice to all potentially affected persons that resettlement is being considered and that there will be public hearings on the proposed plans and alternatives.</td>
<td>Consultation with PAPs and Government Stakeholders commenced in 2016 and has continued throughout the ESIA process in 2017. Regular consultations have occurred with the IPDC representatives and PAPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective advance dissemination by the authorities of relevant information, including land records and proposed comprehensive resettlement plans specifically addressing efforts to protect vulnerable groups.</td>
<td>The IPDC and Federal Government have produced information sheets on the project which have been disseminated to all the PAPs and local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A reasonable time period for public review of, comments on, and/or objection to any options of the proposed plan.</td>
<td>The community and PAPs have had further opportunities through the ESIA stakeholder engagement process to comment on the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public hearings that provided affected persons and/or their legally designated representatives with opportunities to challenge the resettlement design and process, and/or to present and discuss alternative proposals and articulate their views and priorities.</td>
<td>The IPDC has held public hearings and is consulting on a regular basis with the PAPS. The ESIA has included a RAP which details further the process and its requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed masterplan and identify key concerns. ESIA meetings were over four hours long allowing for significant interaction and discussion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF REPORT OF KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW – BURE IAIP/AMHARA

Date of Interview: August 20-23, 2017.

Address: Bure

Name of Village: Wan Gedam

Name of Key Informants:
1. Getachew Wolde – Farmer & Village Head
2. Semahegn Muluneh - Farmer and Administrator of Wan Gedam Kebelle
3. Abebaw Fenta – Farmer & Village Head
4. Alehegn Demelash – Civil Servant
5. Worku Getahun - Guard
6. Mebratu Deje - Farmer
7. Wondimeneh Hiruy – High school Teacher

All the above key informants are residents of the town who lived there for many years and know the area very well. They represent the community and are active participants in every communal activity and some of them also serve as village elders in times of conflict or in mobilizing the community for developmental activities. All their views and concerns about the project is summarized and discussed below.

Wan Gedam is a rural village found in Bure town. Wan and Gedam were two Kebelle's until 1979. After that they were merged into the kebelle local administration and it encompasses 16 small villages within it.

The main job that people do in the community is farming. Agricultural production in the village is very profitable and preferable, as the area is very fertile and productive. The main crops that are produced in the area include Maize, Teff, Chilly and Bean. The majority of the farmers own land through a formal agreement with the government. However, there are few people who don’t own any land and rent from others.

There is no high school around Wan Gedam kebelle and students have to travel six to eight kilometres to the main town Bure in order to find one. There is a hospital five kilometres away from the village, but the residents say it is in short supply of medics and equipment. Similarly, there is only one health centre which has a limited medical supply and an insufficient amount of professionals working there. There is a police station in the village, but there is only one policeman and is insufficient for the size of the area it operates in. There is no market or library in the village and people have to travel to other areas to get access to these facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic infrastructures</th>
<th>How many</th>
<th>If you do not have it, where is the nearest, distance in km?</th>
<th>Is this service sufficient for the current population?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary education school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health center (or a village clinic)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Sufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spring water is the main source of fresh water in the village. However, it is not enough and residents experience water-borne diseases such as Jardia, bacterial infection and the like. One health centre is the only health facility in the village and the residents are not satisfied with it, as there is a shortage of medics, equipment and medicines. The inhabitants are not aware of widespread or contagious diseases in the last five years except the water-borne diseases they experience occasionally. The roads in the village are very muddy and uncomfortable to walk on, especially during the rainy season.

According to the residents, the positive effects of the project would be job opportunities for the youth; as there are many unemployed university graduates in the village. The project provides potential jobs that would reduce the rate of unemployment and most importantly facilitate development in the area. In addition to this, since the industrial park is going to process agricultural products, farmers will be benefited as their products will get an enhanced market and their productivity will increase.

Several of the key informants believe that the project will have no negative impact or effect or in other words its positive effect outweighs the negative ones. Nevertheless, to some, the project will have several negative effects. Infrastructures such as fresh water, electricity and health centres are in short supply in the area and an additional influx of people will only provide further strain on the areas existing infrastructure. In addition, the area reserved for the industrial park is very large and as a result agricultural production might decrease and potentially cause health problems related to waste disposals.

Views on the social structure or the projects income resources effect on the community are divided. Some displaced farmers believe that their income resource or social structure will be affected positively, for they are given compensation and training on how to use the compensation they receive. In addition, they also think that as they were farmers their whole life and their life was of subsistence, it is now going to change since they are becoming urban dwellers. They will be able to create job opportunities for their sons with the compensation money, building and renting houses in town and industry that is coming into their area. Others however believe that the project will affect their social structure and income resource negatively for it displaced them from their land and their livelihood is affected as a result. As to their view, land is invaluable to a farmer and the area was very productive, thus the compensation they received doesn’t match what is taken away from them.
SUMMARY REPORT OF KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW – MOTA RTC/AMHARA

**Date of Interview:** August 26. 2017.

**Address:** Motta

**Name of Village:** Hibreselam

**Name of Key Informants:**
1. Tadelu Getnet - Farmer
2. Mastewal Muluken- Farmer
3. Enat Indalew – Farmer
4. Hawa Kemal – Civil servant
5. Abebe Dires - Farmer
6. Wase Tenaw - Farmer
7. Worku Amare – Civil Servant
8. Ambaye Hulualem – Farmer & Village Head

All the above key informants are residents of the town who lived there for many years and know the area very well. They represent the community and are active participants in every communal activity and some of them also serve as village elders in times of conflict or in mobilizing the community for developmental activities. All their views and concerns about the project is summarized and discussed below.

There has been and still is migration to the area from the neighbouring lowlands. For in the lowlands there is a higher prevalence of malaria and in addition education and health facilities are not fulfilled.

The main job that people do in the community is farming. There is bush land within the close vicinity from which people used to collect fire wood, but it is now protected. Agricultural production in the village is very gainful and preferable, as the area is very fertile, productive and suitable for irrigation. Many of the farmers produce yields twice a year, but since there is not a big enough market that can absorb the product, they sell it at a cheaper price. The main crops that are produced in the area include Wheat, Teff, Maize and Eucalyptus tree. The majority of the farmers own land through a formal agreement with the government.

There is no high school in the village and students have to travel two to three kilometres to the main town Mota in order to find one. There is a hospital in Mota and people go there to get treatment as there is only one health centre in the village, which has a limited medical supply and an insufficient amount of professionals working there. There is a police station in the village but the village is vast and the number of existing policemen is insufficient. There is no market or library in the village and people have to travel to other places to get access to these facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic infrastructures</th>
<th>How many</th>
<th>If you do not have it, where is the nearest, distance in km?</th>
<th>Is this service sufficient for the current population?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary education school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health center (or a village clinic)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Sufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Household hand dug water well is the main source of fresh water in the village and residents experience water borne diseases such as Jardia, bacterial infection, Amoeba, Typhoid and Typhus. The existing health centre is the only health facility in the village and the residents are not satisfied with it, as there is a shortage of medicines and professionals. The only medical supplies which were noted as being consistently accessible were vaccines and birth control pills. The people are not aware of wide spread or contagious diseases in the last five years, but last year there was an incidence of Acute Water Diarrhea and many people were infected. The roads in the village are very muddy and uncomfortable to walk on, especially during the rainy season.

Local residents believe that the positive effects of the project would be; enhanced job opportunities for the youth, increased development in the area and a larger market for agricultural products will be created.

Many people however believe that the project will have a number of negative effects. Firstly, the displaced farmers were not initially consulted and only knew the RTC was going to be built when their land was fenced off without their knowledge or consent. Secondly, farmers are being displaced from their land and are said to not be compensated properly. Thirdly, their main road is blocked and they are forced to travel through farming fields. In addition, during construction of the RTC’s fence, the natural storm water drainage was blocked and as a result the farm fields of several farmers were flooded and eroded. All these incidents are creating inconveniences and people believe the project will affect the community negatively.

The opinion of the people on the social structure or the projects income resource effect on the community is divided. Some believe that the project will bring more development to the area and also enhanced job opportunities, thus improving the income resource or social structure of farmers and the community. Others however believe that the project will affect social structure or income resource of farmers or the community negatively. This view is based on the project displacing farmers from their land, with their livelihood disrupted as a consequence. As to their view, land is invaluable to farmers since they use it for a life time, but the compensation they receive is calculated for ten years. Thus, the project will affect income resource of the farmers negatively.
Figure 1: Showing the key informant interview in Mota town, Amhara RTC
SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CONSULTATION MEETING IN BURE IAIP, AMHARA

Date: 24/09/2017
Location: Bure IAIP Site
Region: Amhara
Attendees:
ZGEC: Ato Zereu Girmay
Ato Goitom Woldelassie
Ato Shemsu Jihad
Community Members: More than 31 participants representing different sections of the community including elderly, women, youth and PAPs
Other Stakeholders: Ato Nurelign, Bure IPDC Project Office Staff

Meeting Agenda and Purpose

The purpose of the meeting was to brief and discuss with members of the community regarding Bure IAIP project and the likely positive and negative significant impacts that may occur during its implementation. The consultation meeting was also aiming to collect the views, concerns and issues of the community and affected parties in relation to the implementation of Bure IAIP project.

Brief Summary of the Meeting

The consultation meeting was held in an open place found near to the Bure IAIP project site office. The community consultation meeting was started at 4:00 am and was attended by more than 31 participants representing community leaders, religious leaders, the elderly, women, youth, civil servants and project affected persons.

At the start of the meeting, a ZGEC consultant made a presentation to the participants in the local language that covered the objectives of the IAIP project, a brief description of the project, the ESIA process, the impact issues to be covered during assessment, the importance of the consultation meeting and expectations from it. The purpose was to create awareness and increase the understanding about the IAIP project among the communities and to involve and engage them in the assessment process. In order to facilitate the meeting, the consultant prepared a summary of the presentation in local language (Amharic) and distributed it to the participants during the meeting.

Following the presentations of the ESIA consultant, the floor was opened for discussion. Several views, questions and comments were raised by the participants. The major issues raised in the consultation meeting include the following:

- Many participants expressed the potential benefits of the IAIP to the community and the wider area in general. They stated that markets for their agricultural products and animal resources will be opened and jobs will be created for their adult off springs. The IAIP will also contribute in further developing the urbanization of the area and widen the attitudes of the local community. They expressed their trust that the side effects/impacts of the IAIP will be tackled by this assessment process.

- A participant stated his concern that the IAIP site is situated close to the residential areas of Bure town. He queried whether the waste and by-products releases from the IAIP affect the community in the area? He stated this aspects need to be addressed.
A participant reiterated that the IAIP site has taken large size of land which is horizontally elongated. If the perimeter of the park is going to be closed the road/foot path access to villages like Adela, Agata, Tenga and Tebelma kebelles will be blocked. These access foot paths/roads are used by villagers to go to school, market, religious places and e.t.c. Thus it is important to look for a solution to the problem of access road/path that will be created in the future.

Another participant stated that there are some small irrigation schemes downstream of the springs in the wetland areas in the IAIP. If the flow of the springs is going to be blocked by the IAIP, the small irrigation farms will be affected and thus should be considered in the assessment.

A participant expressed his concern on the possible impact of increasing living expenses that will be triggered by increase in population size of the town as a result of the large labour force to come into the IAIP. He explained that the rise in living expenses will affect the low income group residents of the town whose purchasing power will be further diminished by the anticipated rise in living expenses. Thus, he queries how such a situation could be addressed during the IAIP implementation process?

Another participant stated that if the IAIP is going to use the agricultural products like maize in our area in bulk quantities as raw material input that will also potentially create a rise in the living expenses of the community. It is important to look for a mechanism for producing additional products that supply the demand of the IAIP labour force and the community.

A participant also expressed his fears whether the local cultures and values of the community would be affected by the incoming large labour force into the IAIP. He stated that the community around Bure is highly cultured with many traditions including in its dressing styles, feeding habits and e.t.c. Thus, expatriate workers and others with different cultures may affect the local traditions.

The participating PAPs stated that employment and livelihood support opportunities for resettled PAPs are not yet realized. Training to support rehabilitation and livelihood restoration is not yet delivered to the PAPs. The resettled PAPs are continuing to depend on the compensation money paid to them for living. The youth of resettled PAPs need to be given employment opportunities to support the incomes of their families and relieve dependence on compensation money for living. The resettled PAPs need to be organized and trained to enable them do jobs that can be performed with their skill. In general there is a need to provide them support and training in restoring their livelihood before they finish their compensation money.

Another participant requested the future plans to give priority for job opportunities to the local youth in the area. She stressed that it is important that the IAIP need to plan on ways of absorbing the local youth in the job opportunities to be created in the IAIP in the future.

A participant expressed his concern that during construction of the IAIP the movement of machineries and equipment will create dust problem to the local community. In addition he stated that the roads connecting the IAIP with the main highway needs to be developed and covered with asphalt to avoid the continuation of the dust problem during operation.

A participant stated that the IAIP is expected to have modern infrastructure facilities such as roads, street lights, e.t.c which is scarcely available in the adjacent residential areas of Bure town. He expressed that it is good if the IAIP can help the local community in developing its infrastructures so that wide gap is not created inside and outside of the IAIP. Thus, he commented that those shared roads that cross the residential areas and leading to the IAIP Park shall be developed and power supply also improved in the area.
During the discussion the consultant explained his reflections to some of the issues raised. It was stated that many of the issues raised by the participants in the meeting are valuable and will be taken up as input to the ESIA and RAP process. It was also explained that one of the major objectives of the ESIA is to assess and predict the potential impacts of the IAIP including waste releases, dust fallouts e.t.c. Thus such issues will be tackled by the ESIA itself.

The meeting was very lively and discussion continued until 12:00am. The participants acknowledged their satisfaction by getting the opportunity to air their views in the consultation meeting and urged that solutions be put forward in the ESIA study for the issues they raised. Finally they endorsed the project and asked for its rapid implementation.

Figure 1: Showing community consultation meeting in Bure IAIP
# ESIA PHASE STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS (2017)

## SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY CONSULTATION MEETING IN BURE IAIP, AMHARA

**Date:** 18/11/2017  
**Location:** Bure IAIP Site  
**Region:** Amhara  
**Woreda:** Bure Town Administration  
**Project:** Bure IAIP/Amhara

| Attendees: ZGEC: | Mr. Robert Els (WSP)  
|                 | Ato Zereu Girmay (ZGEC)  
|                 | Ato Goitom Woldeslassie (ZGEC)  
|                 | Ato Mesgna Gebretensae (ZGEC)  

| Community Members: | More than 39 participants representing different sections of the community including elderly, women, youth and PAPs  
| Other Stakeholders: | Bure IPDC Project Office Staff

| **Meeting Agenda and Purpose:** | The purpose of the meeting was to discuss with members of the community on the scoping report of the Environmental and Social Impact assessment being conducted at Bure Integrated Agro Industrial park. The Consultation also aimed at collecting views of the community on whether there are concerns that they believe are not included in the assessment and must be incorporated.  

| **Brief Summary of the Meeting:** | The consultation meeting was held in Bure IAIP project office. It started at 4:30 am and was attended by more than 39 participants representing community leaders, religious leaders, the elderly, women, youth, civil servants and project affected persons. At the start of the meeting, Mr Robert Els with the translation of Ato Zereu Girmay briefly introduced to participants the ESIA study being conducted on the IAIP to be built on Bure and reminded the activities done so far including the earlier public consultations carried and he further stated that the ESIA process has now reached at the ESIA stage. Following the brief introduction he presented the impacts being assessed as a result of the scoping stage in three levels. During the presentation, regarding environmental and social impact issues, Mr Robert pointed out that environmental impacts are assessed in two ways; during the construction of the park and operation of the park. And based on their level of significance ranging from low significance to high significance, soil erosion, soil compaction, change in land use, surface and ground water, noise and air quality, resettlement issues e.t.c were presented. In addition to this, traffic flow during and after construction, waste management and the issue of biodiversity were also among the identified issues in the scoping and will be assessed based on their level of significance. Concerning wet lands, he mentioned that there are two; one small and one big wet land around the park and are considered as high significance issue at the assessment, discussion was held with the engineering firm who designed the park to devise a way for saving the wet lands. While continuing the presentation, he stated that regarding social impacts being assessed at the scoping stage, as a result of the construction of the industrial park large number of people is expected to come to the town and on the adverse side shortage of social services might happen. In addition to this, displacement of farmers will occur and transmitted diseases might increase. On the other side however, rise of economic activities and income increase related to it will happen. In addition, Job opportunities will also be created. Thus, these issues are also incorporated in the study from low to high significance based on their level. Following the presentation, the floor was opened for discussion and several views, concerns and comments were raised by participants. The major issues raised in the consultation meeting include the following:  
- Many of the participants raised that the community is very happy for the IAIP is to be built in their town and expect many opportunities from it.  
- Some of the participants mentioned that their main road will be blocked and asked for a solution.  
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- Other participants also stated that they have concerns with air quality, shortage of soil dumping places and waste management.
- Another participant raised that the compensation paid is not enough and rehabilitation and livelihood restoration is not delivered to PAPs who received compensation.
- One among the participants mentioned that the area selected for the park is very fertile and asked wasn’t it better to select another location? And he also asked that shouldn’t impact assessment be conducted before construction is carried and compensations were paid?
- One stakeholder who represented the town’s office stated that the soil extracted during construction is being dumped at selected places so that it can be reused.

During the discussion Mr Robert reflected on some of the issues raised. He stated that the compensation process must be conducted based on Ethiopian laws and African Development Bank standards and the issue of livelihood restoration of PAP’s will be looked at in the assessment. Regarding access road he pointed out that a solution must be found. Concerning the impact assessment being conducted after compensation are paid and construction started, he mentioned that impact assessment must be conducted before commencement of construction and compensation are paid but, nevertheless, the time now is not yet so late and that it is tried to indicate problems observed at the current stages during the assessment. In addition, he stated that area selection is done by taking into consideration, the productivity of the area, topography, the IAIP’s distance from the RTC and the like.

The meeting was very lively and discussion continued until 2:00 pm. The participants acknowledged their satisfaction by getting the opportunity to air their views in the consultation meeting and urged that solutions be put forward in the ESIA study for the issues they raised. Finally they endorsed the project and asked for its rapid implementation.
Figure 1: Showing public consultation meeting held in Bure IAIP project office.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Event/Activity</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table contains handwritten notes and details. The content is not legible enough to transcribe accurately.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>Option 4</td>
<td>Option 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Solution 1</td>
<td>Solution 2</td>
<td>Solution 3</td>
<td>Solution 4</td>
<td>Solution 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause</td>
<td>Effect 1</td>
<td>Effect 2</td>
<td>Effect 3</td>
<td>Effect 4</td>
<td>Effect 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>Action 1</td>
<td>Action 2</td>
<td>Action 3</td>
<td>Action 4</td>
<td>Action 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Community Consultation Meeting in Motta RTC, Amhara

Date: 17/11/2017
Project: Motta RTC/Amhara
Location: Motta Town Admn. Hall
Region: Amhara

Attendees:
ZGEC:
- Mr. Robert Els (WSP)
- Ato Zereu Girmay (ZGEC)
- Ato Golom Woldeslassie (ZGEC)
- Ato Mesgna Gebretensae (ZGEC)

Community Members:
More than 31 participants representing different sections of the community including elderly, women, youth and PAPs

Other Stakeholders:
IPDC Project Office Staff

Meeting Agenda and Purpose:
The purpose of the meeting was to discuss with members of the community on the scoping report of the Environmental and Social Impact assessment being conducted at Mota RTC. The Consultation also aimed at collecting views of the community on whether there are concerns that they believe are not included in the assessment and must be incorporated.

Brief Summary of the Meeting:
The consultation meeting was held at Mota Town Administration Hall. It started at 9:30 am and was attended by more than 31 participants representing community leaders, religious leaders, the elderly, women, youth, civil servants and project affected persons.

At the start of the meeting, Mr Robert Els with the translation of Ato Zereu Girmay briefly introduced to participants the ESIA study being conducted on the RTC to be built in Mota and reminded the activities done so far including the earlier public consultations carried and he further stated that the ESIA process has now reached at the scoping stage. Following the brief introduction he presented the impacts being assessed at the scoping stage in three levels.

During the presentation, regarding environmental and social impact issues, Mr Robert pointed out that environmental impacts are assessed in two ways; during the construction of the park and operation of the park. And each identified impact is assessed based on their level of significance ranging from low significance to high significance. Mr Robert presented the impacts being assessed at the scoping stage in three levels as high level significance, medium level significance and low level significance.

Mr Robert stated that based on their level of significance ranging from low significance to high significance, flooding during the construction of the RTC, soil and geology, change in land use and surface and ground water are among the issues identified for further assessment. But the issue of wet lands is neglected for there is none in Mota. He also mentioned that air quality, noise pollution, traffic increase and visual effects are also being assessed. In addition, solid waste management and the issue of biodiversity are being assessed based on their level of significance.

While continuing the presentation, he stated that regarding social impacts being assessed at the scoping stage, as a result of the construction of the rural transformation centre large number of people is expected to come to the town and on the adverse side shortage of social services might happen. In addition to this, displacement of farmers will occur. On the other side however, rise of economic activities and income increase related to it will happen. Thus, these issues are also incorporated in the study from low to high significance based on their level.

Following the presentation, the floor was opened for discussion and several views, concerns and comments were raised by participants. The major issues raised in the consultation meeting include the following:
- Many of the participants rose that the community is very happy for the RTC is to be built in the town and expressed that the positive impacts weigh over the negative ones.
- Some of the participants mentioned that their road is blocked by the fence of the RTC and also water passages are blocked and as a result their land is being badly eroded. In addition, farmers who are found outside of the RTC but are affected are not compensated.
Another participant stated that rehabilitation and livelihood restoration is not delivered to PAPs who received compensation.

One stakeholder who represented the government mentioned that a fourteen meter wide sixteen kilometres road is planned to be built as a replacement for the blocked road and also compensation will be paid to farmers who are found outside the RTC but whose land is affected.

During the discussion Mr Robert reflected on some of the issues raised. He stated that the assessment is being conducted to make sure that things are done based on standards and also for the impact assessment must be done on international standards. He also expressed that the compensation process will be looked at whether it is based on the national and AfDB standards and recommendations will be provided in the report. Finally he thanked participants for their ideas, opinion and participation and expressed that its contribution to the success of the project is high for such kind of projects succeed when the community supports them. Mr Zereu also pointed out that complains must be solved properly and in time through consultation among the stakeholders for the success of the project.

The meeting was very lively and discussion continued until 1:15 pm. The participants acknowledged their satisfaction by getting the opportunity to air their views in the consultation meeting and urged that solutions be put forward in the ESIA study for the issues they raised. Finally they endorsed the project and asked for its rapid implementation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>123 Main St, Anytown USA</td>
<td>555-1234</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.doe@example.com">john.doe@example.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
<td>456 Oak Ave, Anytown USA</td>
<td>555-5678</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jane.smith@example.com">jane.smith@example.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mike Brown</td>
<td>789 Pine Dr, Anytown USA</td>
<td>555-9087</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mike.brown@example.com">mike.brown@example.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Susan Johnson</td>
<td>111 Maple Ln, Anytown USA</td>
<td>555-2345</td>
<td><a href="mailto:susan.johnson@example.com">susan.johnson@example.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>David Green</td>
<td>222 Cedar St, Anytown USA</td>
<td>555-4321</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david.green@example.com">david.green@example.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Notes:
- Additional case details may be found in the electronic file attached.