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Abstract

This article attempts to explore urban relocation impacts on the livelihoods of poor households displaced by a development project in Bahir Dar city in northwestern Ethiopia. Qualitative methods were used to generate the necessary data. The findings identified that the urban relocation caused a variety of livelihood risks such as loss of home or shelter, lack of urban infrastructures such as road facilities, electricity, job opportunities, potable water services and cash compensation for rehousing, as well as landlessness and separation of small cohesive social groups (notably coffee members). Though IDPs are exposed to various livelihood challenges because of a lack of addressing environmental impact assessment recommendations, those who received housing land are partly happy with owning legally recognised urban land. Currently, IDPs are the owners of the land registered by the municipality. The study urges the need to assess and address the unmet needs of poor urban residents as well as the environmental impact of urban development projects.
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Introduction

Displacement is broadly defined as the uprooting of people from their place of habitual residence (Cernea 2005). Population displacement has become a global problem, particularly since the end of the Cold War (Cernea 2009 Cernea & McDowell 2000). Cernea and McDowell (2000: 49), note that ‘displaced populations have been part and parcel of modern history and
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often people are being displaced in the name of progress.’ The literature review outlines the major causes of internal displacement into three typologies, namely development-induced displacement, conflict-induced displacement and disaster-induced displacement (Tesfaye 2007; Getu 2005). There are also various terms that are used to describe a wide range of displaced populations, including ‘refugees’, ‘development displacees’, ‘environment and disaster displacees’, ‘internally displaced people or persons’ (IDPs), ‘forced resettlers’, ‘internal refugees’, ‘environmental refugees’, and ‘climate refugees’ (Internal Displacement Monitoring Center [IDMC] 2010).

This study is conducted among Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) by urban development project, Bahir Dar Ethiopia. What is of primary importance in this study is the fact that development is the largest cause of global population displacement, a phenomenon commonly termed ‘Development-Induced Displacement’ (DID) in the literature (Hussain 2008; Cernea 2000). DID is the process that takes place when people are forced to leave their homes as a result of development projects such as the construction of dams, roads, airports, as well as urban clearance initiatives, mining, deforestation and the introduction of conservation reserves (Baviskar 2009; Mathur 2006). The magnitude of urban development-induced displacement in Ethiopia has been increasing (Birhanu 2006; Fitsum 2007; Gebre 2008; Nebiyou 2000). The recent urban development policy of Ethiopia is designed to address various urban challenges through infrastructural projects such as slum clearance initiatives and housing projects (Tebarek 2013).

The magnitude of population displacement by development projects in developing countries has increased particularly since the 1960s and 1970s (Dessaeleign 2003). Projects assisted by the World Bank in the majority of developing countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America, account for an ever increasing number of displaced populations globally (Thomas 2002). The displaced people face a number of risks that damage their livelihood (McDowell 2002). Significant examples of such projects have been in Malaysia (the FELDA project), Sri Lanka (the accelerated Mahaweli project), Indonesia (the transmigration project), Colombia (Caquetá), and Brazil (Polonoreste) (Cernea & McDowell 2000, McDowell, 2002). Recent research by Cernea (2009: 290) indicates that in India alone during the period 1949-2000, development programs displaced over 6 million people;
in China during a similar period (1950-2005), about 70 million people were displaced. According to Cernea (2009: xxvi):

 [...] every single year in the first decade of the twenty first century, development programs forcibly uproot and displace from their houses and fields cohort of populations conservatively estimated to total at least 15 million people, which is equivalent to between 150 and 200 million for the decade.

The main objective of this study is, therefore, to explore the livelihood impacts of the urban development-induced displacement that involved the transfer of poor squatter settlers from the inner city to the outlying parts of Bahir Dar city. This is done with the aim to conceptualise how urban development-induced displacement relates to vulnerability, livelihood assets (capital), livelihood activities/strategies, policies, and institutions/associations and processes that determine people’s choices in shaping livelihoods and livelihood outcomes as the results of livelihood strategies (Scoones 1998). As a result, the effects of urban displacement on relocatees’ livelihoods are assessed in terms of physical, natural and financial wellbeing, social solidarity and basic services, as well as, infrastructure assets, activities, processes and outcomes.

Generally, studies emphasise the inherent socio-economic risks of involuntary displacement (Shami 1993; Downing 1996). Case-by-case studies across the world indicate how the displaced population experiences risks (Pankhurst & Piguet 2009). In this regard, displacement research has made remarkable achievements in documenting the livelihood risks people encounter due to involuntary displacement. In his multiple studies, Cernea (2000; 2005; 2009) provides lists of the inherent livelihood risks faced by people forcibly displaced for various reasons. These risks include landlessness, homelessness, joblessness, marginalization, increased morbidity and mortality, food insecurity, loss of access to common property resources and social disintegration (Cernea 2000). Analysis of livelihood risks related to displacement has resulted in the identification of supplementary risks. One of which is the loss of access to community services, ranging from clinics to educational facilities, that may result in post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) among displaced people (Aptekar & Behailu 2009). Another identified risk is the violation of human rights (Andnet 2010); displacement from one’s habitual residence and loss of
property without fair compensation is considered a violation of human rights (Robinson 2003; Abebe 2009).

In Ethiopia, there are some evidences gathered from case studies on urban development-induced displacement particularly in Addis Ababa (Birhanu 2006; Dejene 2005; Feleke 2009; Fitsum 2007; Gebre 2008; Ashenafi 2001). The studies indicate that displaced poor households are exposed to various dimensions of livelihood risks. The process usually involves the transfer of poor residents from inner parts of cities and towns to peripheral areas, thereby inhibiting their access to basic social or public services (Birhanu 2006; Dejene 2005; Feleke 2009; Gebre 2008; Ashenafi 2001). The process of relocating people from the inner city to the outskirts is argued to disrupt business ties with customers, fragment informal and social networks and lead to a loss of neighborhood-based organisations (Tebarek 2013; Gebre 2008; Fitsum 2007). In addition, urban displacement results in the separation of work site from home site in female-headed households (Habtamu 2014; Etenesh 2007).

As reviewed above, urban development-induced displacement affects the various aspects of livelihood assets and activities of poor households (Habtamu 2014); some research focuses on the impacts on female-headed households (Tebarek 2013; Etenesh 2007); and some others consider the livelihood outcomes in terms of the coping and survival strategies of relocated residents in urban contexts (Ephrem 1998; Tesfu 2014; Dinku 2004). Most of the previous studies have been confined to Addis Ababa. With no prior study that attempts to investigate how urban relocation erodes a community`s access to all the elements needed for livelihood – physical, social and natural wellbeing and financial capital – this study attempts to explore the livelihood impacts of urban relocation with particular reference to Bahir Bar city located in northwestern Ethiopia.

**Description of the Study Area**

This particular study is conducted in Bahir Dar city, located in the northwestern parts of Ethiopia. The research has been conducted by a single urban development project in Bahir Dar city’s Kotatina resettlement neighborhood. The Bahir Dar Hulegeb Stadium project is a relatively large-scale project covering 15.5 hectares of land that touches Keble 14, 15 and 17 which are sub district in Bahir Dar city (Bahir Dar City Service Office 2000). The construction of the stadium has resulted in the displacement of 352
heads of households. The displaced households were required to resettle in the outskirts of the city. Those displaced live in a new resettlement neighborhood popularly known as Kotatina Sefer or Mender, located in the southwestern peripheral area of Bahir Dar city. The place name of Kotatina refers to the hill place and its surroundings that were identified and reserved by authorities for the settlements of IDPs in the outlying area of the city.

Methods of the Study

The study is based on qualitative methods that involved in-depth interviews with key informants, observations, two Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) (one with a male group and the other with a female group), and documentary assessments. One of the advantages of qualitative methods is the allowance for understanding participants’ experiences within context (Creswell 2007). Understanding the experience of internal displacement, therefore, required the careful selection of key informants who were representative of displaced households or communities living in the Kotatina neighborhood. Key informants were contacted by co-investigators who attended public gathering places in the community, such as churches, mosques, and community-based associational meetings. Participants for interviews were informed of the purpose of the study through a written document and signed an agreement to participate in the study. Local leaders or executive committee members of informal Iddirs, Ikub and other informal associations, were selected as the key informants, along with two experts from Bahir Dar city municipalities. The selection criteria sought out individual heads of households displaced by the Bahir Dar Hulegeb Stadium project, and given plots of land as compensation for rebuilding their homes. Considering gender, six male and six female Iddir leaders, and two male Bahir Dar city municipality experts were identified and interviewed. Each interview was conducted using an interview guide, with questions followed by probes to elicit in depth information. The two FGDs were also conducted by using a FGD guide. In order to maintain anonymity when analysing, organising, and presenting the major themes that emerged from the in-depth interviews, key informants are noted as A1, A2, A3, and so on to A14.

The Results of the Study

Currently, the IDPs live in close proximity. Resettlement involved transferring urban poor residents from their squatter settlement to Kotatina, located on the periphery of Bahir Dar city. Internal displacement and
resettlement as experienced by the IDPs, involved a relatively short physical
distance from Kebele 15 to Kebele 14 of the city administration. Before the
influx of IDPs, the Kotatina site, a stretch of land in the outlying area the city
administration, was possessed by people engaged in agricultural activities.
Now, the new resettlement site is made to be part of Kebele 14 of the city
administration.

The study explored the livelihood impacts of internal displacement,
including the loss of home or shelter, concerns about the sustainability of life
in the new resettlement neighborhood with no mainstream urban services
such as roads, electricity and potable water, the inability to get cash
compensation for rehousing and the separation from coffee members. The
following subthemes outline and describe the controversial issues involved
in livelihood risks such as a lack of cash compensation, basic housing services,
job opportunities and transportation, as well as homelessness and social
disintegration. Some of the positive aspects of urban development-induced
displacement are also noted.

**Physical Capital: Homelessness**

One of the pressing problems or livelihood risks faced by individual
households following the internal displacement was homelessness. The
project planners and designers did not propose any cash compensation for
displacement and resettlement. The study found that relocatees' financial
capacity had also worsened due to extra housing expenses during the
transitional period of relocation. On the one hand, participants considered
their displacement and resettlement without compensation as a wrong doing
committed against their rights. They raised their grievances to Municipal
authorities. On the other hand, authorities and municipalities argued that, for
IDPs who had been squatter settlers in the urban locality, the allocation of
land should be viewed as compensation. An ad hoc committee comprising of
community members was formed to work temporarily with the registration
of household heads in order to identify which households were entitled to
compensation. All informants openly reported compensation related issues,
as well as how the lack of compensation was justified by concerned
authorities.

The sudden dislocation was traumatic and stressful for the displaced people.
According to informants, with no prior warning, all residents were given a
two week deadline to leave their housing. The situation of homelessness,
particularly during the transition period, compelled all displaced households to live in rented houses for two to four months. This information was confirmed in both of the FGDs. One informant (A3) recalled his experiences, stating:

I have passed through many challenges and problems since the date of my displacement in Kotatina. It was in February 2008 that all residents in Ketel Sefer were told to leave the place required by the government for the purpose of building a big stadium in Bahir Dar. Authorities passed orders suddenly to all of us to leave within a week time period by saying all of you go and ‘Jefijifeh giba’, literally to mean ‘build your own temporarily family shelter using leafs or plastics in a places you are provided’. And, I was forced to stay in a temporary housing that I rented from local residents in Kebele 14. For that house, I was paying 300 Birr monthly.

The other key informants from the Bahir Dar municipality argued that they share the inconvenience that the IDPs suffer, however, the multiplier effect of the new project is greater than the IDPS suffering. They state that there is always some negative aspect when doing such projects and the main concern is to ensure that the benefits outweigh the negatives, in favour of majority of people’s wellbeing. For this reason, the municipality tooks action at the expense of the IDPs. In order to minimise homelessness, the municipality gave such lands for the majority of the IDPs except some of them which their residence period in Kettle seffer is less than five years According to his explanation, why the criterion of restricting to five years for giving such land is some IDPs which are not well established residence in the area have not the right to claim to have such lands for housing construction. Because of that they come in this site within a short period of time by expecting such land grant distribution through municipality. They confirmed, if they can construct such home in ketel sefer thus the municipality will supply such lands for them. So in order to minimize such abuse and to address the more victims the municipality distribute lands for whose residence in ketel sefer is great or equal to five years (Informant A14).

**Lack of Access to Basic Services**

Another livelihood-related risk that Kotiatina IDPs continue to face is a lack of access to basic housing services such as electricity, potable water and
waste water management. Though authorities discussed this issue with a group of IDPs and promised to work to develop infrastructure, nothing was done. As Informant A4 recounts:

The place of Kotatina was devoid of any basic services and very detrimental for my life and housing especially during the first two years. There was no water, electricity and even road services which has been still the main problem. Being an IDP especially during the first two years of my displacement and resettlement was the worst experience ever I experienced before.

The existing services are very limited to satisfy both at individual and at household level. Both FGDs and key informant respondents reported that a persisting lack of potable water requires them to buy daily drinking water. Individuals who still do not have access to basic housing services are compelled to pay money to other persons who are getting access to the basic services in their newly built homes. The study participants reported that they were made to resettle outside of the mainstream infrastructure that provides services for urban population of Bahir Dar city. Informant A1 describes the situation:

I have experienced loss of housing that was accessible to the main road, direct electric services, and potable water supply. Still, the serious problem of me is payments for one electric bulb. I am paying 25 Ethiopian birr on a monthly basis that indirectly extended from another relocated person through negotiations and agreements. I am also suffering from regular or daily payments for buying potable water because of the shortage of water supply here in Kotatina. For instance, for one 'Jerika', which could contain ten liters of water, I am supposed to pay 40 cents through agreements and negotiation with local residents.

The two key informants from Bahir Dar municipality responded to this problem by noting that the problem of inadequate service delivery proves challenging. It is not only evident in Kotatina, but also in other new urban settlements. Thus, they argue, the solutions to service delivery problems hinge on the overall development process, and it requires time (Informants A13 and A14).

*Lack of Access to Transportation*
A lack of physical mobility within and beyond their locality is a common characteristic of the economic life of displaced people. Study participants described distinct transportation problems, largely in connection with their livelihood strategies. According to the respondents (FGDs' and key informants), transportation is a major issue as residents strive to survive in the informal labor markets of the urban economy.

Internally displaced households or persons (IDPs) are obliged to commute between their home residences and places of work daily. In this regard, Gebre (2008) found that because of a lack of adequate transportation services, some lose site-related advantages of both formal and informal employment or major livelihood assets and activities, some lose home-sites, and others lose both. A common statement highlighted by Informants A3 and A6 is that ‘everybody here strive to survive by smaller activities.’ Comprising the poorer segment of the wider socio-economic spectrum of the society, the economic survival strategies of IDPs is largely constituted by the informal economy. Most IDPs are predominantly engaged in the informal labor markets such as Gullet-Gebeya, located near Kebele 4, 14, 15, and 16, and comprising of informal and small-trade activities such as, hired day workers, construction workers and sellers of handicrafts, local drinks (such as Arkie and Tella), bread, tea and local coffee.

In securing income, daily travel from Kotatina to market places located in the inner parts of the city in Kebele 4 and Kebele 16 is necessary. As Informant A6 stated, ‘if somebody comes into Kotatina resettlement site early in the morning, every individual of both women and men of a household member are seen coming out from their home and travel for searching for informal activities on a daily basis.’ Or as Informant A4 put it, ‘if somebody comes to Kotatina neighborhood in a day time; most houses are getting closed due to their engagement in daily informal works far from the place of their residences.’ Individuals return from daily informal work at dusk to sleep and have no time for doing anything else. In other words, because their economic activities are far from their homes, IDPs do not undertake working and housing activities simultaneously, as was common practice before their displacement. Another impediment to reliable transportation noted by residents, are the muddy areas located between Kotatina and mainstream urban transport services, because of which, the neighborhood is cut off from taxi services.

**Financial Capital: Compensation Issues**
The redeeming effect of cash compensation was not considered during the relocation process. One of the most common subthemes that emerged from the research is the absence of compensation related to displacement. Informants describes the process leading to their sudden eviction from Ketel Sefer and relocation to Kotatina, noting that a few weeks before their immediate eviction, authorities called a sudden meeting for a discussion with the community. An ad hoc committee drawn from community members was formed to work temporarily with the registration of household heads, and identify households entitled to compensation.

One of the complex problems of poor urban residents internally displaced by development projects is related to the legal statuses of their land and housing. The project planners and designers did not propose any cash compensation for displacement and resettlement except allocating 105 meter square plot of land for individuals in Kotatina as compensation. As previously noted, some participants considered their displacement and resettlement without compensation as a wrongdoing committed against their rights and raised their grievances to municipal authorities. One key informant said, 'I bought the land from the local inhabitants though the municipality didn’t give me legal document.' However, some IDPs who had been squatter settlers in the urban locality viewed the allocation of land as compensation. All of the informants openly reported about the compensation related issues, particularly the justification of the lack of compensation by municipal authorities. Informant A3 describes the responses provided by the authorities concerned in the following way:

The concerned authorities justified that the compensation is offered in forms of land. Your previous land was possessed not through the municipality system. Thus you don’t have legal grounds to complain against the action of this development project. The project is built for the benefits of all people including you. They warned us not to raise the issues of cash compensation, that [we] may be at risk of losing the plots of land provided for housing reconstruction.

The municipality key informants, A13 and A14, outlined this procedure of urban development. Stating that somebody who has a home through the municipality and has a site conformation letter and structural maps of the house that are signed and approved by the municipal authority, has the right to claim both land and finance for the construction of the home. However, somebody that has their own home but does not have an accreditation letter
and structural maps of the house (including additional structures that border the house), does not have the right to claim finance for construction but may only be granted the land for building the house.

In defiance of this municipal protocol, a number of internally displaced households obtained their former housing land through informal arrangements. One informant noted that the formal means of obtaining urban land was unthinkable for poor urban settlers and, as such, informal land transactions constituted the most viable economic alternative. Most participants admitted that their settlement was considered to be illegal. Informant A8’s personal account exemplifies this type of illegal acquisition of housing land through informal arrangements:

I came to Bahir Dar area in 1983. I bought the land of Ketel Sefer in the same year, 1983, informally from the local farming inhabitant and built a home and lived there until I was displaced in 2008.

Despite such informal transactions, money spent for the land and previous housing was overlooked by authorities and relocation was implemented without any compensation given to the poor households. Participants reported that the absence of any compensation for their displacement was a critical problem. In addition to being traumatic and stressful, the absence of any compensation left heavy burdens on poor residents in rebuilding their new home place, as expressed by both FGDs. Key informant participants openly expressed their grievances against being displaced without compensation, as detail by Informant A3:

I didn’t get any compensation for all properties I lost. Initially, authorities promised to give us compensation for the costs of the displacement and resettlement processes. Later, that was not materialised. The situation exposed me to extra and unexpected expense. For instance, I paid 713 Ethiopian birr for the plot of land to get the master planning paper done. Besides, for the first two months in the immediate aftermath of the eviction, I paid 100 Ethiopian birr for the rented house. A lot [of] expenses to buy ‘enchet’ (wood), tin for reconstruction of the home. I was also made to buy water for drinking and for construction purposes. Thus displacement makes me to expend much money, to construct my house, and weakened my financial capacity and makes the day to day lives difficult.

**Natural Capital: Landlessness**
In this particular study, not all displaced households received housing land. The displacement and resettlement scenarios resulted in a crisis of housing land issues for some groups of IDPs. Although the registration of all displaced households was conducted, approximately 65 displaced households were not given plots of land for housing. The land was given based on their lengths of residency in Ketel Sefer. Their residency length is less than five years remain without giving such land for building their house. The issue of landlessness is very complex to understand among IDPs, especially in relation to households that did not receive land. Similarly, Asmamaw (2011) confirms that the displacement and resettlement of squatter settlers further aggravates the risks of homelessness. Although the authorities conducted their registrations, individuals reported that they remained landless:

Mine is a very unique case... I have faced the worst experience of being IDP especially of being homelessness. I [had] been living for 25 years in my Ketel Sefer residence. And I had my own house. As opposed to other IDPs, I have remained landless for the reason that I couldn’t know. Currently, I am living in a rented small room shelter for which I am paying 70 Ethiopian birr monthly. In relation to landlessness, the size of the land is important. Participants expressed their grievances regarding the size of the housing land allocated for displaced households in Kotatina resettlement sites. The size of plot of land is estimated to be 105 m², which is much smaller than the plots of urban residences in Bahir Dar city and other similar nearby cities. This reduced size of housing land curtailed the home-based services and other related activities of households. As Informant A11 reported, ‘we share a single toilet for three to four households. Lack of maintenance makes it unclean. We could not make a private toilet due to the compactness of the land. (Informant A11).

Based on observations, the landlessness and lack of sufficient space has resulted in IDPs currently living in crowded and, therefore unsafe, conditions in the new resettlement neighborhood.

**Human Capital: Lack of Educational and Health Services**

Similar to the above mentioned impacts on the other aspects of livelihood capital, the displacement also negatively affected what will be termed ‘human capital’, referring to those infrastructures such as education and health services that ensure individual wellbeing and development. Because of Kotatina’s newness, the transport, water, electric and telecommunication
infrastructures were not in place before relocation began. As a result, the school, health post, health center and hygiene related developments are by far the most inadequate when compared to the other infrastructural developments observed in the neighborhood. It is noted that as a result inadequate educational facilities, some of the school-age children in Kotatina remained in their houses rather than attending kindergarten or primary schools.

Similar infrastructural failures related to health and hygiene have resulted in the emergence and outbreak of malaria. There is no health service center accessible to the Kotatina neighborhood and, as such, ill residents must take two to three taxis to reach the nearest health center. The situation is described by Informant A8 as follows:

I have four children’s all of them reach at school age but only the two have got the opportunity to attend school and the remaining are around their home because of one of them can’t walk long journey to reach the school and one of the children as is guarding the house during day time when both of us-mother and father are not around homestead in order to win the house livelihood. As I mentioned, we [husband and wife] regularly come back home at the day fall and are engaged to accomplish the remaining housing activities. One day when the smallest kid was ill due to malaria, we were not around our home and nobody was calling us about the situation and the child remained at home until we [came] back to our home. At that day, we were frustrated by the moment. After a lot of ups and downs, we were able to take him to one of the far-off health center and saved our child.

Most significantly, Informant A8 explained that this type of problem is common to most relocated residents of Kotatina as they suffer from a lack of access to adequate health services and facilities.

**Social Capital: Social Disintegration**

As briefly mentioned above, relocation caused changes in the social ties of IDPs. The disintegration of previous and long-lasting networks of relationships was evident following the geographical separation of neighbors caused by the relocation. Housing-based ties were not considered by concerned authorities in the process of household identification, registration and the provision of small plots of land. Informant A12 describes how internal displacement affected his social ties:
The displacement affected only parts of our social life in terms of the disintegration of groups of persons who attended the coffee ceremony together. My close persons of the coffee groups are now disintegrated. Some live in the right corner of the new locality and the remaining is living in the left corner of the locality. It is rarely we are in contact with such coffee members. Now, I have established a new coffee group here in the new place of residence.

Informants described the way in which each head of household was made to resettle in a new place of residence, in a method that disregarded social ties based on geographical proximity. From the registered individual or households, most were identified as eligible to receive plots of housing land. Without consideration given to geographical or residential proximity, IDPs drew lots to have the opportunity to choose a parcel or their share of the plots identified for resettlement in Kotatina. This haphazardly designed land provision led to the dispersion of pre-displacement neighbourly groups. Informant A7 notes:

Right! “ke dero gorebetoch gar terarekenal” literally my long lasting and old neighbours are separated and I have lesser contact and relationships with them in Ketel Sefer. [We] are now made [to] resettle in very separate places of residences.

**Positive Aspects of Urban Development: Displacement in Context**

Study participants were asked their views about the positive aspects of being displaced and resettled into their new neighborhood. The interviews identified some of the positive aspects of internal displacement and resettlement. One such aspect is that IDPs are now the legal owners of the land registered by the municipality. As such, though they are exposed to the various infrastructural problems noted above, they are partly happy with their ownership of urban land. Informant A3 expresses this sentiment, stating:

Thanks to God after a lot of ups and downs, now my housing facilities are better than other IDPs in Kotatina. Now I could be able to get legal land for my housing though built of wood and mud. During our life in Ketele Sefer, we were repeatedly asked by governments to leave the public land.

Another positive aspect of internal displacement and resettlement is that the pre-existing informal, traditional and self-help associations have remained
intact following relocation. Traditional voluntary associations broaden the system of social relations among urban inhabitants. Similarly, self-help associations such as *Iddir, Ikub, and Senbet-Maheber* are seen to establish stable patterns of relationships between individual members of the association. Currently, the communities of IDPs are actively engaged in multiple forms of informal associations. According to informants, most of the informal associations were established prior to their displacement and, as such, the IDPs have had the experience of participating in informal associations such as *Iddir* and *Ikub* in both their old and new neighborhoods. Informant A6 states:

One of the strengths, I realised, is that attempts have been made by authorities to resettle all displaced communities in one locality that would help us protect the disruptions of the existing associations and relationships. This really helped us to maintain our long lasted *Iddir* and *Ikub* associations. For instance, I was and still am the cashier of the *Iddir* since the last ten years even before the displacement of residents from neighborhood in the year 2008.

**Discussion**

The development-induced displacement resulted in a number of undesirable consequences for the poor urban households. Though some livelihood risks play a more primary role in impoverishing poor urban residents, all of the risks may be understood as interconnected. One of the observable features of livelihood risks related to displacement is that the intensity of the individual elements or variables of livelihood risks vary at times (Cernea 2000; Cernea 2005). Data across FGDs indicated that one of the most common livelihood risks faced by individual head of households was the complete destruction or loss of their shelter temporarily without the offer of compensation packages. The situation during the transition period compelled each head of household to stay in rented houses as a survival strategy that varied in length from two to six months. This reality sits in stark contrast to the document reviewed from feasibility studies conducted by the municipality authority that assured that the stadium project would have significant positive socio economic impacts for the overall development of Bahir Dar city and its residents; including the poor, women, men, youth, tourists, merchants, etc... In addition to loss of homes, the relocation process also entailed the complete loss of access to basic public services. Lack of infrastructure for basic services such as electricity, potable water and waste
management, as well as educational and health services, are still critical problems in Kotatina. Cernea (2000; 2005) notes that patterns of livelihood risks spurred by internal displacement vary across affected communities and between groups. In the case of Kotatina, the FGDs in particular indicated that women, children and the elderly are more vulnerable to the livelihood risks faced by the project-affected community.

Finally, but perhaps most importantly, researchers seem to take for granted that development-induced displacement leads to the disintegration of social networks in the form of family separation or neighborhood disintegration. The interview data as well as the FGDs reveals the prevalence and significance of social networks, with consideration being given to the disruption of pre-displacement networks of individual persons and the formation of new networks post-displacement. Parts of social networks of IDPs are changed, such as coffee groups that are formed based on the geographic proximity of neighbors. The change and continuity of networks of IDPs were also understood by referring to the retention of existing social networks. As proved by the respondents, the displacement initiative did not consider residents’ livelihood contexts and denied them agency over their rights to live and their opinions on local development. As such, it is seen that the development project resulted in a number of undesirable consequences for the IDPs. However, after significant struggle (which still greatly affects the daily existence of the IDPs), some IDPs have been successful in overcoming some of these undesirable consequences by developing strategies to recover their lives to their pre-displacement states.

**Conclusion and Recommendations**

As it has been presented so far, urban development-induced displacement in Kotatina resulted in numerous consequences on the livelihoods of poor urban residents. As is indicated by most of the literature, the findings of this investigation have shown that development-induced displacement results in further impoverishments and deteriorations to the livelihoods of residents, particularly vulnerable groups such as women, children and the poor. The implementation of the stadium project also failed to account for the loss of main assets of the IDPs, particularly the land and physical assets that would be important in generating other assets. Though some IDPs received land compensation, it was perceived as inadequate compensation for the extensive loss as a result of the implementation of the project. The relocation also created a financial burden on IDPs by adding a number of additional
expenses that were not manageable for poor households. In addition, lack of market services and accessibility also hampered IDPs income generating activities and options for self-employment.

Urban development-induced relocation partly resulted in the disintegration and loosening of IDPs social ties. Additionally, it was found that lack of transportation and adequate education and health care facilities near residents neighborhoods, pose considerable risks to personal wellbeing and development. Furthermore, women were found to be more affected by the undesirable consequences of relocation that men.

Despite these livelihood risks spurred by urban development-induced relocation, some displaced people seemed positive that households were able to secure small plot of housing land which is legally recognised by the municipality of the city administration. The stadium project is also argued to be important for the future development of Bahir Dar city and, as it was argued by municipal authority side key informants and a noted in the project feasibility study, constructing an international multi-purpose stadium in Bahir Dar city has the potential for direct and indirect positive future impacts for all residents in the city. However, this argument fails to acknowledge that the environmental and social impact assessment was made for nominal rather real measures taken based on such recommendations.

**Recommendations**

The study suggests that knowledge of the multifaceted problems and livelihood risks faced by IDPs is important to consider in the implementation of development programs. Thus, the relocation process should be implemented, not only with project feasibility studies that show promising benefits for the overall urban development and most citizens in the city, but also with environmental and social impacts studies that consider the negative impacts of development-induced displacement on the physical, financial, natural, human and social capital of low-income households. Based on such studies, municipalities should take the necessary measures for each negative impact based on the environmental management plan which is designed in the environmental impacts assessment process.

The study also suggests that understanding the positive aspects of internal displacement is an important avenue for needs- or problems-based development approaches and interventions, including rehabilitative measures and actions. There is a need to understand the interest and consent
of individuals and communities experiencing development-induced internal displacement and resettlement. Currently, the relocated communities in Kotatina are demanding that the concerned authorities provide access to the same basic infrastructures available in the mainstream urban society of Bahir Dar city. Based on this case study, the study advises that urban development plans need to more closely consider the implications of relocation on the lives and livelihood opportunities of poor households.

References


Ababa: Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa.
