

Issues and Gaps Translating R&R Policy into Practice
A Case of Poor R&R in Rengali Irrigation Project in Odisha

Theme:

Theme – 1: Theoretical Perspectives, Legal and Policy Issues on Development-Induced Displacement and rehabilitation

Sub-theme:

Issues and Gaps pertaining to Translation of R&R Policies into Practice

The abstract prepared for the International Conference on Resettlement and Rehabilitation (ICRAR) with Specific Focus on People Displaced and Affected by Development Projects

Jointly organized by Xavier Institute of Management, Bhubaneswar; XLRI School of Business and Human Resources, Jamshedpur and Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai

At Xavier Institute of Management, Bhubaneswar during April 10 - 12, 2012.

Binaya Kumar Rout¹

Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist

Centre for Youth and Social Development (CYSD)

E-1, Institutional Area, PO - RRL, Gangadhar Meher Marg

Bhubaneswar - 751 013, Odisha, India

Tel: +91-9437309247 (M) and +91-674-2507201 (R)

E-mail: binayarout@hotmail.com and binayarout@gmail.com

¹ The author is currently working as Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist in Centre for Youth and Social Development (CYSD), Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India. The present paper is based on M.Sc. thesis of the author in Regional and Rural Development Planning in Asian Institute of Technology, Thailand during 1998-99.

Abstract: The development projects undertaken by Government of Odisha to improve the quality of life of its people sometimes brought adverse effects in the form of displacement from their hearth and home due to large-scale land acquisition. The present paper is a case of poor resettlement and rehabilitation (R&R) in Rengali Irrigation Project in Odisha. Although the state had a well-defined R&R policy for water resource projects, however, several issues and wide gaps were found while practicing the policy in the project studied exhaustively. The Project on the river Brahmani acquired 2,050 hectares of land for reservoir and 2,015 hectares for its canal network. The project displaced 1,054 families from six villages and caused 3,098 “project affected persons”. The paper suggests for proper implementation of policy; involvement of NGOs and PRIs in resettlement planning and implementation; ensuring people’s participation in resettlement work; and completion of resettlement work in time.

Key words: Resettlement, Rehabilitation, Policy and Odisha.

1.1 Introduction

The development projects undertaken by Government of Odisha to improve the quality of life of its people in the post-independence era sometimes brought adverse effects in the form of displacement from their hearth and home due to large-scale land acquisition. Such projects include irrigation, hydropower, thermal power, transport network, mineral exploitation, industrial and allied activities, and urban expansion. In a study by Institute for Socio-Economic Development (ISED) in Odisha, development projects caused displacement of 81,176 families (here “family” denotes the unit for R&R benefits which may consists of single

person or more) between 1950 and 1993, from 1,446 villages through the acquisition of 6,22,463.94 hectares of land. Nearly 80 per cent of them were displaced by dam construction (Pandey, 1998).

In the absence of successful R&R programmes in any development project causing displacement in Odisha; such projects face strong resistance by the affected people in recent years. The projects like Baliapal Missile Test Range, BALCO's mining project in Gandhamardan, Sindol hydroelectric project on river Mahanadi, etc. were put off due to strong resistance by local people. Similarly, execution of POSCO steel project, Utkal Alumina project, Tata Steel project in Kalinga Nagar, ArcelorMittal steel project etc got delayed due to strong resistance by local people. The issue needs serious thinking and reflection on R&R planning and implementation in the state.

The present paper is a case of poor resettlement and rehabilitation (R&R) in Rengali Irrigation Project (hereafter RIP) in Odisha. The paper suggests for proper implementation of policy; involvement of NGOs and PRIs in resettlement planning and implementation; ensuring people's participation in resettlement work; and completion of resettlement work in time.

1.2 A Brief about the Study Project

RIP on the river Brahmani in Odisha is a part of the Rengali multipurpose dam project and is located 34 km its downstream. RIP was executed to provide irrigation for 2,37,904 hectares of land; to supply drinking water to Talcher Township and the public sector undertakings in Angul district; and to generate 30 Megawatt of hydropower (Government of Orissa, 1999).

Construction of RIP which started in 1978 was originally planned to be completed in a 10 years timeframe in 1988-89 with an estimated cost of Rs 214.89 crores. The main dam of RIP was completed in September, 1995 and canal network was not completed by end of 2011. RIP could not be completed as per plan because of delay in its execution in time resulting huge cost overrun and financial constraints to meet the rising cost. The revised estimate of RIP in 1992 was Rs 1851.8 crores. In order to overcome the financial crisis, a part of RIP named as Rengali Irrigation Sub-project was included in the World Bank funded Orissa Water Resources Consolidation Project (OWRCP) to complete balance work of dam, construction of left main canal with distributaries up to 30 km with an investment of Rs 125.41 crores. The state government also received loan of Rs. 1214.95 crores from Overseas Economic Cooperation Fund (OECF), Japan for construction of the remaining length of left main canal from 30 to 141 km (Government of Orissa, 1994).

RIP entailed acquisition of 2,050 hectares of land for its reservoir at 76.5 meters' flood reservoir level and 2,015 hectares of land for its canal network. Out of 4,065 hectares of land required for RIP, 2,651.37 hectares (65.2 per cent) were private land, 1,222.72 hectares (30.1 per cent) Government land; and 1,93.87 hectares (4.7 per cent) forest land. Villages namely Balangi, Languabeda, Sagadipal and Bijigolpatna were submerged fully and Bijigol village partly in its reservoir. People from 31 villages lost agricultural land for its reservoir. Houses and agricultural land of Ekagharia village were affected partly by its right main canal. In addition, people from 40 villages lost their agricultural land due to its canal network. RIP resulted 1,054 (999 from reservoir area and 55 from canal area) 'displaced persons' or DPs (R&R policy term used for people being physically displaced due to land acquisition in water

resources project and are entitled for R&R benefits as per policy) and 3,098 (1,160 from 31 villages in reservoir and 1,938 from 40 villages in canal network) “project affected persons” or PAPs (R&R policy term used for people being affected due to their agricultural land acquired in water resources projects and are entitled for R&R benefits as per policy). 91 per cent of the DPs belonged to general castes, eight per cent to scheduled castes (SCs) and one per cent to scheduled tribes (STs).

Out of 1,054 DPs, 315 resettled in government sponsored resettlement colonies namely Sibarampur, Rutubhuin A, Rutubhuin B, Hanumanpur A, Hanumanpur B and Bhagirathi colony with provision of open well, tube well, pond, primary school, community centre, transit shed, cowshed, internal road, drainage and electricity. The rest 739 DPs made their own resettlement in the vicinity using R&R benefits.

1.3 Methods of Study

Information for the study was generated from both secondary and primary sources. Secondary sources include R&R policy documents of government and published material on R&R. Primary information was collected through questionnaire survey, field observation, key informant interview with DPs and PAPs, and interview with government officials and staff of three NGOs involved in R&R work. Interviews helped to get their perception about R&R policy and practice, and suggestion for improvement. Indices were used for quantitative interpretation of qualitative data. 1,054 DPs constituted 574 households, out of which 104 households were covered in the study, i.e. 43 resettled households and 61 households before their resettlement.

1.4 R&R Policy Practiced in RIP

The R&R work in RIP was based on Odisha R&R policy of 1994. Government partly followed the policy in RIP such as resettlement of DPs in resettlement colonies, involvement of NGOs in resettlement activities, carrying out socio-economic baseline survey, and releasing rehabilitation cash grant for alternative vocations. Unfortunately government failed to practice most aspects of the policy as presented below.

Failure of updating enumeration of DPs: The policy stipulates that DP enumeration for rehabilitation benefits shall be updated or revised by 1st January in the year of actual displacement. In RIP, government considered 1st January 1997 as cut-off date for DP enumeration, whereas actual displacement of people started one-year later (Government of Orissa, 1999).

Irregularities in enumeration of DPs: There are also various instances where people faced problems of irregularities in enumeration of DPs as described in the following cases.

***Bribes taken to enumerate DP:** The displaced people of Balangi village alleged that district medical staff took bribes to the tune of Rs. 5,000/- to Rs.12, 000/- to provide medical certificates either in support of their age or disability to justify their eligibility for R&R benefits. R&R official took similar amount to enumerate as DP under categories such as sons more than 18 years, unmarried daughters more than 30 years, physically handicapped and*

mentally retarded persons. Hence, it is alleged, unmarried daughters less than 30 years, sons less than 18 years and persons having no physical or mental disability were enumerated as DP. Particularly, the better-off and educated villagers cornered such benefits in this manner, whereas poor and illiterate villagers had to struggle hard for their genuine cases.

Irregularities to enumerate DP: *There were cases in RIP where some eligible persons having documentary evidences were not enumerated as DP to avail R&R benefits. For instance, Indra Behera aged 23 from Balangi village and son of a widow named Rumi Behera, was rejected by government although his younger brother, Chandra Behera was enumerated as DP under the category “a son more than 18 years of age”. The voter identity card (evidence normally accepted by government) issued by the Election Commissioner of India showed that Indra was 21 years of age by 1st January 1997(cut-off date for enumerating DP) and he, was therefore, eligible to be enumerated as DP like his brother. Consequently he became mentally disturbed and continued conflicts with family members. Both brothers fought strongly on the issue during my field survey. Indra initiated fighting with his brother and attacked others including his mother who came for their rescue.*

Deprived of R&R benefits: *Sarat Dalei, aged 39, from Balangi village was deprived of R&R benefits. His forefathers started living in the village 80 years back on encroached government land approved by the villagers. Sarat led a happy family life there, earning his living from fish business. But RIP deprived him of his business. Still Sarat did not get any compensation for his house for which he was eligible as per Land Acquisition Act. Moreover, he was deprived of R&R benefits, due to irregularities by government officials in the enumeration of DP, although he was eligible for so under the “encroacher” category. Sarat alleged that he was*

deprived of compensation and R&R benefits because he could not bribe the concerned officials. Sarat was undecided where to resettle and how to earn his livelihood in future.

Source: Field Survey, 1999.

Conflict with Host Population: Two resettlement colonies were developed on government land in Sibarampur and Rutubhuin villages for DPs of Balangi village. The host communities were reluctant to share their common property resources with the resettlers and to accept a reduction of village area for their common use. Initially, they strongly resisted development of resettlement colony in both cases and created disturbance during development of homestead plots and infrastructure. This happened because government officials failed to respect the R&R policy to consult the said villagers in advance and integrating them in the resettlement process. The problem of the Sibarampur colony could be resolved with the intervention of government and NGO officials by providing infrastructure for the host communities as per R&R policy whereas it was unresolved in Rutubhuin colony. In order to oppose and obstruct resettlement in Rutubhuin colony, the host community attacked the resettlers, with sticks and deadly weapons in January 1999, who were engaged in construction of their houses seriously injuring them.

Failure to pay compensation in time: Some displaced people from Balangi village having land and house in Kaunsaberani village and seven DPs who earlier got government leased land were not paid compensation before their displacement. Although several disputed cases on compensation and R&R benefits were pending in different courts, but government failed taking any step for speedier disposal of such cases.

Irregularities in the evacuation of DPs: There were irregularities in the evacuation of DPs from the submerged area of RIP because evacuation of people from the villages started the same year when water was stored in the reservoir (in 1998) whereas it should have commenced at least one year before storage of water in the reservoir as per R&R policy. Other irregularities were: forceful displacement of people before providing R&R benefits and in conflict with the R&R policy norm of evacuation after the harvest season (Ekagharia village); incomplete infrastructures in the resettlement colonies; and court cases of displaced people on DP enumeration, compensation, and rehabilitation cash grant not finalised before their evacuation (Government of Orissa, 1999; Field Survey, 1999).

Failure to provide agricultural land: Government failed to provide agricultural land to the DPs, although land based rehabilitation is the main focus of the R&R policy. Government even failed to provide agricultural land to tribal people, although the policy says in their case it would be followed meticulously (Government of Orissa, 1999). Further the R&R policy stipulates to select adequate and suitable land for resettlement of DPs in the command area of the irrigation project. But government failed in this regard as neither resettlement site nor agricultural land was provided to the DPs in its command area (Government of Orissa, 1999).

Failure to provide 0.20 acre of homestead land: Except Hanumanpur resettlement colony, government failed to provide the R&R policy stated 0.20 acre of homestead land to each DP in all other resettlement colonies because of unavailability of adequate government land in the locality. The DPs were allotted 0.04 acre of homestead land at Bhagirathi resettlement colony, 0.14 acre at Rutubhuin colony and 0.15 acre at Sibarampur colony. They were paid cash for the rest of their homestead land (Government of Orissa, 1999).

Failure to assist purchasing land: In cases where government fails to provide agricultural land, it is mandated to help the DPs through its R&R organisation to purchase agricultural land through a land purchase committee. Unfortunately, such a committee constituted by government failed to help the DPs for purchasing land (Government of Orissa, 1999).

Negligence to revise the rehabilitation cash grant: The provision of revising rehabilitation cash grant for homestead land, agricultural land and house building of the affected people in every 4th year, was not followed in RIP. The amount was not revised by March, 1999 for which due ended in August, 1998 (Government of Orissa, 1999).

Incomplete Civic amenities and facilities: Government failed to provide drainage facility in Bhagirathi and Hanumanpur resettlement colonies and it was incomplete in both Rutubhuin and Sibarampur colonies. Government also failed to provide infrastructures facilities such as grazing land, religious centre and cremation ground in all four colonies; pond in the Bhagirathi colony and the Rutubhuin 'B' colony; and schooling facility in the Rutubhuin 'B' colony. All the three clusters did not have electricity and adequate water facility.

Failure to implement R&R work in time: Government failed to comply the R&R policy norm of completing R&R activities in two years in RIP as such activities could not be completed even after four years.

Poor response from government officials to requests by NGOs: Three NGOs engaged in resettlement work of RIP used to bring the issues of the displaced people to the notice of

government for their resolution, as NGOs did not enjoy power to take decisions and act independently. However, government responded late or not at all. For instance, even after several complaints by displaced people and NGOs; government officials did not repair some defunct tube wells in the resettlement colonies. Similarly, government delayed to open primary school in some resettlement colonies, even after lobby by NGOs. In addition, other problems identified by NGOs like DP enumeration, payment of compensation and R&R benefits were not resolved by government officials.

1.5 Effects of RIP in the Lives of Displaced People

Change in landholding status: As the R&R policy was not followed in total in RIP; thus, agricultural landholding, occupation, income, housing, etc of the displaced people were affected due to physical displacement from their hearth and home. The average agricultural landholding size of the studied households decreased from 1.86 acres to 0.49 acre in post-land acquisition scenario because of absence of land-based rehabilitation by government and their inability to purchase land in the locality due to high price and its unavailability. Average homestead landholding increased from 0.12 acre to 0.18 acre in post-land acquisition situation. This was due to provision of homestead land in resettlement colonies and homestead land purchased by the self-resettlers using R&R benefits.

Change in Occupation and Income: Physical displacement of people due to RIP brought significant change in their occupation showing a decreasing trend in the occupations of the household members in cultivation, fishing, caste-based and business, and an increasing trend

in wage earning and slight increase in case of jobs. There has been slight increase in average income of the households, i.e. from Rs. 21,642/- to Rs. 23,410/-.

Improved housing: The resettled households had improved housing which was known from the fact that none of the studied households had pucca houses before but 95.3 percent of them had such houses after resettlement. The reason was that almost all of them built pucca houses in the new place of resettlement. They built such kind of houses due to disruption of cultivation from which they got materials for house building and maintenance, the government provided house building assistance, and they pooled their resources to built a permanent house.

Perception about the Changes in the Socio-Economic Life due to RIP: The respondents were asked about their perception about the change in their socio-economic life due to RIP, i.e. whether it led to improvement or deterioration of their socio-economic life, or it kept their life at the same level as it was before. Out of 104 respondents, 78 per cent felt that their socio-economic life deteriorated due to RIP, only 15 per cent of them perceived that their socio-economic life have improved due to RIP, and rest perceived no change in socio-economic life. Most of them felt that their economic life has deteriorated because most of them could not restore their previous standard of living.

Perception on R&R policy and its Implementation: Almost four-fifth of the studied respondents had knowledge about R&R policy. 95.2 per cent of them were dissatisfied with the policy. Among those were aware of the policy, almost two-third of them suggested to provide adequate rehabilitation assistance keeping market price of the assets into account;

more than half of them suggested giving more power and role to NGOs in R&R implementation; one third of them suggested policy should be modified to provide R&R benefits to unmarried girls above 18 years who are discriminated at present although such categories of their male counterparts avail R&R benefits in the present system; and little less than one-third of them suggested to ensure and emphasize DPs participation in R&R planning and implementation. In addition, 98 percent of those aware of the policy were dissatisfied with the process of implementation of the policy. Dissatisfaction of the studied households about the implementation of the policy was due to delay in rehabilitation; and bribe being taken and irregularities made in the entire process of rehabilitation. For better implementation of the policy, more than four-fifth of the respondents who were aware of the policy suggested to complete the R&R work in stipulated time; almost four-fifth of them suggested to follow the policy in principle; more than one third of them suggested ensuring participation of the DPs in R&R work; little less than half of them suggested for developing infrastructures in the colonies and clusters properly; and little more than two-third of them suggested for curbing corruption in entire R&R process.

Dissatisfaction about the amount of Rehabilitation Assistance: Government provided Rs 70,500/- as rehabilitation assistance to the DPs doing self-resettlement (Rs. 20,000/- for house construction, Rs. 40,000/- for purchasing land or carrying out any economic activity, Rs. 4,000/- for homestead land, Rs. 6,000/- for maintenance allowance and Rs 500/- for transport of household materials from old village to the place of resettlement) and Rs 66,500 to those who resettled in government sponsored colonies (except for homestead land). All the studied respondents were dissatisfied with rehabilitation assistance because the amount was inadequate to acquire the assets for which it was meant.

1.6 Rating Amenities and Facilities availed in the New Place of Resettlement

Due to failure on the part of government to provide some of the amenities and facilities in the resettlement colonies deviating the R&R policy norms, poor resettlement planning and implementation, and poor infrastructure development in the resettlement colonies; the resettlers faced lots of difficulty in their new place of resettlement. The resettled households faced problems like unemployment, financial strain, lack of basic amenities, debt repayment, and disruption of family life in new place of resettlement. A list of amenities and facilities availed after their resettlement compared with those in the old villages were rated by the resettlers to know their satisfaction whether the facility was better than before resettlement, no change or worse than before as shown in Table 1. Scores of 1, 0 and –1 were assigned to indicate a level of better than, no change or worse than before resettlement, respectively.

Index of satisfaction of facilities = $f_1 \times (1) + f_2 \times (0) + f_3 \times (-1) / \sum f$,

Where:

f_1 = frequency of better than before,

f_2 = frequency of no change,

f_3 = frequency of worse than before,

$\sum f$ = sample size.

Table 1: Quality of Facilities Before and After Resettlement as Assessed by

Resettled Households

Facilities	Worse	Better	No change	Index
	No of households	No of households	No of households	
Community centre	21	17	5	-0.093
Communication	17	14	12	-0.070
Employment	11	6	26	-0.116
Drinking water	32	5	6	-0.628
Transport	3	29	11	0.605
Electricity	19	13	11	-0.140
Market access	19	14	10	-0.116
PDS access	15	8	20	-0.168
Access to forest produces	17	2	24	-0.349
Access to grazing land	33	1	9	-0.744
Access to cremation ground	26	1	16	-0.581
Access to religious centre	20	5	18	-0.349
Housing	1	42	0	0.953
Health services	18	13	12	-0.186
Education services	22	14	7	-0.116
Sanitation	18	12	13	-0.140
Aggregate index				-0.140

Source: Field Survey, 1999.

A close look into the individual index in Table 1 indicates that there have been improvements to the housing and transport facility of the households after their resettlement due to their positive values. The index for housing being very close to 1 indicates that housing facility of the resettlers has been better than before. The reason of improved housing of the resettled households has been explained in the previous section. In case of transport the index is 0.605 that indicates it is better than before. The reason is the resettlement colonies have been developed near the road network and those who have made their self-resettlement, they have also resettled close to better transport facility. The table also shows that except housing and transport, other indices are negative indicating their worsening situation after resettlement. The access to forest produces, grazing land, cremation ground and religious centres has been

slightly worse than before as government failed to provide such facilities in the resettlement colonies. Index for drinking water is -0.628 , which means that it has been slightly worse than before because the resettled households face shortage of water in their place of resettlement. The aggregate index of 16 facilities is -0.14 , which indicates that such amenities and facilities have been slightly worse than before.

1.7 Problems encountered in the Resettlement Colonies and Clusters

In addition to the assessment of the facilities availed by the resettled households as discussed above, here is an account of the problems encountered by them in resettlement colonies and clusters as observed by the author as well as through key informant interviews.

Rutubhuin and Sibarampur resettlement colonies are located in Talcher coal mining area with coal deposit underneath, which could be confirmed during digging of open wells. The resettlers of both the colonies *fear displacement for the second time* apprehending coal mining operation there in future.

The resettlers in all *resettlement colonies and clusters faced problems of insufficient and inadequate* water for bathing, washing and drinking. Except water available in tube wells; ponds in the colonies remained dry most of the time. The resettlers who got water in plenty in their old villages, faced water scarcity due to inadequate and insufficient water from tube wells and almost no water in the ponds. Water scarcity in the colonies is due to their location in Talcher coal mining area and mining operation in the vicinity. The resettlers in Bhagirathi colony complained of being affected by skin diseases by using water from the tube wells for

bathing. Water in the tube wells in Sibarampur colony is unsuitable for use due its blackish colour and foul smell. The resettlers complained that their clothing, utensils, teeth etc. became black by using water from tube wells, which might be due to coal deposit underneath.

Government closed the primary school of Balangi village in June 1998, i.e. from the beginning of 1998-99 academic session. But primary school in Rutubhuin resettlement colony, where part of the displaced people from Balangi had resettled, was not opened simultaneously. This was because government did not appoint teachers in the school. It was finally made functional through the appointment of teachers in February 1999, in response to intervention by one of the NGOs involved in resettlement work. Similarly, the primary school which was opened in June 1998 in Sibarampur resettlement colony, where part of the displaced people from Balangi had resettled, was closed down in the mid-session in February 1999 as the teachers were transferred to the primary school at Rutibhiuin resettlement colony as mentioned above. In both cases *education of children was affected*.

The displaced women, who were engaged in small business in the locality and kitchen gardening in their courtyard in their old places, *discontinued such old occupations* in the new place of resettlement. They found it difficult to arrange capital in the resettled place due to lowering of their economic status and in most cases Rs. 40,000/- paid to their spouses for economic rehabilitation was used for constructing houses. Again kitchen gardening was not possible due to insufficient homestead land and water scarcity in the colonies.

Conflicts among same caste community or between oilmen and fisher communities in the Bhagirathi colony created tension, broke unity among them and affected their peace and

harmony. Conflicts among the oilmen resettlers during distribution of plots led to bitter relationship among them. The RIP authority treated the two sub-caste groups differentially by providing all tube wells in the oilmen side but not a single one in the fisher side leading to tensions between them. Hot arguments and conflicts persisted among them most of the time making the relationship bitter. Hence, social functions and some other activities that they organised together in old village became impossible in the colony. Due to conflicts, arguments and slang language used by people from fisher community, some oilmen filed case against them. Alcoholism was increasingly used in the new place breeding conflicts and tensions among them.

The resettlers in the colonies and clusters got *inadequate cooperation from RIP authority* for resolving their pressing problems. In Rutubhuin 'B' colony, the RIP authority did not repair the defunct tube wells after several complaints from the resettlers. The colonies after one year of establishment were not handed over to Kaniha Block administration for which the latter did not take the responsibility of maintenance of the infrastructures there. Due to this reason, the resettlers in the clusters did not get required facilities.

1.8 Conclusion

The R&R policy in the water resources sector in Odisha evolved over the years from mere payment of compensation for the land and property up to restoring their livelihood in addition to compensation. Government failed to follow most provisions of the R&R policy applicable to RIP like updating DP enumeration; integrating host population in resettlement; providing agricultural land; ensuring community participation in resettlement; revising rehabilitation

grant; providing adequate civic amenities in resettlement colonies and clusters; and completing resettlement work in time.

1.9 Recommendations for Good Practice and Sustainable Resettlement

Revision of Rehabilitation Cash Grant: Rehabilitation cash grant should be revised in time keeping in view the market rate of homestead land, agricultural land, house building materials, transport cost and monthly standard living cost of a family. Revision of such grant should be followed strictly as government failed in this regard in RIP as discussed earlier.

Micro Planning and People's Participation in Resettlement Programmes: The current R&R policy has scope for displaced people's participation in resettlement site selection and purchase of land only. As displaced people were not involved in resettlement planning and implementation like development of resettlement site and infrastructures there; the resettlers encountered problems of water scarcity and obstacles from host population, and conflicts among resettlers in the resettlement colonies. In addition, homestead plots and infrastructures were not developed properly in the resettlement colonies. Hence, the policy should be modified keeping scope for displaced people's participation in resettlement planning and implementation with emphasis on involving the vulnerable groups such as tribal, women, landless and encroachers. Micro planning needs to be integrated into resettlement planning.

Role of PRIs in Resettlement Planning and Implementation: The then R&R policy did not have any role for PRIs in R&R activities. Looking at various issues involved in R&R in RIP as elaborated in earlier sections, it necessitates for making resettlement planning and

implementation as a function of PRIs which will help resolve local issues and in integrating the resettlers in mainstream development process because of their existing greater role in implementing most of the development programmes of government.

Access to Training, Employment and Credit: Government failed to make land-based rehabilitation and to provide employment to the DPs of RIP. Although government gave rehabilitation cash grant towards their economic rehabilitation but no skill training was imparted on alternative vocation. Hence, government should provide skill training to the DPs, employment wherever possible and facilitate them to access credit for alternative vocation.

Engagement of NGOs in Resettlement Planning and Implementation: Experienced NGOs should also be engaged in resettlement planning and implementation by making them partner of government who can facilitate micro planning in resettlement colonies, motivate and facilitate displaced people's participation in such programmes. NGOs should be involved in economic rehabilitation of the affected people specifically in facilitating alternative vocation in case of unavailability of agricultural land or if people opt for so by facilitating access to skill training, credit and market.

Timely Completion of Resettlement Programmes: The resettlement programme in RIP could not be completed after four years, although the R&R policy mandates its completion within two years of time. Delays in resettlement work and providing R&R benefits delayed in completion of RIP leading to its cost overrun. Thus, government should ensure timely completion of resettlement work in order to reduce hardships of the resettlers as well as check cost overrun of executing similar project in future.

Reference

Government of Orissa (1994) *The Orissa Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Projects Affected Persons Policy*, Department of Water Resources, Bhubaneswar.

Government of Orissa (1999) *Status Report for mid-term Review of OWRCPP by World Bank (R&R and IPDP)*, Directorate of R&R, Department of Water Resources, Bhubaneswar.

Pandey, B. (1998) *Depriving the Underprivileged for Development*, Institute for Socio-Economic Development, Bhubaneswar.