

January/July 2016

---

## **The Controversy over Safeguard Policies**

*By Michael Cernea, Vinod Thomas, Rob van den Berg*

**1 February 2016** The World Bank is consulting with European and other regional stakeholders on its proposals to replace existing social and environmental safeguard policies with revised “standards.” This time, the bank board’s Committee on Development Effectiveness, critical of the conduct so far of this consultation (started in 2012) has requested that 52 important issues defined by the committee and Web-posted in advance, be submitted to transparent public discussion, with accountability on how proposals raised are addressed. The international debate around weakening or strengthening the existing safeguard policies is thus becoming more substantive, as it certainly should.

The 52 issues incorporated by CODE address, inter-alia, content omissions and the extent of the separation and/or overlap of responsibilities and accountability between the World Bank and its borrowing states for risks and possible adverse impacts on the environment, the society, or particular subgroups by projects financed by development banks (not only the World Bank) and implemented by borrowers. The discussion conveys on the future status of the safeguards in the World Bank’s policy architecture.

The debate’s ultimate core is an old challenge: to prevent and handle justly the economic and social externalities of development projects. Metaphorically, externalities can be compared with the mythical multiheaded dragon — except that in development projects the externalities are not mythical. They are real and toxic. Examples abound: environmental destructions; the impoverishment of displaced people, exposed to risks imposed on them and left worse off; polluted air, etc. Institutionalized safeguard policies are precisely intended — as their name states — to reduce, prevent and “safeguard” against surreptitious externalization of unrecognized project costs.

Safeguard policies emerged in the 1980s at the World Bank in response to damages to the affected people and the environment from projects it funded, signaling a historic paradigm shift. The Brazil Polonoroeste’s BR-364 Amazon highway had destroyed forests and displaced Amazonian inhabitants; the Philippines’ Chico Dam project had endangered the lands and livelihoods of indigenous populations, triggering epic resistance.

By preventing or reducing risks and dysfunctionalities, the safeguard policies have provided over the last three decades immense services, and vastly improved the Bank’s contribution to poverty reduction. The broadest confirmation of the necessity and operational usefulness of such policies came over the next decade, when the safeguard policies pioneered by the World Bank were replicated by all multilateral development banks, all bilateral aid agencies of member countries of the [Organization for Economic](#)

Cooperation and Development, an increasing number of private sector giant banks (the “Equator Principles Banks”), and by export-credit agencies of all OECD countries. The World Bank now proposes replacing its safeguard policies with weaker and aspirational “standards,” that may be met “flexibly” during a project’s execution, and the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank reflects the same approach. Standards that are discretionary are not standards, except in name. The World Bank, all multilateral donors, and borrowing states have embraced the United Nation’s [Sustainable Development Goals](#) and signaled support for the objectives of the 2015 Paris climate summit. But the pursuit of sustainability is under pressure from the mistaken notion that applying safeguard policies delays unnecessarily project processing, and thus would slow growth.

The lessons from economic theory and empirical evaluative evidence are clear, but policy positions are split. Some MDB board members call for a reduction in safeguards on the premise that this would speed growth. But the reality is that continued economic development and people’s well-being depend on improving social and environmental results, not on worsening them.

The 2011 independent evaluation of safeguards at the World Bank recommended that downstream oversight of safeguards be strengthened. It did not suggest that upstream regulations be weakened. It recommended that project processing be speeded through greater process-efficiency and enhanced resources for project preparation and implementation. Yet so far the revision of World Bank safeguards has pursued the exact opposite route. It also proposes reliance on self-monitoring by the borrower, which could hide damages, thereby raising the costs of correction and legacies. If implemented, the World Bank’s current proposal to revise-down and de-rank safeguard policies would gravely weaken social and environmental safeguards on which investments are now premised. This would lower the sustainability and safeguards bar for new entrants like the [AIIB](#) and the New Development Bank.

The SDGs aim for fast growth that will endure and not implode under social and environmental risks and dysfunctions. For that, it is essential to have safeguard policy systems that are robust and consistently implemented. Safeguards need periodic reforms to absorb research-updated knowledge, but not to diminish their effectiveness in delivering social and environmental protection and higher quality projects.

## **About the authors**

**Michael Cernea** is a professor of social anthropology and international affairs. He is a former World Bank senior adviser for social policy and sociology, and a world-renowned expert on population resettlement issues. During his long career at the bank he initiated several safeguard policies and published widely on development issues.

**Vinod Thomas** Vinod Thomas is director general of the Asian Development Bank’s Independent Evaluation Department since 2011. Thomas also has 35 years experience with the World Bank, where his last position was director general and vice president of the Independent Evaluation Group.

**Rob van den Berg** For 10 years Rob van den Berg was the director of the Independent Evaluation Office of the Global Environment Facility situated in the World Bank. As a visiting professor at King’s College London and a visiting fellow at the Institute of Development Studies he has become more convinced than ever of the need to incorporate these safeguards,

as this is essential for ensuring sufficient financial rates of return and sustainable development. He is the president of the International Development Evaluation Association.

*Note: The opinions expressed are the authors' own, and do not necessarily represent the views of institutions they are associated with.*

## **USAID Releases Guidelines on Compulsory Displacement and Resettlement**

Celeb Stevens and Chad Dear, US Agency for International Development

The US Agency for International Development (USAID) recently released [Guidelines on Compulsory Displacement and Resettlement in USAID Programming](#).<sup>1</sup> The Guidelines provide good practices regarding compulsory displacement and resettlement (CDR). This voluntary tool is intended for use by USAID and its partners at all stages of the program cycle, whether for implementation of activities or as a good practice guide for project design. Ensuring that CDR, in particular avoids, resettlement, minimizes and mitigates risks of impoverishment of affected legitimate landholders is critical to achieving USAID's mission "to end extreme poverty and promote resilient, democratic societies."

USAID's Guidelines are consistent with international good practices established over decades. Since the 1980s, development experts and donors have increasingly recognized CDR risks related to development and have taken concrete actions to address them. Many multilateral development banks and bilateral donors have standards, practices, or policies to avoid CDR or, when unavoidable, minimize and mitigate its associated risks.

These Guidelines are also consistent with [USAID's mission](#) and core values and will help ensure that USAID programs involving CDR do not undermine desired development objectives. The [Vision for Ending Extreme Poverty](#) recognizes that property rights and secure land tenure are essential for inclusive economic growth. Similarly, in the [Democracy, Human Rights and Governance Strategy](#), USAID commits to elevating human rights as a key development objective, including respect for economic, social, and cultural rights. The [Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy](#) acknowledges that women in developing countries are more vulnerable with respect to their land and resource rights. Further, [USAID's Environmental Compliance](#)

[Procedures](#) (22 CFR 216) identify resettlement as a class of action with a "significant effect" on the environment and therefore requiring, as appropriate, an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement. The CDR Guidelines could inform these mandatory analyses.

Finally, the CDR Guidelines are consistent with the leading international standard on land and resource tenure—the [UN Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible](#)

---

[Governance of Tenure of Land, Forests, and Fisheries in the Context of National Food Security](#), endorsed by the Committee on World Food Security in 2012.

Specific guidelines that will enable USAID and partners avoid, minimize and mitigate CDR risks include:

- . Understand the legal and institutional context;
- Identify all legitimate landholders and relevant risks
- If physical displacement is unavoidable, develop a Resettlement Action Plan
- Promote informed and meaningful engagement;
- Improve livelihoods and living standards; and
- Provide additional protections to vulnerable groups, especially women and indigenous peoples.

For more information visit [www.usaidlandtenure.net](http://www.usaidlandtenure.net)

**Source:** <http://www.usaidlandtenure.net/documents/guidelines-compulsory-displacement-and-resettlement-usaid-programming>.

### *Lessons from Development-Caused Resettlement* **A Study by the World Bank's Inspection Panel**

In April 2016, the World Bank's Inspection Panel launched an important study that synthesized the main lessons derived from its investigations of development projects causing population displacement and resettlement. By its quantified findings, lessons, and project-investigation summaries this substantial study is an easy-to-use source of information and guidance for development practitioners, researchers, university professors and their students. The study's title is "*Emerging Lessons Series No. 1: Involuntary Resettlement.*"<sup>2</sup>

Researchers of resettlement processes in India, as well as in other countries -- anthropologists, sociologists, development practitioners working in the government apparatus, as well as private sector corporations -- will find in this study important information that can help their work and enrich their own understanding and studies in this area. This is why **Resettlement News** is pleased to present to its readers a description of this study and its main findings.

The launching of the new series of studies was attended by a large audience, including representatives of governments attending the Bank's/IMF Spring meetings and of civil society organizations (CSOs) from developed and developing countries. The event was chaired by Mr. Franciscus Godts, Executive Director, who, on behalf of the Bank's Board, commended the Panel's initiative of drawing syntheses, highlighting

---

recurrent problems in Bank-financed projects, proposing improvements in involuntary resettlement operations, and highlighting lessons with vast applicability.

Dr. Gonzalo Castro de la Mata, Chairperson of the Inspection Panel, presented the event's Keynote Address. He dissected and explained each of the key lessons derived by the Panel. The report's core -- the 7 main lessons identified and recommended by the Panel for improving future projects -- on which the Keynote focused are presented further in this article.

The presentation of Dr. Castro's report was followed by comments from two invited panelists: Dr. Alberto Ninio (Deputy General Counsel of the World Bank) and Prof. Michael M. Cernea (former World Bank Senior Advisor for Social Policies and Research Professor of Social Anthropology). Ninio commented in depth on the legal aspects of the Panel's lessons. Cernea focused on the Panel's first and foremost lesson that recommends a complete, candid, and transparent scoping of the risks inherent in displacement, and the incorporation of counter-risk measures in Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs).

An animated open floor discussion followed. During it, participants from several countries discussed the lessons emphasized by the Panel's Chairperson in light of their own country experiences, while some World Bank staff outlined the Bank's agreement with the lessons derived by the Inspection Panel from the caseload of its investigation reports.

The Inspection Panel (IP) has taken the initiative of launching a series of studies on "Lessons Emerging from IP Investigation", motivated by its desire to account for its work and findings, and also to broadly disseminate its analytical insights that could help avoid and correct in future projects errors of design or weaknesses of implementation identified in past or ongoing projects involving unavoidable involuntary resettlement. This study is a part of many other constructive initiatives taken by the IP as part of its contribution to improving the overall approach to resettlement of the World Bank and its member countries, drawing on its caseload of analyses over the last 22 years.

The Panel hopes the lessons presented in this study are highlighting the key areas in which continued improvements can enhance the Bank's and its member countries' overall approach to resettlement. These lessons could be useful to all developing countries, members of the World Bank, and beyond, to the global development community.

### **A Critically Important Accountability Mechanism**

The Inspection Panel was created in 1993 as an arm of the World Bank's Board of Executive Directors to receive and investigate complaints submitted by people suffering harm that they allege are caused by Bank projects and in violation of the Bank's development policies.

Since its establishment, the IP has received 105 requests for inspection. Of those, 85 have been registered and 32 investigated. Two additional investigations are under way. The Inspection Panel is independent of the Bank's management. It functions as an accountability mechanism to which people living in the project areas who feel they are adversely affected by violations of the Bank's policies can present their complaints not only to the Bank's management itself, but also to the independent Inspection Panel. Based on its investigations, the IP has already developed over its existence a rich record of studies and publications, including substantial and detailed "Annual Reports" that are publicly available.

### ***A Rich Caseload of Investigations***

Out of the 32 project cases investigated so far, about 21 cases and one relevant pilot case have involved involuntary resettlement. This represents about two thirds, or 65% of the total caseload, reflecting the frequency of involuntary resettlement processes. The trend in frequency has been upward; in the last 1.5 decades, a significantly larger proportion of total number of World Bank projects include involuntary resettlement components compared to the proportion of such processes in the previous 2 or 3 decades.

The geographic distribution of the 21 investigated cases has included 15 countries in five world regions. The lending sectors most represented in this number have been projects in energy, rural development, natural resources, and extractive (mining) projects. While all of the Panel's cases with resettlement were studied to prepare the new report, a special emphasis was put on drawing lessons from the recent cases of the past decade.

This first study will be followed by studies reporting the key lessons on the following topics: Environmental assessments in Bank projects; Indigenous peoples; The conduct of consultation's with project area people's participation; Disclosure of information. Each topic will be addressed in a separate publication.

### ***A New Type of Study***

What is the difference between this new type of Panel studies and the usual investigation reports of the Inspection Panel? The difference is important. The IP's regular investigation reports are each focused exclusively on one single project, the case under examination. In contrast, the new study is a comparative synthesis of findings from many individual project investigations. This type of report is the first that the Inspection Panel has produced.

Many researchers and university professors regard IP case studies as models to be emulated, and also as excellent reading materials for their students. The Panel's investigations are carried at the highest research standards. They have gained a great

reputation within the international research community, which often employs data and conclusions from the Panel's case studies. Complementing the high value of individual project investigation studies, the novelty introduced by the series of synthesis studies is to be highly welcomed both by development practitioners and by development scholars and students, because it encapsulates in one product a set of general and essential conclusions and lessons, valid for entire categories of projects, and not just for one case or another. Obviously, producing this kind of syntheses is of high value from both a cognitive perspective and a practical operational perspective.

The Executive Summary of the new IP study outlines the *"main conclusions from the cases investigated"* as follows:

- *"The frequency of resettlement complaints in the Panel's caseload confirms that involuntary resettlement is one of the most challenging aspects of development. Indeed, many of the emerging lessons that the Panel describes here are recurring and reinforce lessons derived from other recent studies of resettlement. That underscores the need for expertise and additional care and attention when working on projects that involve involuntary resettlement.*
- *The Bank's ultimate policy goal of conceiving and executing resettlements as sustainable development programs has not been achieved in many of the cases investigated by the Panel. It is clear that project activities do not lead to this goal without a deliberate approach to resettlement.*
- *Better analysis of the full economics of resettlement is needed and must go beyond project costs and budgets to include a thorough understanding of what it takes to restore or improve the incomes and livelihoods of those who are resettled.*
- *Panel cases have positively influenced Bank practices on involuntary resettlement over time and resulted in clarifications related to the scope of application of the Bank's Policy on Involuntary Resettlement and guidelines to staff on how to address relevant aspects of the policy" (p. iv)*

### **Relevant Frequencies**

The empirical results from the subset of 21 investigations and one pilot case are presented in the study through an eloquent table which identifies the frequency of each issue and shortcoming, identified by the IP in the resettlement project operations. Since it is graphically difficult to reproduce this large table as a graph, the frequency of each issue and deficiency identified in a project is presented below as a list:

- Insufficient scoping of the risks involved in resettlement: 90.9% -- 20 projects out of 22 projects reviewed.
- Deficiencies in consultation and disclosure: 72.7% - 16 projects out of 22.

- The choice of resettlement instrument: 22.7% - 5 projects out of 22.
- Deficiencies in the supervision of displacement and resettlement: 54.5% - 12 projects out of 22.
- Inadequate compensation for lost assets and harm: 68.2% - 15 projects out of 22.
- Deficiencies in the redress of grievances: 36.4% - 8 projects out of 22.
- Issues unresolved in livelihood restoration: 81.8% - 18 projects out of 22.

Panel cases, by the way of their selection and submission to the Panel's examination, are by definition "challenging projects where things went wrong and therefore -- as the Panel underscored -- are not necessarily reflective of the Bank's entire portfolio. The lessons are important and reinforce the Bank's own reviews (of projects involving resettlement). They are intended to help build the institutional knowledge base, enhance accountability, foster better results in project outcomes, and, ultimately, contribute to more effective development" (p. iv-v).

### **Main Lessons Many of which May Be Valid for Development Studies in India**

It is beyond the space available in **Resettlement News** for this summary review to capture the full ideas, richness, and valuable findings of the Inspection Panel and the usefulness of these main lessons. During the World Bank event, these main lessons were outlined and explained in the keynote presentation made by the Panel's Chairperson, Dr. Gonzalo Castro de la Mata. Therefore, to concisely signal for **Resettlement News** readers the richness of the study and its relevance to domestic projects in India, as well as to researchers, what follows is a summary presentation of the 7 main lessons identified by the Panel with their main sub-points, using the wording of the study itself:

#### **7 Main Lessons**

**LESSON 1:** Accurate Scooping of Risks Is the Foundation of Successful Resettlement Programs

Main Subsections: "Determining the Project's Impact Area; Addressing Legacy Issues; Understanding Legal Frameworks and Institutional Capacity; Addressing Unique Risks with Land-Administration and Land-Management Activities; Carrying out Meaningful Baseline Studies"

**LESSON 2:** Meaningful Consultation and Participation Are Essential Elements of Involuntary Resettlement Programs

Main Subsections: "Participation and Meaningful Consultations; Adequate and Timely Disclosure of Information"

**LESSON 3:** Choice of the Appropriate Resettlement Instrument Is the Cornerstone of Effective Resettlement



Main Subsections: “Choosing the Instrument”

**LESSON 4:** Active Supervision Is Necessary to Effectively Identify and Resolve Problems

Main Subsections: “Supervising the Implementation of Resettlement Instruments”

**LESSON 5:** Compensation for PAPs Needs to Be Timely and Based on Sound Valuation Methodologies

Main Subsections: “Proper Valuation; Timely Compensation”

**LESSON 6:** To Be Effective, a Grievance Redress Mechanism Needs to be Accessible, Reliable, and Transparent

**LESSON 7:** Livelihood Restoration Works Best When Transitional Support, Development Assistance, and Culturally Appropriate Resettlement Alternatives Are Provided

Main Subsections: “Development Assistance and Transitional Support; Cultural Factors; Impact Monitoring and Evaluation”

The study published by the Inspection Panel contains also a set of summaries of 9 of the main project cases studied by the Panel. Two of these projects had been implemented in India: Vishnugad Pipalkoti Hydro Electric Project and Mumbai Urban Transport Project. Readers interested in these two projects can also find on the Inspection Panel’s the full size investigation report focused on each one of these two projects. The other projects summarized in this study are from Nepal, Uganda, Nigeria/Ghana, Albania, Cambodia, and Kenya.

Comments on this series could be sent to the Inspection Panel at the World Bank to: [ipanel@worldbank.org](mailto:ipanel@worldbank.org)

**Source:** *Inspection Panel 2016 Involuntary Resettlement: Emerging Lessons Series No 1 Washington DC: The World Bank (36 pages)*

## **CONFERENCES AND WORKSHOPS**

### ***Workshop on Infrastructure and Population Displacement at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Boston, USA)***

A very interesting workshop on *The State of Hydropower Projects Today* has taken place in May 2016 at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in Cambridge, MA USA. The workshop was organized by MIT and DRAN. “DRAN” stands for *Displacement Research and Action Network* and was established as an initiative of the Program for Human Rights and Justice at the Department of Urban Studies and

Planning at MIT. The convener and organizer of the workshop was Prof. Balakrishnan Rajagopal, who teaches at MIT and is the President of DRAN.

The workshop's theme was selected as a DRAN collective examinations and debate of important changes recently announced in the international architecture of financing for development. In essence, these changes will be triggered by the channeling of very massive resources in designing and implementing infrastructure projects of various kinds. A central place among such infrastructure projects is envisaged to constructing hydropower mega-dams in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, and also to a vast expansion in building infrastructure needed for the modern transportation of people and goods.

The building of many large-scale hydropower projects has not registered over the last decades a record of comprehensive successes, and thus has triggered strong challenges and public criticism. Among various social and environmental dis-functionalities, such constructions have also been accompanied by preventable social disasters and impoverishment consequences resulting from several typical causes: the misplanning and underfinancing of the projects' forced displacement and resettlement components; massive cost overruns; extensive construction delays; and cumulative short- and long term negative environmental impacts.. The workshop was convened to enable a group of known scholars in the development field to take stock of important lessons, discuss them, and identify ways in which past errors might be avoided in the future.

Organized "by invitation only", the workshop brought together scholars of different specialties: engineers; social anthropologists and sociologists specialized in population resettlement; urban specialists; infrastructure planners; arbitration and negotiation researchers; one economist; and representatives of social movements and of civil society organizations. Most participants were from the US, but some also came from far away developing countries, like Nepal, Brazil, and India. A number of MIT college and graduate students were also invited to attend the workshop.

The Keynote Address at the workshop was presented by Prof. Michael M. Cernea (George Washington University, formerly the Senior Advisor for Social Policies and Sociology of the World Bank), on the topic: *The Return of Large Hydropower Dams: Lessons Learned and Lessons Ignored from Past Projects*. The first plenary of the workshop, Chaired by Michael Hooper (Harvard University), gave place to an animated open floor discussion on the key question: "What lessons from the past have been learned?"

The panel of speakers who addressed this question and offered support, comments, or challenges to the many points made in the Cernea keynote address consisted of Prof. Kevin Gallagher (Boston University), Prof. Balakrishnan Rajagopal (MIT and DRAN), Dr. Peter Bosshard (International Rivers), Dr. Mohan Manandhar (Nepal and DRAN), Prof. Flavia Braga Viera (University of Rio de Janeiro and Movement of Persons Affected by Dams), and Prof. Larry Susskind (MIT).

The discussion during this part focused largely on the risks of impoverishment that displacements by dams and large reservoirs regularly impose on the populations subjected to compulsory displacement and involuntary resettlement, and on strategies that are indispensable to reduce and eliminate such risks. Participants also emphasized

that hydropower dams, although seen as one of the important avenues for replacing fossil fuels and help reduce global warming and the risks of climate change, are in their turn not free of immediate adverse effects of their own on the environment.

Several participants pointed to the direct responsibility of Governments and private corporations that invest in dam building while also surreptitiously externalizing parts of the projects' cost on the society at large and, primarily, on the reservoir populations subjected to severe risks of impoverishment by expropriation and forced-displacement. In turn, downstream populations are also subjected to risks and sometimes victimized by improper management of water releases from the reservoir. In this context, participants concurred on the usefulness of the Impoverishment Risk and Reconstruction Model (IRR) as one of the important planning tools for dam projects and their resettlement components.

The strength and utility of the IRR Model is its predictive force in indicating the fundamental risks of pauperizations to which hydropower projects expose the populations they affect adversely. Because these risks are known in advance, they must be factored into the planning from the outset and commensurate financing must be allocated to invest in the reconstruction of the productive economic basis of the displaced population and for providing training and jobs as needed.

An intense discussion in this respect was sparked by the assertion that compensation alone has been proven as insufficient for restoring assets, livelihoods, and the productive systems dismantled by land acquisition, displacement, the closing of businesses, and the loss of mutual help and service networks. Compensation is nothing more than a form of repayment for inflicted losses, not a development investment. Frequently compensation practice is vitiated by open and hidden distortions: incomplete asset inventories; under-valued calculations; price changes, theft, and diversions; omission of the real-life transaction costs which were involved in building the past economic farming systems that are eliminated by expropriation.

Countless empirical studies have documented convincingly that “just compensation” is more a rhetorical formula employed by the agents of displacement than being used scrupulously and systematically, in a monitored way, effective to preempt cost externalization and the pauperization of those displaced.

The theme of the second plenary of the workshop, chaired by Prof. Gabriela Carolini (MIT), was “Current Dilemmas: Costs, Impacts, and Alternatives.” The session was opened by a second panel of eminent speakers: Prof. Atif Asnar (Oxford University), Dr. Reazul Ahsan (Fellow MIT Malaysia Sustainable Cities and DRAN), Prof. Elfatih Eltahir (MIT), Dr. Miloon Kothari (India and DRAN), Dr. Ryan Schlieff (Director, International Accountability Project), and Prof. James Wescoat (MIT).

Much of the discussion in this session focused on increasing the use of benefits resulting from hydropower dam construction for supporting the sustainable reestablishment of dam-displaced populations on a productive basis, and preempt the toxic effects of impoverishment risks. Participants brought into discussion China's experiences in pursuing its announced strategy of “resettlement with development,” predicated on channeling a predetermined proportion of anticipated dam benefits from power into the area in which the reservoir-displaced populations are resettled. Unfortunately, there is still insufficient research available on the outcomes of this

strategy and on the technical approaches for implementing it. Several participants emphasized also the importance of India's new legislation, recently adopted (the LARR), predicated on increasing compensation for land acquisition and on using mandatory SIA (social impact assessment) studies as part of dam project planning and preparation in all projects in which land acquisition and displacement are anticipated. India's new law provides for reforming some of the dysfunctional practices which characterized displacement under the previous land act, dating from over one century ago, which was replaced by the LARR.

Much emphasis was put on transparency and accountability about the adverse effects of hydropower dams and on the need to change the culture of dam planning and project implementation. India has one of the largest research literatures on the social impacts of dam construction, but, as some speakers noted, the findings resulting from such research are insufficiently recognized and acted upon by India's state governments. India also stands out among developing countries by having a very active and widespread network of NGOs and CSOs (civil society organizations). However, although the new law has been in effect already for almost three years, the empirical research on the LARR practical application is still very scarce.

Notably, the workshop was attended also by a number of MIT students, being trained mostly in various engineering specialties. Referring to their participation, some participants stressed the importance of providing systematic training in all technical universities on the economic, social and environmental dimensions of population resettlement. This is indispensable, in developing countries as well, in order to complement the technical training of the future engineers with knowledge from social sciences indispensable to building the students' understanding of the major social, economic, human rights and social justice issues involved in accelerated infrastructure development. Participants from outside MIT commended DRAN the MIT's Program on Human Rights and Justice for organizing the workshop.

The workshop was concluded with the remarks of Professor Balakrishnan Rajagopal, who announced that DRAN would continue periodically organizing such workshops on population resettlement issues, giving increased attention to urban resettlement experiences in developing countries.

### ***76<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of The Society For Applied Anthropology (SfAA)*** Vancouver, Canada, 29 March to 2 April, 2016

The Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA) held its 76<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting from 29<sup>th</sup> March to 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2016 in Vancouver, Canada. Close to 4,000 participants from all over the world attended this international gathering of anthropologists, archeologists, social scientists, applied/ development practitioners, climate scientists and community organizers. This year's program was focused on the important theme of intersection. "Intersections" highlights one of the great strengths of anthropology and related engaged social sciences, because of the ability for strategic engagement with other domains of knowledge and problem solving aimed at sustainable development and progress. In sum, the meeting highlighted the applied and practicing anthropology that is being undertaken worldwide.

The SfAA Program included 700 plus sessions over the five-day period. An important focus of the program was involuntary resettlement and development co-hosted by International Network on Displacement and Resettlement (INDR). The INDR Program Chair, Juan Xi (University of Akron) organized 14 sessions under INDR for the 2016 meeting. The sessions were intellectually stimulating and covered topics including reservoir resettlement, mining related resettlement, environment/climate change related resettlement, and urban resettlement. Many of the sessions focused on China led by a group of seasoned specialists from the National Research Centre for Resettlement (NRCR), Hohai University. To date, China has produced the largest number of resettlers from hydropower, mining, highways and urban development projects. Several of the presentations highlighted the Chinese resettlement policy development, unique national and local challenges, innovations, and best practices in the management of resettlement in China. Other key contributions focused on theoretical and methodological development for re-settlement research, including the ongoing social safeguards policy changes of international financial institutions, practical challenges and national contexts.

INDR President Ted Downing was unable to attend; however, he joined couple of sessions via skype. Others who attended and contributed to the sessions include Michael Cernea, Christopher McDowell, Tony Oliver-Smith, Art Hansen, Guoqing Shi, Shaojun Chen, Ruwani Jayewardene, Susanna Price, Chris de Wet, Brook Wilmsen, Robert Hitchcock, Armine Simonyn, Michaela Bergman, Duan Yuefang, Brian Tilt and Eddie Smyth.

The 77th SfAA meeting will be held in Santa Fe, New Mexico from 28 March to 01 April 2017. The theme is “Trails, Traditions and New Directions” and their implications for practice, theory and action. Metaphorically, this theme highlights the importance of understanding the history and the intended destination of those theoretical “trails” that we follow when engaging our community partners, methodology, and active interpretations.

**Editor's Note:** *The author of this Report, Mohammad Zaman is a Fellow of the Society for Applied Anthropologists (SfAA)*

## **NEW PUBLICATIONS AND REPORTS**

**Pushed Aside: Displaced for ‘Development’ in India A Report written and researched by Nadine Walicki and Maria Swain Geneva: IDMC and NRC July 2016**

By providing a first-hand account of development projects and business activities that have caused displacement across India, this report documents and analyses the scale, process and impacts of this phenomenon. It contributes to the existing body of evidence on the type of displacement and aims to raise awareness among policy-makers, business elites, academics, NGOs and operational decision makers at the national and international level.

The report examines nine cases of displacement caused by development in the states of Gujarat, Jharkhand, Kerala, and the national capital territory of Delhi. They reveal failed regulation, inadequate enforcement and harm to communities that extend to other cases elsewhere in India. They show that land acquisitions have pushed people

aside with no regard for their rights or needs for decades. They are the result of government indifference and a failure to monitor the human rights impacts of projects and establish accountability mechanisms to address them.

The report shows that:

- Government power over land, and its severe approach to dissent are key factors in enabling and perpetuating displacement in the context of development projects. Land acquisitions are facilitated by the exploitation of “public interest” to justify project approval, the use of “special economic zones” to circumvent legal safeguards, inaccurate land categorization, prejudice against the poor and working classes, and lack of transparency. With international evictions standards not adhered to, indigenous peoples’ rights are not respected, and those affected face a power imbalance when trying to assert their rights.
- The authorities’ indifference to – and neglect of – the adverse human and socio-economic impacts on the displaced and society at large lead to a fall in living standards and fractured social networks. IDPs’ access to livelihood becomes more difficult after eviction and income levels, food security and health and education suffer as a result. Housing conditions deteriorate because compensation, resettlement assistance and rehabilitation support are insufficient or not provided. Women and indigenous peoples tend to suffer the adverse effects of displacement disproportionately.
- Data in the pattern of IDPs movement and their progress towards durable solutions is inadequate, leading to underestimates of the scale and consequences of displacement. Patterns of movement are not documented because nationwide data on the number, location and needs of those displaced is not publicly available, whether they are settled or not. In many cases however, displacement tends to become protracted and durable solutions are rare.

The case studies for this report contribute to the global evidence base on displacement caused by development. The detrimental impacts of development projects in India highlight the need to address the issue in key policy agendas and discussions. Despite IDPs’ awareness of their rights and resistance to their eviction and displacement, they will not escape poverty without significant external support and systemic changes to social and economic policies.

The findings of the case studies can help to inform the implementation of new and upcoming UN frameworks on sustainable development at the national and local level, such as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the New Urban Agenda. Both agendas commit to “leave no one behind” and explicitly include IDPs. They could also be used to inform the creation and revision of corporate and financial institutions’ policies on displacement and resettlement, and the work of UN mandate holders, treaty body committees and agencies.

Global development agendas should ensure that while development projects may alleviate poverty for some, they should not at the same time create new poor or heighten the existing economic vulnerabilities of those evicted. Neglecting those evicted and displaced would undermine the achievement of global development goals. The timescale for planning and implementing projects provide ample opportunity to avoid or

minimize displacement, and put measures in place to ensure that those who were displaced achieve durable solutions.

**Development-Induced Displacement in India and China: A Comparative Look at the Burdens of Growth** Edited by *Florence Padovani Lanham*. Boulder, New York, London: Lexington Books 2016

Although a huge amount of literature has grown around Indian and Chinese development experiences, not much has been written in a comparative perspective on development-induced involuntary resettlement. Other than this edited volume comparing Indian and Chinese experiences on this major development issue, perhaps the only other well-researched contribution is a paper titled “Involuntary Resettlement in China and India: A Comparison of Policies and Practices” by Hari Mohan Mathur, which he presented at the 4<sup>th</sup> China-India Roundtable on Population Policies and Development’ held at the Centre for Asian Studies, The University of Hong Kong, 22-23 September 2015. It is hoped that more scholars will initiate studies on this subject of growing interest.

In recent years, the world seems to be discovering that these two countries are big players in Asia, and political and economic contacts between the two are increasing. But the countries do not have much in common and many experiences to share. Both are developing countries with a dynamic economy focused on lifting their people out of poverty. Both have huge populations that are at once an asset and a burden, and both have millions of resettles. There are also some major differences; the fact that India is a democracy and China an autocratic state is clearly reflected in the speed of economic growth in the two countries. The aim of the book is not to provide a comprehensive comparison; it is to provide a focus on development-induced involuntary resettlement, especially that caused by urban development and dam construction. The two projects selected are Mumbai and Shanghai, and the two dams the Gosikhurd and the Three Gorges.

This book brings together scholars and practitioners from India and China for a dialogue. Some of them are either currently associated with or are former consultants to the Asian Development Bank or the World Bank. Some others are academics. This book is a great resource for researchers, policymakers and students interested in Indian and Chinese resettlement experiences.

**Challenges in Implementing Best Practices in Involuntary Resettlement: A Case Study in Sri Lanka**, by *Jayantha Perera, Ameresena Gamaathige, and Chamindra Weerackody*, Manila: Asian Development Bank (forthcoming)

Infrastructure projects physically displace households, and disrupt income sources and livelihoods. ADB offers several good governance practices as best practices to its borrowers to minimize such adverse impacts.

The absorption of such best practices by countries is usually slow and erratic. This book presents an in-depth case study from a complex and sensitive infrastructure project in Sri Lanka – Southern Transport Development Project - where the merger of

international best practices in involuntary resettlement with local legal systems was satisfactorily achieved.

The book demonstrates however that the application of best practices to infrastructure projects need continuous consultations with affected people, and more commitment of resources.

**RESETTLEMENT News**, published twice a year in January and July, reports on current operational, research and capacity building work in resettlement from around the world. The aim is to disseminate practical experience, information and ideas among those working for resettlement agencies, development research centres, and management training institutes. It is published by the **Resettlement News** Network - an informal network of individuals with a concern for the fate of people who are forced to relocate due to development projects.

The submission of material relating to any aspect of development-induced resettlement is welcomed, and should be addressed to the Editor:

Hari Mohan Mathur  
Resettlement News Network  
C95 Jagan Path, Sardar Patel Marg  
Jaipur 302001, India  
Tel: 91(141)2364982  
E-mail: [HariMohanMathur@gmail.com](mailto:HariMohanMathur@gmail.com)  
Website: [www.displacement.net](http://www.displacement.net) or [www.indr.org](http://www.indr.org)