

Viet Nam Expressway Corporation

Sharing Good Practice and Lessons Learned on Income Restoration Programs for Expressway Projects

This is not an ADB material. The views expressed in this document are the views of the author/s and/or their organizations and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Asian Development Bank, or its Board of Governors, or the governments they represent. ADB does not guarantee the accuracy and/or completeness of the material's contents, and accepts no responsibility for any direct or indirect consequence of their use or reliance, whether wholly or partially. Please feel free to contact the authors directly should you have queries.

Background – VEC BEFORE 2008

- VEC pays cash compensation for land acquisition and resettlement
- Support for job training and occupational change are provided in cash
- VEC transfers the funds to local authorities for implementation.

VEC - Income Restoration Program

- Noi Bai – Lao Cai Expressway
 - No. of Participating AHs 16,852 AHs (IRP Budget USD 1.8million)
- HCMC-Long Thanh - Dau Giay Expressway
 - No. of Participating AHs 414 (IRP Budget 0.4 USD__)
- Ben Luc – Long Thanh Expressway
 - No. of Participating AHs 873 (IRP Budget USD 1.2)
- *Proposed Hanoi Lang – Son Expressway*

Why income restoration program?

- Remaining productive land could no longer support families.
- There are no available productive land for APs to buy. If there are, they are very expensive due to demand from APs
- Most of the APs are poor, ethnic minorities, and vulnerable households
- It takes time for them to restore or improve their income

Example of IRP Activities

- Training and provision of farm inputs to increase productivity of remaining land
- Training and provision of non-farm inputs to supplement income (small shops, business)
- Vocational trainings, recruitment by factories/ companies

o --- o --- o

**The level of support is based on the severity
and vulnerability of AH**

(USD 350 – USD 3,000 per household)

Challenges

- IRP was something new. Difficult to convince VEC management and local government to support it.
- Lack of experience of VEC staff and local government agencies to design and implement programs
- Delay in the release of funds
- Not enough suppliers (need to go to other province to buy farm animals)
- Some APs went back to their traditional way of raising animals even if they already did the training
- Some APs want cash only
- Other external factors : weather, change in market demand, family/personal reasons

Good practice and lessons learned

During planning:

- Understand the development context of the area during IRP planning including the direction of local development
- Explain main objectives to local authorities on the objectives of the IRP in addition to cash assistance.
- IRP should be participatory
- Assess and train local organizations involved
- Carry out market studies
- Assess availability of service providers / suppliers
- Link with ongoing social development programs in the area

Good practice and lessons learned

During implementation:

- Re-confirm the level of support of each AH
- No training, no inputs
- Timely provision of funds;
- Allocate contingency fund
- Timely handover of inputs (dependent on the season)
- Timely monitoring , follow-up, evaluation
- Allow flexibility to address issues encountered during implementation.
- Close coordination is important