

Expropriation and Compensation Challenges for Road Construction in Yeka Sub City, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Bantayehu Ayalew Workineh

M.sc in Urban land Development and management, institutes of urban development studies, Ethiopian Civil Service University

Abstract- Expropriation and compensation for road construction are currently big issues and have many challenges which are more unique than for redevelopment. This research focuses on the capacity of the institutes, workflows, perception of expropriated and rules effectiveness in expropriation and compensation. This research helps for scholars to see and pave for further research; and for city government to implement expropriation and compensation in an appropriate way. The research types used were descriptive research and data were collected through a questionnaire and interview. Primary data and secondary data were used in this study. The samples were taken from official and expropriated landholders for asphalt road construction project site of CMC to WONDIRAD and ROOT school to BONO WUHA. In this focus ground, the difficulty existed not only human capacity building, but also lack of full human resources. The flow of works challenges for expropriation and compensation of road construction like inconsistency design and change of marks on the property of expropriated. In addition, the time given was too short from an authorized body to perform expropriation and valuation. Some expropriated landholders were not satisfied by expropriation and they were opposed due to compensation, and involuntary to leave and changes of plan once again. The rules were not effective due to non-considerations of the current site and ignorance of some expropriated. The compensation was not honest and descriptive detail for valuation. The implementation of rules in the study areas was not effective, due to discussion were not fully aware the expropriated, too short time given to expropriated, unfair compensation amount and exposition of expropriated to demolish their property more than two times which leads extra cost for them.

Index Terms- Expropriation, road construction, compensation, work flow, capacity building.

I. INTRODUCTION

According to FAO, (2008) in order to bring sustainable development governments should provide public facilities and infrastructure that ensure the well being and safety of the society, and safeguard and refurbishment of the natural environment. One of infrastructure facility is road transport, which plays a function of both production and consumption. Furthermore, roads can integrate other form of transportation. Provision of road for an urban area is the remedy for development and mostly performed by expropriation of private land holders through compensation. The purpose of expropriation is not mostly for private use rather it is of public interest. During expropriation individual right like the right to develop, use, and

access are violated, though there might be differences from country to country in the context of their legal framework. For these reasons compensations become one phenomenon so as to respect the right of the landholders. In countries that deliver expropriation, compensation faces challenges in relation to the amount that should be compensated; and even though the amounts in legal aspects may be fair they faced implementation and cultural attached problems.

According to Ibrahim (2011) in his term paper Vol-004, In Ethiopia the dominant mode is road transport, which accounts for 90 to 95% of power-driven interurban freight and passenger movements. But, road networks are limited and created difficulty in the provision of infrastructure for undertaking towards socioeconomic development, and poverty reduction (ERA, 2008a as cited in Ibrahim, 2011). In order to reduce poverty and facilitate the day to day activity, road development is essential. The first task before providing facilities and infrastructural services is acquisition of appropriate land (FAO, 2008).

In Ethiopia expropriation becomes one of the issues related to urban redevelopment, but little for road construction. The government of Ethiopia formulates different policy and strategies in relation to have clear, fair, and accountable implementation procedures. In these parts expropriation and compensation is one activity that takes place in order to benefit public (Proclamation 455/2005). This big task of expropriation and compensation are delivered by authorized body or parts of government organs like municipalities (Proclamation No. 35/2012).

The challenge that faces for expropriation and compensation were faced in our country in general and in the Yeka sub city in particular. Challenges can be seen as regulation, workflow, capacity and opposition from owners. In relation to the regulation and legal issues there is lease proclamation No 721/2011, expropriation proclamation No 455/2005, and Addis Ababa city government proclamation No 135/2005 and Directive 19/2006. This regulation incorporates compensation, but doesn't fully been implemented. In addition, for fully expropriates the value at the center are not equal with the transitional zone; for partially expropriated the compensation amount is not fair. These make the expropriated landholders to oppose the compensation values. The other problem is human resource capacity building such as lack of trainings and full human resource.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research is conducted in the Yeka sub city, one of the ten sub cities in Addis Ababa, which is located 9⁰02'17" N and 38⁰50' 05" E. The district is located in Northeastern suburb of the city.

The type of research was a descriptive, which described the challenges of expropriation and compensation in the Yeka Sub City. The research strategy that followed was case study type. The paradigm or the research's approach that research essentially developed was qualitative research, which describe qualitatively. The sampling techniques have been non probability sampling, which is used to select respondents of officials; and key informants were selected purposively but total expropriated landholders in the selected site areas were taken through senses method.

This research used both primary and secondary data sources. The primary data was collected by researcher from governmental bodies such as officials, leaders, communities that were affected by the expropriation and from some key informants. The secondary data sources for this research was taken from books, article, journals, and unpublished materials. These sources have legal, procedural and theoretical aspects. Constitutions, Proclamation, directives and manuals that are described in relation to expropriation and compensation were used as secondary data sources which are relevant to this research.

The methods of data analysis were both qualitative and quantitative data analysis. The quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS to generate percentage, table and graph. The data collected from interviews and open ended questions were analyzed by using content analysis. A description was prepared to reflect the discussion using participants own words.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this part human resource capacity of Urban Development and Renewal Office, work flow between the institution, perception of expropriated and their reflection, and rule and regulations effectiveness and implementation were described.

IV. HUMAN RESOURCE CAPACITY

The total number of workers in study area office was 36. In this office structural human resource requirement was 42. The institute requires eight skilled human resources that would worked in expropriation and compensation.

Table 1.1: Trainers and their capacity built

S.N	Capacity building elements	Response	Number	Percent
1.	Training	Yes	20	95.2
		No	1	4.8
		Total	21	100.0
2.	Capacity built due to training	Higher	0	0.0
		Medium	7	35.0
		Lower	5	25.0
		Not that much	8	40.0
		Total	20	100.0

Source: Based on field survey by the Author.

In table 1.1, Less than 5% of the respondent did not gain training. More than 95% got training, from which majority of the respondents that accounted 65% were responded that their capacity was built lower and not that much by the trainings. This was due to low frequency of training delivered and 35% of respondents' responded training built their capacity at medium level. Nobody was responded their capacity was highly built through training.

Generally, In Yeka Sub City Urban Development and Renewal Office majority gained the training, that most of their capacity was not built that much, lower and medium level.

Table 1.2: Satisfaction of officials by training frequency

Frequency of Training	Satisfaction on Frequency of Training				Total	
	Yes		No		Number	Percent
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
One time in	0	0.0	8	40.0	8	40.0
Two times	3	15.0	2	10.0	5	25.0
One time beyond a	0	0.0	7	35.0	7	35.0
Total	3	15.0	17	85.0	20	100.0

Source: Based on field survey conducted by Author.

In table 1.2, Participant that most of them were trained at least twice a year were responded that their capacity built at medium level, whereas others that trained one time within a year and beyond a year were built their capacity not that much and lower. In this context of Capacity building for them, capacities were built for the majority was not that much and lower. Generally, the more they were participating in training were satisfied.

Table 1.3: Perception of capacity building through training by purpose of trainings to perform tasks

Purpose of Trainings for Perform Task	Capacity Building through Training				Total	
	Strongly agree		Agree		Number	Percent
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Increase ability	9	42.9	1	4.8	10	47.6
Makes to be responsible	2	9.5	2	9.5	4	19.0
Helps to increase	4	19.0	3	14.3	7	33.4
Total	15	71.4	6	28.6	21	100.0

Source: Based on field survey by Author.

In table 1.3, majority of respondents was strongly agreed training built human capacity, from them that accounted 42.9% strongly considered training as way of increased ability. 28.6% were agreed capacity would be enhanced through training from them majority that accounted 14.3% of the respondents

considered training enhanced customer satisfaction. Less of the respondents were agreed capacity would enhance through training and make to be responsible.

Generally, official respondents strongly agreed with trainings built capacity and their perception to perform tasks were training increases ability and customer satisfaction. Less of respondents that were agreed capacity can be built through training were believed that training makes responsible for performing tasks. In this context workers have better attitude towards trainings and its function.

V. WORK FLOW IN EXPROPRIATION AND COMPENSATION

Expropriation and compensation for road construction in the Yeka sub city requires the integration of the Addis Ababa Cabinet, Addis Ababa Plan Institutes, Addis Ababa Road Authority, Construction Industry Development and Maintenance Authority and Finance and Economy Development Office and Districts in different level. The Addis Ababa cabinet has the power to permit construction of road projects or other urban redevelopment. After giving permission Road Authority sends design that was approved by urban plan institutes. The plan institute has the authority to approve plan of the city. The road authority has delegated power to construct road, before it the plans, firstly approved by plan institutes that were designed by consultants or road authority officials. In addition, the authority mark area within identified color by indicating how many amounts would be expropriated and finally pay compensation after valuation approved and received from urban development and renewal office. Construction Industry Development and Maintenance Authority and Finance and Economy Development Office determines the current unit cost of construction inputs and which used as a means of performing valuation for Urban Development and Renewal Office for road construction.

As interview conducted in the study area, Yeka Land Development and Management Office holds six offices that are worked integrate, so as to achieve the goal of authority. Urban Development and Renewal Office/UDRO/ organized under Office of Land Development and Management. This office specifically performs expropriation and compensation within case teams and collaboration with other stakeholders. UDRO has five case teams and major tasks are achieved mission of the authority by making clear for road construction in a specific manner. Compensation Data Collector Case Team /CDCCT/ collect data of landholders based on design received form Road Authority. CDCCT take evidences of the physical aspect of property through photo and any legal owned evidences that landholders had on the property of expropriated. Compensation Valuator and Interpreter Case Team /CVICT/ take measures data from CDCCT and perform valuation based on the assigned value by encoding data into the computer system. Compensation Valuator and Interpreter Approval Case Team/CVIACT/ checked out valuation and compensation issue that were interpreted by CVICT. After clearly identified this case team finally transfer evidences for Place Clearance Case Team/PCCT/; in addition the final version of the approved evidence used for compensation if the landholders evidences are compatible with the Directive no 19/2006. Place Clearance Case Team/PCCT, mainly clear land for road construction. PCCT delivered tasks by integrating with

districts. After accepting full evidences from CVIACT, then ordered landholders to take away their property that did not belong to compensation, but when the expropriated get the compensation they work with district to remove property for government. Mostly property of compensated are taken by expropriated through payment of 10% what they are compensated. Expropriated Rehabilitation Case Team/ERCT/ proposed different fund raising project to deliver rehabilitation for expropriated. ERCT take information from CVIACT and perform a needs assessment of expropriated and then create linkage with NGOs, Small and Micro Enterprise, Education and Health Sector and Women, Youth and Children Affairs Office.

Table 1.4: Time given for expropriation and ways they make compatible with their plan.

Variable	Response	Number	Percent
Time suffices to perform Expropriation	Yes	10	47.6
	No	11	52.4
Total		21	100.0
Amount of sufficient time permitted	More than one year	1	10.0
	One year	0	0.0
	Less than one year	9	90.0
Total		10	100.0

Source: Based on field survey conducted by Author.

In table 1.4, 52.4% responded that the time given for expropriation for them wasn't enough. 47.6% of respondents responded authority bodies give enough time. For respondents that responded time given to them was enough requested to specify the amount of time given; in these contexts that accounted 90% respond time given to them was less than one year. The remaining 10% of them responded that time given from authority body to expropriated was more than one year. In Addition interviewed respondents were responded that the time given for expropriation were not enough. Whereas, as Directive No 19/2006 declared any concerned body that want to be performed development like road, for demarcation approval the institute should give the design of the project before one year within clear and identifiable manner. Giving two months make the burden for landholders and even officials so as to perform what was requested. The landholders became not satisfied with the time given to remove their property.

As the interview was conducted in the work flow of expropriation and compensation, the challenges that were faced from Road Authority were inconsistency of design and given short period of time to perform expropriation. The plan was designed by Road Authority and approved by City Plan Institute. The Road Authority marked on the fence of landholders based on design. Then the order was transferred from Land Clearance Case Team to remove their property for landholders in project sites through Districts. After removal based on marked site they again construct fence. At the other time the design was extended to some area and ordered them ones again. Such activities make the extra cost to landholders. The integration among different

stakeholders decreases the problems that would face like inconsistency design.

Generally, short period of time given and inconsistency of design faced challengeable issue to expropriator. Expropriation is big issue that needs care, since it makes the loss of resource like capital and labor.

VI. SITUATION OF EXPROPRIATED DURING EXPROPRIATION AND COMPENSATION

This part of finding holds types of demolished or taken from landholders for road construction, hearing, feeling and participation of expropriated, acceptance of expropriation, complainant and their satisfaction.

Table 1.5: Type of property and information delivered for demolish.

Property demolished and Information Delivered	Response	Number	Percent
Types of property demolished	Fence	25	21.7
	House	34	29.6
	Fence and house	56	48.7
	Total	115	100.0
Time of Hearing about their property to be taken for road construction	Greater than 6	75	65.2
	Greater than 3	17	14.8
	Greater than 5	5	4.3
	Less than 1 month	18	15.7
	Total	115	100.0

Source: Based on field survey conducted by Author.

As collected data from the field, 21.7% demolished their fences. The 29.6% landholders' house was demolished and 48.7% expropriated their fence and house. Generally, in the two project sites, the demolished property of landholders was a fence, house, and the fence and the house. Mostly demolished properties were fence and building.

The 65% of landholders heard expropriation would be performed before six months, 14.8% of respondents was heard about the expropriation issue before three months. Less than 5% of respondents were heard issues of expropriation before a month, and 15.7% of respondent were heard expropriation deliverable time less than one month. The respondents heard this information either formally or informally, but this information was not the exact time to leave the land within the identified demolished part and the amount of compensation.

As declared in directive No 19/2006 Road Authority prepared and deals with the plan institute for approval and then send a plan for Urban Development and Renewal Office. Then after, the office performed its own discussion with the community on the issue of road construction. The office selected representative from community through discussion. The aim of this meeting was making awareness that road would be constructed and selecting committees. It was not to remove their property because the demarcation or identification was not indicated.

Table 1.6: Acceptance of expropriation and their reason

Variable	Response	Number	Percent
Acceptance to Expropriation	Yes	67	58.3
	No	48	41.7
	Total	115	100.0
Reason for Acceptance	I will benefit from this development	49	73.1
	Does not create any problem for me	2	3.0
	The road constructed previously were more difficult	16	23.9
	Total	67	100.0
Reason for not accepting	Expropriation highly affected	20	41.7
	I didn't like to leave my land	15	31.3
	The compensation may not be enough	6	12.5
	I lost my neighbor and not benefited from Development	3	6.3
	The road could be constructed without affected me	2	4.2
	Fear of unknown	2	4.2
	Total	48	100.0

Source: Based on field survey conducted by Author.

As shown in table 1.6, more than 58% of respondents were accepted expropriation, from them majority of respondents were reason out the acceptance they would benefit from development, less than 24% were reflected previously constructed road was difficult, and 3% of respondents which is insignificant reason out acceptance of expropriation as did not create any problem for them. 41.7 % were not accepted expropriation, from them 73% of respondents reason out opposition for expropriation were highly affected them and involuntary to leave the land. Less than 13% were opposed expropriation because of future expectation of compensation. The share of opposition expropriation due loss of a neighbor and didn't benefit from development and constructed road would perform without expropriation was quite insignificant due to most of them were not fully expropriated and narrow nature of previously road.

Generally, Most of landholders were accepted expropriation and their reason was the future expectation of benefit and development and thinking current problem that faced due to poor quality and gully nature of the road.

As the interview was conducted with expropriated, landholders those mostly opposed were highly expropriated. Landholders were not happy with expropriation process and most of them were feeling sad. The given time and not participating in the development process made them not to accept expropriation process.

In relation to the procedure of expropriation and general perception one expropriated responded as follows:

In this road construction I lost many things like land, fence, and a house that I was feeding my children by renting a house. But this is already happening as you can see the road is not yet started construction. We removed our property last year, it is almost one year. Starting that time infrastructural facilities like light and water services are blocked. There is blow off the dust, and assumed how much it damages our health. In relation to compensation, as I tell you I lost three shops that were constructed through building in good manner, for this property the compensation amount were 30,000 ET, which were not enough for demolishing. Even though I was paid 10 per cent of 30,000 ET birr to get compensation for demolishing property and I am not clear with this payment. In addition, my neighbor was not getting compensation, because of lack of money to pay the requested amount for their remains of demolished property. The time given to demolish was not enough. One day a letter was sent from district administrator to demolish, and they came in third day and said unless you have not demolished it, we demolish by force they said. Assume, it requires money, how can I get? Generally, these expropriations were not participatory and development was not performed as they were saying at first time, this is why some of them were opposed.

Table 1.7: Participation in the expropriation process by the satisfaction of expropriated in expropriation process and reason of not participating.

Participating in Expropriation Process		Expropriation Process				Total	
		Yes		No			
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes		9	7.8	4	3.4	13	11.2
No, reason for none participation	New in the presences of	7	6.1	40	34.8	47	40.9
	None	5	4.3	23	20.0	28	24.3
	voluntary to Another	6	5.2	21	18.3	27	23.5
Total		27	23.5	88	76.5	115	100.0

Source: Based on field survey by Author.

In table 1.7, 76.5% of landholders were not satisfied, but 23.5% satisfied with expropriation process. In relation to participation from the total landholder, 88.7% were not participating in Expropriation process, whereas 11.3% was participated. Of the total respondents more than 64% reasoned for absenteeism for participation were lack of awareness and other reasons like not inviting for participation, from which 53% of them were dissatisfied with expropriation process. Nearly 24% of expropriated reasoned for their non participation as involuntary to participation, from them, 20% were dissatisfied with expropriation process.

According to Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), the guiding principles for process of compulsory acquisition should be based on participation. Participation means the affected people; different organizations should be included in the planning process; support should be provided to landholders and occupants to participate successfully at the time of discussions in valuation and compensation.

Generally, most expropriated landholders were not participating in expropriation process; in the study area, participated in expropriation process were more satisfied than none participants.

Table 1.8: Expropriated feeling expression mechanisms and measures taken by government.

Variable	Response	Number	Percent
Mechanisms of expression Feeling	Through active participation	3	14.3
	Through keeping silent	7	33.3
	Through showing unwanted acts	9	42.9
	Unknown	2	9.5
Total		21	100.0
Mechanisms to make the land free	Using police	7	41.2
	By negotiating them	9	52.9
	Another reason	1	5.9
Total		17	100.0

Source: Based on Field Survey Conducted by Author.

In table 1.8, more than 76% of official respondents were responded that expropriated expressed their feelings through keeping silence and showing unwanted acts. Less than 15% of respondent were responded that expropriated expressed their feelings through active participation and nearly 9% respondents were not identified way of feeling expression.

Generally, most landholders that accepted expropriation where leaving land immediately as compared to none accepted of expropriated land holders.

Table 1.9: Compensation offered satisfaction and its reason.

Variable	Response	Number	Percent
Compensation offered	Yes	66	57.4
	No	49	42.6
Satisfaction with compensation	Yes	6	9.1
	No	60	90.9
Reason for not satisfying	Compensation is low	46	76.7
	Inappropriate valuation of property	7	11.7
	Late compensation	1	1.7
	Unequal treatment with others	3	5.0
	Does not include location advantage	3	5.0

Source: Based on field survey by conducted by Author.

As shown in table 1.9, 57.4% of expropriated got compensation, whereas, 42.6% did not get compensation. Out of compensated 90.9% of them were not satisfied with compensation in which 9.1% were satisfied with compensation. The majority responded the reason for dissatisfaction of compensation was the lowest amount of compensation.

According to FAO, availability of ambiguous legal right makes the difficulty in the determination of equivalent compensation. As interview and questionnaire were conducted,

from the two project sites, CMC to Wondirade School majority of them received compensation. But in the current site of developed area of the Root school to the Bono Wuha project site, almost all of them did not get compensation.

In the FDRE constitution of Article 40(8), the government should pay compensation “commensurate to the value of the property” expropriated. In addition proclamation 455/2005 and Directive No 19/2006 declared that compensation for property is based on replacement cost of the property. The value is based on current market value, whereas most of them were not get appropriated compensation that would used in the replacement previously property. Due to this landholders were not satisfied. Mostly, low compensation amount and the inappropriate valuation system were their reason for dissatisfaction of compensation.

Table 4.14: Types of frequently complain by appealing forms

Forms of frequent appeals	Type of expropriated frequent complain						Total	
	Fully expropriated		Partially Expropriate		None Compensate			
	Number	%	Numbe	%	Number	%	Numbe	%
Compensation	1	4.8	11	52.4	2	9.5	14	66.7
Involuntary to leave	3	14.2	1	4.8	1	4.8	5	23.8
Time sufficiency	0	0.0	1	4.8	1	4.8	2	9.5
Total	4	19	13	70	4	19	21	100

Source: Based on Field Survey by Author.

In the study area, 52.3% were responded that most frequented complaint for road construction was partial expropriated and their appeal forms were compensation related. 19% were fully expropriated were frequently complaining, of them, 14.2% were responded that the forms of appeal were involuntary to leave the land/ area. The remaining 19% were responded that the type of frequently complain were none compensated; from which more than 9% were complaining due to compensation. Appeal form due to time sufficiency to leave the land was insignificant because of more stress on compensation.

In compensation and the expropriation issue majority were appealed to government offices and from the compliant most of them were found in the newly settled area of the ROOT school to BONO WUHA. As described above, most of them were not gain compensation because, the area was currently settled and some of them were expropriated for the second time that was expropriated from previously road construction in other sites. The expropriated were not satisfied by their respond and their final decision was keeping silent, and performs what they required to do. In addition, as data collected from officials and interview were conducted; expropriated landholders have shown unwanted acts like insulting and saying who touch my property. The district administrators and urban development and renewal office manager representative responded that some landholders were opposed expropriation.

VII. RULES AND REGULATION

The interviewed key informant in relation to rule and regulation were Urban Development and Renewal Office manager representative, Addis Ababa Road Authority, and district executive managers.

The rules they were used for expropriation and compensation were proclamation no 455/2005 and Directive 19/2006 mainly they were used directive 19/2006, which were formulated by Addis Ababa City Administration Cabinet that clarify Proclamation No 455/2005. As interview performed in the field survey directive were not fully effective because the amount of compensation were made expropriated to appeal complain. As mentioned in the directive the current amount of cost was determined by Construction Industry Development and Maintenance Authority and Finance and Economic Development Office. The unit cost is not fair and detailed but simple estimation. The other issues in relation to rule were in the two sites, especially at the site of ROOT School to BONO WUHA the landholders were currently settled and most of them were discarded from compensation. These were due to their property were not seen by GIS and did not have a building plan, which the directives were declared and neglected those landholder settled after 1997.

In Addition the directives were not considered the current Sub City development because these areas were transition zone and there were many settlers. In relation to compensation, the directive declared that compensation for expropriated should be based on current building inputs and labor cost, here the current cost were based on an annual study from Construction, Industrial Development Authority and Finance and Economic Development Bureau. But the biggest challenge was the general description cost and unfair cost given for them. These made to low compensation amount, and highly complaint from expropriated. The issue of implementations of rule was inappropriate in the case of the Yeka Sub City level of expropriation and compensation. The first issues were time given to the expropriated and inappropriate letter description to leave the land. As the directive was declared the authority should receive land from the land holder after 30 days and the letter describes the amount that will be paid, but as described above these were not appropriately implemented. The main and big challengeable issue was inconsistent design and the shortest time given to expropriator from Road Authority.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Modern sense of capacity building is increased human, department, institution, and customer satisfaction. Training integrates efficiency and personal satisfaction, formal planning and creativity, result/action orientation and human relationships. In Urban Development and Renewal Office training was delivered for workers, but the majority of their capacities were not built through training due to low frequency delivered to them. Training and satisfaction are directly related. Workers believed that training increased ability and customer satisfaction, and make responsible.

Expropriation and compensation for road construction needs involvement of different stakeholder. Issue of expropriation and valuation were performed by Urban Development and Renewal Office, whereas compensation and Design for roads were conducted besides Road Authority. But estimation of unit cost of labor and construction materials for compensation purpose was determined by Construction Industry Development and Maintenance Authority and Finance and Economic Development Bureau.

There are problems that faced in the work flows like inconsistent design and communication were not addressed problems in the office. The design of the road was changed more than two times. Besides of this, Implementer Authority marked on the landholder's property without making integration to other stakeholders. The time given resulted to burden in the expropriated and expropriators to implement as the rule permits. Road construction project sites, both fences and house were highly demolished. But the information avail for them was not on time.

Expropriated landholders were dissatisfied in the expropriation process and the number of participants was low. In these project sites averagely the participants in expropriation process were more satisfied than none participants, which indicates that participation increase satisfaction of expropriated and acceptance of expropriation process.

Most of the expropriated were getting compensation, but the compensated and none compensated were proportional in number. The amount of compensation was low and the expropriated were appealed to government office, but the complaints were not satisfied.

The base of rules and regulations for expropriation was proclamation and directives. In the Yeka Sub City for expropriation and compensation the base was Directive 19/2006 and Proclamation 455/2005. The directives were not fully effective. The reason behind it ignores the settled landholders from compensation that were stayed beyond Ten years.

Recommendations

- ✓ The office should be built human resource capacity through training.
- ✓ The Road Authority should work to integrate with the Urban Development and Renewal Office while performing tasks like marking on the ground.
- ✓ Expropriation process should be participatory and it should not be one time worked on the committee's selection and there should be continuous follow up and supervision.
- ✓ Awareness creation in the issue of expropriation should be delivered to landholders.
- ✓ Compensation amount should be improved and the concerned body should study the unit costs detail and price should be fair.
- ✓ As a principle of expropriation, there should be clear law, procedures and fair compensation for expropriated, but the directive left currently settled areas or built after 1997 without compensation. Therefore, the directive should be revised and consider the transitional zone.

The research recommended for further research, the need to establish an independent office that performs expropriation, valuation and compensation

at one office.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Above all, I would like to thank mightily God for His Grace and miraculous acts throughout my entire life and for successful completion of the journal.

I would like to express my deep whole-hearted gratitude to my Advisor Dr. Gebrechistos Nuriye for his unreserved support, encouragement, and sacrifice of his precious time to comment and provide valuable support from the very beginning to the end and the accomplishment of the research work.

I would like to extend my deepest thanks to my father and brothers, Melkamu and Shimelis for their heartfelt assistance and encouragement in dealing with matters.

REFERENCES

- [1] Allen. T. (2000). "The Acquisition of Property on Just Terms." 22 Syd LR 35. Available at http://www.unswlawjournal.unsw.edu.au/sites/default/files/32_winnett_2010.pdf
- [2] Alterman, R. (2007). *The "Legitimate Public Purpose" for Land Expropriation*. http://www.tkk.fi/Yksikot/Kiinteisto/FIG/pdf-files/Alterman_presentation.pdf
- [3] Anita KWARTNIK-PRUC and Anna TREMBECKA, (May, 2012). *Analysis of Simplified Mode of Property Acquisition for the Purpose of Road Construction in Poland*. International Federation of Surveyors. Available at: http://www.fig.net/resources/proceedings/fig_proceedings/fig2012/papers/ts03g/TS03G_kwartnikpruc_trembecka_et_al_5698.pdf
- [4] Belachew Yirsaw (2013). *Expropriation, valuation and compensation in Ethiopia: A Doctoral Thesis in Real Estate, Planning, Royal Institute of Technology (KTH): Stockholm, Sweden*. Available at: https://www.kth.se/polopoly_fs/1.418707!/Menu/general/column-content/attachment/Fil%201%20Alemu%20final%20main%20text.pdf.
- [5] Daniel. W (2013). *Land and expropriation in Ethiopia: Doctoral Thesis in Land Law, Royal Institute of Technology (KTH): Stockholm, Sweden*. Available at: https://www.kth.se/polopoly_fs/1.448667!/Menu/general/column-content/attachment/Thesis%20Final_Daniel_2013.pdf
- [6] Daniel W. (2014). *Compensation for Expropriation in Ethiopia and the UK: a Comparative Analysis: Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia 16--21 June 2014 (6821)*. Available at: https://www.fig.net/resources/proceedings/fig_proceedings/fig2014/papers/TS10D/TS10D_7419_abs.pdf
- [7] Denyer-Green, B. (1998). *Compulsory Purchase and Compensation (5th Ed)*. Estates Gazette, London.
- [8] Addis Ababa City Administration. (2014). Expropriation of Property for Public Interest Compensation Issue Improved Directive No 19/2006: Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- [9] Enemark and Williamson. (2004). *Capacity Building in Land Administration: A Conceptual Approach*. Survey Review 39 (294); 639-50.
- [10] Epstein, R. A. (1985). *Takings, Private Property and the Power of Eminent Domain*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press. Available at: <http://www.amazon.com/Takings-Private-Property-Eminent-Domain/dp/0674867297>.
- [11] FAO. (2007). Good Governance in Land Tenure and Administration. FAO Land Tenure series No, 9.
- [12] FAO. (2008). *Compulsory Acquisition of Land and Compensation*. FAO Land Tenure Studies 10. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i0506e.pdf>.
- [13] Jack Harvey and Ernie Jowsey. (2004). *Urban Land Economics (6th Ed.)*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- [14] Kucharska-Stasiak. (2007). *Inadequacy of Valuation in Expropriation Processes: The Case of Poland*. Available at: <http://www.tkk.fi/Yksikot/Kiinteisto/FIG/pdf-files/06092007KucharskaStasiak>
- [15] Ministry of Works and Urban Development (2008). *Urban Local Government Development Project. Resettlement Policy Framework*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- [16] Mirosław Belej and Marek Walacik. (2008). *Land Acquisition for Public Purpose in Poland on Example of Public Roads Construction*. Available at: http://www.fig.net/pub/fig2008/papers/ts04b/ts04b_03_belej_walacik_2849.pdf.
- [17] Nachmias, C. F., & Nachmias, D. (1997). *Research Methods in the Social Science*. Oxford: Oxford University press.
- [18] Nichols, P. (2007). *Eminent Domain*. (Sackman J. & et.al (Eds)). Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Available at: http://www.courts.ca.gov/partners/documents/caci_2015_edition.pdf
- [19] Poland. (1997). *Land Administration*, Act Sec. 131: Available at: <http://www.prawaczlowieka.edu.pl/pliki/348763862f0a868bdc2591812b783206c351bc2f-p332.doc>.
- [20] The City Government of Addis Ababa. (2012). *The Addis Ababa City Government Executive and Municipal Service Organs Reestablishment Proclamation*. Proclamation No. 35/2012. Negari Gazeta. Addis Ababa: Ethiopia. Addis.
- [21] The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (2003). *Constitution of Ethiopia*, Proclamation No. 1/1995. Negarit Gazeta. Year 1 No.1 Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- [22] The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. (2007). *Payment of Compensation for Property Situated on Landholding Expropriated for Public Purposes*. Regulation No.135/2007. Negarit Gazeta. Year 13, No.36.
- [23] The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. (2011). *Expropriation of Landholdings for Public Purposes and Payment of Compensation Proclamation*. Proclamation No. 455/2005. Negarit Gazette. No. 43.
- [24] The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. (2011). *Urban Lands Lease Holding Proclamation*. Proclamation No. 721/2011. Addis Ababa: Ethiopia. Negarit Gazeta.
- [25] The United Nations Development Programme. (2002). *Developing Capacity through Technical Cooperation: Country Experiences*. Ed. Stephen Browne. Earth Scan Publications Ltd London and Sterling, Virginia: USA. Available at: <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/aplaws/publication/en/publications/capacity-development/developing-capacity-through-technical-cooperation-executive-summary/Country-Exp-Exec.pdf>.
- [26] Williamson, Enemark, Wallace, and Rajanbifard. (2010). *Land Administration for Sustainable Development*. Ersi press, 380 New York: California.
- [27] Worku, Ibrahim. (2011). *Road Sector Development and Economic Growth in Ethiopia*: Paper 4. Ethiopian Development Research Institute: Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Available at: www.stlouisfed.org/publications/itv/default.html

AUTHORS

First Author –Bantayehu Ayalew, Lecturer at Mizan Tepi University, College of Social Science and Humanity
Email _ bantayal2006@gmail.com