MODULE 7

MONITORING

I. Monitoring Overview

In the context of resettlement, monitoring is the regular (e.g., weekly, monthly, quarterly, or yearly) assessment of ongoing activities and their outcomes. Monitoring provides project management and affected persons with timely information about whether compensation, livelihood restoration, resettlement, and other measures are being delivered in accordance with RAP or LRP commitments, and whether key outcomes are achieved. Monitoring identifies where adjustments are needed and recommends corrective actions. Monitoring is usually conducted both internally by the project resettlement team, and externally by independent parties.

Internal monitoring looks at resettlement progress and performance. It is an essential implementation and risk-management tool and a key component of the ESMSs mandated by PS1. It provides information to check progress, delays, cost, and efficiency, and it reveals errors, thereby offering opportunities for correction, improvements, and learning. Internal monitoring also generates information that contributes to internal accountability and external transparency with stakeholders.

External monitoring assesses performance and compliance with applicable standards, such as PS5 or similar international requirements, and is typically mandated where external stakeholders require an independent assessment of compliance. Beyond demonstrating compliance to external parties, external monitoring is also critical for assessing the effectiveness of the resettlement process, particularly whether livelihoods have been improved or restored. External monitoring generally includes (i) regular compliance reviews throughout the resettlement-planning and implementation period, which provide unbiased advice to the resettlement team to swiftly identify and fix potential noncompliances, and (ii) a completion audit meant to confirm that commitments in the RAP or LRP have been met, particularly those pertaining to livelihood restoration.

II. Internal Monitoring

II.A. Key Objectives

Internal monitoring is a recurring task that begins at resettlement planning and involves measurement through time of specific indicators to assess ongoing activities and progress including the following objectives:

- Actions and commitments defined in the RAP or LRP are implemented fully and delivered on time.

- RAP actions and compensation measures are effective in helping affected persons in restoring their homes and in sustaining/improving preproject living standards.
- Complaints and grievances are being followed up with appropriate corrective actions and tracking of outcomes.
- PAPs are informed about project impacts and mitigations and have a say in the design of mitigation measures.
- Vulnerable persons are tracked and assisted as necessary.
- Recurrent or systemic problems that require correction are identified and fixed.

II.B. Internal Monitoring Indicators

Internal monitoring measures, on a regular basis, a set of indicators that need to be identified during the planning phase and included in the RAP or LRP. Table 7.1 provides examples of such indicators. These are context- and program-specific and need to be tailored to the nature and magnitude of displacement. Some of these indicators can be used as KPIs for project management and external stakeholders.

Table 7.1. Examples of Internal Monitoring Indicators

INDICATORS	MEASURED HOW	FREQUENCY	KPI?
Overall spending on resettlement activities	Financial records	Quarterly	Yes
Distribution of spending on relevant items (examples): • Planning and surveys • Cash compensation or in-kind compensation • Resettlement site development and housing • Livelihood restoration • Vulnerable groups • General implementation services, including engagement and grievance management, and overhead	Financial records	Quarterly	No
Number of full-time and part-time staff and consultants (gender disaggregated) dedicated to resettlement, compensation, and livelihood-restoration activities	Human resources	Quarterly	Yes
Number of vehicles, computers, GPS units, and other equipment as applicable	Count	Quarterly	No
Number of affected households and/or people by categories and gender (particularly where there are changes from the initial RAP/LRP)	Census, grievance management records, compensation records	Quarterly	Yes
Number of replacement dwellings: construction commenced, completed, and delivered in the period	Construction	Monthly	Yes

(*Table continued on next page*)

Table 7.1. *(Continued)*

INDICATORS	MEASURED HOW	FREQUENCY	KPI?
Number of households moved into their replacement dwelling in the period	Data management system	Monthly	Yes
Number of households and/or people that received cash compensation in the period, with distribution by purpose and by classes of amounts	Data management system	Monthly	No
Community facilities built	Construction team	Quarterly	No
Number of households replacing land and acreage of replacement land actually secured by affected households	Data management system	Quarterly	Yes
Number of households and/or people (sex disaggregated) that received livelihood-restoration–related training or other assistance in the period, with distribution by type of training (agriculture, business, fisheries, etc.)	Data management system	Quarterly	No
Average time for grievance processing	Time between grievance registration and closure	Quarterly	Yes
Number of open grievances at the end of each quarter and trends over time	Grievance log	Quarterly	Yes
Number of grievances opened and closed in the period and trends over time	Grievance log	Quarterly	No
Categories of grievances and trends over time	Grievance log	Quarterly	No
Gender of aggrieved individuals	Grievance log	Quarterly	No

(*Table continued on next page*)

Table 7.1. *(Continued)*

INDICATORS	MEASURED HOW	FREQUENCY	KPI?
Number of ongoing court cases and trends over time	Grievance log	Quarterly	No
Average (mean and/or median) time for payment of compensation	Time between signing of compensation agreements and payment	Quarterly	Yes
Has compensation been paid at full replacement cost? Is compensation updated to take account of value increases in real estate or crops?	For programs spanning several years: check the real estate market yearly. Investigate whether recipients of cash compensation were able to purchase similar properties. Monitor agricultural produce markets. Update compensation rates accordingly.	Yearly	Yes
Use of compensation	Conduct yearly survey of compensated households and/or yearly focus groups with selected layers of project-affected persons. Check on use of compensation and gender aspects.	Yearly	No
Satisfaction with allocated dwellings	Conduct satisfaction survey one year after the move. Look at house layout, materials, heat regulation, ventilation, sanitary facilities, and any other aspects relevant to the particular site and house design; make sure that opinions of youth and women are considered.	One year after move	No
Satisfaction with community facilities (drinking water, power, community center, school, health clinic, recreational facilities, access roads, etc.)	Conduct satisfaction survey looking at accessibility and affordability of services, making sure that opinions of youth and women are considered.	One year after move	No

(*Table continued on next page*)

Table 7.1. *(Continued)*

INDICATORS	MEASURED HOW	FREQUENCY	KPI?
Technical and construction quality issues	Identify technical and construction quality problems in the first few months after resettlement and address them through contractor guarantees, if relevant.	Two to six months after move	No
Sanitation and waste management	Observe cleanliness of public spaces and disposal of wastes. Check on effectiveness of organizational arrangements for maintenance and cost recovery.	Quarterly, until systems are working effectively	No
Renters	Monitor renters to ensure they have found replacement housing.	Quarterly	No
Agricultural land replacement	Is land of equivalent size and potential available to resettlers? Have resettlers been supported in preparing this land for cultivation?	Initially quarterly then yearly	No
Business reestablishment	Have businesses been successfully reestablished? Survey a sample of businesses and compare with baseline.	Yearly	Yes
Business employees	Are employees still employed in the relocated businesses? Survey employees over a sample of businesses and compare with baseline.	Yearly	No
Income	Are household incomes restored? Survey occupations and income over a stratified sample of resettled households and compare with baseline or undertake qualitative interviews in focus groups.	Yearly	No

(*Table continued on next page*)

Table 7.1. *(Continued)*

INDICATORS	MEASURED HOW	FREQUENCY	KPI?
Fisheries	Have affected fisheries been reestablished? Survey fisherpeople and associated workers (driers, smokers, fishmongers) and compare with baseline or undertake qualitative interviews in focus groups.	Yearly	No
Vulnerability	Have some households become vulnerable (e.g., due to illness or death of the main wage earner or loss of their support networks)? Have any households previously identified as vulnerable improved their status?	Yearly	No

II.C. Implementation of Internal Monitoring

Internal monitoring tools and indicators should be designed to be consistent with the methods and initial indicators used for baseline data collection. The LRP and/or RAP must describe internal monitoring methods and implementation arrangements, and demonstrate consistency between monitoring indicators and baseline data. Indicators should preferably be developed as part of the baseline data gathering process to ensure this consistency.

It is better to have 10 indicators that are fully relevant, consistently measured, and used than to have 40 indicators that are measured sporadically, have limited relevance, or are not used.

Monitoring should be a specific function allocated to designated individuals within the resettlement unit of the project. Monitoring is often allocated to people also dealing with resettlement databases and GISs, which makes sense, as much of the work has to do with generating numerical indicators.

III. External Monitoring

III.A. Compliance Reviews

Compliance reviews conducted by external experts check whether the implementation of the program complies with the RAP or LRP and with the government's and lenders' standards. Compliance reviews of the resettlement and livelihood programs may be undertaken on a stand-alone basis or as part of a broader project social and environmental compliance review. Involvement of resettlement specialists is critical, particularly for high-risk projects with large-scale resettlement. Compliance reviews are based on the internal monitoring activities, particularly indicators and surveys, developed and conducted by the project.

Compliance reviews usually start with a review of the ESIA as a whole, including the RAP or LRP. Ideally, external compliance reviewers should be involved early in the planning process, so that they can review and provide input to the draft RAP or LRP before it is finalized. Compliance reviews are undertaken regularly throughout resettlement planning and implementation. The reviews continue until a completion audit is undertaken (if there is one), or until the compliance reviewers declare that resettlement and livelihood restoration are complete, if no completion audit is required. The scope of compliance reviews should include liaising with government representatives and agencies at national and local levels during their audits, as government activities are often critical for the long-term sustainability of resettlement sites and livelihood-restoration activities. Reviews should also include engagement with affected communities and other relevant stakeholders, including local NGOs and CSOs, local leaders and other key resource persons.

The scope of work of compliance reviews for resettlement and livelihood restoration should include the following:

III.A.i. General

- Assess overall compliance with RAP and/or LRP objectives and commitments as well as government and lender policies and standards on land acquisition and involuntary resettlement.
- Verify progress on the recommendations that the external compliance reviewer made during previous visits.
- Interview a representative cross-section of affected households and enterprises to
    - Gauge the extent to which the standards of living and livelihood of displaced households for men and women have been improved or restored.
    - Measure whether men and women in households have been sufficiently informed and consulted with.

- Gather their opinions on entitlement delivery, resettlement housing, livelihood-restoration measures, and grievance management.

- Use panel surveys (visiting the same households once a year over the entire resettlement period).
- Assess the ongoing level of project support or social license to operate in the affected groups.

III.A.ii. Resettlement and compensation process, delivery of entitlements

- Review whether entitlements were delivered and implemented on time (as set out in the RAP/LRP implementation schedule).
- Assess whether compensation is at full replacement cost.

III.A.iii. Livelihood restoration

- Review any livelihood-restoration programs and the extent to which they are assisting in improving or restoring livelihoods for affected households with consideration of gender equality.
- Verify implementation of measures to improve or restore the quality of life and livelihoods of displaced households and assess their effectiveness.
- Assess the extent to which the quality of life and livelihoods of men and women in affected communities are being improved or restored.

III.A.iv. Internal monitoring

- Review internal monitoring and reporting procedures for conformity with the RAP/LRP.
- Review internal monitoring records and identify any potential areas of noncompliance, systemic or recurrent problems, or any vulnerable groups or households that may have not received adequate assistance.

III.A.v. Grievances

- Review grievance records for evidence of any significant noncompliance or recurrent poor performance in resettlement implementation or grievance management.
- Engage with a sample of complainants to review generic grievances (if applicable) and to obtain their views on the fairness of the grievance management process and resolution.

III.A.vi. Vulnerable people

- Appraise systems to identify, track, and assist vulnerable people, and assess compliance with the RAP/LRP.

III.A.vii. Implementation

- Assess whether there are adequate resources to implement the RAP/LRP and any training or capacity-building requirements.
- Assess the data management system and its outputs and outcomes.
- Compare progress against the initial schedule.
- Review any situations of corruption, extortion, or other unethical behavior, and how they have been managed.

The terms of reference of compliance reviews should be included in the RAP/LRP, with a description of implementation arrangements (level of effort, frequency of reviews, and disclosure of reports). A template is presented in Appendix K. Resettlement Compliance Reviews: Template for Terms of Reference.

III.B. Completion Audit

Completion audits assess whether a resettlement program is complete, objectives have been met, commitments delivered, and any corrective actions are needed to achieve targeted outcomes. Completion audits are usually undertaken from one to five years after physical relocation has been completed to ensure sufficient time has passed for livelihood restoration to have been sustainably achieved.

The completion audit is conducted by a resettlement specialist or group of specialists that have not been previously involved with the project that is being audited. The completion audit draws on the data generated by ongoing internal monitoring and the findings of the external compliance reviews. The RAP/LRP must define clear, measurable, and realistic completion indicators. Baseline and completion audit surveys gather data pertinent to the completion indicators as the basis for assessing completion.

III.B.i. Objectives

Key objectives of the completion audit are to undertake the following:

- Assess the effectiveness of all measures to avoid and minimize displacement impacts by comparing final project impacts on land and people against those anticipated in the RAP/LRP.
- Verify that all entitlements and commitments described in the RAP or LRP have been delivered and verify that delivery of compensation and livelihood-restoration measures was transparent, equitable, and prompt.
- Determine whether RAP/LRP measures have been effective in restoring or enhancing affected persons' living standards and livelihoods, including both men and women and vulnerable people.

- Check that resettlement-related grievances and court cases have been satisfactorily resolved (or that adequate provision has been made for their resolution in the near future).
- Check that gender barriers have been effectively challenged to ensure improved livelihood opportunities for women.
- Identify any corrective actions to achieve completion of RAP/LRP commitments and prepare a corrective plan if warranted.

III.B.ii. Scope and methodology

The completion audit should focus on livelihood restoration, since this is usually the most difficult aspect of resettlement, and it should build on previous internal and external monitoring to assess other aspects, such as satisfaction with housing or compensation adequacy. It will generally be based on a comparison of the post-resettlement economic situation of affected households with the baseline data. Where many households have been affected, a representative sample can be used, based on the same sampling strategy used at the baseline stage.

An alternative strategy to the previous method compares affected persons' livelihoods with those of an unaffected control group living in similar conditions and with similar sources of livelihoods. These two methods can be combined (pre-resettlement/post-resettlement and with resettlement/without resettlement). Inputs from a statistician may be needed to verify that comparisons are statistically sound. There is considerable benefit to using household survey questionnaires for monitoring that are identical or at least substantially similar to those that were used for baseline data collection. Identical coding and data management systems are desirable, so that data can easily be compared between the pre- and postimpact situations.

In addition to quantitative household surveys, the completion audit should also include qualitative and participatory approaches (such as focus groups and participatory rural appraisal) to learn about displaced households' level of satisfaction with their standards of living, livelihoods, level of integration with host communities, and other concerns. Particular attention must be paid to assessing the impact of RAP and/or LRP interventions on the circumstances of vulnerable households.

The pre-resettlement/post-resettlement comparison should usually be made over a period of three to six years, and therefore macroeconomic factors must also be considered: inflation and currency fluctuations, changes in real estate values, general growth of the economy or recession, market price for key agricultural products, pandemics, and so forth.

The completion audit report should present conclusions on livelihood improvement or restoration and identify any corrective measures necessary to achieve livelihood restoration (as a minimum) for displaced households.

The completion audit should also focus on whether physically displaced people have been successfully resettled, have security of tenure, and have similar or improved living standards. Particularly where cash compensation is offered, it is critical to verify that compensation was at full replacement cost and that people invested their compensation in replacing their homes and/or other assets, particularly those critical to livelihoods, such as agricultural land.

The scope, timing, and implementation arrangements for the completion audit should be presented in the RAP/LRP.

III.B.iii. Defining "completion"

There are several challenges in assessing the completion of livelihood-restoration measures:

- Accounting for macroeconomic factors (currency fluctuations, inflation, etc.) can be complex, and the comparison between the pre- and post-resettlement circumstances of affected households could very well be inconclusive. (Hence, there are benefits of comparing affected households to a control group in addition or as an alternative method.)
- Some resettled households may experience a decline in their livelihood activities and income as a result of misfortune that has nothing to do with the resettlement process (illness, injury or death of a breadwinner, theft, fire, etc.). Sometimes it may be difficult to clearly distinguish the impacts of misfortune from those resulting directly from resettlement. Such situations should be tracked, and people affected by them should be taken care of as vulnerable.
- The duration of the period between the occurrence of the displacement and completion assessment must be considered carefully.
    - Affected households must be well reestablished in their resettlement location (if they have been physically moved) and their economic activities must also be reinstated.
    - Where agricultural activities have to be reinstated on new, previously unused farming land, it may take several seasons to reach normal yields (usually three as a minimum and possibly up to six may be needed). The completion audit must also wait until the project is no longer providing transitional support or inputs, such as fertilizers or improved seeds, to be able to determine the sustainability of livelihood restoration.
    - A longer observation period can eliminate the effect of unusual natural fluctuations (droughts, locusts, etc.).
- Measuring income is never easy, as interviewees are reluctant to disclose their real earnings, and official tax returns are not always available or reliable. Statements on income should always be complemented by proxy indicators

(such as household expenditures, availability of certain assets and household items, level of indebtedness, etc.). Such proxy indicators should also be captured in the baseline to allow for comparison of the post-resettlement situation to the pre-displacement circumstances.

- In communities where subsistence activities are predominant, consideration of cash income alone is insufficient to describe the economic situation of a household. Self-consumed agricultural produce must be considered, although this is always difficult to appraise and value.
- Some households are impossible to track (especially those that move outside of the resettlement site). Similarly, some households may not want to enroll in livelihood-restoration activities proposed by the sponsor, or they may drop out after a while.

Achieving improved or restored livelihoods for 100 percent of affected households will usually be impossible. The issue is therefore to define a percentage of success that is both achievable and acceptable to communities, project sponsors, government authorities, and lenders, where applicable. This target percentage should be discussed and clearly committed to in the RAP/LRP and fine-tuned during the ongoing monitoring exercise as needed.

If a percentage, such as 90 percent, has been established as the target, then it should apply not only to the entire group of affected persons, but also to individual subgroups such as landowners, formal or informal land users, squatters, women-headed households, vulnerable people, and so forth. It would not suffice to achieve 90 percent of livelihoods restored if only 30 percent of a subgroup have their livelihoods restored, particularly if this group is vulnerable.

Appendix L. Resettlement Completion Audit: Template for Terms of Reference provides an example of terms of reference for a completion audit.

Box 7.1 provides an example of internal and external monitoring.

Box 7.1. Arrangements for Monitoring in the Ahafo South Mining Project

Newmont Ghana Gold Limited established a strong internal monitoring unit for its resettlement project affecting about 8,000 Ghanaian households, of whom 685 were physically displaced. The monitoring unit generated periodic reports as well as all related numerical and qualitative indicators, and commissioned studies on specific themes (e.g., a perception review and/or specific evaluations of certain livelihood-restoration activities) through local consultants.

In addition, two consultants carried out external reviews (on a biannual basis during the implementation phase of resettlement and later yearly). These reviews appraised compliance, outlining any aspect that was in potential or actual noncompliance with the requirements of PS5, and assessed performance against good practice.

Reports of the external reviewers were made public while internal monitoring reports were not. Three years after resettlement was complete, completion surveys were undertaken, and a completion audit report was produced on this basis. This process was reiterated for further phases of displacement related to the same mining operation.

IV. Gender in Monitoring

All socioeconomic information should be disaggregated by gender to capture differential impacts. In complex cases, consider differential impacts on household members by gender and age (not only at the level of household heads). For example, the impacts of household food shortages often fall disproportionately on women and young children. Long distances to a well, or scarcity of firewood at a resettlement location, can increase the burden on women and children.

Specific gender circumstances, such as a change in the status of different wives in polygamous households, gender-based violence and harassment (GBVH), or an increase in the occurrence of polygamy or divorces where cash compensation is paid exclusively to males, should be carefully monitored. This type of monitoring should be based on an initial risk assessment presented in the RAP or LRP, which is usually best achieved through qualitative methods, including separate focus groups with women of different ages, marital status, and social and economic status. Discussions on GBVH are especially sensitive and can place group discussion participants at further risk of violence. Such discussions should therefore be carried out by people with expertise in this area.

The assessment of gender dimensions relating to access to land is also important where agricultural land is affected. While traditional land rights and allocation systems often accommodate married women's access to land through specific mechanisms, this is not always the case, and the situation of single, divorced, or widowed women may be more problematic.

Similarly, there may be specific gender aspects to access to natural resources. For example, women may be more affected than men by impacts to forests: loss of fuelwood that they cook with; loss of NTFPs such as herbs, berries, or mushrooms that they may gather and market; loss of access to ponds for fishing; or increased distance to water sources.

Land-allocation mechanisms and access to natural resources can be disrupted by the resettlement process, resulting in hardship for women. A clear understanding of these mechanisms must be incorporated in the RAP or LRP so interventions can be made if impacts to women are evidenced by monitoring survey techniques that examine intrahousehold roles, and gender dynamics may need to be employed.

V. Arrangements for Implementing Monitoring

V.A. Overview

Resettlement monitoring should be conceived as a specialized component of the broader social and environmental monitoring that must be undertaken as part of the project ESMS.

All projects that entail displacement of any magnitude should organize and undertake internal monitoring as soon as displacement impacts occur. In addition, wherever economic displacement is significant and for most projects with physical displacement, external compliance reviews and a completion audit should be undertaken to check compliance independently, provide an external perspective to planning and implementation teams, and enhance credibility. Monitoring must be clearly defined in the RAP or LRP, including the following:

- Frequency of internal monitoring reports and disclosure arrangements[42]
- Frequency and scope of external compliance reviews and number and profile of independent specialists involved
- The scope of the completion audit, including the livelihood-restoration target (as detailed in section III.B.iii. Defining "completion" of this module), and its timing, indicative methodology, and the level of effort involved
- Disclosure arrangements (which reports to be disclosed to local communities, other local stakeholders, and the general public, and if so, via what avenues)
- Stakeholder engagement related to monitoring and the extent and scope of any participatory monitoring involving affected persons or other stakeholders

[42] Ideally, internal monitoring reports should be produced on a predetermined frequency (e.g., biannually during implementation and yearly afterward), and the frequency of external reviews should ideally be consistent with that of internal monitoring reports.

In projects with less significant displacement impacts, monitoring will typically be internal and allocated to staff also responsible for information management. Ideally, some level of internal auditing of data quality should be undertaken regularly (annually) as provided by internal quality assurance systems and standards per the ESMS.

V.B. Participatory Monitoring

Holding periodic focus groups with representatives of displaced people (including groups such as women, youth, the elderly, businesspeople, etc.) is invaluable, as it allows concerns to be voiced and considered as part of a monitoring or completion audit.

NGOs often take a significant interest in resettlement, and involving them in the monitoring process from the design stage (including selecting indicators) can help build local capacity and better relationships with the project. A simple way to involve NGOs in monitoring is to hold periodic information and consultation workshops to share and discuss outcomes of monitoring with stakeholders. Such workshops can target government agencies, NGOs, and civil society representatives in joint or separate sessions. Some projects have also successfully involved NGOs in more substantial monitoring, with regular visits and capacity-building workshops. Box 7.2 provides an example of a participatory monitoring program.

Box 7.2. Peru LNG Participatory Monitoring

The Peru LNG (PLNG) project consists of a liquefied natural gas (LNG) plant, associated marine facilities, and a 408-kilometer (km) natural gas pipeline. The LNG plant and marine facilities are located on the Pacific coast of Peru. The pipeline traversed 36 highland Andean communities that owned land communally.

PLNG committed to restore vegetation along the length of the pipeline right of way (RoW) with a focus on communal land affected by land take. PLNG recognized the extreme difficulty of monitoring contractor behavior, managing environmental impacts including erosion and rehabilitation of the pipeline RoW—especially at 12,000 feet—and the risks associated with a failure to restore livelihoods. To address this challenge, PLNG partnered with a nonprofit environmental foundation to design and implement a participatory monitoring program.

The program entailed the following elements:

- The program trained over 70 community members to act as monitors of environmental impacts and vegetation restoration along the RoW.
- Each year 37 monitors are enrolled in capacity-building programs.
- The monitors represented 35 highland communities, as well as eight associations of private landowners.
- The monitors were trained to identify and register nonconformities with management plans, such as contractor behavior that posed a reputational risk, delays, or negative impacts to vegetation restoration and construction impacts such as erosion.
- The monitors also provided an early warning system for the company on community grievances.
- The monitors were provided uniforms, personal protective equipment, digital cameras, and GPS units to record nonconformities.

The participatory monitoring program demonstrated that it (i) reduced social conflict by providing an effective way to submit concerns; (ii) strengthened the leadership capabilities of the monitors, who became recognized as community leaders; (iii) improved the company's and contractor's environmental performance; (iv) helped develop creative solutions for revegetation at extreme altitudes; and (v) built trust between the communities and the company. The program has become identified as a best practice in complex projects.

V.C. Reporting and Disclosing Monitoring Findings

Monitoring reports, whether internal or external, should be short and concise, with a summary of findings and a clear set of recommendations and corrective actions. Numerical indicators should be presented in a simple, preset format so comparisons can easily be made from one report to another. Trends between periods should be clearly shown.

To enhance transparency and facilitate stakeholder interest and involvement, the reports produced for each external compliance review, as well as completion audit reports, can be made public while maintaining the confidentiality of participants. Where needed, user-friendly summaries in local languages can be prepared to provide feedback to local communities. In addition, where stakeholders raise issues that require independent review and response, workshops with selected stakeholders (CBOs, representatives of affected persons, local resettlement committees, local municipal councils, NGOs, government officials, etc.) can provide an additional layer of transparency.

Table 7.2 provides a template for monitoring reports and disclosure. An adaptation of this table to each specific resettlement program should be provided in the RAP or LRP.

Table 7.2. Monitoring Reports

REPORT	TYPE OF MONITORING	PRODUCED BY	FREQUENCY	DISCLOSURE
Internal activity report	Input-output/activity monitoring (mainly quantitative)	Resettlement team	Weekly to quarterly	No
Internal monitoring report	Input-output/activity monitoring (mainly quantitative)	Resettlement team	Quarterly to yearly (or more during resettlement implementation)	No
Compliance review reports	Compliance reviews	External reviewer(s) or independent environmental and social consultant	Yearly (or more frequently during resettlement implementation)	Yes, company website and interested stakeholders
Completion audit report	Completion audit	External consultant	Upon completion	Yes, company website and interested stakeholders
Specific survey reports	Mid-term livelihood surveys, specific satisfaction surveys, as provided for in the RAP/LRP Completion surveys	Local survey company	As specified in RAP/LRP and before completion audit	No

V.D. How to Monitor and Evaluate Smaller Projects

Where a few households are affected, monitoring can be done internally for the most part. While regular external compliance reviews may not be needed, an external, independent perspective is often useful from time to time to provide "fresh eyes" to the implementation team.

The monitoring system should focus on the most critical indicators, such as those presented in table 7.3.

Table 7.3. Monitoring Indicators for Smaller Projects

INDICATOR	FREQUENCY
Overall spending on resettlement activities	Quarterly
Number of staff (sex disaggregated) dedicated to resettlement, compensation, and livelihood restoration	Quarterly
Number of households that received cash compensation	Quarterly
Number of resettlement dwellings completed	Quarterly
Number of households that moved	Quarterly
Number of open grievances at the end of each quarter and trends over time	Quarterly
Number of grievances opened and closed in the period and trends over time	Quarterly
Categories of grievances and trends over time	Quarterly
Gender of aggrieved individuals	Quarterly
Satisfaction with allocated dwellings	Quarterly
Satisfaction with community facilities (drinking water, power, community center, school, health clinic, recreational facilities, access roads, etc.)	Quarterly
Land replacement	Biannually or yearly
Agriculture restoration	Biannually or yearly
Business reestablishment	Biannually or yearly

V.E. Special Monitoring Considerations in Government-Led Resettlement

Where a government agency leads resettlement for a private-sector project, the private project sponsor should collaborate with the government agency to provide for monitoring of the government resettlement program. Governments' monitoring systems generally focus on accountability related to public spending. Seldom do such systems provide the type of social and livelihood monitoring required by PS5 and as described in this handbook. The project's private sponsor will therefore have to agree on monitoring and reporting arrangements that can both meet the objectives of PS5 and be acceptable to government agencies. Experience indicates this is usually possible if it is discussed early in the process, and monitoring objectives as well as plans with respective responsibilities are clearly defined in a RAP or LRP, or through a resettlement MoU. The private sponsor may have to cover the cost of specific monitoring arrangements not required by local legislation.

VI. Do's and Don'ts

Table 7.4 summarizes the do's and don'ts of monitoring.

Table 7.4. The Do's and Don'ts of Monitoring

DO'S	DON'TS
Link baseline and monitoring information, particularly in terms of livelihood restoration. Livelihood indicators used to evaluate the program completion must have been gathered as part of the baseline assessment. Combine quantitative and qualitative measurement methods. Establish clear completion objectives with measurable indicators in the RAP or LRP and communicate these clearly to all stakeholders. Report progress and outcomes to key stakeholders, including government, affected persons, and lenders. Introduce layers of external monitoring, particularly in terms of assessing outcomes, in addition to internal monitoring. Staff the internal monitoring unit according to the expected workload. Seek integration of resettlement monitoring into the overall ESMS required by PS1. Include all methodological and implementation details related to monitoring in the RAP or LRP. Make sure there are mechanisms to budget for corrective actions identified as a result of monitoring.	Use too many indicators that will not necessarily be collected in time or may not be particularly meaningful. Rather, make sure that the monitoring program is commensurate to the impacts. Place people at risk during the monitoring process, such as by exposing them to retaliation for criticizing or exposing corruption; for their involvement in extra-legal livelihoods; or through disclosing information that could be used for identifying informants. Change monitoring or survey methods and indicators during the course of the program. Produce lengthy reports with unprocessed quantitative information. Produce reports late or at loosely defined frequency. Use monitoring teams that lack gender diversity.