

# **Multi-agency “Villagisation” mission to Gambella Regional State, Ethiopia**

## **REPORT**

**3-8 June 2012**

*The Development Assistance Group (DAG) in Ethiopia has endorsed the report of this mission and is taking forward the findings. However, not all individual agencies of the DAG were able to confirm all the findings in report.*



**DFID, USAID, UN and Irish Aid**

## Summary

1. The Gambella Regional State Government has embarked on an ambitious plan of “Villagisation” involving the resettlement of 45,000 households between 2010-2013. The stated objectives of the programme are to address the challenges of poverty through cost-effective service delivery to previously scattered populations, to protect vulnerable communities from natural disasters and cross border attacks, to develop agriculture and to socially transform marginalised communities.
2. So far around 30,000 households have moved in Gambella and whilst the first year of the programme appeared to over-achieve the target set, year two has under-achieved. However, it is unclear how many households have returned to their original homelands since the programme began, with some villagers expressing intentions to do so if food security and public service provision do not improve.
3. Since the last multi-agency mission to Gambella in February 2011, there has been a clear improvement in conditions of villagised communities. Shelters have been built, education is being provided, water pumps installed and working, homes are safer from flooding and people have better road access. Health care was regarded as inadequate<sup>1</sup>.
4. The worry expressed during the last visit of potential humanitarian consequences does not appear to have played out, possibly because people have continued to cultivate their original land and have moved back and forth between the new and old sites. Scale, speed, sequencing and implementation capacity remain an issue, although new Government MDG Fund resources appear to be providing the opportunity to catch up on service provision.
5. As in the previous mission, there were no reports of forced relocation or systematic human rights abuses, but half of the people interviewed said they didn't want to move and there were reports of some pressure and unmet promises linked to movement. Those communities that objected to moving have been allowed to stay, and although service provision is on-going, they sense that they are being neglected.
6. The February 2011 mission also reported that some communities were suspicious of authorities' motivations for relocations, fearing that their original

---

<sup>1</sup> Lack of medicine and a shortage of health workers was a common concern, but there was also a mismatch between the expectation of curative health service provision and the reality of health promotion/prevention services from health posts.

land will be granted to private investors. Although a concurrent plan for agricultural investment in Gambella is underway, this June 2012 mission again concluded that there were no reports of any former settled land being used for commercial farming. All villages but one<sup>2</sup> reported having continued access to their original land and that it was reported as unchanged since they moved.

7. There was no knowledge of any mechanism for appeals or grievance reported in the initial mission. This time over half the communities visited had appealed to local government officials in relation to the lack of land or services at new sites. However, there was no reported response as a result.
8. Adherence to the DAG principles and Guidelines for Resettlement and the Government's 'Basic Ingredients' for the Commune Programme need strengthening. This is in particular with regards to: being voluntary; advance preparedness of services and livelihood approaches; adequate water, land and inputs; build on existing experiences; environmental and natural resources care and protection; comprehensive extension services to ensure productivity.

### **Villagisation: Government Plan, motivations and implementation**

9. In 2010, the Government of Ethiopia embarked on implementing the Commune Centre Development Plan and Livelihood Strategy otherwise known as the commune programme, or villagisation. This involves moving as many as 4 million people in the most under-developed regions of Gambella, Benishangul-Gumuz, Afar and Somali regions into new communities (or 'development centres'). The stated purpose of the programme is *"to benefit the people of the Developing Regional States from sustainable development and good governance outcomes"*.
10. In August 2010, Gambella Regional State launched a "Villagisation Programme Action Plan". Major aspects of the plan include:
  - Relocation of 45,000 rural households over 3 years.
  - Allocation of 180,000 ha for housing and arable land for beneficiaries.
  - Establishment of socio-economic infrastructure in new settlement areas including schools, health, water and sanitation and marketing facilities.
11. In phase I, the Regional Government reports that the programme over-achieved, with 20,243 households moving to new sites, out of an original target of 15,000. A recent annual review of the programme for phase II has

---

<sup>2</sup> This particular village had security issues preventing them from returning to their original land.

revealed that the programme is behind target, with between 6-12,000 households moving out of a target of 20,000. However, these figures do not include households which may have returned to their original site, information for which is not presently available, but is estimated to be up to 50-60%. Authorities stated that relocation of communities is solely on a voluntary basis following community awareness raising and consultation, and that the maximum distance of relocation of communities is 5-6 km, with rights to their original land retained. Participating households should be allocated up to 4 ha of land on relocation.

12. The plan is carried out under the authority of a Steering Committee chaired by the Regional President, and coordinated by the Regional Bureau of Agriculture. Various sectoral bureaus including education, health and water are responsible for implementation, and have been constituted into a Technical Committee. This Steering Committee is cascaded through to the various local government structures (zonal/woreda/kebele). The Regional Government is assisted by a Coordinator from the Ministry of Federal Affairs.

**Table 1: Villagisation Programme Service implementation plan and progress:  
Gambella Regional Government Report 2012**

	Phase I - 2010/11		Phase II- 2011/12	
	Planned	Achieved	Planned	Achieved
Primary schools	19	15	19	15
Health Posts	22	18	22	22
Animal Health posts	18	14	20	15
Water points	47	71	186	141
Rural roads (km)	128	128	242	114
Improved seeds (quintals)	3940	4178	5106	4141
Agricultural tools	60,000	59,570	56,000	32,227
Mosquito nets		54,000		40,000
Textbooks		76,000		80,689

## Principles and Guidelines

13. In January 2011, DAG guidelines and principles for resettlement were shared and agreed with the government. These covered four main areas:
- Information and consultation
  - Development of a Resettlement plan
  - Implementation of the plan before relocation
  - Mechanisms for monitoring, safeguards, appeals and redress put in place
14. The Government of Ethiopia has also developed some 'Basic Ingredients' for the Commune Development Programme which are:
- Voluntary
  - Government support and planned implementation
  - Advance preparedness of services and livelihood approaches
  - Adequate water, land and inputs
  - Within their proximity
  - Build on existing experiences; beneficiaries the centrepiece of the programme
  - Environmental and natural resources care and protection
  - Resettlement programme much be implemented in accordance with land and water use policy in the respective areas
  - Comprehensive extension services to ensure productivity
  - Linked with integrated area development programme, medium and large scale agricultural investments and infrastructure expansion

## Methodology

15. This mission by DFID, USAID, UN and Irish Aid is a follow up to the February 2011 multi-agency mission<sup>3</sup> to Gambella. The purpose of this mission was *'To monitor the implementation of the villagisation programme in Gambella, Benishangul-Gumuz, Afar and Somali regions and consider implications for donor investments'*. It took place between 3-8 June 2012 and comprised meetings with the Regional President and Heads of Line Bureaus in Gambella Town, officials at Zonal and Woreda levels and with teachers in village primary schools and health workers in health posts/centres.
16. The team met over 400 people in 18 focus group discussions ranging from one to 100 people in one sitting and including 5 men-only and 7 women-only discussions. These were carried out in 9 of the locations where the villagisation is currently ongoing<sup>4</sup> with the 3 major ethnic groups (Anuak, Nuer

---

<sup>3</sup>DFID, USAID, EU and the UN (OCHA, UNICEF)

<sup>4</sup> The total number of sites is 43 in phase I (2010/11) and 33 in phase 2 (2011/12).

and Majengir). The interviews were conducted by donor agency staff with people who were available in the villages at the time of arrival and with the help of translators. No government officials were present during the discussions.

17. Four existing villages (where new people had joined), four new villages and one 'opt-out' village were visited<sup>5</sup>. Villages were randomly selected on a day-to-day basis by the mission team members, independent of government. An updated questionnaire based on the original mission and structured around the DAG guidelines and principles for resettlement (see Annex 1) was used to guide the interviewers for the basis for focus group discussions. This covered issues of process, access to basic services, food security and livelihoods and conflict. Additional questions about land and systems for redress were added to the original questionnaire, plus a section for returnees and villagers that had not moved.
18. Limitations of the mission include the length of time (one week) and accessibility to sites due to security and weather conditions. The sample size was not representative of the population involved in the programme and there was limited opportunity to validate all of the findings. This resulting report is therefore designed to give a snapshot of community perceptions of programme implementation and their current and comparative living conditions and the findings should be used accordingly.







### **Comparison between February 2011 and June 2012**

The initial mission stated a number of key findings. These have been taken as a baseline and compared with the findings of this mission. However, it should be noted that only two of the original villages were revisited (due to impassable roads) in this mission and therefore some of the reported changes may be due to the different locations as opposed to differences in the villagisation programme.



---

<sup>5</sup> One day's field work was abandoned due to impassable roads. This resulted in fewer Nuer villages being visited than planned and two of the former villages visited in February 2011 not being included.

**Table 2: Comparison of the key findings between February 2011 and June 2012**

Sector	February 2011 mission findings	June 2012 mission findings	Comment	Change	Comparison to expected
<b>Safety</b>	All but 1 of the communities visited reported that they felt safer in their new location.	7/17 felt safer in their new location.	Reduced security <sup>6</sup>		Security should have improved
<b>Water</b>	3/12 communities reported improved access to drinking water. 9 stated pumps were too few for the population present.	16/17 reported improved access to drinking water. 4/17 stated that pumps were too few for the population present.	Substantial improvement		Water pumps were generally operational, close to houses, schools and health centres. Water quality was cleaner than before.
<b>Distance to original home</b>	6/12 communities reported being relocated more than a 2 hour walk (or estimated 8km) from their original home.	3/17 communities reported being relocated more than a 2 hour walk from their original home.	Improvement		Distance was intra-woreda
<b>Appeal</b>	0/12 communities reported awareness of formal systems to raise or address issues faced during the villagisation process.	8/17 communities had complained to kebeles/woredas, but with little response	Improvement in raising issues, but not for response		Appeal mechanism presently ineffective
<b>Latrines</b>	0/12 communities had functioning latrines. Only 1 had any under construction.	7/17 communities had functioning latrines.	Improvement, but very small in terms of the number of latrines		Low levels of sanitation
<b>Returnees</b>	7/12 communities reported that people had left the new site since arriving.	10/17 communities reported that people had left the new site since arriving.	Same – indicates that people are free to move		Returning indicates that food security/ services are not adequate in the new sites
<b>Land</b>	All communities	13/17 had	Improvement,		4 hectares had

<sup>6</sup> This is likely to reflect the recent violence in the area, as opposed to the villagisation process itself.

	had been promised 4 hectares of land per household prior to moving and assistance in clearing this land. 4 were aware that it had been allocated. None had received agricultural inputs or assistance in clearing new land.	been allocated land (from 1-4 hectares). 11/17 had seeds and tools provided.	but assistance was regarded as inadequate.		not been allocated or land certificates given. Clearance of land remained a problem.
<b>Education</b>	6 communities reported improved access to education.	All communities reported improved access to education.	Substantial improvement		Schools were closer and safer to walk to. Some indication of increased class sizes due to new villagers' children.

## Analysis of focus group discussions

19. Highlights from community consultations are summarised below and are drawn from the summary of the focus group discussions presented in Annex 2.

### Process

20. As in the previous mission, there were no reports of forced relocation or systematic human rights abuses, but half of the people interviewed said they didn't want to move and there were reports of some pressure and unmet promises linked to movement. For example, the majority stated that they had been promised a variety of items, including food aid, agricultural tools, seeds and household items to persuade villagers move to the new sites. Whilst some inputs had been provided, this was uneven and not to the level of that expected.
21. Some villagers preferred their new locations because they didn't flood and others appreciated the closer proximity to services. The vast majority of community leaders had engaged in discussion with the government on the proposed plans beforehand, although women were often left out of this process.
22. It was clear that not all villagers had moved – the majority had left some people at the original site in order to access water for cattle or to continue cultivating their original land. Likewise, just over half reported that both individuals and whole households had returned from the new site to their original sites. In one existing village primary school where new villagers had joined, pupil numbers had dropped by 56 children in the last two years (about



10%), indicating that out-migration was taking place, despite the villagisation programme. All but one group<sup>7</sup> stated that there had been freedom to return to original locations.

23. With the community visited that had decided not to move because they felt that they had fertile land and adequate services, they had felt pressure from government officials to move originally, but now officials had stopped discussing this with the village. Services were still being provided as before, with the exception that there were fewer teachers.
24. The pressure on government officials to reach their allocated target of relocations of people seemed high, with one village stating that they had been asked to move within the next week or lose out on food aid distributions. Two months later, no food aid had been distributed and the health post was still being built, questioning the rationale behind the movement of people in that particular time period.
25. For villagers who had joined an existing village, integration into existing village representative structures appeared to have been smooth. For example, elders of the new villagers had been able to join with the existing village elders and new parents had joined the school improvement committee. No incidents of conflict were reported within the villages and all reported feeling safe during the process of moving. All had joined villages of the same ethnic group and were 'intra-woreda' with the majority moving within a two hour walk of their original home.
26. In half of the locations, communities had complained to the kebele and woreda officials, and in some cases very regularly. However, there was little option for women's participation in this process and there was no reported response in relation to these appeals to date.

### **Service Delivery**

27. In the majority of cases, there had been an improvement in service delivery since the last mission. The majority of villagers emphasised that the continued problems with land allocation/clearance and food insecurity outweighed any other benefit from the programme. Some also stated that if things didn't improve, they would return to their former locations.

### **Healthcare**

28. Whilst villagers were often nearer to either a health post or health centre, only a minority were able to report that the service was better than in their original site. The main reason was because of the lack of medicine and in some cases personnel, which are cited as common problems across rural Ethiopia. This has been recognised at Regional level with local purchase of medicine

---

<sup>7</sup> This was due to security concerns as stated previously.

on-going and the training of over 400 female Health Extension Workers due to be completed in the next couple of months. There may also be a disappointment in the health service due to the expectation that health posts would provide curative services, when their mandate is health promotion and prevention services only. Access to roads has facilitated better access to transportation to health services in the larger towns, but overall, health service provision was widely regarded as unsatisfactory.

### **Sanitation**

29. Whilst there was a minor improvement from the previous mission, there were generally no functioning latrines within the community. There are some toilets at school sites, mainly as a result of the Government policy of latrines for all schools. This is comparable with the lack of latrines in original locations and general practice of rural communities in the region. The concern over increased risk of water-borne disease outbreaks from the previous mission did not appear to have been realised, although diarrhoea remained one of the leading causes of sickness and death in the region, as it is across much of rural Ethiopia.

### **Education**

30. In all villages, primary education was reported as better, nearer and the journey to school safer than in their previous locations. Class sizes varied from between 40 to 200 in a class and buildings ranged from temporary mud and stick structures in some new villages, to structures dating back to the time of the Dergue. One school visited had 16 teachers for around 450 pupils, with evidence of textbooks having been received and the School Grant being used for local improvements to the school.

### **Water**

31. With the exception of one, all sites noted that access to water was better, cleaner and closer than in their original village. There were pumps situated next to schools and health centres as well as in the heart of the village. Most pumps were functional, although some were reported as salty and there were not always enough, with women having to queue at times. A few had not been dug deep enough so that they had failed to function in the dry season and water for livestock was lacking.

### **Food security and livelihoods**

32. As with the previous mission, the scale and speed of relocation is causing major disruptions to livelihoods. Land is the major source of tension. Whilst the majority of villagers had been allocated some land, this was usually less than the agreed 4 hectares. In addition, most of the new land had not been cleared, and remained under forest. Therefore people had very limited livelihood options and some felt that these had reduced due to the lack of access to fishing and riverside mango trees. For those who had attempted some farming, they had problems with rats and baboons destroying the crops and in some cases, the soil fertility was cited as worse.

33. Villagers and government officials reported that no land certificates had been awarded to date<sup>8</sup>, although these were reportedly being prepared and would be joint in the case of married couples (as opposed to only the husband). The lack of proper certification was noted as having the potential to lead to intra-community conflict over land at the new sites.
34. Whilst the potential humanitarian crisis due to villagisation has been averted, this appears to be due to the fact that villagers are continuing to farm their original land, obtaining wild fruits and growing maize on small plots around their new homes. There were no reports of any former land having been changed since moving and no observed link to commercial farming.
35. There had been an uneven delivery of food aid, agricultural tools and seeds with some villages receiving a reasonable amount in comparison to elsewhere in rural Ethiopia. However, other villages were yet to receive anything, or had only received one distribution of government food aid (despite being promised it for 8 months), which had had to be shared amongst many. There was no evidence of donor food aid being used in the programme. Whilst grinding mills had been set up in some sites, none were functioning.
36. Livestock had also remained at the original sites, where access to river water was better. Cattle-raiders from South Sudan however had stolen one village's cattle and they were now relying on farming for their livelihood.
37. In order for the government stated goal of the programme, 'sustainable improvement livelihoods' to be realised, and to prevent the worsening of the level of food security, the concern over land and agricultural inputs would appear to be an urgent priority to advance.

### **Shelter**

38. As previously, all communities had built their own huts, which is standard for rural Ethiopia. Some grass for roofing had been provided but no households were staying in the open as witnessed previously. Some houses remained half built and others empty as people had returned to their original sites for farming/livestock purposes. For new villages in one area, flooding remained a problem which would indicate poor consultation with the affected villagers in the planning of the new village.

### **Security**

39. As previously, communities with livestock or at threat from flooding felt safer in the new sites. All of those spoken to had felt safe during the moving process itself and access to schools and water for women and girls was reported as safer due to the proximity to housing. However, due to a number of recent security incidents in the area and the deployment of the Ethiopian

---

<sup>8</sup>It is worth noting that land certification in Gambella is not widespread, and this is not peculiar to villagisation sites.

Defence Force in the Anuak zone, those affected communities reported feeling less secure at the moment.

### **Environment**

40. Commercial farming by both international and domestic actors involves the clearing of forest in order to utilise the land. If the 45,000 planned households are moved and allotted 4 hectares each, then a further 180,000 hectares of significant deforestation would be likely. Whilst Gambella has plenty of land (3.4 million hectares of cultivatable land, of which 225,012 hectares (18%) has been transferred to local and international investment firms) and a very low population density of 9 people per km<sup>2</sup>, there are clear environmental consequences to the changing land use of the region.

### **Roads**

41. New villages were often sited along the edge of a main road or nearer to a dirt road than before. This facilitated access to markets, transport, urban centres, mobile phone coverage, larger health facilities and power. However, there was little noticeable investment in improved market linkages or value chain development to make the most of this opportunity and power lines were not yet linked to village level.

### **Implications for international donor and UN-supported programmes**

42. As with the previous mission, the challenge for the international community remains how best and whether to engage with this commune programme in order to mitigate risks to communities, while continuing to provide development support where needed and humanitarian support when necessary. Given the gaps in the implementation of the DAG principles and guidelines for resettlement, it remains unlikely that international donors or aid agencies would be able to provide any additional developmental financing explicitly aligned with supporting the Gambella villagisation programme.

43. As with all regions of Ethiopia, national programmes support the provision of services in Gambella too. Recent evidence from elsewhere in Ethiopia has demonstrated that where services are provided and functioning, and where the local government provides the administrative support for citizens to relocate (ie, conditions prevail which respect the principles of resettlement) that people will move of their own accord towards better services. Continuing to provide resources on improving quality basic services through existing programmes would be one strategy moving forward to reduce poverty in Gambella, as elsewhere in Ethiopia.

44. Despite reservations with providing direct support to the commune program/villagisation, Gambella remains marginalised and under-developed with significant needs that include improved service delivery and improved livelihoods. Some development partners may think of direct programming in these areas, which could cover could cover climate financing to protect the

natural forest, land-use planning, land certification, technical support for local government in developing livelihoods, market linkages etc.

### **Recommendations for DAG/Development Partners**

45. Continue follow up assessment visits using the same methodology in order to compare progress and challenges over time. Conduct visits in all four regions to begin to understand the regional nuancing of the commune programme. Continue to feedback to Regional and Federal levels to encourage learning from experience.
46. Use regular programme monitoring visits to assess overlap with the commune programme, if any.
47. If any Development Partner engages in direct support to the commune program/villagisation, it should adopt a 'do no harm' and 'conflict-sensitive' approach.
48. Consider longer term research to assess the impacts of the programme in the four regions of Ethiopia.

### **Key Messages for the Government of Ethiopia**

49. The villagisation programme should be re-evaluated in relation to the government's own 'basic ingredients' and the DAG principles and guidelines for resettlement. Both of these should be widely reiterated and cascaded to all levels of government and community members, specifically with regard to:
  - Voluntary
  - Advance preparedness of services and livelihood approaches
  - Adequate water, land and inputs
  - Build on existing experiences; beneficiaries the centrepiece of the programme
  - Environmental and natural resources care and protection
  - Comprehensive extension services to ensure productivity
50. In addition, the overall timing and sequencing of the programme should be reviewed so that the above stated 'basic ingredients' can be realised. Ensuring food security and functional public services at sites before relocation would greatly overcome concerns about the programme.
51. Best practices for site development plans and livelihood strategy plans have been shared with the Government. The development, implementation and monitoring of these would provide a systematic basis on which to roll-out the Commune Development Programme.
52. Developing local government capacity to be able to respond to villagers' concerns is another area which requires strengthening and links closely with the Ethiopian Government's Growth and Transformation Plan goals of capacity building and good governance.

# Annex 1 Questionnaire

**Draft**

## **Questionnaire for developing regions visits<sup>9</sup>**

<b>Site</b>	<b>Village Name:</b>  <b>Zone:</b>  <b>Woreda:</b>  <b>Kebele:</b>  <b>GPS:</b>  <b>Type: new village/village with new settlers/original village/returnee village</b>					
<b>Team</b>						
<b>Date and time</b>						
<b>No. consulted (tick closest)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100+</b>
<b>Males/Females</b>						
<b>Observations of the discussion</b>						

<b>1. Information and Consultation</b>		
<b>1. Geographics and Demographics</b>		
<b>(i) How many households have moved?</b>		
<b>(ii) Where did you move from?</b>		
<b>(iii) How far did you move? Time? Distance?</b>		
<b>(iv) Did everybody in your community move or did some stay? Why?</b>		
<b>(v) Ethnicity? (Nuer, Anywaac, Majengir) Clan?</b>		
<b>(vi) Has anyone gone back? How many? Why?</b>		
<b>2. Process</b>		
<b>(i) Why do you think you were moved?</b>		

---

<sup>9</sup> This questionnaire is framed around the DAG Good Practice Guidelines and Principles Regarding Resettlement

(ii) Were you consulted? How?		
(iii) Did you want to move?		
(iv) When did you move here?		
(v) Do you think that you will go back?		
(vi) What happened to the land you moved from?		
(vii) How were you moved? Were you able to take your possessions with you?		
(viii) Were you promised any services / land prior to moving? Which?		
(ix) Did you get what was promised to you? Which agencies were involved?		
(x) Did anything about the moving process give you concern about your/your family's safety?		
(xi) Could the process be improved? How? Are there alternatives to this programme?		
<b>C. Implementation of the Resettlement Plan before relocation of populations</b>		
<b>3. Services</b>		
<b>3.a) Water and sanitation</b>		
(i) Do you have enough clean water here?		
(ii) Source? How far? Is it safe to collect it?		
(iii) Did you have enough clean water where you were before?		
(iv) Source? How far?		
(v) Is water better here or where you were before?		
(vi) Are you using latrines here? Did you use latrines where you were before?		
<b>3.b) Education</b>		
(i) Is there a school the children can go to here? Primary and/or Secondary? How far?		

(ii) How many children in a class?		
(iii) Was there a school where you were before? Primary and/or Secondary? How far?		
(iv) Is education better here or there? Is it safe to get to and from school?		
<b>3.c) Shelter</b>		
(i) Was shelter available for you when you arrived?		
(ii) Is shelter adequate? Better or worse than where you were?		
<b>3.d) Health</b>		
(i) Is there a health centre here? How far?		
(ii) Was there a health centre where you were before? How far?		
(iii) Is healthcare better here or there?		
(iv) How many community health workers?		
<b>4. Livelihoods, Food Security and Land</b>		
(i) How far is it to where you can buy food?		
(ii) What do you do? (livestock, crops, fishing, labour, mixed - Livelihoods strategy?)		
(iii) What did you do (livelihood) before moving? How has this changed?		
(iv) Have you been given help to change?  (eg seed, fertilisers, tools, agricultural extension)?		
(v) Do you still have access to your original land/river/pasture/crops for livelihoods?		
(vi) Is any food aid being provided?		
(vii) How much? From who? For how long? Is it free?		
(viii) Were you receiving food aid in your previous place?		



(ix) Do you have a surplus of food? Have you been able to sell any at the market?		
(x) Have you been allocated land in the new location? How many hectares?		
(xi) Has your new land been cleared? Who cleared it?		
(xii) Do you have a land certificate? (joint/male/female?)		
(xiii) What have you planted on your land? How good do you think your harvest will be?		
<b>5. Conflict</b>		
(i) Did you join a bigger village or settle in a new area?		
(ii) Who are your neighbours? Same or different tribe/clan?		
(iii) Do you feel safer in your new community or where you lived previously?		
(iv) Have there been any major incidents of violence? Over what?		
(v) Is your community involved/represented in wider community structures/decision making? (do you attend village meetings/voting?)		
<b>D. Mechanisms for monitoring, safeguards, appeals and redress put in place</b>		
(i) If necessary, can you make a complaint about the programme? With whom?		
(ii) Has anyone you know made a complaint? How often? What happened as a result?		
<b>6. Returnees and 'Opt Out's'</b>		
<i>For returnees:</i>		
(i) Why did you return?		
<i>For 'opt-outs':</i>		
(i) Why did you decide not to move?		
(ii) Were you free to return?		

<p><b>For 'opt-outs':</b></p> <p><b>(i) Were you free to stay?</b></p>		
<p><b>(iii) Had anything changed when you returned/whilst you have stayed? What:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- shelter</li> <li>- education</li> <li>- health</li> <li>- land</li> <li>- livelihood options</li> </ul>		
<p><b>(iv) Why did you decide not to go to/stay at the development sites?</b></p>		
<p><b>(v) Are you still being asked to move?</b></p>		
<p><b>(vi) Do you think that you will move/return to the resettlement sites? Under what circumstances?</b></p>		
<p><b>(vii) Has anyone you know made a complaint? What happened as a result?</b></p>		

## Annex 2: Summary of Focus Group Discussion Findings

All figures are out of 17 focus group discussions (not including the one village visited which hadn't relocated). '4/17' means that four focus groups out of the seventeen focus groups made the statement.

### Process

- 4/17 all moved (ie no one in the village remained in the original location)
- 13/17 moved within one hour of their original location
- All moved to a new location/existing village with the same ethnic group
- 10/17 stated that some people had returned
- 2/17 were not consulted
- 8/17 stated they did not want to move

### Livelihoods

- 13/17 had been allocated land (1-4 hectares)
- 16/17 had access to original land
- 8/17 had fewer livelihood options than in the previous site (reduced fishing, fewer cattle and/or growing a smaller range of crops)
- 0/17 had surplus food to sell (3/17 reported having surplus food on their original land)
- 17/17 had been promised a variety of services/inputs at the new sites
- 11/17 had food aid (ranging from 1 to 5 times)
- 11/17 had seeds, tools provided
- No grinding mills were functioning

### Water

- 9/17 had enough water in the new site
- 16/17 water was better in new site

### Sanitation

- 7/17 reported the existence of a few latrines, but not popular

### Primary Education

- 17/17 primary education is closer and safer to get to than previously
- Class sizes varied – 200 to 40

## Health

- 4/17 better in new site

## Roads

- All had better access to roads (and power potential)

## Shelter

- 17/17 had built own houses

## Security

- 7/17 felt safer in new sites
- 0/17 had experienced any major conflicts in the new sites