

The cover features three large, overlapping blue circles of varying sizes and shades, arranged in a descending diagonal line from the top right towards the bottom right. Two thin, light blue lines intersect at the top left and extend diagonally across the page, framing the central text.

SERBIA CORRIDOR X HIGHWAY PROJECT

**RESETTLEMENT ACTION PLAN
(For the E 80 Motorway Section - Dimitrovgrad Bypass)**



**PUBLIC ENTERPRISE
ROADS OF SERBIA**

April, 2010

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	6
ACHAPTER I – INTRODUCTION	9
1.1 Background	9
1.2 Objectives of RAP	9
1.3 Scope of RAP	9
1.4 Social Impact Assessment	10
1.5 Nature of Impacts:	10
1.6 Zone of Impact	11
CHAPTER II – LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND RESETTLEMENT POLICY PROVISIONS	13
2.1 Legal process for Expropriation	13
2.2 Expropriation Process followed for Dimitrovgrad bypass	13
2.3 Resettlement Policy provisions.....	14
2.4 Institutional framework	15
CHAPTER III – EXPROPRIATION AND COMPENSATION PAYMENT	17
3.1 Introduction	17
3.2 Expropriation Process	17
3.3 Compensation cost for standing crops etc	17
3.4 Structures and property in the zone of the Dimitrovgrad Bypass.....	18
3.5 Expropriation in Phase-II.....	19
3.6 Additional Support	19
3.7 Identification of Impact categories.....	20
CHAPTER IV – SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND BASELINE SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS	21
4.1 Social Impact Assessment.....	21
4.2 Methodology followed for Social impact assesment	21
4.3 Socio-economic status of Dimitrovgrad Municipality.....	22
4.4 Socio-economic Status of PAPs.....	23
4.5 Demographic characteristics.....	24
4.6 Loss of land, structures and businesses.....	24
4.7 Income and occupation.....	25
4.8 Expenditure pattern.....	26
4.9 Indebtnes	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.10 Household assets	26

4.11	Ways of spending Expropriation compensation	26
4.12	Self-perception of socio-economic position	27
4.13	Interest in training and certification programs.....	27
4.14	Assessment of Overall living conditions of PAP	27
4.15	Assesment of affected Vulnerble households proposed additional Assistance.....	27
4.16	Positive effects of constructing the Dimitrovgrad Bypass.....	28
4.17	Consultations and Community Participation	28
4.19	Summary of key findings of consultation.	30
	CHAPTER V – IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS.....	32
5.1	Institutional Arrangements	32
5.3	Impact Monitoring	34
5.4	Impact evaluation	34
5.5	Procedure of Grievance mechanism.....	35
5.6	Principles to treat Complaints.....	35
5.7	Record of complaint and appeal and Follow up Feedback.....	35
5.8	Administering the payment of Compensation and R&R assistance	35
5.9	Income restoration Measures.....	35
5.10	Dealing with Temporary Impacts/additional impacts during construction.....	36
5.11	Data base management	36
5.12	Disclosures	36
5.13	Coordination with Civil works and certification.....	36
5.14	Budget and costs.....	36
5.15	Implementation schedule	37
5.16	Monitoring and Evaluation	37
5.17	Concurrent Evaluation	38
5.18	Additional assistance	38
5.20	Additional assistance for PAP losing business, commercial space	39
	Bibliography.....	40
	ANNEXURES.....	41
	ANNEX I – Table with data from the poll conducted in November 2009 in Dimitrovgrad	42
	ANNEX II - Poll questionnaire	43
	ANNEX III - Tables Valuation of compensation for losses	46
	ANNEX IV - List of resolved cases – DIMITROVGRAD	51

ANNEXURE V - Entitlement Matrix.....	59
ANNEXURE VI – Nature of impact	61
ANNEXURE VII.....	62
ANNEXURE VIII – Poll 2009.....	63
ANNEXURE IX - List of grievances and its outcome.....	64

ABBREVIATIONS

CLEIA	CORRIDOR LEVEL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESMENT
EIA	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESMENT
GC	GRIEVANCE COMISSION
K 10 doo	KORIDOR 10 DRUŠTVO S OGRANIČENOM ODGOVORNOŠĆU
K 10 LLC	KORIDOR 10 LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
MOE	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
PAP	PROJECT AFFECTED PERSON
PERS	PUBLIC ENTERPRISE ROADS OF SERBIA
RPF	RESETTLEMENT POLICY FRAMEWORK
RSD	REPUBLIC SERBIA DINARS
SIA	SOCIAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

Executive Summary

The Resettlement Action plan is a document the preparation of which is determined by the Resettlement Policy Framework. The objective of this document is the protection of Project affected person (PAP), fulfillment of international obligations, as well as a greater extent to transparency of the expropriation process.

The RAP is an information-gathering and analytical process that helps to design development that has least impact on affected communities. Its objectives are to evaluate all physical or economic impacts, displacement, or temporary or permanent loss of assets or facilities, that may be experienced by Project affected communities. It thus identifies people affected by the Project, the nature and the degree of the impact on them, measures taken to minimize the effects.

In line with similar projects implemented in Serbia, construction is expected to start after contract signing following international competitive tendering. Pre construction activities associated with design work include soil investigations and detailed survey of the alignment. Actual mobilization for construction work will follow within 3 months from the time the detailed design is finished. The mobilization period includes activities for preparation of material storage areas, camps water, power, communication and other site facilities.

Most works will proceed during the entire year. The project is planned to be completed within 24 months from commencement of works.

Land acquisition and resettlement widely involve many aspects and relate excessively to benefit PAP, thus during the implementation PAP complaint and grievances on the resettlement and compensation are inevitable to occur. In order to solve successfully the complaint and/or grievance, PERS has established an independent body according to the RPF, to precede the grievances fairly and effectively, to ensure the smooth implementation of resettlement and land acquisition.

The Beneficiary of Expropriation PERS, on behalf of the implementation entity K10doo will monitor the implementation of the resettlement processes, both through internal, official institutional arrangements, as well as by independent, external consultant to be appointed by implementing entity. The external monitoring and evaluation consultant will be appointed prior to construction starting on this section.

The Government of the Republic of Serbia wants to develop and complete the core road infrastructure on Corridor X within the next 4 years. The objective is to facilitate sustainable economic development and ensure that the country capitalizes on its geographical position to continue its development as a key transit country on the Trans-European Network. The Government of the Republic of Serbia requested the assistance of the World Bank (WB) to lead the preparation and contribute to the financing of a program to develop the two southern sections of Corridor X.

The total cost of the World Bank Corridor X Highway project, in a parallel financed contribution to the total program, is EUR 298.5 million (US\$ 388 million equivalent) which will be co-financed with the Government of Serbia. In addition, two other International Financing Institutions, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), and the European Investment Bank (EIB), (hereafter referred to collectively as the IFIs), and one bilateral donor, the Hellenic Plan for the Economic Reconstruction of the Balkans (hereafter referred to as HiPERB) have confirmed their commitment to provide parallel financing to a broader Corridor X program to construct 160 km of motorway at a provisional cost estimate of Euros 1.3 billion: EBRD has provisionally committed to lend EUR 150 million for the E 80, and the EIB has provisionally committed to lend up to EUR 600

million for the E 80 and the E 75, and Greece will grant EUR 100 million under HiPERB which will be allocated to one section of the E 75 between Donji Neradovac and Levosoje.

Total length of Dimitrovgrad Bypass is 8,67 km and it acquires a total amount of land of 16.687,00 m² at the Cadastral Municipality of Zeljusa, 308.363,00 m² at the Cadastral Municipality of Dimitrovgrad and 214.136,00 m² at the Cadastral Municipality of Gradinje.

The Social Impact Assessment (SIA) analysis for the Dimitrovgrad Bypass was done in the final phase of drafting the project documentation for construction of the route on this corridor. Within the legislation of the Republic of Serbia, the issue of the local population is defined in the Law on planning and construction and the Law on expropriation, and those two laws are the framework for carrying out preparations for cooperation with citizens, defining the rights of citizens, meaning the owners of the real estate in the zone of the route, as well as defining the obligations of the Beneficiary of expropriation. Legal regulations in Serbia do not envisage an obligation for the contractor to carry out an evaluation of effects of the planned activities on the social development of the community, especially on the populace and households which are directly or indirectly affected by these activities. Following a meeting with representatives of the World Bank (November 3rd and 4th, 2009), whose propositions require an SIA to be carried out for infrastructure projects, it was agreed that a reduced version of an SIA would be carried out which would be based on a research poll and on comparable data on the socio-economic characteristics of the municipality of Dimitrovgrad. The poll questionnaire was developed according to the methodology and requirements received from the representatives of the World Bank. A public invitation to citizens/households, whose property is the subject of expropriation, was sent out through local media (radio, TV, newspapers) with the request to respond and participate in this polling.

The data collected in the polling established the volume and depth of poverty in the municipality of Dimitrovgrad. Specifically, the municipality of Dimitrovgrad belongs to the group of the most poverty-stricken regions in the Republic of Serbia, with high levels of unemployment, below average incomes, intensive emigration and a large percentage of elderly households. Poverty is significantly widespread and profound in rural settlements of the municipality whose poor residents live in substandard environments with poor road infrastructure, poor and unorganized water supply, lack of sewer system infrastructure and telephone networks, low-quality and unavailable health services, low-quality basic education with the likelihood of primary schools being closed due to the small number of students, and unorganized public transportation which connects to the municipality center. The polled city residents live in and own residential structures in the city itself and in that sense they are better off in comparison to the municipality average, especially in comparison to the residents of rural settlements.

The socio-economic and demographic markers of the polled owners and their households reflect the conditions within the municipality of Dimitrovgrad. Despite the estimation of individual socio-economic status, in which nearly all households rated their status as being poor or very modest, and just one as average (and not a single one above average), according to the indicators of income per member of the household, it is undisputed that the polled households are better off than the average socio-economic performance in the referenced limits of the municipality of Dimitrovgrad.

It is generally considered that the money acquired from expropriation of real estate improves the economic situation of the household, and could potentially be a push-factor for advancing the socio-economic status of the household. Specifically, despite nearly two thirds of those polled stating that the money received from expropriation of agricultural land would be partially or entirely used for

immediate expenses, a good number of those polled stated that these funds would be used for improving living conditions (addition to or construction of a house), for children's education, for purchasing agricultural machinery or for starting a business. With that, on the level of individual households, definite positive effects can be expected from the process of expropriation.

Construction of the Dimitrovgrad Bypass will also bring with it definite positive effects for a large number of residents who live in neighboring rural settlements, because the current traffic way, from which transiting traffic will be relocated and redirected to the bypass, will become significantly safer and passable for a large number of daily migrants who walk to school, work or use some other service in the municipality center - Dimitrovgrad.

Expropriation takes place after a certain alignment is declared to be of public interest. The public interest is being declared by the Government of Republic of Serbia. At every phase, PAP has a possibility to protect his given rights by involving them at all and every step being taken either by the Beneficiary of expropriation or by the institutions who by authority take the leading role in the expropriation process. Besides, PAPs have the legal right to challenge all decisions being made either through appeal according to the Serbian Law of expropriation or through grievances consistent with lines of the RPF and this RAP. Finally, PAP has the right to enter into judicial process to exercise their rights to the Supreme Court of Serbia.

CHAPTER I – INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The Government of the Republic of Serbia currently developing the core road infrastructure on corridor X with the assistance of International financial Institutions. The objective of this infrastructure development is to facilitate a sustainable economic development and ensure that the country capitalizes on its geographical position to continue its development on Trans European Network. As part of this core road network improvement, the World Bank is financing the construction of 35 km of motorways consisting of three (3) sections along E 75 and E 80 motorways. These three sections include: Grabovnica - Grdelica (5,6 km) and Vladicin Han - Donji Neradovac (26,3km) on E 75 Motorway to FYR of Macedonia and Dimitrovgrad bypass (8,67 km) on E 80 Motorway. PERS as the Beneficiary of Expropriation, in cooperation with the Department for Urbanism, Civil Engineering, Property and Legal Affairs within the municipal administration of the Municipality of Dimitrovgrad, is conducting the expropriation process for all these three sections and approximately about 150 hectares of land is to be expropriated for improvement of these sections.

1.2 Objectives of RAP

Development projects that involve involuntary land acquisition and resettlement can cause long-term hardship, impoverishment, and environmental damage unless appropriate measures to mitigate these impacts are applied. This Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) is specifically related to the E 80 motorway, from Niš (Prosek) to Dimitrovgrad (border with the Republic of Bulgaria), section Dimitrovgrad bypass - Bulgarian border, in the total length of 8,67 km involving 22 hectares of land expropriation comprising 230 expropriation cases including 6 households losing structures. This RAP is prepared according to the Laws and regulations of Republic of Serbia and Resettlement Policy Framework adopted for this program by Government of Republic of Serbia which is consistent with the World Bank's operational policy provisions for Involuntary resettlement. The objective of this RAP is to set out an action plan for the resettlement and rehabilitation of Project affected person (PAP) to ensure that they will benefit from the protect and their standards of living will improve or at least be restored after the displacement. Acquisition of land and other assets for the project will adversely affect the livelihood of persons who live, work or earn their living on the land that will be acquired for the project. Project affected persons are defined as those persons whose land is being expropriated, or those persons whose income or livelihoods will be adversely affected by land acquisition for the project.

1.3 Scope of RAP

Keeping the above objectives in view, the scope of this RAP includes but is not limited to:

- a) Provide the details on the policies governing land expropriation, the range of adverse impacts and entitlements;
- b) Present a strategy for achieving the objectives of the resettlement/land acquisition policy;

- c) Provide a framework for implementation of the stated strategies to enquire timely acquisition of assets, payment of compensation and delivery of the benefits to PAPs;
- d) Provide details on the public information, consultation and participation, and grievance redress mechanisms in project planning, design and implementation;
- e) Provide identified sources and estimates of required resources for implementation of the RAP;
- f) Provide a framework for supervision, monitoring and evaluation of resettlement implementation.

1.4 Social Impact Assessment

In line with the provisions of RPF, a baseline socio-economic survey among the affected people was carried out to record their key socio-economic and demographic status in which will become the basis for measuring the changes in the living standards in the post impact period. Accordingly, this survey was carried out by K10doo and PERS, in association with local University during November, 2009. The survey covered the details of individual losses of land and other properties and collection of household information related to assets, income and expenditure demographic characteristics, housing and access to basic amenities, etc. PAPs are defined as those who on account of the execution of the project had or would have their:

- a) standard of living adversely affected; or
- b) right, title or interest in any house, land or any other fixed or movable asset acquired or possessed, temporarily or permanently, or
- c) business, occupation, work of place of residence or habitat adversely affected and PAPs means any of the displaced persons.

Accordingly, the following categories of PAPs were identified:

- a) PAPs, with formal title, who lose all or part of their land;
- b) PAPs, with formal title, who have immovable property on the land to be expropriated;
- c) PAPs with formal title over businesses that are affected by the loss of all or part of the land on which the businesses are located;
- d) PAPs with formal title over animal husbandries and agricultural processors that are affected by the loss of all or part of the land on which they are based;
- e) PAPs with formal title of tenancy on private or public land;
- f) PAPs with formal title over land, that will be needed during construction on a temporary basis;
- g) PAPs without formal title on affected land or businesses but their livelihoods are directly dependent on the affected land or businesses (e.g., those working on affected agricultural land or working in the affected businesses); and
- h) PAPs without formal title of ownership or use but who have established usage of public land by investing in immovable objects, crops, woods, trees, fruit bearing trees, vineyards, the age of crops, and the time needed to reproduce them.

1.5 Nature of Impacts:

The following impacts are identified in the project:

- a) **Permanently acquired land** consists of cultivated and non/cultivated land within the line of acquisition. The cultivated land includes paddy field, dry field, vegetable field, non cultivated land, forestry field and housing land.
- b) **Relocated buildings:** buildings relocated within the line of expropriation, mainly including brick and concrete houses and simple houses.
- c) **Affected land attachments:** land attachments located within the line of expropriation, mainly including supporting wall, well, brick/tile kiln.
- d) **Affected families;** all families that have land, building or land attachments
- e) **Project affected persons;** population of all families affected by the project.

Based on the above definition of project impact, the main data of land acquisition and house relocation are shown in the Table shown in Annexure.

1.6 Zone of Impact

While performing the Social impact assessment for the construction of Dimitrovgrad Bypass on local communities, three specific zones of influence were defined according to criteria of expected effects that may be brought on the life quality of local population by the construction of a new road:

- a) Zone of corridor where **direct effects** on residents and households may be expected and from where it is essential to relocate buildings and expropriate all real estate property;
- b) Zone of **indirect effects** on settlements and land in contact zones outside the corridor itself, and
- c) Zones **influenced by intensive traffic volume** on the existing track of E 80 Motorway, which will be mitigated after the construction of a new bypass to which transit traffic will be redirected.

Zone of corridor of direct effect

The expropriation of land in this zone involved 230 land owners. Of these, 6 are losing structures consisting of which two were inhabited permanently; one was used for temporary stay, while three were buildings for over weekend stay (summer houses). All these demanded for reimbursement in money. Agreements on financial reimbursement for the expropriation of these buildings were concluded with respective owners and expropriation was carried out in 2008. During the farmland expropriation all owners opted to be financially compensated instead of receiving other land in exchange for the expropriated land. Obviously, the reason for this is the fact that the land within the corridor zone is not used as a primary or basic income source of a household, but instead the farm production is predominantly pursued for the needs of the household itself. In addition, a number of farm lots that are the subject of expropriation are neglected and uncultivated, which means that the lots are not at all being used for farm production. Expected effect of such practice in farm land exploitation is that all land and building owners within the corridor zone had opted for financial compensation and not for the exchange that is receiving new farm land as a form of compensation for expropriated land, what was offered to them in line with provisions of the Law on expropriation. In sum, in the corridor track there were no owners/households that deal in non-agriculture business or any households whose main income source comes from farm production. Additionally, in line with the Law on Expropriation, households whose property is only partially within the boundaries of the corridor were offered

expropriation of the whole property, should the expropriation of only one part of farm land area jeopardize further agricultural dealings and by that the existence of the household.

Valuation of compensation for losses show data on the number of submitted expropriation applications, as well as on the number of agreements on the compensation form and amount made by mutual agreement. Of the total of 230 cases only 19 were not resolved by mutual agreement but instead they were forwarded to the competent municipal court following the decision on the compensation amount made by the Appeals Commission. Among households with property within the corridor track, there are no vulnerable households (households with only old age members, those are households with no members under age of 65, households with disabled members that require constant care and aid from other persons etc.), that is households that would require certain forms of support during relocation. During the negotiation process on form and amount of compensation for the expropriated land and buildings, no household has demanded some other form of support such as social or support in purchasing new land, construction of a new housing facility, croft arrangement etc. The only required form of compensation was the one in financial equivalent, especially for expropriated real estate property, while none of the owners affected by the planned project exercised their right to accept compensation in adequate land.

Zone of indirect effects in the vicinity of corridor

In the area of protective belt of 300 m there are no settlements or inhabited households, except in the tunnel entrance zone, for which special protection measures are provided. Outside the belt, there are a smaller number of crofts with permanently or temporarily residing population. Protection measures are provided, including design solutions and monitoring during construction and in stages following construction.

Zone of intensive traffic volume

Bypass construction will enable the relocation of the transit traffic from existing regional road that links the settlements Zeljusa and Gradinje to Dimitrovgrad. In this way, spatial and functional integration of the two settlements with the municipal center (Dimitrovgrad) will be provided as well as considerably improved availability and safety of social, health, educational, cultural and other services organized in Dimitrovgrad which lack in these two settlements. Redirecting of transit traffic to the bypass shall provide the citizens of the two settlements (around 2.500 residents) with considerably faster and safer traffic connection with municipal center where larger number of the residents from the two settlements work.

CHAPTER II – LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND RESETTLEMENT POLICY PROVISIONS

2.1 Legal process for Expropriation

The applicable legal framework for Expropriation was described in RPF. The most important features of the Law on Expropriation are provided below:

- a) It is intended to ensure simple, efficient process which be completed within six months.
- b) The fair value of the land affected by a particular scheme, or project, is determined by the Tax Administration, on behalf of the „Beneficiary of Expropriation”. The value is assessed on the basis of comparable sales transactions in the area in the recent past.
- c) In the case of privately owned agricultural land, if comparable land of the same type and quality, or the appropriate value, in the same area or vicinity (Article 15 of the Expropriation Law) identified by accredited expert is offered to the projected affected person with formal title.
- d) In case of disagreement on the comparability of the land offered, a different accredited expert would be hired by the local municipality to determine the comparability of the land offered.
- e) Further disagreement would result in the PAP resorting to the judicial process, where a decision would be made on the comparability of the land, or the payment of the assessed fair value in monetary terms.
- f) Where comparable land cannot be identified, the project affected person with legal title is offered the assessed fair value as determined by the Tax Administration. If the project affected person wishes to challenge the assessment of „fair value” they can resort to the judicial process.
- g) For the project affected person, without formal title, there is no provision to pay compensation currently under the Law on Expropriation. In case where there is a conflict between the Republic of Serbia Laws and WB policy the provisions of the RPF and the relevant safeguards will apply.

In the case of the Corridor X Highway project/program, the Beneficiary of Expropriation is PERS, on behalf of the implementing entity, the K10doo, or in future the latter directly on its own account.

2.2 Expropriation Process followed for Dimitrovgrad bypass

Public interest for expropriation, i.e. administrative transfer of immovable property – land and structures on the land for the purposes of construction of the E 80 motorway from Prosek to Dimitrovgrad (border with the Republic of Bulgaria), was determined by the Decision of the Government of the Republic of Serbia 05 No. 465-3654/08 dated September 11th, 2008 (“Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia“ No. 84/08). The following are some of the selected provisions of the expropriation.

The Law on Expropriation requires the Beneficiary of Expropriation to justify the need for expropriation and to demonstrate that the scheme cannot occur without the proposed expropriation. The declaration of public interest/use is a special procedure, which precedes and enables any property acquisition and expropriation. When the scheme is declared to be „of public interest”, a concrete expropriation proposal by the Beneficiary of Expropriation is prepared and then submitted to the relevant municipality encompassing the project affected persons. A concrete expropriation proposal is prepared for each project affected person that contains the amount of land involved, the assessment of

fair value for any immovable property, the justification of the need for the specific expropriation, together with the confirmation that the scheme is included in the relevant regional and/or spatial plan. The concrete expropriation proposal also involves the Beneficiary of Expropriation arranging a Bank Guarantee with a Commercial Bank for the assessed fair value. This assessment is prepared referring to the Cadastre Register, which provides details on the title holder, the immovable property, the type of land, and the area of the affected land. The concrete expropriation proposal also obliges the Beneficiary of Expropriation to submit a request to the Cadastre Office, Land Registry, or other public register, to prevent any transaction (Article 32) on the land to be expropriated.

Immovable property, as defined, may be expropriated when necessary for the construction of facilities or undertaking of works of “public interest/use”. The key assumption is that the scheme cannot progress without expropriating the immovable property. The assessment of fair value takes into account the value of land, the cost of structures and installations, crops, woods, trees, fruit bearing trees, age of crops, vineyards, and the time needed to reproduce them. The impact of the scheme on the value of land will not be considered in the fair value of the immovable property. Under the Law, expropriation must be completed and all project affected persons are compensated in comparable land or in monetary terms, before the Building Permit (or Construction License) is issued to the contractor to mobilize and start the civil works. In the event that a PAPs disagrees with the offered compensation in either form, they can resort to the judicial process, and the Beneficiary of Expropriation can request the Ministry of Finance, on an exceptional basis, for the permission to access the said plot (s) (Article 35).

For any specific scheme to obtain public interest status, the Beneficiary of Expropriation is obliged to submit to the Government (through the Ministry of Finance) the feasibility study, the justification of the need for the specific expropriation, the estimated costs, the estimated land affected, and to the extent that details are available, the number of affected plots of land. The request for the designation must also document that the scheme is included in the relevant local, regional, or spatial plan. The public interest status can be granted at either national, or local level, depending on the specific Beneficiary of Expropriation, and the nature and size of the „scheme”.

The Beneficiary of Expropriation is not required to prepare a social assessment (socioeconomic study) or a baseline census with regard to project affected persons.

2.3 Resettlement Policy provisions

The RPF outlines the process of expropriation and additional support for various categories of affected people and the process of carrying out the social impact assessment and preparation of Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) prepared consistent with the Serbian Government’s laws and the World Bank’s operational policy provisions for involuntary resettlement has been adopted by the Government of Republic of Serbia for this program has been adopted. The key additional support in addition to compensation under Expropriation is described below. **See Table 1 of RPF** shown in Annexure.

- a) **Unviable or redundant parcel:** An accredited expert, on behalf and at the PAP request will make an evaluation whether the remaining parcels are economically unviable. This assessment is done on site, in the presence of the PAP, the beneficiary of expropriation and representatives of the Municipality. In case of these, the affected people will be offered an option to surrender and receive compensation for the entire parcel of land.

- b) **Land needed for project works on temporary basis:** In case of any land parcels required during the construction period on temporary basis, the lands will be taken on lease basis and rental allowances will be paid for temporary duration. The rental allowance will be determined according to similar allowances as given by the Ministry of Agriculture and cannot be determined in a rate less than 140 EURO per Hectare.
- c) **Loss of Houses:** In addition to compensation under expropriation, the families losing houses will receive additional support for moving expenses, transitional allowance and costs towards administrative and transfer taxes. Moving expenses are defined as costs to move households by truck, costs to move households by Manual workers, according to the price list for similar moving in the area. Transitional allowances are defined to the maximum of 6 months minimum wages at the value given by the Republic Organization of Statistics for the month in which the payment of the allowance is being made. The transitional allowance a According to the Law on Taxes and Tax administration, PAPs are exempted from all and any such obligation to pay administrative and transfer taxes.
- d) **Non title holders occupying the public lands:** Compensation to replace lost assets to the project.
- e) **Affected leased public properties:** Assistance to provide alternative corresponding equivalent public properties.
- f) **Tenants, employees or workers:** Compensation for loss of income and replacement cost for any investments, three months livelihood assistance in the amount of maximum three minimum wages. The replacement cost is determined by an accredited expert.
- g) **Impact on business:** Relocation cost of affected business and replacement cost of business is determined as cash compensation at replacement cost for affected structure calculated based on the market price determined by the Accredited experts office, one time allowance for costs of moving, calculated as moving expenses and taxes. Replacement cost of affected business, cash compensation at replacement cost for affected structure calculated based on the market price determined by the Accredited experts office, one time allowance for costs of moving, calculated as moving expenses and taxes.
- h) **Assistance to Vulnerable people:** Households with many dependants,¹ unemployed heads, households with disabled and poor households, (households with incomes less than 8.800,00 RSD per household member are defined as the ones at the poverty line) will be provided additional support as monthly allowance in the amount of monthly minimum wage for a period of maximum 6 months.

2.4 Institutional framework

Under current regulations there are several institutions involved in the entire process of land acquisition. The details of various institutions and their role in expropriation process are outlined below.

¹ Dependants are being defined as household members who cannot take care of themselves and require alternative care and help either by family members or by specialized persons or services. The level of dependency of the household is being defined through comparison between the number of dependants and number of household member capable of running and supporting and caring of the households and its members and if the number of dependants exceeds the number of nondependent in a level more than a rate 1:2 in favor of the dependants.

Local Municipality

The role of the municipality of Dimitrovgrad is to handle all expropriation proposals submitted by the Beneficiary of expropriation. Its authority also lies in handling the compensation process.

Ministry of Finance

The role of the Ministry is to propose to the Government for the Scheme to obtain Public interest. It is also deciding on the Appeals in second level related with expropriation and properties real rights.

Tax administration office

Its rule is to determine the market value of the land being expropriated.

Ministry of agriculture

Its rule is to submit to the PERS information regarding available agricultural land that can be offered as compensation according to the lines of 15. of Law of expropriation.

CHAPTER III – EXPROPRIATION AND COMPENSATION PAYMENT

3.1 Introduction

Public interest for expropriation and administrative transfer of immobility's, for construction of Highway E 80, section Prosek to Dimitrovgrad, was enforced by the Governments decision according to article 20 Law of expropriation (Official Gazette of Republic of Serbia no. 53/95). The Governments act has been made public at the Official Gazette of Republic of Serbia no 84/2008.

3.2 Expropriation Process

The first phase of expropriation was carried out during September 2008 to January 2009, for a length of 3,7 km on Dimitrovgrad - border with the Republic of Bulgaria. In the first phase of the expropriation process, 125 expropriation proposals were submitted in cadastral municipalities of Dimitrovgrad and Gradinje, whereas the total expropriated area amounts to 30 ha. Upon the legal validity of the decision on expropriation, the owners of the expropriated properties were given written offers on the compensation amount for the land, plants and structures. Upon the completion of the expert survey by agricultural expert, the offer for the expropriated land was made in the amount of 280 RSD/m² and 360 RSD/m², depending on the location, quality and purpose of the land. The value of plants was determined by the agricultural expert from the Institute for Expert Analyses of the City of Belgrade, and in accordance with Article 45 – 47 of the Law on Expropriation (harvest, age, fertility, undercoated investments...), whereas the market value for structures was determined by the building expert from the Institute for Expert Analyses of the City of Belgrade.

3.3 Compensation cost for standing crops etc

Compensation cost for standing crops is determined by an accredited expert and include the value of crops, including the time needed to reproduce them, fruit bearing trees the value of the harvest, including the value of time needed to reproduce such a harvest, the replacement cost for any investment (input, labor, etc) made to raise new plants vineyards and orchards until they reach full yielding potential, young vineyards or orchards not yet fruit bearing, the replacement cost for any investment made for raising a replacement vineyard or orchard, including the value of time needed to reproduce replacement vineyards or orchards and compensation for lost yields for each year from the year of expropriation. Nursery the replacement cost for any investment made on planting material not utilized.

A process has been adopted for negotiations with the local population/households, whose land or structures are located within the boundaries of the impact area, which can have an effect on works and the forming of a new traffic way. After filming the terrain, the properties which will be the subject of expropriation and the owners of these properties were recorded. Owners have been offered two models of expropriation: (1) Providing ownership of new land in exchange for the expropriated land (agricultural), and (2) Payment of money in the amount of the estimated market value of the land or structures. Following the consultation carried out in Dimitrovgrad in the facilities of the Municipality of Dimitrovgrad, the owners selected payment of money and their preferred mode of compensation. Accordingly, the compensation was paid to all those affected under expropriation.

On this particular section, the procedure of making the decision on expropriation and the conclusion of the agreement on compensation have been fully completed (the compensations defined in the Loan Agreements have been fully paid to all property owners). Details of compensation are presented in Annexure.

The role played by grievance redress committee in compensation finalization. The RPF gives in its provisions guidance for PAP who are not satisfied with the monetary compensation offered by the Beneficiary of expropriation. In such cases the PAPs can approach the grievance commission can reconsider the and offer for revaluation of compensation if its determined to be in conflict with the assessment given by the Tax administration office. Since no such cases have been recognized and all the PAPs have been offered monetary compensation as determined by the Tax administration office, and such an offer, in the assessed amount has been made by the Beneficiary of expropriation, the Grievance Committee has not requested revaluation.

Only in 3 cases, the PAPs were not satisfied with the offered compensation for installations and minor assets loss on the land. In all of those 3 cases the Grievance committee offered for revaluation in response to the request.

The details of land acquisition for this section and the number of households affected by different categories and the compensation paid is presented in ANNEXURE.

3.4 Structures and property in the zone of the Dimitrovgrad Bypass

There are no inhabited settlements at this section of the E 80 Highway route, which makes it a considerably attenuating circumstance in potentially negative social effects brought on by construction or route paving for a new road. There is a small number of dispersed housing structures with a croft (6), of which only two were inhabited permanently, one was used for temporary stay, while three were buildings for weekend stays (summer houses). A total of 6 housing structures were expropriated, for which the owners requested monetary compensation. Agreements on monetary compensation for the expropriation of these buildings were concluded with the respective owners and expropriation was carried out in 2008. During the farmland expropriation, all owners opted to be financially compensated instead of receiving other land in exchange for the expropriated land. Obviously, the reason for this is the fact that the land within the corridor zone is not used as a primary or basic income source of the households, but instead the farm production is predominantly pursued for the needs of the household itself or as additional income. In a smaller number of households which responded that the income from the expropriated land is the basic source of income, the reason why they selected the option of monetary compensation was age and inability to continue cultivating the land, as well as that the offered land was unsuitable. Additionally, some of the farm lots which are the subject of expropriation are neglected and uncultivated, which means that the lots are not at all being used for farm production. The expected effect of such practice in farm land exploitation is that all land and building owners within the corridor zone had opted for financial compensation instead of looking for the new farm land as a form of compensation for expropriated land, what was offered to them in line with provisions of the Law on expropriation. In summary, in the corridor route there were no owners/households that deal in non-agriculture business (only one household) or any significant number of households whose main income source comes from farm production. Additionally, in line with the Law on Expropriation, households whose property is only partially within the boundaries of the corridor were offered expropriation of the whole property, should the expropriation of only one part of farm land area

jeopardize further agricultural dealings and by that the existence of the household. 136 PAP have been offered expropriation of unviable parcels. All 136 of them accepted the expropriation.

3.5 Expropriation in Phase-II

Expropriation for phase-II in this section include 5 km. The Public interest for expropriation and administrative transfer of immobility's for construction of Highway E 80, section Prosek to Dimitrovgrad, was enforced by the Governments decision according to article 20 Law of expropriation (Official Gazette of Republic of Serbia no. 53/95). The Governments act has been made public at the Official Gazette of Republic of Serbia no. 84/2008.

The second phase of expropriation was carried out from April 2009, for a length of 5 km on Dimitrovgrad - border with the Republic of Bulgaria. In the second phase of the expropriation process, 90 expropriation proposals were submitted in cadastral municipalities of Dimitrovgrad and Zeljusa, whereas the total expropriated area amounts to 23 ha. Upon the legal validity of the decision on expropriation, the owners of the expropriated properties were given written offers on the compensation amount for the land, plants and structures. Upon the completion of the expert survey by agricultural expert, the offer for the expropriated land was made in the amount of 280 RSD/m² and 360 RSD/m², depending on the location, quality and purpose of the land. The value of plants was determined by the agricultural expert from the Institute for Expert Analyses of the City of Belgrade, and in accordance with Article 45 – 47 of the Law on Expropriation (harvest, age, fertility, undercoated investments...), whereas the market value for structures was determined by the building expert from the Institute for Expert Analyses of the City of Belgrade.

Tables *Valuation of compensation for losses* (ANNEX III) show data on the number of submitted expropriation proposals, as well as on the number of agreements on the compensation form and amount made by mutual agreement. Of a total of 90 cases, only 19 were not resolved by mutual agreement but instead they were forwarded to the competent municipal court following the decision on the compensation amount made by the Appeals Commission.

3.6 Additional Support

Among households which possess property within the corridor route, the records on the vulnerable households are weak and incomplete. During the negotiation process on the form and amount of compensation for the expropriated land and buildings, no household requested any other form of support such as social support or support in purchasing new land, construction of a new housing facility, croft arrangement etc. The only requested form of compensation was the financial equivalent, especially for expropriated real estate property, while none of the owners affected by the planned project exercised their right to or demanded a benefit in terms of higher compensation amount as provided by *Appendix I and Entitlement Matrix of the Provisional Resettlement Plan for Corridor 10, Dimitrovgrad Bypass*, (May 2009). The provision for additional assistance have been clarified to the PAPs at meetings held at the Municipality of Dimitrovgrad at November the 3rd and November the 11th. The announcement of the meeting has been made through the local TV Station "Caribrod" and the local Newspaper.

3.7 Identification of Impact categories

Based on the extent of losses suffered by the affected households, they are categorized based on the entitlement matrix and are summarized below.

No	Impact category	Phase - I	Phase - II	Entitlements	Remarks
1	Loss of Entire land	14	30	Compensation for land and standing crops	
2	Loss of partial land and remaining viable	111	75	Compensation for land and standing crops	
3	Loss of House	6	0	The replacement cost for any investment made, and the value of time invested in construction. Value of structures that are being expropriated is determined as the summarized value of all structures located on the land, in accordance to the methodology of the Organization of assessment from Belgrade, which applies to the entire Republic of Serbia Compensation for structure moving expenses and taxes	
4	Loss of Business	1	0	Full relocation cost of businesses affected, including the inventory, and the replacement cost for any investment.	
7	Employees	0	1		
8	Vulnerable households	0	11	For this group, they will be given additional financial assistance to ensure that they will be no worse off after the project and can maintain and restore their livelihoods.	

CHAPTER IV – SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND BASELINE SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

4.1 Social Impact Assessment

The provisions of RPF requires that the implementing agency carry out a Social Impact Assessment (SIA) for project area to identify the social impacts associated with the project and also collect the baseline socio-economic characteristics of the project affected households which will become the basis for assessing whether the project has realized the resettlement objectives of improving or regaining the pre-project living standards among the PAPs.

The SIA normally expected to be carried out as soon as the project impacts are finalized and the PAPs are identified. However, this could not be carried out for Dimitrovgrad for lack of clarity and the timing for such surveys, since such surveys were not usually carried out under Serbian laws. Legal regulations in Serbia do not envisage an obligation for the project ordered or contractor to carry out an evaluation of effects of the planned activities on the social development of the community, especially on the populace and households which are directly or indirectly affected by these activities. SIA analyses have not yet been applied in infrastructure and other plans and development projects in Serbia. Valid laws in the area of planning, construction and expropriation do not oblige or envisage the carrying out of an SIA, regardless of the number of households or residents which are located in the area which is the subject of the plan or which will be directly affected by the planned activities. In another document, which just recently became a required part of infrastructure project preparations (Environmental Impact Assessment), elements of social development are only marginally included and encompass a modest number of indicators of socio-economic characteristics of the population in the planned area.

The World Bank team during the Implementing support mission in November, 2009 clarified about the requirements of SIA under the provisions of RPF. Accordingly, SIA was carried out via research poll and on comparable data on the socio-economic characteristics of the affected households. The poll questionnaire was developed in consultations with the World Bank team. A public invitation to citizens/households whose property is the subject of expropriation was sent out through local media (radio, TV, newspapers) with the request to respond and participate in this polling.

4.2 Methodology followed for Social impact assesment

In the first attempt during October, 2009 efforts were made to collect data on the basic socio-economic characteristics of the households through telephonic interview, but the response from the citizens was exceptionally poor. A large number of owners gave no required data on their households and they were not interested in any form of joint action in terms of corridor construction. The reason for this is the fact that a majority of land owners on the route of this section of corridor E 80 Highway do not inhabit their property and have moved away a long time ago or acquired their property through inheritance. They were exclusively interested in being financially compensated and thus have, through their authorized representatives, concluded agreements on financial compensation for the expropriated land. Subsequently, after discussions with the World Bank team in November, 2009 direct interview via polls was carried out. Polling was done on the basis of the Poll Questionnaire. (ANNEX - Poll Questionnaire). A public invitation to citizens/households whose property is the subject of

expropriation was sent out through local media (radio, TV, newspapers) with the request to respond and participate in this polling. The public invitation was sent out in November, and polling was conducted during November 10-22, 2009.

Polling was conducted in the facilities of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad. Citizens were also offered the option of polling personnel coming to their homes and conducting the polling there. In the introduction section of the questionnaire it is stated that the Poll Questionnaire is a part of the activities in collecting data of importance for the evaluation of effects that the construction of the Dimitrovgrad Bypass on the highway route E 80 Niš – Bulgarian border would have on the social development of the area, and especially on the population and households that are directly or indirectly affected by construction and use of this road. Data collected in this questionnaire will be used exclusively for the needs of the elaboration of the Impact study and may not be used for any other needs. The interest of citizens in participation in polling was very low. Despite the invitations sent out through the media and through the municipal administration, only 23 citizens/households responded out of 230 affected households 10%.

During this polling, the team tried to organize the citizens into a focus group in which certain aspects of the process of expropriation could be studied in greater detail, especially the future plans of these households, their evaluation of specific problems which they have faced during the process of expropriation, as well as support from the local community. Organization of the focus group was not successful so this phase of cooperation with the citizens was limited to individual interviews. Along with the data collected by polling, data acquired from the service in the municipality of Dimitrovgrad was also used in the SIA analysis, as was data from statistical sources (Municipalities in Serbia 2008).

4.3 Socio-economic status of Dimitrovgrad Municipality

The municipality of Dimitrovgrad is one of the poorest municipalities in Serbia with a negative natural birthrate. The estimated number of residents in 2007 was 10.765. The average age of residents is 45 years old, above the average in Serbia which is otherwise among the countries with one of the oldest populations in Europe. The aging index in the municipality (the ratio of the number of individuals who are 60 years of age and older and the number of those up to 19 years of age) is 166,3. The total share of the working contingent (15-64 years of age) is 64%, preschool 5,2%, and school-age (7-14 years) is 7,4% of the total population.

Available data indicates an above-average level of unemployment and a below-average income level in comparison to the average in Serbia. According to data for 2007 (Municipalities in Serbia 2008), the number of employed for every 1000 residents in the municipality was 183 (respectively in Serbia 271). Of the total number of employed, women make up 38,9% (average for Serbia is 43,4%). The number of registered unemployed individuals was 1910, or 27,7% of the age contingent 15-64 (the corresponding percentage for Serbia is 15,8%). The average income for employed individuals in Serbia in December of 2007 was 27.759,00 RSD and in the municipality of Dimitrovgrad was 19.355,00 RSD.

From the total of around 10.700,00 residents in the municipality, more than one fourth claim a pension (3.071,00 or 28,7%). Retirement pensions make up 63%, while disability and inherited pensions make up 37%. The structure of unemployment indicates long-term unemployment - the share of those in the municipality who are seeking employment for the first time is 24,6% while the corresponding percentage for Serbia is 48,6%. Nearly half of those who are seeking employment in the municipality have no qualifications (48,3%), which is significantly higher than the average in Serbia

(37,2%). The percentage of women who are seeking employment (47%) in the municipality of Dimitrovgrad is lower than the national average (53%). The number of unemployed individuals for every 1000 residents in Dimitrovgrad is 177, while the national average is 106.

Nearly one tenth of the residents in the municipality use some form of social welfare. According to data for 2007, among non-adult beneficiaries of social welfare, there are 352 residents of the municipality, or 20,9% of the contingent, which is significantly higher than the average for Serbia (8,7%). Most of those are individuals with difficult family situations (320). The number of adult citizens which were beneficiaries of some form of social welfare that year was 662, or 7,3% of adult individuals, which is also significantly higher than the average for Serbia (4,1%). The most common are those who have no means with which to support themselves (485) and elderly individuals (122). According to data from the municipal administration, in November of 2009, within the territory of the municipality of Dimitrovgrad, subsidies for children were received by 461 beneficiaries with 760 children.

In this undeveloped and poor municipality, poverty is especially significant in rural areas. In the villages in the municipality of Dimitrovgrad there is a significantly higher share of elderly and solitary households than the municipality average. The lack of access to basic education (likely closing of the area four-grade schools with a small number of students) is an important motive in the decision of households to move into the municipality center. In the report PLA Problems and Potentials Status Survey, the most common and greatest problems of living in rural settlements in the municipality of Dimitrovgrad are: poor transit infrastructure, poor and unorganized water supply, low-quality and unavailable health care, poor connection to public transportation with the municipality center, and lack of sewer system infrastructure and telephone network.

In summary, the municipality of Dimitrovgrad is one of the poorest regions in Serbia. The high level of unemployment, low income level, large number of beneficiaries of various types of social welfare and large number of pensioners with small pensions make this municipality a region of multilevel deprivation. Poverty is also characteristic on the individual level (individuals and households) and on the level of the community collective consumption (spatial availability and quality of services of public interest, utilities infrastructure, transit infrastructure, frequency and quality of public transportation, etc.).

4.4 Socio-economic Status of PAPs

This section presents the findings of the baseline socio-economic survey that was carried among the affected households.

N=23

No	Indicator	Value	Remarks
1	Average Monthly households Income (in Euros)	31.570,00 RSD 330 EUR	
2	Proportion of households below poverty line 8.800,00 rsd 93 EUR per household member	35%	56% including household who are slightly above the poverty line
3	Average Family Size	2,9 members	
5	Proportion of families without any earning members	9%	
6	Proportion of families under Debt	40%	
7	Proportion of families having automobiles	31,8%	
8	Proportion of households rating their economic status as "Poor"	63%	

4.5 Demographic characteristics

Half of the polled households are married couples without children (which live in their own households). One household is a single individual and three are multi-generation. One fifth of the households are in the category of a nuclear family (married couples with children). In two households there is one parent with a child and one household contains a grandmother and grandfather with a minor grandchild.

Nearly half are two-member households, and behind those are three-member households (22%). Four households have four members, and there is one each of one-member, five-member and seven-member households. In the polled households there are only three members younger than 15 years old. In half of the households there are members more than 65 years old. 13% of households fall under the category of elderly households, in which there are no members less than 65 years old.

Just one fifth of the households (21,5%) report having a permanently employed member, and just one has two permanently employed members. In a majority of households there is at least one pensioner (74%). Pensions are the most common source of regular income in the polled households. Only two households report not having any members who provide financial support. Six of the households have one member who provides financial support, three households have two members who provide financial support, three households have three members who provide financial support, two households have four members who provide financial support and one household has five members who provide financial support.

4.6 Loss of land, structures and businesses

The percentage of expropriated land in relation to the ownership which a polled household possesses in the municipality of Dimitrovgrad varies from household to household. 25% of the households reported that up to 10% of their total land is being taken by expropriation, while 20% reported that between 11% and 40% of their total land is being taken. The entire amount of agricultural property is being expropriated from three polled households (around 13%). The usage of the expropriated agricultural land varies (meadows, fields, orchards, vineyards, forest). Three households employ workers outside of the household for work on the agricultural parcels.

For a majority of the polled households, the expropriated land does not represent the basic source of income, and a little less than one fourth of the households responded that income from agricultural production from the expropriated parcels was the primary source of income for the household. Two households report that income from the expropriated parcels was of partial significance in the total income of the household. The evaluation of annual income from the expropriated land goes from natural (for the needs of the household – 16% of households), to relatively low - up to 500 Euros (39% of households), modest – around 100 Euros (22%), to relatively high - more than 1500 Euros (22% of households).

Among the reasons why the households preferred to choose monetary compensation instead of an exchange for other land, eight households stated that the offer of other land in exchange for the expropriated land was unsuitable (distance of offered parcels from Dimitrovgrad and one unsuitable solvency of land). Age, sickness and general inability of the owner or a member of the household to be involved in agriculture was stated by five households as the reason for the monetary compensation. The remaining households stated that the reason the money is needed is to support their unemployed

children and grandchildren, for building a house in Dimitrovgrad or for acquiring agricultural machinery.

The loss of structures due to expropriation was reported by 5 polled households, which shows that the invitation for this polling was answered by all owners of expropriated structures. Two structures were used for regular housing, two for agricultural works and one for vacation and recreation (summer house). Only one of the polled individuals responded that the process of expropriation took away commercial space (premises and auto mechanic service).

4.7 Income and occupation

The monthly income of employed household members ranges from 9.000,00 RSD, through 12.000,00 and 16.400,00 up to 40.000,00 RSD, and 60.000,00 RSD collectively in households with two employed members. Just one household earns 3.000,00 monthly through temporary work. Pension amounts range from a minimum of 10-16 thousand collectively for a household (10 households), between 20.000,00 to 30.000,00 RSD (3 households, and more than 30.000,00 (4 households). More than half of the households generate income from agriculture. Four households stated that they earn around 200.000,00 RSD annually from agriculture and between 100.000,00 and 150.000,00 RSD annually was reported by three households. Eight households earn less than 60.000,00 RSD annually from agriculture.

Just one of the polled households uses some form of social welfare and support (child subsidy in the amount of 2.100,00 RSD for a child). A few of the polled households which have disabled individuals or individuals in need of some form of social support responded that their ownership of agricultural land disqualifies them from seeking such assistance.

Data on income of the households, obtained in the polling, indicates widespread poverty in the municipality of Dimitrovgrad. The polled households earn around 14.700,00 RSD per member, summarized from all incomes. Half of the polled households have income below this average, and within that, one fourth of the households are below the national poverty line (around 8.500,00 RSD). A monthly income per household member of less than 8.500,00 RSD is earned by eight households (35% of those polled), and four are slightly above this poverty line (17.4%). An income of over 20,000 RSD per member was recorded in 25% of households. The highest monthly income per member, including income from agriculture, amounts to around 29.000,00 RSD, or around 300 Euros. According to the data from December of 2007, the average income for employed individuals in Serbia was 27.759,00 RSD and in the municipality of Dimitrovgrad was 19.355,00 RSD. The average income from permanent employment in the polled households in the spring of 2009 was 22.900,00 RSD, meaning it was a little higher than the December average (in 2007) in the municipality of Dimitrovgrad, but significantly lower than the average in the Republic of Serbia.

There are 8 households which live below the poverty line (8.500,00 RSD), and f more which are a little above the poverty line. In summary, more than half of the polled households (56%) live below or on the border of poverty, judging by the amount of income which was stated by the polled residents. There was only one household where an older disabled person that receives financial aid for care was recorded. A household most frequently has one source of income (from pension or through employment), number of households with two sources of income is somewhat smaller (usually from pension and through employment), and households with three or more sources of income are very rare. Household's monthly incomes are very modest and vary from 8.000,00 RSD (around 90 Euros) to 50.000,00 RSD (650 Euros). Estimated monthly income from farm land which is the subject of

expropriation is also very low and varies from 7-8.000,00 RSD to 20.000,00 RSD. There was only one household that estimated its income from expropriated farm land to over 80.000,00 RSD.

All owners (specify the number) of expropriated real estate who responded to the polling live in the municipality center - Dimitrovgrad. They also all live in apartments or residential buildings which they own. Not a single polled household was registered which lives in private or public rental housing.

4.8 Expenditure pattern

Within the spending structure of the households, it is expected that the largest portion of monthly income will be spent on food. In the poorest households, expenses for food make up more than 60% of the total income. Considering that all of those polled live in apartments which they own, expenses for housing encompass payment of utility services (water, electricity, heating). Among the other most common and highest stated expenses are for medicines, which in a few households take up more than one fourth of the total monthly income.

4.9 Indebted

Of the fifteen households which responded to the question about credit debt, 40% make monthly payments for credit debt (ranging in amounts from 2.200,00 RSD to 14.900,00 RSD).

4.10 Household assets

The economic situation of the households can also be measured through ownership of household assets. Less than half of the households have an automobile, but all of those automobiles (except in one household) are more than 15 years old, and a few are more than 30 years old. Additionally, only one household has a tractor (27 years old). All households have a television, refrigerator and freezer, and a majority of these devices are older than 10 years (televisions), and 20 years (refrigerator and freezer). Only two households have a computer with internet.

All of the polled residents live in residential buildings/apartments which they own. There are no households which live in private or public rental housing. More than one fifth of those polled plan to invest a portion of the funds acquired from expropriation in the construction of new houses or additions/improvements to current houses.

4.11 Ways of spending Expropriation compensation

In response to this question, those polled were able to state several ways in which they decided to spend the money received from the expropriation of land and structures. Over 60% of those polled stated that they would completely or partially spend the money on current needs including to help unemployed children and grandchildren who live in separate households. Some also stated they would use the money for obtaining medicines and health care. A few of those polled stated that they would use part of the funds for their children's education. One fourth of those polled responded that the money would be invested in construction of or additions to their house, but with this one must keep in mind that this polling encompasses all owners of expropriated structures (all six of them), and one stated that the money from expropriation would be invested in construction of commercial space (the household from which the commercial space was expropriated). One household will use the money for purchasing agricultural machinery.

4.12 Self-perception of socio-economic position

Of the total number of those polled, just one household rated its socio-economic position as average, 32% of households as very modest, and 63% as poor.

4.13 Interest in training and certification programs

More than one third of those polled were interested in some form of additional training and acquiring new knowledge, whether for themselves or for members of their households. This information will be forwarded to the local self-government and civil society organizations of Dimitrovgrad. With that it must be kept in mind that in this poor and undeveloped municipality, the civil sector is relatively weak and in need of appropriate support from both regional organizations as well as from international civil society organizations.

4.14 Assessment of Overall living conditions of PAP

The data collected in the polling established the volume and depth of poverty among the Project affected person. In general, the municipality of Dimitrovgrad belongs to the group of the most poverty-stricken regions in the Republic of Serbia, with high levels of unemployment, below average incomes, intensive emigration and a large percentage of elderly households. Poverty is significantly widespread and profound in rural settlements of the municipality whose poor residents live in substandard environments with poor road infrastructure, poor and unorganized water supply, lack of sewer system infrastructure and telephone networks, low-quality and unavailable health services, low-quality basic education with the likelihood of primary schools being closed due to the small number of students, and unorganized public transportation which connects to the municipality center. The polled city residents live in and own residential structures in the city itself and in that sense they are better off in comparison to the municipality average, especially in comparison to the residents of rural settlements.

It is generally considered that the money acquired from expropriation of real estate improves the economic situation of the household, and could potentially be a push-factor for advancing the socio-economic status of the household. Specifically, despite nearly two thirds of those polled stating that the money received from expropriation of agricultural land would be partially or entirely used for immediate expenses, a good number of those polled stated that these funds would be used for improving living conditions (addition to or construction of a house), for children's education, for purchasing agricultural machinery or for starting a business. With that, on the level of individual households, definite positive effects can be expected from the process of expropriation.

Construction of the Dimitrovgrad Bypass will also bring with it definite positive effects for a large number of residents who live in neighboring rural settlements, because the current traffic way, from which transiting traffic will be relocated and redirected to the bypass, will become significantly safer and passable for a large number of daily migrants who walk to school, work or use some other service in the municipality center - Dimitrovgrad.

4.15 Assessment of affected Vulnerable households proposed additional Assistance

As it is seen from the above mentioned and available data on the scope of poverty and level of underdevelopment in the municipality of Dimitrovgrad, the households which are affected by

expropriation, when it comes to risk of vulnerability, do not stand out from the other categories of poor and deprived households in this municipality. There are no sufficient arguments to single out the poorest or most vulnerable within the group of households affected by expropriation being that more than ten percent of the residents of the municipality fall into the category of those who accept some form of social welfare, meaning those who are below or near the poverty line. Support for those households is institutionally defined through the criteria of social welfare. Along with that, one must keep in mind that the households affected by expropriation, even the most vulnerable, received significant material support through the very process of expropriation of agricultural land, because from the compared data in the table in ANNEX IV it shows that in a large number of cases the price obtained from expropriation was several times more than the average annual income from agriculture on the expropriated parcels.

4.16 Positive effects of constructing the Dimitrovgrad Bypass

Despite the fact that the process of expropriation led to a loss of a certain amount of agricultural land for the households whose property was located within the route of the bypass, monetary compensation has generally strengthened the economic situation of the households. On one hand, the households acquired money through the transfer of land which in regular trade would go for a much lower price due to the fact that in this part of Serbia there is still no desire for agricultural land and agricultural land is not considered a significant economic resource. On the other hand, the money which was received will allow the households to improve their general quality of life (construction of or additions to residential structures) and to potentially use the money as an investment in strengthening the individual resources of the household members (education, certification, purchasing agricultural machinery, starting up a business, etc.)

The positive effects of construction of the Dimitrovgrad Bypass must also be considered in a wider context, meaning through the improvement of the quality of life of the residents of the municipality. This can first be seen in the increased safety in using the traffic way towards Dimitrovgrad. Dimitrovgrad Bypass construction will enable the relocation of the transit traffic from the existing regional road that links the settlements Zeljusa and Gradinje to Dimitrovgrad. In this way, spatial and functional integration of the two settlements with the municipal center (Dimitrovgrad) will be provided along with considerably improved accessibility and safety for use of social, health, educational, cultural and other services organized in Dimitrovgrad which are lacking in these two settlements. Redirecting of transit traffic to the bypass shall provide the citizens of the two settlements (around 2.500,00 residents) with a considerably faster and safer traffic connection to the municipal center where a larger number of the residents from the two settlements work. As it was stated in the previous analysis, all public services in the municipality are located within the municipality center, and from just the two mentioned villages (Zeljusa and Gradinje), 130 students travel to Dimitrovgrad every day via public transportation.

4.17 Consultations and Community Participation

In accordance with the regulations and practices of planning in Serbia, consultation and cooperation with the local population was carried out within the framework of the EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment) study, which in Serbia was adopted as a mandatory phase in the drafting of project

documentation for infrastructure projects. The national EIA procedure with respect to the Northern Dimitrovgrad Bypass was started on Nov 02, 2005, when PERS (former Serbian Road Directorate) submitted the Request to the Ministry for environmental protection (MOE) in order to obtain the document determining the scope and content of EIA Study. According to the Serbian Law on EIA (Official Gazette of RS, No. 135/04), this step was announced in the daily newspaper "Politika" (Dec 07, 2005), and interested parties were invited to participate in the process of defining the scope and content of the EIA Study. On Jan 09, 2006, the Ministry provided the Terms of Reference and that information was made public in the daily newspaper "Politika" (Jan 29, 2006). The Highway Institute of Belgrade prepared the draft EIA Study, which was submitted to the MOE for its approval. At the same time, PERS announced this step in the daily newspaper "Politika" (Aug 28, 2008), when public and other interested parties and organizations were invited to participate in process of public consultation on the draft EIA Study for the E 80 Highway Project, section Northern Dimitrovgrad Bypass. Public Consultation was held in Dimitrovgrad, on Sep 25, 2008, and there were no major complaints on the prepared draft EIA Study. The EIA Study was subsequently approved by the MOE on Dec 05, 2008. This approval was announced in the daily newspaper "Politika" in December 2008.

In December 2008, in accordance with OP/BP 4.01 the Borrower contracted an independent consultant to prepare a Corridor Level EIA (CLEIA) for the E 80 Highway from Niš to Dimitrovgrad. Besides consolidating the already existing sub-section EIAs, the CLEIA also addressed the cumulative, induced, indirect and trans-boundary impacts. The in-country disclosure of the draft CLEIA was carried out in the period from February 25 (when the document was made publicly available on site and on the PERS website) to March 11, when the public meetings were held in Bela Palanka. Public announcements in Serbian and English were published in the daily newspaper "Politika", on February 25, 2009, inviting the public, authorities and relevant institutions to have an insight into the draft CLEIA. Representatives of the local self-government informed the public through local media of the time and place of public consultations.

The in-country disclosure of the draft EMP began on August 01, 2009, when public consultations were announced in the daily newspaper "Politika". A public announcement invited the public, authorities and relevant institutions to have an insight into the EMP for the Project. Prior to announcement in the newspapers, the EMP was delivered to the Municipality of Dimitrovgrad and made publicly available on site, and also placed on the PERS and K10doo websites. Representatives of the local self-government informed the public through local media (Radio – Television "Caribrod") of the time and place of public consultations. Information about public consultation was repeated twice a day, starting from Tuesday, August 04, ending on Thursday, August 06. Disclosure of the draft EMP finished on August 07, 2009, when the public meeting was held in the city of Dimitrovgrad.

There were 18 attendees at the public consultation meeting in Dimitrovgrad. 15 attendees were local citizens. Among the others, there were local municipal officials, local environmental officer, local media representatives, colleague engineers etc. and officials from K10doo and their consultants.

The EMP was presented in detail to the interested attendees by the K10doo representatives. Questions and comments during the public discussion mainly referred to the concept of environmental protection, prevention of accidents during construction of the bypass, storage of construction material, re-cultivation of the land after removal of waste materials, etc. The meeting was recorded by local TV station RTV "Caribrod", Dimitrovgrad. Along with informing the residents and consultation related to the EIT, special consultations were conducted with residents regarding the issues related to expropriation of property and the models of compensation.

This was done in several procedures:

- Following preparation of the expropriation elaboration for each household, meaning for each Project Affected Person, which contains the area of land envisaged for expropriation, the justification of the need for the specific expropriation is presented, together with the confirmation that the scheme is included in the relevant regional and/or spatial plan. During the meeting, the municipality informs the project affected persons about the project, presents them with all the information about the level of impact on their property with maps, their entitlement based on this RPF (a copy of the entitlement matrix and the RPF will be given to the project affected persons at the first meeting) and the steps which will be taken afterward, provides them with legal advice and informs them about their rights, including the role of the independent grievance commission. In this meeting, there is no discussion of the comparability of the agricultural land or the concept of fair value. It is only a consultative meeting, informing the project affected persons and providing them with their entitlements and rights.
- Public participation was undertaken to make explicit the social factors that will affect the development impact of planned highway improvements and mediate project results. Through public participation, key social issues were identified and strategy was formulated.
- Consultations were held at local (community) level. The objectives of local level consultations were to inform the PAPs about the project, to know their perception on the project in terms of both negative and positive impacts to mitigate measures as suggested to them. Meetings in which the remarks of PAPs are discussed have been held on several occasions at the Municipality of Dimitrovgrad.

4.18 Offers

Offers are being made in the stage when the decision on the expropriation cannot be appealed any more. After that point the Beneficiary of expropriation through the Municipality of Dimitrovgrad proposes at first compensation in adequate land, after which in Case this offer is not accepted Beneficiary offers monetary compensation, fair value, as determined by the Tax administration office.

4.19 Summary of key findings of consultation.

At the public consultations, the basic interest of the residents was directed towards comments regarding the amount of compensation for expropriated property. A small number of residents showed interest in receiving new agricultural land in exchange for that which was expropriated. The residents requested that the new parcels be in direct proximity of the city of Dimitrovgrad, which was a request that the Beneficiary of expropriation could not fulfill. The offered parcels of agricultural land were located at distances between 15 and 20 km from Dimitrovgrad. The reason for requesting land close to the municipality center is due to its perspective of being converted into development land, meaning using it for construction of residential and other structures and not for agricultural production. The owners of structures also did not request that the Beneficiary of expropriation build them corresponding (equivalent) structures, but rather preferred monetary compensation.

(a) Perceived impact and levels of consultation.

The fundamental and basically only theme of negotiations with the PAPs was the amount of monetary compensation for expropriated agricultural land. Sometimes the negotiations would turn into extortion of the Beneficiary of expropriation, when at public gatherings they would

seek significantly higher amounts than the estimated market values of real estate, and then a day after that gathering the individual would sign an Agreement for Compensation (example from the meeting held in Dimitrovgrad, on November 3rd 2009, in the presence of World Bank representatives and representatives of PERS, K10doo, municipality of Dimitrovgrad, and PAPs.

(b) Mitigation through realignment and design cross section.

Typical design cross section adopted.

(c) Mitigation through safety measures and traffic management. Magnitude of impact on community properties, if any.

Settlement owned properties and government owned properties (state, local self-government) are not located within the route of the Dimitrovgrad Bypass.

(d) Approach to consultations during implementation.

During implementation there will be several modes of consultation:

- Direct mode will be conducted through resettlement sessions at which there will be collected opinions regarding the expropriation;
- Indirect Mode, PAPs can provide the complaints, opinions and recommendations regarding the resettlement to the monitoring body.

CHAPTER V – IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

5.1 Institutional Arrangements

Roles and responsibilities of different institutions

Institutions involved in the resettlement process are PERS, as the Beneficiary of expropriation, K10doo as the implementing agency, Municipality of Dimitrovgrad as administrative institution through which the expropriations being completed, Ministry of Finance, ministry of Agriculture, Ministry for spatial planning and environmental protection, Land Cadastre Office, Tax Administration office, Government. The Beneficiary of expropriation PERS is determined to be beneficiary according to the Law on expropriation. It submits proposals to the Municipality.

Implementing Agency K10doo

- To organize all the participants to minimize the magnitude of impact from resettlement and conduct census survey, to keep data and to train resettlement personnel who use the data.
- To make application to relevant authorities for permission of land use plan and permission of land use for construction.
- To formulate various policies on resettlement action plan.
- To train the resettlement personnel of municipalities and other organizations involved in the resettlement process.
- To train the resettlement personnel of prefecture (city) and county.
- To coordinate the project construction and implementation schedule.
- To coordinate signing of resettlement agreement with land administration departments and county (city/district) governments.
- To supervise the disbursement of funds.

Public Enterprise Putevi Srbije

- Submits expropriation proposals.
- Provides budget for expropriation through the business plan.

Local Municipality

- The role of the municipality of Dimitrovgrad is to handle all expropriation proposals submitted by the Beneficiary of expropriation. Its authority also lies in handling the compensation process.

Ministry of Finance

- The role of the Ministry is to propose to the Government for the Scheme to obtain Public interest. It is also deciding on the Appeals in second level related with expropriation and properties real rights.

Tax administration office

- Its role is to determine the market value of the land being expropriated.

Ministry of agriculture

- Its role is to submit to the PERS information regarding available agricultural land that can be offered as compensation according to the lines of 15. Of Law of expropriation.

Cadastral office

- Registers all changes on the land affected by the expropriation.

Ministry spatial planning and environmental protection

- They issue building permits.

Implementation support from Koridor 10 and the Center for Social works

The Center for Social Works, as a specialized center who covers the entire Republic of Serbia, is a recourse for all data collected in reference to the all social issues.

Role of Monitoring & Evaluation consultants

The construction consultant will have a social safeguard specialist on their team whose responsibilities is to ascertain any temporary impacts related to land requirements or safety purposes and ensure that they receive additional support in line with the RPF and this will be reflected in the progress report.

The role of the consultant is to monitor and report on the effectiveness of RAP implementation, including the psychical progress of resettlement and rehabilitation activities, the disbursement compensation, the effectiveness of public consultation and participation activities. The TOR for M&E Consultants is shown in ANNEXURE X.

The RAP will provide a coherent monitoring plan that identifies the organizational responsibilities, the methodology, and the schedule for monitoring and reporting. The three components of a monitoring plan should be performance monitoring, impact monitoring, and complementation audit. The scope of the monitoring plan should be completion audit. The scope of the monitoring plan should be commensurate with the scale and complexity of the RAP.

5.2 Performance Monitoring

Performance monitoring is an internal management function allowing the sponsor of the organizations responsible for resettlement to measure physical progress against milestones established in the RAP. Progress is usually reported against a milestones established in the RAP. Progress is usually reported against a scheduled of required actions (typically displayed through such devices as bar charts, Gantt charts, or MS Project Tables). Examples of performance milestones will include:

- Public meetings held;
- Census, assets inventories, assessments, and socioeconomic studies completed;
- Grievance redress procedures in place and functioning;
- Compensation payments disbursed;
- Housing lots allocated;
- Housing and related infrastructure completed;
- Relocation of people completed;
- Income restoration and development activities initiated;

- Monitoring and evaluation reports submitted.

5.3 Impact Monitoring

Impact monitoring gauges the effectiveness of the RAP and its implementation in meeting the needs of the affected population. Depending on the scale of resettlement, impact monitoring is conducted by the project's management (such as an internal Project Resettlement Unit) or an independent external agency. The purpose of impact monitoring is to provide the sponsor and/or the agency responsible for RAP implementation with an assessment of the effects of resettlement, to verify internal performance monitoring, and to identify adjustments in the implementation of the RAP as required.

5.4 Impact evaluation

After one year after the expropriation has been completed and the assistance to the PAP has been paid there will be an impact evaluation to assess whether the PAP have improved their living conditions in relation with the baseline socioeconomic status collected during the SIA.

Land acquisition and resettlement widely involve many aspects and relate excessively to benefit PAP, thus during the implementation PAP complaints and grievances on the resettlement and compensation are inevitable to occur. In order to solve successfully the complaint and/or grievance, PERS has established an independent body according to the RPF, to proceed the grievances fairly and effectively, to ensure the smooth implementation of resettlement and land acquisition.

According to The Resettlement policy Framework Beneficiary of expropriation shall establish an independent Grievance Commission, from representatives of the PERS, Implementing Agency K10doo, Municipality and representatives of PAPs.

The Grievance commission (GC) has been established by the General Directors of PERS act No. 953-6562/2009 dated June the 6th 2009. The main responsibility of the Grievance Commission is to transparently and practically collect and deal with all complaints or grievances fairly and effectively. The body assembles 7 members. Three of them are elected from and amongst the PAP, one is delegated by the Implementing entity K10doo. Two are delegated from the beneficiary of expropriation PERS and one member is from the Local Municipality of Dimitrovgrad.

The Mode of registering the Grievances is as follows:

- a) The grievance can be registered orally or in writing with the Local Municipality of Dimitrovgrad regardless to the stage of the expropriation. If it is an oral grievance, the grievance commission must record the complaint in writing and must respond to the grievance within 3 weeks. If the complaint is not understandable or has to be clarified in any way, the Grievance commission can advise and give legal assistance to the PAP in order to articulate the grievance in the best interest of the PAP.
- b) The grievance can be registered through the minutes by the Local Municipality whilst discussing the proposed compensation
- c) The grievance can be registered by mail sent directly to either PERS, K10doo

The grievances that are registered may be basically categorized into the following types:

- a) Grievances related to the entitlement framework and implementation, such as discrepancies related to structures and ownership; Categorization of the structure and area occupied, claims related to ownership and occupancy status to the value of crops;
- b) Grievances related to the value of land and other immovable properties, such as the assessment of fair value determined by the Tax administration office whether the PAP is not satisfied with the value or with the parameter used; and
- c) Grievance related to the value of crops, fruit bearing plants, vineyards, orchards and nurseries.

5.5 Procedure of Grievance mechanism

The typical procedures includes: appeal, receipt and verification, resolution through grievance redress committee meetings, intimation to the applicant on the outcome of the decision, public information and documentation.

5.6 Principles to treat Complaints

The Grievance Commission at all level conducts a field survey on the PAP complaint and treats the complaints fairly and objectively according to national laws & regulation, principles and guidelines given through the RPF and the outcome will be sent to the compliant.

5.7 Record of complaint and appeal and Follow up Feedback

During the implementation of RAP, Grievance Commission will record and manage the complaints and the results of treating the complaints. In order for complete records of treating the complaint there will be an electronic monitoring system through the archive system of the PERS and a table recording system as shown in Annexure.

5.8 Administering the payment of Compensation and R&R assistance

The compensation rate for resettlement of Corridor X Highway project will abide the following principles:

- All compensation rates relating to resettlement will be determined in accordance with relevant laws promulgated by the Republic of Serbia in Special compliance with the WBs basic principles of operational policies (OP 4.12) on involuntary resettlement.
- Compensation funds will be acquired prior to land or property acquisition.
- The ultimate purpose of compensation to displaced persons to improve the standards of living of displaced persons or at least restore their living standards to the pre-displacement level.
- Compensation rates shall be determined by the Tax administration office.

5.9 Income restoration Measures

The basic objective of income restoration activities is that no project-affected person shall be worse off than before the project. Restoration of pre-project levels of income is an important part of rehabilitating individuals, households, and socio-economic and cultural systems in affected communities. Income restoration schemes will be designed so as to benefit the PAPs.

5.10 Dealing with Temporary Impacts/additional impacts during construction

Additional impacts will be identified during the construction period by the Construction supervision consultants and if necessary the assistance and support will be provided consistent as described in this document.

5.11 Data base management

A census Database will be created by the consultants. This database will be transferred to the implementing unit for up gradation and further use. The main purpose of the data base and use will be to (i) track progress of R&R implementation (ii) determine the entitlements to be paid; (iii) track pending entitlements and amounts; (iv) organize outputs for periodical reports and other project requirements; and (v) establish input formats. The Database consultants will be responsible for (i) modifying the input/output formats to the project requirements; (ii) Training of field level staffs; (iii) aid the PERS in finalizing the entitlements of each PAPs; (vi) provide for decision making at the PIU; (vii) Monitor and regulate the land acquisition, distribution of compensation and assistance, grievance redress and financial progress.

5.12 Disclosures

This RAP in compliance with World Bank policies will be publicly disclosed at the official website of K10doo, website of PERS, at the website of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad as well as the web site of the World Bank. In order to make the RAP implementation process transparent, a series of meetings etc will be held with all stakeholders for dissemination of information regarding rehabilitation process and entitlement framework. The salient features of RAP and the R&R policy will be translated in Serbian and disclosed.

5.13 Coordination with Civil works and certification

The resettlement program will be co-coordinated with the timing of civil works. The required coordination has contractual implications, and will be considered in procurement and bidding schedules, award of contracts, and release of cleared COI sections to project contractors. The project will provide adequate notification, counseling and assistance to affected people so that they are able to move or give up their assets without undue hardship before commencement of civil works. Under the provisions of the RPF June 2009. the commencement of works will be allowed after the compensation have been paid in full or their grievance has been registered.

5.14 Budget and costs

Basic Cost of resettlement includes land compensation cost, compensation for standing crops, compensation for all affected categories given in the Table 1 Entitlement Matrix Of the RPF, indirect loss of households move, compensation for house relocation, compensation for immovable objects attached to the a land and other taxes. And additional assistance and transitional allowance.

The estimated compensation and the budget for its payment can be shown as followed:

- 74.218.137,00 rsd - compensation for land,
- 15.531.933,00 rsd – compensation for structures,

- 25.236.736,00 rsd – compensation for standing crops,
- 848.000,00 rsd - additional assistance

All the funds made available through PERS are estimated and designated through the Law of the Budget for 2009. By which the necessary amount of needed funds are transferred to the PERS. The Government made those funds operable by passing the Law through the Parliament The law of the Budget for 2009. Has been passed through the Parliament and disclosed at the Official Gazette of Republic of Serbia No 120/2008 and 31/2009 as well as the Law of Budget for the year 2010. Passed in the Parliament and disclosed at the Official Gazette of Republic of Serbia No 107/2009.

5.15 Implementation schedule

Sl. No	Tasks	Target Date
1.	Disclosure of document	April 23rd 2010.
2.	Payment of additional assistance	May 15 th 2010.
3.	Revaluation for compensation in case of three pending cases	May 15 th
3.	Finalization of skill upgrading programs for PAPs	June 30 th 2010
4.	Organizing skill upgrading programs	August/September 2010.
5.	Impact evaluation	September 2011.

Implementation progress to date. The implementation is already in progress since the expropriation has begun at the time when the negotiations with the World Bank has not started. The remaining activities are to be considered insignificant and minor compared to the already commenced and finished activities. The public disclosure of the document is the remaining activity.

5.16 Monitoring and Evaluation

Internal Monitoring

The internal monitoring is a conventional monitoring of government related to physical factors such as, number of families affected, resettled, assistance extended infrastructure facilities provided, etc. and other financial aspects, such as compensation paid, grant extended, etc. the internal M&E must be simultaneous with the implementation of the Resettlement Action Plan (RAP).

The objectives of the internal monitoring are:

- Daily Operations Planning;
- Management and Implementation; and
- Operational Trouble shooting and Feedback.

The periodicity of internal monitoring could be daily or weekly depending on the issues and level.

External monitoring

An external monitoring and Concurrent evaluation consultant will be appointed to monitor and evaluate R&R program on periodical basis. The role of such a consultant will facilitate process of R&R and thus provide support in the proper implementation of resettlement program. It should also

bring the difficulties faced by the PAPs to the notice of PIU so as to help in formulating corrective measures. As a feedback to the PIU and other concerned, the external consultant should submit quarterly report on progress made relating to different aspect of R&R.

The objectives of the external monitoring are:

- To track resettled and host population over time in order to document the restoration of incomes and standard of living.
- Determine remedial action if required.
- If income and standard of living of the PAPs has at least been restored and has not declined.
- In case of host population, whether income and standard of living of host population have not declined due to influence of resettlement.
- Whether PAP and host population has re-integrated with each other.

Further issues on the matter on monitoring and its consultants are described in chapter V.

5.17 Concurrent Evaluation

This evaluation will be carried out simultaneously with the monitoring. For concurrent Impact Evaluation the M&E consultant shall:

- Verify whether the objectives of resettlement have been realized, particularly the changes in the living standards;
- Impact assessments is to be compared with the baseline values for key socioeconomics as given in the RAP;
- To assess whether the compensation is adequate to replace the lost assets;
- Assess the level of satisfaction of the various assets provided as part of R&R implementation;
- Based on the impact assessment, suitable remedial measures are to be proposed for any shortcomings; and
- Remedial measures if PAPs are not able to improve their living standard.

5.18 Additional assistance

The social Impact Assessment (SIA) has identified 11 vulnerable households, 8 below poverty line, 2 with unemployed heads and 1 disabled. In line with the RPF, June 2009. These families are eligible and should be provided with additional assistance.

Since the SIA has described the overall of the social and economic status of all PAP in Dimitrovgrad, especially the ones described as vulnerable, monetary assistance as a nature of additional assistance has been decided to be the most adequate.

8 Households living below poverty line will be provided with additional assistance, and transitional allowance in the amount of 6 months minimum wages as determined by the Republic Statistical organization. This amount will be paid as a onetime allowance.

2 Households with unemployed family members will be provided additional assistance in the amount of 6 months minimum wages as determined by the Republic Statistical organization. This amount will be paid as a onetime allowance.

1 Family with one disabled member will be provided additional assistance in the amount of 6 minimum wages as determined by the Republic Statistical organization. This amount will be paid as a onetime allowance.

Since none of the PAPs have accepted the offer of replacement of agricultural land of equivalent productive value they are not eligible to receive transfer or administrative taxes. According to the Law of tax administration and taxes the PAP using the compensation amount to acquire new land parcels or other immovable properties is exempt from tax obligations in the amount of the compensation received.

In case when the period between the date of the decision on the compensation for expropriation of households and the date of payment of compensation is longer than 6 months, the households are eligible for transitional allowance up to 6 months in the amount of 5.000 rsd per month.

The PERS will make disbursement of the additional assistance directly to the account of those persons eligible to receive the additional assistance.

5.20 Additional assistance for PAP losing business, commercial space

As described in Para earlier the household, losing business has received monetary compensation in the amount that incorporates full relocation cost of business, and the replacement cost for any investment. Given the above explained this household is not eligible for additional assistance.

Bibliography

- *International Principles for Social Impact Assessment*. International Association for Impact Assessment, May 2003. Special Publication Series No. 2
- *PLA Problems @ Potentials Status Survey*. First Report. May 2002 , Milić, B. and Lj. Zrnzević (2002), www.angelfire.com/trek/balkanika/PLApictu.pdf
- *Opštine u Srbiji/Municipalities in Serbia 2008*. Belgrade: National Institute for Statistics
- *Transformation of Settlements and Population in Large Lignite Basins. Case of Kolubara Basin*. N.Spasić, K.Petovar, V.Jokić (2007) Belgrade: Institute of Architecture and Urban/Spatial Planning of Serbia
- *Prostorni i socioekonomski aspekti izmeštanja naselja Vreoci/Spatial and Socio-economic issue in relocation of Vreoci village*. In: *Održivi grad i njegovo okruženje/Sustainable city and its surrounding*. Belgrade; N.Spasić, K.Petovar and V.Jokić (2005): Institute of Architecture and Urban/Spatial Planning of Serbia. Special Edition 48
- *Strategija za smanjenje siromaštva/Strategy for decreasing poverty*. Government of the Republic of Serbia, Belgrade, 2003.

ANNEXURES

ANNEX I – Table with data from the poll conducted in November 2009 in Dimitrovgrad

ANNEX II - Poll questionnaire

This Questionnaire is a part of the activities in collecting data of importance for the evaluation of effects that the construction of the bypass road around Dimitrovgrad on the highway route E-80 Niš – Bulgarian border would have on the social development of the area, and especially on the population and households that are directly or indirectly affected by construction and use of this road. This poll questionnaire was developed based upon the methodology and requirements of the World Bank. The Questionnaire was sent to the households which are affected by the procedure of expropriation of real estate envisaged for the construction of the Dimitrovgrad Bypass.

Data collected in this questionnaire will be used exclusively for the needs of the elaboration of the Impact study and may not be used for other needs. Please cooperate and thus help us collect the necessary data for the benefit of the households possessing property which is the subject of expropriation.

Poll questionnaire

0. Identification of household

0.1. First and last name of head of household _____

0.2. ID No. _____

0.3. Address (place, street and number) _____

0.4. Ownership status of apartment or apartment building (mark appropriate): owner, tenant of apartment in private ownership, tenant of state-owned apartment

1.0. Type of influence to which household is exposed due to construction of Dimitrovgrad Bypass (mark appropriate):

1.1. The loss of agricultural land

1.1.1. The total area of expropriated lot _____ and area of expropriated part of the lot in square meters _____

1.1.2. The percentage of expropriated land in relation to the total ownership of agricultural land on the territory of the municipality Dimitrovgrad _____ %

1.1.3. The purpose of the expropriated land (mark appropriate): predominantly plowed land, predominantly vineyard, predominantly orchard, something else _____

1.1.4. Does your household employ external workers for the cultivation of expropriated land? YES NO

1.1.5. Is the expropriated land the basic source of income of your household? YES NO

1.1.6. How much income do you earn annually from this land? _____

1.1.7. Why did you choose funds for expropriated land instead of other agricultural land?

1.2. The loss of a residential structure (mark appropriate)

1.2.1. The purpose of the building (mark appropriate): for permanent residence; vacation and recreation; agricultural works

1.2.2. Gross area of the building _____ m²

1.2.3. Year of construction/reconstruction of building _____

1.2.4. Construction quality (mark appropriate): solid material; handy material

1.2.5. The following exists in the building (mark appropriate): kitchen, bathroom, connection to water supply of the settlement/pneumatic pump station; connection to sewer system of the settlement/outfitted with septic tank, electrical power.

1.3. The loss of business – business premises

- 1.3.1. Gross area of the building _____ m²
 1.3.2. Type of business _____
 1.3.3. The number of employees (out of which members of household _____, other _____)
 1.3.4. Monthly net income from business _____ RSD
 1.3.5. Total monthly turnover/circulation _____ RSD

1.4. The loss of other land (wood, pasture land...), area _____ m²**2.0. Demographic structure of the population:**

No.	Name	Relation to head of household	Sex	Age	Education	Occupation	Employment status
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							

Relation to head of household: fill in – father, mother, son, child, wife, daughter-in-law, grandmother, grandfather.....

Sex: M – male; F – female

Age: fill in the age

Education: fill in the highest degree of education or craft

Occupation: fill in the current occupation: driver, teacher ..., pensioner, housewife, pupil, student.

Employment status: permanent employment, employment for specific period, occasional employment, unemployed....

3.0. Total monthly income of household (collectively for each type of income)**3.1. Income from work**

- 3.1.1. Income from permanent employment _____ RSD per month
 3.1.2. Income from occasional employment or employment for specific period of time _____ RSD per month
 3.1.3. Income from pensions _____ RSD per month
 3.1.4. Agricultural income, total _____ RSD annually.

3.2. Income from social welfare and help

- 3.2.1. Social welfare _____ RSD per month
 3.2.2. Children support _____ RSD per month
 3.2.3. Disability welfare _____ RSD per month

3.3. Income from real estates

- 3.3.1. Lease of house or apartment _____ RSD per month
 3.3.2. Lease of agricultural land _____ RSD /per month.

5.0. Credit indebtedness of household. Does the household have the obligation to repay credit on a monthly basis? NO YES. If answer is YES, fill in the amount of monthly payment, and the amount of total credit indebtedness _____.

6.0. How does the household estimate its social –economic position:

- 6.1. As above average
- 6.2. As average
- 6.3. As very modest
- 6.4. As poor

7.0. How do you plan to spend the money received from expropriation:

- 7.1. For purchasing a construction lot for building a house (for himself/herself or children), in which town/city? _____
- 7.2. For purchasing and apartment, in which town, city? _____
- 7.3. For starting a new business
- 7.4. For purchasing new agricultural land
- 7.5. For purchasing equipment and devices for household
- 7.6. For purchasing a car
- 7.7. For purchasing a truck or tractor
- 7.8. For current living
- 7.9. For other, what _____

8. Is any household member interested in some kind of additional training and acquisition of new knowledge:

- 8.1. Yes, what kind of training, i.e. courses _____
- 8.2. No, why? _____

9. Please, provide us with data on how you distribute and what do you spend monthly income on:

- 9.1. Food _____ RSD/ monthly
- 9.2. Costs of lodgment _____ RSD/ monthly
- 9.3. Clothes, footwear _____ RSD/ monthly
- 9.4. Hygiene _____ RSD/ monthly
- 9.5. Education _____ RSD/ monthly
- 9.6. Transportation _____ RSD/ monthly
- 9.7. Medicines and medical treatment _____ RSD/ monthly
- 9.8. Other, fill in _____ RSD/ monthly

10. Which of the following devices do you possess in your household: (mark appropriate)

- 10.1. Car, _____ years old
- 10.2. Tractor , _____ years old
- 10.3. TV, _____ years old
- 10.4. Refrigerator, _____ years old
- 10.5. Freezer, _____ years old
- 10.6. Computer with internet connection

Thank you for your cooperation!

Questionnaire filled in by _____

Date and time of interview

ANNEX III - Tables Valuation of compensation for losses

Valuation of compensation for losses

E 80 Highway, Prosek – Dimitrovgrad L=83 km

SECTION: DIMITROVGRAD BYPASS: Dimitrovgrad (West) – Dimitrovgrad (Bulgarian border) L=5 km

CADASTRAL MUNICIPALITY DIMITROVGRAD

Case No.	Cadastral parcel No.	Property owner/ user	Cadastral parcel area (m ²)	Area needed for expropriation (m ²)
1.	4065	VIDENović SNEŽANA CVETKOV LIDIJA	3406	1417
2.	5220	PECEV GEORGI PECEV TODOR IGOV TODORKA PECEV ZLATAN PECEV CENA	6312	3206
3.	4016	JORDANOV GEORGI JORDANOV JORDAN KUZMANović VERA JORDANOV RANGEL JORDANOV IVICA	823	221
4.	4032	SAVOV NIKOLA VELKOV VERA SAVOV LAZAR	1666	921
5.	3814	ŠLJIVANČANIN JEVROSIMA	4690	365
6.	3608	PETROV MIROSLAV LJUBENOV LJUBEN LJUBENOV DANČA	3347	196
7.	5171/1	BRANKović ALEKSANDAR	1709	272
8.	5170	ILJJEV GORAN	2134	2134
9.	4009	FILIPOV SLAVKA	592	53
	4015	FILIPOV RANGEL	120	120
	4028	JAJIĆ PARASKEVA	121	121
	4029	JORDANOV JORDAN	351	351
	4030	JORDANOV JORDAN	281	281
10.	3600	PEJČIĆ HRISTINA JANKOV MARIN	2647	575
	4011	JANKOV IVAN VACEV VASIL	1315	125

Case No.	Cadastral parcel No.	Property owner/ user	Cadastral parcel area (m ²)	Area needed for expropriation (m ²)
11.	4013 4026	TOŠEV LEPOJA	502 1365	502 1365
12.	3605 3606	SOTIROV MILEVA	1109 849	1109 262
13.	4024 3694 4036	DIMIROVA NINA	1204 5107 3257	1204 1199 1330
14.	4063 4067	PECEV ASEN	5317 2629	1063 1917
15.	3695	IVANOV JOVICA IVAN GEORGI IVANOV LjUBA ALEKSOV GEORGI ALEKSOV KIRIL	2053	2053
16.	3998	JOSIFOVIĆ MILIVOJE GOGOV GEORGI	6143	153
17.	4981	IVANOV GOJKO	/	/
18.	4027 4031	PETROV ALEKSANDAR NIKOLOVA SLAVKA	863 803	144 803
19.	3642	IVANOV MILKA	3397	37
20.	4035	STEFANOV TODOR	2097	514
21.	5105	GOGOV LAZAR	1084	1084
22.	5104	NIKOLOV PREDRAG	2882	2882
23.	4980	BASMENKOV NIKOLA	4423	4423
24.	4070	KOSTOV GEORGI	3115	224
25.	3813 4003/1 4004	ANDONOV MLADEN	2165 5130 502	1528 3056 502
26.	5206	IVANOV MILKO TAŠKOV DRAGAN TAŠKOV ALEKSANDAR GEROV MILJA	95	95
27.	5214	JASIM MIRJANA	3156	45
28.	3697/1	VLADIMIROV VASILKA	2804	304
29.	4019	BUKILIĆ CVETANKA MANOILOV IRENA	3814	781

Case No.	Cadastral parcel No.	Property owner/ user	Cadastral parcel area (m ²)	Area needed for expropriation (m ²)
30.	4006 4007/2	ĆIROV LJUBINKA	1313 557	166 73
31.	4010 4012 4014	VOINOV SAŠKO	221 / 281	16 / 281
32.	4025	ĐUROV STEVAN ĐUROV IVAN	3362	2220
33.	4008	HRISTOV IVAN	542	542
34.	4978 4979	GEORGIJEV TODOR	183 2032	183 2032
35.	4033	JOSIFOV VIKTOR	1736	796
36.	3604	MITOV TODOR	2947	2947
37.	4002	BRKIĆ OLGA	1154	459
38.	4068	ALEKSOV KIRIL	3135	866
39.	3811 3812	JOTOV JORDAN	1687	1687
40.	3696	MIŠIĆ PETAR	2654	2105
41.	3693/1	BOŠKOV STANKO BOŠKOV BOŠKO	3781	111
42.	3640	GORČEV MILE	3047	256
43.	4034	KAMENOV VASIL	1556	556
44.	3810	FILIPOV DRAGAN	649	649
45.	5207	PETROV BOGDAN PETROV GEORGI	2816	151
46.	3603	ANTOV PREDRAG	1558	143
47.	3601	BONEV SVETOZAR	2598	834
48.	3968	DIMITROV VENETA IVANOV RAJNA	4374	658
49.	3969	PETROV STANOJE	3230	1581
50.	5171/2	CVETKOV BOGDAN MANEVSKI MILIĆ	500	500
51.	4066	VLADIMIROV ROMAN	2960	2030
52.	760	PANIĆ MIROSLAV KNEŽEVIĆ MIRJANA	1	1
53.	4023	DRAGANOV MIRČA	622	622

Case No.	Cadastral parcel No.	Property owner/ user	Cadastral parcel area (m ²)	Area needed for expropriation (m ²)
54.	5084	ŠUKAREV MARKO ŠUKAREV ZLATA	/	/
55.	5169/1	DIMITROV VASILKA	95396	95396
56.	3681	VELIČKOV KRUM	/	/
57.	4037	NIKOLOV DIMITAR PETROV ALEKSANDAR NIKOLOV SLAVKA	6574	1892
58.	3602	PEJČEV GEORGI	4296	1003

CADASTRAL MUNICIPALITY ŽELJUŠA

Case No.	Cadastral parcel No.	Property owner / user	Cadastral parcel area (m ²)	Area needed for expropriation (m ²)
1.	270	JOSIFOV GEORGI	1287	1287
2.	269	ALEKSOV JORDAN	1517	1517
3.	256	ATANASOV MARIN	3118	1485
4.	251/2	GEORGIJEV VESELKA	1393	873
5.	265	GOCEV LJUBEN	1287	1287
6.	268	PETROV KOŠUTA	1272	1272
7.	248	ZARKOVA LJILJANA	1455	817
8.	247	JORDANOV ROKSANDA	1532	1532
9.	285	MANOILOV BRANISLAV	2297	643
10.	282	NAKOV DEJAN	622	622
11.	284 287	PETROV LJUBOMIR	114 3875	114 810
12.	250	PETROV EVDOKIJA	1328	1328
13.	258	SOKOLOV TOMISLAV	2782	1058
14.	273 274 276	STAMENOV SAŠA STAMENOV BRANISLAV STAMENOV CVETANKA STAMENOV NIKOLA STAMENOV ZORAN	545 2168	325 2168
15.	249/2	STOJANOV LILKA	1496	869
16.	264	SOKOLOV TOMISLAV	769	769
17.	263	STEFANOV PAVLINA	713	713
18.	272	TODOROV PETAR IVANOV VASIL	100	100
19.	275	TODOROV SAVA	228	228
20.	257	TEŠANOVIĆ MILOVANKA	1465	1465
21.	244	ANDREEV DANIEL	1132	1132
22.	245	SOKOLOV TOMISLAV	1178	1178
23.	246	SIMONOV CVETAN	2449	555
24.	271	LEKOV JELENA KUČE ANA	87	87

ANNEX IV - List of resolved cases – DIMITROVGRAD PHASE I AND II

No.	Date and way of resolving		Surface m ²	Name of the party
1.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-21/2008; dated November 18, 2008.	5493 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	1480	Borisov Nikola
2.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-12/2008; dated November 18, 2008.	3358 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	2008	Taškov Stojči
3.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-9/2008; dated November 18, 2008.	5486 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	5895	Kovačev Ivica and other
4.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-14/2008; dated November 18, 2008.	3267 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	3405	Ivanov Boris
5.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-35/2008; dated November 18, 2008.	3266 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	2259	Kamenov Nikola and other.
6.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-66/2008; dated November 21, 2008.	2014,2015, 2016,2042 all in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	4497	Lekov Mirko
7.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-7/2008; dated November 21, 2008.	3361 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	2511	Sotirov Petar (1/2 of amount)
8.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-36/2008; dated November 20, 2008.	3360 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	689	Ilijev Goran
9.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-20/2008; dated November 18, 2008.	3376/4 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	344	Tasev Petar (1/3)
10.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-27/2008; dated November 21, 2008.	3288 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	1656	Stančev Blagoje and other.
11.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-23/2008; dated November 20, 2008.	3289/1 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	338	Stamenov Slavči
12.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-25/2008; dated November 20, 2008.	5494 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	1058	Minov Mino
13.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-10/2008; dated November 20, 2008.	3269 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	1783	Mijalkov Marija
14.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-116/2008; dated November 18, 2008.	3354 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	37	Nikolić Verka and other
15.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-121/2008; dated November 18, 2008.	2013 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje (tenement house)	405	Kolev Vasil
16.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-22/2008; dated November 24, 2008.	3357 and 3270 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	3404	Minev Ljubomir
17.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-52/2008; dated November 27, 2008.	5492 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	1636	Todorov Dušica

No.	Date and way of resolving		Surface m ²	Name of the party
18.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-32/2008; dated November 26, 2008.	5485 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	1769	Marinkov Dinka
19.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-65/2008; dated November 27, 2008.	1251,1252,1379,1180 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	4629	Dojčev Dragan
20.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-29/2008; dated November 27, 2008.	5491 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	177	Hristov Verica
21.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-88/2008; dated November 26, 2008.	2042 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	2272	Gerov Sreten
22.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-8/2008; dated November 26, 2008	3308 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	268	Dimitrov Perka
23.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-19/2008; dated November 27, 2008.	5519 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	605	Gogov Zoran
24.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-26/2008; dated November 27, 2008.	3307 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	979	Dragan Nikolov (1/3)
25.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-26/2008; dated November 27, 2008.	3307 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	979	Nikolov Novica (1/3)
26.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-26/2008; dated November 27, 2008.	3307 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	979	Zarev Bogdan (1/3)
27.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-28/2008; dated November 18, 2008.	5495,5496 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	1421	Jordanov Dejan
28.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-78/2008; dated December 03, 2008.	2029 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	78	Todorov Daniel
29.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-97/2008; dated December 01, 2008.	1222,1256, 1260,1975, 1976,1979 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	8717	Zarkov Dragan and Zarkov Toni
30.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-113/2008; December 03, 2008.	3371 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	11	Vučković Mariola (1/3)
31.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-67/2008; December 03, 2008.	1221,1254,1257, 1258,1259,1977 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	7890	Petrov LJiljana
32.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-120/2008; December 03, 2008.	1211/1 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	543	Nackov Stanul
33.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-6/2008, December 04, 2008.	5487/1 and 5487/2 in Land registry of Municipality of	3088	Tričkov Mihailo and Antov Anki

No.	Date and way of resolving		Surface m ²	Name of the party
		Dimitrovgrad		
34.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-90/2008; dated December 05, 2008.	2012 and 2018 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	134	Gerov Sreten
35.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-86/2008; dated December 05, 2008.	2034 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	2589	Cenkov Milena (1/4)
36.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-58/2008; dated December 09, 2008.	1143 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	1460	Vlajev Emil
37.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-15/2008; dated December 08, 2008.	1144 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	1567	Bijev LJubomir
38.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-98/2008; dated December 08, 2008.	2021, in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	977	Manoilov Rangel
39.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-118/2008; dated December 08, 2008.	1214 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	739	Ivanov Prvan and Milanov Milorad
40.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-106/2008; dated December 09, 2008.	1215 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	926	Mančev Nacko
41.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-57/2008; dated December 09, 2008.	1141 and 1142 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	2854	Todorov Stojan and Todorov Todor
42.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-75/2008; dated December 11, 2008.	2037 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	453	Stanojević Rajnička
43.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-101/2008; dated December 11, 2008.	2028 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	231	Petrov Lenka
44.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-107/2008; dated December 11, 2008.	1981 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	92	Zarkov Dragan
45.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-33/2008; dated December 10, 2008.	1145 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	1071	Ivanov Georgi, Ivanov Koprine and Kocev Olgica
46.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-76/2008; dated December 12, 2008.	1207 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	2556	Stanulov Slavica
47.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-64/2008; dated December 11, 2008.	1982 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	1180	Dimitrov Aleksandar
48.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-74/2008; dated December 12, 2008.	2035 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	446	Lekov Nikola

No.	Date and way of resolving		Surface m ²	Name of the party
49.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-126/2008; dated December 10, 2008.	1234 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	126	Gligorov Mladen
50.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-62/2008; dated December 12, 2008.	1232 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	271	Andonov Sandri and Andonov Ivana
51.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-113/2008; dated December 12, 2008.	2040 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	179	Dimitrov Trifun
52.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-79/2008; dated December 12, 2008.	1983 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	654	Gerasimov Dušan
53.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-33/2008; dated December 15, 2008.	1145 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	1071	Ivanov Georgija
54.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-117/2008; dated December 16, 2008.	2000 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	178	Kostadin Minčev (2/5)
55.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-70/2008; dated December 15, 2008.	1107 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	520	Ilijev Rangel
56.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-13/2008; dated December 16, 2008.	3271 and 5477 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	2619	Kostov Đorđe
57.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-64/2008; dated December 15, 2008.	2038 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	235	Dimitrov Siniša and Dimitrov Ivica
58.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-86/2008; dated December 16, 2008.	2034 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	647	Stanković Dragan (1/4)
59.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-77/2008; dated December 15, 2008.	1238 and 1239 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	717	Ivanov Ivana
60.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-71/2008; dated December 16, 2008.	1220 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	7	Kolev Mladen
61.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-117/2008; dated December 17, 2008.	2000 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	178	Minčev Predrag(2/5)
62.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-117/2008; dated December 17, 2008.	2000 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	178	Georgijev Nikola (1/5)
63.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-91/2008, dated December 17, 2008.	1261,1273, 1274 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	6595	Ilijev Olivera
64.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-119/2008; dated December 18, 2008.	2022 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	1794	Mitov Sima
65.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-18/2008; dated December 18, 2008.	2026 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	247	Gerov Sreten
66.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-33/2008; dated December 18, 2008.	1145 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	1071	Ivanov Koprine (3/15)

No.	Date and way of resolving		Surface m ²	Name of the party
67.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-96/2008; dated December 18, 2008.	1206 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	1967	Milev Vera
68.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-99/2008; dated December 18, 2008.	1985 and 1986 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	981	Gerasimov Dušan, Lekov Anica Andonov Petar (all with 1/3 of the share)
69.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-104/2008; dated December 23, 2008.	2041 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	199	Mocev Stefana
70.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-47/2008; dated December 29, 2008.	1136 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	2262	Veselinov Dimitar-
71.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-55/2008; dated December 26, 2008.	1139 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	2424	Petrov Cvetanka
72.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-85/2008; dated December 29, 2008.	2008 and 2009 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	224	Sokolov Ilija
73.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-38/2008; dated December 30, 2008.	3305 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	2488	Jordanov Jordan(62/160)
74.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-38/2008; dated December 26, 2008.	3305 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	2488	Jordanović Ivica (51/160)
75.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-38/2008; dated December 26, 2008.	3371 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	11	Petrov Nacko(1/3)
76.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-87/2008, dated January 08, 2009.	1984 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	530	Zaharijev Asena
77.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-46/2008; dated December 22, 2008.	1140 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	1684	Vladimirov Mladen
78.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-18/2008-1; dated January 08, 2009.	5484 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	181	Marković Zlatja
79.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-43/2008-1; dated January 21, 2009.	5520 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	581	Krstev Trojan
80.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-43/2008-2; dated January 21, 2009.	5520 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	581	Krstev Todor
81.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-48/2008; dated January 26, 2009.	1138 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	2070	Hristov Slavka
82.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-51/2008-1; dated January 26, 2009.	3264 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	1631	Zarkov Marija(3/16)
83.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-37/2008-1; dated January 26, 2009.	3311 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	2212	Milčev Aca

No.	Date and way of resolving		Surface m ²	Name of the party
84.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-72/2008-1; dated January 26, 2009.	1961 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	377	Stojanov Tanka
85.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-54/2008-1; dated January 27, 2009.	1146 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	1395	Petrović Vesna (1/2)
86.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-54/2008-2; dated January 27, 2009.	1146 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	1395	Vacev Nikola (1/2)
87.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-30/2008-1; dated January 27, 2009.	3268 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	627	Petrović Vesna (2/8)
88.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-30/2008-2; dated January 27, 2009.	3268 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	627	Vacev Nikola (2/8)
89.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-89/2008-1; dated January 26, 2009.	1246 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	430	Atanas Ivanov
90.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-51/2008-2; dated February 02, 2009.	3264 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	1631	Stanulov Slavica
91.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-76/2008-2; dated February 02, 2009.	1207 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	2556	Stanulov Slavica
92.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-122/2008-1; dated February 04, 2009.	1210 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	1233	Petrov Slavko
93.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-28/2008-2; dated February 04, 2009.	5496 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	456	Jordanov Milorad
94.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-59/2008-1; dated February 04, 2009	1229 1230 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	708	Manov Dimitru
95.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-59/2008-1; dated February 04, 2009.	1242 and 1241 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	2431	Matejević Vera
96.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-125/2008-2; dated February 03, 2009.	1211/2, 1211/3 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	906	Petrov Slavko
97.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-50/2008-1; dated February 04, 2009.	1150 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	452	Sokolov Sokol
98.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-25/2008-2; dated February 06, 2009.	5494 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	1159	Minov Mina
99.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-7/2008-1; dated February 05, 2009.	3361 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	1257	Sotirov Petar(1/2)
100	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-12/2008-2; dated February 05, 2009.	3358 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	163	Taškov Stojča

No.	Date and way of resolving		Surface m ²	Name of the party
101	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-38/2008-2; dated February 05, 2009.	3305 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	446	Jordanov Ivica
102	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-38/2008-3; dated February 06, 2009.	3305 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	446	Jordanov Jordan
103	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-128/2008-2; dated February 06, 2009.	5486 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	1253	Kovačev Ivica Antanasov Sonja
104	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-93/2008-2; dated February 06, 2009.	2036 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	884	Milošević Stojan
105	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-129/2008-2; dated February 09, 2009.	2013 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	889	Kolev Vasil
106	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-96/2008-2 dated February 10, 2009.	2013 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	694	Ivanov Ivan
107	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-106/2008-2; dated February 10, 2009.	1215 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	40	Mančev Nacko
108	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-106/2008-2, dated February 10, 2009.	3357 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	agricultural products	Minev LJubomir
109	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-10/2008-2; dated February 11, 2009.	3269 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	676	Mijalkov Marija
110	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-20/2008-2; dated February 10, 2009.	3376/4 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	115	Mitoč Čeda
111	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-11/2008-2; dated February 11, 2009.	3286 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	2284	Gligorov Hristina
112	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-118/2008-2; dated February 12, 2009.	1214 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	136	Ivanov Milorad and Milanov Milorad
113	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-96/2008-2; dated February 17, 2009.	1206 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	750	Milev Vera
114	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-57/2008-2, dated February 18, 2009.	1141 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	400	Todorov Stojan Todorov Todor
115	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-21/2008-2; dated February 19, 2009.	5493 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	1074	Borisov Nikola
116	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-49/2008-1; dated February 19, 2009.	1148 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	1833	Stanković Bojan
117	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-75/2008-2; dated February 23, 2009.	2037 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	651	Stanojević Rajnička
118	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-56/2008-2; dated February 23, 2009.	1135 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	1536	Cenkov Tridafilka
119	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-	2921 in Land registry of Municipality of	696	219,240.00 Manoilov Rangel

No.	Date and way of resolving		Surface m ²	Name of the party
	98/2008-2; dated February 24, 2009.	Gradinje		
120	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-85/2008-2; dated February 20, 2009.	1208 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	210	Sokolov Ilija
121	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-101/2008-2; dated February 23, 2009.	2028 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	293	Petrov Lenka
122	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-52/2008-2; dated February 23, 2009.	5492 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	491	Todorović Dušica
123	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-97/2008-1; dated February 20, 2009.	1975 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	259	Zarkov Toniju
124	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-72/2008-2; dated February 24, 2009.	1961 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	381	Stojanov Tanka
125	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-82/2008-1; dated March 24, 2009	1212/1 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	1264	Rančev Vasil
126	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-1/2009-1; dated March 24, 2009	5516, 5517, 5518 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	5567	Kirov Cvetko
127	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-113/2008-1; dated March 12, 2009.	3371 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	11	Ivanov Petrov Gina
128	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-5/2008-1; dated March 30, 2009	3283/2, 3284/4, 3289/2 3285 in Land registry of Municipality of Dimitrovgrad	3542	Vasov Bogoslav
129.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-82/2008-1; dated June 09, 2009	1212/1 in Land registry of Municipality of Gradinje	Residential structure	Rančev Vasil
130.	Agreement on Compensation No. 465-81/2008-1; dated June 05, 2009	1212/2	260 Residential structure	Rangelov Randel

ANNEXURE V - Entitlement Matrix

Affected Categories	Entitlement
Loss of entire land holding	(i) offer of replacement agricultural land of equivalent productive value in the area and vicinity of the land being expropriated, together with all transfer/administrative taxes; or (ii) Monetary compensation based on the assessed fair value. All PAPs and households have decided upon receiving monetary compensation for the expropriated agricultural land.
Partial loss of land	(i) offer of replacement agricultural land of equivalent productive value in the area and vicinity of the land being expropriated, together with all transfer/administrative taxes; or (ii) Monetary compensation based on the assessed fair value. None of the PAP or households has asked for land as compensation for the land being expropriated
Unviable, redundant parcels of land/structures	If a remaining parcel of land after expropriation is not economically viable, it will be acquired and compensated if the project affected person so desires.
Structures and installations on the land (barns, shacks, fences, etc.)	The replacement cost for any investment made, and the value of time invested in construction. Value of structures that are being expropriated is determined as the summarized value of all structures located on the land, in accordance to the methodology of the Organization of assessment from Belgrade, which applies to the entire Republic of Serbia
Crops	The value of the crop, including the value of time needed to reproduce such a crop, and the replacement cost for any investment made (input, labor etc.). According to the Law on expropriation.
Fruit bearing plants, vineyards, and orchards	The value of the harvest, including the value of time needed to reproduce such a harvest, the replacement cost for any investment made, (input, labor etc.) to raise new plants, vineyard or orchard until they reach full yielding potential.
Young vineyards or orchards not yet fruit-bearing	The replacement cost for any investment made for raising a replacement vineyard or orchards, including the value of time needed to reproduce, and compensation for lost yields for each year from the year of expropriation.
Nursery	The replacement cost for any investment made on planting material (nursery plants and other reproduction material) not utilized.
Land needed on temporary basis	The market rental price for the duration of the lease. The land should be returned to the project affected person, in

	the same condition as it was taken. There are no cases of temporary expropriation .
House	Full compensation based on the replacement cost in a similar/comparable area plus moving, transfer/administrative taxes, and transition allowance.
Lessees of Public or State owned properties	Provision of the use of other corresponding Public or State owned equivalent property with the rights of a lessee for an equivalent period of time. There are no lessees of Public or State owned properties on the alignment..
Legal renters, employees, or workers on the land or in a business	Compensated for lost income earned from the land, as determined in the social assessment, and the replacement cost for any investment made on the land. Only one household had one season worker employed and only on occasions.
Illegal users of public and private land	Compensated for the replacement cost of any investment made on the land. There haven't been identified illegal users of public and private land
Persons with non-agricultural business	Full relocation cost of businesses affected, including the inventory, and the replacement cost for any investment.
Vulnerable groups (affected households with many dependents, household with unemployed head, households with disabled, poor households)	For this group, they will be given additional financial assistance to ensure that they will be no worse off after the project and can maintain and restore their livelihoods.

ANNEXURE VI – Nature of impact

		Impacts				
a)	Permanently acquired land	Cultivated Land within the line of acquisition (paddy field, dry field, vegetable field)				
		Non/cultivated land within the line of acquisition (forestry field and housing land)				
b)	Relocated buildings:	buildings relocated within the line of expropriation, mainly including brick and concrete houses and simple houses				
c)	Affected land attachments	land attachments located within the line of expropriation, mainly including supporting wall, well, brick/tile kiln				
d)	Affected families	all families that have land, building or land attachments				
e)	Project affected persons	population of all families affected by the project				

ANNEXURE VII

Receiving Unit		Date	Location	
Name of complainant PAP	Content of complaint	The request mode of solving the complaint	Proposed plan	The actual results of treating the complaint
Number of complaint				Recorder Member of Grievance Commission*

ANNEXURE VIII – Poll 2009

Anketa 2009- double click to open excel document

ANNEXURE IX - List of grievances and its outcome

Receiving Unit : Dimitrovgrad	
Number of Complaints registered	73
Number of Complaints favored	54
Number of Complaints denied	19
Number of PAP s entering the judicial process	19

ANNEXURE X – TOR for M&E Consultants

The Social Safeguard Specialist (SSS) shall be a graduate of sociology, anthropology, legal or related sciences, with a further qualification in resettlement issues, having at least 15 (fifteen) years experience, of which at least 5 (five) years have been spent working in a senior managerial position supervising the resettlement issues of major projects including control and monitoring of resettlement plans.

The SSS shall be responsible to the TL and to the PM for:

- providing advice on any resettlement issues and assist the Client and other bodies in processing and resolution of resettlement claims;
- providing advice on correct procedures to be followed and preparation of schedule when actions should be taken relevant to the design and construction program (action plan shall comply with the relevant policies of the GoS);
- review, update and/or preparation of new resettlement plans consistent with the resettlement framework plans and assisting the Client in preparing and updating resettlement plans;
- supervision and monitoring the implementation of the resettlement plans;
- monitoring the work related to dealing with complaints and grievances;
- providing updates to the resettlement plans as required to address any recurring problems or complaints;
- coordination and reporting on grievance resolution committee activities;
- management the aspects related to communication and disclosure of resettlement aspects under the Project;
- reporting monthly to the TL and the PM upon resettlement issues;
- Assisting the TL in preparation of guides for environmental management and establishment and implementation of the training program.

ANNEXURE XI- List of 19 pending cases entering the judicial process

<i>List of Project affected Persons entering the judicial process</i>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Josifov Georgije 2. Kaladziski Ljubica 3. Sokolov Tomislav 4. Antov Predrag 5. Mitov Cedomir 6. Josifov Viktor 7. Petrov Desanka 8. Dimitrov Veneta 9. Petrov Evdokija 10. Jovanovic Stanislav 11. Đurov Borka 12. Stojanov Lilka 13. Todorov Petra 14. Petrov Aleksandra 15. Nikolov Dimitra 16. Šljivančanin Jevrosima 17. Gorčev Mida 18. Gogov Lazar 19. Jotov Jordan 	