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DEFINITIONS

Participatory Monitoring

Participatory Monitoring (PM) is a process through which stakeholders at various levels engage in monitoring a particular project, programme or policy, share control over the content, the process and the results of the monitoring activity and engage in taking or identifying corrective actions. PM focuses on the active engagement of primary stakeholders. Key processes of the PM programme in this report include establishment of PM Committee (PMC), site investigation, public consultation, PMC meeting and reporting.

Internal Monitoring

Internal monitoring is conducted by internal resources to monitor and evaluate the implementation of proposed mitigation or actions for a particular project. Internal monitoring normally is conducted through interviews with PAPs and local government, and through review of relevant documents, e.g. resettlement or pollution emission records.

External Monitoring

External monitoring is conducted by independent third parties to monitor and evaluate the implementation of proposed mitigation or actions for a particular project. External monitoring is normally conducted through surveys of project affected people (PAPs), interviews with PAPs, local government and the project owner, and through review of relevant documents.

Public Workshop

Public workshops are common form of public consultation used in PM. The purpose of public workshops is to inform, consult and seek public input in project activities, e.g. the selection of project designs. Public workshops seek to identify key community concerns and reach consensus on priority actions. Public workshops are often held in the form of a roundtable discussion.

Participatory Monitoring Committee Meeting

The purpose of PMC meetings is to discuss the key issues raised during public workshops and those identified by PMC members during site visits to affected communities. PMC meetings seek to reach consensus on progress, and broker solutions to problems identified for implementation by the project owner and/or local government. The PMC meeting is held in the form of informal ‘hearings’.
1  INTRODUCTION

1.1  BACKGROUND

Since initiating lending to China in 1981, the World Bank has required special plans to identify, minimize and mitigate adverse environmental and social impacts associated with project lending. The Bank also requires systematic monitoring and evaluation of mitigation plans during project execution.

In order to meet World Bank and Chinese regulatory requirements, environmental management plans (EMPs) and Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) are developed during the project appraisal phase. Internal and external resources are allocated to monitor the implementation of these plans.

Against a backdrop of rising political and economic significance placed on environmental and social issues, China’s leadership has increasingly emphasized the importance of more effective planning, public accountability, and civil participation in pursuit of a “harmonious and well-off society.”

In light of these factors, the World Bank Office in Beijing initiated a programme of participatory monitoring of the environmental and social performance of a set of urban environment and transport projects it would finance over the next two years. The programme, building on lessons from a Participatory Monitoring (PM) pilot programme conducted in Chongqing, is intended to strengthen the effectiveness of Bank project monitoring, make project staff more accountable to communities that may be affected, and provide new opportunities for affected persons to participate directly in the development process.

The primary emphasis is on monitoring potential adverse impacts identified in mitigation plans prepared in accordance with World Bank Safeguard Policies. However, the programme also identifies and assesses opportunities to extend the PM scope to other aspects of project performance of interest to the general public.

Environmental Resources Management (ERM) was commissioned by the World Bank to organize, facilitate and evaluate the PM programme in two projects, namely the Chongqing Small Cities Infrastructure Improvement Project (CSCIIP) and the Liaoning Medium Cities Infrastructure and Transportation Project (LMCITP).

This Report presents details on the project activity, identification of constraints to greater programme effectiveness and suggestions for improvement.

1.2  SCOPE OF WORK

The scope of work includes:
1.2.1 **Design and Preparation of Participatory Monitoring**

- Join World Bank project teams to assess the suitability of candidate projects and to promote the PM programme;

- Design a PM group and system; and

- Facilitate recruitment of local PM groups.

1.2.2 **Initiating and Assessing Participatory Monitoring Processes**

- Provide training and technical guidance to local PM groups and assist them on reporting.

- Inform the Project Management Office (PMO) and the World Bank task team of any significant safeguards-related issues arising in project implementation, or on issues relating to the PM process.

- Assist the Bank project team in making arrangements for an evaluation of PM effectiveness.

1.2.3 **Assisting on Non-Safeguards-Related Issues**

- Assist project counterparts in identifying and assessing potential areas of general social interest in the project, and any elements of project design that may be contingent on social acceptance or changed behavior.

- Special attention will be given to project affected vulnerable groups.

- As warranted, assist project counterparts and the PM group in formulation of methods for periodic monitoring of relevant non-Safeguards-related aspects of project implementation.

1.3 **Deliverables**

Project deliverables include:

- *Procedural Manual*: a PM Procedural Manual in Chinese was prepared covering the scope of its operations, field monitoring processes, and methods and frequency of reporting. A brief training of the Procedural Manual was conducted during the commencement of the PM programme, which is presented in Annex A.

- *Participatory Monitoring Committee Meetings* were conducted in three cities in Chongqing and three cities in Shenyang.

- *Evaluation Report* is required including identification of constraints to greater programme effectiveness and suggestions for improvement. This Report presents the evaluation of the PM programme.
1.4 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

The remainder of this Report is structured as following:

- Section 2  Participatory Monitoring Programme
- Section 3  Participatory Monitoring for CSCIIP
- Section 4  Participatory Monitoring for LMCITP
- Section 5  Comparison Exercises
- Section 6  Conclusions and Suggestions

Annex A  PM Procedural Manual
Annex B  CSCIIP PM Reports
Annex C  LMCITP PM Reports
PARTICIPATORY MONITORING PROGRAMME

2.1 DESCRIPTION OF PARTICIPANT PROJECTS

2.1.1 Chongqing Small Cities Infrastructure Improvement Project

The Chongqing Small Cities Infrastructure Improvement Project (CSCIIP) is to support emerging small cities of Chongqing Municipality to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of infrastructure service delivery, to accommodate rapid urban growth. The project consists of five broad components in 12 cities:

- Water Supply;
- Flood Protection;
- Road Improvement and Construction;
- Environmental Sanitation; and
- Institutional Strengthening and Training.

The total area of permanent land acquisition and temporary land occupation is 4,050 mu and 3,468 mu respectively. In total, approximately 3,300 households with a population of 13,700 will be affected by land acquisition and resettlement.

The PM programme covers all project components and PMC meetings have been carried out for the following three project components:

- Shizhu Water Supply: extension of existing flood protection embankment on the south side of the river;
- Qianjiang Road Improvement and Construction: spine road in new development area; and
- Rongchang Flood Protection: flood protection embankments to mitigate against serious flood damage.

2.1.2 Liaoning Medium Cities Infrastructure and Transportation Project

The objective of the Liaoning Medium Cities Infrastructure and Transportation Project (LMCITP) is to assist the Project Cities in enhancing: (i) the performance and quality of their existing urban transport infrastructure in terms of mobility, access, and safety; (ii) the efficiency and effectiveness of their urban public transport and road maintenance services; and (iii) the responsiveness of their urban transport systems to the needs of population without access to private motorized vehicles.

The project covers the cities of Panjin, Jinzhou, Fushun, Benxi, and Liaoyang municipalities, and the county town of Dengta in Liaoyang Municipality. The project has been designed to reverse the deterioration of the asset base, improve the livability and investment climate, and support initiatives that reflect national and provincial priorities related to urban transport. The design
has been refined through extensive consultation with user groups. The project has five components in each city consisting of road infrastructure and reconstruction; secondary road rehabilitation and road maintenance equipment, public transport; traffic safety and management; and institutional development.

The total area of permanent land acquisition is around 5,300 mu. In total approximately 5,000 households with a population of 31,500 will be affected by land acquisition and resettlement.

2.2 Selection of Local Agencies

The PM Project Team includes professionals from the Bank, ERM and local agencies. The responsibility of local agencies includes:

- To monitor the implementation status of the EIA and RAP by working with third party monitoring agencies to share findings and avoid duplication of effort;
- To establish a PM Group in each project city with an eye to seeking long-term sustainability of the PM programme;
- To work out a work plan based on the available PM guidelines and project experience;
- To submit monitoring reports;
- To notify the PMO, World Bank and ERM in case of any significant non-compliance of Bank Safeguard Policy or PM Programme; and
- To train community representatives, project affected people, project owners and local government on the PM programme.

2.2.1 Chongqing

The Green Volunteer League of Chongqing (GVLC) has been working with the Chongqing World Bank Project Management Office (CPMO), the Bank and ERM on the pilot PM Project since 2003. As such, key members of the GVLC were invited by CPMO to lead the PM programme for CSCIIP as the local agency.

2.2.2 Liaoning

The Institute of Sociology, Liaoning Academy of Social Science (LASS) has worked on public participation programme of the LMCITP project, including public option surveys, public consultation workshops, expert interviews and reporting. Therefore, the Liaoning Urban Construction and Renewal Project Office (LUCRPO) that is responsible for the LMCITP implementation invited the LASS to lead the PM programme for CSCIIP as the local agency.

2.3 Training

A project kick-off meeting was held between the World Bank, local PMO, ERM and local PM Agencies in Chongqing and Shenyang in September and October 2006. At these meetings, ERM trained local PM Agencies covering the
background, development, methodology and workplan of the PM programme. Technical service has been provided to these local agencies during the entire course of the PM programme.

2.4 Participatory Monitoring Activities

PM activities started in November 2006 in Chongqing and February 2007 in Liaoning. Details of the PM programme are provided in Section 3 and Section 4 respectively.

The PM programme in each project city included the following activities:

a) Selecting of local PM committee (PMC) members;
b) Conducting training for PMC members;
c) Organizing site investigation;
d) Consultation with PAPs via site visits or public workshops to discuss concerns raised by PAPs;
e) Liaison with project owners and relevant government departments on findings from the site visit and public consultation;
f) Convening PMC meetings to discuss public concerns, to seek solutions and to develop remedial action plans; and
g) Feedback results of PMC meeting through PMC Reports to all parties, including external resettlement monitoring agencies.

The Figure 2.1 outlines the main flow of the PM programme.

Figure 2.1 Participatory Monitoring Programme Diagram

Select AC Members PM Training Site Investigation Consultation PMC Meeting Reporting

2.4.1 Reporting

After each PMC meeting, the Project Team had a meeting with local PMO to discuss any issues with the programme and to seek opportunities to improve subsequent rounds of the PM programme. Monitoring reports and minutes of each PMC meeting were submitted to the World Bank, local PMO, external monitoring agencies and ERM after each round of PM programme. In total, five PM reports and three PMC meeting minutes were prepared by GVLC and three PM reports were prepared by LASS.
3

PARTICIPATORY MONITORING FOR CSCIIP

3.1 PARTICIPATORY MONITORING ACTIVITIES

The PM programme led by the Green Volunteer League of Chongqing (GVLC) started in October 2006. Table 3.1 presents details of the activities undertaken.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Subjective Component</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 Oct – 8 Dec 2006</td>
<td>Shizhu embankment &amp; road, Qiangjiang road, Nanchuan embankment, Yubei road, Tongnan water supply &amp; road, Dianjiang water supply, Rongchang embankment</td>
<td>Initial project review to understand current implementation status of the CSCIIP.</td>
<td>PM Work Plan, First PM Monitoring Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–23 Jan, 2007</td>
<td>Shizhu embankment &amp; road</td>
<td>Establishment of local PMC in each city; Training of PMC members; Site investigation; Consultation with project affected communities, local government and project owners; Several public round table workshops in project affected communities to promote PM awareness and collect project information</td>
<td>Second PM Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Feb – 8 Mar 2007</td>
<td>Yubei road, Tongguanyi road, Shizhu embankment &amp; road</td>
<td>Site investigation; Consultation with project affected communities, local government and project owners</td>
<td>First PMC Meeting was held on 7th March in Shizhu, Meeting Minutes of Shizhu PMC Meeting, Third PM Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Mar – 25 Apr 2007</td>
<td>Yubei road, Tongnan road, Rongchang embankment, Songji water supply, Qianjiang road, Chongqing urban toilet</td>
<td>Site investigation; Monitor the implementation status/progresses of each component; Consultations</td>
<td>Forth PM Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Subjective Component</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 26 Apr–26 May 2007 | Yubei road, Rongchang embankment | • Establishment of local PMC;  
• Training of PMC members;  
• Site investigation;  
• Consultation with project affected communities, local government and project owners | • Second PMC Meeting was held on 26th May in Rongchang  
• Fifth PM Report  
• Meeting Minutes of Rongchang PMC Meeting  
• Inception Report of PM Programme for CSCUP |
| 12 Jul 2007   | Qianjiang road       | • Establishment of local PMC;  
• Training of PMC members;  
• Site investigation;  
• Consultation with project affected communities, local government and project owners | • Third PMC Meeting was held on 12th July in Qianjiang  
• Meeting Minutes of Qianjiang PMC Meeting |
3.2 PARTICIPATORY MONITORING COMMITTEE MEETING

PMC Meetings were held in three cities targeted at the following project components:
- Shizhu embankment and road,
- Rongchang embankment and road, and
- Qianjiang road.

Participants at the PMC meetings included PMC members, and representatives from PAPs, village committee members, project owners and government officials. The GVLC facilitated the PMC meetings with support from local PMC members.

During the PMC meetings PAPs raised concerns relating to social and environmental issues that were then discussed among meeting participants. This provided an opportunity for local government representatives or project owners to offer an explanation or to initiate action plans to address issues of concern.

The following sections summarize some key findings of the PMC meetings. Full project reports are presented in Annex B.

3.2.1 Shizhu Participatory Monitoring Committee Meeting

The Shizhu PMC Meeting was held on 7 March 2007 in the Renmin Hotel, Shizhu County. Thirty-three participants attended the meeting including PMC members, local community representatives, project owners, the Vice County mayor, and officers from local Land Resources Bureau (LRB) and Planning Bureau.

Key issues raised by PAPs and discussed in the meeting included:
- **Provision of replacement houseplots**: compensation for houseplots was not paid to the PAPs of Shuangqing Village and replacement houseplots were not provided.
- **Compensation standards**: compensation for demolished houses was not based on replacement value and was insufficient to build replacement houses.
- **General disturbance**: road construction caused problems for the local community e.g. shortage of water supply, disruption of access road and house damage.

3.2.2 Rongchang Participatory Monitoring Committee Meeting

The Rongchang PMC Meeting was held on 26 May 2007 in Changyuan Township Government Meeting Room. Thirt-six participants attended the meeting including PMC members, local community representatives, project owners, officers from the LRB, Planning Bureau, Water Resource Bureau, Construction Committee and local township government.
Key issues raised by PAPs and discussed at the meeting included:

- **Process of the land acquisition**: land acquired in 2003 was not compensated for or used until 2006 when project construction commenced. The PAPs took the matter to the local Court asking for a more compensation. PAPs were not awarded higher compensation, however project construction was delayed;
- **Replacement housing area**: local government had not yet decided the location of replacement housing area, and PAPs asked the government to consider a better location to restore their livelihood, or provide cash compensation as an alternative;
- **Livelihood restoration measures**: some 610 farmers lost their farmland permanently due to land acquisition of the project. PAPs were cash compensated with cash payments and had concerns about generating future income. They asked for additional support or assistance to help restore their livelihoods.

### 3.2.3 Qianjian Participatory Monitoring Committee Meeting

The Qianjiang PMC Meeting was held on 12 July 2007 in the meeting room of Qianjiang Land and Real Estate Group. Twenty-seven participants attended the meeting including PMC members, local community representatives, project owners, and officers from the LRB, Planning Bureau, Construction Bureau, and township government.

There was general consensus at this meeting that the project resettlement was very transparent and PAPs were quite cooperative during the entire resettlement process.

Key issues raised by PAPs and discussed in the forum included:

- **Resettlement Measures**: PAPs affected by physical resettlement wanted to be relocated close to their original homes and hoped that government would offer replacement houseplots. The Qianjiang government acknowledged the demand and has responded.
- **Livelihood restoration**: PAPs asked whether there would be any livelihood restoration activities or policies initiated such as training, provision of social security and tax deduction. Local government explained the training scheme for directly affected PAPs that had lost land, plans for organising local labours to work in other provinces, and social security provisions.
- **Environmental issues associated with construction**: PAPs complained about construction noise, wastewater and dust. The PM team found that Qianjiang Road would cross through a protected forest area and suggested that re-routing would avoid this problem.

---

(1) Where resettlement is not a key concern for local communities, environmental issues were raised as a secondary concern.
3.3 FINDINGS

3.3.1 Experiences

Resettlement
Consultation with those affected by the CSCIIP suggests that a transparent process, early provision of replacement housing and up front consultation maximises the likelihood of a successful resettlement.

It is very important that resettlement procedures and compensation rates are made clear and are transparent to the public. The project owner of the Nanchuan Embankment and Road Project distributed a resettlement pamphlet to all PAPs which was gratefully received and contributed to smooth project implementation.

Replacement houses for the same project were already constructed before old houses were dismantled, thereby minimising disturbance and stress during the transition period. This too was appreciated by PAPs.

Other good experiences reported by PAPs include early consultation on the location of replacement housing and photographic records of those houses to be demolished. By these means, community concerns could be addressed in the project design stage and avoid future disputes.

Environment
The overall aim of the project is to improve the urban environment. Environmental concerns raised were related to construction activities that give rise to noise or to water or air quality impacts. The PM programme identified a primary forest that would be affected by the Qianjiang Road Component and stopped disturbance by re-routing the road.

3.3.2 Concerns

Despite several good project experiences described above, the PM programme revealed that many project components shared similar problems regarding implementation of the RAP and environmental management measures.

It was found the RAP had not been referred to as it should have been during project execution. With the exception of the total budget, limited attention was been paid to mitigation requirements such as livelihood restoration and grievance redress procedures. Although local government is the principal implementing agency, the personnel assigned responsibility for resettlement had limited knowledge of RAP requirements.

While resettlement impacts often have long-term implications for those affected, environmental impacts are mostly temporary and last only for the duration of the construction phase. Major concerns related to the protection of forest and cultural/historical relics, as well as environmental disturbances.
The major findings identified by the PM programme and the status of actions taken to address these findings are summarized in Table 3.2.
### Table 3.2 PM Programme Findings for the CSCIIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Subject Component</th>
<th>Discussed in PMC Meeting</th>
<th>Response from gov’t or project owner</th>
<th>Status as of 20 Jan 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resettlement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of replacement house plot and utilities</td>
<td>Rural house plots either not compensated or replacement plots not provided</td>
<td>Yubei road, Caotong road, Rongchang Road and Embankment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The land of house footprint will be compensated, or replacement house plot provided</td>
<td>Yubei and Caotong not yet paid the compensation. Solved at Shizhu. Rongchang provided replacement house plots but PAPs remain unsatisfied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation rate</td>
<td>1) Differing rural and urban compensation rates for same quality house in the same area 2) lower than replacement value</td>
<td>Rongchang Road and Embankment, Shizhu road and embankment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Compensation rate set by Chongqing Municipal Government</td>
<td>Shizhu affected community had no further grievance. Rongchang affected people remain unsatisfied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency of resettlement procedure</td>
<td>Compensation rates and entitlement unclear to PAPs</td>
<td>Shizhu road and Embankment; Yubei road;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Resettlement should be more transparent to PAPs</td>
<td>Transparency improved through PM programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation payment</td>
<td>Compensation payment was delayed</td>
<td>Yubei road; Caotong road</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Will be compensated later</td>
<td>Still delayed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood restoration</td>
<td>1) Training programme unclear; 2) Worries for employment opportunities 3) utility provision in replacement house</td>
<td>Rongchang road and Embankment Qianjiang road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Training programme is being planned; Government will ensure electricity, water, roads provided.</td>
<td>Training not yet conducted. Utilities were provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to water and road</td>
<td>Access to water and road was affected by road construction</td>
<td>Shizhu Road and embankment, Rongchang Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Project developer to provide alternative access</td>
<td>Solved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to protected forest and fossil relics</td>
<td>Road to cross environmentally sensitive area</td>
<td>Qianjiang Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Consider alternate route</td>
<td>Solved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of river natural ecology</td>
<td>Embankment construction will damage forest and river scenery</td>
<td>Rongchang Embankment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Consideration of mitigation measures</td>
<td>Solved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental disturbances</td>
<td>Noise, dust</td>
<td>Qianjiang Road</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Contractor management</td>
<td>Already in plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other community concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Construction</td>
<td>Low quality of construction is a concern</td>
<td>Shizhu Embankment; Dianjiang Embankment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Government concerned with the Bank’s ‘lowest price bidding policy’.</td>
<td>Outstanding issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many of the issues raised are related to resettlement policies and their management by local government. While some problems are inevitable due to the current regulations (e.g., differences between compensation rates in rural and urban areas), some problems could have been avoided if the provisions contained in the RAPs were followed, including the provision of replacement house plots, training and access to water and utilities.

The PM programme also revealed that changes in government officers or the project developer management team directly impact PAPs. For example, during the political selection period from January to April this year, resettlement for many components (including Shizhu Road and Caotong Road) were put on hold resulting in a prolonged transition period for those physically displaced. This problem could have been avoided if the RAP has outlined the detailed responsibilities of each government department who in turn has managed the resettlement in line with the RAP.

3.4 **EVALUATION OF THE PM PROGRAMME**

Over the course of the PM programme, ERM consulted the following parties on their views and comments on the PM programme:

- The Chongqing PMO;
- The GVLC and PMC members;
- Local communities;
- Project owners; and
- Local government.

The findings in this section are drawn from this consultation.

3.4.1 **Coverage and Depth of Public Consultation**

The PM programme has proactively involved and maintained ongoing communication with project affected communities, relevant government departments, project owners and construction contractors. The local PM agency visited the sites of all project components, held several public consultation workshops in affected communities and mediated conflicts between PAPs and project owners. Over one thousand PAPs were consulted.

3.4.2 **Information Disclosure**

Over the course of the PM programme, all parties had an opportunity to share information. Affected communities benefited from the transparency of the resettlement and compensation plans and standards resulting from public meetings. The PMC meeting also provided the PAPs an opportunity to discuss resettlement policy details with local government, who had previously been inaccessible to affected communities under traditional approaches for resettlement management.
3.4.3 Problem Solving

Through consultation with the PAPs, problems associated with the project implementation were identified and ways to deal with them were recommended.

For example, the Shizhu project experienced several community stoppages before the PM programme started. The community stoppage in Shizhu resulted in lengthy delays to the construction schedule. After the involvement of PMC members and consultation with the affected community, it was found that the stoppage resulted from a misunderstanding over resettlement policies. It was a simple case of rumour and misunderstanding resulting from a lack of information provided to affected communities. Through meditation as part of the PM programme, the two parties reached a mutual understanding and problems were resolved. Similar community conflicts occurred at the Rongchang component and were resolved through mediation as part of the PM programme.

Although some issues were related to regulatory and institutional issues that could not be addressed so readily, e.g. the discrepancy of rural and urban compensation rates, project affected groups tended to be more cooperative when they were kept informed by government of issues that would affect them. The PM programme played a key role in this regard by promoting communication between the two parties and building mutual trust that ultimately achieved better project outcomes.

3.4.4 Benefiting all Parties

Project affected communities are typically the most vulnerable groups during project execution. While the Central Government is trying to promote a “harmonious society”, institutional arrangements create few opportunities for public participation in government decision-making processes. Both the general public and project affected communities have little chance to voice their concerns with project management, even when projects have considerable impacts to their livelihoods. The PM programme revealed several cases where PAPs did not have a full picture of their entitlement and obligations. It is not a surprise that they would protest their interests, even in extreme ways such as community stoppages. The PM programme provided them an opportunity to talk directly to the government through the public consultation forum or indirectly through the local PMC and PM agency. On the other hand, the PM approach empowers them to propose suitable mitigation that is for the consideration of the project owners.

During the public consultation forum, PAPs had the opportunity to listen to the government and project developer, and to understand the challenges they faced. When most successful, community representatives felt that the project owners were being sincere in their desire to resolve issues and a sense of mutual respect developed. This in turn resulted in affected communities being more supportive of project implementation.
Government benefits from the PM programme through broader community support, reducing community conflicts and promoting an image of responsible governance. While some government officers might not feel comfortable talking directly with PAPs at Public Consultation Forums they generally felt that it provided a good opportunity for information dissemination, to gain understanding and support from local communities, and more importantly, to solve problems.

Similarly, project developers benefit from the PM programme through reduced community conflicts and smooth project implementation. PM provided project developers with an opportunity to hear first hand the concerns of affected communities and to address these issues. Especially during the public consultation forum, the project developer had a chance to demonstrate to PAPs their commitment to resolving disputes problems and hence obtained broader community support. This can be viewed as a form of Company Social Responsibility (CSR), which is expected to be a “soft requirement” for Chinese enterprises in the near future. Project developers experienced similar challenges to local government in terms of challenging traditional project management and promoting greater openness to the public.

The World Bank and the PMO benefit from the PM programme through the smooth implementation of the project as well as the promotion of the Bank’s image in the society. The way the Bank manages the project has improved the administration of local government, built capacity in participatory governance and has started to change the way that projects funded by other banks or organisations are managed.

Those involved in the PM programmed who understand its benefits have, in some cases, adopted similar participatory approaches to the monitoring and evaluation of other projects. For example, the GVLC has incorporated participatory approaches into other environmental programmes and has reported positive feedback.

3.4.5 Communication and Cooperation with Other Institutions

While local PM agencies have maintained ongoing communication with affected communities, cooperation and communication with other institutions need to be improved. This includes communication between the local PMO, internal and external monitoring agencies, project owners and local government. For example, during the first round of the PM programme in Shizhu, the PM project team accessed the project site without notifying the local PMO and project developer, resulting in negative feedback from the project developer.
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PARTICIPATORY MONITORING FOR LMCITP

4.1

PARTICIPATORY MONITORING ACTIVITIES

The PM programme led by the Liaoning Academy of Social Science (LASS) started in April 2007. Major project activities are summarized in Table 4.1. The PM programme not only included social and environmental aspects, but also the implementation of broader recommendations made through public consultation during project design.

Table 4.1 Details of Participatory Monitoring Activities for LMCITP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Project City</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-6 Apr 2007</td>
<td>Benxi</td>
<td>Establishment of local advisory committee; Training of PMC members; Site investigation; Consultation with project affected communities, local government and project owners</td>
<td>First PMC Meeting was held on 16 April 2007&lt;br&gt;First PM Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-16 May 2007</td>
<td>Panjin</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Second PMC Meeting was held on 16 May 2007&lt;br&gt;Second PM Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-29 Aug 2007</td>
<td>Liaoyang</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Third PMC Meeting was held on 29 August 2007&lt;br&gt;Third PM Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All project reports are presented in Annex C.

4.2

PARTICIPATORY MONITORING COMMITTEE MEETING

The Benxi PMC Meeting was held on 16 April 2007 in the Meeting Office of the Benxi Construction Bureau. Sixteen participants attended the forum including seven local PMC members and three community representatives.
The Panjin PMC Meeting was held on 16 May 2007 in the Meeting Office of the Panjin Construction Bureau. Sixteen participants attended the forum including six local PMC members and four community representatives.

The Liaoyang PMC Meeting was held on 29 August 2007 in the Meeting Office of the Liaoyang Construction Bureau. Twenty-one participants attended the forum including five local PMC members and ten community representatives.

Local PMC members included representatives from local communities, local enterprises, lawyers, teachers, retired workers and members of local People’s Congress.

Common issues raised at all three forums included the following:

- **General disturbance during the road construction**: besides noise, dust, and vibration from construction activities, temporary alternative road access was reportedly poor;
- **Insufficient public disclosure**: many residents within the affected area were not aware if they were to be resettled;
- **Road planning issues**: although most recommendations raised during public consultation undertaken during project design, problem remain. For example, there is no vehicle exit for Youtian Party School for a road of some 2 km long; and
- **Resettlement issues**: Insufficient resettlement notice, low compensation rate, prolonged transition period (mainly in Liaoyang component).

### 4.3 FINDINGS

While urban resettlement is generally more transparent than rural resettlement because the land is stated owned and compensation standards are more or less based on market value, environmental and design issues tend to be of greater concern to those affected.

Major findings identified by the PM programme and the status of actions to address issues raised are summarized in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2  **PM Programme Findings for the LMCITP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Discussed in PMC Meeting</th>
<th>Response from Gov’t or project owner</th>
<th>Status as of 20 Jan 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td>Environmental emissions</td>
<td>Noise, dust, solid waste, odor and vibration from road construction</td>
<td>Benxi Panjin Liaoyang</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Will supervise contractors to follow the EMP. Contractors are supervised and monitored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction disturbances and inconvenience</td>
<td>Prolonged construction and road restoration.</td>
<td>Benxi Panjin Liaoyang</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The road construction should be supported by sufficient finance in a timely manner. Contractors are warned and required to address these issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction disturbances and inconvenience</td>
<td>Cut-off access road /bridge</td>
<td>Benxi Panjin Liaoyang</td>
<td>Contractor management plus public consultation</td>
<td>New bridge is under design (LY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resettlement</strong></td>
<td>Insufficient project information disclosure</td>
<td>Very short resettlement notice; compensation rates unclear to the affected.</td>
<td>Benxi Panjin Liaoyang</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A Resettlement Pamphlet was distributed to all affected. The problem was caused by a tight construction schedule. Will try to avoid this issue in the 2008 components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prolonged transition period</td>
<td>People were still waiting to move to replacement houses.</td>
<td>Liaoyang</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The construction of replacement houses would be complete soon. All moved into new houses by 26 Dec 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low compensation rate</td>
<td>Affected people wanted to be compensated according to current market price</td>
<td>Panjin Liaoyang</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not possible to revise government standard. Additional allowance was distributed to eligible communities (Youtian, Panjin) Vulnerable groups provided with additional allowance. (Liaoyang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical design from previous public consultation</strong></td>
<td>Public comments on project design not incorporated</td>
<td>E.g. insufficient public toilets along the road, greening style is too plain etc.</td>
<td>Liaoyang</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>More public consultation during technical design. Open toilets at some facilities along the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other community concerns</strong></td>
<td>Inter-departmental coordination during road construction</td>
<td>Some new roads had to be dug up to install water or gas pipelines after the construction.</td>
<td>Benxi Panjin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Coordination between gov’t departments will be strengthened Will try to work with other department to avoid this issue in future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Discussed in PMC Meeting</td>
<td>Response from Gov’t or project owner</td>
<td>Status as of 20 Jan 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road planning</td>
<td>Limited consideration paid to convenience of local access during road design, e.g. no vehicle outlet for 2km</td>
<td>Benxi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Will establish a public consultation channel to collect such information</td>
<td>Will review project design and seek public comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction quality</td>
<td>Some road construction quality was poor</td>
<td>Benxi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Try to establish PM of construction quality</td>
<td>Will improve contractor selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road maintenance</td>
<td>Some new roads were damaged very quickly</td>
<td>Benxi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Road management initiated to supervise this issue</td>
<td>Currently working with Municipal Administration Bureau to address issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4  

**EVALUATION OF THE PM PROGRAMME**

4.4.1  **Coverage and Depth of Public Consultation**

The local PM agency selected a group of people in the project area to establish a local PMC, held a training session to the PMC members, and organised a field investigation with all PMC members. The PMC members included representatives from affected communities. Field work typically took three to four days and was focused on consultation with local communities. After the field work, a public consultation workshop was held. Participants were mainly PMC members. During the workshop, the PMC members raised questions to local government and the project owners on findings they identified during the field trip. Through this approach, community concerns were collected and voiced to the project owners and to government.

4.4.2  **Information Disclosure**

The public representatives felt that the PM approach gave them a channel to exchange ideas, especially with local government and project owners.

4.4.3  **Problem Solving**

Although public consultation was undertaken during the project design phase, no such approach had ever been used to monitor project implementation. Compared to external resettlement monitoring, problems were articulated in more detail through the PM process. In addition, a broader range of issues was identified through PM. However, due to an absence of local government agencies, the public consultation workshop seemingly has not been able to address community concerns.
COMPARISON EXERCISES

5.1 COMPARISON BETWEEN PARTICIPATORY MONITORING AND EXTERNAL MONITORING

While the external monitoring mainly stresses the independence of the monitoring team, the participatory monitoring focuses more on the engagement of general public, especially those are directly affected by the project. Table 5.1 summarises the major differences between these two monitoring schemes.
Table 5.1  
**Comparison between Participatory Monitoring and External Monitoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>External Monitoring</th>
<th>Participatory Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key players</td>
<td>Key players are external agencies, e.g. university professors, or individual social science researchers. In most cases, they are not local.</td>
<td>The key players are the local PM facilitator and members. In the case of this programme, they are representatives of the general public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional background</td>
<td>Monitoring agencies are often qualified professionals, often also engaged in resettlement planning.</td>
<td>Normally the PM members have no academic background or involvement in resettlement planning or monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of work</td>
<td>The scope of work is to monitor the implementation of RAP only.</td>
<td>The scope of work covers monitoring of all safeguard-related mitigation, including EMP and RAP, as well as other community concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process and Outcomes</td>
<td>Monitoring process includes household survey, document review, interviews with government and project owner; normally does not include discussion of possible solutions with project owner or government.</td>
<td>Monitoring process includes site investigation, community consultation, public round able discussion, PMC meeting. PMC meetings provide a platform to voice concerns and seek possible solutions through the discussion among participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication among all interested parities</td>
<td>PAPs consulted by means of one-way information gathering. After reporting problems to the monitoring agency, those affected may not be informed of project progress or remedial actions until the next round of monitoring.</td>
<td>PM involves two-way, “layer-leaping” interactions between those affected and project implementation agencies via the PMC meeting. Regular project updates from PM members shared with those affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working period</td>
<td>External monitoring is normally undertaken twice every year; normally stops when project finance is closed.</td>
<td>The PM programme is an ongoing process, and can be conducted over the life of a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sharing</td>
<td>Project information is normally restricted to project owners, PMO and the Bank. General public have limited access to project information. The external monitoring report is also not disclosed to PAPs.</td>
<td>Project information is disclosed to all PM participants, including PAPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying root cause of problems</td>
<td>External monitoring activities are normally restricted by project budget and timing.</td>
<td>PM tends is more effective in terms of identifying the root cause of issues through the involvement of local community members who have a better understanding of local issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Pressures for problem solving are always from PMO (the Bank) to the project owner who is generally not directly exposed to the public.</td>
<td>With the direct involvement of government and project owners in the PM programme, especially through the PMC meeting, PM is able to develop practical action plans to resolve disputes. Even when concerns cannot be readily solved in the PMC meeting, affected people will normally be given some explanation from the project owner or government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of Response</td>
<td>Reports may not be reviewed for months which can delay remedial action</td>
<td>PAPs are kept informed throughout the PM process, and are able to monitor implementation of remedial actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public involvement in decision-making</td>
<td>Public opinions are normally collected only through site consultation and summarised in the monitoring report.</td>
<td>Public participation via ‘public hearings’ and contribution to remedial action plans to address issues raised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of PMO and government</td>
<td>The external monitoring is contracted by implementing agency.</td>
<td>The PM programme can be less influenced than external monitoring as it is not directly contracted by the PMO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, PM differs from traditional monitoring schemes as follows:

- Public participation;
- Ongoing communication and consultation with all stakeholders; and
- Development of solutions.

The PMC meeting is probably the most effective participation tool used in the PM programme, in that it facilitates dialogue between PAPs and project owners on an equal footing.

A question has been raised as to whether PM could replace traditional external monitoring of safeguards during project execution. While PM tends to be cheaper and may be more effective when properly implemented, practical challenges include:

- Gaining buy-in from project owners, the PMO and local government; and
- The identification and training of local PM facilitators and members.

More pilot PM projects are needed to demonstrate the feasibility of the PM model and its suitability to replace the external monitoring in future.

5.2 COMPARISON BETWEEN CSCIIP AND LMCITP PARTICIPATORY PROGRAMME

Interestingly the Consultant also finds due to the different backgrounds of the CSCIIP and the LMCITP, the PM programme worked differently in the two project areas.

Table 5.2 Comparison between CSCIIP and LMCITP Participatory Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities and Differences</th>
<th>CSCIIP</th>
<th>LMCITP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local facilitator</td>
<td>The local facilitator is a NGO.</td>
<td>The local facilitator is from a social science research institute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td>The local facilitator has been engaged in PM of a similar project in Chongqing since 2003 and built up experience in organising / facilitating consultation and PMC meetings.</td>
<td>The local facilitator had experience with the Liaoning Public Participation programme during project design however the methods used were not the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key findings</td>
<td>Low awareness of safeguard mitigation (e.g. RAP) required during project implementation.</td>
<td>Low awareness of safeguard mitigation (e.g. RAP) required during project implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Work</td>
<td>To monitor project implementation on environment and social (mainly resettlement) mitigation</td>
<td>To monitor project implementation on environment and social (mainly resettlement) mitigation, as well as public comments on project design during the first public participation programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project land take</td>
<td>Mostly rural, with a large affected population</td>
<td>Mostly urban, with a small number of affected suburban communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of PM programme</td>
<td>Greater input of local PM members and more in-depth engagement of project affected community.</td>
<td>The local facilitator was subject to the information provided by the PMO, e.g. nomination of PM members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarities and Differences</td>
<td>CSCIIP</td>
<td>LMCITP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem identification and solving</td>
<td>PM programme identified and helped solve a variety of problems.</td>
<td>PM programme identified some social, environmental and planning issues but problem solving was relatively weak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception of other participants</td>
<td>PM programme encountered some resistance from local government at first, but was highly appreciated by PAPs. With the progress of problem solving, local government and project owners became increasingly cooperative and willing to engage in the PM programme.</td>
<td>The PM programme was very well received by all participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public participation</td>
<td>High degree of public participation. However, the local facilitator could strengthen local PM team in each project city.</td>
<td>Good in terms of building local PM capacity, however the level of public participation was relatively low.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the PM programme was more successful for the CSCIIP than for the LMCITP in the following aspects:
- Involvement of project affected community;
- Involvement of local government;
- Communication between the project affected community and PM members; and
- Problem identification and solving.

These findings reinforce the importance of the key elements of an effective PM programme, namely public participation, ongoing communication and problem solving.
6 CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

6.1 CONCLUSIONS

Public participation in the monitoring of environmental and social management of the CSCIIP and the LMCITP through the local PM agencies and PMC Meetings has resulted in increased awareness of how such projects affect communities and how better communication can improve project outcomes. Public participation benefited not only the project developer, but also local communities, project financiers, and local government, through:

- Establishing a formal channel of communication between project affected communities, local government and project owners;
- Minimising misunderstanding among all parties, reducing project conflicts and delays, and facilitating smooth project implementation;
- Improving government’s image in the affected communities and obtaining broader community support for the project;
- Helping to address community concerns and grievances; and
- Building capacity of local government in administration and governance.

While both external monitoring and PM seek to identify the concerns of affected communities, the PM approach is solution-based rather than procedural-based as is the case for standard external monitoring. For example, household survey and statistical analysis of data is not part of the PM approach. On the other hand, the PM approach is less able to be influenced by the PMO or local government and provides greater opportunity for sharing project information and promoting public involvement.

In this PM programme, the Project Team involved external monitoring agencies by sharing project information and deliverables, which complement each other in terms of the coverage of monitoring and public participation. The PM approach involves a greater level of public participation and has resulted in greater community support for the pilot projects than that which could have been achieved through external monitoring alone.

In summary, the PM programme has the following advantages over traditional monitoring methods:

- Broader public participation, particularly of PAPs;
- Promoting accountability within local government;
- Ongoing communication and consultation with all stakeholders; and
- Resolution of community disputes/complaints.

6.2 CHALLENGES AND CONSTRAINTS

The long-term vision is that PM approaches be adopted by other internationally or even locally financed infrastructure projects in China. However in the short-term the buy-in of project owners, in particular, poses a barrier to the widespread adoption of PM approaches across China. An immediate focus should therefore be to advocate PM approached to project
owners and investors, through a greater number of pilot projects. It is also recommended that the PM programme could be promoted through Media, e.g. TV documentary or presenting case studies at conferences, in industry magazines and other publications.

The administrative and legal framework in China, coupled with a long history of “command and control” government, presents something of a roadblock to the effective public consultation and participation for major infrastructure projects such as the CSCIIP and LMCITP. Current legislation provides little by way of guidelines for meaningful public consultation. Government and the project owners initially resisted adopting a PM approach since it was new to most of the parties involved. Many simply considered it as yet another task to be accomplished in order to secure Bank funding. On the other hand, the general public and affected communities were eager to contribute but were not aware of how to participate once given the opportunity.

The PMC initially encountered resistance when consulting local government and the project management, especially when sensitive issues were raised, for example questions about compensation standards, allocation of responsibilities between government agencies, etc. The lack of prior experience with such approaches made the assignment difficult. This will undoubtedly pose a similar roadblock to undertaking PM of projects elsewhere in China.

At the time that PM for the CSCIIP and LMCITP commenced, construction of had already begun and the majority of the land acquisition and resettlement had been arranged or was underway. As such, identifying issues (and their underlying cause) was relatively straightforward since they had already occurred. Resolving these issues and developing mitigation measures to prevent future problems proved more difficult. There was a general consensus between stakeholders that adopting a participatory approach during the planning phase of infrastructure projects (i.e. RAP, EIA, feasibility study, detailed design, etc) would be more effective. The exercise demonstrated that many problems would likely have been prevented through adequate public participation and consultation in the early stages of the project, combined with a PM programme that continued through project implementation.

It was found that the PM of the CSCIIP was more successful than for the LMCITP. This may suggest that there is no single PM model that can be applied to all projects. Clearly, local facilitators, the PMC, PMO, and local government need to be given some flexibility to adapt the PM approach to the local context.

Currently, the project must bear two monitoring costs in parallel, the PM and the External Monitoring, which is clearly not cost effective. The project owner seeks to integrate these two into a single monitoring scheme. One possible solution would be for the external monitoring agency to assume the role of local PM facilitator and lead the PM with support from community
representatives. Further pilot projects are recommended to test the effectiveness of such an approach.

6.3 suggestions on next step work plan

6.3.1 Short-term Actions

Many findings of this PM programme are related to a simple lack of awareness of the requirements included in the RAP and other safeguard mitigation. Project owners were unaware that the implementation of the RAP was a pre-condition of borrowing from the World Bank. RAP training is considered necessary for the project owners, relevant government as well as the local PM agencies.

The local PM agency lacked technical guidance, particularly with regards to developing and implementing a RAP and in undertaking household surveys. A more detailed briefing should have been conducted during the commencement of the PM programme and should be incorporated into future programmes.

While the local PM agency has maintained ongoing communication with affected communities, communication with other institutions, including the local PMO, internal and external monitoring agencies, project owners and local government, should be strengthened.

Further pilot projects need to be conducted to confirm the effectiveness of the PM programme and to gradually build awareness and acceptance of such approaches in China.

6.3.2 Long-term Vision

Government training to raise awareness of PM approaches will be required to promote broader implementation of PM programmes. Training should highlight the benefits of the PM programme to government, developers and society.

The PM programme revealed that construction quality was a key concern of both local government and the general public. Over the longer term it is envisaged that the scope of PM could be widened to encompass broader issues beyond safeguards compliance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPMO</td>
<td>Chongqing World Bank Project Management Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCIIP</td>
<td>Chongqing Small Cities Infrastructure Improvement Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>Environmental Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERM</td>
<td>Environmental Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVLC</td>
<td>Green Volunteer League of Chongqing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASS</td>
<td>Liaoning Academy of Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMCITP</td>
<td>Liaoning Medium Cities Infrastructure and Transportation Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRB</td>
<td>Land Resources Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUCRPO</td>
<td>Liaoning Urban Construction and Renewal Project Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP</td>
<td>Project Affected People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Participatory Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMC</td>
<td>Participatory Monitoring Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMO</td>
<td>Project Management Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Resettlement Action Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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