

Contents

Executive summary	3
1. introduction	7
1.1 Project Background	7
1.2 Key Socio-Economic Impacts	7
1.3 Purpose and Scope of the Resettlement Action Plan	8
1.4 Swaziland Requirements	9
1.5 Methodology	9
1.6 Outline Resettlement Plan	9
1.7 Draft Resettlement Plan	9
1.8 Resettlement Plan	10
1.8.1 Asset Survey	10
1.8.2 Field Survey	10
1.8.3 Building and Structure Survey	11
1.8.4 Survey of Affected Graves	11
1.9 Structure of the Report	11
2. overview of the affected population	13
2.1 Administrative Structures	13
2.2 Socio-Economic Characteristics	13
2.2.1 Physical and Socio-economic Characteristics	13
2.3 Political Organization	14
2.4 Physical infrastructure	14
2.4.1 Roads	14
2.4.2 Schools and health facilities	14
2.4.3 Commercial, Business and Service Centers	16
2.5 Demographic characteristics	16
2.5.1 Population	16
2.5.2 Migration	19
2.5.3 Population density, distribution and growth rates	19
2.6 Occupation, Education and income	21
2.6.1 Occupation	21
2.6.2 Education	22
2.6.3 Income	22
2.7 Livestock	23
3. Social Organization	24
3.1 Affiliation to organizations	24
4. consultation and participation	25
4.1 Institutional Framework	25
4.2 The Compensation Determination Committee	25
4.3 The Process of Consultation and Community Participation	26
4.4 Consultation at Homestead and Sigodzi Level	26
4.4.1 Consultation at Traditional Authority Level	26
4.4.2 Consultation at Government Level	26
5. legal and policy framework	28
5.1 Land Tenure	28
5.2 Resettlement-Related Legislation and Policies	28
5.2.1 Rural Planning, Development & Resettlement Bill	29
5.2.2 Proposed objectives relating to resettlement schemes are:	29
5.2.3 Resettlement Policy	30
5.2.4 The Policy advocates that rural resettlement in Swaziland should:	30
5.2.5 The Komati River Basin Development Project	31
5.2.6 LUSIP Considerations	32
6. compensation and livelihood restoration	33
6.1 Preparation of Entitlement and Compensation Norms	33
6.2 The CDC was composed of the following members:	33
6.3 Categories of Affected Persons	34
6.4 Funding of Entitlements	35

6.5	Eligibility	35
6.6	Resettlement Options	36
6.7	Entitlements.....	37
6.7.1	Land	37
6.7.2	Standing Crops and Fruit Trees	38
6.7.3	Buildings, Structures and Other Land Improvements	39
6.7.4	Graves	42
6.7.5	Businesses	42
6.7.6	Community Services and Infrastructure.....	42
6.8	Final Costing of Compensation Rates	43
6.9	Special Provisions	44
6.9.1	Displacement Allowance for Free Choice Homesteads	44
6.9.2	Provision for Transport to New Sites.....	44
6.9.3	Vulnerable Categories and Groups	44
6.9.4	Host Communities.....	45
6.10	Dispute Resolution	45
6.11	Livelihood Restoration	45
6.11.1	Introduction	45
6.11.2	Package of benefits	45
6.11.3	Conclusion.....	47
7.	resettlement measures.....	48
7.1	Resettlement Options	48
7.1.1	Site Selection Process.....	48
7.2	Housing Plan	48
7.2.1	Housing Replacement	48
7.2.2	Housing Design	49
7.2.3	Sanitation	49
7.3	Social Services and Facilities	49
8.	implementation	51
8.1	LUSIP Institutional Structure	51
8.2	Implementation Programme.....	51
9.	cost estimates	53
9.1	Introduction	53
9.2	Rates Used in Valuations	53
9.3	Compensation Packages.....	53
9.3.1	Summary of Findings	53
9.4	Total Compensation Costs.....	55
9.5	Items not Costed	55
10.	Monitoring and evaluation	57
10.1	Parameters.....	57
10.2	Monitoring Framework	58
10.2.1	Performance Monitoring.....	58
10.2.2	Impact Monitoring	59
10.2.3	Standardised (Quantitative) Monitoring	59
10.2.4	Social Impact:	59
10.2.5	Economic Impact:	60
10.2.6	Health Impact:.....	60
10.2.7	Participatory (Qualitative) Monitoring	60
10.2.8	External Evaluation	61
10.2.9	Capacity of government and other a Sustainability:	61
10.2.10	Completion Audit	61

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

Lower Usuthu Smallholder Irrigation Project (LUSIP) has been developed the objective of which is to reduce poverty and improve the standard of living of the population in the Lower Usuthu Basin. LUSIP will develop 6500 ha of irrigated agriculture in Lubovane Block in phase 1 and will develop additional 5000 ha in Matata Block in phase 2, in the south-eastern lowveld of Swaziland, of the project currently used for rainfed subsistence agriculture and rangeland to irrigated commercial cash crop production. Water for the LUSIP 2 will be provided from the Main Canal South in LUSIP. The LUSIP 2 currently has three chiefdoms namely; Ngcamphalala, Mngometulu and Matsenjwa.

While poverty alleviation and livelihood diversification is the main outcome of the project, its implementation will lead to a number of short-term impacts that will require mitigation and management. These include the acquisition of land (mainly Swazi Nation Land) and population displacement. The overall aim of this Resettlement Plan is to ensure that all resettlement-related impacts associated with the construction of the project's bulk infrastructure are addressed.

Resettlement Estimates

A total of 22 homesteads will be affected by the construction of the projects of the preliminary canal alignment (excluding homesteads within the irrigation blocks). Of these households, 19 will definitely be displaced and require resettlement since they fall within 100 meters of the preliminary canal alignment. Some of the affected homesteads (3) are located outside the periphery of the canal, may be affected by blasting.

The resettlement impact associated with the development of the irrigation blocks, which is yet to be confirmed, has been adjusted to 21 homesteads. These have to be resettled. It can be noted that the area in the irrigation blocks has been reduced by 170 ha in order to prevent the resettlement of another 21 homesteads and to ensure that 1 ha per remaining homestead is reserved as buffer where no cane production is allowed. One (1) dip tank is affected by the canal and one (1) basic soccer field will also have to be relocated. There are two (2) dip tanks that are located within the irrigation blocks, one (1) Umphakatsi – Mngometulu and three (3) basic soccer fields located in the irrigation blocks. Additional assessments have to be made during the detailed design phase.

A total of 41.64ha of arable fields are affected to varying degrees by the preliminary canal alignment and reservoir at the end of the canal. There are 54 graves that will be affected. There is only one shop that could be impacted by the resettlement of the affected homesteads. This though may be as a result of whether the homesteads are resettled far away from their current locations. Experience from LUSIP I shows though that homesteads may prefer to relocate not far away from the canal so to benefit from the development of the project.

Consultation and participation

A community participation process was initiated in 2000 to establish a representative community consultation and participation structure through which the people of the Lower Usuthu could participate in the planning, design, and implementation of the project.

Consultation and participation in resettlement and compensation planning has thus far occurred at homestead, sigodzi and uMphakatsi level. Individual and group/community consultation will

continue during project implementation to clarify resettlement choices and compensation principles and rates, and to ensure that affected homesteads fully understand their entitlement packages.

Compensation and livelihood restoration

The project's compensation policy is embodied in an Entitlement Framework which was approved by the CDC in April 2003. The overall aim of the Entitlement Framework is to ensure that the different categories of affected homesteads area treated fairly so that none are worse off than prior to project implementation. All homesteads displaced by project activities, as well as non-displaced homesteads whose assets are acquired by the project, will be entitled to the provisions detailed in the Entitlement Framework. The Entitlement Framework defines and specifies:

the categories of affected homesteads and eligibility criteria;

resettlement and compensation principles;

compensation entitlements; and

compensation determination and funding

The compensation principles established by the CDC formed the basis for the establishment/adjustment of compensation rates for the various items detailed in the Entitlement Framework.

The principles were finalised through a process of defining options, costing these, work-shopping and then agreeing on the principle and rate. This was summarised in the document "Entitlement Framework - Final (April 2003)" and then summarised in "Entitlement Framework - Summary Final Update (April 2003)".

It is the stated aim of SWADE that all displaced households should benefit from the primary irrigation development. A cascading package of benefits has been developed to ensure that all displaced households will benefit from the project. The proposed package of benefits includes training, access to finance, project development business opportunities, food production and commercial projects.

Resettlement options and measures

Two broad resettlement options are being proposed: relocation within the project area; and free choice resettlement. Relocation within the project area entails relocation within the project area, either individually to a new site identified by a homestead, or as a group of homesteads to a designated resettlement site. Free choice resettlement entails resettlement to a new site identified by the homestead that is located outside both the homestead's chiefdom and the defined project area.

At present, all the resettler homesteads have indicated that they would prefer the first relocation option, i.e. relocation within the project area. This is mainly encouraged since the main objective of the project is to bring water closer to the people so that they can turn from subsistence farming to commercial farming. Mainly, single homestead resettlement sites have been identified as the preferred option along the canal network for homesteads from Matsenjwa, Ngcamphalala and Mngometulu chiefdoms that will be displaced for the construction of the canal.

Each site has to be surveyed by the LUSIP 2 Agricultural Team to determine soil suitability, while access to social services and water supply options should be assessed by SWADE's Health Team. Water supply alternatives considered both interim and long-term supply options with the longer term options including water distribution to every homestead in the project area.

Construction of replacement housing is proposed to be undertaken according to the following methods:

homesteads can choose to have their houses constructed by conventional construction (i.e. a Project-appointed contractor); or

homesteads can choose to have their houses constructed by a contractor of their own choice; or

homesteads can undertake the construction themselves (owner-builder).

At this stage, LUSIP 2 team should expand on the above options based on lesson learnt from LUSIP 1 but it is advisable that these options are considered based on the construction schedule of the canal. Debushing and terracing will be the responsibility of the Project. Debushing of homestead sites will be selective and as many trees as possible will be left undisturbed.

Implémentation

As the project authority, SWADE will assume overall responsibility for the implementation and coordination of resettlement activities. It is proposed that project implementation, including implementation of the resettlement programme, should be managed and coordinated at two levels: the SWADE Site Office, and an institutional and participation structure to ensure ongoing involvement of communities in decision-making processes. A detailed resettlement implementation schedule, which details activities, responsibilities and timeframes, will be developed in line with the construction schedule.

Cost estimates

The total compensation costs for homesteads affected by the canal are estimated at E11,907,191 (projected to mid-2014 values). These estimates exclude:

resettlement planning and implementation costs;

mitigation of communal resources(e.g. securing of alternative grazing lands);

final design costs;

monitoring & evaluation costs;

government or parastatal administration costs (including administration of contracts);

costs to be borne by the farmers' organisations in the development of irrigation blocks and other development areas; Please note that there are 21 homesteads estimated to be affected in the irrigation blocks and need to be resettled.

Monitoring and evaluation

The project has an obligation to ensure that resettled homesteads regain, and preferably improve upon, their living standards. The measures detailed in the Resettlement Plan are designed to meet this obligation. In turn, the implementation of these measures and the extent to which objectives are being met, require proper checking and assessment. A monitoring and evaluation programme will accordingly be implemented to record and assess project inputs and the number of persons affected and compensated; and to confirm that former subsistence levels and living standards are being re-established.

The monitoring programme will have three broad components:

performance monitoring;

impact monitoring; and

a completion audit.

An Environmental Review Panel will have to be appointed to provide guidance to the project's resettlement programme. Comprising of specialists with expertise in resettlement, development and environmental processes and practises, the Panel will undertake the overall evaluations of the resettlement and livelihood restoration work being done under the project.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

Lower Usuthu Smallholder Irrigation Project (LUSIP) has been developed the objective of which is to reduce poverty and improve the standard of living of the population in the Lower Usuthu Basin (Map - Locality). LUSIP will develop 6500 ha of irrigated agriculture in Lubovane Block in phase I and will develop additional 5000 ha in Matata Block in phase II of the project currently used for rainfed subsistence agriculture and rangeland to irrigated commercial cash crop production. Water for the LUSIP 2 will be provided from the Main Canal South. The LUSIP 2 currently has three chiefdoms namely; Ngcamphalala, Mngometulu and Matsenjwa.

While poverty alleviation and livelihood diversification is the main outcome of the project, its implementation will lead to a number of short-term impacts that will require mitigation and management. These include the acquisition of land (mainly Swazi Nation Land) and population displacement. The overall aim of this Resettlement Plan is to ensure that all resettlement-related impacts associated with the construction of the project's bulk infrastructure are addressed.

The project is being developed under the supervision of the Swaziland Water and Development Enterprise (SWADE).¹

1.2 KEY SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS

The conversion of land from rainfed subsistence agriculture to irrigated commercial cash crop production is anticipated to lead to the diversification of livelihood earning opportunities and to substantial improvements in homestead income generation and income security. While poverty alleviation and livelihood diversification is the main outcome of the project, its implementation will lead to a number of short-term impacts that will require mitigation and management. These include:

- the acquisition of Swazi Nation Land (SNL) and portions of land on two private farms (Nisela and MOAC farm);
- population displacement, particularly the involuntary resettlement associated with the construction of the canal;
- changes to the use of common property and natural resources (e.g. grazing and other homestead utility resources) resulting from the canal and the conversion of previously non-cultivated areas to irrigation; and
- changes to the health status of the project area population.²

A total of 22 homesteads will be affected by the construction of the project's main canal):

¹ SWADE is a parastatal of the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC).

² Vakakis International, 2000. *Environmental Impact Assessment Study on the Proposed Lower Usuthu Small Holder Irrigation Development Project*. European Union.

The project's downstream (irrigation development) component may also necessitate the resettlement of 34 homesteads from the irrigation blocks in order to ensure the viability of smallholder cultivation as well as the welfare of the affected population. In addition, some homesteads in the project development areas may be required to resettle as a result of irrigation and agricultural development, e.g. the construction of farm roads, haul roads, power lines, pump stations, pipelines and irrigation dams.

1.3 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE RESETTLEMENT ACTION PLAN

The overall aim of the Resettlement Action Plan is to ensure that the social impacts associated with the construction of the project's canal are addressed. These include:

- loss of land and other privately-owned assets;
- loss of social infrastructure and community facilities;
- impacts on subsistence/livelihoods and income-earning capacity; and
- collective adverse impacts on host communities and groups/social categories who because of their social position may be vulnerable to changes brought about by project activities.

The Resettlement Action Plan has been prepared with reference to Government policies and legislation and international best practice, as embodied in the involuntary resettlement safeguard policies and guidelines of institutions such as the World Bank. The Resettlement Action Plan deals mainly with resettlement and livelihood-related impacts. Additional project reports (completed or scheduled for completion), which are required under Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland (GoS) legislation, describe other socio-economic and environmental impacts, mitigation measures and development measures. The Resettlement Report should be read in conjunction with these documents.

The Resettlement Action Plan builds on two earlier project resettlement documents. An Outline Resettlement Plan (ORP) was prepared between August-November 2000, with the overall aim of:

- providing more detailed (preliminary) information on the magnitude, mitigation options and likely costs associated with project-related involuntary resettlement; and
- ascertaining the level of community commitment to LUSIP, particularly with regard to the possible need for the boosting of beneficiary numbers within the irrigable area identified.

A Draft Resettlement Plan (DRP) was undertaken between March-May 2001 with the aim of reporting on:

- the likely number of homesteads and individuals affected by Phase 2 of the project and the number of homesteads that may be displaced;
- private and community resources affected by the project (e.g. land, houses, infrastructure, etc.) and the entitlements required for effective homestead re-establishment;
- potential resettlement sites for displaced homesteads;
- socio-economic issues associated with the downstream (irrigation) development component;

- organisational and institutional requirements for the implementation of compensation, resettlement and rehabilitation activities;
- implementation schedules and monitoring mechanisms; and
- compensation, resettlement and rehabilitation cost estimates.

1.4 SWAZILAND REQUIREMENTS

Government legislation requires the submission of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and Comprehensive Mitigation Plans (CMPs) for projects such as LUSIP. A feasibility-level Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and CMP for LUSIP were submitted to the Swaziland Environmental Authority (SEA) in April 2000. On the basis of this documentation, the SEA issued an Environmental Compliance Certificate (ECC). Conditions were attached to the ECC, which included the submission of a resettlement and compensation policy, a resettlement proposal, and social and biophysical monitoring programmes.

1.5 METHODOLOGY

The Resettlement Action Plan is based on an extensive data collection and consultation exercise, which commenced with the preparation of the ORP, continued during the preparation of the Resettlement Plan. The main resettlement-related studies and activities undertaken during the three study phases are summarised below:

1.6 OUTLINE RESETTLEMENT PLAN

- Census (Phase 1 and 2): to create a geo-referenced database of homesteads in the study area containing basic socio-economic information, for use as a baseline in resettlement planning.
- Community consultation: to create community awareness of the project, to contribute to a better understanding of people's general views on important project related issues and to establish a representative participation structure.
- Attitudinal survey: to obtain the views of a sample of homesteads in the project area concerning specific project-related issues.
- Resettlement survey: to confirm the numbers of homesteads to be affected and to initiate a participatory resettlement planning process.
- Assets and land inventory: to establish assets and arable land inventories for homesteads identified as being affected by Canal and the Irrigation Blocks.

1.7 DRAFT RESETTLEMENT PLAN

- Update of project area population figures: to establish population figures for the extended project area.
- Community participation: to establish a representative structure through which the people of the Lower Usuthu could be represented on LUSIP; empower the people of the Lower Usuthu to meaningfully participate in the project; and to obtain a clearer understanding of conditions related to cross-domain issues.

- Poverty survey: to provide a qualified assessment of the status of poverty in the project area.
- Land tenure survey: to gain a better understanding of land tenure arrangements.
- Livestock survey: to establish the number of livestock that would be affected by the Reservoir and the irrigation scheme.
- Survey of potential growth areas, including a regional perspective: to identify potential future growth points and settlement patterns.
- Survey of landholdings of reservoir-affected homesteads: to update information on fixed assets and cultivated land that will be affected by construction of the Canal.
- Resettlement figures and asset losses: to update the estimates of displaced homesteads and asset losses determined during the ORP, including total resettlement and compensation costs.
- Entitlement Framework: preparation of a project Entitlement Framework, in consultation with representatives of affected communities and from relevant government departments.

1.8 RESETTLEMENT PLAN

- Socio-economic survey of all homesteads: to establish the socio-economic characteristics of, and a baseline for, homesteads to be displaced from the Canal.
- Socio-economic survey of a sample of homesteads in the project area: to establish a socio-economic baseline of general socio-economic conditions in the project area prior to the development intervention.
- Asset verification survey and update of compensation rates: to obtain updated information on all assets affected and to determine compensation entitlements as defined in the Entitlement Framework.
- Survey of affected graves: to identify all graves affected by the project's main canal
- Consultation programme: ongoing consultation at homestead and community level to further advance the finalisation of resettlement sites.

The asset survey undertaken is described in more detail below.

1.8.1 Asset Survey

The objective of the asset survey was to obtain updated information on all assets affected and to determine compensation entitlements as defined in the Entitlement Framework. In particular, the following surveys were undertaken:

1.8.2 Field Survey

A survey was undertaken of all affected fields, which included: (a) fields within the 100m servitude of the Canal; and (c) all Fields affected by the reservoir to be developed at the end of the canal.

The Canal from the Main Cal South passes through grazing land utilised by the Ngcampahala and Mngometulu community, through to the private Title Deed Land (Nisela Farm).

Fields have been recorded using a GPS and then captured into the LIMS GIS system following a process of GPS data correction through control stations. A photograph was taken of each field with its homestead owner or, if the owner was not available, a substitute representative member of the community.

The location of affected fields and homesteads are shown in Map Attached for the Ngcamphalala area and, for Mngometulu area, for Matsenjwa area

1.8.3 Building and Structure Survey

This survey entailed: (a) verification of homesteads within the within canal servitude (100m); and (b) update of inventory of assets.

Each affected homestead or structure was visited and physical information recorded. The following information was collected and recorded during the survey:

- total number of buildings and size of each;
- the total area of the residential site ("footprint");
- a field sketch of the homestead's buildings within the foot print;
- fields utilised by each homestead, and location in relation to proposed canal;
- vegetable gardens and number of fruit trees;
- all secondary structures owned by the homestead owner, like drying lines, grinder stands, grinder shelters, kraals, pigsties, maize cribs, nest platforms, poultry shelters, tank shelters, tank stands, water ponds, water trenches, windbreaks, fences and cotton pits; and
- the number of graves associated with each homestead.

Photographs were taken of each homestead, with GPS co-ordinates taken at the centre of each homestead.

1.8.4 Survey of Affected Graves

This survey entailed: (a) identification and geo referencing of graves belonging to affected homesteads (displaced homesteads); (b) identification and geo-referencing of all other graves within the canal servitude areas.

1.9 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

The Resettlement Plan is organised around the following topics:

- Section 2 provides a brief description of the project;
- Section 3 presents the resettlement estimates in more detail, against the background of a description of the measures to enhance project benefits and minimise resettlement;
- Section 4 provides an overview of the affected population, based on the results of a socio-economic survey and information from secondary sources;
- Section 5 describes the social organization;

- Section 6 describes the consultation and participation structure in the project
- Section 7 presents an outline of the legal and policy framework for resettlement;
- Section 8 summarises the project's compensation and entitlement framework, and the approach to livelihood restoration;
- Section 9 describes the resettlement measures, including site selection procedures, the provision of replacement housing, and restoration and development proposals;
- Section 10 outlines the implementation programme and arrangements;
- Section 11 gives a breakdown of resettlement and compensation costs;
- Section 12 describes the programme that will be implemented to monitor and evaluate resettlement activities.

The following appendices are appended to the report:

Appendix 1	List of Affected Homesteads
Appendix 2	Summary of Community Interactions
Appendix 3	Monitoring Indicators
Appendix 4	Summary of affected homestead assets
Appendix 5	Maps
Appendix 6	Resettlement Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Appendix 7	List of Homesteads in Irrigation blocks

2. OVERVIEW OF THE AFFECTED POPULATION

2.1 ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES

The project area is situated in the Lubombo District in the Siteki Regional Administration. Two administrative bodies operate alongside each other:

- The Traditional Authority system: clusters of dispersed homesteads form part of a local community (*sigozi*), led by a headman (*induna*) appointed by a chief (*sikhulu*). These communities make up a chiefdom (*sive*), which is an administrative and political unit which recognises the chief as its head. The position of chief is hereditary and passed on patrilineally. Chiefs rule their chiefdom with assistance from a council of advisors (*libandla*).
- The parliamentary *Tinkhundla* system: constituencies elect a Member of Parliament (MP), and a counsellor (*bucophu*) to the MP. The Project Area is made up of four *Tinkhundla*: Siphofaneni, Sithobela, Nkilonko and Lubuli.

2.2 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

2.2.1 Physical and Socio-economic Characteristics

The LUSIP II project area lies in the cane and cattle agro-ecological zone lowveld of eastern Swaziland, where the average annual rainfall is 600 to 700. Rainfall is highly variable, with peak periods occurring during November to January. The Greater Usuthu and Mhlathuzane rivers are the only perennial natural surface water sources in the Project area. There are a number of seasonal water courses draining into these rivers.

There are no continuous aquifers in the project area, and groundwater is generally limited to fracture zones in hard rock formations. The area is underlain by sedimentary rocks of the Karoo sequence. Groundwater in parts of the project area is saline and not used by the population for drinking. There are numbers of boreholes fitted with hand pumps, located mostly in low-lying areas which are associated with fracture zones.

Former large-scale cotton and maize cultivation in the area has drastically declined in recent years, due mainly to erratic rainfall and prolonged periods of drought. There is a so-called "hunger season" extending from August to January, where staple food is relatively scarce and often has to be purchased from outside sources.

The average size of cattle holdings has also declined in recent years, due in part to the sale of cattle to compensate for lost income from other sources and the decline in the quality of pastureland and the amount of land available for grazing.

There is high unemployment and widespread poverty in the Project area. Main sources of income include casual labor and sale of produces from gardens and livestock. The most common employment is cane planting, weeding and cutting, cattle keeping and to a lesser extent labor migration to other cities in Swaziland and neighboring countries, mainly South Africa.

Families generally have little surplus savings available for investment in household improvements. However in cases where there is labor migration, remittances are invested in improved housing, purchase of consumer goods and access to social facilities.

2.3 POLITICAL ORGANIZATION

The most important political unit in the project area is the Chiefdom which constitutes the traditional authority structure. In rural Swaziland the chiefdom is the highest authority on Swazi Nation Land (SNL). Ultimately these hereditary chiefs are answerable only to the king with regards to chiefdom they govern. The chief has an *Indvuna* or headman and a *Bandlancane* or inner council to work with. These structures make up the Traditional Authority. The traditional authority allocates land, and settles disputes. In cases where the chief and/or his council are active, they also direct development activities within the community. For this reason the traditional authority is very important in establishing the legitimacy of a project, its acceptance in the community and its sustainability.

In terms of interface between civil government's administrative structures, the 4 Regional Administrators work closely with all the chiefs in each of the regions and is therefore very influential. A Member of Parliament is chosen from each of the 55 constituencies or '*Tinkhundla*'. As a rule each *Inkhundla* is made up of a number of chiefdoms depending on the size. At the *Inkhundla* level the council is called *Buchopho Benkhundla*.

The three chiefdoms in the LUSIP II PDA are further divided into tigodzi (sections) as shown below:

Imiphakatsi (Chiefdom)	Tigodzi (Sections)	Inkhundla
Matsenjwa	Bhobo; Hhungwane; Lushikishini; Ngonini; Sichelwini; Tinhlabeni; Gamula	Nkilongo
Ngcamphalala	Goboyane; Ludlodlo; Mahlabaneni; Makhasane; Makhulusihlenge; Mayayeni; Mkhalamfene; Mcumaneni; Mdobandoba; Ncandweni; Ntamakuphila	Nkilongo
		Lubulini
Mngometulu	Gangakhulu; Lubulini; Mabantanini; Madabukeni; Matjetjeni; Moyeni; Ncandweni; Ndzevane; Ngonini; Victory	Lubulini

2.4 PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE

2.4.1 Roads

There are two main roads in the project area, both running in a north-south direction from Big Bend: MR8, an asphalt road connecting Big Bend with Lavumisa on the border to South Africa and Siteki, the capital of Lebombo Region to the north, and a secondary gravel road running parallel to the MR8 connecting Big Bend with the village of Nsoko to the south. Radiating from these two roads is a network of tertiary dirt roads connecting a number of small settlements and homesteads. Where the topography is relatively flat, settlements tend to be distributed in a linear pattern along roads, and in areas where the topography is relatively hilly, settlements tend to be located in a clustered pattern on the sides and tops of hills.

2.4.2 Schools and health facilities

There are 19 schools in the PDA run by government, private and religious organizations as shown in Table 1 below. There are also a number of pre-schools run by community and religious organizations as well as private individuals.

Table 4.4.2: Schools in the LUSIP II PDA

Chiefdom	Schools
Matsenjwa	5
Mngometulu	4
Ngcamphalala ¹	10
Total	19

¹ The part of Ngampalala Chiefdom located in Phase 2

Regarding health facilities located in or serving the PDA, there are health clinics run by MoH at Matata, Ndzevane and Lubulini. There is also a clinic at St. Phillips run by a religious organization which also serves the LUSIP 2 project area.

There is a primary hospital in Big Bend managed by the Ubombo Sugar Company and a regional hospital, the Good Shepherd Hospital, in Siteki, about 60 km from Big Bend.

In addition to these health facilities, there are a number of private clinics in and around Big Bend and Matata as well as practitioners of traditional medicine known as *sangoma* and *inyanga*.

2.4.3 Commercial, Business and Service Centers

The town of Big Bend, with a population of about 10,500, serves the Project Development Area (PDA) with banking, service stations, auto repair services, restaurants, supermarkets and related facilities. At Matata there is a large commercial complex which includes a supermarket, banks, shops, government offices, bus/combi stand, an agricultural cooperative, mechanical workshops, a train station, warehouses, a prison and other facilities.

2.5 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS**2.5.1 Population**

The population in the project area by chiefdom is shown in the table below:

Table 4.5.1.1: Population by Chiefdom (2011)

Chiefdom	Population
Matsenjwa	64
Mngometulu	47
Ngcamphalala ¹	65
Total	276

Table 4.5.1.2: Households and Average Household and Homestead Size by Chiefdom (2011)

Chiefdom	Households	Household Size	Households per Homestead
Matsenjwa	280	6.6	1.1
Mngometulu	967	6.2	1.2

Ngcamphalala ¹	1,012	6,3	1.2
Total/Average	2,259	6.3	1.2

Homesteads are typically located on dispersed plots. The large majority of homesteads have access to nearby land for farming and grazing which average 8 hectares in size. Plots may contain homesteads consisting of 1 or more related households. Homesteads are mainly headed by males and include the head of household, spouse and children. In most cases there are also extended family members such as the head of household's parents, grandchildren, adult siblings, in-laws, cousins, etc. The following table shows the gender of heads of households by Chiefdom.

Table 4.5.1.3: Gender of Head of Household by Chiefdom

Chiefdom	Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%
Matsenjwa	164	66	85	34
Mngometulu	565	72	225	28
Ngcamphalala ¹	162	65	86	35
Total/Average	891	69	396	31

Source: LUSIP Phase 2 Census Report

¹ Information for the part of Ngcamphalala Chiefdom in LUSIP Phase 2 only.

Each chiefdom is divided into sub-divisions consisting of a number of sections. These divisions and their population are shown in the following table:

Table 4.5.1.4: Sub-divisions of Chiefdoms and Population (2011)

Chiefdom	Sub-division	Section	Number of homesteads	Number of households	Population
Matsenjwa	Gamula	Bhobo	112	123	770
		Hhungwane	15	19	122
		Lushikishini	18	20	138
		Ngonini	19	21	141
		Sicelwini	89	95	673
		Tinhlabeni	2	2	20
Total			255	280	1864
Ngcamphalala	Mahlababeni	Goboyane	76	88	487
		Mahlabaneni	89	102	593
		Mkhalamfene	63	76	475
	Sub-total		228	266	1555
	Lusabeni	Ludlodlo	53	63	403
		Makhasane	28	39	198
		Mcumaneni	64	68	425
		Ncandvweni	88	103	765
		Ntamakuphila	71	83	491
	Sub-total		304	356	2282
	Phafeni	Makhulusihlenge	99	122	785
		Mayayeni	61	66	420
		Mdobandoba	166	202	1323
	Sub-total		326	390	2528
Total			858	1012	6365
Mngometulu	Ndzevane	Gangakhulu	50	53	306

		Ndzevane	136	158	1000
	Sub-total		186	211	1306
	Lubulini	Lubulini	124	149	389
		Madabukeni	61	69	981
		Ngonini	8	10	61
		Victory	100	120	786
	Sub-total		293	348	2217
	Mabantaneni	Mabantanini I	26	41	273
		Mabantanini II	61	79	502
		Matjetjeni	109	141	789
		Moyeni	80	90	543
		Ncandvweni	47	57	417
	Sub-total		323	408	2,524
Total			802	967	6,047
Grand Total			1,915	2,259	14,276

2.5.2 Migration

One would expect significant out-migration from the area, given the relatively high prevalence of poverty, high unemployment and limited educational opportunities. However, it is reported that new immigrants continue to move into the area from other parts of Swaziland. This may be due to the expectation of a significant increase in agricultural and commercial activity within the next few years.

2.5.3 Population density, distribution and growth rates

The following table shows the area and population density for the three chiefdoms in the LUSIP II PDA.

Table 4.5.3.1: Area and Population Density by Chiefdom (2011)

Chiefdom	Area (km ²)	Population (inhabitants/km ²)	Density	Comments
Matsenjwa	29.90	62.3		Population concentrated along main and secondary roads
Mngometulu	92.72	65.2		Population concentrated along main and secondary roads
Ngcamphalala ¹	91.95	69.2		Population concentrated along main and secondary roads
Total/Average	214.57	66.5		

Note: Population density in Matsenjwa Chiefdom is from the Chiefdom Development Plan, 2011.

¹Part of Ngcamphalala Chiefdom included in LUSIP Phase 2 only

The population density in the LUSIP II project area is significantly higher than that of Lubombo Region as a whole, which has a population density of only some 35 people/km².

The projected population at the end of the design period (2022) may be calculated as follows:

$$P_D = P_P (1 + G_R)^D$$

Where

P_D	=	Design population
P_P	=	Present population
G_R	=	Annual growth rate expressed as a percentage
D	=	Design period (years)

Table 4.5.3.2: Projected Population Growth Rates and Population in 2022 by Chiefdom

Chiefdom	Annual Growth Rate	Projected Population (2022)
Matsenjwa	2.9% ²	2,553
Mngometulu	2.9%	8,282
Ngcamphalala ¹	2.9%	8,717
Average/total	2.9%	19,552

¹Part of Ngcamphalala Chiefdom in Phase 2 only

² Annual growth rate used in the Rural Water Supply Design Manual, Rural Water Supply Branch

The projected gross annual growth rate is significantly higher than the intercensal annual population growth rate for 1997-2007 for Lubombo Region, which was only 0.47%. Future population growth in the Project Area will be a combination of natural increase estimated at about 450 live births per year as well as immigration from other areas in response to the increased demand for land, labor and services.

Settlement patterns

Settlements in the project area are generally clustered in a nucleated pattern along hillsides or in a linear pattern along primary and secondary roads. In Ngcamphalala Chiefdom (Phafeni Section) a nucleated cluster of houses, schools and farms lays immediately west of the gravel road and south of the Usuthu River. Separated from this cluster by fields and a ravine forming part of the natural drainage pattern of the area is a second cluster in a linear north-south pattern along a tertiary dirt road (Mahlabaneni section).

To the south of this cluster, in the Lusabeni Section, settlements become more dispersed and tertiary roads become narrower and less well maintained.

In the Matsenjwa Chiefdom, the settlement pattern consists of two linear clusters located between the main MR8 road and the Lubombo mountain range which forms the border between Swaziland and South Africa to the east.

In Mngometulu Chiefdom, the settlement pattern is generally linear, extending along a network of secondary dirt roads, with the highest density occurring in the northern part of the chiefdom and becoming more scattered to the south.

2.6 OCCUPATION, EDUCATION AND INCOME

2.6.1 Occupation

According to the census conducted by SWADE (SWADE, 2011) there are 5,890 people in the 15-64 age group in the Project Area, which represents 58.1% of the total population in the three chiefdoms. According to the census conducted by SWADE (SWADE 2011), 2,268 or 38.5% of this age group reports being formally employed.

The population in the PDA is overwhelmingly rural in character, which is reflected in the occupational structure of the area. The distribution of occupations in the LUSIP 2 PDA is shown in the following table:

Table 4.6.1.1: Occupation of Employed Persons in the LUSIP 2 Project Area by Gender

Occupation	Total	%	Male	%	Female	%
Farm labor	365	16.1	249	16.7	116	14.9
Other laborer	290	12.8	186	12.5	104	13.4
Driver/mechanic	254	11.2	251	16.8	3	0.4
Domestic worker/gardener	255	11.2	87	5.8	168	21.6
Construction worker	185	8.2	182	12.2	3	0.4
Security (incl. police)	160	7.1	145	9.7	15	1.9
Factory worker	144	6.3	67	4.5	77	9.9
Teacher	106	4.7	37	2.5	69	8.9
Miner	91	4.0	88	5.9	3	0.4
Clerk/office worker	64	2.8	18	1.2	46	5.9
Hotel worker	36	1.6	8	0.5	28	3.6
Taxi driver	26	1.1	20	1.3	6	0.8
Commercial farmer	23	1.0	14	0.9	9	1.2
Subsistence farmer	23	1.0	15	1.0	8	1.0
Military	21	0.9	15	1.0	6	0.8
Nurse	18	0.8	7	0.5	11	1.4
Spaza owner	12	0.5	4	0.3	8	1.0
Other	195	8.6	98	6.6	97	12.5
Total	2,268	100	1,491	100	777	100

Map 1: Nucleated cluster settlement in Phaféni Section, Ngcamphalala Chiefdom

Figure 1

As can be seen from the above table, the majority of those employed are farm labors, driver/mechanics, domestic worker/gardeners, construction, security guards and factory workers. Most of these occupations are dominated by men. Almost twice as many men report being gainfully employed in an occupation as women. Over one-fifth of women who are employed are employed as domestic workers.

About 26% of population in the PDA is classified as migrant labors that have their primary residence outside the PDA. With the completion of LUSIP II water and land development activities, this number can be expected to increase significantly in the future.

2.6.2 Education

The table below shows the highest level attained by residents of school-going age and above:

Table 4.6.2.1: Highest Education Attained by persons of school age and above

Education	%
None	27.4
Grade 1-2	9.8
Grade 3-6	21.1
Grade 7	8.5
Form 1-2	11.2
Form 3-4	10.9
Form 5	9.7
Diploma	0.9
Degree	0.4

2.6.3 Income

Cash incomes in the LUSIP 2 PD are generally low and irregular and tend to be seasonal in nature following the agricultural calendar and crop cycles. Only 21% of individuals interviewed reported having a cash income. There is wide variation in the reported incomes, ranging from E50 to E30,000 per month, with the majority reporting between E200–E500. The distribution of reported monthly incomes are shown in the table below:

Table 4.6.3.1: Distribution of Reported Monthly Incomes

Income (E)	%
No income	78.9
50 – 1,000	13.4
1,000 < 2,000	3.6

2,000 < 3,000	2.2
3,000 < 4,000	0.9
4,000 < 5,000	0.3
5,000 < 6,000	0.3
6,000 < 7,000	0.1
<14,000 – 30,000	0.2

58.2% of households interviewed in the Socio-economic Baseline Survey stated that they benefitted from food distribution (*mshamdane*) between January and December 2011

2.7 LIVESTOCK

Livestock represents an important source of food and animal products as well as having cultural importance. Livestock and domestic fowl are most commonly used for consumption, income from sales and for ceremonies such as weddings and funerals. Cattle also play an important social and cultural role in Swazi society and are kept for as symbols of social status, for payment of *lobola* (bride price) and as savings that can be sold and converted to cash in case of hardship.

Livestock is widely kept in the project area as shown in the following table:

Table 4.7.1: Livestock Owned/Kept by Chiefdom (2011)

Livestock	Matsenjwa		Ngcamphalala		Mgomethulu		Total
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	
Cattle	810	11	3,404	47	3,007	42	7,221
Goats	499	6	3,477	42	4,253	52	8,229
Sheep	47	15	190	60	78	25	315
Donkeys	0	0	121	53	106	47	227

The above table shows that cattle and goats are the most common type of livestock in the Project Area. While there are no reliable data available for pigs and domestic fowl such as poultry, guinea fowl, ducks and geese, these animals are also widely kept at homestead level in the project area.

3. SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

3.1 AFFILIATION TO ORGANIZATIONS

In spite of the small size of most communities in the Project Area, there is a relatively dense network of agricultural, social and religious organizations. The most common type of community level organization in the project area is religious/church groups where around 30-35% of the adult population are affiliated, followed by farmer's associations and cooperatives, where an average of 15-20% of households are members. Between 5-10% of adults participate in Traditional Authority (TA) structures, including development committees.

Other important community-level groups are school committees, women's groups, Rural Health Motivators (RHMs), home-based care groups, gardening and craft groups, among others. These groups often have overlapping membership. It is estimated that 10-15 % of the adult population, mostly women, are members of one or more of these groups.

Rural Health Motivators (RHMs) are especially important for planning and implementing the water and sanitation component of the Project. RHMs are typically adult women who have been trained by the Ministry of Health (MOH) to promote sanitation and hygiene at community level. RHMs are found in all sections of the chiefdoms in the project area and were used as entry points to communities and key informants during the preparation of this feasibility study.

4. CONSULTATION AND PARTICIPATION

A community participation process was initiated in 2000 to establish a representative community consultation and participation structure through which the people of the Lower Usuthu could participate in the planning, design, and implementation of the project.

4.1 INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

- At the apex of the LUSIP 2 structure is the Project Steering Committee (PSC). The PSC is comprised of the PS Ministry of Agriculture, Ps Ministry of Economic Planning, Ps Ministry of Natural Resources, CEO SEA, CEO SWADE, RA and LUSIP 2 Chiefs Representative.
- The next level is the LUSIP structure is the Project Technical Committee (PTC). The PTC comprises of Secretariat (SWADE Project management), representatives from Government, three members from the Lubovane Development Committee (LDC) for each of the LUSIP Chiefdoms and Illovo, Regional Secretary, Nsoko farmers and USA Distillers.
- The next level is the Lubovane Development Committee (LDC), which consists of nine (9) members from each of the three (3) Chiefdoms. The LDC will have two subcommittees: the Resettlement Committee and a Subcommittee on Employment.
- Below the LDC are the Chiefdom Development Committees (on average 13 members), comprising of representatives from each Sigodzi in each of the Chiefdoms.
- The next level in the structure is the Sigodzi Development Committees.

The traditional leadership structure operates alongside the LUSIP2 Development institutional structure.

- At the Apex is His Majesty the King. An officer in charge is the Regional Administrator, Mr Esau Dube.
- The next level are the two Acting Chiefs and one permanent chief.

The next level are the *thetindvuna temcuba* who work closely with the Inner Council will interact with the Community Development Committees (CDC), while *emadvuna* and sectional inner council interact with the Sigodzi Development Committees (SDC).

4.2 THE COMPENSATION DETERMINATION COMMITTEE

The Compensation Determination Committee (CDC) – comprising a chairperson, one nominated LPC member, five LRC representatives, Traditional Authority representation, as well as representatives from SWADE and GoS Ministries – was formed on 22 March 2002 to determine compensation procedures and rates for ratification by the LPC and the SWADE Board. Having been involved in the establishment of compensation procedures and rates as well as the assessment of resettlement options, the CDC played an important role in the finalisation of the Entitlement Framework. The CDC was disbanded in April 2003 upon completion of the SWADE report “Entitlement Framework - Summary Final Update (April 2003)”.

4.3 THE PROCESS OF CONSULTATION AND COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Guided by the LPC, and in particular the LRC, and initiated by SWADE, the process of community participation and consultation unfolds on household, sigodzi, Mphakatsi, host community and government level. It is conducted through different consultation and communication techniques, including questionnaires, informal discussions, interviews, meetings and other participatory techniques. The resettlement and compensation issues that are addressed are by and large determined by the level of consultation and the participation and the communication techniques employed.

4.4 CONSULTATION AT HOMESTEAD AND SIGODZI LEVEL

Individual consultation with the homesteads facing displacement commenced in 2011 with a socio-economic survey, undertaken as part of the project EIA. This was followed by a homestead census, an asset survey and ongoing consultation on resettlement issues to prepare an Outline Resettlement Plan and a Resettlement Plan in 2012. The consultation programme, which will continue after finalisation of the Resettlement Plan, will create a widespread awareness of LUSIP's resettlement and related impacts.

Since early 2009, further fieldwork and consultations have taken place to assist affected homesteads to make informed decisions about their future. Fieldwork was undertaken to confirm homestead assets and to prepare homestead asset registers. A socio-economic survey was undertaken of the homesteads to update the socio-economic database. This survey also provided homesteads the opportunity to express their views and concerns on key resettlement and project issues.

A number of sigodzi-level meetings, at which the CDC members played an instrumental role, were held where homesteads could express their views and deliberate resettlement and compensation issues. Although meetings were held in all affected communities, the focus was on homesteads that have to be relocated at the start of project implementation.

Individual and group/community consultation will continue during project implementation to clarify resettlement choices and compensation principles and rates, and to ensure that affected homesteads fully understand their entitlement packages. The socio-economic survey has also been extended to non-displaced homesteads whose fields are affected by the project's infrastructure.

4.4.1 Consultation at Traditional Authority Level

Communities and committees are often reluctant to commit to project-related issues without consultation with their Mphakatsi. For this reason, it was decided that traditional authorities would be represented on LUSIP through the LUSIP Traditional Authorities Development Forum (LTADF). This forum was established on 23 January 2001 and consists of the chiefs of the affected communities, along with two chiefs' representatives from each chiefdom.

4.4.2 Consultation at Government Level

Coordination with government departments and line agencies is required to obtain approval on key mitigation issues and commitment to responsibilities. Consultations have occurred with the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, the Department of Rural Water, as well as with the Siteki Regional Administration and the SEA. These consultations will

occur throughout the resettlement programme as mitigation measures are implemented. SWADE will continue to play a supportive and facilitative role to ensure that government agencies and other participating stakeholders can fulfil their obligations.

5. LEGAL AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

5.1 LAND TENURE

Land in Swaziland is held under two systems of tenure, namely Title Deed Land (TDL) and Swazi Nation Land (SNL). Title deed land is individually (privately) or corporately owned, and is generally utilized for commercial farming and ranching, whilst Swazi Nation Land is held in trust for the nation by the King and administered by the chiefs. An important difference between TDL and SNL is that land rights to the latter are non-tradable, and hence may not be used as loan collateral (i.e. users of the land have usufruct rights but no formal property rights).

Swazi Nation Land accounts for some three quarters of land in Swaziland, and supports roughly seventy percent of the country's population. Grazing lands are held as a common resource by communities, whilst agricultural land is allotted to individual households.

The administration of SNL is entrusted on the Traditional Authorities (chiefs and indvunas) who allocate it to the people on behalf of the King and who settle disputes. Each household is allocated a piece of land and will use this land for generations, becoming the perpetual property of that family and its offspring.

When young men 'come of age' (are ready to start a family), they approach the Chief, starting a new line of inheritance. Women generally gain access to land via their husbands, although unmarried women with children are sometimes allocated land in their own right at the discretion of the Traditional Authorities and women may also inherit land.

Because land allocation and use is controlled by the Traditional Authorities, the Chief can decide to reallocate the land for another use. Though the affected parties are generally consulted if this is to happen, this does not imply that consultation is a requirement, but rather a courtesy.

Following the establishment of the National Development Strategy in 1999, a National Land Policy was prepared to address access to, and security of tenure on, SNL. The Policy discusses leasehold arrangements, transferable user rights and a 99 year leasehold on SNL in rural areas. Further development of the National Land Policy is subject to the outcome of the Constitutional Review Commission.³

5.2 RESETTLEMENT-RELATED LEGISLATION AND POLICIES

Although government in Swaziland has been involved in the resettlement of Swazi nationals since the Swazi Land Settlement Act of 1946, at present there is no clear and comprehensive legal and institutional framework that covers the acquisition of property and resources, resettlement and compensation. Historically, the Swazi Land Settlement Act No 2 of 1946 governed the resettlement of Swazi nationals on Title Deed Land (TDL). Although this law remains on the statute book and is not directly applied in any settlement scheme, it has been of considerable influence in the development and use of law in such schemes and continues **to exert an influence**

³ IFAD, 2001.

on the legal arrangements for various forms of existing settlement⁴. The land, which was resettled, is now largely Swazi Nation Land (SNL), governed by Swazi law and custom.

The King may also regulate the use of Swazi Nation Land (SNL) under Section 10 of the Swazi Administration Act, including the use of such land for public purposes and the resettlement of persons living thereon if necessary. The Act made provision for the creation of the Central Rural Development Board (CRBD) to carry out programmes of resettlement, and manage land use and conservation.

The government is empowered to acquire any land under the Acquisition of Property Act No 10 of 1961. The Act allows for, amongst others, compulsory acquisition of land for public works schemes and major agricultural developments. Compensation must be paid when Swazi Nation Land is thus acquired.

Given the need to develop a national compensation and resettlement policy to fill the legislative and institutional void, and with increasing international pressure from funding organisations for countries world-wide to follow fair standards and procedures in resettlement policies, the Government of Swaziland through the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives:

- initiated the development of a policy framework for the resettlement and compensation of communities affected by the construction of Maguga Dam;
- developed a draft resettlement policy to guide the planning, implementation and monitoring of rural resettlement; and
- prepared recommendations for legislative reform in the Rural Planning, Development & Resettlement Bill (the Bill is yet to be enacted, pending the outcome of the Constitutional Review Commission).

5.2.1 Rural Planning, Development & Resettlement Bill

The Bill aims to promote established principles of rural planning and development. It provides for land to be allocated to (including the ability to undertake land transactions), and inherited by, single or married women.

5.2.2 Proposed objectives relating to resettlement schemes are:

- to ensure that they are planned and implemented with the full co-operation and participation of those being resettled;
- to ensure transparency and equity in the allocation of land;
- to encourage the development of/provide for fair tenure arrangements, contributing to greater security of tenure;
- to pay full, fair and prompt compensation and provide other appropriate assistance to any person whose occupation of or interest in land is ended or interfered with to their detriment, or otherwise suffers loss by reason of any resettlement scheme; and

⁴ Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, 1997. *The Legal Framework Applicable to Resettlement in Swaziland: Issues and Options for its Reform* (TCP/SWA/6611). Draft paper executed under a consultancy contract with the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations.

- to establish an independent, expeditious and just system for the resolution of disputes relating to such schemes.

According to the Bill, “resettlement” encompasses “the relocation of persons, their homesteads, goods, possessions and livestock from the location where they customarily reside ... to another location (the new land) as a result, direct or indirect of some public works etc. ... or for any other purpose which involves as a necessary and unavoidable consequence of its implementation, the removal of persons from their former land.” This resettlement may be voluntary or involuntary.

Where involuntary, people adversely affected would be entitled to compensation in accordance with the provisions of the Bill. Where voluntary, “the Minister may, at his discretion, pay persons involved in the process of resettlement such sums of money to assist them in the process of resettlement as he shall consider is fair and reasonable in all circumstances.”

The Bill considers specific resettlement issues, *inter alia*:

- the declaration of a resettlement scheme area;
- the institutional base, such as the creation and functions of a Rural Planning, Development and Resettlement Board and a Community Resettlement Committee, and the appointment and role of a Resettlement Officer;
- the preparation and implementation of a resettlement scheme plan; and
- tenure arrangements in resettlement schemes.

5.2.3 Resettlement Policy

MOAC’s recently promulgated Resettlement Policy⁵, which links resettlement with development and economic growth, would be relevant for the downstream (irrigation development) component of LUSIP. The policy recommends the following key principles to direct future resettlement in Swaziland:

- resettlement should meet clearly defined development objectives;
- as an increasing number of people have to depend on an ever-shrinking land base, resettlement should optimise and bring about more intensive and efficient use of land resources;
- as present resettlement related-legislation is fragmented, a legal and policy framework should be established to coordinate and enforce the resettlement policies of government;
- the participation of affected people, including host communities, should be a leading planning principle;
- monitoring and evaluation should be an integral part of resettlement programmes and a project responsibility.

5.2.4 The Policy advocates that rural resettlement in Swaziland should:

- optimise and promote sustainable land use;
- accommodate the three main land uses (cultivation, grazing and resource use and accommodation) in resettlement models;

⁵ Policy and strategy relate to departmental/sectoral intent which, although not legally mandatory is expected to be respected.

- introduce appropriate resettlement models guided by local topography, ecology and land use potential;
- ensure transparency in the allocation and redistribution of land;
- base compensation and mitigation measures on actual impact and the extent of disruption and displacement brought about by a project.
- introduce capacity building programmes as part of the process of community participation and consultation.

5.2.5 The Komati River Basin Development Project

Within Swaziland, the Komati River Basin Development Project (a joint venture between the governments of Swaziland and South Africa) involved the construction of the Maguga Dam and the implementation of the Komati Downstream Development Project (KDDP).

In the absence of a legislative framework governing resettlement, the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC) and the Komati Basin Water Authority (KOBWA) jointly developed policy guidelines for mitigating the impacts of involuntary displacement associated with the development of Maguga Dam. Based on the World Bank's (then) Operational Directive 4.30, the Resettlement and Compensation Policy (1996) of the Komati River Basin Development Project was approved by both the Swaziland and South African governments, with the proviso that the document can be "adjusted and fine-tuned during the implementation as circumstances require."⁶

The policy provides a set of guiding principles for resettlement and compensation, the underlying objectives of which include:

- to restore and enhance the livelihoods, living standards and conditions of project-affected people as closely as possible so that they are better off than they were prior to the construction of the dam;
- to ensure that affected people and communities do not bear the costs of resettlement, by relocating and supporting them during the transition period, and by compensating them for the losses they incur;
- to plan and implement mitigation measures, and provide for the monitoring and evaluation of project impacts, up to post-resettlement stages;
- to give special attention to the needs of vulnerable groups and individuals;
- to consider the host community as an affected party; and
- to ensure the participation of affected people as a leading planning principle.

The Maguga resettlement programme was planned and implemented between 1999 and 2003. Although a Resettlement Plan was not completed, two CMPs were prepared according to the principles detailed in the Resettlement and Compensation Policy - one for the host area to which the bulk of the displaced homesteads were resettled and one for the reservoir area.

⁶ Komati Basin Water Authority, 1996. *Phase 1B: Maguga Dam and Associated Infrastructure. Resettlement and Compensation Policy*.

Resettlement on the Komati Downstream Development Project (KDDP), the area downstream of the Maguga Dam where irrigation development occurred, was mainly based on the principle of voluntary resettlement. Coordinated by SWADE (then SKPE), the KDDP is similar to LUSIP in that it converted subsistence agriculture to irrigated cash crop production.

The KDDP implemented sugar cane farming in such a way that resettlement was largely avoided. Where population displacement was unavoidable, resettlers were encouraged to participate in the scheme. Furthermore, the emphasis was on voluntary resettlement, with Farmer's Associations evaluating, on a business basis, the need for the resettlement of member homesteads situated on irrigable soils. Because of the emphasis on participation and voluntary relocation, resettlement and reestablishment costs were reduced: homesteads were encouraged to relocate as close as possible to their current sites (with compensation for building losses based on reasonable local rates), while their participation in the scheme obviated the need for costly development initiatives to re-establish their livelihoods.

5.2.6 LUSIP Considerations

With regard to resettlement issues, LUSIP is essentially a combination of the Maguga Dam development and the KDDP:

- as on Maguga Dam, LUSIP will lead to the involuntary displacement of homesteads from the bulk infrastructure areas. Unless measures can be implemented to secure their participation in the irrigation development, they will be non-beneficiaries, displaced for the benefit of others;
- as with the KDDP, homesteads with irrigable soils in the Command Area will have the opportunity to participate in the development, diversify their livelihoods and raise their standard of living.

It follows that entitlements and resettlement measures should account for both involuntary and voluntary displacement, and the likelihood of some homesteads being resettled as non-beneficiaries (see Sections 6 and 7). The following two broad resettlement categories are therefore anticipated for which resettlement, compensation and re-establishment measures would be required:

- non-beneficiary resettlement, consisting of displaced homesteads that cannot participate in the irrigation development;
- beneficiary resettlement, consisting of displaced homesteads that do participate in the irrigation development.

6. COMPENSATION AND LIVELIHOOD RESTORATION

The project's compensation policy is embodied in an Entitlement Framework which was approved by all participants of the Compensation Determination Committee in April 2003. The overall aim of the Entitlement Framework is to ensure that the different categories of affected homesteads area treated fairly so that none are worse off than prior to project implementation.

All homesteads displaced by project activities, as well as non-displaced homesteads whose assets are acquired by the project, will be entitled to the provisions detailed in the Entitlement Framework. This includes homesteads affected in Phase 1 and Phase 2.

The Entitlement Framework defines and specifies:

- the categories of affected homesteads and eligibility criteria;
- resettlement and compensation principles;
- compensation entitlements; and
- compensation determination and funding.

The key elements of the Entitlement Framework are detailed in this Section.

6.1 PREPARATION OF ENTITLEMENT AND COMPENSATION NORMS

A LUSIP Compensation Determination Committee (CDC) was established under the auspices of the LPC on 22 March 2002. The overall aims of the Committee were to:

- refine the principles and procedures detailed in the Entitlement Framework;
- determine and negotiate compensation norms and principles (for approval by the LPC) for non-beneficiary affected homesteads;
- prepare compensation guidelines (for approval by the LPC) for beneficiary affected homesteads, for use in the subsequent implementation of irrigation activities.

6.2 THE CDC WAS COMPOSED OF THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS:

- five LRC (Lubovane Resettlement Committee) members to represent homesteads facing involuntary resettlement;
- the Chairperson of the LPC and three further members to represent communities in the irrigation development area;
- representatives from SWADE (then SKPE) and the following GoS Ministries/ Departments: Natural Resources & Energy, Agriculture & Cooperatives, Finance and Economic Planning & Development;
- the Resettlement Consultants (ex officio members).

The compensation principles established by the CDC formed the basis for the establishment/adjustment of compensation rates for the various items detailed in the Entitlement Framework. The principles were finalised through a process of defining options, costing these, work-shopping and then agreeing on the principle and rate. This was summarised in the document “Entitlement Framework - Final (April 2003)” and then summarised in “Entitlement Framework - Summary Final Update (April 2003)”. Having defined the principles and procedures for determining rates, these have been updated to 2005 values. Rates will be adjusted annually for inflation according to the time of implementation.

6.3 CATEGORIES OF AFFECTED PERSONS

The project will affect homesteads that will lose their assets in different ways:

- Some homesteads will have to be moved from the project areas and resettled to new residential sites.
- Homesteads located in the irrigation areas should as far as possible remain where they are. However, the relocation of some of these homesteads to other nearby locations may be necessary for infrastructure or economic reasons. It is SWADE's stated policy to minimise resettlement in these areas.e proposed irrigation blocks of the project).
- Some homesteads will not have to relocate but would still lose some of their assets, for example arable land areas and fruit trees.

An important aim of the project is to ensure that homesteads that lose assets to the project also participate in the irrigation scheme. This is particularly important for the homesteads that will lose their homes and all or most of their cultivation land in the Lubovane reservoir area. The traditional authorities, project agents and community participation structures must ensure that these homesteads become *project beneficiaries* as far as possible – in other words that they participate in the irrigation scheme.

However, it may happen that not all the resettled homesteads or persons who lose assets to the project participate in the scheme. Because of this possibility, the project must take account of, and devise resettlement and compensation measures for the following types of affected homesteads:

- ***non-beneficiary resettlers*** – i.e. homesteads who must be moved because of the project and who will not participate in the irrigation development;
- ***beneficiary resettlers*** – i.e. homesteads who must be moved because of the project and who will participate in the irrigation development;
- ***non-displaced beneficiary homesteads*** – i.e. homesteads who lose assets but do not need to move, and who will participate in the irrigation scheme; and
- ***non-displaced, non-beneficiary homesteads*** - i.e. homesteads who lose assets but do not need to move, and who will not participate in the irrigation scheme.

Displaced homesteads (i.e. homesteads that must be relocated) will be grouped into the following categories:

- **Category 1A: Beneficiary - Bulk & Secondary Infrastructure.** Homesteads displaced by the bulk & secondary infrastructure and who become project beneficiaries, i.e. who participate in the irrigation development.

- **Category 1B: Non-Beneficiary - Bulk & Secondary Infrastructure.** Homesteads displaced by the bulk & secondary infrastructure who do not wish to become project beneficiaries.
- **Category 2A: Beneficiary - On-Farm Development.** Beneficiary homesteads that require resettlement from the irrigation blocks of their member irrigation institutions.
- **Category 2B: Non-Beneficiary - On-Farm Development.** Homesteads displaced by on-farm developments who do not wish to become project beneficiaries and who have been evaluated and approved as such by the Lubovane Planning Committee.

6.4 FUNDING OF ENTITLEMENTS

The funding of entitlements will vary depending on the affected homestead's project beneficiary status and the cause of displacement. The CDC recommended that the actual mix of financing sources for the various categories of entitlements should be along the following lines:

- The Government to assume prime responsibility for the financing of entitlements related to the construction of the bulk and secondary infrastructure (i.e. diversion weir, main and secondary canals, Lubovane Reservoir).
- Individual irrigation institutions to assume prime responsibility for the financing of entitlements related to the development of their respective irrigation blocks, and any resettlement or asset acquisition planned by the irrigation institution will be included in the loan application and Business Plan. Their financing responsibility will be as follows:
 - For Category 2A homesteads (i.e. those that are affected by or require resettlement from the irrigation blocks of their member irrigation institutions): Entitlements will be negotiated between the affected homestead and the concerned farmer's/irrigation organisation. In all instances, the project authorities will attend these negotiations to ensure fair treatment and uniformity in the compensation approach.
 - For Category 2B homesteads (i.e. those displaced by on-farm developments who do **not wish to become** project beneficiaries). These homesteads will be offered the same entitlements as Category 1A and Category 1B homesteads, as determined by the Lubove Resettlement Committee.

6.5 ELIGIBILITY

Some homesteads may wish to use the resettlement process to split into independent households. For example, a married son may wish to split from his parental homestead and establish his own homestead site. Since these processes may have implications for the disbursement of compensation, the CDC adopted the following resolution:

- The project will ensure that fair allocation is made for each affected household within the homestead. This allocation will detail the landholdings, buildings and other improvements of the homestead, including individual ownership as agreed between the various homestead members. A representative of the concerned Traditional Authority will be present during the asset verification exercise to ratify the agreements. Compensation certificates will be prepared and compensation payments made to the head of the homestead. The Traditional Authority has the responsibility to ensure equitable allocation to family members who have split.

It is also likely that conflict could arise over the compensation entitlements and claims of newly established homesteads in the project area. For example, a person may establish a residential

site in the canal area in the hope of gaining access to the project's compensation and support measures. To address this issue the CDC adopted the following resolution:

- The concerned Traditional Authority will be required to confirm any newly established homestead, as would occur according customarily law. Only new homesteads ratified in this manner will be considered for resettlement and compensation entitlements.

The CDC also agreed that a moratorium on further development, or a cut-off date for eligibility to entitlements, will be declared at an appropriate time. This was subsequently done by the LPC.

6.6 RESETTLEMENT OPTIONS

Two broad resettlement options need to be agreed, these are based on the Resettlement Policy:

- relocation within the project area; and
- free choice resettlement.

Relocation within the project area will be available to beneficiary and non-beneficiary resettlers, and entails:

- homesteads relocating individually to new sites that they have identified; or
- homesteads relocating as a group to a resettlement site in the project area.

Free Choice resettlement will be available to non-beneficiary (*Category 1B and 2B*) homesteads only, and entails resettlement to a new site identified by the homestead that is located outside both the homestead's chiefdom and the defined project area.

Homesteads selecting this option will receive a modified compensation package. The most important elements of the free choice compensation package are:

- Compensation will **not** be paid for any land losses, since it is assumed that the homestead would have made its own arrangements for land allocation in the new area of residence.
- Cash compensation will be paid for housing, structures and other improvements (pit latrine, fencing, etc.), as defined in **Section 6.7.3**.
- Cash compensation will be paid for fruit tree losses, as defined in **Section 6.7.2**.
- A cash allowance will be paid for the removal of personal belongings, to a maximum amount as determined during the implementation programme.
- An additional allowance to the value of 10% of the buildings and structures on the homestead site will be paid.

6.7 ENTITLEMENTS

6.7.1 Land

6.7.1.1 Swazi Nation Land – Rainfed

- a) All avenues will be explored by SWADE to ensure that homesteads that lose land to any project component become project beneficiaries through participation in the irrigation development or will benefit from participation through indirect means. In this way land losses will be replaced through the allocation of irrigated land in the Command Area on the basis of a negotiated irrigable landholding or some form of water right, not the traditional land-for-land principle. The allocation of replacement land in the irrigation development areas will be undertaken according to the rules and regulations of the irrigation/farmers' organisation but all homesteads losing land project infrastructure will receive direct compensation for land loss through development programmes, annuity or other investment initiatives. Direct cash compensation will only implemented as a last resort.
- b) **Non-beneficiary homesteads** who select the free choice option will forfeit all entitlements to land losses and agricultural re-establishment specified in this section, since it is taken that they would have made their own replacement land arrangements in their new residential areas.
- c) In the case of beneficiary homesteads displaced by the infrastructure (*Category 1B*), suitable interim measures may be necessary to support them from the time of their displacement or land loss until their participation in the irrigation scheme some time later. These measures could include one or a combination of the following:
 - i. as a first priority, the allocation of irrigable but currently non-cultivated land in their Chiefdom, for use as temporary rainfed fields while the irrigation scheme is being developed;
 - ii. preferential employment on the construction works;
 - iii. direct compensation for land lost (investment programmes, annuities, or cash as last resort);
 - iv. food packages or equivalent as interim measures.
- d) The replacement land requirements of non-beneficiary homesteads (*Category 1B and 2B*) will be for the entire landholding, including fallow land, and will be addressed in the following ways:
 - i. identification, through the Traditional Authority structure, of replacement land within the Chiefdom, to re-establish lost agricultural production capability;
 - ii. Should land not be available then the returns from cotton will be used to determine compensation for loss of rainfed arable land (according to the costs and incomes as agreed by the CDC). The values so determined could then be used for the implementation of land intensification measures, such as small irrigation schemes, to re-establish lost agricultural production levels. Cash compensation will only be considered as a last resort;
 - iii. Should land of similar potential and extent not be available but only land of smaller in extent or of possible lower potential, then affected homesteads will receive the following: (a) assistance with land clearing and preparation of the replacement land areas approved by SWADE; and (b) direct compensation for the original land area lost to the project through development programmes, investments and cash as a last report.
- e) All homesteads suffering land losses will be assisted with land preparation through one of the following measures:
 - i. the irrigation development, in the case of beneficiary homesteads (*Category 1A and 2A*); and

- ii. an agricultural support programme (bush clearing, land preparation and basal fertilizer inputs), in the case of non-beneficiary homesteads (*Category 1B and 2B*).

6.7.1.2 Swazi Nation Land – Irrigated Vegetable Gardens

- a) A schedule of rates and a representative crop mix have been identified by which vegetable gardens for own consumption will be valued. The value reflects production mainly for own consumption and thus refers to an area less than 0.2 ha per homestead. Larger areas will be based on valuation of rates for commercial lands.
- b) Cash compensation will only be paid for vegetable gardens should suitable replacement land not be available.

6.7.1.3 Private Land

- a) Compensation for private land will be based on market values for equivalent land, to be determined by registered land valuers. In the case where there is a standing crop, the commercial value of that crop will also be taken into consideration.
- b) The valuation will take account of any other negative impacts of the project, such as the subdivision of lands by the canal.

6.7.2 Standing Crops and Fruit Trees

- a) Construction of the civil works and implementation of irrigation farming will as far as possible be planned to allow for the harvesting of crops before land is acquired. Where crops cannot be harvested or the destruction of crops is unavoidable, cash compensation will be paid, based on the principles established by the CDC.
- b) Compensation will be paid for the loss of privately-owned fruit trees, but excluding wild fruit trees such as marula and guava, according to the following principles:
 - i. For Category 1A, 1B and 2B homesteads: This will include: a) two replacement seedlings/saplings, of the same or acceptable alternative, for every fruit tree lost, and b) Cash compensation will be paid for lost production, for the period between planting and full production, at the rates agreed by the CDC. These compensation rates would only be applicable to trees utilised for own consumption. All commercial production will be compensated at commercial rates as for private land.
 - ii. For Category 2A homesteads:

According to a negotiated agreement between the displaced homestead and the concerned irrigation/farmer's organisation.

6.7.3 Buildings, Structures and Other Land Improvements

6.7.3.1 Buildings

- a) Two housing compensation packages will be determined for resettlers: a full (replacement cost) package and “like-for-like” package.
- i. The full package will be for: homesteads displaced by the infrastructure, irrespective of whether they are project beneficiaries (Category 1A) or non-beneficiaries (Category 1B); and non-beneficiary homesteads displaced by on-farm developments (Category 2B). The housing entitlements of free choice homesteads will also be based on the full package. The full package will be based on a square meter rate using modern building materials, according to the items listed in Table 6-1.
- ii. The like-for-like package will be for beneficiary homesteads that require resettlement from the irrigation blocks of their member irrigation institutions (Category 2A). These homesteads will resettle of their own accord to improve the operation of their irrigation association, and therefore their own livelihoods and living standards. A “like-for-like” approach is therefore considered to be appropriate for these homesteads. The project authorities will attend all negotiations between these homesteads and their irrigation/farmer’s organisations to ensure that a uniform approach is followed.

Table 6-1: Replacement Housing Packages

Item	Replacement Housing Package	
	Non-Beneficiary: Bulk, Secondary & On-Farm Beneficiary: Bulk & Secondary	Beneficiary: On-Farm
Excavations	√	The principle to be used for on-farm beneficiary resettlement is “like for like”
Concrete foundations	√	
Plinting	√	
Filling	√	
Floor slab	√	
Door frames	√	
Windows	√	
Brick laying - window pane	√	
Brick laying - top of window	√	
Brick laying - roof height	√	
Roof timber	√	
Roof covering - corrugated iron	√	
Plaster	√	
Window panes	√	
Fit glass in windows	√	
Ceilings	√	
Floors	√	
Doors (hanged) with locks	√	
Flashing, guttering, etc.	√	
Painting	√	

b) Homesteads resettled from the bulk and secondary infrastructure areas, as well as non-beneficiary homesteads resettled from the irrigation development area (*Category 1A, 1B and 2B*), will receive the following additional housing entitlements: Based on experience in LUSIP 1 SWADE needs to have a clear strategy on how these will be distributed considering the problems faced in LUSIP1

- i. an appropriate, non-electric, energy-efficient stove;
- ii. fencing to enclose the new homestead plot;
- iii. a ventilated improved pit latrine (VIP);

a water tank and guttering for the harvesting of rain water.

Homesteads that have selected the free choice option will not be eligible for these four entitlements. However, they will be compensated for all items on their sites (including fencing, pit latrines and water tanks/guttering) at the time of the final asset verification exercise.

- c) The housing replacement packages will be provided as follows:
- i. The full replacement package will either be in cash or through the provision of replacement housing. For the cash option an owner-builder or owner-contractor approach will be followed, undertaken according to agreed standards to ensure proper use of compensation funds. Non-beneficiary homesteads that elect the free choice option will be compensated in cash only.

- ii. The like-for-like package will be provided according to a negotiated agreement between the displaced homestead and the concerned irrigation/farmer's organisation.
- d) Homesteads will be compensated for all other immovable structures and land improvements affected by project activities according to:
 - i. the principles established by the CDC, for homesteads resettled from the bulk and secondary infrastructure areas, as well as non-beneficiary homesteads resettled from the irrigation development area (Category 1A, 1B and 2B); or
 - ii. a negotiated agreement between the displaced homestead and the concerned irrigation/farmer's organisation, for beneficiary homesteads resettled from the irrigation development area (*Category 2A homesteads*).
- e) Homesteads will be allowed to retrieve moveable assets and will be assisted with the transportation of these items to their new residential sites. Non-beneficiary homesteads that elect the free choice option will not be assisted with transportation but will be paid a removal allowance, the amount of which will be determined at the time of resettlement.
- f) All *Category 1A, 1B and 2B* homesteads will be assisted with the preparation of their new residential sites (e.g. bush clearing or levelling where required). This would ideally be in the form of a cash payment for homesteads to undertake their own site preparation according to agreed environmental guidelines. *Category 2A* homesteads will be assisted according to a negotiated agreement between the displaced homestead and the concerned irrigation/farmer's organisation. Homesteads that have selected the free choice option will not be entitled to this assistance.
- g) An allowance for performing the homestead establishment ceremony will be paid as follows:
 - i. according to the rate established by the CDC, for homesteads resettled from the bulk and secondary infrastructure areas, as well as non-beneficiary homesteads resettled from the irrigation development area (Category 1A, 1B and 2A); or
 - ii. according to a negotiated agreement between the displaced homestead and the concerned irrigation/farmer's organisation, for beneficiary homesteads resettled from the irrigation development area (*Category 2A homesteads*).
- h) A basic principle is that resettler homesteads (other than those exercising the free choice option) will not be moved until their new houses are ready for occupation.

6.7.3.2 Structures

- a) Privately owned structures will be compensated on a cash basis based on the following materials and construction methods:
 - i. Drying lines will be replaced with two poles set 15m apart, cross piece and three wire strands.
 - ii. Maize grinder stand: A single timber pole sunk into the ground.
 - iii. Kraal: Constructed with treated timber poles and wire.
 - iv. Maize crib & shelter: Replaced with MOAC (conventional) crib.
 - v. Maize shelter: Timber poles with timber or corrugated iron roofing.
 - vi. Poultry nest platform: Elevated, constructed with timber and weaved grass nests
 - vii. Poultry shelter: Timber poles, mesh wire and roof of mesh wire, corrugated iron or wood.
 - viii. Bathing area: A reed and grass shelter, used as a bathing area.
 - ix. Working table (fixed): Constructed from timber.
 - x. Tank shelter: Corrugated iron roof on four poles, serving as shade **cover**.

- xi. Tank stand: Four timber poles with wooden platform.
- xii. Water pond: Gravel earth dam.
- xiii. Wind break: These are constructed with shrubs.
- xiv. Car port: Corrugated iron roof on four poles, serving as shade cover.
- xv. Other sheds and buildings: Timber pole structure with corrugated iron roof and sides.
- xvi. VIP pit latrine: Constructed to a standard design.
- xvii. Fencing: standard fence constructed of corner posts, steel hangers, steel poles and barbed wire).

6.7.4 Graves

- a) All affected graves will be treated in accordance with the wishes of the relatives of the deceased. These graves will be identified, in conjunction with the community participation structure and geo-referenced.
- b) Compensation payments will be made for the following items for each affected grave:
 - exhumation of the remains, including removal and proper replacement of tombstones;
 - digging of new grave; coffin; reed mat; shroud; blanket;
 - a 'wake fee/allowance', to allow for incidental expenses during the reburial ceremony.
- c) In addition, one sacrificial beast will be provided for every five homestead graves to be exhumed (e.g. a homestead with 5 affected graves will receive one sacrificial beast, a homestead with 10 affected graves will receive two sacrificial beasts).
- d) Government will be responsible for costs associated with the removal and reburial of affected graves from the infrastructure areas, and the Farmer's/Irrigation Associations for graves to be moved from their respective irrigation areas.

6.7.5 Businesses

Construction of the Phase 2 Bulk Infrastructure may impact on business enterprises. Although there are no businesses in the canal area, those in the canal periphery may be affected, because of a reduced customer base following the resettlement of homesteads. Any such impacts will be assessed in consultation with the affected person and the community participation structure in order to agree on mitigation requirements where necessary. These may include:

- i. development measures, as defined through a business plan, to support the continued functioning of the enterprise; or
- ii. relocation and re-establishment of the business at an appropriate resettlement site.

6.7.6 Community Services and Infrastructure

- a) LUSIP 2 will have significant impacts on communal resources such as livestock grazing and household utility resources (fuel wood, medicinal plants and other useful resources). These impacts will be permanent and affect people living in/adjacent to the Command Area. Since these losses cannot be replaced, the only way to mitigate this impact will be to explore, with affected communities, ways of reducing reliance on these resources. Detailed planning around land and natural resource use should therefore take place as part of project preparation, with the emphasis on sustainable use and conservation of a significantly reduced natural resource base. This planning

should take into account the alternative income-generating opportunities (benefits) resulting from implementation of LUSIP 2.

- b) Community infrastructure and services affected by project infrastructure will be replaced in areas identified in consultation with the concerned communities. For LUSIP Phase 2 this includes:
 - i. the Lusabeni Dip Tank at KaNgcamphalala Chiefdom;
 - ii. One soccer fields within the canal servitude at KaNgcamphalala Chiefdom.
- c) The need for additional mitigation measures (e.g. crossings at various points of the canal) to improve access to services/facilities should be assessed during construction phase.
- d) With the exception of non-beneficiary homesteads that elect the free choice option, the project will ensure that displaced homesteads have improved access to water supply at their new residential sites. Wherever possible, *Category 1A, 1B and 2B* homesteads will be resettled to areas that will allow linking up to an extension of existing communal water supplies (standpipes). SWADE is to facilitate the provision of water systems throughout the project area. Where an existing in-yard water supply system cannot be replaced, then cash compensation will be paid.

6.8 FINAL COSTING OF COMPENSATION RATES

The compensation rates defined for 2005 and updated to Mid- 2014 are summarised below:

Table 6-2: Summary of Compensation Rates (July 2005)

Item	Unit	Rate per unit
<u>Buildings</u>		
Building & material costs	m ²	3,029.71
Supporting Services	m ²	975.36
<u>Structures</u>		
Drying Lines	running meter	720.00
Fences	running meter	11.20
Grinder stand	Unit	196.00
Kraal - cattle	running meter	101.86
Kraal - goat	running meter	23.98
Maize crib	m ²	330.46
Nest platform	Unit	252.27
Pipelines	running meter	4.34
Poultry shelter	Unit	1,952.23
Tank shelter	Unit	660.95
Tank stand	Unit	285.60
Water pond	Unit	116.41
Water trench	Unit	0.00
Wind breaks	Unit	56.00
Cotton Pit	Unit	93.99
Pigsty	m ²	350.00
Graves	Unit	9,093.83

Item	Unit	Rate per unit
Garden - to be replaced as unit	Unit	0.00
Toilette - replaced with VIP	Unit	7,500.00
Carport	m ²	2,702.80
Working table	Unit	350.00
<u>Fruit Trees</u>		
Avocado	per tree	8,759.31
Banana	per tree	348.60
Grapefruit	per tree	2,516.68
Guava	per tree	1,339.45
Mango	per tree	1,141.40
Mulberry	per tree	548.02
Orange	per tree	2,516.68
Paw paw	per tree	570.94
Peach	per tree	685.73
Prickle Fruit	per tree	227.00
Other	per tree	126.00
Sapling replacement provision	per tree	63.00

6.9 SPECIAL PROVISIONS

6.9.1 Displacement Allowance for Free Choice Homesteads

Homesteads that select the free choice resettlement option will receive an allowance to the value of 10% of the buildings and structures on their residential sites.

6.9.2 Provision for Transport to New Sites

The project has a responsibility to ensure that all involuntary displaced homesteads and businesses are relocated in an orderly manner sufficiently in advance of any construction activities.

In addition to management and support functions that will be provided by SWADE, the project will be responsible for covering the costs of the physical movement of people, livestock, and other moveable assets. To this effect, a once-off cash shifting allowance will be provided to displaced homesteads and business owners. This allowance will be paid sufficiently in advance of actual evacuation dates and will be based on the physical size of the homestead/business to be relocated.

In some instances physical assistance (e.g. transport and labour), rather than a cash allowance, may be necessary; for instance, in the case of vulnerable households such as the elderly or disabled. The need for such assistance will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

6.9.3 Vulnerable Categories and Groups

The position of social categories and groups who, because of their social position, may be vulnerable to the changes brought about by the project or excluded from its associated

benefits (e.g. the elderly and disabled), will be monitored and remedial measures implemented where necessary.

6.9.4 **Host Communities**

Significant impact of resettler households on communities not benefiting from the project is not expected in the case of LUSIP 2, but should this occur then appropriate mitigation measures will be considered.

6.10 **DISPUTE RESOLUTION**

The resolution of homestead grievances will occur through the participation structure and the Traditional Authorities, as well as a Dispute Resolution Tribunal (DRT), by which terms of reference will be developed by SWADE.

6.11 **LIVELIHOOD RESTORATION**

6.11.1 **Introduction**

The Lower Usuthu smallholder Irrigation Project is primarily a project designed to develop smallholder irrigators on Swazi Nation Land. The main mechanism for the involvement of the project beneficiaries in the irrigation will be to participate as members of co-operatives or as shareholders in farming companies. The project design allows for all households that are located within the project area, which includes all resettled households, to participate in the irrigation development.

It is the stated aim of SWADE that all households should benefit from the primary irrigation development and it is expected that a significant amount of time and facilitation effort will be expended by the LUSIP 2 site office to ensure that this occurs.

As project facilitators however, SWADE will not be in a position to enforce total participation by all households and it is probable that in some instances some households may not get the opportunity to participate in the irrigation. With this possibility, the site office should develop a cascading package of benefits that will ensure that each and every one of the identified households will benefit from the project. In all instances, the resettled households will receive the primary effort from the LUSIP 2 site team in delivering these benefits.

6.11.2 **Package of benefits**

The proposed package of benefits includes the following:

6.11.2.1 **Training**

The main activity that will be undertaken by the site office will be training. The training that will be given will have three focus areas. The first area will focus on developing the organizational skills of the community and will develop skills that will be used in the formation of groups for business purposes. Life skills will also be imparted to the beneficiaries during this training phase. The second training focus areas will concentrate on the development of business skills. These skills will be used in development of business plans for the range of business opportunities that the project will realize. The third training focus area will be skills training and will focus on the skills required to run and manage the proposed new businesses.

Due to the fact that the resettled communities are the first discreet groups that the project will encounter, they must be among the first recipients of this training.

6.11.2.2 Access to Finance

One of the biggest limiting factors to the development of sustainable businesses in the project area is access to finance. LUSIP has a defined set of activities that will facilitate better access to finance among project beneficiaries for viable business projects. This access will be through ensuring that identified business opportunities are put to existing financiers in a form that allows easy evaluation due to the business training that the beneficiaries receive. Further, the project has an activity that specifically looks at developing an alternative financing infrastructure in the project area. This alternate structure will ensure that bankable projects proposed by resettled communities will be financed.

6.11.2.3 Project Development Business Opportunities

In the development phase of the project a number of short to medium term business opportunities will arise. These will range from sub-contracting opportunities through to opportunities created due to increased economic activity in the project area. In many instances, SWADE will be in a position to influence the beneficiaries resulting from these opportunities. Where this opportunity exists, the resettled communities must receive preference in realizing these opportunities.

SWADE must continue to work with the resettled communities to ensure that as many opportunities that come about as a result of the development are captured by the resettled communities.

6.11.2.4 Livelihood Improvement Using Water as a Catalyst

Experience has shown that the cornerstone of livelihood improvement among rural people is the provision of water at homestead level. This water could be used in three main ways to ensure that the lives of the people living in the homesteads improve. Firstly and possibly the most importantly, the water can be used for basic consumption and sanitation. Secondly the water could be used for ensuring food security and lastly the water could be used to generate income through commercial irrigated projects.

At LUSIP 2, all resettled households must be provided with potable water and sanitation as part of the resettlement compensation package. This will improve the quality of life of people who did not have access to clean water. The project will however need to guide and train the resettled homesteads in the production of food and in generating commercial projects. In some instances, water will also be made available at homestead level for food production and commercial projects. In all likelihood, this water will only be available to those households that are resettled not far from the canal. Those communities that are resettled far away from the canal will have access to this water via dedicated gardens adjacent to the canal but a distance from the household, this needs to be looked at carefully by the SWADE site office.

6.11.2.5 Food Production

Experience from other projects has indicated that an average homestead would be able to become substantially food secure by producing vegetables and maize through the year on 0.1-0.15 ha of land either adjacent to the homestead or in a separate communal vegetable garden. In order for the food production to be sustainable however, the following aspects should be considered:

- where possible some of the food should be sold locally or to hawkers in the area. This should enable the household to purchase the basic input supplies needed to maintain the vegetable garden. In the KDDP project for instance, this has been achieved by homesteads producing and selling green maize;
- households should in as far as possible be encouraged to participate in some other commercial activity; and
- access to a savings based micro-finance scheme can assist in assuring the sustainability of the food gardens

SWADE will facilitate the development and training that will be required to run and manage these food plots. Particular focus must initially be on the needs of the resettled communities.

6.11.2.6 Commercial Projects

The provision of water will also allow for the development of micro-commercial projects. These projects could either be developed individually or in groups. The primary aim of these projects will be income generation.

6.11.3 Conclusion

The resettled communities will have a number of different opportunities to ensure that they benefit from LUSIP. The focus of SWADE will be on ensuring that this benefit reaches them in two years after being resettled.

Although all fields that are affected by the canal will be compensated, opportunity exists to utilise the remaining portions of land on either side of the canal which can be negotiated with SWADE. The same applies to grazing land.

In addition to the above opportunities and associated development assistance, financial provision must also be included for the re-establishment of fields and food gardens where land is available. All homesteads losing land will receive substantial compensation for land lost to the project, which can be used to pursue the above development opportunities so as to replace cropping income or subsistence production on a sustainable basis.

7. RESETTLEMENT MEASURES

7.1 RESETTLEMENT OPTIONS

As stated in Section 6.6, two broad resettlement options exist: (a) relocation within the project area; and (b) free choice resettlement outside the project area. At present, all the homesteads have indicated that they would like to resettle within the project area. There are currently no group resettlement sites identified but homesteads will resettle individually along the canal. Resettlement Sites

7.1.1 Site Selection Process

A resettlement site selection process should be initiated as early as possible by the LUSIP 2 site office. The approach adopted in LUSIP 1 should be followed in a reiterative process:

- Consultation with the Chiefdom leadership – project staff should inform the leadership about resettlement implications and obligation of communicating with all affected homesteads.
- Interaction with the LDC/CDC - The CDC is both a representative committee of the Chiefdoms and also of the affected homesteads.
- Consultation with affected homesteads - The project staff, together with the CDC, conducted consultation meetings with all affected homesteads to explain to them the implications of the project and obtain their views on resettlement sites and means of defining these sites. The affected communities were also briefed on the entitlement framework.
- Reconfirmation with affected homesteads - After the evaluation of the sites, affected homesteads should be consulted again to reconfirm their acceptance of the site and boundaries as defined on a map.
- Formal confirmation of site allocation by Chief - The respective Chief must confirm the dimensions and allocation of the site in writing to the affected communities.
- Assessment of livelihood alternatives - The project team must make a final assessment of livelihood opportunities and requirements, such as water supply and soil suitability.

7.2 HOUSING PLAN

7.2.1 Housing Replacement

Construction of replacement housing can be undertaken according to the following methods:

- a) homesteads can choose to have their houses constructed by conventional construction (i.e. a Project-appointed contractor); or
- b) homesteads can choose to have their houses constructed by a contractor of their own choice; or

- c) homesteads can undertake the construction themselves (owner-builder).

For all options, debushing and terracing will be the responsibility of the Project. Debushing of homestead sites must be selective and as many trees as possible will be left undisturbed.

Experience has indicated that given the tight schedule in construction of the infrastructure, owner-builder construction must be properly managed and supervised. This option must be structured into four construction phases:

1. construction to foundation level;
2. construction to window level;
3. construction to roof level; and
4. construction of the roof and interior completion.

An advance payment through a system of coupons must be made to the owner-builder, after which progress payments/coupons will be made according to each construction phase.

7.2.2 Housing Design

Homestead representatives must participate extensively in the formulation of housing replacement options through the Community Development Committee, the Compensation Determination Committee as well as directly as affected households.

Homesteads must also define their individual layouts with the help of the project. Homestead Establishment

7.2.3 Sanitation

VIP toilets will be provided at each homestead site. The following guidelines will be followed:

- toilets should be located in positions selected to minimize the risk of surface or groundwater pollution;
- toilets should not be constructed in areas of perched water table, and pits should not be in the immediate vicinity of any water source;
- if a soak-away is decided on in the detailed design for the disposal of the liquid, then the pit must be constructed in suitable fully weathered sub-soils and not in soft rock;
- acceptable buffer distances should be determined on site once the final location of structures on the residential sites is determined.

Homesteads will also be assisted with the establishment of waste disposal sites, located to serve clusters of homesteads.

7.3 SOCIAL SERVICES AND FACILITIES

The affected soccer field and a dip tank must be relocated. The owners of the soccer field must arrange for a replacement site the same way as the homesteads in consultation with their

Traditional Authorities. The Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives will be contacted to supervise the construction of the replacement dip tank.

Affected graves will be exhumed and reburied at designated graveyards and the concerned Traditional Authorities have been requested to identify sites for the graveyards.

8. IMPLEMENTATION

As the project authority, SWADE will assume overall responsibility for the implementation and coordination of resettlement activities. Amongst others, this entails:

- implementation of procedures to minimise adverse social impacts throughout the project's planning, design and implementation phases;
- implementation of procedures for the recording of project-affected persons and their assets;
- ongoing consultation with project stakeholders and dissemination of project information;
- capacity-building initiatives to create a supportive environment for the implementation of resettlement activities; and
- co-ordination with government line agencies and non-governmental organisations to ensure delivery of mitigation measures, and to create and maintain linkages.

Project implementation, including implementation of the resettlement programme, will be managed and coordinated at two levels: the SWADE Site Office, and an institutional and participation structure.

8.1 LUSIP INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE

The institutional structure for LUSIP 2 is as follows:

- At the apex of the LUSIP structure is the Project Technical Committee (PTC). The PTC comprises of LUSIP stakeholders, Non-Government Organizations, representatives from Government, three members from the Lubovane Development Committee (LDC) for each of the LUSIP Chiefdoms and Private Companies.
- The next level is the Lubovane Development Committee (LDC), which consists of nine (9) members from each of the three (3) Chiefdoms. The LDC will have two subcommittees: the Resettlement Committee and a Subcommittee on Employment.
- Below the LDC are the Chiefdom Development Committees (on average 13 members), comprising of representatives from each Sigodzi in each of the Chiefdoms.
- The next level in the structure is the Sigodzi Development Committees.
- The traditional leadership structure operates alongside the LUSIP institutional structure. The Indvuna Yesigodzi will interact with the Sigodzi Development Committees, while the Inner Council members and Indvuna yemcuba will interact with the Chiefdom Development Committees.

8.2 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMME

A detailed resettlement implementation schedule, which details activities, responsibilities and timeframes, is included in ESIA. The resettlement implementation is linked to bulk infrastructure implementation schedule. Key activities are summarised below.

8.2.1.1 Site Finalisation

Final overall layouts are will be finalised for the Ngcamphalala affected homesteads by the canal. The resettlement sites for the individual homesteads that will be displaced by the canal network will not be far away from their original homesteads, this is encouraged so that affected homesteads are not resettled far away from the development areas. Site layouts for the Ngcamphalala homesteads will commence after the detailed assessment of the sites have been completed.

This task can be completed in 3 weeks and will be coordinated by SWADE LUSIP 2 team.

8.2.1.2 Homestead Layouts

Homestead layouts will be finalised following completion of the architect's concept designs. Designs and layouts for the homesteads relocating from the canal will be finalised first, followed by homesteads affected by the irrigation blocks.

This task can be completed in 2 months by architects and the LUSIP 2 team.

8.2.1.3 Livelihood Restoration

Development programmes (land-based, non land-based and livestock) will be finalised by LUSIP 2 team. The task is scheduled to continue from the moment homesteads are being resettled up until they are integrated in the agricultural development.

8.2.1.4 Graves

This task includes the finalisation of new Chiefdom graveyard sites and the exhumation and reburial of affected graves. The task is scheduled to occur well before the affected homesteads are resettled will be coordinated by LUSIP 2.

8.2.1.5 Resettlement Agreements

This task entails the formalisation of resettlement agreements with each resettler homestead, including compensation packages and formal sign-off procedures. Resettlement agreements and sign-offs must be completed before homesteads are resettled

8.2.1.6 Homestead Construction

This task entails the physical construction of replacement housing, commencing with homesteads that will relocate from the start of the canal. This will follow the schedule of the bulk infrastructure. Initial activities include the preparation of tender documentation and the appointment of a construction contractor/supervisor.

9. COST ESTIMATES

9.1 INTRODUCTION

All affected assets have been assessed and surveyed to obtain an asset inventory for each affected homestead. This chapter provides the final cost estimates for compensation due to affected homesteads as well as the ancillary mitigation programmes identified in the Entitlement Framework and other development initiatives defined by SWADE.

9.2 RATES USED IN VALUATIONS

The principles by which rates are to be determined are defined by the Compensation Determination Committee (CDC). The CDC was established under the auspices of the LPC on 22 March 2002 and completed their task in April 2003 as is summarised in the report, "Entitlement Framework - Summary Final Update (April 2003)".

The approach to the determination of the rates was initially based on the rates defined for the Maguga Dam Resettlement project and LUSIP 1 in 2005 and then updated for LUSIP 2 to mid-2014. Further details are provided in Section 6 – Compensation and Livelihood Restoration. Overall, these rates can be considered generous and so will assist in reducing the impacts of resettlement.

9.3 COMPENSATION PACKAGES

Package B is applicable to resettlement within irrigation areas undertaken by Farmers Organisations on a "like for like" basis and so has not been included as a government cost.

Final costs have now been determined and being prepared for final agreement with the affected homesteads. The findings are summarised in the section below:

9.3.1 Summary of Findings

9.3.1.1 Land

Most land affected is that within SNL land areas with sections of the Canal running through the MOAC farm (Manyonaneni Sisa Ranch). The respective areas and total value are summarised in the table below.

Table 9-1: Summary of Compensation for Land

Land	Total Area (ha)	Value
Subsistence & Smallholder lands (SNL)	41.64	546,816.46
Commercial lands (TDL)	0	0
Total		546,816.46

[Note: Areas to be verified]

9.3.1.2 Homesteads, Structures and Businesses

Homesteads include residential structures, kitchens and related buildings. Structures include such items as drying lines, fences, grinder stands, kraals (cattle and goat), maize crib, nest platform, pipelines, poultry shelter, tank shelter, tank stand, water pond, water trench, wind breaks, cotton pit and pigsty.

The average value of replacing the buildings of a homestead is E 347,507.74 and the average value of structures is E 19,016.00.

The numbers and values for homesteads, structures and businesses are summarised in Table 9-2:

Table 9-2: Summary of Compensation Provisions for Fixed Assets

Item	No. of units	Total
Compensation Homesteads (Package A)	22	10,524,755.95
VIP Toilets	22	165,000.00
Dip Tanks	1	158,000.00
Graves	54	491,066.60
Soccer fields	1	21,128.00
Compensation Package B	21	9,647,012.11
Dip Tanks (On Farm)	2	316,800.00
Soccer Fields (On Farm)	3	63,385.71
Total		21,387,148.37

9.3.1.3 Other Losses and Assets

According to the Entitlement Framework, the compensation package is to include provision for other losses and assets to be replaced. These include provisions for:

- land preparation and base fertilizer for the first agricultural season;
- provision for food packages should replacement lands or investment programmes not be ready
- provision for water reticulation, fences and gardens at the site of relocation;
- an improved latrine system, such as VIP toilets;
- an improved wood burning stove;
- provision for transport to the new site of preference;
- grave relocation and re-interment.

Development programmes are planned by SWADE to reduce the impact of the loss of communal grazing and so are not specified here. Development proposals and demonstration units will first be implemented in the resettlement areas.

In addition to the above, provision has been made for the following:

- Graves – in addition to graves identified in the assets survey, further provision is made for graves that may have to be moved as a result of secondary infrastructure development that are the responsibility of the government.
- Contingency and provision for interim mitigation measures – a nominal provision of 10% is included to finance unexpected items as well as measures that may be necessary to cover homesteads, which may require additional assistance. This could, for example, include homesteads that may need to move early in the development process and then have to wait years before expected benefits are derived.

9.4 TOTAL COMPENSATION COSTS

A summary of total compensation costs is provided in Table 9-3.

Table 9-3: Total Compensation Costs

Item	Cost
Structures (Canal and On- Farm)	20,171,768.00
Other Assets	1,382,411.65
Contingency (10%)	2,155,417.99
Total	23,709,597.68
Projected to mid 2014 values	25,132,173.54

9.5 ITEMS NOT COSTED

Provision is not included in the above table for the following:

- resettlement planning & implementation costs (Resettlement Unit and consultants);
- mitigation of communal resources(e.g. securing of alternative grazing lands);
- final design costs;
- monitoring & evaluation costs;
- government or parastatal administration costs (including administration of contracts);
- costs to be borne by the farmers' organisations in the development of irrigation blocks and other development areas;

Table: Costs of Homesteads and Structures to be Relocated and other Provisions

Items	Number	Average Rate	Total
Structures			
Compensation Package A			
Homesteads – Building	22	347,507.74	7,645,170.21
- Support Services	22	111,873.79	2,461,223.42
- Structures	22	19,016.47	418,363.32
Other Assets			
Graves	54	9,093.83	491,066.60
Dip-tank	1	158,400.00	158,400.00
Soccer Fields	1	21,128.57	21,128.57
VIP Toilets	22	7,500.00	165,000.00
Fields	41.64ha	13,132.60	546,816.48
Compensation – Package B (On Farm)			
Homesteads – Buildings	21	347,507.74	7,297,662.48
- Support Services	21	111,873.79	2,349,349.63
Sub-total			21,554,179.71
Contingency / Provision for Interim Measures	10%		2,155,417.97
Total			23,709,597.68

Note: Items not included – RAP planning costs, Communal mitigation, Monitoring & Government Administration Costs

10. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The project has an obligation to ensure that resettled homesteads regain, and preferably improve upon, their living standards. The measures detailed in the Resettlement Plan are designed to meet this obligation. In turn, the implementation of these measures and the extent to which objectives are being met, require proper checking and assessment. A monitoring and evaluation programme will accordingly be implemented to record and assess project inputs and the number of persons affected and compensated; and to confirm that former subsistence levels and living standards are being re-established.

The range of resettlement-related activities and issues that would therefore have to be recorded, monitored and evaluated includes:

- asset acquisition and compensation;
- preparation of resettlement sites;
- construction of replacement housing;
- reestablishment of displaced households and business enterprises;
- reaction of severely affected households, in particular, to resettlement and compensation packages; and
- re-establishment of income levels.

10.1 PARAMETERS

The overall aim of the monitoring programme will be to measure the extent to which the goals of the Resettlement Plan have been achieved. Indicators and targets will be established by SWADE, in consultation with representatives of the affected communities and other key stakeholders. Indicators are usually grouped into the following categories:

- Input indicators – measure the resources (financial, physical and human) allocated for the attainment of resettlement and livelihood restoration goals.
- Output indicators – measure the services/goods and activities produced by the inputs. Examples include compensation disbursements for acquired assets, preparation resettlement sites and allocation of residential plots, and the construction of replacement services/facilities (e.g. school).
- Outcome indicators – measure the extent to which the outputs are accessible and used, as well as how they are used. They also measure levels of satisfaction with services and activities produced by the inputs. Examples include the ways in which compensation was used by recipients, access to community development or micro-credit funds, changes to schools enrolment figures in resettlement areas, and changing local attitudes to project implementation. Although not measures of well-being (i.e. livelihood restoration) in themselves, they are key determinants of well-being.
- Impact indicators – measure the key dimensions of livelihood restoration and well-being so as to establish whether the goals of the Resettlement Plan have been achieved. Examples are restoration and diversification of income levels across different social categories, the sustainability of income-generating activities and changes in literacy levels.

- Process indicators – process indicators are often included in a monitoring programme to measure and assess implementation processes. Examples are the processes by which indicators and targets were established, the functioning of liaison/participation structures, the levels of representation of different social categories/interest groups and the processes by which conflicts and disputes are resolved.⁷

Indicators will be established for the resettlement programme as a whole. Indicators will also be disaggregated to ensure that geographical and social variables are properly accounted for. The following are examples of the variables to be accommodated in the monitoring programme:

- different resettlement areas;
- specific social categories;
- gender and age;
- income and asset ownership level.

Appendix 3 contains examples of indicators to be established for the monitoring of resettlement implementation and livelihood restoration.

SWADE will undertake preparatory activities for the implementation of the monitoring programme. Important preliminary activities will be:

- establishment of a monitoring management system, including a monitoring database that is linked to available demographic and resettlement databases;
- early training and capacity-building exercises to prepare communities for participation in the monitoring programme; and
- establishment of indicators and targets in conjunction with community structures.

10.2 MONITORING FRAMEWORK

The monitoring programme will have three broad components:

- performance monitoring;
- impact monitoring; and
- a completion audit.

SWADE will plan, manage and supervise all project monitoring activities.

10.2.1 Performance Monitoring

SWADE will coordinate the project's performance monitoring system. Performance monitoring will measure progress with resettlement and livelihood restoration against scheduled actions and milestones. Input and output indicators associated with performance milestones will be monitored. Examples of input and output indicators are:

- appointment of staff and provision of logistical support to resettlement officials;
- establishment and functioning of community structures;
- number and success of public meetings and consultations;

⁷ World Bank, 2004.

- completion of census and socio-economic surveys;
- completion of site identification and selection process;
- establishment of required institutional structures;
- operation of compensation, grievance and other necessary procedures;
- disbursement of compensation payments;
- acquisition of alternative land for resettler households;
- construction of household and related infrastructure.;
- replacement of community/social infrastructure and services;
- physical relocation of displaced persons;
- provision of reestablishment assistance to resettlers;
- Compilation/submission of monitoring and evaluation reports.

Internal monthly monitoring reports will be compiled by SWADE, while formal monitoring reports will be prepared on a quarterly basis for distribution to relevant stakeholders.

10.2.2 Impact Monitoring

Impact monitoring will focus on the effectiveness of resettlement and livelihood restoration measures, the identification of constraints and the recommendation of any corrective measures that may be necessary. While the internal monitoring reports will be a source of information, impact monitoring will require the generation of new data to compare against pre-displacement (baseline) conditions. Data generation will occur at two levels:

- at the level of households and businesses, through the use of quantitative (standardised) socio-economic and health survey instruments;
- at group/community level, through the use of qualitative (participatory) monitoring and evaluation techniques.

SWADE will be responsible for impact monitoring and may outsource components of the impact monitoring programme to qualified local agencies. Impact monitoring will be conducted on an annual basis.

10.2.3 Standardised (Quantitative) Monitoring

It will be important to monitor the changing socio-economic status of displaced persons. Socio-economic status will be tracked against baseline conditions of the population prior to resettlement. A number of simple, objectively verifiable quantitative indicators will be established for measuring the impact of physical relocation on the health and welfare of the displaced population. The following are examples of quantitative (impact-related) indicators that will be monitored:

10.2.4 Social Impact:

- demographic changes (e.g. changes to residential status of household members);
- education levels (e.g. school enrolment);
- changes to status of women, children and vulnerable groups;
- changes to land use and tenure patterns, and associated impacts.

10.2.5 Economic Impact:

- employment levels;
- crop output and production costs;
- household asset profiles;
- landholding sizes;
- security of tenure of affected households;
- income and expenditure levels, and consumption patterns;
- changes to livestock farming practices;
- success of livelihood restoration initiatives.

10.2.6 Health Impact:

- birth rate, death rate, infant mortality rate;
- incidence of communicable and preventable diseases (e.g. diarrhoea, HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis);
- access to primary and other health care;
- access to potable water;
- changes to nutritional status of households.

10.2.7 Participatory (Qualitative) Monitoring

A community-based Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) programme will be implemented to gauge the effectiveness of resettlement measures in meeting the needs of displaced households. The value of participatory monitoring and evaluation is that it involves affected persons (as the key actors) in the collective examination and assessment of resettlement implementation processes and outcomes. PME is action-oriented and seeks to build local capacity by:

- providing project-affected persons the opportunity to reflect on the progress with/obstacles in resettlement implementation and livelihood restoration;
- generating knowledge that informs practice and leads to corrective actions;
- providing project-affected persons with the tools to transform their environment (Coupal 1998).

A facilitator (SWADE or local agency) will undertake the Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation PME programme. The facilitator will assist affected communities to:

- develop their own criteria for acceptable standards of living;
- assess their pre-project (baseline) standard of living in terms of their own criteria;
- monitor their own progress towards recovering their pre-Project standard of living;
- evaluate the effectiveness of mitigation measures; and
- develop and communicate their own solutions to outstanding problems.

The outcome of this process would be an assessment of affected persons' attitudes, perceptions, views and fears regarding both general and specific elements of the resettlement implementation and livelihood restoration process. Given the participatory nature of this type of monitoring, there would be a continual process of learning, with new ideas and concerns integrated and incorporated into the implementation process.

PME will utilise qualitative indicators identified in consultation with the full range of affected groups/social categories. The following are examples of broad qualitative indicators that would be generated and used during PME exercises:

- attitudes to key resettlement initiatives (e.g. adequacy of compensation);
- perceptions and suggestions relating to negative project impacts;
- perceptions and suggestions relating to positive project impacts (e.g. access to services);
- disturbances to social practices and fabric (e.g. influx of job seekers);
- pressure on the work of local authorities;
- satisfaction with the consultation and participation process;
- host community reaction and concerns regarding presence of resettled households.

An inclusive problem-solving approach will be followed, using local experiences and realities as the basis for solutions to implementation problems and constraints.

10.2.8 External Evaluation

An Environmental Review Panel will provide guidance to the project's resettlement programme. Comprising of specialists with expertise in resettlement, development and environmental processes and practises, the Panel undertakes overall evaluations of the resettlement and livelihood restoration work being done under the project. Amongst others, this entails:

- examining internal monitoring reports as well as quantitative and qualitative socio-economic monitoring reports;
- visiting resettlement sites and consulting the affected population on a random basis to verify the success of the resettlement implementation process;
- evaluating project institutions, including capacity and operating constraints;
- focusing on the project's progress with providing beneficial resettlement and management;
- analysing budgets and expenditure in relation to milestones and realities on the ground;
- advising SWADE and affected communities of any emergent issues, together with recommendations on how to address issues and improve the practices, focus and orientation of the resettlement programme.

In addition to the various indicators assessed by the other forms of monitoring listed above, the Panel also considers process and sustainability indicators. Examples are listed below:
Process:

- commitment and capacity of the project agency (e.g. funding, staffing, transparency);

10.2.9 Capacity of government and other a Sustainability:

- degree of autonomy of affected community leadership structures;
- sustainability of livelihood restoration initiatives; emergence of unsustainable dependencies;
- sustainability of resource utilisation patterns in the project and host areas.

10.2.10 Completion Audit

At the end of the resettlement programme a completion audit must be undertaken by an independent agency. The overall aim of the audit will be to verify that resettlement and livelihood

restoration activities have undertaken in compliance with the objectives and principles of the Resettlement Plan. Specific aims of the audit will be to:

- confirm that all physical inputs specified in the Resettlement Plan (e.g. compensation, relocation assistance, livelihood restoration assistance) have been delivered
- confirm all outputs achieved under the resettlement programme; and
- assess whether the outcomes of the resettlement programme have had the desired beneficial impacts.

An important aim of the audit will be to allow SWADE to sign-off its responsibility for compensation, resettlement and livelihood restoration. The audit will therefore also describe any outstanding issues that require attention prior to the closing of the project's resettlement and livelihood restoration programme.

- agencies to fulfil their respective roles;
- processes used to identify and resolve grievances and disputes;
- appropriateness of the consultation and participation process

APPENDIX 1 : LIST OF AFFECTED HOMESTEADS

Name	Chiefdom	Current Sigodzi	Category	Contact Number
Christopher Stewart (kaLizzy)	Ngcamphalala	Lusabeni	Displaced	76895566
Robert Sithole	Ngcamphalala	Lusabeni	Displaced	76078012
Thomas Muntu Fakudze	Ngcamphalala	Lusabeni	Displaced	76954713
Alfred Sacolo	Ngcamphalala	Phafeni	Displaced	76367678
Maltha Ntombifuthi Mabuyakhulu	Ngcamphalala	Phafeni	Displaced	76450589
Sazi Wisey Ngcamphalala	Ngcamphalala	Phafeni	Displaced	76127052
Tovu Mphenguli Dlamini (laTsabedze)	Ngcamphalala	Phafeni	Displaced	76275750
Tovu Mphenguli Dlamini (laShongwe)	Ngcamphalala	Phafeni	Displaced	76275750
Agrippa Hlekwako Dlamini	Ngcamphalala	Phafeni	Displaced	76229375
Annah Nonhlanhla Ngcamphalala	Ngcamphalala	Phafeni	Displaced	76644621
Jerome Richard Mdvoti	Ngcamphalala	Mahlabaneni	Displaced	76703073
Majezi Amos Mbhamali	Ngcamphalala	Mahlabaneni	Displaced	76364575
Phathi Matthew Mbhamali	Ngcamphalala	Mahlabaneni	Displaced	76245875
Phuzingwebu Elijah Simelane	Ngcamphalala	Lusabeni	Displaced	76313487
Agnes Shabangu	Ngcamphalala	Lusabeni	Displaced	76171560
Phumelela Donald Simelane	Ngcamphalala	Lusabeni	Displaced	76351643
Thembinkosi Sithole	Ngcamphalala	Lusabeni	Displaced	
Manyazini Mkhweli Dlamini	Ngcamphalala	Lusabeni	Displaced	
Thabsile Shongwe	Ngcamphalala	Phafeni	Displaced	
Jethro Mthombo	Ngcamphalala	Lusabeni	Non-displaced	
Mthini Simelane	Ngcamphalala	Lusabeni	Non-displaced	
Mashayina Simelane	Ngcamphalala	Lusabeni	Non-displaced	
Mveli Matsenjwa	Ngcamphalala	Lusabeni	Non-displaced	
Thomas Fakudze	Ngcamphalala	Lusabeni	Non-displaced	
Douglas	Mngometulu	Gangakhulu	Non-displaced	

Mngometulu				
Dumsani Mngometulu	Mngometulu	Gangakhulu	Non-displaced	
Zephania Matsebula	Mngometulu	Gangakhulu	Non-displaced	
Jimson Themba Mngometulu	Mngometulu	Gangakhulu	Non-displaced	
Mandla Msane	Mngometulu	Gangakhulu	Non-displaced	
Msweli Mngometulu	Mngometulu	Gangakhulu	Non-displaced	
Juliet Ngcamphalala	Mngometulu	Gangakhulu	Non-displaced	
Thoko Msane	Mngometulu	Gangakhulu	Non-displaced	
Bheki Msane	Mngometulu	Gangakhulu	Non-displaced	
Esther Mngometulu	Mngometulu	Gangakhulu	Non-displaced	
Tryphina Mngometulu	Mngometulu	Gangakhulu	Non-displaced	
Lothi Mamba	Mngometulu	Gangakhulu	Non-displaced	
John Mngometulu	Mngometulu	Gangakhulu	Non-displaced	
Constance Mngometulu	Mngometulu	Gangakhulu	Non-displaced	
Jabulani Mngometulu	Mngometulu	Gangakhulu	Non-displaced	
Joseph Mngometulu	Mngometulu	Gangakhulu	Non-displaced	
Mandla Msane	Mngometulu	Gangakhulu	Non-displaced	

APPENDIX 2 : SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY INTERACTIONS

NO	DATE	AREA	SIGODZI	PURPOSE
1	25/05/2012	Big Bend LUSIP 2		Introduce resettlement consultant to LDC members
2	28/05/2012	Ngcamphalala	Ngcamphalala	Introduce resettlement consultant to CDC members
3	29/05/2012	Matsenjwa	Matsenjwa	Introduce resettlement consultant to CDC members
4	30/05/2012	Mngomentulu	Mngomentulu	Introduce resettlement consultant to CDC members
5	04/06/2012	Ngcamphalala	Ngcamphalala	Progress reporting on Asset survey, graves survey and field survey.
6	05/06/2012	Matsenjwa	Matsenjwa	Progress reporting on Asset survey, graves survey and field survey.
7	07/06/2012	Mngomentulu	Mngomentulu	Progress reporting on Asset survey, graves survey and field survey.
8	08/06/2012	Ngcamphalala	Ngcamphalala	Entitlement framework workshop
9	09/06/2012	Matsenjwa	Matsenjwa	Entitlement framework workshop
10	11/06/2012	Mngomentulu	Mngomentulu	Entitlement framework workshop
11	12/05/2012	Ngcamphalala	Ngcamphalala	GPS homesteads within Irrigation Blocks and inform them that resettlement for them will be decided by On Farm Schemes and SWADE
12	16/05/2012	Matsenjwa	Matsenjwa	GPS homesteads within Irrigation Blocks and inform them that resettlement for them will be decided by On Farm Schemes and SWADE
13	19/05/2012	Mngomentulu	Mngomentulu	GPS homesteads within Irrigation Blocks and inform them that resettlement for them will be decided by On Farm Schemes and SWADE
14	21/05/2012	Ngcamphalala	Ngcamphalala	Discuss issues on resettlement sites with inner council
15	12/06/2012	Ngcamphalala	Ngcamphalala	RAP sensitization on impacts and discussions on compensation rates
16	14/06/2012	Matsenjwa	Matsenjwa	RAP sensitization on impacts and discussions on compensation rates
17	02/07/2012	Mngomentulu	Mngomentulu	RAP sensitization on impacts and discussions on compensation rates

APPENDIX 3 : KEY MONITORING INDICATORS AND VARIABLES

NO	DATE	AREA	SIGODZI	PURPOSE
1	25/05/2012	Big Bend LUSIP 2		Introduce resettlement consultant to LDC members
2	28/05/2012	Ngcamphalala	Ngcamphalala	Introduce resettlement consultant to CDC members
3	29/05/2012	Matsenjwa	Matsenjwa	Introduce resettlement consultant to CDC members
4	30/05/2012	Mngomentulu	Mngomentulu	Introduce resettlement consultant to CDC members
5	04/06/2012	Ngcamphalala	Ngcamphalala	Progress reporting on Asset survey, graves survey and field survey.
6	05/06/2012	Matsenjwa	Matsenjwa	Progress reporting on Asset survey, graves survey and field survey.
7	07/06/2012	Mngomentulu	Mngomentulu	Progress reporting on Asset survey, graves survey and field survey.
8	08/06/2012	Ngcamphalala	Ngcamphalala	Entitlement framework workshop
9	09/06/2012	Matsenjwa	Matsenjwa	Entitlement framework workshop
10	11/06/2012	Mngomentulu	Mngomentulu	Entitlement framework workshop
11	12/05/2012	Ngcamphalala	Ngcamphalala	GPS homesteads within Irrigation Blocks and inform them that resettlement for them will be decided by On Farm Schemes and SWADE
12	16/05/2012	Matsenjwa	Matsenjwa	GPS homesteads within Irrigation Blocks and inform them that resettlement for them will be decided by On Farm Schemes and SWADE
13	19/05/2012	Mngomentulu	Mngomentulu	GPS homesteads within Irrigation Blocks and inform them that resettlement for them will be decided by On Farm Schemes and SWADE
14	21/05/2012	Ngcamphalala	Ngcamphalala	Discuss issues on resettlement sites with inner council
15	12/06/2012	Ngcamphalala	Ngcamphalala	RAP sensitization on impacts and discussions on compensation rates
16	14/06/2012	Matsenjwa	Matsenjwa	RAP sensitization on impacts and discussions on compensation rates
17	02/07/2012	Mngomentulu	Mngomentulu	RAP sensitization on impacts and discussions on compensation rates