iihs™
INDIAN INSTITUTE FOR HUMAN SETTLEMENTS

REDUCING RELOCATION RISK IN URBAN AREAS

Reducing Relocation Risk in Urban India

Site Report for Urban Risks and Resettlements

Section III
Data from primary work

Credits by Garima Jain, Amir Bazaz; Rohit Jigyasu; Teja Malladi; Sushmita Ramoji; Sunil Kraleti; Aishwarya Balasubramanian; Andaleeb Rehman; Mohan Raju JS from Indian Institute for Human Settlements

July 2016

This document is an output from a project funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and the Netherlands Directorate-General for International Cooperation (DGIS) for the benefit of developing countries. However, the views expressed and information contained in it are not necessarily those of or endorsed by DFID, DGIS or the entities managing the delivery of the Climate and Development Knowledge Network, which can accept no responsibility or liability for such views, completeness or accuracy of the information or for any reliance placed on them.

The Research project Reducing Relocation Risk in urban areas is carried out by The Bartlett Development Planning Unit (DPU) at UCL, the Indian Institute for Human Settlements (IIHS) the Latin American Social Science Faculty (Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO), and Makerere University.

This report is downloadable for free from: **www.bartlett.ucl.ac.uk/dpu/reducing-relocation-risk/**

The findings, interpretations and conclusions expressed here do not represent the views of any organisations that have provided institutional, organisational or financial support for the preparation of this paper

Designing Support by Pallavi Sharma and Nawaz Khan

Reducing Relocation Risk in Urban India

Site Report for Urban Risks and Resettlements

Section III
Data from primary work

Lead Author
Garima Jain

Project Team
Amir Bazaz; Rohit Jigyasu
Teja Malladi; Sushmita Ramoji; Sunil Kraleti
Aishwarya Balasubramanian
Andaleeb Rehman; Mohan Raju JS

Reviewed by
Aromar Revi; Chandni Singh

Edited by
Arpita Das, Rekha Raghunathan

Table of Contents

Descriptive Statistics of the Sample

The following are some descriptive statistics of the sample surveyed during field work:

Average no. of family members by rural and urban.

While most of the families in the rural context (both Odisha and AP), were primarily nuclear in nature, the families in urban Odisha and AP seemed to have a larger number of family members living together, potentially because of the lack of choice as well as the constraints to move out to alternate spaces. It is difficult to say if this is a way to pool risk or share resources in a way that the outcomes for all are better, or if one problem can act as a stressor for all in the household. But the larger question is whether it is a cost to break these networks, and could it add to the burden of these families. There is some benefit that is a derivative of such an arrangement which intuitively is in some ways a coping or adaptive mechanism. It is difficult to say whether such arrangements are structurally embedded but it will be interesting to understand the dynamics of such an arrangement and how it helps in reducing household-level risk.

Average no. of working members in a family

Comparing this with the above statistic, the families we surveyed seemed to have more people on average working in the urban areas versus the rural areas. This could also be an outcome of costs in the urban areas being higher than those in the rural areas. Working members and their high numbers could be partly explained through the informal nature of jobs or the fact of jobs being seasonal. This kind of skill pooling could be a way of compensating for other socio-economic risks faced by households. These reasons and others could be explored through additional research. Although people were asked about their incomes the stated incomes may have response biases, hence we are not stating them at this point.

Family members statistic	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total of Sample
Average of total number of Family Members	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.8	**4.3**
Maximum of total number of Family Members	7	8	10	11	**11**
Minimum of total number of Family Members	3	2	1	2	**1**

Working members statistic	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total of Sample
Average no. of working members in a family	1.8	1.6	1.6	2	**1.7**
Maximum no. of working members in a family	3	4	4	6	**6**
Minimum no. of working members in a family	1	1	0	1	**0**

Male vs. Female headed households

For the sake of simplicity and brevity, the question that was asked was 'Who takes the big decisions in the family—decisions of marriage, investment, etc.' Other than that, we do not have information on who took the financial versus domestic decisions. We encountered a large number of families that were headed by women (41 out of 157) and many where the family as a whole including the woman took decisions (29 out of 157). One of the reasons for more female enterprise here could be prevalent male migration, which has created a situation where it is the woman who is now making all decisions, big or small. But this phenomenon may need to be studied in greater detail.

Head of the family	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total of Sample
Male	3	17	33	24	**77**
Female	2	8	16	15	**41**
Male and Female	0	13	3	13	**29**
Others	0	13	6	3	**9**
DKCS		1			**1**

The differential outcomes of female headed households vs. male headed households in terms of living conditions, impact of cyclones, beneficiary identification and the outcomes of the relocation processes may need to be studied in greater detail with a larger sample size. Is leadership maintained at the household level after the relocation interventions? Are there institutional mechanisms that ensure equity? In the long term (beyond the scope of this research) some of these trajectories could be taken up for a longitudinal study within the existing sites.

Levels of education and reasons for dropping out of school

The predominant levels of education seem to be limited to Class 7, particularly among women. One reason pointed out was that free public education was available till that level after which financial reasons forced people to drop out. Other reasons quoted for not pursuing higher education (particularly in the rural areas) was that there were no education facilities nearby, and that women were not allowed to travel far or stay away from the home for safety/cultural reasons. More instances of higher education were noticed among male respondents in urban areas but in Berhampur particularly, many instances of under-employment were also observed where higher education did not guarantee a formal job.

Level of education of main responder (by gender)	Rural AP	Urban AP	Rural Odisha	Urban Odisha	Total
Female	**2**	**26**	**14**	**25**	**67**
Illiterate	2	16	5	10	**33**
Primary (1st - 4th)			1	2	**3**
Middle (5th - 7th)		4	4	5	**13**
Matriculation/Secondary (8th - 10th)		4		4	**8**
High/ Senior secondary/ Intermediate/Pre University			1		**1**
Non-technical diploma or certificate not equal to degree					**0**
Graduate and above		2		1	**3**
DKCS			3	1	**4**

Level of education of main responder (by gender)	Rural AP	Urban AP	Rural Odisha	Urban Odisha	Total
DNA				2	**2**
Male	**3**	**32**	**26**	**30**	**91**
Illiterate	3	9	7	4	**23**
Below Primary		1	1		**2**
Primary (1st - 4th)			2	5	**7**
Middle (5th - 7th)		8	5	7	**20**
Matriculation/Secondary (8th - 10th)		11	3	9	**23**
High/ Senior secondary/ Intermediate/Pre University		1	1	1	**3**
Non-technical diploma or certificate not equal to degree		1		1	**2**
Graduate and above		1	2	1	**4**
DKCS			4	2	**6**
DNA			1		**1**

Reasons for dropping by main responder	Family didn't allow	Financial Reasons	Health related - including handicap	Marriage	Never attended	No interest	Grand Total
1: Non Beneficiary	**1**	**9**		**2**	**7**	**4**	**23**
Rural AP		2			2		4
Rural Odisha		2		1	4		7
Urban AP	1	5		1	1	4	12
2: In Situ Housing		**1**		**1**			**2**
Urban AP		1		1			2
3: Relocation in process		**6**		**1**	**3**	**1**	**11**
Rural Odisha		6		1	3	1	11
4: Relocated	**1**	**14**		**5**	**7**	**7**	**34**
Rural Odisha		3			4	2	9
Urban AP	1	11		5	3	5	25
5: Infrastructure Upgradation		**5**	**1**	**2**	**6**		**14**
Urban Odisha		5	1	2	6		14
6: Identified for relocation	**1**	**12**		**2**	**8**	**1**	**24**
Urban Odisha	1	12		2	8	1	24
Grand Total	**3**	**47**	**1**	**13**	**31**	**13**	**108**

Livelihoods practiced. Sources of livelihood

Of the 151 responses regarding primary sources of livelihood and additional sources of income (in some cases more than 1 per household), most households (46 HHs) in urban areas are involved in daily wage work or work as casual labour which could partly explain the higher number of working members per family. Many households (50 HH) were also involved in other forms of entrepreneurial work such as small shops or in-house small-scale industry, etc. A large number of people were involved in fishing (selection bias as most of the cyclone-affected families stay close to the coasts), but many also practise horticulture and agriculture (primarily in rural Odisha). Many of these could also be forms of daily wage work, as many of them worked in other people's farms or boats rather than having access to their own resources. Many families noted more than one form of livelihood including migration, which may be a form of risk-mitigation strategy. It could be a burden if these forms of support, networks and informal safety nets are broken down by any external intervention, like relocating some members of these communities, and need to be studied more closely. It was also observed that the fisher communities who migrated continued to fish in the new sites, and this governs their destinations (Chennai, Goa, Vizag, etc.), but those who are predominantly agriculturalists or horticulturists migrated to work in industries or as daily wage workers during off-seasons. Studying this distinction may provide some insights on current capacities to adapt by types of livelihood.

Livelihood prevalence	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total of Sample
Fishing	5	10	7		**22**
Agriculture		7			**7**
Horticulture		13			**13**
Animal Rearing				8	**8**
Daily Wage / Casual Labour			23	23	**46**
Regular Wage/ salaried			10	5	**15**
Other livelihoods*			31	19	**50**
Migration		17		5	**22**

**Other = Entrepreneurial/ independent forms of work*
Note: Migration numbers could be biased due to the fact that we may have visited at a certain time of the year where we didn't meet the people who were already migrating out

Households with any alternate source of income

About 46 out of 158 HHs mentioned they had additional sources of income in the family, which included holding multiple jobs, or having access to pension schemes, etc. The relationship between type of livelihood and alternate sources of income could be studied to ascertain if the time spent on certain kinds of livelihood allows time for alternate work, and if following the relocation, there is an opportunity cost to not continue working.

Does the location itself enable an ability to earn through alternate livelihoods and does the new location destroy these abilities or opportunities? A time-allocation study to see how time is expended for something that may have been avoided in an earlier location could be conducted. This could also provide insights for programmes like the mason training programme, where people were required to get trained for 30–60 days to construct their

Additional Source of Income in the family	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
No	5	20	49	38	**112**
Yes		20	9	17	**46**
Grand Total	**5**	**40**	**58**	**55**	**158**

own houses, or for owner-driven or self-construction housing programmes. Also, it may be enquired if this work is seasonal or continues through the year to know more about risk mitigation through livelihood diversification practices.

Households willing to migrate to other areas, if given a chance

Migration is often an aspiration for a better life, but also an adaptation method to get away from the current conditions of living. People who are non-migrants in cities are more likely to be poor as compared to rural-to-urban or urban-to-urban migrants (Kundu, 2007), as migration is also an indication of choice and the ability to adapt.

Household willing to migrate	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Yes			2	1	**3**
Yes, if there's work		1	4	2	**7**
Don't mind, but cannot		1	1	1	**3**
Not by choice		1		1	**2**
No	1	2	10	3	**16**
Already migrate		16		4	**20**
Move back		1	3		**4**
Grand Total	**1**	**22**	**20**	**12**	**55**

Of the households who responded (55HHs) to the question if they would be willing to migrate given a chance, many (10 HHs) said yes or did so with the condition that work be available. Many (20 HHs) mentioned they were already practising migration within the family. Some (3 HHs) also said they would do so but there are limitations because of which they cannot. Some expressed concerns about how they would migrate, but not by choice, showing a kind of helplessness. Many also vehemently opposed the idea of migrating from their 'land of birth' (20 out of 55 of which 16 were in rural Odisha).

Aspirations of future generation to work by current type of professions

Most people we interviewed said that they would want their children to have better jobs than them and be educated. Evidently, getting government jobs particularly with the police is a huge aspiration. But while many farmers (2 out of 2) and horticulturists (3 out of 7) said that they would want their children to get educated, only fisher-families said that they would want their children to continue their profession but with bigger boats and nets. Pudimadaka was an exception, where even the fisher communities hoped for their children to get jobs in nearby upcoming special economic zones and industries and not continue fishing. Here it is increasingly becoming economically non-viable for small-scale fishermen. Most of the daily wage workers (19 out of 20) said that they would want their children to be educated unlike themselves and have better jobs.

Aspirations for future generations	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Continue our profession but better	1	3	1		5
Educate and get jobs	2	17	17	20	56
Work as a police / govt. job		5	8	6	19
Work in Industries	1			1	2
Others (marriage, etc.)		1			1
Good human being		1			1
Not in our control	1	3	4	1	9
DKCS		5	6	9	20

Aspirations for future generations	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
DNA		4	6	16	26
NA		1	14	1	16
Grand Total	**5**	**40**	**56**	**54**	**155**

Aspirations for future generations by current professions or forms of livelihoods	Continue our profession but better	Educate and get jobs	Good human being	Not in our control	Others (marriage, etc.)	Work as police / govt. job	Work in Industries	Grand Total
Fishing	4	8	1	3	1	1	1	**19**
Agriculture		2						**2**
Horticulture		3			1	3		**7**
Daily wage/ Casual Labour		14		1		5		**20**
Regular salaried		7		1		1		**9**
Animal Rearing		1				1	1	**3**
Other work		18		3		9		**30**

House construction materials

This could be used to assess what the original living conditions were when the cyclone hit, and if people were correctly identified to be beneficiaries of such housing programmes and interventions. Of the non-beneficiaries, 22 out of 33 respondents were living in thatch/asbestos/ plastic roofed structures, most of whom (14 out of 22) were in urban AP. This gives some sense of Type1 errors (non-beneficiaries with fragile structures). It was difficult to observe the housing conditions of those who had already relocated. Therefore, it is difficult to assess the Type 2 errors (beneficiaries with non-fragile structures) that may have crept into the allocations.

Besides roofing material, wall and plinth are other indicators for physical vulnerabilities, which otherwise do not seem to be considered for housing allocation.

House Construction Materials	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Roof material in the current sites of habitation					
1: Non Beneficiary	**5**	**6**	**22**		**33**
RCC		3	8		11
Asbestos/ Others	1	1	4		6
Thatch/ Plastic	4	2	10		16
2: In Situ Housing		**5**			**5**
RCC		3			3
Asbestos/ Others		1			1
Thatch/ Plastic		1			1
3: Relocation in process		**13**			**13**
RCC		2			2
Asbestos/ Others		2			2

House Construction Materials	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Thatch/ Plastic		9			9
4: Relocated		**11**	**36**		**47**
RCC		11	27		38
Asbestos/ Others			2		2
Thatch/ Plastic			6		6
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				**16**	**16**
RCC				6	6
Asbestos/ Others				7	7
Thatch/ Plastic				3	3
6: Identified for relocation				**34**	**34**
RCC				5	5
Asbestos/ Others				21	21
Thatch/ Plastic				8	8
Grand Total	**5**	**35**	**57**	**50**	**147**
Wall type in current sites of habitation					
1: Non Beneficiary	**5**	**6**	**22**		**33**
Brick Mortar	1	3	13		17
Mud	4	3	8		15
Plastic/ Asbestos/ Tin			1		1
2: In Situ Housing		**5**			**5**
Brick Mortar		4			4
Mud		1			1
3: Relocation in process		**13**			**13**
Brick Mortar		6			6
Mud		7			7
4: Relocated		**11**	**29**		**40**
Brick Mortar		11	29		40
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				**16**	**16**
Brick Mortar				12	12
Mud				4	4
6: Identified for relocation				**35**	**35**
Brick Mortar				22	22
Mud				7	7
Plastic/ Asbestos/ Tin				6	6
Grand Total	**5**	**35**	**57**	**51**	**142**
Plinth Height in current sites					
1: Non Beneficiary	**5**	**5**	**22**		**32**
Above Road level	1	4	3		8

House Construction Materials	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Road level	3	1	10		14
Below Road level	1		2		3
DNA			7		7
2: In Situ Housing		**5**			**5**
Above Road level		4			4
Road level		1			1
3: Relocation in process		**11**			**11**
Above Road level		6			6
Road level		5			5
4: Relocated		**9**	**36**		**45**
Above Road level		9			9
Road level			3		3
Below Road level			3		3
DNA			30		30
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				**14**	**14**
Above Road level				9	9
Road level				5	5
6: Identified for relocation				**28**	**28**
Above Road level				18	18
Road level				10	10
Grand Total	**5**	**30**	**58**	**42**	**135**

Asset ownership

Of all the households (158 HHs), 80 said they had gas stoves, 94 had some furniture, 76 had televisions, 90 had other electronics (like fan, fridge, etc.), 41 had bicycles, 37 had two wheelers, and 5 had 4-wheelers. 34 said they had work-related assets, but this could be an underestimation. 22 said they had some animals or pets. But the most used asset across the regions was a mobile phone; 129 HHs said they had at least 1 mobile phone in the family. This could be assessed further to know more about people's strategies of accumulation and risk-coping abilities (Moser & Dani, 2008).

Asset Ownership	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Gas Stove					
1: Non Beneficiary	2	2	15		19
3: Relocation in process		3			3
4: Relocated		4	32		36
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				9	9
6: Identified for relocation				13	13
Grand Total	**2**	**9**	**47**	**22**	**80**
Furniture					
1: Non Beneficiary	1	7	12		20
2: In Situ Housing		2			2

Asset Ownership	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
3: Relocation in process		6			6
4: Relocated		7	26		33
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				12	12
6: Identified for relocation				21	21
Grand Total	**1**	**22**	**38**	**33**	**94**
Television					
1: Non Beneficiary	3	6	16		25
3: Relocation in process		3			3
4: Relocated		3	27		30
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				6	6
6: Identified for relocation				12	12
Grand Total	**3**	**12**	**43**	**18**	**76**
Other electronics like fan, fridge, etc.					
1: Non Beneficiary	1	6	9		16
2: In Situ Housing		2			2
3: Relocation in process		7			7
4: Relocated		6	20		26
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				16	16
6: Identified for relocation				23	23
Grand Total	**1**	**21**	**29**	**39**	**90**
Mobile phone					
1: Non Beneficiary	3	7	18		28
2: In Situ Housing		4			4
3: Relocation in process		13			13
4: Relocated		6	35		41
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				17	17
6: Identified for relocation				26	26
Grand Total	**3**	**30**	**53**	**43**	**129**
Bicycle					
1: Non Beneficiary		1	6		7
3: Relocation in process		2			2
4: Relocated		5	6		11
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				7	7
6: Identified for relocation				14	14
Grand Total		**8**	**12**	**21**	**41**
2-Wheeler ownership					
1: Non Beneficiary		4	4		8
2: In Situ Housing		3			3

Asset Ownership	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
3: Relocation in process		2			2
4: Relocated		4	7		11
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				5	5
6: Identified for relocation				8	8
Grand Total		**13**	**11**	**13**	**37**
4-Wheeler ownership					
1: Non Beneficiary		1			1
4: Relocated			3		3
6: Identified for relocation				1	1
Grand Total		**1**	**3**	**1**	**5**
Other work related / productive assets					
1: Non Beneficiary	1	2	5		8
2: In Situ Housing		2			2
4: Relocated		3	19		22
6: Identified for relocation				2	2
Grand Total	**1**	**7**	**24**	**2**	**34**
Animals / pets					
1: Non Beneficiary		1	1		2
2: In Situ Housing		3			3
3: Relocation in process		3			3
4: Relocated			2		2
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				6	6
6: Identified for relocation				6	6
Grand Total		**7**	**3**	**12**	**22**

Desire for a new house as a public provision

Of the sample that was asked 'Do you want a new house from the government', the responses varied between yes of any kind, yes but in situ, yes, even relocation, and no. Of the non-beneficiaries, 33 of the 35 respondents said that they would like the government to provide a house, of which 21 said that they would like an in-situ house. In contrast were those who were relocated (44 HHs)—4 HHs said they did not want a house, and 11 of them said that they would have liked to get it in-situ instead. Of those who said yes to the need for a new house, particularly among the non-beneficiaries, 13 of 34 HHs said their current houses were not strong to withstand rains and cyclones. Other reasons quoted were the need to have a patta (ownership or occupancy certificate), or to own a house (particularly by those who were currently renters). Of those relocated, 11 out of 29 gave renting previously as their primary motivation to relocate, and 8 of 29 said they wanted a patta to a safe house.

Desire/Reason for a new house	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Desire for a new house from the government					
1: Non Beneficiary	**5**	**8**	**22**		**35**
Yes - Any kind		7	1		8
Yes - in situ	5		16		21

Desire/Reason for a new house	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Yes - relocation			4		4
No		1	1		2
2: In Situ Housing		**5**			**5**
Yes - Any kind		5			5
3: Relocation in process		**15**			**15**
Yes - Any kind		12			12
Yes - relocation		3			3
4: Relocated		**9**	**35**		**44**
Yes - Any kind		6	4		10
Yes - in situ		2	9		11
Yes - relocation			19		19
No		1	3		4
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				**20**	**20**
Yes - Any kind				10	10
Yes - in situ				4	4
No				6	6
6: Identified for relocation				**33**	**33**
Yes - Any kind				16	16
Yes - in situ				14	14
No				3	3
Grand Total	**5**	**37**	**57**	**53**	**152**
Reasons for wanting a house					
1: Non Beneficiary	**3**	**5**	**19**		**27**
House not strong	1	4	8		13
Want patta and safe	1		4		5
Area not sufficient			1		1
Renting			3		3
Got but want in-situ	1		3		4
Should support work		1			1
2: In Situ Housing		**4**			**4**
House not strong		1			1
Want patta and safe		3			3
3: Relocation in process		**13**			**13**
House not strong		13			13
4: Relocated		**7**	**22**		**29**
House not strong		1	1		2
Want patta and safe		1	7		8
Area not sufficient		1			1

Desire/Reason for a new house	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Renting			11		11
Got but want in-situ		2			2
Should support work			3		3
Other services like toilets schools, etc.		2			2
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				**16**	**16**
House not strong				8	8
Renting				4	4
Got but want in-situ				1	1
Should support work				3	3
6: Identified for relocation				**28**	**28**
House not strong				5	5
Want patta and safe				3	3
Area not sufficient				2	2
Renting				1	1
Got but want in-situ				12	12
Should support work				4	4
Other services like toilets schools, etc.				1	1
Grand Total	**3**	**29**	**41**	**44**	**117**

Prevalence of bank accounts by reasons of opening

According to a World Bank estimate, only 35 per cent of Indians above the age of 15 had bank accounts in 2011 (26.5% of females and 43% of males). By 2014 this number had increased to 53 per cent (43% of females and 62% of males). This was also the time when Cyclones Phailin and Hud-Hud hit the coastal states of Andhra Pradesh and Odisha. From primary surveys, 148 of 158 HHs responded that they had at least one bank account. Many even had multiple accounts that they had to open due to various schemes which do not allow using existing accounts. For instance, the ODRP scheme would require transactions of more than Rs 10,000 which the zero balance account does not allow and so new accounts had to be opened. The Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojna (PMJDY)-linked zero balance accounts also have a fair penetration (41 of 145 respondents had bank accounts under this scheme). It was however noticed that most people despite having bank accounts were not using them for any purpose other than availing

Prevalence of Bank Accounts	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Yes	**5**	**37**	**55**	**48**	**145**
Zero Balance - PMJDY	1	2	24	14	41
For compensation	1	9	4	9	23
For receiving govt. benefits	1	10	7	2	20
For savings	1	10	11	6	28
For work	1	1	5	3	10
Others		5	4	14	23
No		**3**	**3**	**4**	**10**
DKCS				**3**	**3**
Grand Total	**5**	**40**	**58**	**55**	**158**

these schemes. Only 10 of 145 HHs said they were using bank accounts for work-related transactions and 28 of 145, for savings.

This phenomenon can be studied further in the next phase of research, to see if households could use the bank accounts to reduce their exposure to risk, or to examine the ways in which access to credit is responsible for mitigating risks. In some instances, people said that they had inhibitions in putting money in these accounts as they did not trust them. Many also said that they did not save enough to put any money aside in the account and much of the savings were being consumed for everyday needs and health issues.

People's stated priorities of risk management

This was asked as a proxy to the question 'What would they save for, if they could' (even if they didn't). Most people (63 HHs) mentioned health as a primary reason for which they would save to mitigate their risks, followed by education (56 HHs). Only 36 mentioned future eventualities, which could include cyclones and rains but also any other everyday eventualities. 19 said they would save for their children's marriages, and 17 mentioned livelihood-related risks. 15 HHs also mentioned future repairs in the house as one of their motivations to save. This indicates that while most people consider health, education, livelihoods, etc., their future risks, not so many perceive cyclones and future eventualities as risks for which they may need to save. This may give an insight to policy makers who are working on reducing climate-related risks that people's current set of risks are different from what the former are trying to mitigate by providing housing and through other interventions. This is also an indication of a larger mistrust people have in what are meant to be public provisions and services (health, education, provision of livelihoods, etc.) and that they have taken it upon themselves to save for those rather than other private affairs like children's marriages

Reasons they would save	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Health		13	35	15	**63**
Education	1	15	23	17	**56**
Future eventualities	1	4	24	7	**36**
Children's marriages		2	12	5	**19**
Livelihoods and work		2	13	2	**17**
House	1		10	4	**15**
Other reasons		2	1	2	**5**

Priority	Frequency
Suitable Work Opportunity nearby	45
House title	35
Health card and facilities	34
Piped water & adequate water supply	31
School	23
Strong house	18
Access to Schemes for BPL, Old	15
Education/Business Loan	12
In-situ house	11
Access to markets	8
Roads and street lights	7
Toilets/Bathroom for women	5
Solid Waste management	5
Drainage system	5
Work opportunities for women	4
Food Security	4

Priority	Frequency
Gas	3
Port	3
Safety	3
Cattle-shed	2
Affordable Transportation facilities	2
Professional registration (fishing, etc.)	2
Treatment for alcohol abuse	2
Anganwadi	1
To stay together as family	1
Old age home	1
Vegetation clearing	1
Electricity	1
Alcohol	1
Migration	1
Community participation	1

and housing repairs.

When asked what they valued most—the precise question posed was 'What were the three most important things for them', people seemed to focus more on what they currently lacked but wanted in the future. Some of these were aspirations which they had the requiste skills and education for such as work opportunities nearby, title to a house, health facilities and insurance, piped water supply with adequate water, schools (many specified higher education and English medium), strong houses (safe against rains and cyclones), access to government schemes, loans for business and education, and in-situ houses. There were others, albeit in smaller numbers, that gave a sense of the current needs of the people, for instance one person also said 'alcohol' as a top priority—which aligns with the rampant alcoholism in many of the sites visited. Breaking this down by rural and urban site and by type of beneficiary could give us some sense of the needs of the people and site-specific interventions to address them.

Government assistance and IDs

Of the 158 HHs surveyed, about 93 said that they were receiving some kind of assistance from government schemes or programmes. Only 76 said they had voter IDs, 75 had Adhaar Cards, and only 47 said they had BPL cards (while many more appear to have been eligible). This data is patchy since not all households responded to this question, but it needs to be studied in depth to understand whether having such IDs has an implication on their beneficiary eligibility. And if there are people who are eligible but do not have access to any compensation or scheme, what is the burden that is being created in the process?

Stated health issues

Apart from common cold and fever, nearly 35 HHs out of 141 complained of various water- and vector-borne diseases, particularly typhoid, diarrhoea, malaria, etc. Many of the relocated people, particularly in Urban Andhra Pradesh, stressed on increased incidence of water- and vector-borne diseases in the new locations due to improper environmental service provisions. People here also complained about various kinds of infections caused by polluted water, air or soil conditions. But many also mentioned the prevalence of what are popularly known as 'rich-people diseases'—such as blood pressure, diabetes, cholesterol, etc. There was also a mention of veterinary problems and the lack of suitable and approximate veterinary hospitals. Women mentioned several OB/GYN issues that they face, and that they often found it difficult to reach the nearest hospitals on their own. Some mentioned that they took the help of their neighbours in such instances.

Average distances to the nearest health facilities (or those that they visited) as stated by the people was

Govt. assistance & IDs	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Voter ID	3	14	40	19	76
Adhaar Card	3	11	41	20	75
BPL Card	2	6	28	11	47
APL Card		1	4	2	7
Old Age Pension		9	15	16	40
Old Age Pension NA	2		20		22
Widow Pension		2	3	2	7
Widow Pension NA	2		28	1	31
Maternity Benefits		8	3	6	17
Maternity Benefits NA	2		29	1	32
Health card		6	1	3	10
White Ration card			2		2
Applied for self-employed women loan but didn't get			1		1
Insurance Scheme				1	1
Polio Vaccination			1		1
Households availing some government scheme	**3**	**27**	**22**	**44**	**93**

Stated health issues							
Regular health problems as stated by households	**1: Non Beneficiary**	**2: In Situ Housing**	**3: Relocation in process**	**4: Relocated**	**5: Infrastructure Upgradation**	**6: Identified for relocation**	**Grand Total**
Regular cold and fever	15	7	4	20	3	11	60
Water and Vector borne	3		1	6	2	4	16
Vector borne diseases	5	1	1	3	2	2	14
Water borne diseases	1		1		1	2	5
BP, Diabetes, Gastric, Asthma, Cancer, Cardiovascular problems	3		3	3	2	3	14
Body Pains and Arthristis	5		1	1	2		9
Paralysis or physical handicap	1		1	1		1	4
Infections (skin, eye, ear, etc.)				1		1	2
Professional Hazards	1			1			2
Lack of treatment facilities						1	1
OB/GYN problems				1			1
Veterinary problems					1		1
Many of the above				1	1		2
None	1			2	2	5	10
Grand Total	**35**	**8**	**12**	**40**	**16**	**30**	**141**

Average distance of health facility from current sites of habitation	**< 1 km**	**1 - 5 km**	**> 5 km**	**Grand Total**
1: Non Beneficiary	11	14	12	37
2: In Situ Housing	1	2	5	8
3: Relocation in process	3	1	11	15
4: Relocated	1	22	19	42
5: Infrastructure Upgradation	2	15		17
6: Identified for relocation	10	18		28
Grand Total	**28**	**72**	**47**	**147**

predominantly less than 5 km, but about 19 HHs from the relocated types of respondents said that they had to travel more than 5 km (in many cases more than 20 km) to reach the nearest hospitals.

Disability

Of the random sample of 158 HHs, 14 had family members who were differently-abled. Of these, only 7 mentioned they received any government support or housing allocation (50% of the sample).

Insurance

40 out of 156 respondents said that they had some form of life insurance or the other. 38 out of 150 said they had LIC policies, and 5 out of 150 said that they had recently bought the Pradhan Mantri Bima Yojna (although most of them did not know how to operate it, and if they did not use their zero balance bank accounts on a regular

basis they would not be entitled to the insurance either). While there is still some penetration of life insurance in these parts, non-life insurance products are non-existent. It was learnt that ODRP beneficiaries are entitled to a non-life multi-hazard insurance. But none of the beneficiaries mentioned this themselves probably due to lack of awareness. This could be because the insurance plan is still in process and people may be informed in the future. But it might be a policy dilemma whether to let people know about their entitlement to this multi-hazard house insurance as making them aware could lead to 'moral hazards' on the part of beneficiaries, while not letting them know may lead to ineffective service delivery.

Insurance	No	Yes	Grand Total
Prevalence of life insurance			
1: Non Beneficiary	30	7	37
2: In Situ Housing	8		8
3: Relocation in process	14	1	15
4: Relocated	31	12	43
5: Infrastructure Upgradation	10	9	19
6: Identified for relocation	23	11	34
Grand Total	**116**	**40**	**156**
Prevalence of LIC			
1: Non Beneficiary	27	6	33
2: In Situ Housing	7		7
3: Relocation in process	14	1	15
4: Relocated	32	10	42
5: Infrastructure Upgradation	10	9	19
6: Identified for relocation	22	12	34
Grand Total	**112**	**38**	**150**
Prevalence of PMBY			
1: Non Beneficiary	31	2	33
2: In Situ Housing	7		7
3: Relocation in process	15		15
4: Relocated	39	3	42
5: Infrastructure Upgradation	19		19
6: Identified for relocation	34		34
Grand Total	**145**	**5**	**150**
Prevalence of non-life multi hazard insurance			
1: Non Beneficiary	33		33
2: In Situ Housing	3	5	8
3: Relocation in process		15	15
4: Relocated	32	11	43
5: Infrastructure Upgradation	10		10
6: Identified for relocation	23		23
Grand Total	**101**	**31**	**132**

Health Card Prevalence by beneficiary type	No	Yes	Grand Total
1: Non Beneficiary	18	18	36
2: In Situ Housing	5	3	8
3: Relocation in process	4	11	15
4: Relocated	20	22	42
5: Infrastructure Upgradation	14	5	19
6: Identified for relocation	26	7	33
Grand Total	**87**	**66**	**153**

	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Health Card Prevalence by rural and urban	2	22	30	12	66
Use of the health card		3	10	1	14

Health insurance

Of 153 HHs who responded to the question, 66 said they had the health card (National Health Insurance Scheme Rashtriya Swasthya Bima Yojana) covering their immediate family, but of these 66 only 14 said that they had ever been able to use it (10 of whom were in Urban AP) since it covers only major medical treatments and emergencies.

Other shocks faced in the household

Many families mentioned several shocks they had faced recently that had affected them often more than the cyclone itself. In the 105 responses received, many stated lack of livelihood options and loss of jobs (10 responses), monkey menace (predominantly by horticulturists among the Devi Nagar-Lakshmipur-Ramayapalli residents), extreme health issues and deaths in the family (11 responses), women-headed household problems (4 responses), relocation itself (4 responses), and evictions (2 responses), etc. It is possible that there are certain biases in the responses depending on the way they were interviewed and what state in their life they were. But this information was collected to get a sense of the major perceived problems and risks that may have affected them even more than a cyclone and which they had the least capacities to deal with.

Types of shocks faced by families	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Lack of livelihood options and safety nets		3	3	4	10
Monkey Menace		8			8
Health issues		3	3	2	8
Financial loans and high interest rates	1	1	4	1	7
Women headed household			3	1	4
Relocation		2	2		4
Multiple shocks		1	1	2	4
Weak house (rains, etc.)				3	3
Deaths in family			2	1	3
Cyclone related damages and lack of sufficient relief	1	1	1		3
Alcoholism			3		3
Accidents and fires		2	1		3
Sold land		1			1

Types of shocks faced by families	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Migration		1			1
Locational problems (sea shore, etc.)			1		1
Lack of fishing activity / food produce / cattle				1	1
Lack of fishing activity / food produce			1		1
Lack of BPL card / Ration card			1	1	2
Evictions			2		2
None	2	3	27	4	36
Grand Total	**4**	**26**	**55**	**20**	**105**

Primary survey findings of Post Cyclone Effects

Primary survey findings related to post-cyclone effects

Following are findings related to the effects of recent cyclones in 2013 (Odisha) and 2014 (AP):

Early warning about the cyclones

Only 15 out of 158 HHs said that they did not know about the cyclone in advance, and most of these (14 out of 15) were from urban Andhra Pradesh. The various sources of information people said they had access to included TV and radio (73 out of 142 respondents), government announcements (51 out of 142) and neighbours and relatives (17 out of 142—which also indicates that people still believe what they hear from others, which can sometimes be a boon but also a burden.)

Losses faced during the recent cyclones

House damage is often used as an eligibility criteria for any compensations or beneficiary identification. This question was asked to know from people what their perceptions of damages were, and whether or not the assessors had noted the same. In most cases these were observed first-hand and noted and not limited to stated damages. Of the non-beneficiaries (35 respondents), 26 said they had partial-to-completely damaged houses after the recent cyclones; 19 of these were from AP. Of those identified for infrastructure upgradation (type 5), none had severe or complete damages. Of the relocated (37 respondents), 17 said their previous houses were damaged, and 12 (from urban AP) said their houses did not exist anymore after the evictions so there were no damages during the recent cyclone.

Warning about the cyclone	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Advance information about cyclone					
No		1	14		15
Yes	5	39	44	55	143
Grand Total	**5**	**40**	**58**	**55**	**158**
Sources of information for early warning					
TV/ Radio	1	15	20	37	73
Government Announcement	4	16	19	12	51
Neighbors/Relatives		7	6	4	17
Others			1		1
Grand Total	**5**	**38**	**46**	**53**	**142**

Note: These are responses for their current residences in the recent cyclones, which for relocated could mean those who were already living in relocated sites (particularly those in Urban AP) at the time of the cyclones and effects on these sites.

Losses faced in Cyclone	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
House damage by type of beneficiary					
1: Non Beneficiary	**5**	**8**	**22**		**35**
Complete Damage	3		13		16
Partial Damage		7	3		10
No Damage	2	1	6		9
2: In Situ Housing		**4**			**4**
Partial Damage		4			4
3: Relocation in process		**8**			**8**
Partial Damage		7			7
No Damage		1			1
4: Relocated		**11**	**36**		**47**
Partial Damage		1	9		10
No Damage		10	27		37
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				**15**	**15**
Partial Damage				13	13
No Damage				2	2
6: Identified for relocation				**28**	**28**
Partial Damage				27	27
No Damage				1	1
Grand Total	**5**	**31**	**58**	**43**	**137**
Roof Damage					
1: Non Beneficiary	**5**	**9**	**22**		**36**
Complete Damage	5	1	14		20
Partial Damage		6	2		8
No Damage		2	6		8
2: In Situ Housing		**5**			**5**
Complete Damage		5			5
3: Relocation in process		**15**			**15**
Complete Damage		14			14
No Damage		1			1
4: Relocated		**11**	**36**		**47**
Partial Damage		1	7		8
No Damage		10	29		39
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				**19**	**19**
Complete Damage				9	9
Partial Damage				7	7
No Damage				3	3

Losses faced in Cyclone	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
6: Identified for relocation				**35**	**35**
Complete Damage				21	21
Partial Damage				12	12
No Damage				2	2
Grand Total	**5**	**40**	**58**	**54**	**157**
Wall Damages					
1: Non Beneficiary	**5**	**9**	**22**		**36**
Complete Damage	3	1	11		15
Partial Damage	2	7	5		14
No Damage		1	6		7
2: In Situ Housing		**5**			**5**
Complete Damage		1			1
No Damage		4			4
3: Relocation in process		**15**			**15**
Complete Damage		9			9
Partial Damage		1			1
No Damage		5			5
4: Relocated		**11**	**36**		**47**
Partial Damage		1	3		4
No Damage		10	33		43
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				**19**	**19**
Complete Damage				4	4
Partial Damage				9	9
No Damage				6	6
6: Identified for relocation				**35**	**35**
Complete Damage				7	7
Partial Damage				16	16
No Damage				12	12
Grand Total	**5**	**40**	**58**	**54**	**157**
Of the relocated, damages to their previous sites of habitation					
4: Relocated		**10**	**27**		**37**
Yes		10	7		17
No			8		8
NA			12		12
Note: The Not applicable ones are those where the previous sites do not exist anymore as housing, and have either been reused as some other land use, or lying vacant.					

Compensations

Of the 158 HHs surveyed, 131 said that they received some form of compensation or relief from either the state government or other non-governmental agencies. Of the 156 who offered details of these compensations, 143 had received standard packages that were being offered to everyone irrespective of whether they had suffered damages or not (in the case of Odisha, this was Rs 500 and 50 kg rice per family). Of those who did not (43 HH), 25 were already relocated. One of the reasons mentioned by households was that since they lived far away, no one came to ask how they were doing after the cyclone. This was unlike what their experiences had been when staying within the city.

119 out of 138 responders said that they received other in-kind aid including tarpaulin, solar lights, etc. 55 out of 133 also said that they received additional money based on damage assessments by assessors. But the emerging observation from here is that while people have received relief after extreme shocks, they are not getting much support after everyday shocks. Does universal compensation have a merit over that provided after assessments and follow-ups?

Compensations	No	Yes	Grand Total
Households who received any govt. or private relief after the recent cyclones by Beneficiary Type			
1: Non Beneficiary	**7**	**30**	**37**
ASR Nagar	1	7	8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		6	6
Jalari Peta	3	7	10
Markundi		3	3
Pudimadaka		5	5
Sevanagar	1	2	3
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	1		1
Vambay Colony	1		1
2: In Situ Housing		**8**	**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		5	5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		3	3
3: Relocation in process		**15**	**15**
Markundi		15	15
4: Relocated	**13**	**30**	**43**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		11	11
Paradesipallyam	6	6	12
Sevanagar	4	9	13
Vambay Colony	3	4	7
5: Infrastructure Upgradation	**1**	**19**	**20**
Canal Street	1	19	20
6: Identified for relocation	**6**	**29**	**35**
Bada Harijan Sahi	2	8	10
Khaja Sahi		5	5
Pichipicha Nagar		5	5
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi	4	11	15
Grand Total	**27**	**131**	**158**

Compensations	No	Yes	Grand Total
Standard Universal Compensation Packages			
1: Non Beneficiary	**14**	**22**	**36**
ASR Nagar	5	3	8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		5	5
Jalari Peta	5	5	10
Markundi		3	3
Pudimadaka	1	4	5
Sevanagar	1	2	3
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	1		1
Vambay Colony	1		1
2: In Situ Housing	**2**	**6**	**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		5	5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	2	1	3
3: Relocation in process		**15**	**15**
Markundi		15	15
4: Relocated	**25**	**18**	**43**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		11	11
Paradesipallyam	9	3	12
Sevanagar	12	1	13
Vambay Colony	4	3	7
5: Infrastructure Upgradation		**20**	**20**
Canal Street		20	20
6: Identified for relocation	**2**	**32**	**34**
Bada Harijan Sahi		10	10
Khaja Sahi		5	5
Pichipicha Nagar		5	5
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi	2	12	14
Grand Total	**43**	**113**	**156**
In kind (Tarpaulin, lights, etc.)			
1: Non Beneficiary	**10**	**21**	**31**
ASR Nagar	2	6	8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		4	4
Jalari Peta	6	3	9
Markundi		3	3
Pudimadaka	1	4	5
Sevanagar	1	1	2
2: In Situ Housing		**7**	**7**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		5	5

Compensations	No	Yes	Grand Total
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		2	2
3: Relocation in process		**15**	**15**
Markundi		15	15
4: Relocated	**7**	**26**	**33**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		11	11
Paradesipallyam	2	5	7
Sevanagar		9	9
Vambay Colony	5	1	6
5: Infrastructure Upgradation		**19**	**19**
Canal Street		19	19
6: Identified for relocation	**2**	**31**	**33**
Bada Harijan Sahi		9	9
Khaja Sahi		5	5
Pichipicha Nagar		5	5
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi	2	12	14
Grand Total	**19**	**119**	**138**
Additional money for damages			
1: Non Beneficiary	**22**	**5**	**27**
ASR Nagar	8		8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	4		4
Jalari Peta	5	3	8
Markundi	1	2	3
Pudimadaka	3		3
Sevanagar	1		1
2: In Situ Housing	3	4	7
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	1	4	5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	2		2
3: Relocation in process		**15**	**15**
Markundi		15	15
4: Relocated	**24**	**9**	**33**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	4	7	11
Paradesipallyam	7		7
Sevanagar	9		9
Vambay Colony	4	2	6
5: Infrastructure Upgradation	**5**	**14**	**19**
Canal Street	5	14	19
6: Identified for relocation	**24**	**8**	**32**
Bada Harijan Sahi	9		9

Compensations	No	Yes	Grand Total	
Khaja Sahi	2	3	5	
Pichipicha Nagar	2	2	4	
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi	11	3	14	
Grand Total	**78**	**55**	**133**	
Eligibility for compensation	**After Damage assessment**	**After pursuing /submitting documents/ special request**	**Universal compensation**	**Grand Total**
1: Non Beneficiary	**12**	**1**	**13**	**26**
ASR Nagar	4		2	6
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar			3	3
Jalari Peta	4	1	2	7
Markundi	2		1	3
Pudimadaka	2		3	5
Sevanagar			2	2
2: In Situ Housing	**4**		**3**	**7**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	4		1	5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar			2	2
3: Relocation in process	**15**			**15**
Markundi	15			15
4: Relocated	**11**		**16**	**27**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	9		2	11
Paradesipallyam			6	6
Sevanagar			7	7
Vambay Colony	2		1	3
5: Infrastructure Upgradation	**13**	**2**	**4**	**19**
Canal Street	13	2	4	19
6: Identified for relocation	**12**		**15**	**27**
Bada Harijan Sahi	2		4	6
Khaja Sahi	3		2	5
Pichipicha Nagar	4		1	5
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi	3		8	11
Grand Total	**67**	**3**	**51**	**121**

Problems with services (water, sanitation, electricity, education, transport)

129 HHs said they faced drinking water challenges after the recent cyclones including 30 who were already living in relocated sites in urban AP. 92 mentioned that they faced problems related to defecation, either because open defecation was difficult or because they were forced to defecate in the open because there was no water to service their existing toilets.

68 HHs said that they faced problems with electricity1.

1 This question was added later, and 88 respondents were not asked this question. All those who were asked said that they had electricity problems for a few days

119 HHs said they had problems accessing schools right after the event, and gave reasons including loss of books and damaged school buildings especially after being used as emergency shelters. 54 said that they faced problems with transportation, and some of the reasons included trees having fallen on streets and roads being blocked.

Problems with Servives after recent cyclone	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Households with drinking water problems					
1: Non Beneficiary	5	7	21		33
2: In Situ Housing		2			2
3: Relocation in process		10			10
4: Relocated		10	30		40
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				14	14
6: Identified for relocation				30	30
Grand Total	**5**	**29**	**51**	**44**	**129**
Households with defecation problems					
1: Non Beneficiary	4	7	11		22
3: Relocation in process		13			13
4: Relocated		7	17		24
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				9	9
6: Identified for relocation				24	24
Grand Total	**4**	**27**	**28**	**33**	**92**
Households with electricity access problems					
1: Non Beneficiary	5		22		27
3: Relocation in process		3			3
4: Relocated			36		36
6: Identified for relocation				2	2
Grand Total	**5**	**3**	**58**	**2**	**68**
Households with school education problems					
1: Non Beneficiary	4	9	10		23
2: In Situ Housing		5			5
3: Relocation in process		12			12
4: Relocated		11	21		32
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				20	20
6: Identified for relocation				27	27
Grand Total	**4**	**37**	**31**	**47**	**119**
Households with transportation access problems					
1: Non Beneficiary	5		19		24
3: Relocation in process		2			2
4: Relocated			27		27
6: Identified for relocation				1	1
Grand Total	**5**	**2**	**46**	**1**	**54**

Work related losses

Of the 25 respondents engaged in fishing, 23 said that they faced serious challenges for long periods of time. Apart from loss of work days, many even said that the catch had substantially reduced since the two cyclones in 2013 and 2014. Four of the 7 respondents engaged in agricultural activities said they faced various kinds of problems in operating from the new sites. This number might be low because the cyclone occurred at a time of the year when most people did not have crops in the field. Early warnings also helped some secure their outputs in advance. 12 said they faced serious problems in their horticulture work after the cyclones. This number is relatively high for the total number of households in the sample involved in horticulture activities (13). In most of these cases, the outcomes were long-drawn-out as the trees would take much longer to recover and bear fruit again. Many of the horticulturists we spoke to had moved to alternate livelihoods for the time being. 92 respondents out of 116 said they faced challenges with other kinds of work they were involved in, and the reasons included access to work, difficulty in finding work, and loss of productive assets.

Work related losses among households	No	Yes	Grand Total
Problems in Fishing activity			
1: Non Beneficiary	**2**	**13**	**15**
Jalari Peta	2	6	8
Markundi		2	2
Pudimadaka		5	5
3: Relocation in process		**10**	**10**
Markundi		10	10
Grand Total	**2**	**23**	**25**
Problems in agricultural activity			
1: Non Beneficiary		**1**	**1**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		1	1
2: In Situ Housing	**3**	**1**	**4**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	3	1	4
4: Relocated		**2**	**2**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		2	2
Grand Total	**3**	**4**	**7**
Problems in horticulture activity			
1: Non Beneficiary		**1**	**1**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		1	1
2: In Situ Housing		**5**	**5**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		5	5
3: Relocation in process	**1**	**1**	**2**
Markundi	1	1	2
4: Relocated		**5**	**5**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		5	5
Grand Total	**1**	**12**	**13**
Problems in other jobs and professions			
1: Non Beneficiary	**5**	**14**	**19**
ASR Nagar		3	3

Work related losses among households	No	Yes	Grand Total
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	2	3	5
Jalari Peta	2	2	4
Markundi		2	2
Sevanagar		3	3
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	1		1
Vambay Colony		1	1
2: In Situ Housing	**2**	**1**	**3**
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	2	1	3
3: Relocation in process	**1**	**6**	**7**
Markundi	1	6	7
4: Relocated	**10**	**24**	**34**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		5	5
Paradesipallyam	5	6	11
Sevanagar	4	7	11
Vambay Colony	1	6	7
5: Infrastructure Upgradation	**1**	**18**	**19**
Canal Street	1	18	19
6: Identified for relocation	**5**	**29**	**34**
Bada Harijan Sahi	1	9	10
Khaja Sahi		4	4
Pichipicha Nagar	2	3	5
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi	2	13	15
Grand Total	**24**	**92**	**116**

Other asset losses post-cyclones

Of the 133 responders, 83 said they had suffered losses in their household and/or productive assets. 72 out of 105 said they had suffered losses in household assets, and 30 out of 105 said they had suffered losses in their productive or work-related assets.

Other losses	No	Yes	Grand Total
Asset losses			
1: Non Beneficiary	**7**	**27**	**34**
ASR Nagar		8	8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	1	4	5
Jalari Peta		10	10
Markundi	2		2
Pudimadaka		5	5
Sevanagar	2		2
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	1		1
Vambay Colony	1		1

Other losses	No	Yes	Grand Total
2: In Situ Housing	**3**	**2**	**5**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	1	1	2
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	2	1	3
3: Relocation in process	**3**	**11**	**14**
Markundi	3	11	14
4: Relocated	**25**	**13**	**38**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	4	2	6
Paradesipallyam	10	2	12
Sevanagar	8	5	13
Vambay Colony	3	4	7
5: Infrastructure Upgradation	**3**	**13**	**16**
Canal Street	3	13	16
6: Identified for relocation	**9**	**17**	**26**
Bada Harijan Sahi	1	6	7
Khaja Sahi	1	3	4
Pichipicha Nagar	2	2	4
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi	5	6	11
Grand Total	**50**	**83**	**133**
Losses to Household assets			
1: Non Beneficiary	**1**	**28**	**29**
ASR Nagar		8	8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		4	4
Jalari Peta		10	10
Pudimadaka		5	5
Sevanagar	1	1	2
2: In Situ Housing	**2**	**2**	**4**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		1	1
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	2	1	3
3: Relocation in process		**11**	**11**
Markundi		11	11
4: Relocated	**25**	**9**	**34**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		2	2
Paradesipallyam	10	2	12
Sevanagar	10	3	13
Vambay Colony	5	2	7
5: Infrastructure Upgradation	**2**	**10**	**12**
Canal Street	2	10	12
6: Identified for relocation	**3**	**12**	**15**

Other losses	No	Yes	Grand Total
Bada Harijan Sahi	1	4	5
Khaja Sahi	1	1	2
Pichipicha Nagar	1	1	2
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi		6	6
Grand Total	**33**	**72**	**105**
Losses to work related / productive assets			
1: Non Beneficiary	**14**	**15**	**29**
ASR Nagar	5	3	8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	3	1	4
Jalari Peta	4	6	10
Pudimadaka	1	4	5
Sevanagar	1	1	2
2: In Situ Housing	**4**		**4**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	1		1
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	3		3
3: Relocation in process	**8**	**3**	**11**
Markundi	8	3	11
4: Relocated	**28**	**6**	**34**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	2		2
Paradesipallyam	12		12
Sevanagar	10	3	13
Vambay Colony	4	3	7
5: Infrastructure Upgradation	**9**	**3**	**12**
Canal Street	9	3	12
6: Identified for relocation	**12**	**3**	**15**
Bada Harijan Sahi	4	1	5
Khaja Sahi	1	1	2
Pichipicha Nagar	1	1	2
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi	6		6
Grand Total	**75**	**30**	**105**

Important things people carried at the time of evacuation

Of the 128 responses, 49 said they carried some items with them at the time of evacuation, whereas 35 said they carried nothing. This number is the highest in Andhra Pradesh, most likely because people had no memories of the last cyclone (unlike in Odisha) and did not consider the importance of taking their most important things with them as they evacuated. 44 also said that they did not evacuate.

Whether people carried anything with them at the time of evacuation	Didn't Evacuate	No	Yes	Grand Total
1: Non Beneficiary	**9**	**10**	**12**	**31**
ASR Nagar	3		5	8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		1	1	2
Jalari Peta	1	5	3	9
Markundi		1	1	2
Pudimadaka		3	2	5
Sevanagar	3			3
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	1			1
Vambay Colony	1			1
2: In Situ Housing	**5**	**3**		**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	4	1		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	1	2		3
3: Relocation in process		**1**	**8**	**9**
Markundi		1	8	9
4: Relocated	**21**	**9**	**6**	**36**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		2	2	4
Paradesipallyam	6	2	4	12
Sevanagar	12	1		13
Vambay Colony	3	4		7
5: Infrastructure Upgradation	**4**	**6**	**4**	**14**
Canal Street	4	6	4	14
6: Identified for relocation	**5**	**6**	**19**	**30**
Bada Harijan Sahi	1	3	4	8
Khaja Sahi		2	3	5
Pichipicha Nagar			3	3
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi	4	1	9	14
Grand Total	**44**	**35**	**49**	**128**

Households that did not carry anything with them as they evacuated	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
1: Non Beneficiary	3	2	5		**10**
2: In Situ Housing		1			**1**
3: Relocation in process		1			**1**
4: Relocated		2	9		**11**
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				6	**6**
6: Identified for relocation				6	**6**
Grand Total	**3**	**6**	**14**	**12**	**35**

What people carry with them at the time of evacuation is an indication of what they consider important as well as what they think they may not have access to in the next few days while being away from home. 31 HHs said they carried documents (IDs, home ownership documents, bank passbooks, etc.), 30 carried food items, 20 carried clothes, only 9 carried work-related assets, while 5 said they carried some other household items. What people carry with them can also become an asset or a liability in the evacuation areas, as resources available are limited, but the space available is also less.

Things people carried while evacuating	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Households that carried key documents with them while evacuating					
1: Non Beneficiary	2		8		10
3: Relocation in process		6			6
4: Relocated		1	2		3
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				1	1
6: Identified for relocation				11	11
Grand Total	**2**	**7**	**10**	**12**	**31**
Households that carried food items with them while evacuating					
1: Non Beneficiary	2	1	6		9
3: Relocation in process		3			3
4: Relocated		1	5		6
6: Identified for relocation				12	12
Grand Total	**2**	**5**	**11**	**12**	**30**
Households that carried clothes with them while evacuating					
1: Non Beneficiary	2	1	4		7
3: Relocation in process		1			1
4: Relocated			2		2
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				1	1
6: Identified for relocation				9	9
Grand Total	**2**	**2**	**6**	**10**	**20**
Households that carried work related with them while evacuating					
1: Non Beneficiary		1			1
3: Relocation in process		3			3
4: Relocated		1	3		4
6: Identified for relocation				1	1
Grand Total		**5**	**3**	**1**	**9**
Households that carried household assets with them while evacuating					
1: Non Beneficiary		1			1
6: Identified for relocation				4	4
Grand Total		**1**		**4**	**5**

Risk sharing

Most people (72 out of 99 responders) took help from their friends and relatives to recover after the cyclones. This is an indication of the social safety nets people rely on at the time of emergencies and crises, but also of what is most accessible. Any destruction to these safety nets and networks could mean creating greater burden as far as their adaptive capacities and resilience to risks is concerned.

72 out of 99 respondents also borrowed money to recover after the cyclone. This is an interesting corollary to having bank accounts which seems to be widely prevalent and yet did not help them in the time of need and crisis. 76 HHs mentioned that they took loans for recovery. This may imply longer-term burdens for these households. The loans range from Rs 3000 to Rs 2 lakh; the figures vary in keeping with the economic and social capital people have, which are difficult to capture as part of this study. Also, these the rate of interest of these loans varies from 0 per cent to 5 per cent with the most common being 3 percent, as stated by people.

Risk Sharing	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Who did people take help from after the recent cyclones?					
1: Non Beneficiary	**5**	**7**	**17**		**29**
Government	1	1	2		4
Money lender	2		4		6
Other Institutions			1		1
Relatives/ Friends/ Neighbours	2	6	10		18
2: In Situ Housing		**2**			**2**
Government		1			1
Relatives/ Friends/ Neighbours		1			1
3: Relocation in process		**13**			**13**
Relatives/ Friends/ Neighbours		13			13
4: Relocated		**9**	**15**		**24**
Employer		1			1
Money lender			1		1
Other Institutions		1	2		3
Relatives/ Friends/ Neighbours		7	12		19
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				**13**	**13**
Employer				3	3
Government				3	3
Other Institutions				1	1
Relatives/ Friends/ Neighbours				6	6
6: Identified for relocation				**18**	**18**
Other Institutions				3	3
Relatives/ Friends/ Neighbours				15	15
Grand Total	**5**	**31**	**32**	**31**	**99**

Risk Sharing	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
The type of help families took after the recent cyclone experiences to recover					
1: Non Beneficiary	**5**	**7**	**17**		**29**
In kind		1	2		3
Money	4	4	13		21
Place to stay/cook		2	1		3
Others	1		1		2
2: In Situ Housing		**2**			**2**
Money		1			1
Place to stay/cook		1			1
3: Relocation in process		**13**			**13**
Money		11			11
Place to stay/cook		2			2
4: Relocated		**9**	**15**		**24**
In kind		1	4		5
Money		7	10		17
Place to stay/cook		1	1		2
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				**13**	**13**
In kind				2	2
Money				10	10
Place to stay/cook				1	1
6: Identified for relocation				**18**	**18**
In kind				4	4
Labour				1	1
Money				12	12
Place to stay/cook				1	1
Grand Total	**5**	**31**	**32**	**31**	**99**
Number of households that took loans for recovery after the recent cyclones					
1: Non Beneficiary	**3**	**5**	**9**		**17**
3: Relocation in process		13			13
4: Relocated		5	9		14
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				13	13
6: Identified for relocation				19	19
Grand Total	**3**	**23**	**18**	**32**	**76**

Action people are likely to take if there's a warning of a cyclone in near future (1 week)

This question was asked to learn about people's preparedness, and also their perception of being at risk to cyclones. 73 out of 143 said that they will move to safe shelters but 60 said they will stay in the same place and not move; 23 of the latter were in the relocated sites.

Actions people are likely to take if there is a cyclone warning in the near future	We will do what community does	Stay in the same place	Move to safe shelter	Grand Total
1: Non Beneficiary		**20**	**14**	**34**
ASR Nagar		7		7
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		2	4	6
Jalari Peta		4	6	10
Markundi			3	3
Pudimadaka		4	1	5
Sevanagar		3		3
2: In Situ Housing	**4**	**2**	**1**	**7**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	4		1	5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		2		2
3: Relocation in process	**3**	**2**	**9**	**14**
Markundi	3	2	9	14
4: Relocated	**1**	**23**	**11**	**35**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	1	3	5	9
Paradesipallyam		6	1	7
Sevanagar		9	4	13
Vambay Colony		5	1	6
5: Infrastructure Upgradation	**1**	**6**	**11**	**18**
Canal Street	1	6	11	18
6: Identified for relocation	**1**	**7**	**27**	**35**
Bada Harijan Sahi			10	10
Khaja Sahi		2	3	5
Pichipicha Nagar			5	5
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi	1	5	9	15
Grand Total	**10**	**60**	**73**	**143**

Actions people are likely to take if there's a cyclone every year

This was asked as an indication of long-term adaptation measures people are likely to adopt against climate risks. Despite knowing that these climatic incidents may happen every year, most people (77 out of 101 responders) still said that they would not do anything different and continue to live where they are living. Few (24 out of 101 respondents and mostly those of the younger generation) said that they would move out permanently or take the government's help to find alternatives. This is an indication of what livelihood and migration changes might take place in the long-term in the face of changing climate and increasing frequency and intensity of such events in these areas.

Actions people are likely to take if there is a cyclone almost every year	Ask for government support	Move permanently	No Change	Grand Total
1: Non Beneficiary	**3**	**5**	**19**	**27**
ASR Nagar	2		6	8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		1	4	5
Jalari Peta	1	2	3	6
Markundi		1	1	2
Pudimadaka		1	3	4
Sevanagar			2	2
2: In Situ Housing			**1**	**1**
Sonia Gandhi Nagar			1	1
3: Relocation in process		**1**	**4**	**5**
Markundi		1	4	5
4: Relocated		**7**	**26**	**33**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		1	7	8
Paradesipallyam			10	10
Sevanagar		5	5	10
Vambay Colony		1	4	5
5: Infrastructure Upgradation		**2**	**10**	**12**
Canal Street		2	10	12
6: Identified for relocation		**6**	**17**	**23**
Bada Harijan Sahi			4	4
Khaja Sahi		1	2	3
Pichipicha Nagar		2	2	4
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi		3	9	12
Grand Total	**3**	**21**	**77**	**101**

Resttlement & Relocation interventions findings

Findings related to resettlement and relocation interventions

Following are the key findings related to the relocation and resettlement interventions.

Relocated people by distance from original locations

The sample of sites comprised relocation areas within 1 km from the original site (Markundi) but also households which had been relocated by more than 5, 10 and 20 km. There are also many sites that have been identified for relocation, but without clear decisions on the new locations, primarily in Berhampur.

Average no. of years stated of inhabiting the current location and house

Of the 158 HHs surveyed, 32 said they have been living in the current site for over 50 years (through generations), 55 between 10–50 years, and 20– between 5–10 years. 26 HHs said they have been living in this site between 1–5 years of which 11 belong to the recently relocated type of respondents. 24 HHs stated the residence in the current locations as being for less than one year and almost all of those were recently relocated.

Distance from original site to relocated site by beneficiary type	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
3: Relocation in process	**15**			**15**
< 1 km	15			15
4: Relocated	**11**	**33**		**44**
< 1 km				
1 - 5 km		1		1
> 5 km	11	1		12
> 10 km		4		4
> 20 km		27		27
6: Identified for relocation			**35**	**35**
DKCS			35	35
Grand Total	**26**	**34**	**35**	**94**

Residence in current locations by no. of years and type of responders	<1 year	1- 5 years	5 - 10 years	10 - 50 years	50 + years	Grand Total
1: Non Beneficiary		4	7	9	16	36
2: In Situ Housing				3	2	5
3: Relocation in process		1	1	11	2	15
4: Relocated	23	11	10	2	1	47
5: Infrastructure Upgradation	1	4		11	4	20
6: Identified for relocation		6	2	19	7	35
Grand Total	**24**	**26**	**20**	**55**	**32**	**158**

Of the relocated, no. of years stated of inhabiting the previous locations

Of the relocated, most people had inhabited the previous location for more than 10 years or had been living there through generations, both in urban AP and rural Odisha. This could have greater implications for the outcomes of these resettlements that need to be studied in detail, in the holistic context of their earlier and new settlements.

Residence in previous locations by no. of years	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Grand Total
<1 year		2	2
1- 5 years		1	1
5 - 10 years		2	2
10 - 50 years	1	23	24
50 + years	6	8	14
Grand Total	**7**	**36**	**43**

Problems faced in operating from new sites

Of those who were relocated, 40 HHs responded to this question, and 36 of them said that if they were to continue with their regular activities as before their travel expenses had increased after relocation. Of those who were relocated, 35 said they were facing challenges after relocation, whereas only 8 said they were not facing any serious challenges in operating from the new locations. Most of these who shared concerns belonged to the relocation sites in urban Andhra Pradesh. Of the 24 HHs which gave reasons for changing their work after relocation, 11 in urban AP claimed that they changed their work after being relocated due to an increase in their distance from work. Of the relocated, 16 of 31 respondents mentioned that they were facing a reduction in the family income after relocation.

Change in travel expenditure after risk reduction travel	Increased	No Change	Grand Total
1: Non Beneficiary	**1**		**1**
Sevanagar	1		1
4: Relocated	**36**	**4**	**40**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	9		9
Paradesipallyam	10	2	12
Sevanagar	13		13
Vambay Colony	4	2	6
Grand Total	**37**	**4**	**41**

Problems faced in operating from new location	Yes	No	Grand Total
4: Relocated			
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	11		11
Paradesipallyam	11	1	12
Sevanagar	13		13
VAMBAY Colony		7	7
Grand Total	**35**	**8**	**43**

Reasons for changing work after relocation	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Grand Total
Distance from work increased	1	11	**12**
Family financial needs	2	3	**5**
Could not continue after cyclone	3		**3**
Was not of working age		2	**2**
Retired		1	**1**
Got a better job than before		1	**1**
Grand Total	**6**	**18**	**24**

Type of relocation by division of community

Resettlements tend to divide and mix people in different ways. Some of the resettlements such as Paradesipallyam are a mix of entire communities (auto driver unions and watch manufacturer unions) who lived together earlier, sub-sections of communities and also singular families. One would need to study what becomes of the voices of people who have moved as single families within the neighbourhood versus those who have moved as a community.

Division of community by Urban and Rural	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Grand Total
3: Relocation in process	**15**		**15**
As part of a community	15		15
4: Relocated	**11**	**36**	**47**
As entire community		17	17
As part of a community	11	8	19
As a family		11	11
Grand Total	**26**	**36**	**62**

Division of community by sites	As entire community	As part of a community	As a family	Grand Total
3: Relocation in process		**15**		**15**
Markundi		15		15
4: Relocated	**17**	**19**	**11**	**47**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		11		11
Paradesipallyam	4	5	3	12

Division of community by sites	As entire community	As part of a community	As a family	Grand Total
Sevanagar	10		4	14
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	3			3
Vambay Colony		3	4	7
Grand Total	**17**	**34**	**11**	**62**

Satisfaction with the new house allocation

Many of those who have relocated, particularly in Markundi & Paradesipallyam, mentioned that they were happy with the houses they got. But there were mixed opinions in some sites such as Devi Nagar, Sonia Gandhi Nagar & VAMBAY colony. The respondents in Sevanagar all vehemently disliked the housing that they were asked to move into. One must note that Sevanagar was a site of evictions whereas the rest were sites where people got to state their choices or accepted relocation.

Reasons of motivation for relocation

When asked what motivated them to move to a new location for a house, about 25 HHs mentioned safe house as a reason, about 10 said they could not afford the rent, 10 said they wanted a house of their own, and 13 were evicted forcefully and had no choice in the decision to move. Only 4 mentioned better facilities and opportunities of livelihood as their reason.

People's stated satisfaction with the house allocation	Yes	No	Grand Total
2: In Situ Housing	**5**		**5**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	5		5
3: Relocation in process	**15**		**15**
Markundi	15		15
4: Relocated	**27**	**20**	**47**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	8	3	11
Paradesipallyam	12		12
Sevanagar		14	14
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	1	2	3
Vambay Colony	6	1	7
Grand Total	**47**	**20**	**67**

Row Labels	Devi Nagar	Markundi	Paradesi-pallyam	Sevanagar	Sonia Gan-dhi Nagar	VAMBAY Colony	Grand Total
3: Relocation in process		**15**					**15**
Safe house		15					15
4: Relocated	**11**		**12**	**14**	**3**	**7**	**47**
Own house			5		1	4	10
Safe house	10						10
Better facilities	1		1		1		3
Can't afford rent			6		1	3	10
Forcibly evicted				13			13
Better livelihood options				1			1
Grand Total	**16**	**15**	**12**	**14**	**3**	**7**	**67**

House Ownership details of current residences (business as usual)

While most of the relocated have some form of certification for occupation, most of these are non-alienable, i.e., they cannot be rented out or sold but can only be passed on as inheritance to future generations. Defaulters stand to lose their rights of occupation. Some households who were currently renting these apartments and were actually non-beneficiaries were also interviewed. Of the 123 who responded about their ownership details, 50 were staying in these locations without any certificate of occupancy and 37 said they had non-alienable rights to the house.

The question that arises then is whether a thought needs to be given to such families who have now been staying in these lands for generations, and yet do not have any rights to occupancy. If not tenure, could there be some form of no-eviction rights made available to them such that it enables people to invest in their own improvement?

Current resident's Housing Status	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
House ownership / certificate of occupation					
1: Non Beneficiary	**5**	**9**	**24**		**38**
Yes	1	7	5		13
No	4	2	13		19
Rent			6		6
2: In Situ Housing		**5**			**5**
Yes		5			5
3: Relocation in process		**15**			**15**
Yes		15			15
4: Relocated		**11**	**34**		**45**
Yes		11	30		41
No			4		4
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				**20**	**20**
Yes				12	12
No				8	8
6: Identified for relocation				**35**	**35**
Yes				17	17
No				17	17
DKCS				1	1
Grand Total	**5**	**40**	**58**	**55**	**158**
Type of ownership					
1: Non Beneficiary	**5**	**6**	**23**		**34**
Freehold	1		2		3
Non alienable		4			4
Rent			6		6
Occupation without certificate	4	2	15		21
2: In Situ Housing		**2**			**2**
Non alienable		2			2
3: Relocation in process		**4**			**4**
Non alienable		4			4

Current resident's Housing Status	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
4: Relocated		**11**	**34**		**45**
Freehold			1		1
Occupation Certificate			16		16
Non alienable		11	13		24
Occupation without certificate			4		4
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				**11**	**11**
Freehold				2	2
Non alienable				1	1
Occupation without certificate				8	8
6: Identified for relocation				**27**	**27**
Freehold				7	7
Occupation Certificate				1	1
Non alienable				2	2
Occupation without certificate				17	17
Grand Total	**5**	**23**	**57**	**38**	**123**

House ownership by gender

House ownership in the non-relocated (type 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6) households (52 responders) is primarily (32HHs) owned by the male, whereas the relocated houses are now more in the name of women (33 out of 43) as part of the policies of most relocation programmes. This is an intervention that may have far-reaching outcomes that could be studied in the long term.

House ownership by gender (current residences)	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
1: Non Beneficiary	**1**	**7**	**9**		**17**
Female		1	1		2
Male	1	4	4		9
Male and Female		2			2
Male (Relative)			2		2
Female (Relative)			2		2
2: In Situ Housing		**5**			**5**
Female		4			4
Male		1			1
3: Relocation in process		**15**			**15**
Female		6			6
Male		9			9
4: Relocated		**11**	**32**		**43**
Female		7	20		27
Male		2	8		10
Male and Female		2	2		4

House ownership by gender (current residences)	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Female (Relative)			2		2
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				**13**	**13**
Female				3	3
Male				8	8
Male and Female				1	1
Female (Relative)				1	1
6: Identified for relocation				**17**	**17**
Allotted				1	1
Female				4	4
Male				12	12
Grand Total	**1**	**38**	**41**	**30**	**110**

House ownership before relocation

Of those who were beneficiaries of various housing allocations across Odisha and Andhra Pradesh, most people had some form of occupation rights (non-alienable patta, certificate of occupation, etc.) but there were also many instances (20 out of 34) in urban Andhra where people did not have occupation certificates in their original locations (and were essentially evicted and made to move to the new sites). There were many instances of renters (14 out of 45 HH) also who by choice moved to the new locations.

Form in which allocation received

In ODRP projects, people received money to construct houses (31 out of 66 responders), whereas in JNNURM and other programmatic allocations, people received constructed houses (35 out of 66 responders) after paying a beneficiary contribution in many cases.

House ownership before allocation of new house	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Grand Total
2: In Situ Housing	**5**		**5**
Yes	5		5
3: Relocation in process	**15**		**15**
Yes	15		15
4: Relocated	**11**	**34**	**45**
No		20	20
Rent		14	14
Yes	11		11
Grand Total	**31**	**34**	**65**

Form of allocation	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Grand Total
2: In Situ Housing	**5**	**3**	**8**
Constructed house		3	3
Money	5		5
3: Relocation in process	**15**		**15**
Money	15		15
4: Relocated	**11**	**32**	**43**

Form of allocation	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Grand Total
Constructed house		32	32
Money	11		11
Grand Total	**31**	**35**	**66**

Self-built or contractor-built

Of those who received money for construction, most people (12 out of 31 responders) engaged contractors as a group to build their houses. Many of them also hired contractors individually. Some of them who could make the time to build their own houses did so either as labourers or as masons (9 out of 31). Few also participated in building their own houses after getting trained in the mason training programme. In many cases where the contractor was engaged by a group of people, there were complaints about the quality of construction with cracks showing up already. On the other hand, in most cases where people were able to build the houses themselves, they seemed satisfied with the construction.

Purpose given to the old houses

When asked what the old sites of habitation are being used as, most people in rural Odisha (13 out of 15 respondents) said that they were using them either for themselves or for other family members. Most people (16 out of 18 HH) in urban AP mentioned that either the houses were demolished, or if they were renters, they did not know how the old houses were being used.

Type of owner-build housing	Rural Odisha	Grand Total
2: In Situ Housing	**5**	**5**
Contractor - Group	1	1
Self	4	4
3: Relocation in process	**15**	**15**
Self	5	5
Contractor - Individual	10	10
4: Relocated	**11**	**11**
Contractor - Group	11	11
Grand Total	**31**	**31**

It is yet to be seen in terms of long-term risk reduction outcomes of these differential policy decisions, whether it is advisable to let people hold on to their older houses, versus moving them entirely.

Use given to the original site of habitation	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Grand Total
1: Non Beneficiary		**1**	**1**
Demolished/Evicted		1	1
2: In Situ Housing	**1**	**1**	**2**
Demolished/Evicted		1	1
Other family	1		1
3: Relocation in process	**4**		**4**
Self	2		2
Vacant	2		2
4: Relocated	**10**	**16**	**26**
Demolished/Evicted		14	14
Other family	3	2	5
Self	7		7
Grand Total	**15**	**18**	**33**

Use given to the original site of habitation by site	Demolished/ Evicted	DKCS	Other family	Self	Grand Total
1: Non Beneficiary	**4**	**1**			**5**
Sevanagar	3				3
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	1				1
Vambay Colony		1			1
2: In Situ Housing	**3**		**1**	**4**	**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar			1	4	5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	3				3
3: Relocation in process				**14**	**14**
Markundi				14	15
4: Relocated	**13**	**18**	**4**	**8**	**43**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar			3	8	11
Paradesipallyam		11	1		12
Sevanagar	13				13
Vambay Colony		7			7
Grand Total	**20**	**19**	**5**	**26**	**70**

Source of drinking water before and after relocation

There seems to be a marginal improvement in drinking water facilities after the housing intervention was made. Before relocation, almost 50 per cent of responders (34 out of 66) were dependent on hand pumps for their water supply, but after the housing intervention (66 respondents in type 2, 3 and 4), only 13 said they are still using hand pumps. 21 out of 43 HHs said they use piped water connection for their drinking water needs after the relocation, whereas only 10 out of 43 respondents had access to piped water before relocation. But in-situ housing still continues to rely on hand pumps and public taps, despite the housing upgradation.

Drinking water Source	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Business as usual (when surveyed)					
1: Non Beneficiary	**5**	**9**	**23**		**37**
Hand pump	1	5	3		9
Piped Water Connection		3	3		6
Public Tap	2	1	15		18
Water cans	2				2
Water tank			2		2
2: In Situ Housing		**5**	**3**		**8**
Hand pump		3	2		5
Public Tap		2	1		3
3: Relocation in process		**15**			**15**
Hand pump		6			6
Piped Water Connection		3			3

Drinking water Source	Rural AP	Rural Odisha	Urban AP	Urban Odisha	Grand Total
Public Tap		6			6
4: Relocated		**11**	**32**		**43**
Hand pump		2	1		3
Piped Water Connection		7	14		21
Public Tap		1	13		14
Tube well		1			1
Water cans			1		1
Water tank			3		3
5: Infrastructure Upgradation				**20**	**20**
Hand pump				3	3
Piped Water Connection				6	6
Public Tap				8	8
Tube well				3	3
6: Identified for relocation				**35**	**35**
Hand pump				8	8
Piped Water Connection				3	3
Public Tap				23	23
Tube well				1	1
Grand Total	**5**	**40**	**58**	**55**	**158**
Before new housing allocation					
2: In Situ Housing		**5**	**3**		**8**
Hand pump		4	3		7
Public Tap		1			1
3: Relocation in process		**15**			**15**
Hand pump		15			15
4: Relocated		**11**	**32**		**43**
Bore pipe connection			1		1
Hand pump		5	9		14
Piped Water Connection		6	4		10
Public Tap			8		8
Water Cans			2		2
Water Tank			8		8
Grand Total		**31**	**35**		**66**

Prevalence and use of toilets before and after relocation

There is also a marginal improvement in the access to toilets after the housing interventions. While 34 respondents (of 51 responders of in-situ type 2 and relocated type 4) had mentioned that they practised open defecation before the housing intervention, 45 out of 46 HHs in these types of respondents said that they now had toilets. Only 1 house in the in-situ category is still practising open defecation (potentially because they were still completing the construction of their toilet). The other categories of respondents (non-beneficiaries, on-site upgradation and identified for relocation) still do not have access to toilets (20 of 33, 7 of 16 and 15 of 28 respectively). But the level of utility of these toilets in the relocated sites varied. Reasons people gave for not using some of these toilets included: weak doors, lack of water supply, leaking soak pits and pipes, too close to the house, etc. But more or less once provided, most people seemed to be using them.

Prevalence of toilets in current locations of residence	No	Yes	Grand Total
1: Non Beneficiary	**20**	**13**	**33**
ASR Nagar	5	3	8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	2	3	5
Jalari Peta	8	2	10
Pudimadaka	5		5
Sevanagar		3	3
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		1	1
Vambay Colony		1	1
2: In Situ Housing	**1**	**3**	**4**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	1		1
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		3	3
3: Relocation in process	**10**	**3**	**13**
Markundi	10	3	13
4: Relocated		**42**	**42**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		10	10
Paradesipallyam		12	12
Sevanagar		13	13
Vambay Colony		7	7
5: Infrastructure Upgradation	**7**	**9**	**16**
Canal Street	7	9	16
6: Identified for relocation	**15**	**13**	**28**
Bada Harijan Sahi	6	4	10
Khaja Sahi	3		3
Pichipicha Nagar	3	2	5
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi	3	7	10
Grand Total	**53**	**83**	**136**

Ways of defecation before housing allocations	Open defecation	Toilet	Grand Total
2: In Situ Housing	**8**		**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	3		3
3: Relocation in process	**12**	**3**	**15**
Markundi	12	3	15
4: Relocated	**26**	**17**	**43**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	10	1	11
Paradesipallyam	1	11	12
Sevanagar	13		13
Vambay Colony	2	5	7
Grand Total	**46**	**20**	**66**

Changes in animal rearing practices

There have been instances, particularly in Canal Street and Ram Nagar Odiya Sahi in Odisha, where people lost their livelihood after the cyclone. In some cases, people mentioned their cattle had suffered severe shocks and stopped giving milk for a long time, and many died in the long term. This has affected some families' main source of income. The numbers are small because the sample included very few animal-rearers (8 HHs), and none of them belonged to the type 4 category of relocated people. But most of these people suffered shocks after the cyclone. This needs to be studied further, particularly to learn how people could be re-engaged with their livelihood in cases of relocation such that shocks are not exacerbated.

Problems faced in current location

Of the relocated people in the current locations, the problems faced by them included that of livelihood (31 out of 42), housing (20 out of 43), drinking water (24 out of 43), sanitation (18 out of 43), electricity (15 out of 43), health (25 out of 43), education (18 out of 39), and transportation (29 out of 42). Most of them did not find rent (only 4 of 43) and missing the feeling of a community (8 out of 41) as a problem after relocation. Other problems mentioned by many included safety, snakes, open drains, access to markets, etc.

Problems at Current Location	Earlier yes but not now	None	Yes	Grand Total
Livelihoods (in current locations)				
1: Non Beneficiary		**14**	**22**	**36**
ASR Nagar		2	6	8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		2	4	6
Jalari Peta		4	5	9
Markundi		1	2	3
Pudimadaka		2	3	5
Sevanagar		1	2	3
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		1		1
Vambay Colony		1		1
2: In Situ Housing		**4**	**4**	**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		2	3	5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		2	1	3

Problems at Current Location	Earlier yes but not now	None	Yes	Grand Total
3: Relocation in process		**4**	**11**	**15**
Markundi		4	11	15
4: Relocated	**1**	**11**	**30**	**42**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		3	8	11
Paradesipallyam		4	7	11
Sevanagar			13	13
Vambay Colony	1	4	2	7
5: Infrastructure Upgradation		**13**	**6**	**19**
Canal Street		13	6	19
6: Identified for relocation		**25**	**9**	**34**
Bada Harijan Sahi		7	3	10
Khaja Sahi		4	1	5
Pichipicha Nagar		3	2	5
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi		11	3	14
Grand Total	**1**	**71**	**82**	**154**
Rent (in current locations)				
1: Non Beneficiary		**31**	**5**	**36**
ASR Nagar		7	1	8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		5	1	6
Jalari Peta		9		9
Markundi		3		3
Pudimadaka		4	1	5
Sevanagar		2	1	3
Sonia Gandhi Nagar			1	1
Vambay Colony		1		1
2: In Situ Housing		**7**	**1**	**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		2	1	3
3: Relocation in process		**15**		**15**
Markundi		15		15
4: Relocated		**39**	**4**	**43**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		11		11
Paradesipallyam		12		12
Sevanagar		10	3	13
Vambay Colony		6	1	7

Problems at Current Location	Earlier yes but not now	None	Yes	Grand Total
5: Infrastructure Upgradation		**16**	**4**	**20**
Canal Street		16	4	20
6: Identified for relocation		**33**		**33**
Bada Harijan Sahi		10		10
Khaja Sahi		5		5
Pichipicha Nagar		3		3
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi		15		15
Grand Total		**141**	**14**	**155**
Housing (in current locations)				
1: Non Beneficiary		**18**	**18**	**36**
ASR Nagar		2	6	8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Laksh-minagar		6		6
Jalari Peta		4	5	9
Markundi		3		3
Pudimadaka			5	5
Sevanagar		1	2	3
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		1		1
Vambay Colony		1		1
2: In Situ Housing		**6**	**2**	**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Laksh-minagar		5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		1	2	3
3: Relocation in process		**12**	**3**	**15**
Markundi		12	3	15
4: Relocated		**23**	**20**	**43**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Laksh-minagar		8	3	11
Paradesipallyam		10	2	12
Sevanagar		2	11	13
Vambay Colony		3	4	7
5: Infrastructure Upgradation		**14**	**6**	**20**
Canal Street		14	6	20
6: Identified for relocation		**28**	**6**	**34**
Bada Harijan Sahi		9	1	10
Khaja Sahi		5		5
Pichipicha Nagar		1	4	5
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi		13	1	14
Grand Total		**101**	**55**	**156**

Problems at Current Location	Earlier yes but not now	None	Yes	Grand Total
Drinking Water (in current locations)				
1: Non Beneficiary		**19**	**17**	**36**
ASR Nagar		3	5	8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		4	2	6
Jalari Peta		7	2	9
Markundi		3		3
Pudimadaka		1	4	5
Sevanagar		1	2	3
Sonia Gandhi Nagar			1	1
Vambay Colony			1	1
2: In Situ Housing		**5**	**3**	**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar			3	3
3: Relocation in process		**12**	**3**	**15**
Markundi		12	3	15
4: Relocated	**1**	**18**	**24**	**43**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		7	4	11
Paradesipallyam		7	5	12
Sevanagar			13	13
Vambay Colony	1	4	2	7
5: Infrastructure Upgradation		**12**	**8**	**20**
Canal Street		12	8	20
6: Identified for relocation		**17**	**17**	**34**
Bada Harijan Sahi		6	4	10
Khaja Sahi		3	2	5
Pichipicha Nagar		2	3	5
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi		6	8	14
Grand Total	**1**	**83**	**72**	**156**
Sanitation (in current locations)				
1: Non Beneficiary		**21**	**15**	**36**
ASR Nagar		3	5	8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		5	1	6
Jalari Peta		5	4	9
Markundi		3		3
Pudimadaka		1	4	5

Problems at Current Location	Earlier yes but not now	None	Yes	Grand Total
Sevanagar		2	1	3
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		1		1
Vambay Colony		1		1
2: In Situ Housing		**8**		**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Laksh-minagar		5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		3		3
3: Relocation in process		**10**	**5**	**15**
Markundi		10	5	15
4: Relocated		**25**	**18**	**43**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Laksh-minagar		8	3	11
Paradesipallyam		11	1	12
Sevanagar		2	11	13
Vambay Colony		4	3	7
5: Infrastructure Upgradation		**14**	**6**	**20**
Canal Street		14	6	20
6: Identified for relocation		**18**	**17**	**35**
Bada Harijan Sahi		10		10
Khaja Sahi			5	5
Pichipicha Nagar			5	5
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi		8	7	15
Grand Total		**96**	**61**	**157**
Electricity (in current locations)				
1: Non Beneficiary		**26**	**10**	**36**
ASR Nagar		3	5	8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Laksh-minagar		4	2	6
Jalari Peta		8	1	9
Markundi		3		3
Pudimadaka		3	2	5
Sevanagar		3		3
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		1		1
Vambay Colony		1		1
2: In Situ Housing		**8**		**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Laksh-minagar		5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		3		3
3: Relocation in process		**11**	**4**	**15**

Problems at Current Location	Earlier yes but not now	None	Yes	Grand Total
Markundi		11	4	15
4: Relocated	**1**	**27**	**15**	**43**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Laksh-minagar		10	1	11
Paradesipallyam		7	5	12
Sevanagar		5	8	13
Vambay Colony	1	5	1	7
5: Infrastructure Upgradation		**15**	**5**	**20**
Canal Street		15	5	20
6: Identified for relocation		**26**	**6**	**32**
Bada Harijan Sahi		8	2	10
Khaja Sahi		3	2	5
Pichipicha Nagar		2	1	3
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi		13	1	14
Grand Total	**1**	**113**	**40**	**154**
Health (in current locations)				
1: Non Beneficiary		**18**	**18**	**36**
ASR Nagar		3	5	8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Laksh-minagar		5	1	6
Jalari Peta		6	3	9
Markundi			3	3
Pudimadaka		2	3	5
Sevanagar		1	2	3
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		1		1
Vambay Colony			1	1
2: In Situ Housing		**8**		**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Laksh-minagar		5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		3		3
3: Relocation in process		**11**	**4**	**15**
Markundi		11	4	15
4: Relocated		**18**	**25**	**43**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Laksh-minagar		8	3	11
Paradesipallyam		5	7	12
Sevanagar		1	12	13
Vambay Colony		4	3	7
5: Infrastructure Upgradation		**14**	**6**	**20**

Problems at Current Location	Earlier yes but not now	None	Yes	Grand Total
Canal Street		14	6	20
6: Identified for relocation		**22**	**12**	**34**
Bada Harijan Sahi		10		10
Khaja Sahi		2	3	5
Pichipicha Nagar		2	3	5
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi		8	6	14
Grand Total		**91**	**65**	**156**
Education (in current locations)				
1: Non Beneficiary		**27**	**7**	**34**
ASR Nagar		3	3	6
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		5	1	6
Jalari Peta		9		9
Markundi		2	1	3
Pudimadaka		5		5
Sevanagar		1	2	3
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		1		1
Vambay Colony		1		1
2: In Situ Housing		**7**	**1**	**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		2	1	3
3: Relocation in process		**12**	**3**	**15**
Markundi		12	3	15
4: Relocated		**21**	**18**	**39**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		9	2	11
Paradesipallyam		5	4	9
Sevanagar		1	11	12
Vambay Colony		6	1	7
5: Infrastructure Upgradation		**20**		**20**
Canal Street		20		20
6: Identified for relocation		**32**	**2**	**34**
Bada Harijan Sahi		10		10
Khaja Sahi		5		5
Pichipicha Nagar		3	2	5
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi		14		14
Grand Total		**119**	**31**	**150**

Problems at Current Location	Earlier yes but not now	None	Yes	Grand Total
Transportation (in current locations)				
1: Non Beneficiary		**31**	**5**	**36**
ASR Nagar		8		8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		5	1	6
Jalari Peta		9		9
Markundi		3		3
Pudimadaka		5		5
Sevanagar			3	3
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		1		1
Vambay Colony			1	1
2: In Situ Housing		**7**	**1**	**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		2	1	3
3: Relocation in process		**9**	**6**	**15**
Markundi		9	6	15
4: Relocated	**1**	**12**	**29**	**42**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		6	5	11
Paradesipallyam		3	9	12
Sevanagar			12	12
Vambay Colony	1	3	3	7
5: Infrastructure Upgradation		**19**	**1**	**20**
Canal Street		19	1	20
6: Identified for relocation		**31**	**3**	**34**
Bada Harijan Sahi		10		10
Khaja Sahi		5		5
Pichipicha Nagar		4	1	5
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi		12	2	14
Grand Total	**1**	**109**	**45**	**155**
Community (in current locations)				
1: Non Beneficiary		**36**		**36**
ASR Nagar		8		8
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar		6		6
Jalari Peta		9		9
Markundi		3		3
Pudimadaka		5		5

Problems at Current Location	Earlier yes but not now	None	Yes	Grand Total
Sevanagar		3		3
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		1		1
Vambay Colony		1		1
2: In Situ Housing		**7**	**1**	**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Laksh-minagar		5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		2	1	3
3: Relocation in process		**12**	**3**	**15**
Markundi		12	3	15
4: Relocated		**33**	**8**	**41**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Laksh-minagar		10	1	11
Paradesipallyam		9	3	12
Sevanagar		7	4	11
Vambay Colony		7		7
5: Infrastructure Upgradation		**20**		**20**
Canal Street		20		20
6: Identified for relocation		**33**	**1**	**34**
Bada Harijan Sahi		10		10
Khaja Sahi		4	1	5
Pichipicha Nagar		5		5
Ramnagar Odiya Sahi		14		14
Grand Total		**141**	**13**	**154**

Problems faced in original locations

Of those who underwent housing interventions, the problems they claimed they faced before these interventions included rent (16 of 37), housing (15 of 37), and sanitation (10 of 37). Comparing the information presented above (after intervention) with data from before the intervention, it seems that while the problems of rent may have decreased for some, many other problems of livelihood, drinking water, electricity, health, education, and transportation have emerged. Problems involving housing and sanitation are also not completely rectified in this process.

Problems faced in the original locations	None	Yes	Grand Total
Livelihoods (in previous locations)			
2: In Situ Housing	**8**		**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	3		3
3: Relocation in process	**15**		**15**
Markundi	15		15
4: Relocated	**29**	**7**	**36**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	8	3	11

Problems faced in the original locations	None	Yes	Grand Total
Paradesipallyam	9	3	12
Sevanagar	7		7
Vambay Colony	5	1	6
Grand Total	**52**	**7**	**59**
Rent (in previous locations)			
2: In Situ Housing	**6**	**2**	**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	1	2	3
3: Relocation in process	**15**		**15**
Markundi	15		15
4: Relocated	**21**	**16**	**37**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	11		11
Paradesipallyam	2	10	12
Sevanagar	7		7
Vambay Colony	1	6	7
Grand Total	**42**	**18**	**60**
Housing (in previous locations)			
2: In Situ Housing	**5**	**3**	**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar		3	3
3: Relocation in process	**15**		**15**
Markundi	15		15
4: Relocated	22	15	37
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	9	2	11
Paradesipallyam	6	6	12
Sevanagar	5	2	7
Vambay Colony	2	5	7
Grand Total	**42**	**18**	**60**
Drinking Water (in previous locations)			
2: In Situ Housing	**6**	**2**	**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	1	2	3
3: Relocation in process	**15**		**15**
Markundi	15		15
4: Relocated	**30**	**7**	**37**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	11		11
Paradesipallyam	9	3	12
Sevanagar	6	1	7

Problems faced in the original locations	None	Yes	Grand Total
Vambay Colony	4	3	7
Grand Total	**51**	**9**	**60**
Sanitation (in previous locations)			
2: In Situ Housing	**6**	**2**	**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	1	2	3
3: Relocation in process	15		15
Markundi	15		15
4: Relocated	**27**	**10**	**37**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	9	2	11
Paradesipallyam	10	2	12
Sevanagar	2	5	7
Vambay Colony	6	1	7
Grand Total	**48**	**12**	**60**
Electricity (in previous locations)			
2: In Situ Housing	**6**	**2**	**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	1	2	3
3: Relocation in process	**15**		**15**
Markundi	15		15
4: Relocated	**31**	**6**	**37**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	9	2	11
Paradesipallyam	11	1	12
Sevanagar	6	1	7
Vambay Colony	5	2	7
Grand Total	**52**	**8**	**60**
Health (in previous locations)			
2: In Situ Housing	**8**		**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	3		3
3: Relocation in process	**15**		**15**
Markundi	15		15
4: Relocated	**32**	**5**	**37**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	10	1	11
Paradesipallyam	11	1	12
Sevanagar	6	1	7
Vambay Colony	5	2	7
Grand Total	**55**	**5**	**60**

Problems faced in the original locations	None	Yes	Grand Total
Education (in previous locations)			
2: In Situ Housing	**8**		**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	3		3
3: Relocation in process	**15**		**15**
Markundi	15		15
4: Relocated	**32**	**2**	**34**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	10	1	11
Paradesipallyam	12		12
Sevanagar	4	1	5
Vambay Colony	6		6
Grand Total	**55**	**2**	**57**
Transportation (in previous locations)			
2: In Situ Housing	**8**		**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	3		3
3: Relocation in process	**15**		**15**
Markundi	15		15
4: Relocated	**35**	**2**	**37**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	10	1	11
Paradesipallyam	12		12
Sevanagar	6	1	7
Vambay Colony	7		7
Grand Total	**58**	**2**	**60**
Community living (in previous locations)			
2: In Situ Housing	**8**		**8**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	5		5
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	3		3
3: Relocation in process	**15**		**15**
Markundi	15		15
4: Relocated	**36**	**1**	**37**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	11		11
Paradesipallyam	12		12
Sevanagar	6	1	7
Vambay Colony	7		7
Grand Total	**59**	**1**	**60**

Changes in family income after relocation

Of the relocated, 16 of 31 respondents mentioned they were facing reduction in family income after relocation.

Changes in family income after housing allocations	No change	Yes - decreased	Yes - Increased	Grand Total
2: In Situ Housing	**3**			**3**
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	3			3
4: Relocated	**12**	**16**	**3**	**31**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	3	2		5
Paradesipallyam	2	7	2	11
Sevanagar	5	7		12
Vambay Colony	2		1	3
Grand Total	**15**	**16**	**3**	**34**

Changes in older family members living together before and after intervention

Of the relocated, 14 out of 33 HHs mentioned that their older family members stopped staying with them after the relocation. Many of them are staying in the older locations (ODRP rural sites, where families continue to have possession of the old sites) or households have split into multiple families due to the lack of space in one allotted house, among other reasons.

Change in older family members staying with family before and after relocation	No Change	Together after not before	Together before not after	Grand Total
2: In Situ Housing	**2**		**1**	**3**
Sonia Gandhi Nagar	2		1	3
3: Relocation in process	**3**		**2**	**5**
Markundi	3		2	5
4: Relocated	**15**	**4**	**14**	**33**
Devi Nagar / Ramayapalli / Lakshminagar	3		4	7
Paradesipallyam	4		6	10
Sevanagar	4	3	3	10
Vambay Colony	4	1	1	6
Grand Total	**20**	**4**	**17**	**41**

iihs™
INDIAN INSTITUTE FOR HUMAN SETTLEMENTS

dpu
Development Planning Unit

FLACSO
Secretaría General

CDKN
Climate & Development Knowledge Network