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Accountability in Resettlement Monitoring and Using Control Groups

What is success in “resettlement”?  
Why is it so difficult to assess success in resettlement?  
Successful cases  
Monitoring methods and using control groups  
Case 1: Tahtali Dam  
Case 2: Oil Project in Vietnam  
For an accountable monitoring..
“Success” in resettlement

“when the resettled people end up better-off, in terms of income and livelihood, or at least restore to the same level as before” (Cernea, 2008, p. 23)

◦ What percentage needs to be equal or better-off?
◦ How and when should the assessments be held?
Why so difficult to assess a resettlement project?

- Large numbers of people
- Different categorizations
- Heterogenous groups
- People move
- Particular difficulties in assessing livelihoods (no accounting, tendency to not want to declare income)
- Need for longitudinal data
- Changing conditions
- Lack of official statistical data
- Lack of baseline data

Political nature of the field
“Successful” resettlement cases in literature

  - 500 HHs, 100%, 6 years after resettlement, quantitative + qualitative tools

- Shuikou Hydroelectric Power Plant, China (ADB, 2000)
  - 17000 HHs, 3% (same HHs - 5 years), 4-8 years after resettlement, qn+ql tools

- Dalian Water Supply, China (Zhu et al., 2000)
  - 239 HHs, 12%, 1-2 years after resettlement, qualitative tools

► Why only resettled people?

“Success” for some “failure” for others

- Sardar Sarovar Dam, India
- Kotapanjang Dam, Indonesia

What is an accountable monitoring?
Monitoring methods

◦ Quantitative and/or qualitative tools
◦ 1 year to 8 years after resettlement
◦ 100% - 3%
◦ Following up with same people over time— one close-out survey
◦ Only resettled people
◦ No control groups (except for two studies)
Tahtali Dam
Turkey, 1998

1400 affected HHs
Resettled, people, economically displaced and uncompensated groups
Survey with 20% of affected HHs
12 years after resettlement
Quantitative and qualitative tools
Control group chosen with affected people
1994 baseline available
(Satiroglu, 2015)
Tahtali Dam

Qualitative Results

Quantitative results

% who claimed to be better or worse off

Income in 2011, TRY/person/year
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Vietnam, oil project, 2015

Three resettlement sites, host communities and economically displaced people

No official statistics

No baseline data

Livelihood commitment - When do we finish?

4200 affected HHs

Survey with 20% of affected HHs

2-7 years after resettlement

Quantitative and qualitative tools
Composition of average monthly income per person per month (VND/person/month)

- Other income
- House rent
- Interest from bank savings
- Fish products
- Fishing
- Forestry
- Aquaculture
- Social allowence
- Pension
- Agriculture
- Livestock breeding

Resettled
Host
Economically displaced
Control group
For an accountable monitoring..

- Using both qualitative and quantitative tools
- Taking representative samples
- Not only resettled people, but considering all affected groups including host communities and economically affected people
- Triangulating the assessment with a control group

Thank you for listening
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