Chapter - 4

RESETTLEMENT AND REHABILITATION POLICY OF INDRAVATI PROJECT
Wherever development projects are implemented, there is bound to be an acquisition of land. This always affects those directly or indirectly dependent on land. These people, who are forced to sacrifice their livelihood for the cause of development, should therefore be considered the most important part of the whole project. And they should be rehabilitated suitably to improve or at least regain the standards of living they were enjoying prior to displacement and be provided with appropriate compensation and an adequate social and physical rehabilitation, infrastructural, including community services and facilities.

Keeping these aspects of rehabilitation package in view, in this chapter we shall make an effort to study the rehabilitation policy undertaken by the project authorities to resettle the dam affected people at Indravati Project. We shall also try to assess its strength, weakness at policy level and implementation level. To make such an assessment, a comparison is made between Gujarat policy of Sardar Sarovar Project and resettlement and rehabilitation policy of Upper Indravati Project.

**Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy: The National Scenario**

As mentioned earlier, after independence, several developmental projects including major dams, power plants, mining-operations etc. have been carried out to accelerate the tempo of economic development. As a result, millions of people have been displaced from their ancestral homes by these projects. Despite the magnitude of displacement and the longevity of the multiple traumas that most oustees faces, one of the most glaring examples of
successive central governments shunning their constitutional responsibility has been, the lack of a national policy for those who have been forcibly displaced in the 'national interest' (Kothari, 1996). In the last five years, only a Draft of National Rehabilitation Policy is prepared by the Ministry of Rural Development (MRD) and Water Resources Department (WRD) of Government of India (Fernades, 1995), which is yet to be made into a law.

In absence of such a national level policy for rehabilitation, it is left for the project authorities to prepare the plans for rehabilitation and implement them in accordance with various circulars issued by the concerned state governments. But of late, few state governments like the Karnataka, Gujarat, Maharashtra have prepared detailed resettlement and rehabilitation policies to resettle the displaced people.

**Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy of Government of Orissa**

With an objective to utilize the vast water resources and mineral resources and to achieve rapid economic growth, the Government of Orissa has undertaken various mega projects. As a result of these development projects about 5 lakh people (nearly 86,110 families) have been displaced. Despite the large scale displacement of people from various state sponsored projects, no uniform and concrete state level resettlement and rehabilitation policy has been formulated by the Government of Orissa till 1994. It was in 1994 that the Water Resources Department of Government of Orissa came out with a detailed resettlement and rehabilitation policy due to tremendous pressure from World Bank which is the major funding agency of various on going irrigation
projects in Orissa. Before 1994, resettlement and rehabilitation activities were carried out by individual project authorities and were based on a broad set of guidelines issued by Government of Orissa. These Government guidelines have also been revised periodically. Even the criteria keep varying for identifying a person to be displaced and for being eligible to receive the rehabilitation benefits.

A displaced person, according to the Irrigation and Power Department Resolution No.- 131619 dated 20.4.77 means: "A person who on account of the acquisition of his/her lands for the purpose of the major and medium irrigation projects has been displaced from such lands, including any landless and homeless person, who is dependent for his livelihood, by manual labour, on agricultural lands immediately before the area comprising such land is taken up for acquisition by the project and who is being deprived of such livelihood on account of acquisition of the lands" (Circular and Orders, Department of Irrigation, p. 14).

And displaced family means "displaced person and his or her spouse, minor brother(s) or sister(s), father and mother and other members residing with him and dependent on him for their livelihood". In the year 1990, as per the Department of Irrigation Resolution No. 31888, dated 21.8.90, two more clauses were incorporated in the definition of family viz., (i) a person who is more than 18 years of age irrespective of his marital status, and (ii) physically and mentally retarded person irrespective of their age.
Again in 1992, two more clauses were added to the definition of displaced family by two different resolutions of the irrigation department. As per the Resolution No. 13446 dated 20.4.94 minor orphans who have lost both parents and have nobody to fall back upon (such orphans numbering more than one in a particular family will be clubbed together and counted as one family), and Resolution No. 25101 dated 14.7.92 stipulated inclusion of divorcees with dependent child/children and divorcees without children but having no source of livelihood. (For the purpose of treating women as divorcee, the claimant should make an affidavit and file her claim along with a copy of such affidavit. After receipt of the claim, the officer-in-charge of rehabilitation shall enquire into the matter and take a decision depending on the merit of the case).

Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy of Upper Indravati Project

Government of Orissa in 1978 started the Upper Indravati Hydro-Irrigation Project and the heavy construction activities were initiated in mid 1980s. The evacuation of displaced people started in 1989 and was completed in 1992. By the time all the evacuation activities were carried out there was no uniform state level resettlement and rehabilitation policy to rehabilitate the displaced people. To resettle the displaced people the project authorities by and large followed different set of guidelines and government resolutions passed during different phases of evacuation from 1989 to 1992.
In the early phase of evacuation, the Rengali Resettlement Policy\(^1\) was broadly followed and later on some modifications were made in the resettlement and rehabilitation policies during different phases of evacuation. Thus no uniform resettlement and rehabilitation policy was followed at the project level to resettle the displaced people. Details of resettlement and rehabilitation Policy followed at UIP to carryout the rehabilitation activities during different phases are given below.

**Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy during Phase- I (1989)**

During the first phase of displacement in 1989, the policy laid down that each displaced family should be provided with 5 acres of reclaimed un-irrigated land or 2.5 acres of reclaimed irrigated land and 0.5 acres of homestead land.

The policy further laid down that in case it was not possible to provide land to the displaced families in lieu of land or where the displaced family opted to make their own rehabilitation arrangements, cash payment was made to them. All the displaced families in the 1st phase opted for cash payment as authorities failed to provide land based resettlement. The rate of cash grant paid to the oustee in lieu of land was Rs 3,650 per acre. Thus, the total cash grant paid to them was Rs. 20,075 in lieu of agriculture land and homestead land. Besides, Rs 9,500 was paid for house building assistance. The total package is:

In lieu of 5 acres of unirrigated land or

---

\(^1\) Rengali Irrigation was a state sponsored Project, situated in the costal area of Orissa. The project was started in 1973. To resettle the Rengali DPs a broad set of guidelines were issued by Irrigation Department, Govt. of Orissa, which subsequently followed at other irrigation Projects.
2.5 acres of irrigated land + 0.5 acres of homestead land =  Total =

5.5 \times 3650 \quad \text{Rs 20,075}

House building assistance = \text{Rs 9,000}

Total = \text{Rs 29,575}

Each DP received Rs 29,575 as cash during 1st phase of evacuation in 1989.

**Policy during II Phase (1990)**

In the 2nd phase, according to Irrigation Department Order No. 6251, dated 24.4.90 it was decided that the rehabilitation assistance of Rs. 20,075 would be paid to displaced family in lieu of land (as was 1st phase). But during the 2nd phase the procedure of payment was modified. Savings Bank accounts were opened in the name of each oustee and the passbook was kept with the resettlement and rehabilitation unit. The amount was to be released in installments after proper field verification and negotiations by the oustees for the purchase of suitable agricultural and homestead land. The amount was to be paid to them at the time of actual registration.

Instructions were issued that if a family is not able to purchase the entire extent of resettlement land i.e. 5 ac. of un-irrigated or 2.5 ac. irrigated land, at least they should purchase 50% of the total land (2.5 of un-irrigated or 1.25 ac. of irrigated land) to qualify for the entire rehabilitation assistance of Rs 20,075. It was also decided that the house building assistance has to be deposited along with the rehabilitation assistance in the S.B. Account.
During Third Phase (1991)

The Rehabilitation and Resettlement Policy changed further during the third phase. As per Government Resolution No. 31888 dated 21.8.90, of Irrigation Department:

(i) Each displaced family was provided with cash equivalent of homestead land of 10 decimals at the rate of Rs. 16,000 per acre i.e. Rs. 1600/-

(ii) Each DP family was provided with cash equivalent of agricultural land, determined as follows:

Those in category (ii) (a) received not less than (at least/ minimum of)

1. For agricultural land 2 acre of un-irrigated @ Rs 8,000 /- acre or 1 acre irrigated land @ Rs 16,000 /- acre Rs. 16,000.

(a) For displaced people having lost an area up to 4 ac. the extent of land to be allotted was equal to the extent of land acquired, if un-irrigated; or 50% of the extent of land acquired if irrigated, but not less than 2 acre of un-irrigated land or 1 acre of irrigated land.

(b) For displaced people having lost an area of more than 4 acres, the extent of land to be allotted was equal to 4 acre of un-irrigated land or 2 ac. of irrigated land.

The amount of rehabilitation assistance was reviewed with the extent of land lost by the displaced people and the rate was fixed @ Rs 8000/- ac. of un-irrigated land or @ Rs 16000/- ac. of irrigated land. Thus, the cash assistance provided to each DP in lieu of agricultural land varied from Rs 16,000/- to Rs 32,000/-
(iii) Besides the above, each displaced family was provided with house building assistance of Rs 17,000/- (as against Rs 9,500/- in the previous two phases).

@ Rs 8,000/- ac. or 1 ac. irrigated

@ Rs 16,000/- = Rs 16,000/-

2. For homestead land i.e. 10 decimals

@ Rs 16,000/- = Rs 1,600/-

3. House building assistance = Rs 17,000/-

Total = Rs 34,600/-

Those in category ii(b) received an amount equal to:

1. For agricultural land 4 ac. of un-irrigated @ Rs 8,000/- ac.
   or 2 ac. of irrigated @ Rs 16,000/- = Rs 32,000/-
   For homestead land = Rs 1,600/-

3. For house building assistance = Rs 17,000/-

Total = Rs 50,600/-

In the third phase rehabilitation assistance ranges from Rs 34,600 to Rs 50,600/-

**During 4th Phase (1992)**

Some modification was made in Rehabilitation and Resettlement policy during 4th phase also. In the 4th phase:

(i) Each displaced family was given cash equivalent to 20 decimal of homestead land @ Rs 16,000/- ac. (as against 10 decimal in phase 3)

(ii) Each displaced family was given cash equivalent of 2.5 acre of un-irrigated land or 1.25 ac. of irrigated land @ Rs 8,000/- ac. or @ Rs 16,000/- ac. respectively.
(iii) Each DP family was provided with house building assistance, some as third phase:

i.e. 1. For agricultural land = Rs 28,000
2. For homestead land = Rs 3,200
3. House building assistance = Rs 17,000

Total = Rs. 40,200

Thus, the oustees were provided with total rehabilitation assistance of Rs 40,200 each on a uniform basis.

**During Last Phase (1998)**

In the year 1998, only 7 tapu villages (island village) were displaced and the Rehabilitation and Resettlement Policy further changed during the last phase also. In the year 1994, Department of Water Resources, Government of Orissa had formulated a detail R and R policy for displaced people affected by water resources projects. In the Upper Indravati Project when the people from 7 island villages were displaced in 1998, the project authorities broadly followed the new R and R Policy guidelines. As per 1994 R and R Policy:

(i) Each displaced family was provided with @ 4 ac. of un-irrigated land or cash equivalent @ Rs 10,000/- ac. or @ 2 ac. of irrigated land or cash equivalent to @ Rs 20,000/- ac.

(ii) Each displaced family provided with @ A.O.20 acre of homestead of land or cash equivalent to @ Rs 20,000/- ac.

(iii) And housing assistance of Rs 20,000/- as against Rs 17,000/- in 4th phase.

i.e. 1. For agricultural land = Rs 40,000
2. For homestead land = Rs 4,000
3. For house building assistance = Rs 20,000

Total = Rs 64,000

In the year 1992, as per the Irrigation Department Resolution (No. 13446, dt. 20.4.90), a maintenance allowance of Rs 500/- per month for one year was sanctioned for each displaced family in a retrospective manner. There was also provision that 50% of the unskilled and clerical posts in the project would be filled up from the oustees of the project. (Resolution No. 31888, dtd. 21.8.90)

Civic Amenities

Besides the above, the resettlement and rehabilitation policy also promised for providing the following civic amenities in the resettlement colonies:

1. One-two room primary school for every 100 families or less. There will be a drinking water well too in the school campus.

2. Drinking water well with trough as per norms prescribed by government of India under minimum needs programme.

3. One village pond for each colony irrespective of number of families. There will also be a drinking water well also near it.

4. One dispensary for every 500 families.

5. Each colony will be linked to the main road by all weather roads.

6. Each and every colony will be electrified.

7. Amenities such as schools for higher education, veterinary dispensary, panchayat ghar etc. should be provided.

The colonies set up by the project authorities must contain all civil facilities necessary for a decent community living. Fair price shops wherever
required may be set-up by the resettlers by forming cooperative societies. The government should also pay equal attention for the development of the area near about the settlement colonies so as to create healthy guest (resettlers) and host relationships.

In case of the oustees opting to make their own rehabilitation arrangements and resettlement in groups or clusters of 10 or more number of families, minimum civic amenities of drinking water wells, tube wells, tanks, approachable all weather road, electrification etc. should be provided. In a resettlement in 30 or more number of families, primary school building, community centre should be provided.

Besides the above, the R and R policy also speaks out that resettlement and rehabilitation programme should be seen as an integrated process which not only includes provision for basic civic amenities but also measures to strengthen community organizations, promote and restore income generating activities (like agro forestry, forest based cottage industries, dairy, pisci-culture), provide vocational training and social assistance aimed at ensuring long term viability of communities in the new and changed environment.

**Policy guidelines for selection of displaced person and displaced village**

The R and R Policy defines displaced person as "a person who since at least one year or prior to the date of publication of the notification under the section 4 of the land acquisition act, 1894, has been ordinarily residing, and who on account of acquisition of his/her land including homestead land in the
submerge zone for the purpose of the project is displaced from such land. This would also include landless labourers”.

The policy guidelines also mentioned that for the purpose of selection of displaced village, village submerge will be taken as a unit. Any village where homestead land is not affected or partially affected; but more than 75% of the total agricultural land is acquired, or it is found on due inquiry that partial acquisition of land and property in the submergence zone may lead to socially and economically unviable living, the entire village may be treated as fully submerged village and R and R benefits given to all the villagers as per resettlement and rehabilitation policy.

Again, a person who loses land for the project but is not displaced land for the project, but is not displaced, is entitled to get compensation for such acquisition, amounting to an equal area of land if un-irrigated or half of the area if irrigated but not more than four acre of un-irrigated land, as rehabilitation benefit along with reclamation cost.

A person losing his/her only house due to acquisition for the project, but the village is not displaced and who is entitled to get compensation, will be given an equal area of house site subject to maximum of Ao.20 along with house building assistance as applicable to the oustees.

A person of the affected village who has no landed property what so ever will not be entitled to any rehabilitation benefit, if the village is not evacuated due to construction of the project, but if the whole village gets relocated, he/she will get the rehabilitation benefits. In case of displacement from encroached
government land, rules and procedures as in force in settlement of encroachment will be followed.

**A Comparative analysis of Upper Indravati Policy with Gujarat Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy**

To assess the strength and weakness of the Upper Indravati resettlement and rehabilitation policy, a comparative analysis has been made between UIP policy and Gujarat policy which is regarded as the best resettlement and rehabilitation policy formulated till today.

**Table: 4.1 A comparative analysis of UIP and Gujarat Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>UIP Policy</th>
<th>Gujarat policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Eligibility</td>
<td>Every displaced family more than 75% of its agricultural land holding of which, is acquired in the village shall be entitled to get resettlement and rehabilitation benefit.</td>
<td>Every family displaced from more than 25% of its land holding through acquisition shall be entitled to resettlement and rehabilitation benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Landed oustees</td>
<td>Entitled to get land as per the policy prevailing during the phase of evacuation.</td>
<td>Land equivalent to that acquired with a minimum of 2 hectares and maximum limited to ceiling. Irrigation facility is to be provided by the state. In case Government land is not acceptable, then private land would be purchased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Major son:</td>
<td>Entitled to get land as per policy prevailing during the phase of evacuation.</td>
<td>2 hectare of land free of cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Encroacher oustees</td>
<td>Encroacher will be entitled to resettlement and rehabilitation benefits but not entitled for compensation for land if he/she does not have legal record</td>
<td>Those cultivating Government waste land/forest land, which is going under submergence. No cut off year is mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land allotment</td>
<td>As policy prevailing during the phase of evacuation.</td>
<td>Entitled to 2 hec. of land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Land less Agricultural and non Agricultural labourers</td>
<td>Entitled to get land allotment as Per prevailing Policy</td>
<td>2 hec. of land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) For women</td>
<td>only divorcee with dependence child/children having no source of livelihood.</td>
<td>Only those women who become widow after 1980.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Compensation for Acquiring Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>U.I.P Policy</th>
<th>Gujarat Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Land holders</td>
<td>For calculating the compensation money for acquiring agricultural land under submergence, the price of similar land in the adjacent areas will be taken as basis.</td>
<td>The cost of the produce of only 40% of the total cultivable land for 5 years and after deducting the cost of the produce the 3 yrs lost due to drought would be sum of the total compensation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. For encroached land</td>
<td>Only patta holders will get compensation of encroached land but not the non patta holders</td>
<td>Ex-gratia payment as per the prevailing rates of private land after excluding solacium – interest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Civic Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>U.I.P Policy</th>
<th>Gujarat Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic Amenities</td>
<td>a) One primary school (two rooms) for every 100 families or less.</td>
<td>a) One primary school (3 rooms) for 100 families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) One dispensary for every 100 families.</td>
<td>b) One Panchayat Ghar for 500 families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) One village pond for each colony irrespective of families.</td>
<td>c) One dispensary for 500 families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Drinking water with trough as per norms prescribed by Government of India under minimum needs programme.</td>
<td>d) One seed store for every 500 families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Each colony will be linked to main roads.</td>
<td>e) One children’s park for every 500 families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Every colony will be electrified.</td>
<td>f) One village pond for every 50 families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) Amenities such as school for higher education, veterinary dispensary, Panchayat Ghar should be provided</td>
<td>g) Drinking water with trough for every 50 families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>h) Each colony will be linked to main Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i) One platform for every 500 families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j) One religious place of worship for every 500 families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k) Electrification, water supply to all colonies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IV. Other Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>U.I.P. Policy</th>
<th>Gujarat Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Transportation grant</td>
<td>Costs to the resettlement site are to be borne by the state</td>
<td>To be borne by the state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| B. Rehabilitation Grant in Aid - | Each family will be provided Rs 500 per month for one year as maintenance allowance | a) Each family is paid subsistence allowance at Rs 15/- per day for 25 days in a month for a period of one year.  
b) Rs 750 per family as resettlement grant with an increase of 8 percent per year worked out with January 1980 as base year; Grant in – aid up to Rs 500  
c) Rs 5,000 as assistance for economic development to all families. Tribal oustees covered under tribal sub-plan get subsidy varying from 50 percent to 100 percent against 50 percent admissible to them with a maximum of Rs. 5,000. |
| C. Insurance                 |                                | a) Personal Insurance Rs 3,000.  
b) House holds materials Rs 1000. |

Review of Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy:

Eligibility Criteria

Any person who loses his / her livelihood directly or indirectly should be considered as project affected person (PAP) or displaced person (DP) and should be provided with rehabilitation assistance. But according to the resettlement and rehabilitation policy, an oustees is only a DP but not a PAP and hence is not eligible to get rehabilitation assistance. As per the resettlement and rehabilitation policy, DP means, “a person who since at least one year or prior to the data of publication of notification under section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1984, has been ordinarily residing, and who on account of acquisition of his / her land including homestead land in the submergence zone for the purpose of the project is displaced from such land”. This definition of a DP as in Gujarat is limited because it recognises those affected by submergence as the displaced. This would simply mean that people affected in the project in the following areas will not be eligible for rehabilitation assistance. They are:

i) People from 32 villages where only agricultural lands have been acquired and people are not displaced.

ii) People whose lands have been acquired for construction of canal, road etc.

iii) People whose lands have been acquired for building of offices, quarters at Khatiguda, Mukhiguda and Kusumkhunti;

iv) Scores of people living in the areas surrounding the reservoir, whose market and other activities are affected because of displacement.
v) Those who live in Tapu (island) villages, but not getting displaced, and
vi) All the affected farmers in the down stream dry areas, which are not displaced.

The differences in eligibility criteria do not end here but widen further when we look at the definition in greater details. Even to be identified as DP, the cut off percentage of total land holding acquired is different. In Tehri it is 50 per cent, in SSP, 25 percent. But in UIP if more than 75 per cent of the total agricultural land of the village is acquired, the total village will be treated as fully submergence village and the villager displaced will be eligible to get rehabilitation assistance. It is a mystery how the planners have decided upon these cut-off percentage. The arbitrary fixation of cut-off percentage to be eligible for getting rehabilitation assistance thus creating tremendous dissatisfaction amongst displaced people though they have been displaced in a similar nature of project and for the national development.

The UIP policy and Gujarat government have also defined the ‘family’ which will be eligible for the rehabilitation package. According to the resolution of department of irrigation, a family means “Displaced person and his or her spouse, minor brother (s) or sister (s), father and mother and other members residing with him / her and dependent on him/her for livelihood”. Later on, the Policy was modified and included the following category of persons in the family (i) a person more than 18 years of age irrespective of marital status (ii) physically and mental retarded person irrespective of age (resolution No. 31888, dt: 21.8.90, Department of Irrigation) (iii) minor orphan
who have lost both parents and have no body to fall back upon, (Resolution No –13446 dtd. 20.4.1994), and (iv) divorces with children or without children but having no source of livelihood (Resolution No. 25101, Dtd: 14.7.1992).

The definition of family adopted in Upper Indravati Project, seems wider than Narmada water Dispute Tribunal Award. But Upper Indravati Project, though certain categories of persons have been included in the definition of family, the project authorities did not provide rehabilitation assistance to them. For example as per the revised rehabilitation and resettlement policy every person who is more than 18 years of age irrespective of marital status should be eligible to rehabilitation benefit. Despite this provision, adult single unmarried daughter / women were not treated as separate family. A family with more than one adult daughter have received only one rehabilitation package. An instance in which the adult daughter has lost her father and is dependent on her brother has been ignored if none of her brothers is willing to support her. This policy measure seems to be discriminatory and it is gender biased. Unmarried women are still not being given the same status as adult son. Though much is being said about improving the status of women, in actual practice, women have no place in the governmental scheme of things.

The rehabilitation policy also speaks of providing rehabilitation assistance to divorcee. As per the Resolution No. 25101, dt. 14.7.92 for the purpose of a woman to be treated as a divorcee, the claimant should make an affidavit and file her claim along with a copy of the affidavit. It is too much of
a task expected out of an illiterate divorcee women to get an affidavit after all the traumas she has undergone from family separation, and run from pillar to post to get the affidavit. It would be much wiser to consider some simpler method, such as conducting inquiry at the village level to identify if the woman is a divorcee.

Provisions of Resettlement And Rehabilitation Policy

The resettlement and rehabilitation policies formulated in UIP to resettle the oustees can broadly be divided into two parts. Part one of the policy deals with reconstruction and restoration of economic activities, and part two deals with providing civic amenities necessary for a decent community living and to strengthening community organizations. The following segment analyses the two aspects of the resettlement and rehabilitation Policy.

i) Policy relating to restoration and reconstruction of economic activities:

To restore the standards of living, the policy laid down that displaced people should be provided with agricultural land, homestead land, house building assistance, and maintenance allowance to regain their previous economic position in new site.

Before formulation of rehabilitation and resettlement policy to restore their income and standards of living, first of all a proper and systematic study of the socio-economic system and culture of the oustees is called for, to know their needs and back ground to formulate a just rehabilitation policy. But no base line survey was conducted at the Upper Indravati Project to know, i.) the exact total impact of the project; ii) the number of people going to be affect by
reservoir, canal and other irrigation structure, their socio-economic characteristics, and iii) the extent of resources and finances and institutional mechanisms required for resettling the displaced. None of these aspects were studied before commencement of construction of dam. It was in 1990 when the second phase of evacuation had already taken place that a local NGO named Agragamee was asked to conduct base-line survey. Thus, no effort was made to prepare the basic requirements for rehabilitating the oustees before initiating the process of displacement.

Though the resettlement and rehabilitation policy speaks of land based rehabilitation, these policies could not be implemented as the project authorities failed to provide government land to all the displaced people. Without trying to understand the psychology and cultural habits of the oustees, a patch of land at Talajarangi area of Kalahandi and another patch at Sasahandi in Koraput district were offered to the oustees for resettlement and cultivation. But the oustees rejected these facilities because the land was barren, the soil was rock hard and there were no trees around.

Even then, no effort was made to purchase private land as done by the Gujarat Government. To avoid the responsibility, the authorities chose an easy method of resettlement, and cash in lieu of land was announced, which was much below the market price. As a result, displaced people were forced to purchase private lands by paying huge amounts of money for purchasing of homestead land and agricultural land. Most of the displaced people belonged to tribal and scheduled caste families, whose interaction with the rest of the world
was limited, they definitely needed help for economic rehabilitation, but were left to fend for themselves.

The present policy also does not take into account the needs of various occupational groups among the oustees, as there is no provision for planned economic rehabilitation that will ensure economic development. The fate of the artisans, barbers, potters and blacksmith, hunters, forest produce collectors, farm labourers, cattle grazers and shifting cultivators will be uncertain. The present source of livelihood of these categories of people will be destroyed by the project, as the policy provisions do not take into account of the economic interest of the poorest among the poor oustees.

Furthermore, the planners have overlooked the needs of tribals and scheduled caste oustees who account for 62.1% of the displaced people. These oustees are illiterate, ignorant and extremely poor. Most of them were dependent on river, stream and forest for their livelihood. Their engagement in secondary and tertiary sector was almost nil. But there is no special provision for economic rehabilitation of these backward class people as in Gujarat policy. Gujarat policy for the SSP oustees for example, provides that tribal oustees will be covered under Tribal sub plan and will be eligible to get subsidy varying from 50 percent to 100 percent against 50 percent admissible to them with a maximum of Rs. 5,000/-. It also laid down that Rs.5,000 will be provided to oustees as assistance for economic development and for purchasing of agricultural implements, bullock etc.
Last but not the least, there was no uniform resettlement and rehabilitation policy followed by the project authorities and several policy changes have been made during the four phases of evacuation. As a result, the benefits of rehabilitation have also undergone several changes. For example, those displaced in during I and II phases were provided with only Rs 29,575, while during IV phase, the amount of R. A. was fixed at Rs. 40,200. In the last phase, the amount of assistance was hiked to Rs. 64,000. But the benefits of revised policy were not provided to oustees as in the case of Gujarat. In Gujarat, the policy for oustees is being constantly revised but with retrospective effect (Singh, 1992: 96). Difference in rehabilitation assistance to oustees, thus is creating inevitable, dissatisfaction amongst the displaced people. Though affected by the same project, they were treated differently by the policy makers.

ii) Policy relating to provision of Civic Amenities

Besides economic rehabilitation, to strengthen community life and for a decent life, the resettlement and rehabilitation policy also speaks of providing various civic amenities to the newly settled clusters. As per the guidelines, one primary school (2 room) for 100 families, one dispensary for 500 families, drinking water facility, link all weather road, village pond, electrification and other civic amenities should be provided for decent community living.

In comparison to Gujarat policy, the Provision for civic amenities in the Upper Indravati Project seems to be less adequate. While the Gujarat policy has laid down that community centre, seed store, children's park, construction of
one platform, and religious place of worship for every 500 families, there is no such provision to be found in UIP resettlement and rehabilitation policy.

However, like Gujarat policy, the UIP resettlement and rehabilitation policy laid down that certain basic civic amenities be provided for healthy and comfortable living of the displaced people at the new site. In the following section, an attempt has been made to assess various civic amenities facilities provided at the new site.

1. **Drinking water**: As per the policy, new clusters should be provided with one village pond irrespective of families, drinking water well with trough as per norms prescribed by Government of India. In case displaced people resettle in-groups or clusters of 10 and more number of families, water wells, tube wells, tank should be provided.

But against the policy, it is found that adequate number of tube wells were not provided in new clusters. Tube wells bored in some clusters contains high percentage of iron, which displaced people do not use as drinking water. In some clusters, Tube wells are not properly installed and therefore lie in defunct state putting oustees in a miserable condition. Tanks provided in newly settled clusters are not deep enough and get dried up even before the summer sets in. Thus, availability of potable water, for the resettlers as well as the animals domesticated by them, is a great problem in the newly resettled villages.

2. **Primary School**: As per policies, primary schools were to be made available for every 100 families. Though some primary schools building have been provided in some clusters they are non-functional due to non-
availability of teachers. The education department has failed to provide any teacher to those project made schools. As an obvious consequence, these schools are now in dilapidated condition in absence of any care. Some schools are now being used as cowsheds. As a result, there is total loss of education for the children of the oustees. Though some of the oustee’s children are attending primary schools existing in host village, their attendance is very thin as they have to travel 2-3 Km and are some times facing the problem of ‘social isolation’.

3. **Primary Health Centre and Veterinary Centre**: Though the Policy speaks of providing PHCs and Animal Care Centres for 500 families, not a single Primary Health Centre and Animal Health Care Centre has been provided at any of the new sites. Oustees are still dependent on the existing health care centre available at Khatiguda, the head quarter of the project which is approximately 50 Kms away from some of the new clusters.

**Other facilities**

(1) Other facilities like internal roads and all weather roads were constructed 8 years back. In absence of maintenance, most of these roads are in bad shape.

(2) On the other hand, as against the policy no community centre, panchayat ghar, temple or shrine has been provided in any new site. Provisions for free electricity, irrigation and self-employment programme, agro-forestry, vocational training, as promised in the policy are yet to be fulfilled.
(3) A package of benefit to host villages to avoid conflict between host and displaced people have proved to be non-starter.

**Implementation**

Not only, the policies on resettlement and rehabilitation are inadequate, but the implementation of these policies are also shoddy. No serious attempt has been made to implement these policies holistically. No separate organization was created to carry out the rehabilitation and resettlement works. Initially the Land Acquisition Department was created which was looking after both land acquisition and evacuation and rehabilitation work with the help of four zone officers (Jena; 1999: 30). In 1990, due to pressure from the World Bank, which was the funding agency then, Resettlement and Rehabilitation Organization was separated from Land Acquisition department and located at Khatiguda. By the time the 2nd phase of evacuation took place. Though a separate resettlement and rehabilitation organization was created, it remained handicapped and was fully dependent on the project set-up for distribution of compensation of cash and creation of infrastructure in clusters. The resettlement and rehabilitation organization was mostly taking up evacuation of the displaced people as it was of prime importance to the project for its completion. As a result, other aspects of the resettlement and rehabilitation such as development of clusters, extension of infrastructure, economic rehabilitation and social welfare of the displaced people suffered a lot. The RRU was so heavily dependent on the project that often they did not get logistic and establishment support to develop rapport with people, plan
systematically for their development and guide them with respect to utilisation of rehabilitation assistance. As a result, the displaced people spent the rehabilitation assistance in unnecessary items and did not purchase any land. Because of increased emphasis on evacuation without due thinking by RRU about the socio-economic aspect, displaced people suffered a lot.

In 1993 the Rehabilitation and Resettlement Unit of the project was declared autonomous with administrative and financial authority vested in the Rehabilitation and Resettlement Organization. A small project steering committee was constituted to assist the Rehabilitation and Resettlement Unit in programme implementation and inter-department coordination. A full – fledged engineering department was placed at the disposal of Rehabilitation and Resettlement Unit. Later on though Rehabilitation and Resettlement Unit developed a good working relationship with the help of a local NGO named Agragamee, but it could not maintain the pace of implementation of rehabilitation work as several transfers of the officials were done during the period.

Besides the independent rehabilitation and resettlement unit, the rehabilitation work was also hampered due to lack of proper coordination and cooperation between various departments. For example, at the UIP the dam and powerhouse were placed under Energy Department and the canal works were placed under the Water Resources Department. Displacement caused due to dam and reservoir was the responsibility of the Energy Department while the Water Resources Department looked after canal related displacement. And
Water Resources Department took all the policy level decisions. As a result, sometimes there was no coordination and cooperation between two departments for which the Resettlement and Rehabilitation Unit at the project level suffered in its work.

Interestingly, there was a Rehabilitation Commissioner in Revenue Department to look after resettlement and rehabilitation work. But during the process of displacement and rehabilitation work, the post was laying vacant. The Rehabilitation Commissioner neither coordinated, reviewed the activities of various department, nor did the department look upon the Rehabilitation Commissioner for any policy decision or guidance.

There was also no coordination at the government level between various administrative departments regarding extension, of infrastructure and programme support to the Rehabilitation and Resettlement Unit.

Not only at the governmental level, but also at the project level, there was lack of coordination between Rehabilitation and Resettlement Unit and engineering department. Functionaries at the Rehabilitation and Resettlement Unit were lacking in specialised skills to understand the situation and rehabilitation work. Particularly their skill and effective rural extension and communication techniques were lacking. Work culture and enforcement of discipline were lacking at the implementation level.

Lastly, at the implementation level, no effort was made by the project authorities to involve displaced people by forming village implementation
committees. They have also not tried to provide information, education and involve host population in carrying rehabilitation and infrastructural work.

From the above analysis it may be concluded that in Upper Indravati Project without proper database and sufficient investigation, resettlement and rehabilitation policy has been formulated and guidelines have been issued by irrigation department. Even though some aspects of the polices were good and supported reconstruction of economic activities and strengthening of community life, these policies were not implemented properly. Civic amenities provided in new sites are inadequate. ‘After care’ facilities are totally absent. There has been no inter-departmental coordination, and implementing organization has been found lacking in specialised skill to understand the intricacies of rehabilitation, and has thus failed to carry out the rehabilitation and resettlement work properly. As every where in India at the Upper Indravati Project also, the attitude of the authorities towards the people displaced by the dam has been one of negligence and apathy.