

LSC, LUMPL



**Elevated Conveyor Belt,  
Meghalaya: *Social Impact  
Assessment & Social Impact  
Mitigation Plan Rehabilitation  
Action Plan***

July 2002

**ERM India Private Limited**  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, 3 Palam Marg, Vasant Vihar  
New Delhi - 110 057, India  
Telephone 91 11 615 45 50  
Facsimile 91 11 615 45 48  
Email: india@erm.com

LSC, LUMPL

**Elevated Conveyor Belt,  
Meghalaya: *Social Impact  
Assessment & Social Impact  
Mitigation Plan Rehabilitation Action  
Plan***

July 2002

Reference I-5466

For and on behalf of ERM

Approved by: ***Dr T K Moulik***

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Position: ***Vice Chairman & CEO***

Date: ***22 July 2002***

This report has been prepared by ERM India Private Limited a member of Environmental Resources Management Group of companies, with all reasonable skill, care and diligence within the terms of the Contract with the client, incorporating our General Terms and Conditions of Business and taking account of the resources devoted to it by agreement with the client.

We disclaim any responsibility to the client and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of the above.

This report is confidential to the client and we accept no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report, or any part thereof, is made known. Any such party relies on the report at their own risk.

## **CONTENTS**

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>PROJECT BACKGROUND</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>LAYOUT OF THE REPORT</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>THE PROJECT</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b>PROJECT AREA</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>PROJECT OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.3</b>	<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>LEGISLATIVE &amp; REGULATORY FRAMEWORK</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>GUIDELINES APPLICABLE FOR SOCIAL ISSUES</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>LEGISLATION / GUIDELINES APPLICABLE FOR MEGHALAYA</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>ADMINISTRATIVE &amp; SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE OF THE REGION</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>GENERAL ADMINISTRATION</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>DEMOGRAPHY</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4.3</b>	<b>SOCIAL STRUCTURE</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.4</b>	<b>LAND TENURE SYSTEM</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>4.5</b>	<b>OCCUPATIONAL PATTERN</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>4.6</b>	<b>BANKING &amp; COMMERCE</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>4.7</b>	<b>INFRASTRUCTURE</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>APPROACH &amp; METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE ASSIGNMENT</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>APPROACH &amp; METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>PROJECT AFFECTED FAMILIES: A SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b>LOCATION OF THE AFFECTED FAMILIES</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF THE PAFs</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>6.3</b>	<b>FAMILY SIZE</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>6.4</b>	<b>OCCUPATIONAL PATTERN OF THE PAFs</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>6.5</b>	<b>LANDHOLDING DETAILS</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>6.6</b>	<b>INCOME PROFILE OF PAFs</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>6.7</b>	<b>VULNERABILITY</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>6.8</b>	<b>LIMITATIONS</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>7.1</b>	<b>LOSS OF COMMUNITY LAND</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>7.2</b>	<b>LOSS OF LAND</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>7.3</b>	<b>LOSS OF LIVELIHOOD &amp; INCOME</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>7.4</b>	<b>VULNERABILITY DUE TO EXTENT OF LANDLOSS</b>	<b>50</b>

<b>8</b>	<b>ENTITLEMENT FRAMEWORK &amp; REHABILITATION ACTION PLAN (RAP)</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>8.1</b>	<b>ENTITLEMENTS</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>8.2</b>	<b>REHABILITATION ACTION PLAN</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' DEVELOPMENT PLAN (IPDP)</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>9.1</b>	<b>OBJECTIVE OF THE IPDP</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>9.2</b>	<b>SCOPE OF THE IPDP</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>9.3</b>	<b>LOCAL CONTEXT RELEVANT FOR IPDP</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>9.4</b>	<b>IDENTIFICATION OF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>9.5</b>	<b>PROJECT PROPONENT'S COMMITMENT ON IPDP</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>STRATEGY FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>10.1</b>	<b>STAKEHOLDERS</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>10.2</b>	<b>REVIEW OF PREVIOUS CONSULTATION</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>10.3</b>	<b>PUBLIC CONSULTATION &amp; DISCLOSURE PROGRAM</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL MECHANISM</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>IMPLEMENTATION ACTION PLAN</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>12.1</b>	<b>FINALISATION OF AGREEMENTS WITH THE VILLAGE DURBARS FOR THE</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>12.2</b>	<b>FINALISATION OF AGREEMENTS AND TRANSFER OF PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL LANDOWNERS</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>12.3</b>	<b>UPDATING THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC INFORMATION OF PAFs</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>12.4</b>	<b>IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RAP</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>12.5</b>	<b>IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' DEVELOPMENT PLAN (IPDP)</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>12.6</b>	<b>PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>12.7</b>	<b>MONITORING AND EVALUATION</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>13.1</b>	<b>LAFARGE SURMA CEMENT</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>13.2</b>	<b>LUM MAWSHUN MINERALS PRIVATE LIMITED (LMMPL)</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>13.3</b>	<b>LAFARGE UMIAM MINING PRIVATE LIMITED (LUMPL)</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>13.4</b>	<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>13.5</b>	<b>INDEPENDENT SUPPORT AGENCY</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>13.6</b>	<b>VILLAGE INSTITUTIONS</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>MONITORING &amp; EVALUATION</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>14.1</b>	<b>INTERNAL MONITORING</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>14.2</b>	<b>EXTERNAL MONITORING &amp; EVALUATION</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>14.3</b>	<b>REPORTING</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>BUDGET &amp; COST ESTIMATES</b>	<b>84</b>



This report has been prepared by ERM India Pvt Ltd on behalf of Lafarge Surma Cement (LSC), Bangladesh and contains the Social Impact Assessment and Mitigation Plan, including the findings of the Social Assessment, Entitlement Framework and Rehabilitation Action Plan (RAP), the Indigenous Peoples' Development Plan (IPDP) and the Public Consultation and Disclosure Plan (PCDP) for the proposed Elevated Conveyor Belt Project associated with the proposed limestone and shale/silt stone mining project in Nongtraï, Meghalaya.

This report assesses the possible socio-economic impacts likely to emerge due to the construction of the elevated conveyor belt, and describes how the project proponents propose to avoid or minimise adverse effects. Where adverse effects are unavoidable, this plan proposes a plan for consultation, compensation and community development for mitigation of the socio-economic impacts towards the overall objective of restoring socio-economic conditions, and where possible, improving them.

**1.1****PROJECT BACKGROUND**

Lum Mawshun Minerals Private Limited (LMMPL) and Lafarge Umiam Mining Private Limited (LUMPL) proposes to set up an open cast limestone and shale/silt stone mine at Phalangkaruh, Nongtraï - Shella, within the Shella Confederacy in the district of East Khasi Hills, Meghalaya, India. The proposed mine will extract about 2 million tonnes of limestone per annum and 0.35 million tonnes of shale/silt stone that will be transported to the proposed cement plant at Chhatak in Bangladesh through an elevated belt conveyor. The proposed belt conveyor corridor will be approximately 17 km in length, of which 7.2 km will lie within the Indian territory, while the remaining part will be situated in the Bangladesh territory.

Lum Mawshun Minerals Private Limited (LMMPL), a joint venture company incorporated in India with 74% equity participation of Lafarge Surma Cement Ltd (LSC), is the lease holding company, while Lafarge Umiam Mining Private Limited (LUMPL), a 100% subsidiary of LSC incorporated in India, is the operating company for the mining project.

**1.2****LAYOUT OF THE REPORT**

The remaining part of this report has been organised as follows:

Section 2	provides the background of the project
Section 3	summarises the relevant rules and regulations, including the legislative framework of the state
Section 4	gives the socio-economic profile of the project region
Section 5	summarises the approach and methodology adopted for the study

Section 6	provides the socio-economic profile of the project affected families
Section 7	provides the analysis of impacts
Section 8	details the entitlement framework and the Rehabilitation Action Plan (RAP)
Section 9	includes the Indigenous Peoples' Development Plan (IPDP)
Section 10	details the strategy for public participation
Section 11	describes the grievance redressal mechanism
Section 12	outlines the plan for implementation of the mitigation programs
Section 13	reviews the organisations and the institutions responsible for the implementation of the mitigation plan
Section 14	proposes a mechanism for monitoring and evaluation of the plan
Section 15	provides the cost estimates for implementation of the plan
Section 16	provides the time schedule for implementation of the various components of the mitigation program.

**2.1 PROJECT AREA****2.1.1 Site Selection**

The proposed mining plant site has been selected based on following considerations:

- Availability of rich belt of limestone and shale/silt stone in this region;
- Closeness of Indian territory to that of Bangladesh for supply of limestone and shale/silt stone for a cement plant to be located at Chattak in Bangladesh;

**2.1.2 Project Site**

The project area lies in the north eastern Indian state of Meghalaya in the southern part of the East Khasi Hills District, near the international border with Bangladesh (refer to *Figure 2.1*). The project area falls within the Community Development (CD) Blocks of Mawsynram and Shella Bholaganj within the Shella Confederacy.

The project area consists of:

- Mine lease area
- Belt Conveyor route

*Mining Lease Area*

The limestone mining lease area lies within the Mawsynram CD Block between the latitudes 25° 11' 25" N & 25° 12' 00" N and longitudes 91° 37' 28" E & 91° 38' 01" E. The lease area falls in hamlet Phlangkaruh, in the Nongtraï village and lies on the western side of the Umium River, about 2 km NW of village Shella Bazaar. The mining lease area lies within the jurisdiction of the Nongtraï village. The map showing limestone mine area and its key plan are shown in *Figure 2.2*. The details of the land contained within the limestone lease area are given in following *Table 2.1*:

**Table 2.1 Details of the Limestone Lease Area**

District & State	P.S./ Taluka	Proposed Mine Area	Ownership of land within the lease area	Nearest Villages and crow fly distances
East Khasi Hills, Meghalaya	Shella.	100 hectares	Village Durbar of Nongtraï	Phlangkaruh (about 1 km to the South) Shella Bazaar (about 2 km to the South-east) Pyrkan Village (about 1.5 km to the South-southeast)

The Nongtraï / Shella area is located in the southern part of the East Khasi Hills District. To the south of the lease area lies the international border between India and Bangladesh which runs in an east-west direction.

#### *Belt Conveyor Route*

The 17 km conveyor belt track originates from the crushing unit at the southern side of the lime stone mine site and terminates at the cement plant in Chhatak in Bangladesh. On the Indian territory, it runs for about 7 km on the western side of the River Umiam. It traverses across hilly terrain at the point of origin from the crushing unit, over stretches of flat barren land, a dry channel of Umiam riverbed and across cultivated agricultural lands up to the international border with Bangladesh.

The belt conveyor traverses mostly across private lands owned by the people of the Shella village. However, at the point of origin from the crushing unit, the route crosses the community lands belonging to the village durbars of Nongtraï and about midway across the route traverses through the dry river bed belonging to the Shella durbar.

The affected lands mostly consist of uncultivated barren lands covered with bushes or jungle, although as the conveyor belt route moves along the plains towards the Bangladesh border, there are long stretches of paddy fields.

In the part of the conveyor belt lying within the Indian territory, the construction of the conveyor belt would require a 40 m wide strip of land and in some cases, up to 70m, especially in the hilly areas.

## **2.2**

### ***PROJECT OBJECTIVE***

Meghalaya is very rich in mineral resources like limestone, shale, coal, sillimanite and uranium. The size of limestone deposits in Meghalaya has been estimated at 2166 million tonnes, with additional unconfirmed deposits of 180 million tonnes. Most of the deposits are currently lying unutilised and can be exploited commercially for the development of the state.

Bangladesh is almost wholly dependent on limestone imported from other countries, mostly from the state of Meghalaya in India. With the growing co-operation between India and Bangladesh, LSC is proposing to set up a cement plant in Bangladesh with limestone and shale/silt stone to be sourced from Meghalaya through LMMPL / LUMPL.

The objectives of the proposed mining project are to conduct limestone and shale/silt stone mining, while achieving a balance between impacts on the local environment, community needs and economic viability. For the proposed mine, LMMPL/LUMPL aims to achieve the following objectives:

#### **2.2.1**

#### ***Production and Operational***

- establish open cast limestone and shale/silt stone mine producing export quality limestone and shale/silt stone;

- develop and manage the mine in an environmentally sensitive manner according to the regulatory requirements and best environmental practices, whilst ensuring economic viability;
- maximise operational flexibility;
- optimise resource use; and
- develop and operate a mine that meets or exceeds community expectations in terms of environmental outcomes and cost.

### **2.2.2 Environmental**

- protect native flora and fauna;
- protect quality of local surface and groundwater;
- minimise public health risks from mine operations;
- ensure that ecological balance of the area should not be adversely affected by dust; and
- minimise noise and blasting impacts on surroundings.

### **2.2.3 Socio-economic**

- maximise local employment and educational opportunities by direct and indirect means;
- protect the surrounding during the operation of the mine with appropriate environmental safeguards;
- maintain safety along the belt conveyor corridor while conveying limestone or shale/siltstone to Bangladesh;
- establish monitoring program and provide procedures for the resolutions community concerns; and

## **2.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The salient features of the proposed limestone mines are briefly summarised below in *Table 2.2*.

**Table 2.2 Salient Features of the Proposed Limestone Quarry**

<b>Salient Features of the Proposed Limestone Quarry</b>	
Method of mining	Fully Mechanised Opencast mining (Drilling 115 mm dia), Shovel (4.3 m <sup>3</sup> ), Dumper (18 t) combination.
Mining leased area	100 hectares (excluding the residential complex)
On site and offsite infrastructure facilities	Mine Office Complex, Explosive magazine Crushing plant and Loading unit Sub-station for Electricity supply Residential complex for employees Belt conveyor
Geological reserves	
Proved reserves	35.7 million tonnes
Probable Reserves	35.84 million tonnes
Possible Reserves	136.12 million tonnes
Mineable reserves (based on proved reserves only)	32.01 million tonnes
Command area	90.4 hectares

---

**Salient Features of the Proposed Limestone Quarry**

---

Ultimate pit depth	Up to 90 m RL
Pit Slope angle	Maximum 45°
Bench height	10 m
Statutory barrier width from the lease boundary	7.5 m
Life of the Mine	Proved Mineable reserves - 16 years Probable reserves - 12 years Possible reserves - 25 years
ROM Limestone	800 tph
Method of cuts	Bench cut up to 10 m
Average Quality of Limestone	CaO 51.90% MgO 1.08% SiO <sub>2</sub> 1.96% Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> 1.05% Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub> 0.60%
Annual limestone production	2.0 mpta of crushed limestone (-80 mm) i.e. 7,000 tonnes per day
Targeted commencement year of production	Year 2004
Present owner of the land	Nongtraï village Durbar
Land Lease Period	35 years
Working hours	Two shifts 8 hour basis
No of employees (current estimate)	57

---

The mining method chosen is conventional drilling and blasting followed by loading. It is proposed to set up a crushing unit just outside the lease area on the southern side. The run-of-mine limestone of approximately 1000 mm size will be fed into a single stage impactor, which will crush the limestone to 80 mm.

#### *Belt conveyor*

The project proponents propose to install an overhead conveyor from the crusher at the mine site to the cement plant in Chhatak in Bangladesh to transport the limestone and shale/silt stone.

The salient features of the belt conveyor system are summarised below:

- Capacity: 800 tph
- Proposed Belt Speed: about 3 m / sec
- Distance: 17 km (approximately) – 7 km within India and 10 km in Bangladesh
- Clearance above the ground level: 5m
- Working hours: normally 2 shifts per day for 6 days a week
- Elevation at despatch point: 80-90 m RL approximately
- Elevation at the border and beyond in Bangladesh: 15 m RL

**3.1 GUIDELINES APPLICABLE FOR SOCIAL ISSUES**

Although the proposed project will not involve any physical relocation of people and thus will not entail any resettlement, the project will involve loss of land and other productive assets which will have some impacts on livelihood systems and income levels. Although the policies and guidelines summarised below deal primarily with resettlement issues, they also provide the principles for determining compensation packages and other entitlements.

**3.1.1 National Guideline for R & R**

There are no national guidelines for dealing with resettlement and rehabilitation issues within projects in different sectors in India. A national policy on resettlement and rehabilitation has been drafted and is being debated at various forums. It has however not yet been approved by the parliament, and therefore does not have any legal sanctity.

**3.1.2 State Policies and Acts**

There are at least five states in India that have their own policies and acts on resettlement and rehabilitation of project affected persons or displaced persons. However, Meghalaya does not have any specific policies to deal with payment of compensations to people affected by development projects.

**3.1.3 Existing Guidelines of World Bank Group**

The International Finance Corporation (IFC) has its own policies, review procedure and guidelines, including the IFC 1998 Procedure for Environmental and Social Review, IFC's Policy on Disclosure of Information. The other relevant IFC policies on social and environmental issues are the OP 4.01 on Environmental Assessment, OP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement, OD 4.20 (OP 4.10, forthcoming) on Indigenous People and OPN 11.03 (OP 4.11, forthcoming) on Cultural Property.

In absence of a national, state and sectoral policies on R & R for development projects, the project proponents would follow IFC guidelines, incorporating best practices that have emerged in the country and ensuring policies and principles adopted reflect close relationship with the ground realities and cultural context of the project area.

## **3.2 LEGISLATION / GUIDELINES APPLICABLE FOR MEGHALAYA**

### **3.2.1 Legal Status of the State of Meghalaya**

#### *Assam Reorganisation (Meghalaya) Act 1969*

Meghalaya was created by the Parliament of India in 1969. The Assam Reorganisation (Meghalaya) Act 1969 was passed by the Parliament as the Act No 55 of 1969 and assented to by the President of India on 29 December 1969. It was published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II, Section I on 30 December 1969. The act declared that on and from the date appointed by the Central Government of India there shall be formed within the State of Assam, an autonomous state to be known as Meghalaya. The territory of Meghalaya would comprise the Tribal Areas of the United Khasi and Jaintia Hills District and the Garo Hills District of the state of Assam as described in the Sixth Schedule to the Constitution. The Central Government appointed 2 April 1970 as the date for the formation of the Autonomous State of Meghalaya.

#### *North eastern Areas (Reorganisation) Act 1971*

In the session of 30 September 1970, the Meghalaya Legislative Assembly unanimously passed a resolution requesting the Government of India to grant full fledged statehood to Meghalaya. This was ultimately granted by the North eastern Areas (Reorganisation) Act 1971 which was enacted by the Parliament and received Presidential assent on 30 December 1971. The new state of Meghalaya was formed on 21 January 1972.

### **3.2.2 Legislation related to Public Administration in Meghalaya**

In addition to the above Acts, public administration of Meghalaya are also governed by the provisions laid down in Article 166 and Article 167 of the Constitution of India in Chapter II of Part VI, which deals with the executives of the State. The First Schedule of the Constitution of India also specifies rules determining the Departments of the State.

In Meghalaya, all matters concerning the constitution and dissolution of the Autonomous District Councils are governed by the provisions of the Sixth Schedule of the Constitution of India. The Sixth Schedule of the Constitution of India was brought into effect in the Garo Hills, Khasi and Jaintia Hills when the Governor of Assam exercised his powers conferred by the Sixth Schedule and published in 1951 the Rules known as the Assam Autonomous District (Constitution of District Councils) Rules 1951. The Sixth Schedule is a self-contained code for the governance of the tribal areas which empowers the Parliament to make any changes in the provisions of the Schedule without going through the formal procedures laid down in the Constitution for amendments to the Constitution.

As per the provisions of the Sixth Schedule, Meghalaya has three Autonomous District Councils – the Khasi, Jaintia and the Garo Hills District Councils. More details regarding the District Councils are provided in *Section 4.1*.

### **3.2.3**

#### ***Legal Status of the Project Affected People***

Under the Constitution of India, the provisions of the Sixth Schedule apply to the tribal areas in the state of Meghalaya.

In Meghalaya, there are 16 Scheduled Castes and 17 Scheduled Tribes as recognised by the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Act 1976 and the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order Amendment Act 1987.

The East Khasi Hills District of Meghalaya consists almost exclusively of the Khasi tribe and its sub-tribes, including the Wars, Bhois and the highlanders. The War Khasis are predominant in the southern region of the district. The project area also has the Garo ethnic groups and a few Bengali migrants forming a small segment of the population.

### **3.2.4**

#### ***Legislation related to Land***

In the tribal land administration, the community and clan councils, the Autonomous District Councils, the State Government constitute the different levels of authority who have a say in land related matters. In Meghalaya the following legislation have been enacted related to land matters:

##### *The Meghalaya Transfer of Land (Regulation) Act 1972*

This act was passed by the Meghalaya Legislative Assembly, which prohibited alienation of tribal land to non-tribals. This legislation was made by the Legislative Assembly due to the fact that a similar legislation passed by the Autonomous District Councils was declared invalid by the Supreme Court on the interpretation of the provisions of the Sixth Schedule of the Constitution of India that the District Councils can only make laws on allotment, occupation or use of land but have no powers to do so on alienation of land.

##### *Meghalaya Adaptation and Application of Laws Act 1972*

After the formation of the state of Meghalaya, the Government of Meghalaya adapted the Assam Land Revenue Regulation 1886 by the Meghalaya Adaptation and Application of Laws Act 1972, under which certain section of the Regulations were brought into force. These provisions of the Regulations were also adapted by the Autonomous District Councils of Meghalaya.

The Regulation determined the right over land, the procedure for settlement of land with the various types of land holders and tenant including the steps required to be followed in periodical Survey and Settlement Operations of the Land, the assessment of revenue and the preparation and distribution of the Records of Rights.

##### *The Meghalaya Land Survey and Record Preparation Act 1980*

The Act enables the State Government to conduct cadastral survey and prepare land records. To make the scheme operational and successful, the District Councils were also included in the operation and implementation of the scheme. In spite of the fact that officers and staff with necessary funds were

placed under the District Councils, the scheme has not made progress and Meghalaya continues to remain a non-cadastral and non-land records state. Further some community and clan landowners agitated against the scheme and took up the case in the courts.

*The Meghalaya Removal of Restrictions on use of Land and Enjoyment of Land Act 1980*

The Act made it unlawful for any landowner to impose restriction on the buyer of land regarding enjoyment and disposal of the land, such restriction shall be void notwithstanding any contract, custom or usage in the matter. The Act also made the realisation of “*salami*” or royalty in any form unlawful.

*(Public Administration in Meghalaya, J M Phira, 1996).*

In essence, the land tenure system and land administration in Meghalaya represents a collective and community defence mechanism against land alienation, impoverishment and exploitation. Attempts at reforms of land administration has in the past, evoked strong resentment among the community.

**4.1 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION****4.1.1 District Administration**

The state of Meghalaya comprises seven districts: West and East Khasi Hills, Ri Bhoi, Jaintia Hills, East, West and South Garo Hills. The district forms the basic unit of administration in the state. The head of each district in Meghalaya is the Deputy Commissioner (District Magistrate). The Deputy Commissioner plays the dual role of administrator and judicial officer. The Deputy Commissioner has overall charge of the district administration. He remains head of the general administration and the chief representative of the state government in his own district.

For the purpose of general administration, each of the districts is divided into several sub-divisions.

For the purpose of rural development, the district is further sub-divided into Community Development (CD) Blocks. The CD Block, although not a unit of general administration, are considered an important unit for the rural development projects. In the East Khasi Hills District, there are a total of nine CD Blocks – Nongpoh, Bhoi Area, Myllem, Mawryngkneng, Mawphlang, Mawkyntrew, Pynursla, Shella Bholaganj and Mawsynram CD Blocks.

**4.1.2 District Council Administration**

An important aspect of the district administration in Meghalaya, especially in the Khasi Hills, are the tribal units of administration comprising the Khasi “states” under the traditional chiefs, which is a part of the district administration. With the creation of the Autonomous District Councils under the Sixth Schedule of the Indian Constitution in 1952, the tribal institutions became by law, a part of and subordinate to the Autonomous District Councils <sup>(1)</sup>.

There are three Autonomous District Councils in the state of Meghalaya – the Khasi Hills, the Jaintia Hills and the Garo Hills Autonomous District Councils. The Khasi Hills District Council has the jurisdiction of the East and West Khasi Hills Districts and the Ri Bhoi District.

Under the Autonomous District Council Rules 1951, the District Council elects a Chairman and a Deputy Chairman. The Autonomous District Councils have three wings: legislative, executive and judiciary. The legislative and the executive wings have their own separate Secretariat headed by a Secretary as

---

(1) Autonomous District Council was created by the Sixth Schedule to the Indian Constitution as a grass root level political institution. The basic Rules governing the functioning of the District Councils in all areas were framed by the Governor of Assam in exercise of powers conferred by paragraph 2(b) of the Sixth Schedule in 1951. They are known as the Assam Autonomous District (Constitution of District Councils) Rules 1951 and are followed and enforced till date in Meghalaya. In accordance with the Rules, the first general elections to the Autonomous District Councils were held in February 1952 after which the three Autonomous District Councils in Meghalaya were constituted.

the Chief Officer. The executive function of the District Council is vested in the Executive Committee headed by the Chief Executive Member (CEM). The Executive Committee consists of upto four members elected by the Governor, in addition to the Chief Executive Member, who is elected by the Council members. For the administration of justice, there are three classes of courts:

- The District Council Court, presided over by a judge;
- The Sub-ordinate District Council Court presided by Magistrates; and
- The Additional Subordinate District Council Court generally presided over by the traditional chiefs of the Khasi “states”.

In addition there are village courts in some of the villages.

The District Council derives its income from various sources including taxes on professions and trades as well as grants – in – aid, loans and subsidies from the State Government. They also receive royalties from licenses for mineral extraction and earlier earned revenue from royalties on timber and other forest resources (presently timber trade has been prohibited). The District Council receives grants from the State Government for specific purposes such as primary education, development of roads, rural water supply and sanitation, improvement of transport facilities, implementation of forest development schemes, etc.

#### **4.1.3 Traditional Khasi “States”**

The traditional administration in Meghalaya consists of the Khasi “states” under the chiefs called Syiems, Lyngdohs, Sirdars and Wahadadars. At the time of the time of the British occupation of the Khasi Hills, there were twenty five petty states, sixteen under the Syiems, five under Sirdars, three under Lyngdohs and one under Wahadadar. These traditional “chiefs in the Khasi Hills states are not territorial Sovereigns but elected democratic chiefs and ...they have no right whatever to the soil. Lands in the Khasi Hills ....are the property of the owner.” (*Public Administration in Meghalaya, J.M. Phira, 1996*). The Khasi chiefs have authority over their subjects but not over their lands and they cannot assert territorial limits. The head of these traditional states presides over the Additional Subordinate District Council Court and is subordinate to the Subordinate District Council Court.

Each of these traditional tribal states (Syiemsships, Lyngdohships, Sirdarships or the Wahadadarship) consists of a voluntary association of a number of villages.

#### **4.1.4 Village Administration**

The administration of the village is conducted by a village durbar or *durbar* (*dorbar shnong*) or council. Every adult male member of every household in the village is required to actively participate in the deliberations of the durbar and facilitate decision making. The village durbar is presided over by a *myntri*, a *basan* or a *matabor* (local chiefs) but usually by a *Rangbah shnong*, a village elder chosen by the durbar members as per the local customs and practices to act as the headman.

In some Syiemships, there is another body composed of elders of the village durbar and presided over by a *Syiem Raid*, *Lyngdoh* raid or a *Basan Raid*.

A significant feature of the Khasi village administration is that the village headman has no individual power to decide on any issue. There are always lengthy discussions on all disputes before the durbar with the headman presiding over the meeting. Consensus is arrived at with collective wisdom being preferred to arbitrary decision making by the headman.

The durbar customarily exercises all functions for the general well being of the village. Enforcement of law and order has been the foremost duty of the village durbar. The durbar lays down the policy for the conduct of village affairs and makes rules in accordance with local customs which the village has to observe and follow. The durbar is responsible for looking after common properties, including grazing land and community forests. The durbar also looks after maintenance and upkeep of roads, drinking water sources and general sanitation of the village. These activities are generally carried out by the entire village with each household participating.

For the settlement of disputes, there is a Village Court constituted by the District Council. The village courts are found more commonly in the southern parts of the state. The persons constituting the village courts are those who have been elected by the village durbar, according to the District Council rules and regulations. The village courts consist of not less than two members and not more than six members, in addition to the headman. The jurisdictions of the courts extend to the hearing and trials of suits and cases arising within the territorial limits of the village.

#### **4.1.5 Administration in the Project Area**

The project area falls within the East Khasi Hills District and under two CD Blocks – Shella Bholaganj and Mawsynram CD Blocks with their respective headquarters at Cherrapunji and Mawsynram. The mine site area falls within the Mawsynram CD Block while the land required for the conveyor belt track belongs primarily to the people residing in the Shella village which falls under the Shella Bholaganj CD Block.

Under the traditional administrative set-up, the project area falls within the Shella Confederacy, which is the only Wahadadarship in the Khasi Hills. The Shella Confederacy is an association of nine village durbars: Shella, Nongtrai, Nongwar, Tyngnger, Mustoh, Lyngkhom, Dewesaw, Umptlang and Rumnong. The Wahadadar is the administrative head of the Shella Confederacy and is assisted by two elected representatives from each village durbar under the Confederacy.

There are ten different Khasi hamlets which comprise the Shella village durbar: Sohlap (or Shella Bazar), Disong, Jasir, Jamew, Duba, Nongrum, Rymsonkatonar, Nong – Nong, Mawryngkhong and Pyrkan. In addition, there are a number of small Garo habitations, which fall within the Shella durbar, including Umkhabaw, Khahmohi, Umtham and Dalia. The Kalatek

village also lies within the Shella durbar and is primarily inhabited by Bengali migrants.

## **4.2 DEMOGRAPHY**

### **4.2.1 Population**

As per the Census of India, 1991, the East Khasi District had a total population of 665,218, about 37% of the state's population. The CD Blocks of Mawsynram and Shella Bholaganj had an estimated 38,194 and 38,022 persons respectively in 1991.

### **4.2.2 Gender ratio**

The gender ratio (females to 1000 males) was 947, higher than the national average of 927. The gender ratio for the two CD Blocks of Shella Bholaganj and Mawsynram were higher than the district average at 954 and 964 respectively.

### **4.2.3 Urbanisation**

65% of the district's population is rural, significantly lower than the state's percentage of rural population of about 81%. Shella Bholaganj has a small urban population (about 16.76% as of 1991) while Mawsynram is entirely rural.

### **4.2.4 Decennial Growth of Population**

The decennial population growth rate for the East Khasi Hills district has been 30.07% over the 1981 – 1991 period. Shella Bholaganj has had a 25% increase in population in the decade from 1981 to 1991, while Mawsynram has shown only a limited decennial increase in population by about 12%, the lowest in the district.

### **4.2.5 Population density**

The population density of the district at 128 persons per sq km is also significantly higher than the state's average of 79. However, the population density for the region as well as for the state are considerably lower than the national average of 267 persons per sq km.

### **4.2.6 Literacy rates**

In terms of literacy rates, the district of East Khasi Hills shows higher literacy levels (60.04%) as compared to the state literacy rate of 49.1%. Although male literacy rates in the district is higher than the female literacy rate, the difference is not significant with more than 57% of the females estimated as being literates as compared to 63% of the males being literates. In general, female literacy rates in the Meghalaya at 44% is higher than the national female literacy figures of about 39%.

The literacy rates for the CD Blocks of Shella Bholaganj and Mawsynram were close to the state's averages at 49.61% and 45.91% respectively. The female

literacy rates are also closer to the state averages than the district levels at 47.54% female literacy for Shella Bholaganj and 42.77% for Mawsynram.

#### 4.2.7

#### **Social Classification**

Meghalaya is predominantly a tribal state. In Meghalaya, there are 16 Scheduled Castes and 17 Scheduled Tribes as recognised by the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Orders (Amendment) Act 1976 and the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order Amendment Act 1987. The East Khasi Hills District consists almost exclusively of the Khasi tribe and its sub-tribes, including the Wars, Bhois and Maram. The War Khasis are predominant in the southern region of the district. The project area also has the Garo ethnic groups and Bengali migrants forming a small segment of the population. However, as per the customary law of the Khasis, land ownership in the Khasi Hills is restricted to the Khasi tribes and sub-tribes.

#### 4.3

#### **SOCIAL STRUCTURE**

The East Khasi Hills District of Meghalaya consists almost exclusively of the Khasi tribe and its sub-tribes, including the Wars, Bhois and Maram. The War Khasis are predominant in the southern region of the district. The project area also has the Garo ethnic groups and Bengali migrants forming a small segment of the population.

The Khasi society has been greatly influenced by the advent of the British in the nineteenth century. The traditional beliefs and cultural practices have declined with the increasing influence of the modern culture and practices. A large segment of the Khasi community have converted to Christianity. They have partly or wholly discontinued the customary rites and ceremonies of their old Khasi religion although the matrilineal society and the law of inheritance prevails. Although “a majority of the Khasis have become Christians, the fact that they no longer profess or practice the old Khasi beliefs, .....will not debar a Khasi from his customary rights and privileges....provided that he follows the matrilineal system, observes the socio-political system of the people, identifies himself with every other respect with them, and is accepted by the community...” (*Report of the Land Reforms Commission for Khasi Hills, 1974*)

The Khasi society is a classless society consisting of a number of *kurs* (clans) each of which ascribes its origin to a primeval ancestor (*U Thawlang*) and ancestress (*Ka Iawbei*). A Khasi belongs to the *kur* of his / her mother – Khasi women typically retain their maiden names after marriage and the children adopt their mother’s family name. Descent in the Khasi society is reckoned from the mother and the children belong to the clan of the mother. Generally, the succession of property is to the *iing-khadduh* (the house of the youngest female in the family), who is considered to be the custodian of the ancestral property and is responsible for carrying out the religious duties related to her *kur*. However, among the War Khasis in the Shella Confederacy, all the children in the family (both male and female) are entitled to receive equal shares of the ancestral and acquired properties. However the youngest daughter gets an additional share in order to perform the religious rights and ceremonies of the clan.

Although a matrilineal society, the men hold an important position in the society. Although the man comes to live in his wife's house after marriage, he manages and controls the ancestral property and is the decision maker in the family. The men also control in public affairs and administration since the women in the Khasi society, usually, do not have the right to vote in the election of the traditional village durbar, nor can they attend durbar sessions in all villages. However, women in the Shella Confederacy can exercise their rights during the election of the Wahadadar.

#### 4.4

#### **LAND TENURE SYSTEM**

The land administration in Meghalaya is a unique and complex system and radically different from that prevailing in any other part of the country. Although the various Acts related to land tenure system, including the United Khasi Jaintia Hills Autonomous District (Transfer of Land) Act, 1953, the Meghalaya Transfer of Land (Regulation) Act, 1971 have made significant departures from ancient customary practices, traditional laws and customs are still followed and enforced in terms of the land tenure system. Land in Meghalaya belongs to the community and ownership of the land is divided among the various clans of the community. Each village in the Khasi hills has its known lands, in which rights of private ownership are recognised. Distribution and allotment of land for various purposes is done by the elders of the community and the clans recognised by custom and usage. The concept of tribal land administration in Meghalaya was based on the age old wisdom that land belongs to every member of the community. Land is held in trust by the community for use of its members, as and when it is needed and according to actual needs. In the Khasi hills, community land can be used for cultivation as long as required. In some cases, if the land is no longer cultivated and left abandoned for a period of more than three years, the land reverts back to the community and can be utilised by any other member of the community. Inherent in the tribal administration of land is the absence of any land records. In Meghalaya, there exist no land records and the customary laws are not codified. As the government does not own any land in the project area, it is not in a position to guarantee location and successful implementation of development schemes.

Community ownership of land in Meghalaya has sustained the people through the ages and has helped preserve the tribal institutions and identity. The system of community ownership of land however, has had its aberrations from what was originally conceived and practised. It has also been subject to abuse through the years. Due to advanced methods of agriculture and cultivation, the people have, over the years, moved from a system of shifting cultivation (*jhum*)<sup>(1)</sup> to a more permanent form of cultivation. Community lands have been converted into private lands as the law of reversion back to the community has been side-tracked due to continued use of land.

---

(1) Shifting cultivation called *jhum* was practised in Meghalaya where a plot of land was allowed a rest period of about ten years before it is again considered fit for cultivation. During the long periods of rest, the land would be allowed to be covered with forests.

In view of the diverse land tenure systems varying from region to region within the state, a need was felt to integrate the customary laws into the legislative framework. In 1973, the Government constituted a Land Reforms Commission for Khasi Hills to inquire and examine the land system and to study the difficulties in land management and administration caused by the absence of cadastral maps and record of rights, and also to recommend codification of the customary land laws and usages. However, the Commission faced difficulties as it created an impression that the Commission was a camouflage under which the Government would assess revenue on land. While the Commission attempted to codify the customary land laws and usages, till date there exist no cadastral maps and record of land ownership in Meghalaya.

The District Council is empowered to enact and make laws on all matters relating to the customs and usages of the Khasis, from land tenure system to inheritance. (*Report of the Land Reforms Commission for Khasi Hills, 1974*)

Land in the Khasi hills essentially comprises either *Ri Raid* or community land (on which every village resident has rights), *Ri Seng* (on which some of the village residents have rights, but not all) or *Ri Kynti*, private land.

*Ri Raid* lands are lands set apart for the community over which no persons have proprietary, heritable or transferable rights excepting for the right to use and occupancy. Such rights revert back to the community when the person ceases to occupy or use the land for a period of three years consecutively. Heritable or transferable rights over *Ri Raid* lands accrue when the occupant has made permanent improvements on the land.

*Ri Seng* lands are those lands which belong to a group of people or to an association. All members of this association have rights on this land, but not the entire village, as different from *Ri Raid* land.

*Ri Kynti* lands are lands set apart from the time of the founding of the state for certain clans upon whom were bestowed the proprietary, heritable and transferable rights over such lands. The same applies when the lands are disposed of by the original owners by way of sale or transfer of the land as mentioned before, in the Khasi Hills District

#### **4.4.1      *Transfer of Land***

In Meghalaya, land transfer within the Khasi community does not require any clearances from the administration. However, for transfer of land from a Khasi to a non-Khasi, government clearance is required, approval is necessary from the relevant village durbar and sale deeds will need to be signed with terms and conditions of the transfer. As per the Meghalaya Transfer of Land (Regulation) Act, when two or more Khasis form a registered company, they lose their identity as Khasis for all purposes related to land transfer, and they would be subject to all requirements relevant to non-Khasis.

For the purpose of obtaining the land rights and extracting the minerals, LMMPL has been formed by the partnership of two members of the Khasi community. The company would require prior permission from the

Government in order to obtain the rights to the land, approval from the relevant durbars before negotiating with the individual landowners to determine the terms and conditions of the transfer. On finalisation of the agreement, a sale deed needs to be signed with the landowner. Although the consent of the durbar is essential for transfer of private land, the ultimate decision will be that of the landowner.

In case of leasing out of the community land, the company will require the consent of the village durbar and a lease agreement will be signed which will detail all the terms and conditions of the agreement.

On receiving the title transfer on land by LMMPL from the relevant owners, the rights for construction and operation of the conveyor system on the land will be transferred to LUMPL.

## **4.5 OCCUPATIONAL PATTERN**

Agriculture, horticulture and other farming activities form the predominant occupation of the East Khasi Hills District. Other occupations comprise employment in the following sectors:

- Transport, Storage and Communications
- Trade and Commerce
- Mining and quarrying activities
- Manufacturing, including household industry
- Construction activities
- Other services

A brief overview of the major livelihood systems is provided in the following sub - sections.

### **4.5.1 Agriculture**

The following table shows the landuse classification of the district.

**Table 4.1 Landuse classification**

<b>Classification of land</b>	<b>Area in ha</b>
Forests	159,453
Not available for cultivation	76,994
Other uncultivated land excluding fallow land	213,993
Fallow land	27,905
Net sown area	40,055
Total cropped Area	50,800
Reported area for land use	518,400

30% of the total geographical area of the district is classified as forests. Majority of the land. Majority of the land (62%) is uncultivated / fallow land or land not available for cultivation.

Although only 7% of the total area is classified as net sown area, agriculture forms the primary occupation of the region. Rice is the primary foodgrain

cultivated in the district, although many villages (especially the ones in the higher ranges where the growing season for rice is too short to allow cultivation of the high yield varieties of rice) supplement their production of rice with other cereals like maize and millets. On the southern slopes and in the plains of the Shella Confederacy, rice is cultivated in the marshy fields and along river banks.

There are two varieties of rice which are cultivated in the district – the upland rice grown on unirrigated land and the wetland rice grown in the low lands and the irrigated paddy fields. The wet variety of rice is generally grown in valleys and other plain areas and occasionally on terraced hill slopes which are irrigated by the gravitational flow of water. Each rice field is divided into small parts by erecting earthen banks called *stir*. Cultivation of wet rice is carried out through the indigenous system of artificial irrigation by diverting part of the water from the main stream to the field by means of artificially constructed channels, which is designed to control the flow of water as required.

The rice traditionally grown in the region was of inferior quality, the coarse grain being of a brownish red colour. Increasingly more cultivators are using the high yielding varieties which thrive well in the low lying areas. There are usually two harvests of paddy annually. The *murali dhan* (summer harvest of paddy) is cultivated from April to July, while the *bawa dhan* (winter harvest of paddy) is cultivated from August to December. Discussions with local communities indicate that one acre of paddy land produces, on an average, 600 – 800 kg of rice per year. The current market price is estimated as Rs 6 – 8 per kg of paddy (2002 ).

In some areas, maize is also grown as a supplementary staple crop. It is planted just before the rains and requires about three to four months to mature.

For a period of about five months, from December to April, black pepper and vegetables (consisting of radish, cauliflower, potato, sweet potato and yam) are grown. The Khasis have developed an innovative method of cultivating potatoes in rotation with rice, which ensures maximum utilisation of land and yields substantial profits.

The Khasis usually enter into sharecropping arrangements with landless cultivators who cultivate the land and give a part of the produce to the Khasi landowners as "*khajna*". The share of the produce given to the landowner varies from case to case. It depends on the sharecropping arrangements and in most cases, ranges from 25 to 50% of the annual produce. The usual practice is that the landowners fix a minimum level of produce, which will be retained by the sharecroppers, irrespective of the yield. The remaining crop is given to the landowner as *khajna* once every year, usually during winter. In most cases the landowners provide the sharecroppers with draught cattle and other agricultural inputs at the start of the agricultural season.

In addition to cultivation of foodgrains, there are also plantations of betelnuts, betel leaves, which form an important source of livelihood for the local people. As per local estimations, the betelnut trees usually grows on the well drained hill slopes and requires about 8 – 10 years before maturing, although, in some cases, the trees mature as early as 6 years depending on soil fertility. Mature

trees usually have an average productive life span of about 35 years, after which their productivity declines. The trees bear fruit once every year, usually in winter. The harvest period may extend from October to February. A healthy betelnut tree yields approximately 240- 250 nuts each harvest. Usually the betelnuts are measured in units known as “*spah*”. Each *spah* has 240 pieces. The betelnuts are sold in bags containing 16 *spahs*, *i.e.*, a total of 3840 nuts.

The cost of each *spah* depends on the level of processing of the betelnuts. The unprocessed nuts unshelled sell on an average for about Rs 70 - 75 per *spah*, as per local assessments, while the processed and shelled “wet” nuts can fetch upto Rs 150 – 200 per *spah* (2002 ).

Another source of livelihood are the orchards of oranges, banana and pineapples and cultivation of black pepper, bay leaves (*tezpatta*), potato, tobacco, pepper, ginger and vegetables.

Irrigation facilities are not well developed in the district. The topography makes the alignment and construction of irrigation channels difficult and expensive. Irrigation is usually confined to the flat plains bordering major rivers and streams. Agriculture in most places is dependent entirely on rainfall.

Although the rainfall and wide climatic conditions and the soil character offer scope for cultivation of a wide variety of crops, agriculture in the region is severely limited by several factors, including hilly terrain and limited availability of valley or plain land, the difficulty in adoption of agricultural machinery in the narrow valleys and the traditional practice of shifting cultivation which have denuded the forests. In the War areas near the international border with Bangladesh, the problem was aggravated after the partition of the country in 1947 which lead to the closure of the cross border trade of agricultural goods. The dearth of adequate road infrastructure and communication systems have also limited the agriculture growth of the region. Another factor which lead to the decline of agriculture in the Shella region was the abrupt decline on the production of oranges, which had traditionally formed an important source of livelihood for the War Khasis, brought about by the widespread attack of blight which severely affected the orchards.

#### **4.5.2            *Animal Husbandry***

Rearing of livestock forms only a subsidiary occupation among the rural Khasis. The livestock consists of non-descript local varieties of poultry, cattle, buffaloes, pigs, goats, sheep and horses. Buffaloes provide the draught power for agricultural activities and are used to cart timber from the forests, while horses are used for carrying packloads. Cattle constitute the main source of milk production. Pigs also form an important source of income for the locals. The favourable climatic conditions for rearing of pigs and the popularity of pork among the tribal society makes piggery a very viable livelihood option in the region.

#### **4.5.3            *Forestry***

The Khasis have traditionally followed the practice of *jhum* or shifting cultivation which have lead to increasing denudation of forests. Also a large

part of the forests are within private lands, and the opportunity the forests offer in terms of monetary benefits from timber and non-timber forest produce have lead to great exploitation of the forest resources in these regions. The principal forest products are:

- Major produces: Pinewood, Salwood, Plywood, Timber, Firewood
  - Minor Produce: Bamboo, Charcoal, Cane Resin, Broomsticks, Agar, Honey, Thatchgrass, Cinchona, Dhupwood, Tezpatta, Lac, Wild pepper, Chaulmugra, Wood Lichen, Orchids, etc
  - Minor Minerals: Limestone, Sand, Gravel, Boulders, Shingles, Clay
- (Source: Gazetteer of India, Meghalaya District Gazetteer, Khasi Hills District, 1991)

The forests which have been preserved are those which are designated as village forest lands (*law shnog*) and the sacred groves (*law kyntag* or *law lyngdoh*). The respect and veneration that the tribal people have for the sacred forests have prevented desecration and depletion of these forest resources. However, the State Government has undertaken several measures to secure scientific exploitation and development of forest resources.

#### **4.5.4 Limestone Mining Industry**

The southern belt of the Khasi Hills is very rich in limestone deposits. Much of this mineral was being commercially exploited by private individuals with limestone deposits within their private lands. These were usually small quarries operated by manual labour. Some of the quarry owners also owned lime kilns for extraction of lime for sale in the local markets.

Some people sold the limestone directly to traders in nearby market places. While most people owned their own modes of conveyance to transport the limestone from the quarry to the nearest market, others depended on hired transport. However, in the past decade, their profitability declined and a large number of private limestone quarry owners have found it unviable to continue such labour intensive quarrying activities.

#### **4.5.5 Local and Cross Border Trade**

With the restrictions of the border markets after the partition of the country, traditional Khasi trading system with the Surma Valley in Bangladesh declined. However, there still exists an informal trading system of goods, especially betelnuts and leaves, paddy, fruits, vegetables and limestone.

#### **4.5.6 Other Small Scale & Cottage Industries**

The climatic conditions of the region are favourable for development of sericulture industry. The state government had undertaken several schemes and programs for expansion and development of the sericulture industry in the district. However, the government's efforts are still confronted with lack of trained technical personnel, absence of research facilities and dearth of rearing accommodation for individual silk worm rearers which have limited the success of these schemes.

Other small scale industries include wax manufacture, honey making, cane and bamboo work, brick production. Cottage industries include carpentry, bee keeping and leather tanning. Lime burning is widely practised in the Shella region.

## **4.6**

### ***BANKING & COMMERCE***

The Meghalaya Co-operative Apex Bank Ltd set up in 1971 is one of the oldest financial institutions in the state and provides funding to co-operative credit societies, which cater to the credit requirements of the rural sector. The Meghalaya Co-operative Apex Bank has a branch in Cherrapunji, in addition to providing usual banking services, is responsible for giving direct finance to co-operative societies and unions. There are primary credit societies and credit unions in rural areas which, gives credit facilities for agriculture and industrial activities and also provide distribution and marketing services. They engage in wholesale and retail trade in consumer goods; storage of agricultural produce and inputs and allocation of agro - based mechanical services.

The primary credit societies are of two kinds – agricultural and non-agricultural credit societies. The agricultural credit societies provide credit for agricultural operations and other allied activities, facilitate marketing of agricultural products and undertake processing of agricultural goods. The non - agricultural credit societies primarily provide credit for education, health and construction of residential structures.

In addition there are several nationalised banks which operate in the district including the United Bank of India, State Bank of India and the United Commercial Bank. The United Bank of India has branches at Balat on the Bangladesh border as well as in Cherrapunji and Shella (Sohlap). The State Bank of India also has a branch at Mawsynram. These banks provide loans for agriculture, small scale industries, finance small business and also provide personal loans.

The Directorate of Industries was established in 1970 to facilitate industrial growth in Meghalaya. They provide training facilities and technical guidance, marketing opportunities, financial assistance for hire / purchase of equipment and also supply raw materials.

The Meghalaya Industrial Development Corporation was established in 1971 to promote the growth of industries in the state. The corporation also supplies raw materials to small scale units and extends financial assistance for the hire / purchase of machinery and provides training to local people in technical and management skills. The Meghalaya Handicrafts Development Corporation also extend financial aid to individual units at low rates of interest. The Small Industries Service Institute set up in 1973 also provides training to small scale units. The industrial co-operatives in the district provide technical assistance and training facilities as well as marketing assistance and access to credit, loans and subsidies from banks, financial institutions and government agencies.

## **4.7 INFRASTRUCTURE**

### **4.7.1 Accessibility**

The details of the accessibility of the project area is as follows:

#### *Road*

The mining lease areas lie on the western side of the Umium river valley, about 2 km NW of village Shella Bazaar and is approachable from Shillong (109 km), the capital of Meghalaya, via Mawsynram & Nongtraï villages by a tracked road. It is also accessible from Shillong (96 km) by a tracked road via Cherrapunji upto the village Shella Bazar. However, there is no access road/bridge across the Umium river to connect the two villages of Shella Bazar to the east and Pyrkan Shella to the west of the river. During the dry season, a temporary bamboo bridge is constructed by the village people, which provides access by foot across the river. However, during monsoons the only approach across the river is by boats.

#### *Rail*

The nearest Rail-head is at Guwahati, about 200 km away towards the North of the area.

#### *Air*

The nearest airports are in Upper Shillong (110 km away) and Guwahati (200 km away). However, no regular flights are scheduled to Shillong. Recently, the Government of Meghalaya has commenced helicopter service between Guwahati and Shillong.

### **4.7.2 Public Infrastructure & Civic Amenities**

The following section present an overview of the existing infrastructure in the villages of:

- Pyrkan
- Disong
- Duba
- Jasir
- Jamew
- Nongrum
- Nong Nong
- Mawryngkhong
- Rymsonkatonar
- Nongwar
- Khahmohi
- Nongtraï

These villages have been selected based on the location of the people who are likely to be affected by the loss of land for the conveyor belt route.

### *Education*

Sohlap has two primary schools and a middle level school. Jasir has a primary and a middle level school, while Mawryngkhong only has a primary school. The villages of Pyrkan, Disong, Duba, Jamew, Nongrum, Nong Nong, Rymsonkatonar do not have educational facilities within the villages but depend on the schools in the neighboring villages.

### *Health Facilities*

While Sohlap has a registered private practitioner, none of the other villages have any health facilities. The nearest medical facility for most of the villages lies within 5 km.

### *Drinking Water Sources*

All the villages have drinking water sources within the village. Most of the villages use taps and river water for drinking purposes.

### *Market*

Although most of the villages have small provision shops, Sohlap has a market day every four days, which is attended by the people from all other neighbouring villages.

### *Communications*

The mine sites lie on the western side of the Umiam river valley, about 2 km NW of village Shella Bazaar and is approachable from Shillong (109 km), the capital of Meghalaya, via Mawsynram & Nongtraï villages by a tracked road. It is also accessible from Shillong (96 km) by a tracked road via Cherrapunji upto the village Sohlap. Sohlap and Jatap are the only two villages which are accessible by vehicles. Pyrkan is situated across the Umium River opposite to Sohlap. However, there is no access road/bridge across the Umium river to connect the two villages of Sohlap to the east and Pyrkan Shella to the west of the river. During the dry season, a temporary bamboo bridge is constructed by the village people, which provides access by foot across the river. However, during monsoons the only approach across the river is by boats.

The remaining villages of Duba, Disong, Jasir, Jamew, Nongrum, Nong Nong, Rymsonkatonar and Mawryngkhong are located north of Sohlap along the Umiam River and can be accessed only on foot.

The nearest Rail-head as well as the airport are at Guwahati, about 200 km away.

Only Sohlap has a post and telegraphic connection. The post office at Sohlap provides postal service for the other villages in the neighbourhood.

**5.1 SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE ASSIGNMENT**

The scope of work for the assignment included:

- Identifying the various stakeholders, and enumerate the Project Affected Families
- Identifying and assessing the likely social impacts of the project through a socio-economic survey of the affected families
- Assist the project proponents in developing and documenting the Public Consultation and Disclosure Plan (PCDP), Indigenous People Development Plan (IPDP), the entitlement package and the Rehabilitation Action Plan (RAP), institutional and financial arrangements for implementation of the above plans.

**5.2 APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The initial social assessment was undertaken by ERM in September 2000. Subsequently, there were modifications in the elevated conveyor belt route. Some of the plots of land which were previously required for the construction of the conveyor belt were excluded and some new plots of land were included. The list of landowners whose plots would be affected by the conveyor belt was updated in 2001 to reflect such changes. A follow-up socio-economic survey was undertaken by the project proponents in February – March 2002 to update / obtain new information on all project affected families.

The following section details in brief the tasks and methodology adopted for the social assessment.

This section provides the methodology adopted for identifying the stakeholders and conducting the socio-economic survey.

**5.2.1 Review of Project Design & Secondary Literature**

In September 2000, prior to visiting the project site ERM undertook a detailed review of documents related to the project, including the project feasibility reports, project location, design and components, as well as relevant studies including the Environmental Impact Assessment Report for the project. Some information on the anticipated impacts in terms of land loss was available for review, along with a list of Project Affected Persons and their family details. ERM conducted an extensive review of secondary literature to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the tribal society, the administrative structure, prevalent customs and traditions, occupation patterns, land holding systems and land transfer procedures.

## 5.2.2

### ***Visit to the Project Area (September 2000)***

#### *Discussions with Project Proponents*

The ERM team visited the project area in September 2000. A detailed discussion was held with the project proponents in Shillong before the commencement of the survey to obtain a detailed understanding of the project, the project area, the administrative set-up of the area, the land ownership and transfer procedures and the details of the land required for the project. The discussions with the project proponents also helped in identifying the key stakeholders groups in the project.

#### *Transect Walk*

Following these discussions the ERM team visited the project area and made a line transect walk over a part of the belt conveyor route to assess the existing landuse pattern of the affected area.

#### *Interviews with the Project Affected People (PAP)*

For the September 2000 socio-economic survey, the ERM team visited the project area and the neighbouring villages and settlements to discuss the project and its likely impacts with the local people. Individual interviews were held with the affected landowners. At the time of the interviews, the ERM team was accompanied by the Community Relations Officer (CRO) of the project, who helped the team in identifying the community leaders and introduced the team to the community. The presence of the Community Relations Officer also helped the ERM team in building rapport with the community.

The affected households reside in the various hamlets and villages, neighbouring the project area. Most of them fall within the Shella village durbar, though some fall within the jurisdiction of the Nongwar, Nongtraï and Mustoh durbars.

The ERM team visited the following hamlets within the Shella durbar:

- Sohlap
- Disong
- Jasir
- Duba
- Jamew
- Nongrum
- Rymsonkatonar
- Nong Nong
- Pyrkan
- Mawryngkhong
- Khamohi
- Umkhabaw

The information gathered included

- Family details

- Nature of loss (loss of land, productive assets, livelihood and income)
- Details of total family income and occupation pattern
- Total landholding (wherever possible)
- Ownership of land and nature of sharecropping arrangements if any
- Landuse, yield and income from the total landholding
- Extent of land holding affected by the project
- Current landuse of the affected plot
- Income from the affected plot
- Awareness regarding the project
- Opinion regarding the project

#### *Group Discussions with the PAFs and Other Residents*

During the course of the socio-economic survey, ERM organised several small group discussions at the villages. People were met in these small groups to discuss general perceptions regarding the project, their apprehensions and expectations, and also to understand the social structure, landholding and occupational patterns, priority development needs of the villages, role of women in the society, etc. In addition to discussion with the people in their villages / hamlets, discussions were also held with the both the affected families as well as other residents of the villages (in groups and individually) at Sohlap during the market days which, are held once in every four days at Sohlap.

ERM also held focus group discussions with specific groups including women and the landless people. At Umkhabaw, discussions were held with Garo sharecroppers.

#### *Discussions with Local Administration*

The headman of the Nongtraï village was also met to elicit his views regarding the project and its likely impact on the community. Discussions were held with the Wahadadar of the Shella Confederacy at Jasir as well as at the office of Additional Subordinate District Council Court in Sohlap.

#### *Discussions with District Administration*

The ERM team visited the Collectorate Office of the East Khasi Hills District and held discussions with the officials in the Rural Development Division, including the Deputy Commissioner, Rural Development. Discussions focussed on the regional development plans proposed for the Shella Confederacy.

### **5.2.3**

#### ***Follow-up Socio-economic Survey (Feb-Mar 2002)***

Subsequent to the change in the route of the conveyor belt, the follow-up socio-economic survey was undertaken by LUMPL in February – March 2002 based on the same interview schedule, which was used for the initial survey in September 2000. The follow-up survey helped to update some of the crucial information about the families which had been interviewed previously as well obtain information on those families included in the list of PAFs after the change in the route and not covered under the previous survey.

The updated information was used for the analysis of impacts and in assessing the extent of losses.

#### **5.2.4**

#### ***Analysis***

The findings from the social assessment are summarised in the next section. The Public Consultation and Disclosure Program (PCDP), the Entitlement Framework, the Rehabilitation Action Plan (RAP) and the Indigenous Peoples' Development Plan (IPDP) as developed in consultation with the project proponents, are also provided in subsequent sections of the report.

The project will have a direct impact on the people whose land will be required for the mine site area and for the purpose of constructing the elevated conveyor belt. This section provides details of the current location of the project affected families, their social classification, occupational pattern, income details and vulnerability.

The mine site area is community land belonging to the Nongtraï village. The land is a rocky area with limestone deposits and at present is lying unutilised. There is reportedly no income generating or productive use of the land at present.

Due south of the mine site, the belt conveyor track traverses mostly across private lands owned by the people of the Shella village (there is one owner from Nongwar durbar and 2 from Nongtraï). At the point of origin from the crushing unit, the route crosses the community lands belonging to the village durbar of Nongtraï. This community land also contains limestone deposits but is reportedly not being used by the village people. Mid-way across the route, the belt traverses through community land belonging to the Shella village durbar. This land is reported to be part of the dry river bed of the Umium river.

The social assessment revealed that the elevated conveyor belt project would result in land loss for 54 <sup>(1)</sup> families belonging to the village durbars of Shella, Nongwar, and Nongtraï. Some of these families are also non-resident owners, i.e., although they own land in the project area, they currently not residing within the project area or in its immediate vicinity.

## **6.1 LOCATION OF THE AFFECTED FAMILIES**

Of the 54 families identified as being affected by the loss of private lands, two families belong to the Nongtraï durbar, one family belongs to the Nongwar village durbar and one family currently resides in Shillong. The remaining families reside within different villages / hamlets under the Shella durbar. The following table summarises the location of the PAFs.

**Table 6.1 Location of PAFs**

<b>Sl No</b>	<b>Name of Owner</b>	<b>Village</b>	<b>Durbar</b>
1	Shr. SS Synrem	Jasir	Shella
2	Shri. A. Lyngdoh Nongbri	Rymsongkatnor	Shella
3	Shri. Addito Syngwan	Jasir	Shella
4	Shri. Alphantis K.	Nongtraï	Nongtraï
5	Shri. Bidot Pde	Sohlap	Shella
6	Shri. Botdronath Youroi	Jamew	Shella
7	Shri. Clerington Youroi	Mawryngkhong	Shella
8	Shri. Dhormo R. Dkhar	Sohlap	Shella
9	Shri. Dhrubo Dkhar	Jasir	Shella
10	Shri. Digesor Chyne	Pyrkan	Shella

(1) There are 55 owners listed as PAFs - one of them (Ines Youroi) is wife of another affected landowner (Rosbel Laitmon).

Sl No	Name of Owner	Village	Durbar
11	Smt. Emsidora Lyngdoh	Mawryngkhong	Sheila
12	Shri. Evergreen Chyne	Nongrum	Sheila
13	Shri. Frosland Swett	Pyrkan	Sheila
14	Shri. Giri Ksaning	Jasir	Sheila
15	Shri. GR Ksaning	Jasir	Sheila
16	Shri. Hekron Syngwan	Nong Nong	Sheila
17	Shri. K. Bidhan Roy	Jasir	Sheila
18	Shri. Kranstanel K.	Nongtraï	Nongtraï
19	Shri. Livingstone S.	Nong Nong	Sheila
20	Shri. LN Diengdoh	Sohlap	Sheila
21	Shri. Lumlang Swett	Mawryngkhong	Sheila
22	Shri. MN Synrem	Jasir	Sheila
23	Shri. Pearlstarwell Dolloi	Rymsongkatnor	Sheila
24	Shri. Pherington Youroi	Mawryngkhong	Sheila
25	Shri. Prince SW. Sarubai	Sohlap	Sheila
26	Shri. Querister Tiewsoh	Jamew	Sheila
27	Shri. Ragesor Syngwan	Jasir	Sheila
28	Shri. RL Roy Youthborn	Mawryngkhong	Sheila
29	Shri. Rosbell Laitmon	Sohlap	Sheila
30	Shri. Sorkey Chyne	Disong	Sheila
31	Shri. Stolitit Lyngdoh	Mawryngkhong	Sheila
32	Shri. Suken Dkhar	Jamew	Sheila
33	Shri. Sunday & Friday R.	Disong	Sheila
34	Shri. Susanta Swett	Jamew	Sheila
35	Shri. Susendro Chyne	Sohlap	Sheila
36	Shri. Winstarlin Swer	Nongrum	Sheila
37	Shri. Woren Ksanlah	Nongnong	Sheila
38	Shri. Woslin Chyne	Duba	Sheila
39	Smt. Baiahunlang S.	Mawryngkhong	Sheila
40	Smt. Belnoda Dkhar	Duba	Sheila
41	Smt. D. Saibon	Nonglum	Mawlai (Shillong)
42	Smt. Ekret Natep	Pyrkan	Sheila
43	Smt. Gracybell Chyne	Mawryngkhong	Sheila
44	Smt. Greensila Lyngdoh	Mawryngkhong	Sheila
45	Smt. Ines Youroi	Sohlap	Sheila
46	Smt. Kelo Khylllep	Mawryngkhong	Sheila
47	Smt. Markret Ropmay	Jamew	Sheila
48	Smt. Mitila Swett	Nongwar	Nongwar
49	Smt. Nitrida Swett	Pyrkan	Sheila
50	Smt. Phimilian M.	Pyrkan	Sheila
51	Smt. S. Synrem	Jasir	Sheila
52	Smt. Saroda Nongbri	Jasir	Sheila
53	Smt. Sodatri Sarubai	Nongrum	Sheila
54	Smt. Sotida Sarubai	Rymsongkatonar	Sheila
55	Smt. Supria Langrai	Sohlap	Sheila

**Table 6.2** *Distribution of PAFs (Village wise)*

Name of Village	Name of Durbar	No of PAFs
Disong	Sheila	4
Duba	Sheila	2
Jamew	Sheila	5
Jasir	Sheila	8
Mawryngkhong	Sheila	10
Nong Nong	Sheila	4
Nongrum	Sheila	3
Pyrkan	Sheila	5
Rymsongkatonar	Sheila	1

<b>Name of Village</b>	<b>Name of Durbar</b>	<b>No of PAFs</b>
Sohlap	Shella	8
Nongwar	Nongwar	1
Nongtraï	Nongtraï	2
Nonglum	Mawlai, Shillong	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>54</b>

## **6.2 SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF THE PAFs**

The landowners affected by the project belong to the War Khasi tribal community.

Landholding in the region is restricted to the Khasis tribes and sub-tribes, as per the customary law of the Khasis. No non-Khasi is legally allowed to own land in the Khasi Hills District. However, the Khasis usually engage a sharecropper with whom they have an arrangement of sharing the agricultural yield. Most of the Khasis in the project area have given up practising their traditional beliefs and have been greatly influenced by modern civilisation. A few people in the project area are also followers of the Ramakrishna Mission.

The most significant aspect of the socio-economic setting of the Khasis community is their unique matrilineal society. Descent in the Khasis society is reckoned from the mother and the children belong to the clan of the mother. Among the War Khasis in the Shella Confederacy, all the children in the family (both male and female) are entitled to receive equal shares of the ancestral and acquired properties. However the youngest daughter gets a relatively larger share in order to perform the religious rights and ceremonies of their family members.

Although a matrilineal society, the men hold an important position in the society. Despite the traditional custom of the man coming to live in his wife's house after marriage, he manages and controls the ancestral property and is the decision maker in the family. The men also control in public affairs and administration. The women are not allowed to attend durbar sessions.

The traditional religious and cultural practices have faded with a large segment of the Khasi community having been influenced by modern civilisation. They have partly or wholly discontinued the customary rites and ceremonies of their old Khasi religion although the matrilineal society and the law of inheritance prevails.

## **6.3 FAMILY SIZE**

Family sizes of the affected people range between 1 to 13 – the average was estimated to be 6.4. the following table provides the family sizes of the PAFs.

**Table 6.1 Family Size**

<b>PAP SI No</b>	<b>Name of Owner</b>	<b>No of Family Members</b>
1	Smt. Saroda Nongbri	8

PAP SI No	Name of Owner	No of Family Members
2	Shri. GR Ksaning	9
3	Shri. Dhormo R. Dkhar	9
4	Smt. Sodatri Sarubai	4
5	Smt. Mitila Swett	5
6	Smt. Kelo Khylllep	3
7	Shri. LN Diengdoh	6
8	Smt. Belnoda Dkhar	6
9	Shri. Stolitit Lyngdoh	7
10	Smt. S. Synrem	10
11	Shr. SS Synrem	6
12	Shri. Botdronath Youroi	7
13	Shri. Woslin Chyne	10
14	Shri. Bidot Pde	8
15	Shri. K. Bidhan Roy	3
16	Shri. Rosbell Laitmon	6
17	Shri. Ragesor Syngwan	3
18	Shri. MN Synrem	8
19	Smt. Markret Ropmay	11
20	Shri. Susanta Swett	7
21	Shri. Susendro Chyne	4
22	Shri. Woren Ksanlah	5
23	Shri. Pherington Youroi	13
24	Smt. Supria Iangrai	8
25	Shri. Dhrubo Dkhar	5
26	Shri. Addito Syngwan	6
27	Smt. Emsidora Lyngdoh	6
28	Smt. Ines Youroi*	6
29	Smt. Nitrida Swett	7
30	Shri. RL Roy Youthborn	10
31	Shri. Evergreen Chyne	1
32	Shri. A. Lyngdoh Nongbri	9
33	Shri. Hekron Syngwan	2
34	Shri. Frosland Swett	8
35	Smt. Baiahunlang Syngwan	2
36	Shri. Winstarlin Swer	7
37	Shri. Digesor Chyne	10
38	Shri. Querister Tiewsoh	7
39	Shri. Sorkey Chyne	7
40	Smt. Greensila Lyngdoh	8
41	Shri. Sunday & Friday R.	9
42	Shri. Livingstone S.	7
43	Smt. Gracybell Chyne	5
44	Shri. Suken Dkhar	4
45	Shri. Clerington Youroi	2
46	Shri. Giri Ksaning	5
47	Shri. Lumlang Swett	8
48	Smt. Phimilian M.	5
49	Smt. Ekret Natep	5
50	Shri. Kranstanel K.	4
51	Smt. Sotida Sarubai	4
52	Shri. Pearlstarwell Dolloi	4
53	Shri. Prince SW. Sarubai	4
54	Shri. Alphantis K.	10
55	Smt. D. Saibon	9

\* Wife of Rosbel Laitmon and part of the same family.

Most people in the region depend on more than one source of income. Although betelnut plantations and agriculture form the main occupation of the people in the region, with diminishing return on plantations and agriculture, a large number of households have started small commercial establishments, while some have started small scale local and cross border trade (mostly betelnut and other agricultural produce). A significant number of the respondents also work as daily labour for their livelihood. Some people are engaged in service (both in the private as well as the public sector). Although limestone mining at one time was a lucrative option for many families, most families with small quarries are unable to sustain operations due to increasing transportation and labour costs and low returns. Only three of the PAFs still continue quarrying limestone. The following table summarises the occupational pattern of the affected people, based on information provided by the PAFs:

**Table 6.1 Occupational Profile of PAFs**

Sl No	Name of Owner	Primary Occupation	Secondary Occupation	Other Sources of Income
1	Smt. Saroda Nongbri	Betelnut Plantation		
2	Shri. GR Ksaning	Betelnut Plantation	Agriculture	Fruit Orchards
3	Shri. Dhormo R. Dkhar	Trade	Betelnut Plantation	Agriculture
4	Smt. Sodatri Sarubai	Betelnut Plantation	Fruit Orchards	Agriculture
5	Smt. Mitila Swett	Agriculture	Betelnut Plantation	
6	Smt. Kelo Khylllep	Agriculture		
7	Shri. LN Diengdoh	Labour	Agriculture	
8	Smt. Belnoda Dkhar	labour	Betelnut Plantation	
9	Shri. Stolis Lyngdoh	Agriculture		
10	Smt. S. Synrem	Betelnut Plantation	Agriculture	Service & Labour
11	Shr. SS Synrem	Agriculture	Betelnut Plantation	
12	Shri. Botdronath Youroi	Betelnut Plantation	Agriculture	
13	Shri. Woslin Chyne	Service	Agriculture	Betelnut Plantation
14	Shri. Bidot Pde	Business	Agriculture and Betelnut Plantation	
15	Shri. K. Bidhan Roy	Agriculture	Business / Trade	Betelnut Plantation
16	Shri. Rosbell Laitmon	Service	Agriculture	Betelnut Plantation
17	Shri. Ragesor Syngwan	Betelnut Plantation	Agriculture	
18	Shri. MN Synrem	Agriculture	Betelnut Plantation	
19	Smt. Markret Ropmay	Betelnut Plantation	Agriculture	
20	Shri. Susanta Swett	Business	Betelnut Plantation	Agriculture
21	Shri. Susendro Chyne	Betelnut Plantation	Agriculture	
22	Shri. Woren Ksanlah	Business	Betelnut Plantation	Agriculture
23	Shri. Pherington Youroi	Betelnut Plantation	Labour	
24	Smt. Supria Langrai	Betelnut Plantation	Business	Agriculture and Service
25	Shri. Dhrubo Dkhar	Betelnut Plantation	Labour	Trade
26	Shri. Addito Syngwan	Betelnut Plantation	Agriculture	
27	Smt. Emsidora Lyngdoh	Labour		
28	Smt. Ines Youroi	Agriculture	Service	Betelnut Plantation
29	Smt. Nitrida Swett	Agriculture	Betelnut Plantation	
30	Shri. RL Roy Youthborn	Business	Betelnut Plantation	Agriculture and Rent
31	Shri. Evergreen Chyne	Agriculture	Betelnut Plantation	
32	Shri. A. Lyngdoh Nongbri	Betelnut Plantation	Fruit Orchards	Labour
33	Shri. Hekron Syngwan	Labour	Agriculture	Pension
34	Shri. Frosland Swett	Limestone Quarrying	Agriculture	Trade and Betelnut Plantation

Sl No	Name of Owner	Primary Occupation	Secondary Occupation	Other Sources of Income
35	Smt. Baiahunlang S.	Betelnut Plantation	Labour	Agriculture
36	Shri. Winstarlin Swer	Service	Betelnut Plantation	Labour
37	Shri. Digesor Chyne	Betelnut Plantation	Limestone quarrying	Agriculture; service
38	Shri. Querister Tiewsoh	Service	Betelnut Plantation	Agriculture
39	Shri. Sorkey Chyne	Agriculture	Service	Betelnut and Fruit Orchard; Labour
40	Smt. Greensila Lyngdoh	Labour	Betelnut Plantation	
41	Shri. Sunday & Friday R.	Betelnut Plantation	Labour	
42	Shri. Livingstone S.	Service	Betelnut Plantation	Agriculture
43	Smt. Gracybell Chyne	Betelnut Plantation	Limestone Quarrying	Trade
44	Shri. Suken Dkhar	Betelnut Plantation	Labour	
45	Shri. Clerington Youroi	Service	Betelnut Plantation	Agriculture and Fruit Orchard
46	Shri. Giri Ksaning	Betelnut Plantation	Agriculture	
47	Shri. Lumlang Swett	Trade	Agriculture	Betelnut Plantation
48	Smt. Phimilian M.	Agriculture	Betelnut Plantation	Trade
49	Smt. Ekret Natep	Betelnut Plantation		
50	Shri. Kranstanel K.	Labour	Betelnut Plantation	
51	Smt. Sotida Sarubai	Labour	Agriculture	Betelnut Plantation and Fruit Orchards
52	Shri. Pearlstarwell Dolloi	Labour		
53	Shri. Prince SW. Sarubai	Business	Agriculture	Betelnut Plantation and Fruit Orchards
54	Shri. Alphantis K.	Betelnut Plantation	Agriculture	
55	Smt. D. Saibon	Service	Betelnut Plantation	Business, Pension and Agriculture

**Table 6.2 Distribution of PAFs according to Occupational Profile**

Occupation and Source of Family Income	Primary		Secondary		Other		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	% of Total PAFs
Agriculture	11	20%	19	37%	11	29%	41	76%
Betelnut Plantation	21	38%	19	37%	9	24%	49	91%
Trade & Business	7	13%	2	4%	4	11%	13	24%
Labour	8	15%	5	10%	3	8%	16	30%
Limestone Quarrying	1	2%	2	4%	0	0%	3	6%
Service	7	13%	2	4%	3	8%	12	22%
Fruit Orchards	0	0%	2	4%	5	13%	7	13%
Others	0	0%	0	0%	3	8%	3	6%
Total	55	100%	51	100%	38	100%		

### *Plantations*

Betelnut plantations are a major source of livelihood for people in the region. . Some families cultivate betel leaves along with the betelnut trees. The well drained hill slopes in the project area are conducive to betelnut cultivation and the demand in local markets makes it profitable for people in the region to invest in betelnut plantations.

Another source of livelihood are the orchards of oranges, banana and pineapples, although high input and maintenance costs have discouraged many families from continuing their fruit orchards.

### *Agriculture*

Agriculture also forms a source of livelihood for the PAFs. Agriculture meets the subsistence needs of most of the households, though a number of them also sell the surplus to generate cash income. Paddy is the predominant crop, which is alternated with cultivation of black pepper and vegetables. The region primarily depends on rainfed agriculture. There is usually two harvests of paddy annually. The *murali dhan* (summer harvest of paddy) is cultivated from April to July, while the *bawa dhan* (winter harvest of paddy) is cultivated from August to December.

For a period of about five months, from December to April, black pepper and vegetables (consisting of radish, cauliflower, sweet potato) bay leaves (*tezpatta*), tobacco, ginger, etc are grown. The vegetables are mostly for self-consumption or for sale in the local markets.

As mentioned before, the Khasis usually have sharecropping arrangement with sharecroppers who are provided with inputs for agriculture by the Khasi landowner and who cultivate the land and give a part of the product to the Khasi landowners as "*khajna*". The share of the product given to the landowner varies from case to case. It depends on the sharecropping arrangements and in most cases, ranges from 25 to 50% of the annual product. The *khajna* is given to the landowners once every year usually during winter. Suitable compensatory arrangements have been made to mitigate the loss of crop for the landowners as well as the sharecroppers. Although the Khasi landowners have continued the practice of engaging sharecroppers for a considerable number of generations, social relations between the Khasis and the sharecroppers tend to be strained. There exists ethnic tension between the Garos / other ethnic groups and the Khasis, especially in the Khasi Hills where the latter are a majority community. Also, there have been instances of violent interactions among the Khasi and the Garo communities in the recent past (1997 / 98) which resulted in a further rift between the two tribes. As such, the Khasi landowners are not forthcoming with information regarding the identities of the sharecroppers they engage to cultivate their fields.

### *Limestone Quarrying*

Some of the affected households own private limestone quarries which are operated on a commercial scale. These are usually small quarries operated by manual labour. Some of the quarry owners also owned lime kilns for extraction of lime, which is sold in the local markets.

Some people sold the limestone directly to traders in nearby market places. While most people owned their own modes of conveyance to transport the limestone from the quarry to the nearest market, others depended on hired transport. Some of the families had leased out the quarries to private operators and receive an annual rent. However, a number of people also reported that

their quarries were not being utilised as profit margins were very low and it had become economically unviable to operate them.

#### *Commercial Establishments / Local and Cross border trade*

A few of the affected families depend largely on their incomes from small provision shops or commercial establishments selling tea and snacks. Some had small shops in Sohlap and others would set up small stalls on every market day. A segment of the affected population is involved in local and cross border trade. Usually this involved sale of goods (including betelnut, paddy, fruits, vegetables, limestone, fish) in nearby market places and also across the border in Bangladesh.

#### *Service and Other Sources of Income*

Some families were government employees or are engaged as teachers in private schools, nurses in local health centres or derived income from rent and / or interest from savings.

#### *Daily Labour*

A few families work as daily labour to sustain themselves. Most of them work in plantations, or as construction labour. One of the affected persons works as a carpenter. The work is mostly seasonal in nature and does not provide a regular source of income.

#### *Fishing*

Although a large number of people are engaged in fishing activities, it is mostly a small scale activity, primarily for self-consumption. Some surplus amount is also sold in the local markets on market days.

## **6.5**

### ***LANDHOLDING DETAILS***

The land administration in Meghalaya is a unique and complex system and radically different from that prevailing in any other part of the country. Inherent in the tribal administration of land is the absence of any land records. In Meghalaya, there exist no land records and the customary laws are not codified. Attempts at reforms of land administration has in the past, evoked strong resentment among the community and attempts to obtain information regarding landholding and ownership is unwelcome and in most cases does not evoke any response.

Discussions with selected representatives of the community revealed that while average landholding in the area was fairly large, much of the land was unproductive and unfit for cultivation. Although attempts were made by both ERM and the project proponents to obtain information on landholding and ownership patterns in the region, most families could / did not provide accurate information regarding details of their total landholding. This combined with an absence of land records made it very difficult to assess landholding patterns.

None of the PAFs interviewed could / were willing to provide an estimate of their total landholding. 25 of the families interviewed could / did not provide any estimations of their landholding (total or area under cultivation), while 29 families, did provide an estimate of their land under paddy cultivation, although they did not provide an estimate of their total landholding. The area under paddy cultivation reported by these 29 families area provided in the following table. It needs to be noted that in addition to the land under paddy cultivation, most of these families reported owning betelnut / fruit plantations as well as uncultivated unproductive land, and hence for most families, total landholding is likely to be greater than the area reported under paddy cultivation.

**Table 6.1** *Reported area under Paddy Cultivation*

Sl. No.	Name of the Owners	Area in sq m	Area in acres
3	Shri. Dhormo Roy Dkhar	97125	24.0
4	Smt. Sodatri Sarubai	242812	60.0
5	Smt. Mitila Swett	404686	100.0
6	Smt. Kelo Khylllep	20234	5.0
7	Shri. L. N. Diengdoh	6475	1.6
8	Smt. Belnoda Dkhar	10117	2.5
10	Smt. S. Synrem	19425	4.8
11	Shri. S. S. Synrem	12141	3.0
14	Shri. Bidot Pde	24281	6.0
15	Shri. K. Bidhan Roy	56656	14.0
16	Shri. Rosbell Laitmon & Ines Youroi	48562	12.0
17	Shri. Ragesor Syngwan	16187	4.0
18	Shri. M. N. Synrem	40469	10.0
22	Shri. Woren Ksanlah	24281	6.0
24	Smt. Supria Langrai	141640	35.0
26	Shri. Addito Syngwan	60703	15.0
29	Smt. Nitirda Swett	80937	20.0
34	Shri. Frosland Swett	48562	12.0
36	Shri. Winstarlin Swer	121406	30.0
37	Shri. Digesor Chyne	22258	5.5
39	Smt. Sorky Chyne	18211	4.5
40	Smt. Greensila Lyngdoh	28328	7.0
42	Shri. Livingstone Syngwan	20234	5.0
45	Shri. Clerington Youroi	20234	5.0
46	Shri. Giri Ksanieng	40469	10.0
47	Shri. Lum Lang swett	28328	7.0
48	Shri. Phimilian Marbaning	202343	50.0
53	Shri. Princestarwell Sarubai	72843	18.0
54	Shri. Al Phratis K. Chandy	8094	2.0

## 6.6

### *INCOME PROFILE OF PAFS*

The following table provides the total monthly family incomes and the per capita monthly incomes (of each family) as reported by the PAFs. The information on income details were initially collected during the September 2000 survey and was thereafter updated during the follow-up survey in February – March 2002. It needs to be noted that in some cases the incomes reported by the people during the survey was assessed to be an inadequate

indicator of their current economic status. Also the reported income reflects only their monetary income since for most of the people, subsistence needs are met from the agricultural produce.

**Table 6.1** *Reported Per Capita Income (Rs per month)*

PAP SI No	Name of Landowner	Reported Family Income per month	Per capita Income per month
1	Smt. Saroda Nongbri	667	83
2	Shri. GR Ksaning	12,000	1,333
3	Shri. Dhormo R. Dkhar	17,500	1,944
4	Smt. Sodatri Sarubai	10,292	2,573
5	Smt. Mitila Swett	13,750	2,750
6	Smt. Kelo Khylllep	750	250
7	Shri. LN Diengdoh	2,196	366
8	Smt. Belnoda Dkhar	3,050	508
9	Shri. Stolitit Lyngdoh	5,125	732
10	Smt. S. Synrem	3,833	383
11	Shr. SS Synrem	3,917	653
12	Shri. Botdronath Youroi	4,617	660
13	Shri. Woslin Chyne	11,800	1,180
14	Shri. Bidot Pde	10,000	1,250
15	Shri. K. Bidhan Roy	12,460	4,153
16	Shri. Rosbell Laitmon	5,667	944
17	Shri. Ragesor Syngwan	4,417	1,472
18	Shri. MN Synrem	4,233	529
19	Smt. Markret Ropmay	27,267	2,479
20	Shri. Susanta Swett	6,083	869
21	Shri. Susendro Chyne	5,665	1,416
22	Shri. Woren Ksanlah	2,917	583
23	Shri. Pherington Youroi	8,600	662
24	Smt. Supria Iangrai	65,250	8,156
25	Shri. Dhrubo Dkhar	3,750	750
26	Shri. Addito Syngwan	7,000	1,167
27	Smt. Emsidora Lyngdoh	2,200	367
28	Smt. Ines Youroi*	-	
29	Smt. Nitrida Swett	2,083	298
30	Shri. RL Roy Youthborn	22,500	2,500
31	Shri. Evergreen Chyne	700	700
32	Shri. A. Lyngdoh Nongbri	3,200	356
33	Shri. Hekron Syngwan	1,710	855
34	Shri. Frosland Swett	7,600	950
35	Smt. Baiahunlang Syngwan	2,842	1,421
36	Shri. Winstarlin Swer	4,000	571
37	Shri. Digesor Chyne	9,700	970
38	Shri. Querister Tiewsoh	8,542	1,220
39	Shri. Sorkey Chyne	4,017	574
40	Smt. Greensila Lyngdoh	3,117	390
41	Shri. Sunday & Friday R.	4,900	544
42	Shri. Livingstone S.	8,833	1,262
43	Smt. Gracybell Chyne	5,400	1,080
44	Shri. Suken Dkhar	1,867	467
45	Shri. Clerington Youroi	8,817	2,939
46	Shri. Giri Ksaning	4,583	917
47	Shri. Lumlang Swett	4,000	500
48	Smt. Phimilian M.	24,750	4,950
49	Smt. Ekret Natep	1,000	200
50	Shri. Kranstanel K.	2,333	583
51	Smt. Sotida Sarubai	2,408	602

PAP SI No	Name of Landowner	Reported Family Income per month	Per capita Income per month
52	Shri. Pearlstarwell Dolloi	1,800	450
53	Shri. Prince SW. Sarubai	8,333	2,083
54	Shri. Alphrantis K.	4,500	500
55	Smt. D. Saibon	96,058	10,673

\* Wife of Rosbel Laitmon – Family Income included in details given for Rosbel Laitmon

**Table 6.2** *Distribution of PAFs according to Average Per Capita Income (Per month)*

Per capita Monthly Income ranges	No of Families	Percentage
< Rs 328 (BPL)	4	7%
Rs 328 - 499	7	13%
Rs 500 - 749	15	28%
Rs 750 - 999	7	13%
Rs 1000 - 1499	10	19%
Rs 1500 - 2499	4	7%
Rs 2500 - 5000	5	9%
> Rs 5000	2	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>54*</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* Ines Youroi & Rosbell Laitmon are considered as a single family.

## 6.7

### VULNERABILITY

For the purpose of assessing vulnerability, the income profile of the family was assessed to the most important criteria. All families below the poverty line <sup>(1)</sup> (Rs 328 per capita per month) were considered vulnerable.

In addition to families below poverty line, families with per capita monthly income below Rs 500 are considered economically vulnerable. For such families, three additional criteria have been used to assess vulnerability, which include:

- Families with one or more members above the age of 60
- Families with one or more members with permanent disabilities (mental or physical)
- Families headed by women

Economically vulnerable families with one or more of the above three vulnerabilities have been considered as vulnerable families.

*Vulnerability is therefore defined as:*

- Families below poverty line (average per capita per month income of family members is less than Rs 328)
- Families which are economically vulnerable (average per capita per month income of family members is less than Rs 500) and the family is either women headed, and / or has disabled member(s) and / or has at least one senior citizen (above the age of 60).
- In addition any family affected by more than 25% loss of land / asset / income as a result of the project are also considered vulnerable (See Section 7.3).

(1) Average poverty line figures for India was estimated as Rs 205.84 per capita per month (rural areas) at 1993-94 prices – Ninth Five Year Plan, Government of India. Assuming an average annual inflation of 6%, average poverty line for 2001-02 is estimated at Rs 328 per capita per month. Poverty line figures for the state of Meghalaya was not available.

The table below provides the details of all the PAFs and their socio-economic vulnerabilities.

**Table 6.1 Vulnerability**

Sl No	Name of Landowner	Per capita Monthly Income (Rs)	Members over 60 Years	Women headed	Family members with disabilities
1	Smt. Saroda Nongbri	83			1
49	Smt. Ekret Natep	200	2		1
6	Smt. Kelo Khylllep	250		Yes	
29	Smt. Nitrida Swett	298	1	Yes	
32	Shri. A. Lyngdoh Nongbri	356	2		
7	Shri. LN Diengdoh	366			2
27	Smt. Emsidora Lyngdoh	367		Yes	1
40	Smt. Greensila Lyngdoh	390			
10	Smt. S. Synrem	426		Yes	
52	Shri. Pearlstarwell Dolloi	450			
44	Shri. Suken Dkhar	467	2		2
47	Shri. Lumlang Swett	500	1		
54	Shri. Alphantis K.	500	1		1
8	Smt. Belnoda Dkhar	508		Yes	
18	Shri. MN Synrem	529	1		
41	Shri. Sunday & Friday Ropmay	544	1	Yes	
36	Shri. Winstarlin Swer	571	1		
39	Shri. Sorkey Chyne	574	1		
22	Shri. Woren Ksanlah	583	1		
50	Shri. Kranstanel K.	583			1
51	Smt. Sotida Sarubai	602		Yes	
11	Shr. SS Synrem	653	1		
12	Shri. Botdronath Youroi	660	1		
23	Shri. Pherington Youroi	662	2		
31	Shri. Evergreen Chyne	700	1		
9	Shri. Stolitit Lyngdoh	732			
25	Shri. Dhrubo Dkhar	750	1		
33	Shri. Hekron Syngwan	855	1		
20	Shri. Susanta Swett	869			
46	Shri. Giri Ksaning	917			
16	Shri. Rosbell Laitmon	944	1		
34	Shri. Frosland Swett	950			
37	Shri. Digesor Chyne	970	1		
43	Smt. Gracybell Chyne	1080		Yes	
26	Shri. Addito Syngwan	1167	1		
38	Shri. Querister Tiewsoh	1220			
14	Shri. Bidot Pde	1250			
42	Shri. Livingstone S.	1262			
13	Shri. Woslin Chyne	1311	1		
2	Shri. GR Ksaning	1333			
21	Shri. Susendro Chyne	1416			
35	Smt. Baiahunlang Syngwan	1421			
17	Shri. Ragesor Syngwan	1472			
3	Shri. Dhormo R. Dkhar	1944	1		2
53	Shri. Prince SW. Sarubai	2083			
30	Shri. RL Roy Youthborn	2250			
19	Smt. Markret Ropmay	2479	1	Yes	
4	Smt. Sodatri Sarubai	2573		Yes	
5	Smt. Mitila Swett	2750	1	Yes	
15	Shri. K. Bidhan Roy	4153	1		
45	Shri. Clerington Youroi	4408			

Sl No	Name of Landowner	Per capita Monthly Income (Rs)	Members over 60 Years	Women headed	Family members with disabilities
48	Smt. Phimilian M.	4950	1	Yes	
24	Smt. Supria Iangrai	8156	1		
55	Smt. D. Saibon	10673	2		
28	Smt. Ines Youroi	944	1		
		(same as Rosbell Laitmon)	(same as Rosbell Laitmon)		

### 6.7.1 **Families below Poverty Line**

Considering an average poverty line estimate of Rs 328 per capita per month, a total of 4 families were estimated to be below the poverty line as per reported family incomes.

- Saroda Nongbri
- Ekret Natep
- Kelo Khylllep
- Nitrida Swett

All the above 4 families are considered vulnerable.

### 6.7.2 **Families with Senior Citizens**

A total of 28 families reported at least one member above the age of 60. Two of the families were below the poverty line, while two were economically vulnerable.

- Nitrida Swett (Per capita monthly income below Rs 328)
- Ekret Natep (Per capita monthly income below Rs 328)
- A Lyngdoh Nongbri (Per capita monthly income below Rs 500)
- Suken Dhkar (Per capita monthly income below Rs 500)

These 4 families are considered vulnerable.

### 6.7.3 **Families with Physically / Mentally Challenged Members**

Eight families reported at least one family member physically or mentally challenged – five of these families have an average per capita monthly income less than Rs 500.

- Saroda Nongbri
- Ekret Natep
- A Lyngdoh Nongbri
- Suken Dhkar
- Emsidorah Lyngdoh

These 5 families are considered vulnerable.

#### **6.7.4 Women Headed Households**

A total of 12 affected families were found to be women headed households, four were also economically vulnerable.

- Kelo Khylllep
- Nitrida Swett
- Emsidora Lyngdoh
- S Synrem

These 5 families are considered vulnerable.

#### **6.7.5 PAFs Classified as Vulnerable**

As per the definition provided in *Section 6.7*, the following 8 families were classified as vulnerable families <sup>(1)</sup>.

- Saroda Nongbri
- Ekret Natep
- Kelo Khylllep
- Nitrida Swett
- A Lyngdoh Nongbri
- Suken Dhkar
- Emsidora Lyngdoh
- S Synrem

#### **6.8 LIMITATIONS**

*Assessing Income Levels:* In certain cases, the PAFs interviewed were either unable to or reluctant to disclose details of landholding, assets, income sources and income figures for the family. Attempts were made both by the project proponents and the consultants to hold informal discussions with the families to elicit accurate information regarding landholding and income levels – however, in some cases, it was assessed that the incomes reported by the people during the survey, was not an accurate indicator of their current economic status – many families were assessed to under-report their family incomes. Also, in many cases, the agricultural produce is entirely used for self-consumption and the monetary incomes reported would not include this agricultural yield.

*Estimating Total Landholding:* None of the families interviewed provided estimates of their total landholding. Also as mentioned before, lack of land records and the reluctance on behalf of the local people to provide details on their land made it difficult to estimate total landholding. Of the 54 project affected families, 25 families did not provide any information regarding landholding, 29 families did provide an estimate of their area under paddy cultivation but would not divulge their total landholding.

---

(1) In addition there would be families who would be categorised as vulnerable due to severity of project impacts (See Section 7.3)

*Enumeration and Identification of Sharecroppers:* Although discussions with some members of the community did indicate that almost all the landowners had sharecropping arrangements (mostly with landless Garo labourers), none of the families interviewed reported sharecropping arrangements. This made it difficult to identify the number and identities of the sharecroppers working on the affected.

The proposed conveyor belt project does not envisage any loss of homestead land and no person shall be displaced or resettled. The project is also not likely to involve any impacts on public infrastructure and civic amenities. The elevated conveyor belt would require a linear strip of land. A significant part of this strip along the conveyor belt route is uncultivated and barren land although in some locations, the proposed route traverses through paddy fields.

The major socio-economic impacts of the project is likely to be in terms of

- Partial loss of land
- Partial loss of livelihood and income

**7.1****LOSS OF COMMUNITY LAND**

The limestone mine site is proposed on the community land which belongs to the Nongtraï village durbar. It is estimated to be about 100 ha in area in hilly area which is currently not in use by any of the village residents.

The elevated conveyor belt will require two plots of land belonging to the Nongtraï durbar and two plots which belong to the Shella durbar. The two plots belonging to the Shella durbar are estimated to be 8995 and 8186 sq m in area respectively, while the Nongtraï durbar plots are estimated to be 5663 and 4168 sq m, respectively. The Shella durbar plots are part of the dry river bed of the River Umium and part of a small dry canal (nala), while the Nongtraï durbar plots are in hilly areas and not put to any productive use.

**7.2****LOSS OF LAND****Definitions**

- **Total Landholding** denotes the consolidated land ownership of the affected family, including the plot (s) affected by the project.
- **Affected plot** denotes the plot of land owned by a family over which the belt conveyor route passes and a part of which will be required to be purchased by the project proponents for construction purposes. While majority of the families have only a single plot of land falling within the conveyor track route, there are some families which have two or more plots of land within the route of the belt conveyor.
- **Affected land / Extent of land required by project:** Within the affected plot, the belt conveyor would require only a linear strip of land (of normally 40 m in width and up to 70m in some areas especially in the hills), while the remaining part of the affected plot will remain available for use. This strip of land required for the project is defined as the affected land.

**7.2.1****Total land ownership**

As mentioned before, lack of land records and reluctance on behalf of the PAFs interviewed to divulge details regarding land made it difficult to estimate the total landholding among the PAFs. Most of the affected families indicated that

they owned several plots of land in various locations with different land use. While the survey undertaken by ERM in September 2000 and the follow-up survey in February – March 2002 attempted to collect information regarding the total land ownership of the people, none of the PAFs provided accurate estimates of their consolidated landholding. Almost all the PAFs however, indicated that they owned in plots in addition to the one (s) which are likely to be affected by the project, while some provided an estimate of the area under cultivation <sup>(1)</sup>. The details of the area reported under cultivation is provided in Section 6.5.

## 7.2.2 **Number of Affected Plots & Affected Land**

The following table shows the number of plots affected for each PAF and the total area required for the project from each family. One family stands to lose five plots, 4 PAFs are likely to lose 3 plots of land and 12 families will lose 2 plots of land along the route of the conveyor belt.

**Table 7.1 Affected Area of Land & Number of Affected Plots**

PAF Sl No	Name of Owner	Area Affected (sq m)	Area affected (Acres)	No of plots affected
1	Smt. Saroda Nongbri	6804	1.68	2
2	Shri. GR Ksaning	10082	2.49	3
3	Shri. Dhormo R. Dkhar	10145	2.51	3
4	Smt. Sodatri Sarubai	3215	0.79	2
5	Smt. Mitila Swett	30745	7.60	5
6	Smt. Kelo Khyllap	2449	0.61	1
7	Shri. LN Diengdoh	1335	0.33	1
8	Smt. Belnoda Dkhar	886	0.22	1
9	Shri. Stolitit Lyngdoh	11719	2.90	2
10	Smt. S. Synrem	993	0.25	1
11	Shr. SS Synrem	1781	0.44	1
12	Shri. Botdronath Youroi	7882	1.95	3
13	Shri. Woslin Chyne	5219	1.29	1
14	Shri. Bidot Pde	4587	1.13	1
15	Shri. K. Bidhan Roy	5452	1.35	2
16	Shri. Rosbell Laitmon	8899	2.20	3
17	Shri. Ragesor Syngwan	4910	1.21	1
18	Shri. MN Synrem	1936	0.48	1
19	Smt. Markret Ropmay	7173	1.77	1
20	Shri. Susanta Swett	2406	0.59	2
21	Shri. Susendro Chyne	3075	0.76	2
22	Shri. Woren Ksanlah	1993	0.49	1
23	Shri. Pherington Youroi	2651	0.66	2
24	Smt. Supria Iangrai	2407	0.59	1
25	Shri. Dhrubo Dkhar	5329	1.32	2
26	Shri. Addito Syngwan	4054	1.00	1
27	Smt. Emsidora Lyngdoh	11094	2.74	2
29	Smt. Nitrida Swett	1785	0.44	1
30	Shri. RL Roy	15514	3.83	2

(1) Includes land under cultivation of paddy, vegetables, etc., but excludes land under plantations (betelnut, fruits, etc.).

PAF Sl No	Name of Owner	Area Affected (sq m)	Area affected (Acres)	No of plots affected
	Youthborn			
31	Shri. Evergreen Chyne	5453	1.35	1
32	Shri. A. Lyngdoh	3994	0.99	1
	Nongbri			
33	Shri. Hekron Syngwan	4001	0.99	1
34	Shri. Frosland Swett	7987	1.97	1
35	Smt. Baiahunlang S.	4001	0.99	1
36	Shri. Winstarlin Swer	2000	0.49	1
37	Shri. Digesor Chyne	1600	0.40	1
38	Shri. Querister	1590	0.39	1
	Tiewsoh			
39	Shri. Sorkey Chyne	2001	0.49	1
40	Smt. Greensila	2000	0.49	1
	Lyngdoh			
41	Shri. Sunday & Friday R.	2400	0.59	1
42	Shri. Livingstone S.	3599	0.89	2
43	Smt. Gracybell Chyne	5800	1.43	2
44	Shri. Suken Dkhar	1600	0.40	1
45	Shri. Clerington	2442	0.60	1
	Youroi			
46	Shri. Giri Ksaning	3552	0.88	1
47	Shri. Lumlang Swett	2800	0.69	1
48	Smt. Phimilian M.	5600	1.38	1
49	Smt. Ekret Natep	2764	0.68	1
50	Shri. Kranstanel K.	3419	0.84	1
51	Smt. Sotida Sarubai	4632	1.14	1
52	Shri. Pearlstarwell	744	0.18	1
	Dolloi			
53	Shri. Prince SW. Sarubai	10346	2.56	1
54	Shri. Alphantis K.	3053	0.75	1
55	Smt. D. Saibon	4444	1.10	1

\* Wife of Rosbel Laitmon and part of the same family.

The area of land required for the project is a linear strip of land ranging from 744 sq m to 30,745 sq m for each family. The following table provides the distribution of land loss (in acres).

**Table 7.2 Distribution of PAFs according to Landloss**

Range of Landloss (in acres)	Number of PAFs	Percentage of PAFs
< 0.25	2	3.70%
0.25 – 0.49	12	22.22%
0.50 – 0.74	8	14.81%
0.75 – 0.99	9	16.67%
1.00 – 1.99	15	27.78%
2.00 – 2.99	6	11.11%
> 3.00	2	3.70%
Total	54*	100.00%

\* Ines Youroi, although an individual landowner has been considered as the same family as Rosbell Laitmon (husband)

Majority of the PAFs (57%) are likely to lose less than 1 acre of land due to the project, about 15 families (28%) stand to lose between 1 and 2 acres of land,

while about 15% (8 PAFs) are likely to lose more than 2 acres of land. Only 1 PAF is likely to lose more than 4 acres.

### 7.2.3 *Landuse of the Affected Land*

Of the 54 families likely to lose land, 23 families have productive land which is likely to be affected (21 families have paddy fields, 1 has betelnut plantation while another family has limestone deposits on their land). The remaining families mostly have land which are uncultivated and are overgrown with bushes and trees.

**Table 7.1** *Current landuse of the affected plots*

<b>PAF Sl No</b>	<b>Name of Owner</b>	<b>Total Area Affected sq m</b>	<b>Landuse</b>
1	Smt. Saroda Nongbri	6804	Paddy field
2	Shri. GR Ksaning	10082	Paddy field
3	Shri. Dhormo R. Dkhar	10145	Paddy field
4	Smt. Sodatri Sarubai	3215	Paddy field
5	Smt. Mitila Swett	30745	Paddy field, uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
6	Smt. Kelo Khylllep	2449	Paddy field
7	Shri. LN Diengdoh	1335	Paddy field
8	Smt. Belnoda Dkhar	886	Paddy field
9	Shri. Stolitit Lyngdoh	11719	Paddy field
10	Smt. S. Synrem	993	Paddy field
11	Shr. SS Synrem	1781	Paddy field
12	Shri. Botdronath Youroi	7882	Paddy field
13	Shri. Woslin Chyne	5219	Paddy field
14	Shri. Bidot Pde	4587	Paddy field
15	Shri. K. Bidhan Roy	5452	Paddy field
16	Shri. Rosbell Laitmon	8899	Paddy field
17	Shri. Ragesor Syngwan	4910	Paddy field
18	Shri. MN Synrem	1936	Paddy field
19	Smt. Markret Ropmay	7173	Paddy field
20	Shri. Susanta Swett	2406	Paddy field, uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
21	Shri. Susendro Chyne	3075	Paddy field, hilly land with jungle
22	Shri. Woren Ksanlah	1993	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
23	Shri. Pherington Youroi	2651	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes; hilly land with jungle
24	Smt. Supria langrai	2407	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
25	Shri. Dhrubo Dkhar	5329	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
26	Shri. Addito Syngwan	4054	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
27	Smt. Emsidora	11094	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes

PAF Sl No	Name of Owner	Total Area Affected sq m	Landuse
	Lyngdoh		
29	Smt. Nitrida Swett	1785	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
30	Shri. RL Roy	15514	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
	Youthborn		
31	Shri. Evergreen	5453	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
	Chyne		
32	Shri. A. Lyngdoh	3994	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
	Nongbri		
33	Shri. Hekron	4001	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
	Syngwan		
34	Shri. Frosland	7987	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
	Swett		
35	Smt. Baiahunlang	4001	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
	S.		
36	Shri. Winstarlin	2000	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
	Swer		
37	Shri. Digesor	1600	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
	Chyne		
38	Shri. Querister	1590	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
	Tiewsoh		
39	Shri. Sorkey Chyne	2001	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
40	Smt. Greensila	2000	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
	Lyngdoh		
41	Shri. Sunday & Friday R.	2400	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
42	Shri. Livingstone S.	3599	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes & Hilly land with jungle
43	Smt. Gracybell	5800	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes; hilly land with jungle
	Chyne		
44	Shri. Suken Dkhar	1600	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
45	Shri. Clerington	2442	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes
	Youroi		
46	Shri. Giri Ksaning	3552	Uncultivated land overgrown with bushes & Hilly land with jungle
47	Shri. Lumlang	2800	Hilly land with jungle
	Swett		
48	Smt. Phimilian M.	5600	Hilly land with jungle
49	Smt. Ekret Natep	2764	Hilly land with jungle
50	Shri. Kranstanel K.	3419	Hilly land with jungle
51	Smt. Sotida Sarubai	4632	Hilly land with jungle
52	Shri. Pearlstarwell	744	Hilly land with jungle
	Dolloi		
53	Shri. Prince SW.	10346	Hilly land with jungle
	Sarubai		
54	Shri. Alphrantis K.	3053	Betelnut plantation and hilly land with jungle
55	Smt. D. Saibon	4444	Limestone deposits

#### 7.2.4

#### **Percentage of Landloss & Severity of Impact**

The percentage of land affected to the total landholding was difficult to calculate as none of the PAFs provided information on their total landholding. However, the project proponents have at the time of the conveyor belt route survey obtained information on the affected plot – both in terms of the area likely to be required for the project as well the total area of the affected plot (i.e., area within and outside the conveyor track). Also during the household survey, some of the families have provided an estimate of their total land under cultivation (paddy, vegetables, etc.). Using these two estimates (area of the

affected plot and reported area under cultivation), it was assessed that not more than 9<sup>(1)</sup> families would stand to lose more than 25% of their total landholding.

The two families which may lose more than 25% of their area reported under cultivation are:

- Ragesor Syngwan
- Al Phrantis K Chandy

Complete or adequate information to assess severity of impact is not available for the following 7 families:

- Saroda Nongbri
- Woslin Chyne
- Emsidora Lyngdoh
- Gracybell Chyne
- Ekret Natep
- Sotida Sarubai
- D Saibon

### **7.3**

#### ***LOSS OF LIVELIHOOD & INCOME***

Only 23 families stand to lose productive land (21 families with paddy fields, 1 with betelnut plantation and 1 with limestone deposits) which is likely to have partial impacts on their livelihoods and incomes.

The rest of the families have unproductive land which is lying uncultivated and unutilised. These are either sandy floodplains along the river or are land overgrown with trees and bushes.

##### *Loss of Income from Agriculture & Other Land Based Livelihoods: Landowners*

There are a total of 21 families which grow paddy on the fields affected by the proposed conveyor belt, while 1 family has betelnut plantations on their land. The families whose livelihoods are likely to be affected due to land loss are listed below:

1. Smt. Saroda Nongbri
2. Shri. GR Ksaning
3. Shri. Dhormo R. Dkhar
4. Smt. Sodatri Sarubai
5. Smt. Mitila Swett
6. Smt. Kelo Khylllep
7. Shri. LN Diengdoh
8. Smt. Belnoda Dkhar
9. Shri. Stolitit Lyngdoh
10. Smt. S. Synrem
11. Shr. SS Synrem
12. Shri. Botdronath Youroi
13. Shri. Woslin Chyne

---

(1) Of the 9 families, adequate information is not available for 7 families to assess severity of impact.

14. Shri. Bidot Pde
15. Shri. K. Bidhan Roy
16. Shri. Rosbell Laitmon
17. Shri. Ragesor Syngwan
18. Shri. MN Synrem
19. Smt. Markret Ropmay
20. Shri. Susanta Swett
21. Shri. Susendro Chyne
22. Shri. Alphantis K Chandy (Loss of income due to loss of betelnut plantation).

In addition, D Saibon stands to lose part of the land which has limestone deposits.

#### *Loss of Income from Agriculture: Sharecroppers*

The 21 households who have cultivated paddy fields lying within the belt conveyor track, may have sharecroppers associated with them who cultivate these agricultural lands as tenants and retain a part of the agricultural produce for meeting subsistence requirements. All the land owners belong to the Khasi community while the tenants are primarily Garos or Bengali migrants.

No information is available at present regarding the identities and the exact number of such sharecroppers who are likely to be affected by the project as it was extremely difficult to conduct any assessment or survey of the sharecroppers in the absence of information made available by the respective landowners or the durbar regarding the sharecroppers. The project proponents also were unable to obtain any further information on the identity and details of the sharecroppers.

Also, information regarding the project and the process of land transfer was disseminated more than two years ago among the local residents. According to the project proponents, upon receiving information regarding the land transfer process, the sharecroppers cultivating the affected plots may have, in the last two years, moved to alternate locations and / or have identified alternate plots of land for sharecropping. They are reportedly no sharecroppers cultivating the affected plots of land at this point of time.

## **7.4**

### ***VULNERABILITY DUE TO EXTENT OF LANDLOSS***

It is assumed that those families which stand to lose more than 25% of their productive land will be rendered vulnerable due to project impacts as it may have a significant impact on their livelihoods. Of the 9 families who may lose more than 25% of their total landholding, only 4 have productive land and hence may be categorised as “vulnerable”:

- Ragesor Syngwan (Paddy fields)
- Al Phrantis K Chandy (Betelnut plantations)
- Woslin Chyne (Paddy fields)
- Saroda Nongbri (Paddy fields)



**8.1 ENTITLEMENTS**

This section provides details regarding the following categories of entitlements which the project proponent propose to pay to the various stakeholders:

- Royalty to the State & District Council
- Compensation for Loss of Community Land (Nongtraï & Shella village durbar)
- Compensation for Loss of Private Land (including Income and Productive Assets)

**8.1.1 Royalty to the State & District Council**

As per the Sixth Schedule of the Indian Constitution, “share of the royalties accruing each year from licenses or leases for the purpose of prospecting for, or extraction of minerals granted by the Government of Meghalaya in respect of any area within an autonomous district as may be agreed upon between the Government of Meghalaya and the District Council of such district shall be made over to that District Council.”

Accordingly, the project proponents will pay a royalty to the State Government at a rate of Rs 40 per tonne of limestone exported for the entire lease period. Based on the estimation of 2 million tonnes of limestone to be extracted from Nongtraï annually, LMMPL/LUMPL will pay an estimated royalty of Rs 80 million per annum to the State Government. 60% of this royalty amount will be shared by the Khasi Hills District Council, for further investment in regional development, including construction of roads, provision of sanitation facilities, etc.

LMMPL/LUMPL will pay a royalty to the State Government at the provisional rate of Rs. 5 per tonne of the quantity of shale/siltstone extracted. Based on an estimated production of 0.35 million tonnes of shale/siltstone per year, LMMPL/LUMPL will pay to the State Government Rs 1.75 million per annum. 60% of this royalty amount will be shared by the Khasi Hills District Council, for further investment in regional development, including construction of roads, provision of sanitation facilities, etc.

In addition, LMMPL/LUMPL will pay all applicable taxes / cess to the Government of Meghalaya.

**8.1.2 Compensation for Loss of Community Land**

*Nongtraï Durbar*

**Land for Limestone Mine:** The project proponents have held consultations with the village durbar of Nongtraï to determine the appropriate compensatory arrangements for the lease of the mine site area. The lease agreement has

already been finalised, and the terms and conditions have already been discussed and agreed upon.

The 1 sq km land for the mine site and related areas is being leased by the Nongtraï village durbar to LMMPL for a period of 35 years. LMMPL will pay Rs 200,000 per year up to the start of limestone quarry commercial operation. From the start of quarry commercial operation, LMMPL will pay Rs 5 per tonne of limestone extracted/exported from the mine site as royalty or *musur* to the Nongtraï village durbar. It is estimated that LMMPL will extract about 2 million tonnes of limestone annually, which would imply a total annual *musur* of about Rs 10 million.

In view of the traditional role of the village durbar and the cultural practice of collective decision making, the decision regarding the utilisation of the *musur* will rest solely with the village durbar. Based on discussions which the project proponents have held with the Nongtraï durbar, it is expected that the Nongtraï village durbar will distribute 70% of the royalty amount equally among the 137<sup>(1)</sup> households in the village, while the remaining 30% of the royalty would be invested in community development projects to enhance the existing public infrastructure of the village. Assistance will be provided by the Community Relations Officer (CRO) of LUMPL to guide the individuals to utilise the compensation money in an appropriate manner. Necessary technical assistance will be provided by the project proponents to help the durbar plan and implement community development activities.

The 70% (almost Rs 7 million) of the royalty which will be distributed equally among the 137 families of the Nongtraï village as per the decision of the durbar. The amount is likely to be distributed in terms of fixed / savings deposits and is expected to enhance the income levels of each family by more than Rs 50,000 annually. This amount will be payable to the 137 families identified by LMMPL in 1999. New settlers who have migrated to the village thereafter will not be entitled to a share of the royalty, unless they are duly recognised and approved of by the village durbar.

The 30% of the *musur* which has been earmarked for community development projects is proposed to be invested in upgrading the health and educational facilities in the village and in improving and enhancing the existing road and communication infrastructure. There are also some preliminary proposals for creating youth associations and community centres in the village. However, the proposals for the community development projects are at a conceptual stage and yet to be finalised by the village durbar. The project proponents shall provide all necessary assistance required by the village durbar in terms of technical skills to implement any community development programs.

LMMPL has already paid a security deposit of Rs 500,000 to the Nongtraï durbar. LMMPL has also paid Rs. 200,000 to the Nongtraï durbar, the amount payable for the first year against lease of limestone land.

---

(1) As per the survey carried out by ERM during the Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment in 1999, there were 137 families in Nongtraï village.

**Land for Conveyor Belt:** Consultations regarding the transfer of the community land of Nongtraï which falls within the conveyor belt track is completed and an amount of Rs 1,550,000 has mutually agreed upon and paid to the Nongtraï durbar.

**Annual Grant:** In addition to the above compensation, as overall compensation to the entire village durbar for the construction of the conveyor belt, a sum of Rs 500,000 will be paid annually to the durbar from the start of quarry commercial operation. It is expected that this amount will be used for community development activities. (Please see Section 9 on IPDP)

#### *Shella Durbar*

**Land for Conveyor Belt:** The Shella Durbar is affected by the loss of two plots of community land. These two plots are part of the dry river bed of the River Umium and are currently not put to any productive use by any of the villagers. The project proponent is proposing to pay a sum of Rs 100,000 per annum as compensation amount to the Shella durbar from the start of quarry commercial operation, although specific terms and conditions are currently being negotiated with the Shella durbar and not yet finalised.

**Annual Grants:** In addition to this amount the project proponents have made a provision for payment of compensation amount to the entire village durbar for their overall support to the construction of the conveyor belt. A sum of Rs 1,500,000 will be paid to the durbar annually from the start of quarry commercial operation. The utilisation of this amount will depend on the decision of the village durbar and the part of it may be invested for enhancement of public infrastructure (Please refer to Section 9 on IPDP).

### **8.1.3 Compensation for Loss of Private Land**

The land required for the construction of the conveyor belt is almost entirely private land, barring the four plots of community land which belong to the Nongtraï and Shella village durbars, respectively.

In Meghalaya, there exists no official land records or any documented / registered price for land. Land transactions between two tribals do not require any formal approval or registration process. As such there exist no official record of title / registered price for the land.

In view of the absence of formal land records, the landholding survey for the affected plots were undertaken by the project proponents and landholding maps and details were documented. The landholding maps and ownership details were compiled and sent to the respective village durbars and the village headman. Public notifications were also issued to inform the affected landowners. The village durbars after verification of the information, issued certificates of landholding to individual landowners. The landowners, based on the certificates received from the village headman, executed and registered the deeds of declaration for issuance of non-encumbrance certificates for the affected plots of land. Subsequently, the project proponents and the individual

landowners jointly applied to the Government of Meghalaya <sup>(1)</sup> in the prescribed format for approval of land transfer. Government approval has been received for all the concerned plots of land after which the project proponents have executed and registered the land lease / sale deeds with each of the individual landowners.

Given the lack of any registered land prices in at the project area, the transfer of land was based on mutually agreed upon prices. The project proponents have held a series of consultations with the village durbars and the affected landowners to determine the compensation prices for the land required for the project. The landowners have quoted compensation amounts based on their individual assessment of the value of the land and its productivity. The project proponents have, through such consultation processes, determined the compensation payable to each landowner and the terms and conditions for the transfer of land. Accordingly, the compensation prices have been fixed and paid to each affected landowner through the above mentioned process of land transfer. The compensation amount for the individual landowners have been determined to include compensation for loss of land, loss of all other assets on the land (agricultural produce, etc.) as well as loss of income resulting from the loss of the land.

The land required for shale/siltstone mine belongs to the private owners (not covered under the present study) under the jurisdiction of Shella village durbar. The terms and conditions for the transfer of land for shale/siltstone mine is currently under negotiations with the respective landowners.

#### **8.1.4 Compensation for Loss of Livelihood and Income**

##### *Landowners*

The project is not likely to result in any large scale disruption of livelihood and income for the Khasi landowners. There are only 23 families, which are likely to be partially affected by the loss of productive land (of these 21 have paddy fields, 1 family has betelnut plantations and 1 has limestone deposits). The remaining households have not reported any income from the affected plots of land.

As stated earlier, the compensation amounts paid to the individual landowners have been determined to include compensation for land, loss of agricultural produce and potential loss of income.

While major impacts are not anticipated on most affected landowners, based on the socio-economic impact assessment and the information provided, there may be 4 families which may lose more than 25% of their productive land. These families may be significantly affected in terms of livelihoods and income sources. The project proponents shall verify the severity of impacts on these families through further studies and in case, they are assessed to lose more than 25% of their productive lands, they shall be provided with additional assistance as provided in *Section 8.2.1*.

---

(1) Under the Meghalaya Transfer of Land (Regulation) Act, 1971, transfer of land from tribal to non-tribal is prohibited unless specific approval is obtained from the State Government.

### *Sharecroppers*

At the time of the socio-economic survey, the sharecroppers could not be identified since neither the landowners nor the durbar reported any sharecropping arrangements. The project proponents also were unable to obtain any further information on the identity and details of the sharecroppers. Information regarding the project and the process of land transfer was disseminated more than two years ago among the local residents. According to the project proponents, upon receiving information regarding the land transfer process, the sharecroppers cultivating the affected plots may have, in the last two years, moved to alternate locations and / or have identified alternate plots of land for sharecropping. They are reportedly no sharecroppers cultivating the affected plots of land at this point of time.

Moreover, the project proponents have held discussions with the local village durbars on this issue. The durbars do not recognise the rights of the sharecroppers and the project proponents will not be allowed to compensate the sharecroppers without the consent of the durbars and the relevant landowners.

In view of the above difficulty regarding identification of sharecroppers and providing them compensation in the context of the local administration and customs, the project proponents are unable to provide an entitlement framework for the sharecroppers.

## **8.2**

### ***REHABILITATION ACTION PLAN***

The project proponents have proposed the above entitlement framework to compensate the affected people for any loss of livelihood and income. Also, a large number of the landowners who are likely to lose land are not dependent on the affected land for their livelihoods. The project proponents expect that the entitlements proposed by them will address the adverse impacts due to the project and therefore minimise the need for income restoration schemes for rehabilitation of livelihoods.

There are about 23 Khasi landowners in the project which are dependent on the affected land for income generating activities. The project proponents recognise that there will be some loss of income / livelihood for all persons likely to be affected by the loss of productive land. However the project proponents do not anticipate that these losses are unlikely to result in large scale disruption of their livelihoods and incomes. In view of the partial and limited impact on livelihoods and incomes, and based on discussion with the affected people, the project proponents do not feel the need for any additional income restoration program.

However, the project proponents shall offer assistance through the following initiatives:

### **8.2.1 Land Purchase Assistance Program**

In case any of the affected landowners wish to invest their compensation money to purchase alternate land, the project proponents through the Community Relations Officer, LUMPL shall provide assistance to such landowners to identify, negotiate and purchase alternate land.

### **8.2.2 Priority for Employment Opportunities**

The mining project and its ancillaries are likely to generate a demand for both skilled and unskilled labour. These employment opportunities will first be made available to the project affected families and thereafter to the residents of Shella and Nongtraï. It will be for the project proponents to identify the employment opportunities and make these known to the village durbars. The project proponents will make an assessment of the skill base of the project affected families and the rest of the community in Shella and Nongtraï in consultation with the village durbars. In the event that the basic skill level exists and specific training is required to enable people to avail of these employment opportunities, then it will be up to the project proponents to provide a forum for such training. Project proponents will also attempt to provide employment opportunities to the local people through the contractors involved in the construction activities.

### **8.2.3 Assistance for Skill Development / Income Enhancement Activities**

In the event that either the project based employment opportunities are not sufficient to cover all the project affected families or if the PAFs are primarily interested in enhance / establishing their own agricultural, commercial or other income generating activities, the project proponents will make an attempt to provide assistance for their skill development through training in their income generating sources.

### **8.2.4 Assistance to Vulnerable & Severely Affected Families**

Based on the information received, 8 families are estimated as socio-economically vulnerable (below poverty line, or families which are economically vulnerable and are either women headed households or have members over the age of 60 or with disabilities):

- Saroda Nongbri
- Ekret Natep
- Kelo Khylllep
- Nitrida Swett
- A Lyngdoh Nongbri
- Suken Dhkar
- Emsidora Lyngdoh
- S Synrem

As already mentioned in *Section 7.1.4*, in addition to the above families, there are likely to be a maximum of 3 <sup>(1)</sup> additional families which may be affected by loss of more than 25% loss of productive land:

- Ragesor Syngwan (Paddy fields)
- Al Phrantis K Chandy (Betelnut plantations)
- Woslin Chyne (Paddy fields)

These families losing a significant part of their total productive landholding may be vulnerable to project impacts.

The project proponents through their further studies shall assess the PAFs identified as socio-economically vulnerable and / or severely impacted and will verify their socio-economic status. All affected families identified to be vulnerable as per the criteria provided in *Section 6.7* and / or losing more than 25% of their productive lands will be provided special assistance in the form of:

- Employment opportunities depending on their skill base and availability of jobs, or
- Vocational training and income generating programs.

The project proponents have initiated discussions and consultations with the village durbars for discussing the RAP. Such consultations shall be continued on an ongoing process throughout the planning and implementation stage. The meetings will also provide a forum for the durbars to make suggestions regarding any new proposals they may have, help finalising the families who would be covered under such initiatives, develop an implementation strategy, time frame, and specify mechanisms for monitoring the effectiveness of these initiatives.

---

(1) Saroda Nongbri may also stand to lose more than 25% of her productive land - she has already been included in the socio-economically vulnerable category. In total there are 11 families who may be eligible for assistance because they are socio-economically vulnerable or because they are likely to lose more than 25% of their productive land.

**9.1 OBJECTIVE OF THE IPDP**

The IPDP aims to ensure that the development process benefits the indigenous people of the region and that any potentially adverse impacts emanating from the elevated conveyor belt project are adequately mitigated through community development plans.

**9.2 SCOPE OF THE IPDP**

The IPDP shall include development activities to be taken up within the jurisdiction of the Shella and the Nongtraï village durbars <sup>(1)</sup> only. The IPDP will aim to enhance existing investments in the region or initiate development in the fields of education, health and nutrition, establishment of credit facilities, public infrastructure and communication facilities, including roads, bridges, etc. or any other activities which may be identified as a primary need of the community.

**9.3 LOCAL CONTEXT RELEVANT FOR IPDP**

It needs to be noted that the state of Meghalaya is predominantly tribal with its very unique and complex socio-political systems. A very significant feature of the Khasi society and village administration is that there exists very strong and effective village institutions. These local village institutions or durbars have a village headman, and although the headman has no individual power to decide on any issue, the durbar as a collective representative of the community's interests has a very influential role to play in the matters which concern the overall well-being and development of the village.

The durbar customarily exercises all functions for the general well being of the village, including enforcement of law and order, deciding on the policy for the conduct of village affairs and general rules and customs which the village has to observe and follow. The durbar is also responsible for looking after common properties, including grazing land and community forests, maintenance and upkeep of roads, drinking water sources and general sanitation of the village. Decision on these issues is always taken collectively by the durbar and then implemented by the entire village with each household participating.

The project proponents are concerned that in addition to compensating for direct impacts on individual landowners, adequate provisions should be made to ensure that the entire village benefits through community development activities (in the form of the IPDP). In view of the prevalent socio-political systems in the region and the traditional role of the durbar, the project proponents consider it culturally appropriate to allow the durbar to take the lead in deciding and implementing community development plans. The project

---

(1) This shall include all villages / hamlets under jurisdiction of the durbars.

proponents propose to provide financial assistance (in the form of annual *musur* / royalty to Nongtraï durbar and annual grants to both the Nongtraï and Shella durbar as outlined in *Section 8.1.2*), along with technical assistance to help the durbars identify and implement such community development activities that the durbar considers relevant in the local development context. The project proponents have also proposed some separate initiatives for enhancing education infrastructure and providing health care facilities which have been described in *Section 9.5*.

#### **9.4 IDENTIFICATION OF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES**

This section highlights the three key sectors which are development priorities in the region and could be taken up as target sectors for development in the IPDP. These sectors have been identified after preliminary consultations with the project proponents, the village residents, the local administration, including discussions with the village headman of Nongtraï village and the Wahadadar of Shella Confederacy and representatives of the District Administration.

While the interventions proposed here indicate some of the priority sectors which require development, a more detailed and elaborate plan for such community development activities will need to be developed by the village durbars in consultation with the project proponents, the Wahadadar, the District Council and the District Administration. There needs to be general consensus from these stakeholders to identify specific activities, select technical options, draw up detailed plans for implementation, specifying design, financial estimates, workplan, roles and responsibilities for execution and management, operations and maintenance, monitoring and evaluation.

##### **9.4.1 Education**

Although there are two schools in Shella Bazar (Sohlap), the children of the neighbouring hamlets / villages (within the Shella durbar jurisdiction) have to travel substantial distances for attending schools each day. There is need for establishing more educational centres in these hamlets / villages as well as enhancing the infrastructure and facilities in the existing schools.

##### **9.4.2 Health**

While Sohlap has a registered private practitioner, none of the other villages / hamlets have any health facilities. The nearest medical facility for most of the villages / hamlets lies within 5 km.

There is need to enhance the medical facilities in the region by providing for a proper health centre with a registered medical practitioner and adequate support systems to cater to the needs of the local population.

##### **9.4.3 Roads & Other Public Infrastructure**

Lack of adequate road infrastructure in the region also create difficulties for local people to travel within the villages or access local markets, education and

health care facilities. Some of the villages / hamlets require renovation of existing community centres / halls.

## **9.5**

### ***PROJECT PROPONENT'S COMMITMENT ON IPDP***

As mentioned before, the project proponents, after extensive discussions with the respective durbars have proposed the following arrangements for the IPDP.

- The annual musur / royalty provided to the Nongtraï durbar will be partly (30% of the amount) used for community development activities which the durbar decides to be the most appropriate and beneficial for the residents. The project proponents already have an understanding with the Nongtraï durbar which specifies that 30% of the annual musur / royalty will be invested in community development projects to enhance the existing public infrastructure of the village. In addition an annual grant of Rs 500,000 is also being provided to the Nongtraï durbar for overall community development activities. The project proponents will provide the necessary technical assistance to help the durbar plan, design and implement the various other community development activities.
- The project proponents will also provide an annual grant of Rs 1,500,000 to the Shella durbar for partial investment in community development activities. During discussions with the durbar, the project proponents have been assured that part of this annual grant shall be utilised towards appropriate community development activities (improvement of education and health care facilities, enhancing roads and communication systems, etc.) which will be decided by the durbar. The project proponents will provide the necessary technical assistance to help the durbar plan, design and implement the various other community development activities. The project proponents are in the process of obtaining a written commitment from the Shella durbar assuring investment of a pre-determined part of this grant in community development activities. The project proponents also propose to link subsequent annual payments to the durbar based on utilisation of the previous year's funds.
- In addition, the project proponents have already donated Rs 100,000 for enhancing the infrastructure and facilities of the existing schools in Shella.
- The project proponents are proposing a health centre which will cater to the mine colony. All local residents of the Shella and Nongtraï durbars will have access to the health centre.

**10.1****STAKEHOLDERS**

The execution of the limestone mining project would have environmental and social impacts which would affect a number of people, although the intensity of the impact might vary. In addition to directly affected people losing land and incomes, a number of other agencies (permitting agencies, people with political stakes in the region, government agencies, regulatory bodies, etc) play a crucial role in the establishment and successful operation of the project. The spin-off effects of the project also result in benefits for a number of entities such as service providers and input providers.

It is the objective of the project proponents to identify all the stakeholders and engage them in a consultative process as partners in the development process for mutual benefits. The potential stakeholders are enumerated in this section. These stakeholders have been identified during the visit to the site and discussions held with the Lafarge Surma Cement, LMMPL/LUMPL, affected people, local and district administration. The list may need to be updated at the time of commencement of the project implementation and as new stakeholders are identified.

The following are the primary stakeholders for the project:

- Village Durbars and village level administration of the Shella and Nongtraï Villages
- Landowners affected by the loss of private land for the belt conveyor

Secondary stakeholders include:

- Khasi Hill District Council
- District Administration of the East Khasi Hills District
- Government and Regulatory Bodies
- Social and political organisation, Media
- Financial institutions

**10.1.1*****Village Durbars of the Shella, Nongtraï Villages***

The village institutions form an important stakeholder category as they represent the interest of the community in general and provide a forum for interaction of the village people. The village durbar comprises every adult male member of the village, including the headman, the executive durbar and other influential members and will constitute key stakeholders for the project. The village durbar selects two members who represent the village in the Confederacy of Shella headed by the Wahadadar. In addition to ensuring general welfare of the community, maintenance of law and order, settlement of land disputes and other developmental activities are the main functions of the village durbar. Each village also has a village defence association, which plays vital role in maintaining social tranquillity.

Invariably matters related to the proposed project, the transfer of land, potential environmental impacts would be discussed in such forums. It is necessary to provide these institutions with accurate and relevant information regarding the project in order to facilitate the building of the right process of dialogue with the community. Also, since there are no formal land records in the state, and landowners rarely possess documents establishing ownership, the village durbar plays a crucial role in resolving disputes and grievances related to land ownership through its village courts.

The entire land required for the mine lease area and a small part of land within the route of the belt conveyor is community land, which belongs to the village durbar of Nongtraï. A section of the belt conveyor route also passes over the land belonging to the Shella village durbar. The project proponents have consulted the village durbars in finalising the lease arrangements and in determining the terms and conditions of the lease agreement.

The village durbar of Nongtraï has two committees, which will be consulted and involved in the project planning:

- Special affairs committee relating to boundary dispute
- Local affairs committee relating to Governmental Schemes and methods of implementation.

The Shella village durbar would also constitute an important stakeholder for the project, as most of the land over which the belt conveyor is routed are private lands belonging to the people of Shella village and two plots of land in the dry river and nala belonging to the Shella village durbar under community land. The village durbar has been consulted and their permission sought in obtaining clearance for transfer of land for constructing the belt conveyor. Although the private landowner has the sole discretion regarding transfer of land and in determining terms and conditions, the village durbar has been involved in issuing permission / No Objection Certificate (NoC) to the project authorities to present to the regulatory authorities.

The project proponents shall maintain a regular dialogue with the village durbars and provide them information on a regular basis regarding the project activities and all other development activities in the region. The village durbars shall also play a crucial role on implementing the social impact mitigation plans and grievance redressal.

### **10.1.2 People affected by the loss of private land for the belt conveyor**

This category of stakeholders consists of the people whose private land (*Ri Kynti*) would be required for the construction of the belt conveyor. As per the local customary practices, the ownership of land is restricted to the people belonging to the Khasi community. Although transfer of such land (from tribal to non-tribal) requires prior approval from the state government and the consent of the village durbar, the durbar has no jurisdiction over private lands and the landowner is the ultimate decision maker.

The individual landowners therefore form one of the most important stakeholder groups for the project. The project proponents will continue to provide them information on project activities and consult them on an ongoing basis during the entire project period.

### **10.1.3 *Khasi Hill District Council***

As per the Sixth Schedule of the Indian Constitution, the Autonomous District Council is entitled to “share of the royalties accruing each year from licenses or leases for the purpose of prospecting for, or the extraction of, minerals granted by the Government of the State in respect of any area within an Autonomous District Council.” The royalty to be paid to the state has already been fixed at Rs 40 per tonne of limestone extracted, and Rs. 5 per tonne of shale/siltstone (provisional rate) from which the District Council receives 60% for investment in developmental activities. The project proponents shall at appropriate intervals share project information with the District Council and consult them with regard to development programs in the region.

### **10.1.4 *District Administration of the East Khasi Hills District***

The District Administration, especially the Deputy Commissioner, East Khasi Hills has jurisdiction over the project area need to be informed and consulted regarding the project in getting various permissions.

### **10.1.5 *Other Government and Regulatory Bodies***

Both the state government and the central government constitute a key stakeholder for the successful implementation of the project. The Ministry of Environment and Forests and the Ministry of Mines are the two nodal government agencies, which are responsible for implementation of the legislation for mitigating and controlling environmental issues in the process of mining operations. Within these two nodal agencies, the Central Pollution Control Board, the Meghalaya Pollution Control Board, the National Environmental Appellate Authority, the Chief Conservator of Forests, the District Forest Officer and the Indian Bureau of Mines will constitute the most important stakeholders for the project.

### **10.1.6 *Social and Political organisations, Media***

The social organisations, NGOs and advocacy groups in the region constitute a stakeholder category as their decisions may directly or indirectly affect the project implementation process.

The media also provides a vibrant forum for information dissemination. At appropriate stages the project has to provide accurate information to the media, which will help in percolating the information to all other stakeholders.

In addition, any cultural, socio-political organisations, youth clubs, village welfare associations, form important channels of communication and information dissemination.

### 10.1.7 **Financial institutions**

The financial institutions, including IFC, which are involved in the project finance have stakes in terms of the involvement in the project. The financial institutions will be provided information regarding to the project on a regular basis.

## 10.2 **REVIEW OF PREVIOUS CONSULTATION**

The project proponents have engaged the various stakeholders in consultations and discussions at various stages of the project planning regarding both the land required for the limestone mine as well as for the conveyor belt. Extensive discussions were held with both individual landowners as well as the village durbars on the following:

- Information dissemination regarding the conveyor belt project – its objectives, the selected route, the construction process, the extent of land required, the people likely to lose land as a result of the conveyor belt.
- Consultations regarding the likely impacts of the conveyor belt and the benefits likely to accrue to the local people in terms of compensations paid to the individual landowners as well as to the village durbar of Shella.
- Determination of compensation amounts for loss of land, crops and other productive assets
- Procedures of transfer of land
- Terms and conditions for transfer of land

The following table provides a brief summary of the information dissemination and consultations held in the course of project planning.

**Table 10.1 Summary of Previous Consultation**

<b>Details of Information Dissemination &amp; Consultations</b>	<b>Time Period</b>
Notification to Shella village durbar regarding belt conveyor route survey and definition.	Notification given during the last quarter of the year 1998.
Regular information dissemination regarding project to the village durbar through detailed durbar meetings	Last quarter of the year 1998
Discussion with the durbar to seek permission for carrying out survey works and route definition.	Permission given through their letter dated 16.12.1998
Durbar further requested information on landowners along the conveyor route and their consent to transfer the land plots to the company.	December 1998
Survey works and route definition undertaken	1999.
Initial discussions with individual landowners	
Established the landowner list along the track based on route survey.	
Detailed discussions with landowners regarding extent of land required and routing of conveyor belt.	End of 1999
Discussions with the individual landowners to understand their willingness and terms of transfer of the land plots to the company.	

<b>Details of Information Dissemination &amp; Consultations</b>	<b>Time Period</b>
Most of the landowners have given their consents indicating price offers (based on individual assessment of the value of land and productive assets) for transfer of the land plots to the company. Negotiations were continued with rest of the landowners.	
Information to the Shella village durbar regarding list of landowners and those who had provided their consent to land transfer.	Early 2000
Shella durbar confirmed to allow the company to install belt conveyor in the land under their jurisdiction without any objections. Durbar also advised LUMPL to take further coordination with the individual landowner in respect of payment of the compensation amount for loss of their land. They also advised LUMPL to enter into an agreement with the durbar to this effect.	February 2000
Negotiations and discussions with the individual landowners continued on a day-to-day basis.	Throughout 2000
Initial social assessment survey undertaken by ERM during which information was disseminated by ERM and LUMPL CRO to individual landowners and through group discussions held at various villages.	September 2000
Support agreement with the Shella village durbar was signed detailing the terms of support and the project proponents' commitment to pay Rs. 1,500,000 per year to the durbar.	December 2000
Information was provided to the Shella durbar on the status of negotiations with the individual landowners in obtaining their consent. Negotiations continued with the remaining landowners who had not provided consent to transfer their lands.	Mid 2001
One landowner refused to transfer his land.	Mid 2001
Re-definition of about 50% length of the conveyor route was undertaken following the unwillingness of one landowner to transfer his land. In absence of one landowner consent even after involvement of the Shella durbar in the discussions, the conveyor route re-definition work was started (taking into consideration of few alternatives to match the conformity of the landowner willingness to transfer their land. The survey work has been re-done for about 50% of the conveyor track length and the route was re-defined and updated landowner list was prepared.	Mid 2001
Discussions with the landowners in the re-located conveyor areas and finalization of the consents. Consultations with individual landowners regarding assessment of the values of land including productive assets. Received consents and price offers from all the landowners	2001.
Information provided to the durbar about landowner list and survey map showing location of the land plot and the area of each plot. In the absence of any land records in the area, the survey map was prepared based on the information received	Mid 2001

<b>Details of Information Dissemination &amp; Consultations</b>	<b>Time Period</b>
locally.	
<p>The durbar confirmed that they had received the information on conveyor belt route and affected landowners and their consents as provided by LUMPL.</p> <p>Durbar advised LUMPL to proceed to finalize the agreement with the respective landowners and compensate them for the loss of their land.</p>	August 2001
<p>Discussions with Nongtraï durbar regarding transfer of two land plots community belonging to them. Discussions held regarding terms and conditions of transfer of their land. Consent from Nongtraï durbar regarding transfer of land.</p> <p>Land agreements and payment of compensations.</p> <p>Procedures followed as under:</p> <p>Preparation of individual landholding maps.</p> <p>Village Durbar headman issued certificate of landholding to each individual landowner attaching the landholding map.</p> <p>The landowners, based on the Headman certificates, executed and registered the deeds of declaration and non-encumbrance certificates were issued by the registration office concerning the land holdings. (In absence of any land records in the area)</p> <p>Subsequently the agreements for sale/lease were executed with the individual owners stating the compensation prices, subject to Government of Meghalaya approval for transfer. Under the Meghalaya Transfer of Land (Regulation) Act, 1971 transfer of lands to non-tribal company is prohibited unless specific approval is obtained from the Govt.</p> <p>Accordingly, LUMPL, along with the landowners, jointly applied in prescribed form to the Govt of Meghalaya for approval of land transfer and obtained such approval from the Govt.</p> <p>Following the Govt approval the land lease/sale deeds were executed and registered.</p> <p>Agreements with Nongtraï Durbar regarding transfer of two community land plots and payment of compensations.</p> <p>Agreements regarding the two land plots belonging to the Nongtraï village durbar were finalized and the compensation amount was paid.</p> <p>Company also committed to pay Rs. 500,000 per year to the Nongtraï Durbar.</p>	May – October 2001
<p>Agreements with Shella Durbar against regarding of two community land plots and payment of compensations. Shella durbar has confirmed their agreement to transfer the said plots of land to the company through their letter dated 17.01.2002, however, the terms of transfer are presently under discussions.</p>	January 2002
Follow-up survey to update social assessment	February – April 2002

**10.3.1****Key Principles for the PCDP**

This section outlines the key principles applied in the development of the PCDP. These principles are in conformity with IFC guidelines suitably modified to align with cultural specificity in the project area. The principles are:

- All stakeholders must be consulted and be involved in a two-way communication with the project sponsors. Special attention needs to be paid to ensure participation of women and vulnerable households.
- The consultation should be preceded by providing all the relevant and accurate information in written medium.
- Consultations should be a continuous process to allow the participants to know whether their concerns are being addressed by the project proponents.
- Consultation shall take into account the traditional customs, decision making processes and involve the tribal institutions to safeguard the interests of the indigenous people.
- Information should be disseminated and consultations should be held in the local languages, as appropriate. Both written and verbal information should be provided in a manner and medium in which the affected community is comfortable with.
- Since the negotiations for the transfer of land is entirely between the village durbars and / or the private landowners and the project proponents, it is crucial that the affected people are provided full and accurate information regarding the project and its impacts to ensure that they understand the entire process.
- The consultation and information dissemination process should be initiated well before the commencement of the project implementation and continued throughout the project execution period.
- There should be a specific and transparent mechanism for recording of grievances and a feedback mechanism to know the action taken by the project proponents.
- There should be clear enunciation of responsibility and accountability procedures, personnel and resources assigned to and available for effective implementation of the PCDP.
- There should be a mechanism to ensure effective monitoring of the PCDP, with a mid course review to assess the effectiveness of the consultation process.

Based on these principles, the plan for information sharing and consultation for the different stakeholders is given below:

**10.3.2****Information Requirement for the PCDP**

For a public consultation to be effective, it is important that relevant and comprehensive information is disseminated to all stakeholders. The following are the key documents which have been / need to be prepared for information dissemination:

**Summary of Project Information :** A Summary of Project Information (SPI) is essential for information dissemination to the stakeholders. The SPI is a document which will provide a brief summary of the main elements of the project, including its sponsors, the project company's shareholders, the total project cost, the location of the project, description of the project and its purpose, the environmental category and a brief summary of the likely environmental and social issues and methods of accessing further information on the project. The SPI needs to be updated to reflect any changes in the project planning process. The SPI will be prepared in the local languages, as appropriate.

**Documents related to Environmental & Social Issues:** The project proponents have undertaken an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and a Social Assessment for the project to identify the potential environmental and social impacts of the project. The Summary EIA, including the Environmental Management Plan and the summary reports on the Social Assessment will be made available to all the stakeholders. The project proponents will also prepare a non-technical Executive Summary of the Environmental and Social Assessment Reports in the local languages so far as possible, outlining the likely environmental and social impacts and the proposed mitigation measures. This non-technical summary will be proactively circulated among the local stakeholders.

**List of PAPs and Details of Affected Assets:** The project proponents shall provide the village durbars with detailed information on the extent and location of the land that will be required for the mine site area and for the construction of the belt conveyor, along with a complete inventory of other assets that are likely to be affected (such as trees and plantations) and the list of the affected land owners.

**Details of Compensation Payment:** The village durbars as well as all directly project affected persons should be provided written as well verbal information regarding the principles for determining the compensation for loss of land and income, the eligibility for claiming compensation, the procedures of transfer of land and the details of rehabilitation action programs being undertaken for income restoration. This information should be provided well in advance before the commencement of the project activities.

**Indigenous Peoples' Development Plan:** The project proponents have also proposed an IPDP for overall development of the project area which is consistent with the IFC policy on Indigenous People. The implementation of the IPDP will ensure indigenous people benefit from the project and mitigate potentially adverse effects resulting from the project. The IPDP proposed by the project proponents needs to be discussed with local people and village institutions to ensure that the development plans address local needs and also with the district administration for synchronisation with development activities undertaken by the government.

**Grievance Redressal:** The project proponents need to provide information to the affected community and all other stakeholders regarding the grievance redressal mechanism. Written documents will be provided to the village

durbars and notices will be put up in each hamlet at appropriate public places providing the details regarding the project authorities to be contacted for grievance redressal and for obtaining further information.

### **10.3.3 Medium of Providing information**

The project proponents will rely on the following media for providing information to the various stakeholders:

- Documents and reports in English and the local languages, as appropriate.
- Specific written information, leaflets, brochures in English and local languages.
- Public Announcements through the durbar
- Village Durbar Meetings
- Individual meetings and word of mouth
- Information dissemination during local market days

The choice of a specific medium for a specific target group will be determined by their facility with the particular medium and the need and relevance for the information being provided.

The Summary of Project Information (SPI), the non-technical summary of the Environmental Impact Assessment and the Social Assessment will be made available as reports in both English and the local Khasi language. For government and district authorities, the report will be provided in English. For the local community these reports will be circulated in local languages. The reports shall also be kept in public places such as durbar offices and local clubs.

The details of affected plots of land, the inventory of affected assets, details of compensation payments and procedures for transfer of land, entitlements, and grievance redressal mechanisms shall be circulated as written documents in the appropriate language depending on the target audience. Each affected family needs to be provided with the written information on the above issues.

Public announcements will be made through local durbars. Local market days are an effective opportunity for information dissemination. Market days are held every four days in Sohlap (Shella Bazar) when the people from all adjoining villages and hamlets assemble and interact and which could provide a forum for communication. The Wahadadar is also in office on every market day.

Individual meetings and dissemination of information through word of mouth is also an effective means of spreading information in the region.

Consultations with the ministry, government departments and district administration will need to be in the form of focussed meetings in the presence of appropriate representatives of the project proponents.

### **10.3.4**

#### ***Place & Method of Consultation***

The place and methodology for consultation has been decided keeping in view the appropriateness of the place for the specific stakeholders, the ease and comfort for free expression of their views and acceptability of the place.

*Central and State Government Officials, District Administration, District Council, Media, NGOs and Politicians*

The meetings will be conducted in their offices or in the office of the project proponents, as appropriate. In case of all the government officials and the District Council, the meetings are likely to be held in their respective offices. They are likely to be one-to-one discussions on the basis of previously submitted reports and documents. With the media, NGOs and other political stakeholders, group discussions or meetings could be arranged at the office of the project proponents.

*Village Administration and Affected People*

Meetings with the village durbars may be arranged in the respective offices of the village durbars. The *Wahadadar*, Shella Confederacy should be consulted in the Office of the Additional Subordinate District Council Court in Shella. Information shall be disseminated through meetings, group discussions, leaflets and public announcements. Information regarding the village meetings will be provided through the village durbars and also through communication during market days.

Consultations with the affected people should be held in durbar offices or other appropriate community meeting centres or local clubs. Special attention needs to be paid to involve women in the consultation process. As per the local customary practices, women are not allowed to attend the durbar meetings. Hence the project proponents will ensure that separate meetings are held with the women at community centres, the project proponents' local office in Shella or at any other convenient and suitable location in the respective hamlets and villages to inform them regarding the project and to consult them in the planning process.

### **10.3.5**

#### ***Representative Institution***

*Affected people*

The details of the land transfer needs to be discussed and negotiated with each individual affected person. However, for matters related to the determining of compensation rates, payment of consultations and royalties, the affected community along with the respective Executive Durbar members should be present for the consultations. The village headman and the durbar Executive Committee members are democratically elected representatives of the people and should be involved in the consultation process. The *Wahadadar* should also be present at the meetings where important decisions are taken with regard to the overall development schemes for the area.

### *Government Officials*

The project proponents will organise separate consultation sessions with the government officials from the relevant departments.

### *Project Proponents*

Officials of LMMPL/LUMPL and / or LSC will be present for consultation sessions with the affected people and the local and district administration. Senior officials from LSC should be present for discussions with ministers and senior government officials / bureaucrats.

#### **10.3.6 *Record of Consultation***

All records of public consultation sessions will be maintained and made available for public access at the office of the village durbars and also at selected other places such as the Additional Subordinate District Council Courts and the offices of LMMPL/LUMPL and LSC.

#### **10.3.7 *Response***

Queries and grievances raised at any particular meeting, if not resolved on the same occasion, will be responded to at the next meeting. Project proponents will attempt to provide a response to grievances within a fortnight. More details on the grievance redressal mechanism is provided in *Section 11*.

#### **10.3.8 *Periodicity of Consultation***

The frequency of the consultation sessions will depend on the intensity of the impact and the need to discuss and resolve particular issues. However, before the commencement of the construction activities, consultations should be held regularly to inform and apprise the people regarding the progress and status of the project and also to consult them regarding the compensation packages.

However, periodic consultations will need to be continued during the construction stage as well as through the operational stage of the project. Meetings and discussions should be held once every month to take into account grievances and problems that may be arising from the project implementation. Individuals as well as village durbars will be consulted to ensure mitigation of any adverse impacts during the construction or the operational stage, as well as to cater to any special problems or requirements of the people.

With other stakeholders such as the district council, or the district administration, the project proponents should maintain a process of dialogue and information sharing as when the situation requires exchange of information.

#### **10.3.9 *Tasks for an Effective PCDP***

A step - by - step task list is provided to allow for the effective implementation of the PCDP.

### *Preparation and Circulation of Necessary Documents for Information Dissemination*

The project proponents will undertake the preparation of the Summary of Project Information (SPI) which is an essential document for preliminary information dissemination to the stakeholders while the project is still under consideration.

The project proponents will also publicly make available the non-technical summary of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) along with a Social Impact Assessment for the project, identifying the potential environmental and social impacts of the project.

### *Stakeholder Identification*

The stakeholders identified in this report was based on the discussions with the project proponents, the local and district administration as well as the affected people. The list of stakeholders will be updated, as necessary, as the project implementation progresses to reflect any changes. The identification of all stakeholder groups is essential to ensure that project information is disclosed to all relevant interest groups and that they are involved in the development process.

### *Preliminary Information Dissemination on Project to all Stakeholders*

Although the project proponents have already disseminated information and consulted the relevant stakeholders regarding the proposed project and discussed potential impacts at the initial stages of project planning, a written document providing relevant information will be provided to all the interest groups regarding the project objectives, design, possible environmental and social impacts and their proposed mitigation plans. The SPI will be directly shared with financial institutions, government officials and the local and district administration, as well as the affected people.

In addition to the SPI, the non-technical summary of the Environment and Social Assessment will be proactively circulated amongst stakeholders and placed at pre-designated places. Consultations will be held with the local people to elicit their views and incorporate them into their planning process.

Apart from providing general information, the project proponents will consult each affected person, apprise them regarding likely environmental and social impacts and elicit their opinions and suggestions for mitigating them. These consultations could be in the form of village meetings, focus group discussions and individual meetings. These consultation sessions will provide an effective forum for the affected people to voice their apprehensions and opinions.

### *Consultation regarding Indigenous Peoples' Development Plan*

The project proponents have proposed an Indigenous Peoples' Development Plan (IPDP) (detailed in this document). The development activities will be decided in consultation with the local people and the respective village institutions to ensure that the plan addresses local needs. The implementation

procedures, the institutional arrangements, and the timeframe will also be discussed with the people before finalisation of the IPDP.

The project proponents will also discuss the plan with the district administration to ensure synchronisation with the government plans for development activities in the region.

*Information dissemination and consultation regarding land requirements, land transfer and entitlements*

The project proponents have already consulted the affected landowners and have signed the lease / transfer deeds with the individual owners. The project proponents shall ensure the landowners are provided a copy of the deed and will continue dialogue with such landowners to clarify their queries, address grievances and concerns related to payment of compensation and land transfer.

*Consultation regarding utilisation of compensation amounts*

The project proponents, through their Community Relations Officer (CRO), will hold discussions with the people receiving compensation money to help them in appropriate utilisation of money. The CRO will also assist the landowners in case they wish to purchase alternate land.

*Information dissemination and consultation with village durbars and local administration*

The project proponents have initiated and undertaken several consultation sessions with the village durbars of Nongtraï and Shella regarding the environmental and social impacts of the project and also to determine the compensation packages and the terms and conditions for leasing the community land for the project. The community land required for the mine site area and a part of the belt conveyor route belongs to the Nongtraï community and negotiations between the project proponents and the durbar have been concluded. Detailed consultations have also been held with the Shella durbar to determine the terms and conditions and the compensation packages for the lease arrangements of the land required for the belt conveyor. Discussions have also been held with the Shella village durbar regarding the requirement of private land for the construction of the belt conveyor.

The project proponents will maintain a regular and ongoing process of consultation with the village durbars regarding the overall progress of the project, development activities in the region, proper implementation of the RAP and IPDP and possible employment opportunities for the local people.

### *Information dissemination and consultation with district administration*

The project proponents will provide all relevant information to the District Administration, as and when required during the period of project planning and implementation.

### *Information dissemination and consultations with women*

The Khasis are a matrilineal community with inheritance of property usually being to the youngest female of the family. Land ownership, thus, is in most cases in the name of women. While women are usually not allowed to attend durbar meetings, they take an active part in household decision making. Thus, it is important to hold separate meetings with women to convey the information regarding the project to the women and provide them with a forum to voice their opinions and apprehensions regarding the project.

### *Information dissemination and consultation regarding grievance redressal and dispute settlement mechanism*

In order to establish an effective and operational grievance redressal mechanism, a fortnightly consultation schedule will be developed by the project proponents. The consultation schedule will ensure that any queries or grievances shall be addressed within a period of two weeks at the next consultation session. Specific information shall be provided to the affected people and other stakeholders on the grievance redressal and dispute settlement mechanism that would be established. The information provided will cover:

- Procedure for lodging complaints, grievances and disputes
- Institutional arrangements and people responsible for grievance redressal and dispute settlement at the project office on site, at the district level and at the offices of the project proponents, together with contact details.
- Timeframe for redressal of grievances and settlement of disputes
- Steps to be taken if no action is taken on grievances

Consultation sessions will be organised on a regular basis to assess the effectiveness of the mechanism and problems being faced by the community.

### *Consultations for Ex-post Evaluation*

The ex-post evaluation of the entire project will be conducted in conjunction with the affected people and the various other stakeholders. The evaluation will be done through consultations with the affected people and other stakeholders to obtain feedback from them regarding the adequacy and effectiveness of the mitigation measures and compensation packages provided to them.

To ensure the effective implementation of the social impact mitigation plan, it is considered essential to put into place a formal grievance redressal mechanism. The project proponents are proposing the following grievance redressal mechanism to address complaints and resolve dispute emanating out of the process of land transfer, payment of compensation or other developmental activities in the villages.

All disputes and grievances related to land ownership will need to be resolved by the village durbar. Traditionally the village durbar takes major decisions and is responsible for grievance redressal and dispute settlement in the villages. The village durbar will be actively involved in resolving the grievances of the community and will be a part of the decision making. However, where intervention is required from the project proponents, the matter will be taken up by the CRO.

With respect to grievances related to payment of compensations and other community development activities, the main point of contact for recording grievances will be the CRO. Every grievance will be recorded by the CRO and the community worker in a register which will be maintained at the site office. The CRO will address every grievance in active consultation with the village durbar.

In case the matter is not resolved by the CRO, the issue will be taken up by the Assistant Manager (Environment, Industrial Relations and Social Welfare) or the Manager (Mining). Each grievance will be provided a response within 14 days.

The Review Committee formed will also oversee the grievance redressal mechanism and make regular assessments of the process. They will also evaluate if the grievance redressal mechanism requires any changes and interventions.

The Social Impact Mitigation Plan will include the delivery of the Entitlement Framework, the Rehabilitation Action Plan (RAP), the Public Consultation and Disclosure Plan and the Indigenous Peoples' Development Plan (IPDP).

The strategy of the implementation includes the delineation of roles and responsibilities of organisations, community groups and the procedures to be followed. (For details on institutional arrangement refer to *Section 13*). The following broad category of tasks will form part of the implementation strategy:

- Finalisation of agreements and transfer of payment to the village durbars
- Finalisation of agreements and transfer of payments to individual landowners
- Updating the list of PAFs with relevant details
- Implementation of the RAP
- Implementation of the community development schemes as outlined in the IPDP
- Public Consultation and Grievance Redressal
- Monitoring and Evaluation

**12.1*****FINALISATION OF AGREEMENTS WITH THE VILLAGE DURBARS FOR THE***

The project proponents have already finalised the lease agreement with the Nongtraï village durbar for the mine site and also the community plots within the conveyor belt route. Agreements have also been drawn up with the Shella durbar regarding the grant to be paid annually for the construction of three conveyor belt route, although agreement for the lease of community plots are nearing completion. All relevant documents and agreements shall be finalised prior to commencement of construction.

**12.2*****FINALISATION OF AGREEMENTS AND TRANSFER OF PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL LANDOWNERS***

All lease / transfer agreements have been drawn up with the individual landowners. All payments to individual landowners shall be completed before construction begins.

**12.3*****UPDATING THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC INFORMATION OF PAFs***

The project proponents shall, on a regular basis, update the details of the affected families. Details of family members, changes in occupational profile, income details, landholding details, etc shall be documented through periodic consultations and interviews.

## **12.4**

### ***IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RAP***

Before and in the course of the mining operations, the project proponents will draw up a list of potential employment opportunities, for both skilled and unskilled labour. A skill assessment will also be conducted to identify the existing skill base and gaps that will be covered by training inputs.

A list of potential people who would be eligible for training and subsequent employment for the mining operations will be drawn up. The selection procedure will give priority to the project affected families and thereafter to the residents of the Nongtraï and Shella villages.

In the event that either the project based employment opportunities are not sufficient to cover all the project affected families or if the PAFs are primarily interested in enhance / establishing their own enterprises, the project proponent will make an attempt to assist them as per the RAP detailed in *Section 8*. The implementation of the RAP will be the responsibility of the CRO with active support of the village durbar.

## **12.5**

### ***IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDIGENOUS PEOPLES' DEVELOPMENT PLAN (IPDP)***

While the main responsibility of implementing the IPDP shall rest with the village durbar, the CRO shall maintain continuous dialogue with the durbar and the local people in co-ordinating activities proposed in the IPDP.

In addition, the CRO will assist the village durbars of both Nongtraï and Shella to identify any special technical inputs they may require for utilisation of the *musur* / compensation money for community development projects which shall be provided by the project proponents.

All community development activities and fund utilisation will be closely monitored by the project proponents.

## **12.6**

### ***PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL***

The project proponents shall hold regular consultations with the affected people to ensure timely delivery of the entitlements and ensure effective implementation of the RAP.

## **12.7**

### ***MONITORING AND EVALUATION***

The project proponents have developed a monitoring and evaluation program for ensuring that the mitigation plan is implemented in an appropriate and time bound manner. Provisions have been made for both internal and external monitoring. An ex-post evaluation will be conducted at the end of the implementation period.

**13.1****LAFARGE SURMA CEMENT**

The project proponents essentially include three organisations:

- Lafarge Surma Cement (LSC), Bangladesh
- Lum Mawshum Minerals Private Limited (LMMPL)
- Lafarge Umiam Mining Private Limited (LUMPL)

Lafarge Surma Cement (LSC), Bangladesh, are the main project proponent who propose to set up a cement plant in Chattak, Bangladesh using the limestone and shale from the State of Meghalaya. For this purpose LSC has invested in Lum Mawshum Minerals Private Limited (LMMPL), which has 74% equity participation of LSC, and Lafarge Umiam Mining Private Limited (LUMPL), which is a 100% subsidiary of LSC, for developing and operating the limestone and shale/siltstone mines in Meghalaya. The Foreign Investment Promotion Board (FIPB) of India has cleared the equity participation of LSC in LMMPL as the mining rights holding company and in LUMPL as the mining Operations Company. LSC will purchase the limestone and shale/siltstone from LUMPL on a long term basis for the purpose of producing cement in the Chattak plant in Bangladesh.

**13.2****LUM MAWSHUN MINERALS PRIVATE LIMITED (LMMPL)**

As the mining rights holding company, LMMPL is currently obtaining various rights such as mining leases and land leases for the project. Besides the 74% equity held by LSC, the remaining equity of LMMPL is owned by two individual Indian shareholders.

**13.3****LAFARGE UMIAM MINING PRIVATE LIMITED (LUMPL)**

As the mining operations company, LUMPL is investing in developing the mining site and will be responsible for operation of the mine, once commissioned.

The mining operations will be the overall responsibility of the Manager (Mining). The Manager (Mining) will be assisted by two Mining Engineers/Assistant Managers (Mines) working on each shift. The Manager (Mining) have the overarching responsible for mine operations, equipment maintenance and crushing, planning, vocational training, environmental issues, industrial relations and social welfare, information systems. Under the Manager (Mining) there would be 4 Assistant Managers:

- Assistant Manager - Mechanical
- Assistant Manager - Electrical
- Assistant Manager – Planning, Vocational Training and Safety
- Assistant Manager – Environment, Industrial Relations, Social Welfare

It is proposed to create a position of a Community Relations Officer (CRO) who will be the main point of interaction with the community. The CRO will be responsible for:

- providing accurate information to the appropriate target groups at the appropriate stages of the project,
- organising and holding the consultation sessions
- facilitating the payments of compensation
- providing assistance for alternate land purchase
- identifying the skill base of the affected community and assessing eligibility for employment opportunities
- addressing training needs and requirement for access to credit, etc for affected landowners
- redressing grievances on an ongoing process
- internal monitoring of the social impact mitigation plan

The CRO will report to the Assistant Manager (Environment, Industrial Relations, Social Welfare), who will supervise the effective delivery of the social impact mitigation plan and monitor its progress on a regular basis.

The Assistant Manager (Environment, Industrial Relations, Social Welfare) shall report to the Manager (Mining).

#### **13.4**

##### ***REVIEW COMMITTEE***

It is proposed to have a Review Committee consisting of Mining (Manager), Assistant Manager (Environment, Industrial Relations and Social Welfare), CRO, a senior manager level person from LSC, the Indian partners, and a community representatives from the two village durbars of Shella and Nongtra. The Committee will meet every quarter to review the progress of the implementation of the mitigation plan.

#### **13.5**

##### ***INDEPENDENT SUPPORT AGENCY***

An independent support agency will be appointed to facilitate the effective implementation of the social impact mitigation plan. This agency could be a local university, a local non-governmental organisation or any other social welfare organisation. The support agency will be present in the project area throughout the implementation period of the project.

This agency will act as an external body to facilitate the implementation of the social impact mitigation plan and will provide an interface between the community and the project proponents. The main responsibility of the support agency will be to establish a rapport with the community, participating in public consultation and disclosure sessions, providing neutral advice in case of disputes and to provide an objective feedback mechanism to the project proponents. The support agency will work in close association with the CRO.

The village durbars will play an important role in the project implementation process. The village durbars will be involved to disseminate information to the affected people and in facilitating the consultation process. The village durbars have traditionally been responsible for decision making, addressing grievances and resolving disputes in the villages. The village durbar will advice and assist the support agency in community organisation and mobilisation and also help in grievance redressal and dispute settlement. The village durbar will also play a pivotal role in implementation of the RAP and the IPDP.

To assess the effectiveness of the action plan developed to mitigate the socio-economic impacts of the project, the project proponents have proposed a monitoring and evaluation program, which will identify the shortcomings of the implementation program and also provide a feedback mechanism to enable them to undertake appropriate corrective actions.

#### **14.1 INTERNAL MONITORING**

The internal monitoring program will be an on-going process, conducted by the project proponents themselves through the CRO. The internal monitoring shall be in the form of a monthly report to be prepared by the CRO which shall track the progress of the implementation program and provide regular updates to the LUMPL / LSC management. The monthly monitoring is expected to identify delays, shortcomings, gaps in the implementation program.

#### **14.2 EXTERNAL MONITORING & EVALUATION**

In addition to the monthly monitoring, to ensure an independent and objective assessment, the project proponents will also engage an independent organisation to undertake a monitoring and evaluation exercise. To begin with, an annual monitoring shall be undertaken through a socio-economic survey of the affected people for a period of three years from the date of payment of compensations. A mid-term evaluation shall be undertaken at the end of one and a half years, and an ex-post evaluation at the end of three years from date of transfer of land and other assets from the durbar and the individual landowners.

The key indicators that will be monitored, both internally and by the external agency, will include:

- The consultation process – the numbers of meetings held, the topics discussed, the key decisions taken, the number of people participating, etc.
- The land transfer process and payment of compensation, its timeliness, adequacy and disbursement mechanism.
- The changes in the socio-economic conditions of the affected people, their income levels, their livelihood patterns and standard of living, employment opportunities generated, etc. (especially for the vulnerable families).
- Utilisation of compensation amounts and effectiveness of entitlements to address adverse impacts and enhance socio-economic status.
- Effectiveness of the community development programs – utilisation of funds for community development, the number of people benefiting from it, their appropriateness with regard to local needs (both collective and individual).
- Grievance redressal mechanisms in place and their effectiveness

- Adequacy of the budget allocated for the social impact mitigation plan
- Adherence to time schedule proposed for the implementation of the mitigation plan.

This monitoring and evaluation exercise is expected to identify gaps and lacunae in the implementation process and provide recommendations to address them. At the end of three years, an ex-post evaluation will be carried out by the independent agency to assess the adequacy and effectiveness of the mitigation plan.

### **14.3**

#### ***REPORTING***

The monthly monitoring reports prepared by the CRO shall be reviewed by the Assistant Manager (Environment, Industrial Relations, Social Welfare).

The annual monitoring reports and the mid-term and ex-post evaluation reports shall be prepared by the external monitoring agency and reviewed by the Manager (Mining) as well as other senior officials of LSC for necessary action. The Annual Monitoring, Mid-term and Ex-post Evaluation shall also be submitted to IFC for review.

The following table provides the budget outlay proposed by the project proponents for mitigation of social impacts. The budget comprises essentially of the one-time payments to be made at the start of the project and some recurring payments to be made at specified intervals over the project period.

**Table 15.1 Initial one - time expenses**

Expense Item	Amounts in USD (indicative figure only)	Amounts in INR	Source of Funds	Channel of Disbursement	
				From	To
Compensation for Loss of Land (community & private), standing crops, trees and other productive assets (all included)	186,493	8,765,000	LSC	LMMPL	Landowners / Durbars / Sharecroppers
Expenses on Public Consultation	4,255	200,000	LSC	LMMPL	Direct Expenses
Monitoring & Evaluation	21,277	1,000,000	LSC	LMMPL	M&E Agency
Contingency	21,277	1,000,000	LSC	LMMPL	
<b>Total</b>	<b>233,302</b>	<b>10,965,000</b>			

**Table 15.2 Recurring Annual Expenses**

*Up to start of quarry commercial operation*

Expenses Items	Amounts in USD (indicative figure only)	Amounts in INR	Source of Funds	Channel of Disbursement	
				From	To
Compensation to Nongtraï Durbar	4,255	200,000	LSC	LMMPL	Durbar
Salary for CRO	3,191	150,000	LSC	LMMPL	CRO
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,446</b>	<b>350,000</b>			

*From start of quarry commercial operation*

Expenses Items	Amounts in USD (indicative figure only)	Amounts in INR	Source of Funds	Channel of Disbursement	
				From	To
Musur to Nongtraï Durbar (limestone extraction)	255,319	10,000,000	LSC	LMMPL	Durbar
Compensation to Nongtraï Durbar (long belt conveyor land)	10,638	500,000			
Compensation to Shella Durbar (long belt conveyor land)	31,915	1,500,000	LSC	LMMPL	Durbar
Compensation to Shella Durbar (land along dry river/nala)	2,127	100,000 <sup>1</sup>			
Salary for CRO	3,191	150,000	LSC	LMMPL	CRO

<b>Expenses Items</b>	<b>Amounts in USD (indicative figure only)</b>	<b>Amounts in INR</b>	<b>Source of Funds</b>	<b>Channel of Disbursement</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>303,190</b>	<b>12,250,000</b>		

*Note 1: under negotiation*

