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Displacement and Poverty: Measures for Restoring Meagre Livelihoods

Hafiza Khatun

INTRODUCTION

Since independence, large infrastructure projects have been implemented in Bangladesh\(^1\) that has led to the displacement of about 0.05 million people annually. More than 0.5 million people have been involuntarily displaced between 1994 and 2004 due to the acquisition of more than 7,000 ha of land development projects such as the Jamuna Multipurpose Bridge Project (JMBP), Regional Road Management Project III (RRMP), City Development Projects (CDP) of Dhaka, Chittagong, Khulna and Rajshahi, Development of Export Processing Zones (DEPZ), Bhairab Bridge Project (BBP), Jamuna Bridge Access Road Project (JBARP), Jamuna Bridge Rail Link Project (JBRRLP), South-West Road Network Development Project (SRNDP), Pakshy Bridge Project (PBP), and so on (Khatun
2004; Rashid 2004). While some of these projects are funded by international agencies such as the World Bank (WB), Asian Development Bank (ADB), Department for International Development (DFID) and Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), the Government of Bangladesh (GoB) has provided grants for others.

Development-led involuntary displacement embodies perverse intrinsic contradictions (Cernea 2000). It raises many ethical questions and reflects on the inequitable distribution of development’s benefits and losses. Most development projects, which cause displacement, invariably lead to the impoverishment of the project-affected persons (PAPs).

This chapter evaluates various mitigation measures undertaken by the GoB for the large infrastructure projects funded by the donor agencies and their impact on livelihood restoration of PAPs. It also focuses on the planning and implementation to restore the income of those affected.

The GoB does not have any mechanism to assist and rehabilitate those affected and enable them to overcome displacement-led impoverishment. For the government-funded infrastructure projects, land is acquired for ‘public interest’ by using the ‘eminent domain’ under the Land Acquisition Ordinance (LAO). This ordinance does not have any provision for resettlement and rehabilitation (R&R) of the PAPs. It merely provides for monetary compensation, that is, Cash Compensation under Law (CCL) for legally-owned property. The CCL is being paid by the Deputy Commissioner’s (DC) office by assessing the market value (MV) of the lost assets (assessed on the basis of average recorded value of similar kind of land in the vicinity for preceding 12 months) plus 50 per cent premium on assessed MV for compulsory acquisition of the land. The compensation amount is much lower than the replacement value (RV), that is, the actual market price of the acquired asset at the time of acquisition. The RV is assessed through market surveys and information collected from various sources at the time of designing the resettlement plan (RP). The LAO does not consider the socio-economic status of the affected persons prior to and after the commencement of the project. For the reasons cited above, land acquisition by the state-funded project is considered a curse or a misfortune for the PAP.

The R&R policies of all international donors are similar in nature. They provide compensation for all the losses and also give support to restore livelihoods and thereby reduce the risk of
impoverishment among those displaced by development projects. Special attention is also given to protect the livelihoods of disadvantaged groups (irrespective of their legal entitlement to the affected property); with the help of experienced non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to ensure that the project is beneficial for all the stakeholders.

Table 14.1 illustrates the gaps between the eligibility for compensation under the LAO and the R&R policy of the international funding agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Types of Losses/Assistance Eligible for Compensation</th>
<th>Donors’ Policy</th>
<th>LAO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Loss of land by title owners (RV/CCL)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Loss of property on titled land</td>
<td>Yes (RV)</td>
<td>Yes (CCL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Loss of house or other build structures on owned land</td>
<td>Yes (RV)</td>
<td>Yes (CCL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Loss of crops</td>
<td>Yes (RV)</td>
<td>Yes (CCL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Loss of trees, perennials and ponds</td>
<td>Yes (RV)</td>
<td>Yes (CCL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Loss of house or other build structures on others land</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Loss of property on without titled land</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Salvageable materials</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shifting cost for relocation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Loss of workdays, income, employment (that is, wage labour) due to dislocation and relocation, loss of access to work</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Assistance to improve or at least restore former living standards, income and productive level</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Especially income restoration assistance to women/vulnerable group of people</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Assistance for restoration of community facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Khatun 2005.

The compensation package offered under government and donor-funded projects discriminates between the PAPs of the two types of projects. At times, it causes serious difficulties for the implementing agency at the field level, where they are responsible for the
management of both donor- and GoB-funded projects in the same locality. Therefore, a uniform and appropriate mitigation package needs to be devised for the restoration of livelihood of all the development-induced displacees, regardless of the source of funding for the project. To do so, the GoB in the first place needs to draw up a national resettlement policy.

However, so far in comparison to the entitlements under the state-funded projects the compensation package for the PAP under donor-funded projects is very generous. However, irrespective of the compensation package, resettlement of displaced people is always disadvantageous. They rarely regain their lost ways of life and livelihood in spite of the mitigation measures (Khatun 2000; Zaman 1996). The percentage of PAPs with a record of regaining or changing their livelihood in the positive sense is not very encouraging (ADB: 2003). The issue of livelihood restoration needs urgent attention at the design and planning stage so that adequate mitigation measures can be factored in, mainly in the state-funded projects.

This study is based on an analysis of primary and secondary data of major transport network projects in Bangladesh since the early 1990s. These include five major projects—Jamuna Multipurpose Bridge Project (JMBP), Bhairab Bridge Project (BBP), Jamuna Bridge Road Access Project (JBRAP), South-West Road Network Development Project (SRNDP) and Jamuna Bridge Railway Link Project (JBRLP)—that have been selected for evaluation. Relevant research reports and published materials on the above-mentioned projects have been studied and evaluated. These project areas have been surveyed for research and the stakeholders of these projects have been interviewed in 2004. Among them, three projects, namely, JMBP, JBRAP and JBRLP are directly related with the longest bridge over the Jamuna river in Bangladesh. On the other hand, the SRNDP has been developed as a connecting road between the Padma Bridge that is being built and the existing national highways. The ADB is the exclusive donor for JBRAP, JBRLP and SRNDP and partner donor for JMBP. Other donors of JMBP are the WB and the Overseas Economic Cooperation Fund (OECF) of Japan. The BBP is being partially funded by the DFID. The implementation (construction) period of these projects are between 1994 and 1998 for JMBP, 1999 and 2002 for BBP, 2001 and 2005 for SRNDP, 1995 and 1999 for JBRAP, and 1997 and 2001 for
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JBRLP. The R&R activities continued for one or more years after the completion of the physical work of all the projects.

The following sections evaluate various mitigation measures undertaken by the GoB for the large infrastructure projects funded by the donor agencies and their impact on livelihood restoration of PAPs.

DISPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION

As stated earlier, Bangladesh does not have a national rehabilitation policy for the PAPs. Displacement due to infrastructural projects is governed by the Acquisition and Requisition of Immovable Property Ordinance II (LAO II) of 1982, which was amended in 1993 and again in 1994. As per an amendment to this ordinance in 1993, the premium value was increased on the calculated market value from 20 to 50 per cent. The 1994 amendment included a provision for crop compensation to the bargadar/share cropper/tenant farmer (JMBP 1999). But, in most of the cases this money cannot compensate for even 25 per cent of the losses (Khatun 2005a).

On the other hand, guidelines by international funding agencies suggest appropriate planning for R&R so that impoverishment can be avoided or minimised. In the mid-1990s, during the JMB project, guidelines on R&R spelt out by the donors were followed for the first time in Bangladesh. Various mitigation measures including appropriate compensation at the current market price for all the lost assets, irrespective of the legal status of the PAP were adopted. These R&R activities were implemented through a resettlement unit (RU) headed by a project director (PD).

Since 1994, the GoB has formulated and implemented RPs as an integral part of the donor-funded projects. The RP is formulated independently for each project and a similar compensation package based on the donor R&R guidelines is offered. Special attention has been given to protect the livelihood of the disadvantaged groups (irrespective of the legal entitlements on the affected property) and to prevent their impoverishment. However, until 1999 barely 50 per cent of the PAPs of different projects were able to overcome the impoverishment hazards even with
donor guided generous mitigation measures. Though slow paced, the percentage of PAPs with success stories has been on a rise over a period of time (ADB 1999; Khatun 2000a).

According to the Michael Cernea (2000) the major impoverishment risks that accompany development-induced displacement are landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, marginalisation, increased morbidity, food insecurity, loss of access to common property resources and social disarticulation. The above-stated risks have an adverse impact on livelihood restoration at the pre-project level. Experts believe that adverse outcomes of resettlement can be avoided or minimised by risk reversal through appropriate resettlement planning and the adoption of proper mitigation measures detailed in Cernea’s ‘impoverishment risk and reconstruction’ (IRR) model (Cernea 1986, 1988, 1996). This can be achieved through:

(1) Good policy and management practice,
(2) Consultation with stakeholders,
(3) Socially responsible design to minimise impact,
(4) Good planning, and
(5) Enhanced capacity and commitment of the government/executing agency.

CURRENT RESETTLEMENT PRACTICE IN BANGLADESH

The guidelines on R&R by international funding agencies have added a new dimension to the practice of land acquisition and resettlement in Bangladesh. As per donor guidelines on R&R, the state has formulated RPs by incorporating additional entitlements over and above the legal entitlements outlined by GoB, though exclusively for donor-funded projects. The RP delineates the entitlement matrix and also outlines the mechanism of implementation, monitoring and the involvement of agencies: both governmental and non-governmental. So far a number of RPs have been prepared, approved, financed and implemented by the GoB for the development projects such as JMBP, JBARP, JBRLP, BBP, SRNDP. However, the government of Bangladesh is financing the entire resettlement and rehabilitation
component for all the projects irrespective of the source of funding agency for the project. For example, in the case of JMBP, out of the total project cost of US$ 960 million the GoB contributed US$ 350 million, which included the resettlement cost of US$ 14 million. The R&R cost was about 7 per cent of the total project cost. The JMBP and subsequent funded projects have established some good practices in dealing with involuntary resettlement issues (Khatun 2000a) (Table 14.2).

**TABLE 14.2**

A Typical Compensation Package and Potential Beneficiaries of Resettlement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Compensation Packages</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Replacement agriculture land/cash value to the titled owners by the Deputy Commissioner’s (DC’s) office. Additional cash grant based on MARV* to match present market value of the land</td>
<td>Households affected by loss of agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cash grant in Tk (to be assessed from type of crop production and return from one harvest) for the loss of access to land by tenant/share croppers</td>
<td>Tenant/share croppers affected by land acquisition for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Compensation for crops, trees, perennials and fish ponds paid by the DC’s office Additional cash grant to match market value of the asset (if applicable)</td>
<td>Households affected by loss of crops/trees/ponds-fish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Replacement house plots/cash for homestead land (by owners) at present market value</td>
<td>Tenant farmers to receive 50 per cent of the (appropriate share) compensation for crop loss (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>One-time cash grant for alternative housing to PAP without titles to homestead land/structure</td>
<td>All homestead/house plot owners affected by the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cash compensation for residential/commercial structures at replacement cost</td>
<td>Tenants, leaseholders, squatters affected by the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Households/CBEs (owners of the structure only) affected by the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14.2 (Contd.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Compensation Packages</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cash compensation to owners/renters/non-title commercial and business enterprises (CBEs) for loss of commercial premises</td>
<td>One-time cash grant to CBEs to re-establish business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Transfer/shifting cost for relocation</td>
<td>All PAPs (tenants/squatters) are eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional assistance to female-headed households</td>
<td>Female-headed households to hire manpower for relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Allowed to take away all salvageable materials</td>
<td>All PAPs who lose assets (structure, trees, fish, other infrastructure) are eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cash assistance for income restoration</td>
<td>Compensation provided to all affected households/CBEs employees and indirectly affected persons for the loss of work, income and business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roadside plantation and social forestry programmes</td>
<td>To enable vulnerable groups such as women and landless people to have a source of alternative income generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reconstruction of community facilities (school, mosque, temple, church, madrassa, and so on) or resource affected by the project</td>
<td>All partial and fully affected community facilities are reconstructed in consultation with affected communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Provision of civic amenities in host areas to increase the carrying capacity of the host village</td>
<td>Relocated areas/villages where PAPs will be relocated in small groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GoB (2004).
Note: *Maximum Allowable Replacement Value (MARV) assessed through land market survey.

**GOOD PRACTICES IN DEALING WITH INVOLUNTARY RESSETLEMENT ISSUES**

(1) Steps were taken to minimise or eliminate involuntary resettlement wherever feasible by exploring all viable design options. For example, at least four options for the proposed location of a bridge are considered at the initial planning and design
stage and the best is chosen after considering all the options including resettlement.

(2) Under projects where displacement was unavoidable, resettlement measures were conceived and implemented as ‘development programmes’.

(3) Accurate socio-economic survey aided with video filming of structures before the cut-off date and the land, market and property assessment surveys were carried out to assess the replacement value of the lost assets.

(4) All PAPs including those without title to land were identified and the entitlements for their losses were assessed at replacement rates.

(5) Information about the planning and implementation of RPs were disseminated to all the PAPs through appropriate mechanisms.

(6) All primary and secondary stakeholders, including vulnerable groups were involved in the consultation process through household surveys, focus group discussions, public consultations and formal meetings.

(7) A time bound RP, which identified the categories of PAPs and their entitlements was prepared. The responsibilities of the implementing agencies, their budget and monitoring mechanisms were outlined clearly.

(8) Photo-identification cards (ID cards) were given to PAPs with details of their entitlements. Issuance of such cards gave confidence to those affected and enabled a proper tracking and monitoring of the R&R process.

(9) Where relocation was required, relocation plans and options in consultation with PAPs and host communities were developed. For example, two resettlement sites were developed through the resettlement unit of JMBP. The PAPs were given an option of selecting either the developed sites or the host village.

(10) ‘Incentive driven mechanisms’ were introduced for the host communities. These incentives aimed at increasing the carrying capacity of the village by providing/improving infrastructure such as roads, school buildings, mosque, tube-wells, and so on, so that they could attract the PAPs.

(11) Special attention was given to the vulnerable PAPs, especially to all the female-headed households. For example, those in the vulnerable category were entitled for an additional grant.
(12) Appropriate income restoration programmes (for example, replacement land, employment, skill training, credit facilities and grants in some cases) were established with the objective of improving the productive base and existing living standards of the PAPs. Credit facilities were provided to all the PAPs of JMBP through NGOs. A grant of Tk 10,000 in two instalments was granted to all vulnerable PAPs of BBP.

(13) Periodic monitoring and evaluation of resettlement operations was undertaken.

**Mitigation Measures**

Relevant and appropriate mitigation measures that focus on resettlement and poverty issues are undertaken in all donor-funded infrastructure projects of Bangladesh to protect the PAPs. The JMBP is the largest infrastructure project in the country and also the first where R&R of PAPs was done as per the WB/ADB guidelines in the early 1990s. Resettlement operations for the JMBP were implemented mostly in the rural context. Since then the GoB has formulated and implemented RPs, designed in conformity with the policy and guidelines of the funding agencies to fulfil the precondition of donors for providing grant/aid for projects. The RPs needs to address both physical relocation and economic dimensions. Physical relocation includes for instance, relocation to a chosen site and structure but it is the economic aspects that are more critical because the inability to address them can cause impoverishment and have a negative impact on the livelihood of PAPs.

Various techniques or methodologies appropriate to the formulation and implementation of RPs for various projects are evolving over the years. Video filming of the affected households and properties was adopted to identify the genuine PAPs and prevent the influx of population and fraudulent claims. Facilitation of rehabilitation according to their preference in terms of types and locations are in the process.

The extent of impact largely depends on the nature of the project and its geographical location. The maximum land acquisition was undertaken for JMBP, followed by JBRLP, SRNDP, JBARP and BBP (Table 14.3).

Among these four projects, the JMBP is the earliest, the largest and distinctive for various reasons. In this project the homestead
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## TABLE 14.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Impact</th>
<th>JMBP*</th>
<th>JBARP*</th>
<th>JBRLP*</th>
<th>BBP**</th>
<th>SRNDP**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land acquired (ha)</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population affected</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected population/ha</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of land acquired</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Along the</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Semi-urban,</td>
<td>Along the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land</td>
<td>road</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>cultural</td>
<td>existing</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ferry ghat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** ADB 1999, ADB 2003a*, Christian Commission for Development of Bangladesh (CCDB) 2004**.  

Resettlement was provided wherein the sites were developed with civic facilities. Mitigation programmes, mainly for livelihood restoration of PAPs were implemented with the help of NGOs and supervised by the resettlement units (RUs).

The BBP provided commercial plots for resettlement/rehabilitation, as most of the affected persons lost commercial structures. It also provided supervised grant of Tk 10,000 to the vulnerable project-affected households (PAHs), that is, to those with household incomes less than Tk 3,000 per month. The RP, of the BBP, named as the Social Action Plan (SAP) was supervised by the NGOs and experienced consultants who kept a close contact with the vulnerable PAPs and provided them guidelines for livelihood restoration. They were based on the assumption that the RP package (mostly financial support as described in the entitlement matrix) would help the affected persons rebuild their lives and livelihoods. But for the other projects the RP was neither supervised nor supported by NGOs.

## SALIENT FEATURES OF THE JMBP

### TYPES OF COMPENSATIONS PAID AND RESETTLEMENT

Compensation was given for expropriation of all kinds of assets including land, structure, trees, crops, fish, and so on, owned by
the occupier at present market rate irrespective of legal ownership of land but dislocated by the project in Bhuapur and Shirajgong districts.

To facilitate livelihood restoration, additional mitigation measures included were payments for loss of income, monetary compensa-
tion for R&R that included expenses for relocation, reconstruction, purchase of alternate land and provision of other basic amenities, and so on.

Apart from these the JMBP provided short-term/long-term rehabilitation measures that comprised of training, human resource development (HRD), occupation skill development (OSD) and credit facilities through assigned NGOs that gave credit on terms and conditions similar to other credit-providing NGOs in the neighbouring areas.

**RESSETLEMENT PROCESS**

The implementation of JMBP started in 1993 and was completed in 2000. For immediate relocation of the losers of homestead, the JMBP followed the twin strategy that:

1. Encouraged the PAPs to relocate by themselves in the host villages surrounding the project area. The traditional practice of relocating housing structures affected by riverbank erosion was also followed.
2. Provided with an alternative option of relocation to resettlement centres (RCs) where community facilities including schools, hospitals, mosques, roads, electricity and water supply were developed for the vulnerable PAPs who could not relocate by themselves.

After being compensated for appropriation of homestead by the district administration all salvageable materials were returned to the PAPs free of cost. Each relocated Household (HH) was given a transfer grant (TG) or a shifting allowance, house construction grant (HCG), MARV and stamp duty (SD) to buy an alternate land. Each household was provided with sanitary facilities as well. Squatters were given 101 sq. metre of homestead land in
resettlement sites free of cost. They could also buy another 101 sq. metre land adjacent to their plots. At the resettlement sites, schools, health centres, mosques, temples, community centres, access to drinking water were provided at project cost. Besides, at least one member of the family was entitled to training, employment and income generation programmes. The displaced families were also given credit support through locally active NGOs.

To promote social and cultural integration of the PAPs with their host villages, a number of community infrastructure like roads, schools, mosques, temples, tube-well, and so on, were developed in the host villages. This effort reduced potential conflicts between the PAPs and their hosts and developed a sense of belonging for the PAPs amidst the host community. Above all these facilities helped the host villages to increase their carrying capacity.

**Resettlement Sites**

The RU of the JMBP developed two resettlement sites (RSs), initially to accommodate 755 households on either side of the river Jamuna, as these homesteads could not find a suitable location for themselves. Over 1,200 plots were developed in a total area of about 140 ha. Initially, people were not interested in relocation at the resettlement sites as it was a new concept. Besides, they also felt that the sites did not have the necessary infrastructural facilities. But over time with the development of infrastructure and community facilities they got well adjusted to their new sites. The plot size varied from 101, 202 and 404 sq. metre per household (ADB 1999).

The plots at the resettlement sites were sold at par with the compensation price paid at the time of land acquisition price, on a 99-year lease arrangement. The sale of land at the resettlement sites was banned for 10 years from the date of purchase but some PAPs sold their land through power of attorney. For squatters and uthulies (constructed house structure on others land with permission), the plot was jointly owned by the husband and wife and registered in their name and on separation (if any); the wife could retain ownership.
OTHER MITIGATION MEASURES

A programme for Erosion and Flood Affected Persons (EFAPs) was undertaken to help people living in an area 8 kilometre upstream and 10 kilometre down stream of the bridge and compensation was provided for the loss of land, crops and employment due to erosion caused by flooding. This programme was initiated to compensate more than 180 thousand people and implemented by an NGO named Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC). The women headed households under the EFAP programme were given 20 per cent additional relocation grant.

Another programme undertaken was the Environment Management Action Plan (EMAP). The aim of this programme was to mitigate the adverse impact on livelihoods of the people, fisheries and agriculture and wildlife of the area. In total, eight NGOs including the RP implementing NGO and a GoB organisation, the RU of the Jamuna Multipurpose Bridge Authority (JMBA) were involved in the project area. The NGOs were involved mainly for providing credit, raising awareness about human development and gender equity, skill training, informal education, health and sanitation service and enable the affected people to adopt livelihood activities such as fish cultivation, poultry, cattle rearing and small business activities.

In other projects as well, almost the same guidelines were followed for their Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs)/SAPs. In some cases extra benefit such as latrines, and tube-wells were provided to the affected households. However, except the BBP none of the project-implementing NGOs or consultants provided any guidance for the training for human resource development, restoration of livelihoods or credit facilities. Therefore, the BBP can be considered as one of the success stories for the R&R of livelihoods in the semi-urban context. It is a unique case where consultants as well as implementing NGOs supervised and provided a two-day short training on awareness, business management of certain occupational skills as desired by the vulnerable PAPs and on the investment of grant money.

LIVELIHOOD RESTORATION LEVEL

However, on an average, hardly 50 per cent of the PAPs of different projects could overcome the impoverishment risks despite the
implementation of the RPs as per the donor guidelines. PAPs were subject to marginalisation, social disarticulation, loss of land and livelihood. The impoverished PAPs were mostly poor and marginal landholders prior to the acquisition of their property. Communities with an agricultural base such as those affected by the JBRLP were the worst affected. Table 14.4 illustrates that a larger number of PAPs along the existing roads (JBARP and SRNDP) and living in semi-urban areas (BBP) could recover their losses as compared to those PAPs who lived far away from the road network like JMBP and JBRLP. It was also observed that livelihood restoration level of the agriculture community/PAPs/households is higher among those who adopted non-agriculture employment generation avenues, as their primary or secondary occupation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change of Socio-economic Status</th>
<th>JMBP*</th>
<th>JBARP*</th>
<th>JBRLP*</th>
<th>BBP**</th>
<th>SRNDP**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as before</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorated</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: ADB 2003a*; Christian Commission for Development of Bangladesh (CCDB) 2004**.

The time gap between the completion of the resettlement activities and the post-relocation impact assessment could be an important variable in understanding the success or failure of livelihood restoration. Evaluation of the socio-economic condition by the ADB in the year 1999 identified 49 and 48 per cent of households with improved condition for the JMBP and JBARP as compared to 52 and 58 per cent, respectively in 2004. The PAPs of the JMBP as well as JBARP were more or less at the same level in 1999.

This indicates that over time those affected could recover from the psychological shock and depression shock of forced displacement and improve their income levels with support, training facilities from the government/NGOs and the use of infrastructure facilities. In most cases, other family members could also improve their socio-economic conditions by acquiring education or special skills.
provided by the project authorities. For instance, the establishment of a good road network and an exposure to development helped the PAPs establish linkages with a number of agencies involved in the project area. Improved communication and contact could provide them with an opportunity to seek various occupations for livelihood restoration.

The PAPs of BBP best exemplify livelihood restoration via the adoption of additional strategies. Many of them were employed in the project activities as part of the condition of contract agreement for the bridge or road construction. PAPs of the BBP improved their income level within the short resettlement period as they had the additional advantage of a short training, close supervision and guidance by the consultants and NGO on the manner in which the grant money was to be spent.

The locational advantage or proximity to the job market and transport connectivity had a positive impact on the income level of PAPs under all projects under review. The development projects have a positive impact on the communities dependent on secondary occupations or tertiary activities. They find employment opportunities mainly in the formal or informal sector, in the small-scale industries that have been set up in newly developed areas and other urban centres that are well connected by the newly constructed road network facilities developed as a part of the project. The level of success also varies in accordance with the parameters adopted for the measurement of income improvement (Table 14.5).

The community-based economic activities facilitated by the project in rural areas showed positive impact on livelihood restoration within a short time frame. Many PAPs of JMBP have improved their condition from locally available means of employment; predominantly fish cultivation in the resettlement area through the formation of a co-operative society with the help of the NGOs. This can be compared with the resettlement by the government of those affected by natural calamities such as cyclone and river bank erosion, around a community pond that provides with livelihood restoration through fishing and related activities (Khatun 2003, 2004a).

As shown in Table 14.5, employment at a far away location seems to have a significant impact for all the projects irrespective
Table 14.5
Parameters Adopted for the Measurement of Improvement in Livelihood (data in percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livelihood Parameter</th>
<th>JMBP*</th>
<th>JBARP*</th>
<th>JBRLP*</th>
<th>BBP**</th>
<th>SRNDP**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local employment</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance employment</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income of household</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH member’s income</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-credit facilities</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other micro-credit assistance</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional skills</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource development</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ADB 2003a*; Christian Commission for Development of Bangladesh (CCDB) 2004**.

of nature and timing of their implementation. This indicates that the PAPs have changed their occupation and many of them work in more than one occupation in distant locations. This happens when the shift of jobs is mainly from agriculture to an urban-based economy, a lower level to a higher skill level employment or investment in an area that is more developed than their original habitat. It can also be the reverse in some cases, though the percentage of such cases is negligible. Income restoration was higher in households where more than one family member was earning. The PAPs of the JMBP reported a restoration of their livelihoods due to access to credit facilities. The JMBP was the first and only development project where access to credit was seen as a mitigation measure and formed an integral part of the RP.

The PAHs of the BBP were entitled to a supervised grant of Tk 10,000. The vulnerable PAPs were given a short-term skill training and counselling. Those who lost their business were allotted commercial plots at the market centre on the resettlement sites. As a result of these mitigation measures implemented under the supervision of a resettlement specialist, there was a positive impact on the livelihood restoration of the PAPs (Table 14.5). During the study, the PAPs were still in a stage of shock and disarray and it is hoped that with time and an improvement in the levels of income, the PAPs would be more settled.
CONCLUSION

Since the 1990s, the guidelines on R&R by funding agencies are being followed in the design and implementation of donor-funded infrastructure projects in Bangladesh, to facilitate income restoration of those adversely impacted. However, in most of the projects, various mitigation measures are undertaken to compensate those affected, but logistical support such as credit, training and counselling are not provided. The level of income restoration among the PAPs who are resettled in a semi-urban environment or with access to better transport network and connectivity is much higher than among PAPs who live in a rural environment and depend mainly on agriculture. However, concerted efforts and additional mitigation measures, such as access to credit, training and counselling can enhance the income restoration level in the rural areas as well.

The JMBP can be considered as an example of good resettlement in a rural setting and can be replicated as a case of best practice. The resettlement model of the JMBP can be improved by adding good practices from other projects that focus on the creation of employment opportunities and consult the PAPs in the designing of skill and training programmes. Resettlement plans should incorporate locally oriented measures that are compatible with the social and cultural practice of the geographical area and the income restoration levels can be improved if more time is devoted to the design and implementation of the resettlement activities. The mitigation measures, mainly for income restoration, undertaken so far in donor-funded projects are more effective than entirely government-aided projects.

The issue of unequal compensation packages offered to PAPs of state/private and donor-funded projects have been addressed in the draft National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation (NPRR) of August 2007 prepared by the GoB with the technical assistance (TA) provided by the ADB. The NPRR also includes persons affected by river erosion (an estimated 100,000 people per year) and slum evictions, whose rights and needs had not been recognised so far. The NPRR proposes to amend LAO and provides for mitigation measures for all those who are involuntarily
displaced, that is, those displaced by development projects and persons affected by river erosion and evictions displacees (non-projects).

Alleviation measures identified in the policy are comprehensive as they cover all the donor guidelines on resettlement. The draft policy provides the same compensation package to those affected by the acquisition and requisition of land for development projects as well as for non-project (slum eviction and river erosion) affected. Provision for an identical compensation package has been made in the draft NPRR, 2007 for those impacted by (i) public sector projects, irrespective of the source of funding; (ii) private sector and Public–Private Partnership (PPP) projects; (iii) river erosion and eviction displacees. The draft NPRR mandates appropriate assistance and rehabilitation with special attention to the vulnerable that are unable to absorb the risks and costs of modern development (Halcrow et al. 2007).

Further, the draft policy ensures appropriate assistance to affected people and communities to restore and improve their socio-economic conditions and establish community social systems and networks during and after resettlement has taken place. It is expected that overall socio-economic development, the objective of any development project or nation as whole, can be achieved with the appropriate implementation of draft NPRR of 2007.

However, the draft policy needs to be endorsed at the political level and get the legal status to amend the LAO. Required modifications in the LAO to provide for a comprehensive R&R package will strengthen the government’s legal framework and effectively mitigate the ‘impoverishment risks’ of involuntary displacement.

The author recommends the following measures to restore or improve the livelihood of the PAPs.

(1) A detailed needs assessment and evaluation of the potential of the PAPs, should be done through a participatory process during the feasibility study and incorporated in the resettlement plans.

(2) Resettlement planning and implementation should commence prior to the civil work for the project.

(3) Adequate time needs to be given to the PAP to relocate after receiving the compensation.
(4) Besides, cash compensation, mitigation measures for the restoration of livelihoods such as skill training, credit facilities and counselling should be arranged for.

(5) Special medical facilities to children, women and disabled should be provided.

(6) Sound institutional arrangement/linkage (government/NGO/Institution) must be established by giving high priority to resettlement activities.

(7) The institutions and manpower involved from designing to the implementation of RPs need to be oriented about the objective. This can be done through organising adequate training programmes.

(8) PAPs and their family members should be encouraged to explore various employment avenues in order to restore their livelihoods.

(9) Employment opportunities in the vicinity must be evaluated, and if necessary, created to augment the PAPs income generation capacity.

(10) Community-based economic activities need to be encouraged and facilitated through the development project.

(11) While developing the resettlement sites, special attention needs to be given to spatial arrangements in order to facilitate community cohesion and its sustenance.

(12) A careful consideration of the geographical and cultural context in which the RPs are being implemented is essential as guidelines provided by donor agencies are of a general nature and may not be appropriate for a country or a specific area within a country.

(13) Selection criteria of implementing agency/NGO and their scope of work should be defined clearly.

(14) The GoB needs to take adequate measures to control encroachment on government land.

(15) The implementing agency needs to be empowered with logistic instruments, that is, legal powers to execute the necessary orders. It should have access to government documents/information, legal support as well as trained manpower to follow-up on future actions and programmes that can make a project more viable and people centric at the same time.

(16) Provision of a generous compensation package for all the PAFs that have suffered forced displacement. An unequal
compensation for the donor-funded projects creates hurdles at the implementation level due to dissatisfaction among PAPs of government-aided project where the entitlements are much less. Development is for everyone and therefore, the GoB should endorse and give legal status to the draft NPRR of 2007 that provides for identical reparation for development induced displacedes and for non-project induced impacts such as river erosion and slum evictions. An equal compensation package to all the victims of involuntary displacement would ensure effective reconstruction of livelihoods and reduce poverty.

NOTE

1. Bangladesh is a developing country with a population density of about 850 people per sq. kilometre. For various reasons including natural calamities and infrastructure development projects, about 0.15 million people are displaced every year. Of this two-thirds of those displaced or 0.10 million people are affected by natural calamities such as riverbank erosion, flood and cyclone.
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