Mid Term Review – Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement Tsunami Recovery Program - Housing Projects - Matara District

Table of Content

Foreword

1. Acronyms

AGA	Additional Government Agent
BPI	Better Programming Initiative
C of C	Code of Conduct
CBDM	Community Based Disaster Management
CBO	Community Based Organisations
CHA	Consortium for Humanitarian Agencies
DM	Disaster Management
DMC	Disaster Management Committee
DS	Divisional Secretary
ERU	Emergency Response Unit
EWS	Early Warning System
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GA	Government Agent - District Secretary
GoSL	Government of Sri Lanka
HLG	High Level Group
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
KII	Key Informant Interview
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MC	Movement Coordination
MCF	Movement Coordination Framework
MCO	Movement Coordination Office
MoH	Ministry of Health
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSC	Most Significant Change
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NS	National Society
OD	Organisational Development
PNS	Participating National Society
PPP	Project Planning Process
PSP	Psychosocial support programme
RADA	Reconstruction and Development Agency
RAT	Recovery Assessment Team
RC	Red Cross
RC/RC	Red Cross Red Crescent
RCM	Red Cross Movement
RTE	Real Time Evaluation
SLRCS	Sri Lanka Red Cross Society
SME	Small Medium Enterprises
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats.
TAFREN	Task Force for Rebuilding the Nation (former name for RADA)
TEC	Tsunami Evaluation Coalition
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UN OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
VCA	Vulnerability Capacity Assessment

Executive Summary

Introduction

The review of selected RCM tsunami housing reconstruction projects in Matara District is part of series of Mid Term Reviews (MTR) undertaken on the initiative of the Movement Task Force Sri Lanka, and executed by the SLRCS/IFRC Technical Support Service Centre in cooperation with the TEC Construction. The overall goal is to collect real time lessons learnt from the ongoing RCM tsunami recovery housing construction program and to share these within the Movement for the benefit of ongoing and future operations.

The individual project reviews aim to give concise, practical and constructive suggestions to implementing partners on how they can improve project efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and impact. The scope of the individual project reviews considers the complex history, background and external influences upon projects but does not devote substantial space to documenting the context. For those not intimately familiar with the Sri Lanka operations, there are various reports and papers (available upon request) which document the changing context for tsunami housing reconstruction. Some of the key contextual factors and constraints considered by the review team are listed below:

1. Immediately after the tsunami the GoSL introduced a "buffer zone" of 50 to 200 meters around the coast of Sri Lanka in which reconstruction of houses would be prohibited. This resulted in the need to relocate approx. 70,000 families to land provided by the GoSL further inland. This policy was "relaxed" in early 2006 allowing some 40,000 families to reconstruct on their land inside the old but outside the new buffer zone. Whilst this pragmatic policy change was welcomed by the humanitarian community – it further compounded difficulties over beneficiary lists and undermined participatory planning.
2. The generous international humanitarian response to support post tsunami housing reconstruction, fuelled a situation of fierce competition for land and skilled contractors amongst NGOs. In the rush to reconstruct, many organisations accepted plots of land from the GoSL that were located several kilometres inland, away from the original locations of the affected communities and with difficult site conditions. The viability and acceptability of these sites to beneficiaries was not adequately investigated before commitments were entered into with the GoSL.
3. Land scarcity also contributed to GoSL pressure for smaller individual plots (6 to 10 perches - 150m2 to 250 m2) with little regard for beneficiary livelihood needs or cultural practices. Space allocated for community infrastructure and open spaces was also often not prioritised or based on adequate community consultation.
4. GoSL and public expectations about the pace of reconstruction were not well managed adding to very high pressure on donors and their implementing agencies to "fast track" reconstruction.
5. The GoSL requested donors to use ICTAD registered contractors for the construction works and adhere to a set of technical standards for construction of houses and provision of watsan facilities ensure the technical quality of the housing.
6. Coordination within the RC Movement, especially during 2005 and early 2006, was difficult and time consuming adding to delays in reconstruction progress, uncertainty and duplication of roles. The "non-core" status of reconstruction resulted in a loss of opportunities to build the capacity of the SLRCS branches, staff and volunteers for reconstruction project management.

Having noted the above, the intention of the project specific review reports is not to explain in depth what has happened in the past, but rather to look forward and suggest ways to improve project efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability. The reviews take a beneficiary

centred approach to reviewing progress and reflecting on likely longer term recovery impacts on the lives of tsunami affected people.

The "constructive criticism" approach may make some remarks in the reports seem unjustly harsh to those trying their utmost in striving for excellence in helping people struck by the tsunami to recover. The reports are not intended to be "negative", but reflect the need to focus on how the RCM can learn and improve our work for the benefit of those we seek to serve. This said, let me end this foreword with an acknowledgement that the efforts of those involved in planning and implementing the projects under review are highly appreciated both by the peers within the RC Movement and most importantly by the beneficiaries interviewed as part of the review process.

Objectives and Methodology

Between the 20th and 27th January.2007 an interdisciplinary team of six experts, five of them working with different organizations within the RCM and one external team leader, undertook to review three tsunami recovery construction projects initiated by the Belgian RC and the IFRC in Matara district. Two of the projects are contractor built relocation housing projects (ex nihilo) – and one is an owner driven housing reconstruction project (in situ).

The main objectives of the review process are to:

- provide information on the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability of the projects scrutinized
- translate this information into practical advice for other ongoing and future housing construction projects within the RCM
- make this information available through discussion and information sharing

The review is part of a series of peer reviews of housing construction projects within RCM's Sri Lanka Tsunami Recovery Program. Each review is conducted by an interdisciplinary group of RCM experts not directly involved in the implementation of the respective projects and a permanent team leader who acts as a reference point to ensure consistency in the methodology applied and serves as the keeper of the collective memory for the whole review series. The team gathered its information mainly by conducting semi structured interviews with internal and external stakeholders and project beneficiaries. The review takes a beneficiary centred approach to reviewing progress and reflecting on likely longer term recovery impacts on the lives of tsunami affected people.

The Matara Mid Term Review looked at the following three projects:

1. Belgian Red Cross Flanders / Grubebila School Land / Weligama Div. / 51 units / double story, semi detached houses including area infrastructure
2. IFRC / Kongalahena / Devinuwara Div. / 28 units / single story detached houses including area infrastructure
3. Belgian Red Cross Flanders / Owner Driven Housing Project / Weligama Div. / 80 fully damaged cases and 55 partly damaged cases / Financial and Technical support of Tsunami effected families to reconstruct their houses in situ

Findings

Overall the feedback given by the stakeholders and beneficiaries was extremely positive towards - highlighting the quality of the technical delivery of all three projects when compared to the work of other humanitarian actors in post tsunami housing reconstruction in Matara District. Appreciative statements focused around the following project qualities:

- high quality of workmanship and materials used in construction

- money well spent on sustainable site infrastructure (water, roads, electricity) and ecological (water and sanitation) aspects
- good relationship between implementing agencies, government authorities and the local SLRCS branch

In this over all positive scenario there are still some lessons learnt within the projects reviewed that are worth considering for future RCM post disaster recovery and reconstruction projects:

General Observations and Recommendations

- Whilst cooperation and coordination with the local authorities was well maintained, links with the locally elected bodies (who are in charge of the long term maintenance of the site infrastructure) also need to be nurtured to ensure the sustainability of the projects and to support local level good governance.
- Coordination and collaboration between RCM partners on district level must be on the basis of establishing mutual understanding about roles and responsibilities and, at all times, should seek to actively and systematically strengthen the local branch in its long term development and ability to work within the local communities.

Contractor Built Relocation Projects:

- Projects should not be started without a complete list of beneficiary households validated with local government authorities. Affected families need to be treated as project partners instead of helpless beneficiaries. Participation in all stages of the projects is a right and not a mercy. The RCM should establish institutionalized structures for participation and feedback at the community level.
- Relocation is a complex and very sensitive issue that needs to be tackled from the beginning through a comprehensive process of participatory planning and with a view towards supporting the longer term livelihoods development of affected families and host communities.

Owner Driven Reconstruction Projects:

- House construction in Sri Lanka as elsewhere in the developing world is frequently an incremental process. This is in contrast to donor expectations of delivering finished houses within a short time frame. While appreciating the idea of responsible support (e.g. promotion of good construction practices) and donor accountability, supporting people to reconstruct their homes and the future plans of these people should be the focus of interests.
- The successful implementation of owner driven housing projects requires relevant training and information prior to starting construction, constant household and community level technical support during the entire construction process and due consideration of the livelihoods and long term plans of the affected families.

When it comes to more specific issues the review identified “room for improvement” regarding the following issues (selected from the detailed project specific reports which follow):

- Kitchen design lacks sufficient consideration for local cooking practices.
- Space limitations in house design and plot size do not allow for the requirements of domestic income generating activities.
- Difficult topography of the GoSL allocated land results in steep unsecured slopes which pose considerable hazards and difficult hurdles for children, elderly and people with special needs.

- Some challenges in site layout planning may result in conflicts between neighbours and lack of privacy for the dwellers.
- Desire of project partners for more freedom and higher degree of self-determination in reconstruction process on own land.

In conclusion, it is acknowledged that many of the findings of the Matara review report are consistent with the first mid term review conducted in November 2006 in Kalutara District. However some interesting new aspects have been revealed relating to beneficiary and broader stakeholder participation, project design relevance and the likelihood of sustainability and recovery impact. The emergence of these additional aspects may be due to different approaches used and personalities involved in project implementation, the different composition of the review team and the perspective added by meetings with representatives of the NHDA in Matara and representatives of the Pradeshiya Saba in Kongalahena – these organisations were not interviewed in Kalutara.

1.1 A Background for the RC/RC Projects

1.1.1 Overview of the tsunami recovery programme

The tsunami of 26th of Dec. 2004 devastated over two thirds of Sri Lanka's coastline, affecting about one million people, with 35,322 registered fatalities[1] and 21,411 injured persons, furthermore displacing 516,150 people in 14 districts. Overall, 65,275 houses were fully damaged and 38,561 were considered to be partially damaged. An estimated 150 thousand livelihoods in the coastal areas were adversely affected, with 75% of the fishing fleet damaged[2] (16,919 boats). Educational facilities were extensively damaged (195 facilities damaged or destroyed, including 182 schools) and health facilities (100 affected) were also hit hard. To make things worse, approximately 60,000 wells were contaminated, and 23,449 acres of agricultural lands were affected by the disaster, in addition to extensive overall damage to infrastructure[3].

The immediate response to the disaster was unprecedented. The influx of internal and external assistance to the affected areas was massive, and (according to the GOSL) the relief operation and the immediate recovery of infrastructure were successful in adverting further loss of life and in the provision of emergency accommodation for the affected populations, with a further commissioning of 60,000 transitional shelters at a later stage. It has been reported[4] that 80% of the fishing industry was restored to pre-tsunami levels quite rapidly, and the health facilities and schools also managed to gear up within manageable timeframes.

In the first instance the GOSL assigned the coordination function of the relief operation to Task Force for Building the Nation (TAFREN), later rolled into the Reconstruction and Development Agency (RADA), while the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN OCHA) and the locally set up Consortium of Humanitarian Agencies (CHA) were at the core of the information sharing between the local and international non-government organizations (NGOs/INGOs).

1.1.2 The Red Cross / Red Crescent Movement Response

In conjunction with the Sri Lankan Red Cross society, over 70 National Societies pledged their support to the tsunami response, totalling over one billion US dollars. As an immediate response, eight Emergency Response Units (ERUs) were deployed, and thirty-two Participating National Societies (PNSs) were active in-country. Out of these, 23 PNSs have since committed to mid- and long support to the recovery programming.

The Federation Recovery Assessment Team (RAT), in its report of February, 2005, proposed the reconstruction of housing (both temporary and permanent), together with water and sanitation, and livelihoods as key components of the Recovery Strategy and Operational Framework for the RC/RC Movement in Sri Lanka. This evaluation has a specific focus on permanent housing, however taking note of the links that this component has with water and sanitation and livelihood-linked efforts.

The RC/RC Movement coordination in the tsunami response is institutionally framed through the Movement Platform, a joint body of the National Society, the IFRC and the ICRC, where strategic and policy decisions are made, serving as the voice for the RC/RC operation and providing public communication guidelines for the RC/RC in-country partners. The Movement

[1] Source: Government of Sri Lanka, December 2005
[2] Source: FAO, Ministry of Fishing and Agriculture
[3] GOSL (2005) Post Tsunami Recovery and Reconstruction. Joint report of the Government of Sri Lanka and its Development Partners, December, 2005.
[4] Telford, J. and Cosgrove, J. (2006) Joint evaluation of international response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami: Synthesis Report Tsunami Evaluation Coalition (TEC) (www.tsunamireports.org)

Task Force, involving also the partnering PNSs, in turn ensures the strategic direction and compatibility of the RC/RC operations in conjunction with the Movement, the National Society and the GOSL, maintaining an operational overview with a continuous assessment of changing humanitarian needs, and the monitoring of the response. On a more operational level, Technical Committees (with joint SLRCS/IFRC/PNS participation) bring together programme managers and technical experts from specific areas, to develop, adopt and promote coherent, relevant and appropriate approaches and solutions to address the needs of the most vulnerable.

1.1.3 Permanent Housing

To date, the RC/RC Movement has committed itself to supporting fully or partially the construction of 29,714 houses. Out of these, 5,347 houses are fully donor funded with donor managed implementation (so-called "donor-driven"), 3,297 houses are fully donor funded with owners taking the implementation lead (referred to as "owner-driven"), with a further 607 houses being funded by the RC/RC Movement but implemented by a non-Red Cross partner. A total of 6,200 are co-financed by the RC/RC Movement with the owner-driven approach (4,000 (est.) though the SLRCS/IFRC/UN-Habitat partnership and another 1,200 through PNS-led initiatives). Still another 10,778 (est.) owner-driven houses are co-funded through the IFRC/World Bank/IDA partnership, and 4,485 through the Swiss-Austrian RC and SDC initiative.

In total 9.251 houses are being fully funded and 20.4463 are being co-funded. As of 30 November 2006, RC progress reports indicate that 6,083 (21%) houses have been completed, another 9,894 (33%) are at foundation level or greater, and 13,737 (46%) are either in process or planned. Project plans indicate that the majority of the housing projects will be finalized during 2007.

In 2006, 21 PNSs, the IFRC and SLRCS are working in Sri Lanka in implementing housing construction projects. As seen from the above, the implementation strategies range from cash grants with owner-driven implementation and beneficiaries themselves reconstructing their damaged or destroyed houses, to extensive relocation projects involving the construction of several hundred new units including infrastructure development and construction of community facilities, implemented through consultants and contractors. The policy environment has seen an opening from centralized donor driven approaches towards owner driven initiatives.

Like most of the tsunami reconstruction effort, the RC/RC construction program has also suffered from considerable delays in implementation, inflated prices for material and labour in the construction market, and a lack of competent and reliable consultants and contractors in the country. Additionally, the basic assumptions that have driven the planning of the projects have changed – sometimes radically - since the start of the RC/RC operation. The identification of available land, the changes in the regulations on restriction of construction and reconstruction within the coastal belt, and the identification of beneficiaries, has put huge challenges on the implementing agencies.

The RC/RC partners are under increasing pressure from the beneficiaries, the GOSL, donors, and the media to expedite the projects and demonstrate that their usage of resources within the construction program is effective, efficient and creating adequate results for the Tsunami affected population.

1.2 Objectives of the Evaluation

1.2.1 Rationale for the evaluation process

A series of evaluations in the form of mid term reviews have been initiated by IFRC Construction Coordination, in order to provide reliable information and knowledge for all RC/RC partners,

beneficiaries and other stakeholders on the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the RC/RC construction program.

The rationale for choosing the tool of a mid term reviews is to enable the use of the results to give real time feedback and come up with suggestions for improvements (to ongoing and planned initiatives) to project managers and implementing agencies at a stage when such corrections are still meaningful and timely. The Evaluations are targeted to provide information to the various implementing parties, the beneficiaries, the PNSs, the SLRCS, the IFRC, possible other donors, the local authorities and the GOSL.

The project client is the RC/RC Movement as a whole, represented by the Task Force. The evaluation results will be reviewed by the members of the Technical Committee (TEC) Construction. Based on the recommendation of the TEC Construction, the Task Force shall approve the Evaluation Reports.

The report will be composed of two sections: in the first place there will be a joint section, covering RC/RC wide issues and common matters to all of the individual projects, and secondly, a project specific section will be produced for each single initiative. Evaluation reports will be available to all RC/RC partners. The whole report or selected parts of it can also be presented to local authorities, GOSL and all stake holders involved based on approval by Task Force.

The scope of the various evaluations that are to be completed under this initiative are selected housing construction projects in all districts by RC/RC Movement partners, involving both owner and donor driven approaches in both relocation and reconstruction projects.

1.2.2 Expected Outcomes

The main outcome targeted in the process of evaluation is to improve on the efficiency and effectiveness of the RC/RC construction projects, while making them more relevant and sustainable to the beneficiaries and other stakeholders. This is to be achieved through knowledge sharing and the enhanced coordination and cooperation between the various stakeholders within and outside the RC/RC, by involving them actively in the discussion and elaboration of conclusions and suggestions for improvements, based on the process of the Mid-Term evaluation. The involvement of beneficiaries, local authorities and other outside stakeholders is expected to contribute significantly to a better common understanding and acceptance of the projects.

Overall, the process of the evaluation is expected to:

- Contribute to the creation of a knowledge base to improve the setting up and the management of the projects, and the handling of risks associated with efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the initiatives.
- Help to ensure that best practice is disseminated in quality and accountability within the RC/RC, taking into account and assessing current needs and concerns of beneficiaries, implementing partners and other stakeholders.
- Contribute positively to the improvement of the RC/RC-wide coordination activities.

As the single tangible output, the evaluation process will produce a written report, which is expected to:

- Improve the RC/RC wide knowledge by establishing a common framework for the analysis of construction projects within the RC/RC as well as among different groups of stakeholders.
- Assist in the identification of critical attributes of assumptions on the project implementation and subsequent indicators to be monitored.

- Provide advice on best practice and in the identification of information and knowledge needs and recognizing the appropriate way of applying different information gathering techniques

1.3 Applied Methodology & Approach

1.3.1 Methodology & Approach

There has been a significant GOSL policy shift in the implementation of the tsunami reconstruction process, from a centralized focus, based on a donor driven approach, to one that gives emphasis to multiple implementation strategies, including owner driven approaches. The RC/RC Movement has adapted to this policy change, giving new emphasis to co-funding approaches that place the beneficiary initiative at the centre of the stage.

There is a focus on giving *due emphasis to the voice of the beneficiary*, in line with the concerns that the RC/RC Movement has for the welfare of the most vulnerable. The basic approach of the evaluation is qualitative, and involves extensive semi-structured interviews[5] with stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries, key staff from PNS and local authorities.

Technically the evaluation team has been based on a peer approach, where individual experts within the RC/RC Movement have contributed to the evaluation process, while the team leader has been appointed as an external party, maintaining the continuity between the various evaluations.

The evaluation has been primarily concerned with the four areas of efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability in function of the beneficiary, the technical delivery and the PNSs within the overall institutional framework. While the clear focus of the evaluation is on the effect that that impact have (had) on the beneficiaries, it is of prime interest to also reflect on: i) the technical delivery aspects (in order to improve on the delivery approach, mechanisms and content) of the projects; ii) the contribution that the various organisations and institutions involved have had on the projects; iii) and how the projects themselves have shaped the parties involved.

The matrix below sums up the overall approach:

	Beneficiary	Technical Delivery	PNSs & Institutions
Efficiency	*Have project resources been utilised to achieve the best possible performance?*		
Effectiveness	*Have the projects achieved the set objectives?*		
Relevance	*Does the project make sense in meeting the long term shelter needs of tsunami affected people, and why?*		
Sustainability	*Does the project offer the beneficiary an opportunity to reap lasting benefits?*		

1.3.2 Specific Issues

The evaluation, inter alia, addressed the following concerns in the course of the work, in terms of efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability, in conjunction with: i) beneficiaries, ii) the technical delivery of the project, iii) the internal and external institutional linkages:

[5] With mostly a pre-determined list of questions to be asked (sample list annexed to this report)

- Social impact of intervention
- Technical quality of construction
- Project management quality (time, cost, quality relation)
- Questions on “time cost” in the event of a delay of a project
- Externalities affecting the project
- Environmental Impact of the project
- Relevance and sustainability
- Impact of program on and linkage with SLRCS’ mid and long term development

A standard set of guiding questions dealing with the above listed topics including evaluation criteria was developed and used in the interviews at hand. As this present evaluation was a pilot initiative, the ToRs of the evaluation process were reviewed and updated to reflect the methodological concerns that emerged during the work.

1.3.2 Timeframe and Schedule

Starting with a pilot evaluation in October 2006, up to four projects of one district per month are planned to be reviewed until the end of June 2007, when most of the housing construction projects are expected to have been concluded. The evaluations will form a series, based on a common template that will enable a comprehensive desk review at the end.

The results and recommendations will be fed into the monthly TEC construction meetings and made available to all movement partners electronically. Should TEC find, that the value added by the reviews decreases over time, the series can be stopped at any time.

1.4 Common Findings

This section outlines the main common findings across all of the projects within the evaluation. It should be noted that these findings are comparative as well as aggregate observations. The section involves appreciative observations (positive findings common to all evaluations), neutral perceptions, and critical emerging issues (in which cross-cutting observations are set out).

1.4.1 Key findings

The three projects covered by the Matara mid term review are within the scope of the overall Tsunami Reconstruction Rrogram of RC/RC movement in Sri Lanka. Project selected are:

1. Donor driven housing project implemented by Belgium Red Cross at Gurubebila in Weligama DS Division
2. Owner built housing project implemented by Belgium Red Cross in Weligama DS Division
3. Donor driven housing project implemented by IFRC in Kongalahena in Devinuwara DS Division

The Donor driven housing project at Gurubebila is a permanent housing typology, ground floor plus one floor twin houses built by a private contractor. Where as the donor driven housing project built by IFRC in Kongalahena is a single storey detached house type built by a private contractor under the supervision of a consultant. In both donor driven projects infrastructure works as well as roads, storm water drainage, electricity and water supply are included.

The Owner Driven houses supported by Belgium Red Cross are in the following GN Divisions: Grubebila, Palenakada, Pelena South and Kapparathota South. Housing types built under this option vary from assistance given for individual families for repair work for partially damaged houses to two- storied houses built either on self-help or by contractors hired by the user families.

1.4.2 Appreciative observations, neutral perceptions, and critical emerging issues

1.4.2.1 Beneficiary participation

The families selected for the housing projects were directly affected by tsunami and it appears that most of the beneficiaries were under the low income category. Most families who have been selected for donor driven projects were living on the beach in temporary make-shift houses, with relatives or in transitional shelters. Overall, the families selected for the reviewed housing projects appeared to be happy as they were chosen (or happened by chance to be allocated) to be supported by the Red Cross. It is popularly known in the district that Red Cross houses are good in quality and that the Red Cross provides all necessary physical infrastructure facilities.

According to the information the review team gathered, in both donor driven projects the families had little opportunity to participate in the projects, mainly due to changes of the beneficiary list made by the government during the project implementation. This resulted in very limited if at all interaction with the beneficiaries during planning and construction of both donor driven projects. Prior to construction the consultant was tasked with an initial project study including environmental studies, beneficiary survey and land survey. The project team got to understand that in both cases the information gathered through this channel was not very conducive especially when it comes to beneficiaries input into planning and mapping out beneficiaries needs in housing in function of their social and economical situation.

The Owner built program includes fully as well as partially damaged reconstruction cases. Families selected for the owner driven housing project had the choice of four house types. Design are based on the minimum requirements for a house specified by the GoSL as well as donor

specifications. In addition, families in the owner built housing program had the opportunity to change arrangements in the internal living space and if they wanted to add more space into the house such as balcony, additional toilet etc. on their own expense they could do so provided they could proof that they are in possession of sufficient funds to complete the full house within the project time frame.

1.4.2.2 Livelihoods

Livelihood is the way how people are living and how they earn their living. Most affected people prior to tsunami were living on their own as communities close to the sea with the skills that they acquired through traditional practices. Individuals and families are strongly linked to the natural environment, eco-systems and local level socio-political institutions. Their built environment was not planned but it had emerged spontaneously in order to support their livelihoods. The owner driven housing project seems to have supported to improve the people's traditional livelihoods as they are building their homes on the same location on self-help basis, thereby gathering additional experience and skills.

The donor driven process has spent more resources for building a planned, built up environment. It is visually pleasant and structurally sound as the houses are planned by architects and constructed as per standard engineering code of practice and the location is out of danger if another such disaster takes place in the future. While additional infrastructure was provided taking on board GoSL regulations and environmental concerns, people's perceptions were that relocation sites tendencially offer less favourable conditions for supporting traditional livelihoods due to small plot sizes, locations far away from the sea and houses designed for mere living and not as a place to support income generation.

It was noted with great appreciation that the proposed livelihood support program in the district run by IFRC is taking all vulnerable families in the GN division as the target and not only beneficiary communities. This is a progressive attempt to integrate tsunami affected people into host communities and support new as well as traditional livelihoods arrangement.

1.4.2.3. Land and Houses

The Review team observed that every stakeholder in the tsunami housing reconstruction process in Matara district appreciates the technical quality and finish of the houses built by both, Belgium Red Cross as well as IFRC. It has become, the norm for a good house for tsunami affected to be build like a Red Cross Houses. A statement heard often during the review was, that "People want a Red Cross House". In terms of the technical delivery, the overall perception is, that money on the houses has been well spent and that the technical staff of the PNSs has been seen as dedicated and competent.

The two donor driven housing projects at Gurubebila and Kongalahena have been completed within the agreed period of less than one year. However, it took a long period of time to identify lands for the projects. The Land for the Kongalahena project is considered not optimally suitable for social housing as its terrain consists of very steep slopes. Therefore, after completion of houses, IFRC had to spend more time (nearly six months) for the constructing of proper drains and retaining walls. In addition, no space is reserved and no public building has been constructed for the common use of the Kongalahena community due to the general land scarcity. IFRC considered a common building unnecessary for a small community of 28 families. The Houses of Kongalahena have been handed over to the people on November 7, 2006.

The beneficiary families in both donor driven projects received land as well as houses for free. Layout planning of plots of an average size in 7 perch (175 Sq. Meters) per lot has been done in

order to get the maximum benefit from the land and to accommodate as many affected families within the site as possible (as requested by the GoSL). In terms of location, people have more advantages in Gurubebila land than in Kongalahena as it is located close to the town center on the main road between Colombo and Hambantota in Weligama Urban Council area. Families selected for Gurubebila say that they like that the location is close to town, schools, hospitals, and main roads and their work places. Kongalahena housing scheme is about four kilometers away from the original place of living of the families who are mostly fishermen. People in Kongalahena face some problems due to its location and the hilly terrains. People often mentioned that they have to travel in the night or early morning to their work and transport is not so convenient.

The houses – designed by local architects and constructed by local contractors with the given parameters - look visually extremely pleasant, functional and structural sound and environmentally friendly. Materials used are durable and non-toxic.

Design problems are observed in both donor driven housing projects with regard to cooking and kitchen spaces. The area for kitchen space seems to be too small for the life style of a rural fisher family in Matara area. Kitchens have been designed for the use of gas cookers with a work top, wash basin and water tap. This is based on the assumption that the usage of gas is environmentally friendlier and healthier than the use of the traditional firewood and people will change their habits once they are getting used to the new fuel. Many people affected by tsunami used to cook in a fire place placed on the floor mostly built outside the main house.

People still prefer to use firewood as energy source for cooking as it is available from bio mass around their houses and people think that fire wood is still cheaper than the LP gas. In new houses, people comment that there is no chimney built-into the kitchen space in order to use fire wood. As a result all households who are permanently living in newly allocated houses in Kongalahena have built improvised fire places outside the kitchen to cook food using fire woods. This seems to be less of an issue in the owner driven project as people are building their houses on their own land and have the opportunity to include such needs at the designing stage[6].

It is however curious that local architect consultants as well as beneficiaries obviously didn't discuss the kitchen issue during planning, while changes are immediately made by beneficiaries for cooking outside after moving into their new homes. This can be interpreted in various ways:

- Local architects do not understand local rural cooking practices.
- There was no proper mechanism of encouraging feedback by beneficiaries.
- People prefer make shift kitchens or cooking outside anyway and do not bother about the integration of fireplaces into their house.

The site layout as well as the individual house design does not reflect the live style of rural fisher folks. For poor people their house is multi functional. The house serves as their work place as well as their dwelling. Stitching nets, drying fish, etc… are works done by fisher families at home. Income generating activities like these need space, either communal or individual in order to allow for continuation of livelihoods with the support of all family members. The major constraint in this regard is the individual plot size defined by the GoSL[7].

---

[8]Comment BRC: Although beneficiaries had vast opportunities in owner driven housing projects to discuss and influence design, none of them included a firewood cooking place in their house

1.4.2.4 Organizations and institutions

The Organization of house a building process by a PNS or IFRC is a complex task in coordination with SLRCS, several organizations of the central / local government and the community. PNS/IFRC carries out construction projects according to the construction law of Sri Lanka through local consultants and contractors. The owner built housing program in addition strives for community organization and getting houses built with the involvement of the user family. Under the given constraints (see Introduction/Executive Summary), the delivery of technically sound and good quality houses to the satisfaction of user families within a limited period of time is a real challenge.

In the absence of a capable lead agency which would effectively coordinate all reconstruction activities at district level, the implementing agencies have delivered technically good quality houses plus the necessary infrastructure compared to other donor driven housing projects. This has happened due to the commitment, coordination ability and the patience of construction delegates of BRCF and IFRC. It was mentioned frequently during the interviews that both local and external staff of RC/RC is highly committed with good technical knowledge. In all projects it was noticed that there is a good understanding about the local situations among construction delegates, consultants and contractors. The BRCF construction team particularly has been able to obtain the financial and technical support from the NWSDB and AmCross to introduce drinking water supply system and a waste water treatment plant (Man-made wet land) for the community in Gurubebila. IFRC got the support of AmCross to establish the water connection from the main water supply line to the site.

It is important for the successful implementation of reconstruction projects to understand the local administration and local government systems. Tsunami reconstruction projects at district level have been implemented based on the instructions and directives given by central government agencies such as the Presidential Office in Colombo, RADA, UDA, CCD and so on. The DS carries out all functions on behalf of the central government that include the identification of land, land surveys, land release for development for donors and other partners and the beneficiary identification. Projects start with central and district level administrative support but there is a need to build good relationships with the elected bodies such as Pradesiya Sabhas and Urban Councils at local level for the sustainability of new investments made for tsunami affected. This relationship has to be built right at the inception of a project with the intention that the projects will be managed in the long run by communities and local government authorities. It was observed that local bodies are yet to be taken aboard as a primary stakeholder of the tsunami reconstruction process.

1.5 Common Conclusions & Recommendations

This section presents the general conclusions and recommendations of the mid term review on the RC/RC construction program in Matara in terms of efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, and sustainability, in function of the beneficiaries, technical delivery, and the organisational and institutional setting. The conclusions and recommendations have been grouped into single sections, divided into cross-cutting subsections to avoid extensive repetition.

1.5.1 Beneficiary selection and participation

It was found in the review, that effected families selected for RC construction program had limited opportunities to get actively involved in the construction program through out the project cycle due to the changes of beneficiary list, lack of proper methodology and institutional setup for getting people involved in construction process. The team sensed a discomfort among beneficiaries to voice their concerns at meetings or by other means. This may be due to cultural patterns of behavior as well as a general sense of fear (factually unfounded but deeply routed in subconscious) to be removed from the beneficiary list to a less favorable resettlement project or even to be left behind. Therefore; the critical question could be formulated as:

"How do we create an enabling environment for an effective dialogue with beneficiaries throughout the project cycle?"

Participation of affected families in the house construction process is fundamental whether it is relocation sites or on-site development. Community participation creates better opportunities and brings many advantages for actors involved in the process of development. Community participation is essential and relevant for human development processes. The right approach to the community participation improves the delivery efficiency and effectiveness of physical outputs and services. Houses and their supportive services could be functional for long run if user participation is recognized and institutionalized to a satisfactory level.

In order to enhance the development of an enabling environment for improving the user participation it is recommended that:

- The term 'Beneficiary' should not be used for identifying or for recognizing affected families who are eligible for development assistance. Its meaning or the connotation reduces people to recipient of funds or other benefits. RCM as a principal supporter of programs could act as a model for other humanitarian actors in changing this terminology. Instead one should try to use a suitable term that gives pride, respect and sense of ownership of the program to the affected households who would in turn be motivated to become respected partners of the RC programs. Suggestions could include: **primary stakeholder** / **key partner** / **program partner/ Client**
- The families identified for RC assistance must be known at the very beginning to the project. No capital investments should be started until eligible household lists are completed validated and a firm commitment exists from the selected families, authorities and the donor. Changes imposed by other partners like DS should not be accepted other than in exceptional situations.
- RCM should introduce and implement a methodology for community mobilization by which selected families would be involved in a step by step process to participate in the whole project cycle. One important activity of this process would be as the first step the formation of a Community Based Organization from the selected households. In all project activities this CBO would be consulted and linked to other partners. If so changes of beneficiary lists could only be done in consultation with the CBO. A mobilized

community usually has a strong ability to deal with local politics and power to influence and make changes for the betterment of the community.

- Construction projects for tsunami effected should be integrated into a comprehensive livelihoods program. The commitment of the selected households must be given voluntarily through an extensive participatory planning process which will ideally be part of a wider livelihoods program.
- Improvement of housing and basic services should be looked at as a part of the community assets building process by which people are better equipped to manage the vulnerable situations they are exposed to. Community activities like micro finance and other livelihood development activities (hygiene promotion, first aid training, disaster preparedness programs, etc.) should be introduced in an early stage of the project implementation in order to capitalize on the community development momentum during the whole project live cycle.
- Regular meetings with the community (CBO) should be held to discuss issues related to planning, progress, decision making, with a special agenda set for issues emerging from the community development process. The community needs to be informed at all times of pending issues, perhaps through a bulletin board or similar. It is recommended that separate technical meetings be held that deal with construction related issues and contractual matters only. Clear timelines and objectives should be indicated to the CBO and selected beneficiary families.
- Create proper feedback mechanisms (e.g. feedback boxes[8]) that allow people to reach directly to the relevant authority or the person to get the work done or informed quickly. Additionally, it is proposed to pay more attention to introduce information and communication mechanism in order to improve the quality of the day to day operations.

1.5.2 Cross-Cutting Issues in Technical Delivery

The review concluded that there is a clear need for improved incorporation of lifestyles, livelihoods and daily needs of the beneficiaries into the house designs, in order to achieve sustainable and relevant living environments. The key issue could be formulated as:

"Beneficiaries want homes and not simply shelter – how do we ensure that this happens?

While the technical quality of the construction has been perceived to be good by all parties, other aspects have left open issues to be discussed. To improve on the planning, design and implementation of housing programs it is recommended that:

- The decision to proceed with a construction project should be taken on the basis of a feasibility study focusing on the given local situation of the affected families and the qualities of the proposed land for development. This study should broadly look into the following aspects of the project in timely manner:
    - Location and its advantages for selected households to continue and their livelihoods
    - Suitability of land for residential use in terms of terrain, soil condition, ecology and infrastructure difficulties
    - Both technical and resource bases for implementation (financial and human resources)
    - Preliminary commitments from key stakeholders – community, government at DS office level and local government elected body
    - Cost effectiveness of possible options
- The feasibility study should be followed by a comprehensive project development including:

[8] BRC has already started a similar arrangement at DC office in Weligama to get households requests for installment payment in the owner driven program.

- Profiles of selected households (Beneficiary or Key partner survey)
- Formation of community based structures in order to enable households in a structured way to join the project development cycle on an institutional basis
- Participatory methodology (e.g. PRA or VCA) to get community views and ideas for incorporation into planning and design briefs
- Preparation of design brief for architect consultants that includes:
    - Site layout and
    - House plans

    The standards used for these plans should be reviewed in light of the local context, best worldwide practice and in function of the production system adopted.

Both, site layout and house plans, should be prepared in consultation with key program partners who would be basically officers in charge of the project at DS office, local government body (MC, UC, PS), selected community and Central government agencies including District Secretary, UDA, CCD, NHDA, RADA and so on.

- Outcome of the participatory design process should be the decisions taken by key partners on key aspects of housing projects. Some concerns of people who have already occupied houses built with RCM assistance are: plot size, privacy, legal title of land, demarcation of plot boundaries, safety aspects, operation and maintenance of water supply and sanitation infrastructure, proper space arrangements for living and cooking, sufficient space and structure (chimney) for kitchen, quality of materials, methods of production (owner built or donor driven), affordability, livelihoods and lifestyle with special cultural concerns.
- Regular feedback sessions with key partners should be held during the implementation especially to share views and take suitable actions early with regard to the following issues as indicated by families who already moved in RC houses: plot size, safety, networks (drainage channels, sewer systems and water supply), quality of materials, operational procedures.
- Infrastructure works should generally be seen as a separate task that are best tackled in relocation as well as reconstruction projects in a consultant contractor driven way. The construction/reconstruction of the individual houses is best handled by the individual families with an adequate level of financial, technical and organizational support extended by donors and local government authorities. The review team acknowledges that in specific situations, in which families or individuals are not in a position to deal with their need for housing, donor driven social housing projects are a viable solution. Whether the Red Cross in general is well positioned and equipped to undertake the implementation of such projects or should rather leave this to other organizations is a separate question exceeding the scope of this review.
- The plot allocation plan (blocking out plan) should follow the basic principles of site planning to select suitable lands for residential purpose and leave alone lands with steep slopes, water logged, flood prone, mud slide prone and ecologically sensitive areas.
- Local Government bodies (MC, UC and PS) have the authority for granting approval for physical development plans within their respective areas. Most house constructions for tsunami affected have been initiated by the central government bodies without planning approval from the local authorities prior to the implementation. Therefore, the local government bodies should be given the opportunity to participate in housing development process according to the law and take the responsibility of human settlement management right from the beginning of the projects.
- The relevant authorities should be kept aboard as key stakeholders in all of the stages, making sure that they endorse each step, and that arbitrary and ad hoc decision-making

does not undermine the process. This could be achieved through a relevant MOU that outlines the premises and uses the feasibility study as the main document of reference.
- The project should help to make sure that formal titles of ownership and possession are in place before the formal exit of the donor. Therefore it would be appropriate to make arrangements with the DS office to provide land and house entitlement certificates for all selected families in new relocation projects before the actual house construction begins.

1.5.3 Common Issues for RC/RC and stakeholder organizations and institutions

In the review it was observed that often people felt that they participated in a process which prioritized agency requirements over beneficiary needs. In this regard:

How do we ensure that accountability to beneficiaries is the highest priority? And, as the RC/RC movement, how do we ensure that our humanitarian values are better reflected in program delivery?

- Obviously, a project is managed by the implementing agency, who must take great care to actively involve beneficiaries at all stages of the project cycle and to place them and their needs at the centre of the project. ***The idea that projects should as much as possible be run BY the beneficiaries FOR the beneficiaries should be core to RCM thinking.***
- Implementing agencies need to educate their donors, especially on the question –"Why does it take time?" - To ensure an adequate resource base and take the time pressure from secondary stake holders.
- In order to ensure that relevant strategies are utilized, it is strongly recommend that the RCMcreate a strategic toolbox for future operations, which can be used on site to analyze and make educated decisions when choosing the best mode of implementation - whether owner or donor driven, whether reconstruction or relocation, etc. It should be noted that some of these issues are driven by operational constraints, but others are based on choice. Combining best choice with available options results potentially in best practice.
- Implementing agencies must ensure that newly recruited staff to the organization is fully aware of the RC Fundamental Principles and Humanitarian Values and that these principles and values are intrinsically woven into all projects. Time must be made at the beginning of projects for proper inductions for all staff at all levels.

Overall, the role of the public administration is central to the success of large recovery programs. In the case of the GOSL, significant weaknesses can be observed in terms of the management of the process and the handling of the complex and daunting tasks of the tsunami recovery. It is argued in this context that good relations with the relevant authorities are a key enabler of successful projects. In this context:

How do we better and more proactively deal with GoSL issues (volatile beneficiary lists and land situation)?

- IFRC should take a strong lead in working with GoSL from the very beginning (post disaster) and take the position that no houses will be built until beneficiary lists are confirmed. PNS should support the RCM position in this respect by giving the same message to local authorities. RCM needs to use its collective strength in advocacy.
- One of the key issues is integrated planning. The key stakeholders should be well aware of the overall timeframes, subscribe to them through integrating them into their own activity planning.

- If working with government bodies such as water or electricity board to supply services to project sites, implementing agencies must involve them in the initial planning phase of the projects. Government institutions tend to be overburdened by requests from many agencies in post disaster situations. Therefore their full endorsement to agreements needs to be ensured through constant involvement and communication rather than arbitrary imposed timeframes.
- A real time evaluation system should be installed on institutional level either within RCM or (preferably) among the whole donor community which provides a kind of appeal system for disaster effected populations to create a rights based approach on client grievances in contrast to the current situation that creates dependent beneficiaries who are at the mercy of donors to consider their needs and intentions for their future prospering.

There is a general statement from beneficiaries and local government in the district that says: "People want a Red Cross House!"

How do we take this positive attitude to use it for the benefit of the RC/RC Movement in general - and more specifically for the development of the SLRCS branches?

- The key to a successful partnership between local RC branch and external RC donor coming to the scene is an initial clear definition of roles and responsibilities. A common understanding needs to be established from the early stages of an operation, how host and guest will link into each others' activities and how they can best achieve the desired result in function of the resources available. Overall the review notes the excellent opportunity to strengthen the branches through projects in multiple ways and on many levels.
- PNSs should meet regularly with the host branch to update them on progress and jointly plan support needed. In some cases PNSs have assumed arbitrary timeframes that do not allow sufficient time for effective participation of the branch. As reconstruction is not emergency work, adequate planning and timelines should be possible. Overall it is recommended that integrated joint planning is done from day one.
- RCM represented by SLRCS should form forums on divisional level to capitalize on the current momentum of positive echo on RCM support in the country which will make sure that local authorities are well integrated and aware of the maintenance requirements for the resettlement communities. In addition it would be an opportunity to establish a permanent partnership between SLRCS and local gov. authorities to tackle the core program issues of SLRCS like DM, Health and Care, Blood Donation and HIVS awareness to only name a few.
- SLRCS branches should put a special focus on training their staff and volunteers in community mobilization as this is not only key to support a long-term, positive and sustainable development for (re)construction projects but also to develop all other SLRCS core program areas on the long run.

In order to ensure *accountability throughout the RC / RC Movement*, it is furthermore recommended that:

- Reconstruction programs need to be seen as integrative part of the entire process of relief. IFRC and PNSs were involved in the emergency aid and the reconstruction but did not engage in transitional shelter. The constant involvement with communities from the time a disaster strikes onwards provides a solid basis for the subsequent implementation of complex program activities like relocation or reconstruction.
- In planning, attention needs to be paid to applying the lessons learnt (appropriateness of design, links to community development, livelihoods, well-being/ quality of life) into the development of proper indicators for applying the same in future operations.

- With regards to participatory implementation, care must be given to educate delegates, staff, contractors and other parties in methods and approaches. Indicators must be developed and utilized, and oversight and governance issues must be addressed, with clear roles and responsibilities throughout.
- In participatory monitoring and evaluation, the beneficiary roles and positions must be explicitly defined. Accountability checklists should be used throughout, and external accountability audits are to be put in place.
- Finally, in public information sharing (transparency), regular information sharing meetings and updates have to take place supported by simple tools like notice boards and suggestion boxes.

1.6 List of Annexure

- Annex 1 List of Stakeholders met
- Annex 2.1 Interview questionnaire beneficiaries
- Annex 2.2 Interview questionnaire stakeholders
- Annex 3 ToR
- Annex 4 Contact List

Part 2 Project Specific Sections – BRCF Relocation

2.1 Gurubebila School Land

Project Name	Grubebila School Land / Matara / BRC 004
Location	Grubebila / Weligama
Final Duration	13 Months
Commencement date	12.01.2006
Final Budget	Total budget 101 Mio SLR Av. cost/house incl. watsan and infrastructure SLR 1.98 Mio SLR
Managing partner	BRC Flanders
Implementation type	Client – Consultant - Contractor model
Main objective	Provide permanent housing for beneficiaries
Key activities	Construction of 25 twin double story houses plus one single double story house including area infrastructure

2.1.1 Project Background

The project realized by the Belgium Red Cross Flanders is based on a donor-driven relocation programme providing new houses for the owners of houses that were situated within the 100 m buffer zone (first buffer zone). The project is located on the Gurubabila School Land - 1,4 ha (14164 m²) - in Welligama division. The original project proposal from BRC planned to build 54 double storey single-family houses. Due to the governments decision to build a community centre on the Gurubebila School Land only 51 double storey houses were build, including 25 twin houses and one single house. The plot area amounts to 150 m² while the floor area of a single house comes to 650 ft² or 62 m². The construction of the community centre is funded and managed by Save the Children and UNICEF.

When the BRC team arrived in Welligama, Matara in june 2005, they received the list of land plots chosen by the local authorities. They visited the different sites and chose Gurubabila School Land, mainly for the excellent location. In August 2005 the contract with the consultant (a Sri Lankan architect from Colombo chosen from the list set up by the RCM Technical Committee) was signed. In October 2005 BRC did apply for a building licence. The design of the project was done by the consultant and was improved and adapted in consultation with the BRC team leader.

The project started in January 2006 and should have been finished in December 2006. Due to court issues, regarding the ownership of the land, the construction has been delayed by 1.5 month (3 weeks court case, 3 week to reorganisation and restart the construction). At the time of the assessment all houses were almost finished and only some minor mistakes and clean up had to be done. The hand over of the houses is planed for the 7th of February. This means that, considering the court delay, the construction project will be finished on time.

Before the construction project started 71 temporary shelters and a school were located on the site. The lower part of the site was marsh land and had to be filled up and compacted to provide a stable underground for the constructions. Since the prices of material and labour had risen due to the needs for reconstruction after the tsunami the project leader chose to divide the project in 2

parts, the external work and the houses, and to address small contractors. All contractors chose to take both parts of the project.

In April 2006 the 100 m buffer zone was decreased to 35 m. Consequently some of the beneficiaries figuring on the beneficiary list were able to repair or rebuild their old house and didn't need to be relocated anymore. At that time the beneficiaries could choose between reconstruction and relocation. Facing a difficult choice a lot of beneficiaries changed their mind a couple of times. Moreover a couple of beneficiaries were replaced to relocation sites lacking beneficiaries. The final beneficiary list was known the 12th of November. Nearly 50% of the beneficiaries figuring on the first list were replaced.

The total cost per house including the cost for infrastructure and wetland (excluding water tank and pump) is 1.490.000 Rs with unit cost per house 1.175.000 Rs.

2.1.2 Project Findings

2.1.2.1 Findings: Beneficiary issues

Appreciative Remarks:	***Suggestions and Concerns:***
Participation[9]	
• Since most of the beneficiaries figuring on the first list were living in transitional shelter on the project site, they were highly involved in the development of the project. • The project and the design of the houses have been discussed on a regular time-base with the initial beneficiaries. These meetings were held on the construction site • Beneficiaries participated to the clean up of the field (started in November 2005). • The design of the houses has been adapted according to the needs of the beneficiaries; a bench has been added in the entrance porch and a work tab was integrated at the back of the house allowing beneficiaries to cook outside. • Some of the beneficiaries said that	• Most of the current beneficiaries could not give inputs into planning as a result of the changing of the beneficiary list. Some were only nominated by the DS 2 months before handover. • Other beneficiaries were told how the house would be but they did never see any plan; they were able to see the house during the construction period. • Some of the beneficiaries said that they would have preferred to build their own house so that they could choose the plan and use his knowledge and skills to construct it. • The beneficiaries had to give 3 choices regarding the place where they wanted to live and they chose Gurubabila. • There was no participation of the final beneficiaries regarding the design of the lay out and the common outdoor spaces.

[9] BRC Constr. Delegate: The design was discussed with the initially nominated beneficiaries in a very early stage. BRC made a few changes. Things like chimneys were never asked for, People understood the use of and endorsed the kitchen worktop outside. They also asked to separate the toilet from the shower. All these changes were incorporated in the design. Later the beneficiary list changed and when the final beneficiaries were known it was too late for any further changes. The group interviewed was never asked for their opinion cause BRC only knew them in November - "2" months before hand over!

they are very happy about the donor driven approach because they are not able to manage the construction of their own house and at least they are sure to have a house that is finished.	
Livelihoods	
• The government initially wanted to relocate 100 families on the Gurubabila School Land; this would have led to the construction of apartment buildings which would not have been appropriate to the way of living of a local fisherman community. • The project managers decided to build 51 double storey houses among which 25 twin houses so that enough land would remain to offer the opportunity to extend the houses for e.g. the creation of small shops or working places.	• For some of the fishermen the relocation will result in a loss of income because they have to find a place where they can leave their motors, repair their nets, etc. • The fishermen would have preferred to stay on the beach but Gurubabila was the best choice they could get, as it is the nearest to the sea and to the city.
• Best site they could find: near the Galle road, near the centre of the city, near the sea and near to schools.	• Some of the beneficiaries need a place to work to provide for their livelihood; it is not possible to have all the livelihood activities in the house (e.g. polishing, fish drying, etc.)
Remarks	
• Due to the shortage of beneficiaries some people were removed from the Grubabila beneficiary list and relocated in the Turkish village resulting in a changing of the beneficiary list, some of the beneficiaries refused the Turkish village as too far and overpopulated.	• The attitude and appreciation of the beneficiaries towards the donor and the owner driven approach depends on the level of education, skills and affectedness from Tsunami as well as different priorities, mental status and life patterns of the beneficiaries.

2.1.2.2 Findings: Technical delivery

Appreciative Remarks:	***Suggestions and Concerns:***
Project Management	
• There was a good and extensive cooperation between the project managers and the consultant and contractor.	• An unusually high level of supervision and thrusting from the side of the client representative was imperative to get the job done in time and at a good level of quality.
The site & environment	
• WATSAN was done in cooperation with the American RC providing	• Roads should be made of concrete, especially on the steepest slope.

drainage, a wetland, water supply, a water pump house whit external buffer tank and a water tank, septic tanks, grease traps, etc.	
• A lot of retaining walls are necessary due to the topography of the land and have been provided.	• On one side of the land an additional retaining wall is needed because the site is lower than the adjacent land and the people are afraid of erosion. • Balustrades are going to be added on the retaining walls creating a big difference in height.
• Beneficiaries are satisfied by the facilities that have been provided for them.	• There are no gutters.
The houses	
• The consultant and team leaders have chosen to add a "vide" in the living area to improve the cross ventilation and keep down the price.	• Some beneficiaries commented critically on the waste of space for the vide.
• After the "model house" was finished some changes were made resulting from the feedback of the consultant and the project leader to improve the wellness of the beneficiaries (door, electricity points, etc.)	• The "model house" should have been used to be discussed with the community or what was known at that time of the community
• The houses are of good quality, one of the reasons being that the contractor insisted on delivering a good quality of construction and finishing.	• Outside doors in plywood is inappropriate

2.1.2.2 Findings: Design issues

Appreciative Remarks:	***Suggestions and Concerns:***
• The twin house typology was chosen to enlarge the amount of houses on the site while maximizing open outdoor spaces for the individual families. • The site planning allows for some space to enlarge the house, add a work space or an external kitchen, etc. • The project is perceived as a nice	• The beneficiaries are afraid of privacy problems related to the twin house typology[10] and would have preferred separated houses; more space to expend and more space around. • Beneficiaries are afraid that there might be fights if the plot boundaries are not clearly marked before handover[11]. • Some beneficiaries would have preferred a smaller house but a single house;

[10] Comment BRC Constr. Delegate: In the process of allocation of the houses people could choose their neighbor. Most of the people are living next to their family, father, mother, sister, brother.

[11] Comment BRC Constr. Delegate: This is the responsibility of the DS - he's informed. A surveyor has to come to the site to demarcate the plots, he's informed too.

and pleasant site to live. • A work table was integrated at the back of the house to give the opportunity to work and cook outside	• The kitchen is to small even for the storage of the kitchen accessories; some of the beneficiaries are planning to build an outside kitchen with the material of their temporary shelter. • The concept of vide is not understood by many beneficiaries, they plan to close it and enlarge the room. • For most of the beneficiaries 2 storey are ok; only a few would have preferred a single storey house • The size of the rooms is conceived as to small according to different interviewees, which is due to the fact, that the design of the building provides an easy opportunity us open space on the upper floor as an additional room by enclosing it. • There is no chimney

2.1.2.3 Organisational & Institutional Issues

Appreciative Remarks:	***Suggestions and Concerns:***
Beneficiary relations	
• The BRC organised community meetings to inform the beneficiaries; • Feed back was given by the first beneficiaries resulting in minor changes of the design.	• due to the change of beneficiaries it was impossible to involve all final beneficiaries in the project
Government Stakeholders	
• There was a good cooperation between the DS and the project manager. • The DS was consulted during the design of the plan and approved it.	• It was not possible to establish cooperation with NHDA or Urban Council although this could have been useful because of their knowledge of local skills, construction methods and habits.
• The project was examined and approved by RADA	• Water board and Electricity Board works were slow and very low quality ???. Agreements were not kept and there was a permanent need of closest supervision to ensure proper installations of appliances.
RC/RC issues	
• Good cooperation between BRC and AmCross. The same contractor was used by both.	• Local SLRCS branch capacity building was not considered as integral part of the construction project implementation process in the project.[12]

[12] WIM: Next to the AmCross involvement in the WatSan activities which will run for 3 years with extensive branch involvement, BRC-F will fund an integrated Livelihoods program, implemented by IFRC

• Good cooperation between the consultant and the team leaders; • The rep. of consultant didn't do the job where he was hired for Project leader had to take over his job to be able to propose a qualitative project • The design was made by the Sri Lankan consultant and adapted to the current design in cooperation with the BRC. • Good cooperation between the contractor and the team leaders; meetings were held on regular time base and everyday guiding and supervision of the construction work. • To show the contractors how the construction had to be finished a "model house" was finished in August 2006	• Bad cooperation and communication water and electricity board. The work had to be done 2 or 3 times because of inefficient and bad work of the companies. • Delay in the delivering of materials and poor quality of materials (not dried concrete blocks) have delayed the work • Workshops had to be organized to explain to the workers (mainly "Tsunami masons" with low skills) how they have to do the work.

2.1.3 Specific Conclusions & Recommendations

2.1.3.1 Efficiency
Have project resources been utilised to achieve the best possible performance[13]?
• The opinions voiced by different stake holders involved were split and didn't form a coherent picture. Although average cost does not exceed the average of RCM average house cost the project leader thinks the total cost is still too high due to the rise of price for labour and materials***. ???*** • Some people think that an owner driven, more decentralised approach to construction would have been more efficient. At the same time here are parties saying that the project delivered good value for money in a timely fashion. • Thanks to an extended cooperation and communication between the team leader and the contractor the job was done in time and at a good level of quality.
To improve the efficiency of resource utilisation it is recommended that:
• To work with small and local contractors. However one needs to be aware of the trade of between cutting cost and increasing flexibility in implementation compared to

and covering both the new inhabitants and the host community. The project aims at direct livelihoods, support, and building of community cohesion and development of community infrastructure. This project will be fully integrated in the SLRCS branch activities. BRCF is also supporting the branch in OD (volunteer recruitment & retention) and First Aid. These projects will also specially focus on the Relocation Communities. The branch was only not directly involved in the physical construction activities, which was completely in line with national agreements on Core and Non-Core programming between PNS and SLRCS.

[13] In examining the efficiency of the project, the review team tried to establish whether or not project resources had been utilised to achieve the best possible performance. They also examined working relationships and the efficiency of decision making.

cooperation with one big contractor while taking higher risk of stranded cost due to non performance of the contractor and contractors disappearing before expiration of defects liability period.

2.1.3.2 Effectiveness

Did the project achieve its objectives[14]?

- The main objective – the construction of 51 houses for the relocation of tsunami affected families – was achieved successfully.
- The quality of the infrastructure and the WATSAN facilities enhance the effectiveness of the whole project in an excellent way, however more attention should be paid on street lights and the covering of the internal roads[15].
- A community centre was built on the site by UNICEF and Save the Children, unfortunately, the integration of the community centre in the design of the project is small.
- Taking into account the unforeseen delay due to court issues the houses and infrastructure were finished in the planned time span delivering a high quality of construction.

To enhance the ability of the project to achieve better its objectives, it is recommended that:

- A good communication and cooperation is achieved between the different parties working on the project site and integrating the different levels as a unity in the project.
- An efficient cooperation with the local authorities responsible for infrastructure and street light is settled up.

2.1.3.3 Relevance

Does the project make sense in the context of meeting the long term shelter needs of tsunami affected people, and why?

- The project is considered to be very relevant. The project resulted in an extremely congenial environment in which the long term needs of the beneficiaries can be supported.
- Although the design of the construction does not meet all the needs of the users/beneficiaries regarding lifestyle and livelihood.

In order to enhance the relevance of the project, it is recommended that:

- A finalised beneficiary list should be available and laid down on contract before the design of the project starts.
- All livelihood and community issues should be integrated into the project from the early beginning.
- The project start-up should be conditional to handing over land titles to beneficiaries at the start of the project, to retain beneficiaries and eliminate disruptive changes.
- The beneficiaries are involved in the design programme and are enabled to make

[14] In examining the effectiveness of the project, the review team tried to establish whether or not the project had achieved its specific objectives, which can be looked at on a number of different levels. Firstly, the number of houses intended to be built; secondly, infrastructure for the site (piped water, internal roads, electricity, sewage and sanitation); thirdly, community infrastructure (playground, community centre) and finally, community mobilisation/social organisation.

[15] Comment BRC Constr. Delegate: RDA has accepted to finish the road with tar. The street lights are a problem cause nobody is willing to pay for them. The government does not pay for streetlights in internal roads. In this case the beneficiaries have to pay for it and they are not willing to do so.

adaptations that will suit their life-style and livelihood in a better way.
- As a consequence of previous points the involvement of the beneficiaries will lead to an effective response to their needs and the needs of the community.

2.1.3.4 Sustainability

Does the project offer an opportunity to reap lasting benefits from the projects[16]?

- The site is located near the city, the school and the sea. Consequently the beneficiaries will be able to sustain there livelihood and there houses easily.
- The local authorities and the SLRC should be involved into the project from the early beginning to ease the follow up once BRC and AmCross have left.
- For most of the people the effects of relocation on livelihood are neutral. Although for some fishermen the relocation will result in a decrease in income due to the distance and problem of storage for nets and boat motors.
- The WATSAN system (wetland) is quite complicate. It is important to train the users to maintain it.
- The people of the neighbouring land use the drains designed for the collections of rainwater to dump their waste water (grey and black water) in it. Consequently a more intense maintenance will be required and the proper working of the draining system and wetland can be damaged [17].

For the project to enable lasting benefits from opportunities it is recommended that:

- Community based workshops are organized in which the beneficiaries are trained and mobilized to maintain the site, the infrastructure, the wetland and their house. The AmCross is staying for 3 more years to train and instruct the community to maintain the WATSAN infrastructure, wetland, etc
- The construction of small working spaces would be an opportunity to enable some people to sustain their livelihood.

- The local authorities responsible for the solid waste collection integrate Grubabila School Land in their collecting programme.
- Community based meetings should be organized to inform the neighbouring communities and eventually integrate them in a sustainable way in the development of WATSAN programmes.

Ecologic matters

- The wetland provides a good way to clean the gray water and the overflowing black water of the lower houses. As such it sustains the ecology of the site and environment.
- A security system has been designed for the houses situated in the lower part of the site regarding the evacuation of the grey water to avoid contamination of the ground water when the ground water level is high.
- As many trees as possible were kept, 10 trees will be added.

[16] Sustainability: project offers opportunities to cope with and recover from stresses and shocks due to disaster and maintains or enhances people's capabilities and assets while not putting their future generations (children, spouse and neighbours) into trouble / vulnerable positions.

[17] Comment BRC Constr. Delegate: These pipes are illegal and need to be removed.

Part 3 Project Specific Sections – IFRC Relocation

3.1 Project Section

Project Name	Kongalahena / Matara / IFRC 005/02
Location	Talalla / Devinuwara
Final Duration	12 months
Commencement date	19.12.2005
Final Budget	Total budget 48.2 Mio SLR Av. cost/house incl. watsan and infrastructure SLR 1.7 Mio SLR
Managing partner	IFRC
Implementation type	Client – Consultant - Contractor model
Main objective	Provide permanent housing for beneficiaries
Key activities	Construction of 28 houses including area infrastructure

3.1.1 Project Background

The original project proposal planned to build 36 houses in Kongalahena Matara district. After the lifting of the buffer zone and in consideration of the difficult, steep topography of the land the number was reduced in consensus with UDA and the DS Devinuvara to 28 houses in Nov. 2005. Kongalahena is situated around 500 m from the main road between Matara and Hambantota and approximately 4 km from the sea. At the time of the review, 28 houses had been handed over on 7th of November 2006. Most of the relocated families were previously living with relatives or in the remainders of their prior to Tsunami houses within the buffer zone (now 35 – 60 m) in the area of Dondra.

The project approach was to design and construct the permanent houses through a conventional consultant - contractor approach. The services of a consultant have been retained through competitive bidding. The Consultant has designed the house and the area works. Subsequently a contractor has been selected to execute construction of the buildings through a competitive bidding exercise. The overall project management has been done by the IFRC, through their dedicated construction management staff. The project has followed closely the RC/RC Movement approach set for delivering relocation houses to beneficiaries.

The original timeframe for construction was six months, which has been delayed by one month, but the pace of construction has been acceptable, with construction of the houses finishing mid June 2006. However the finishing of the works has been delayed due to the fact that the internal decision making process within IFRC regarding the matter of constructing the necessary retaining structures to prevent the steep slope from eroding was not finished timely. This of course was caused by significant budget crises within IFRC and the high amount - 9.2 Mio SLR or 25 % of the total project budget – which had to be spent for this part of the project. External works subsequently finished End of October 2006. Handover was delayed for more than another month due to failure of local authorities to establish proper road access (finally achieved through the help of another NGO) to the site and water and electricity supply (funded and supported by AmCross).

The actual unit cost of the finished 28 houses was 1.7 Mio SLR including infrastructure and retaining walls. This unfavourable high cost and the ecological loss of 2.5 acres of virgin

rainforest in combination with the difficult topography of the land leads to the conclusion (reinforced by statements of government officials) that the land provided by the GoSL is unfavourable for social housing.

The project also includes a livelihoods aspect, which will be carried out by IFRC livelihoods team on basis of a VCA exercise with the whole GN of Kongalahena (host community plus relocation community). SLRCS will participate in these activities with a special focus on capacity building in the field of community mobilization. IFRC hired a project officer to work specifically on beneficiary issues in late 2006.

3.1.2 Project Findings

3.1.2.1 Findings: Beneficiary issues

Appreciative Remarks:	***Suggestions and Concerns:***
Participation	
• IFRC was securing a final beneficiary list in December 2005 after a major change due to the lifting of the buffer zone which was later verified and staid almost unchanged (4 families exchanged only).	• There was no interaction with the beneficiaries what so ever during planning or construction. • Beneficiaries did not have a chance to voice any concerns or suggestion regarding the project prior to handover[18].
Livelihoods	
• The impact of the housing development on livelihoods seems to be neutral. The site was not considered to be too far away from income earning places, or schools, and transport was considered to be affordable.	• The small plot size does not enable livelihoods that require storage, working shelter, or cultivation in small scale on site. • The site is about 4 km away from the main fishing area at the coast. Public transport is needed (which is only available from the main road about 500 m from the settlement) to reach work as well as school[19]. Hence road quality and maintenance as well as street lights and affordable regular public transport are imperative.
• The chairman of the Pradesia Saba clearly accepts responsibility for solid waste management and stated his willingness to tackle the issue.	• The small plot size in combination with the topography of the resettlement site doesn't permit the usual garbage pits where people in rural areas usually bury and burn their solid waste.
• Pradesia Saba further considers applying for street lightning for the	• Still the question of funding is open for both issues and especially the steepest

[18] Although the designs were displayed at the DS Office, beneficiaries were either not aware of this or/and didn't feel in a position to comment on the designs

[19] The price for school transport varies from Rs 700 to Rs 1100 per child per month

access road with CEB and is aware of its responsibilities regarding road maintenance.	part of the access road will be washed away by the next heavy rain.
• Considerable effort has been made by the consultant and the contractor to provide proper access to the individual houses.	• Beneficiaries as well as Pradesia Saba are highly concerned and are pushing for concreting of the steepest part of the road. • There is a high risk especially for elderly, kids and during night time for all people travelling on this road. • People are also afraid of kids falling from the road side, which is not secured by fences or handrails into the yards of neighbouring houses several meters deeper.
• Clear signs that beneficiaries are getting their lives together and assets are being re-acquired including TV sets in many houses have been observed. • The community mostly indicated that they could afford to live in and maintain the houses. People did not indicate that they had plans to move on.	• House are still very bare and basic furniture is lacking in many cases. • Some 7 houses were reported by the interviewees to be uninhabited so far and couple of others have been passed on by the original beneficiaries to relatives.

3.1.2.2 Findings: Technical delivery

Appreciative Remarks:	***Suggestions and Concerns:***
Project Management	
• The management of the contract, design, site works and the work of the contractor has over all been successful and of good professional standard, and the contactor performed technically well[20].	• The works were somewhat late, and forced changes in the scope of the works added to the overall delay in delivery. • IFRC internal funding issues considerably delayed the handover of the houses.
• Resources were sufficient and although somewhat delayed available and houses were perceived to be good value for money[21].	• Some additional inputs into safety, fencing and accessibility of the main internal road are urgently needed and would add great value with minor cost.
The site & environment	
• The Land provided by the GoSL is beautifully located between virgin rain forests and paddy fields and in	• 2.5 Acres of virgin rainforest have been destroyed • Bad ecological impact in terms of loss of

[20] IFRC hired a construction project officer to work with the contractor and consultant, and it was felt that this arrangement ensured a good working relationship with the contractor and also minimised delays in decision making and approvals.

[21] In comparison to the other donor-driven projects reviewed, the unit cost was high, with the range between projects being Rs 1,250,000 to Rs 1,360,000 and this project on about Rs 1,720,000.

close proximity to the main road linking Matara and Hambantota.	living space for species and erosion.
• Layout planning was challenging considering the difficult terrain and limited land.	• Plot size is perceived to be very small (around 8 perches). • This is partly due to the steepness of the terrain leading to a scenario of houses being more or less enclosed by retaining walls and steep slopes. • The main internal road is to steep. The team was under the impression that the slope exceeds the legal max. for slopes in public roads (at least in Europe). • It proofed to be very difficult to draw a cost efficient site layout plan accommodating a high number of small units on a plot that is more suitable for a villa with a huge garden than a social housing scheme for fisherman • The orientation and placing of the individual houses on the plots did not take privacy issues into consideration as in many cases verandas of one house are facing the toilet entrance of the other[22]. • No effective consideration has been given for inclusion of people with reduced movement abilities[23].
• Were possible trees have been kept	• Some of the trees that were kept are having destructive impact on the roofing because of falling down of fruits and roots reaching under foundations.
• Erection of retaining walls and basic planting of turf to control erosion and dust have been taken into account, and storm water drainage has been provided.	• The storm water drainage is reported to be insufficient and in many places water drains from higher plots into lower plots. • Erosion and flooding of certain areas in and outside lower situated houses during peek rainy season is predictable.
• The houses have been placed on site taking the topography well into account and using it to develop an interesting area design.	• Residents felt that houses were not safe for small children mostly due to possibility of dangerous falls near some houses. • A comparatively small investment into handrails, balustrades and additional staircases along the steepest part of the

[5] This is not only embarrassing in the context of Sri Lankan culture but also in conflict with traditional construction philosophy of Vastu (Sri Lankan variaty of Feng Shui).
[6] This is becoming a concern as the population is aging. Access to houses along the main internal road is difficult (steepness of slope clearly exceeds international standard limits) and would require additional external stairs along the road.

	main internal road could make a big difference for the overall situation and perception of Kongalahena.
The houses	
• The beneficiaries greatly appreciate the technical quality of the construction, with good materials and workmanship[24]. • A unique design for all houses is appreciated by the beneficiaries, since their can be no jealousy[25].	• Small inputs in additional design and perhaps free issue of basic materials could make a big difference for the new inhabitants e.g. : 1. Material to construct external kitchen would enabled better cooking sheds 2. Issue of plants and erosion stoppers for steep slopes embedding the plots 3. Material and tools to construct additional drains between the plots
• Overall beneficiaries (and the review team) appreciated the overall house layouts and the dimensioning of the spaces.	• However the kitchen is seen to be inadequate for use as there is no chimney and all people interviewed are evidently cooking (at present mostly in the open) with firewood[26].
• The WatSan solution chosen responds to the requirements of GoSL and National Water and Drainage Board.	• The septic tank is placed very close to the kitchen window and almost on the surface which easily leads to problematic annoyance by smell in case of small leaks. • The team couldn't find a vent pipe in the septic tank and will seek technical advice on this. • The pipes and fittings of the water supply system (piped water from main road pressure line) are generally poorly installed and leaks are to be found in almost every house. • The pipes are installed over ground and in some cases enter foundation or pavement over ground which makes for a predictable future defect.
• The structural strength of the buildings is by far over local standards and legal requirements in SL.	• The pavement surrounding the houses is showing massive cracks in many cases.
• Many beneficiaries were already thinking about extensions (mainly external kitchens, utility sheds) and	• The ad hoc solutions made to add cooking sheds could have been done better overall, with slabs and solid, safe

[24] The quality of the houses was commented on by all stakeholders, and the perception is that comparatively, the build quality was better than in other projects

[25] The same goes for the use of a unconditional lottery system to allocate plots and houses amongst beneficiaries.

[26] Fire wood is abundant in the area and therefore available for free.

home improvements thus taking ownership of their houses.	structures. • Plot size in conjunction with situation of house on plot does not enable extensions for cooking in some places.

3.1.2.3 Organisational & Institutional Issues

Appreciative Remarks:	***Suggestions and Concerns:***
Beneficiary relations	
• The IFRC staff was following closely the beneficiary list established by the DS finally verifying it in Dec 2006.	• There was neither RC/RC institutional structure nor any other form of beneficiary participation during planning and construction. • It was felt that people participated in the RC processes but the RC did not participated in peoples' processes. • Some interviewees mentioned that they only came to notice about the fact that they will get a house in Kongalahena a few days before handing over.
Government Stakeholders	
• There were positive perceptions by the authorities for the project and the PNS[27].	• The linking back of the projects in terms of handing over responsibility for long term sustainability of the project to the authorities remains to be done[28].
RC/RC issues	
• Extensive consultation was done with the RC/RC Partners and the coordination & mechanisms (The Technical Support Service Centre, Technical Committees, Task Force). The project followed the contractual template laid out by RCM[29].	• There was little involvement of the SLRCS Branch and the opportunity to use the project to build up relationships with the community was not fully taken up[30].
• The project team felt that they had had appropriate resources (human, financial) and support (technical, management) to plan and implement the project.	• There was no indication that IFRC had included capacity building of the Branch into their project[31].

[27] The team had good relationships with the GN of the host community and divisional authorities, a fact that was commented positively by all parties.
[28] The working relationship with the Pradesia Saba has not been established so far. Responsibility on maintenance of roads, drainages and septic tanks is unclear.
[29] In terms of decision making inside the RC/RC, the project team felt that although the project approval process took some time, RC/RC implementation processes did not hamper the progress of the project.
[30] Although the branch was not involved in the project implementation, they did give IFRC support in dealing with beneficiary issues, land issues and infrastructure authorities.
[31] The branch felt that they had a good relationship with IFRC but that cooperation and efficiency of project management would have been better if the branch would have been in control of human and financial project resources.

3.1.3 Specific Conclusions & Recommendations

3.1.3.1 Efficiency

Have project resources been utilised to achieve the best possible performance[32]?

- The opinions voiced by different stake holders involved were split and didn't form a coherent picture. On the one hand overall unit cost is way over RCM average house cost. Some people think that an owner driven, more decentralised approach to construction would have been more efficient. At the same time here are parties saying that the project delivered good value for money in a timely fashion, thereby responding to the need for relocation housing in an environment where land scarcity is the determining constraint to social housing.
- A flat land condition would have reduced the cost of infrastructure and thus the total cost per house. As a result the choice of the land is an important precondition for the efficiency
- The management structure was able to overcome the operational obstacles and to deliver an overall acceptable solution in permanent housing under the given circumstances, through a well functioning organizational set-up.

To improve the efficiency of resource utilisation it is recommended that:

- A finalised beneficiary list should be available as pre-condition to project start-up.
- A comprehensive feasibility study needs to be done as a prerequisite to relocation projects including social and environmental aspects and cost estimates.
- The project start-up should be conditional to handing over land titles to beneficiaries at the start of the project, to retain beneficiaries and eliminate disruptive changes.
- Decentralization in project management, enabling project management to take necessary project decision once overall concept is approved to drive implementation would improve overall project performance.
- Unnecessary delays be avoided by planning different construction actions at the same time - retaining walls had to be constructed after the houses were finished **à** extra delay of 6 months.

3.1.3.2 Effectiveness

Did the project achieve its objectives[33]?

- Out of identified need of 28 houses has been covered and thereby the project has achieved its basic objectives well within the operational constraints outside of the control of the project. The infrastructure will still have to be looked into in terms of maintenance and improvements in internal road and drainage systems. Overall, the

[32] In examining the efficiency of the project, the review team tried to establish whether or not project resources had been utilised to achieve the best possible performance. They also examined working relationships and the efficiency of decision making.

[33] In examining the effectiveness of the project, the review team tried to establish whether or not the project had achieved its specific objectives, which can be looked at on a number of different levels. Firstly, the number of houses intended to be built; secondly, infrastructure for the site (piped water, internal roads, electricity, sewage and sanitation); thirdly, community infrastructure (playground, community centre) and finally, community mobilisation/social organisation.

review felt that the project had well achieved its objectives.

To enhance the ability of the project to achieve better its objectives, it is recommended that:

- No works be started before beneficiary, land and infrastructure issues are resolved – that beings said, it is not enough to secure promises in the current environment from the authorities, but contractual commitments are required.
- Objective setting could be effectively enlarged to include consideration for livelihoods development at the initial project stage.
- The fact that the defects liability period is ending less than half a year after occupancy of the houses poses an additional challenge in identification and rectification of all pending issues with contractors[34].

3.1.3.3 Relevance

Does the project make sense in the context of meeting the long term shelter needs of tsunami affected people, and why?

- The project is considered to be extremely relevant to the needs of the beneficiaries despite the fact there are some design related issues that impact the overall impression of an otherwise professional implementation.

In order to enhance the relevance of the project, it is recommended that:

- Participation of the beneficiaries is enabled at all levels.
  People are given real choices as to the support modes that they may require. Some beneficiaries may wish to make life-choices that are not in-line with the support offered.

3.1.3.4 Sustainability

Does the project offer an opportunity to reap lasting benefits from the projects[35]?

- The link with the local authorities and the local SLRCS branch who will be the long term involved parties in sustaining the settlement and its infrastructure needs to be considered more prominently and from the initial project stage.
- The location of the area is good as it is linking into sustainable livelihoods as well as necessary community infrastructure like schools, health facilities and local markets, thus creating an enabling environment for the community to maintain its houses and improve on the living standard. Site Layout planning has been challenging but with some improvements linked to minor investments or/and community mobilization the future development of the settlement is deemed to be prosperous and positive on the long run.

For the project to enable lasting benefits from opportunities it is recommended that:

- The planned Community Mobilization/Livelihoods program of IFRC' livelihood department shall be started as soon as possible building on already existing organizations and activities[36].
- The community mobilization activities of IFRC livelihoods team are carefully connected to the host community, local authorities and the SLRCS branch to create lasting partnerships.

[34] House construction was finished half a year before handing over to beneficiaries.
[35] Sustainability: project offers opportunities to cope with and recover from stresses and shocks due to disaster and maintains or enhances people's capabilities and assets while not putting their future generations (children, spouse and neighbours) into trouble / vulnerable positions.
[36] E.g. support a rural community organization that has been initiated by one of the beneficiaries. Each month all participants pay Rs 10 into a joint fund. Till now Rs 2000 have been collected in a kind of woman's bank to make a loan in emergency cases.

- The new inhabitants be informed and trained on simple rules and practices how to maintain their new houses and the individual as well as the community infrastructure provided (e.g. watsan training on how to deal with effluents to enlarge emptying periods of septic tank and avoid blockage of sewage pipes, introduction of composting system for organic waste…)

Part 4 Project Specific Sections – BRCF Reconstruction

4.1 OWNER DRIVEN Housing Project Belgian Red Cross Flanders

Project Name	OWNER DRIVEN Housing Project Belgian Red Flanders
Location	Gurubebila, Paranakade, Pelena South and Kapparathota South GN / Weligama DS / Matara
Final Duration	1 Year
Commencement date	Planning July 2006, Construction Works October 2006
Final Budget	Total budget 1 Mio Euro Av. cost/house incl. watsan SLR 1 Mio for fully and 500.000 for partially damaged cases
Managing partner	BRC Flanders
Implementation type	Owner Driven Reconstruction
Main objective	Top Up Program to support owner driven housing reconstruction
Key activities	Financial and Technical support of Tsunami effected families to reconstruct their houses in situ: - 80 fully damaged cases - 55 partly damaged cases

4.1.1 Project Background

To support the recovery of communities following the tsunami event of the 26 December 2004, BRCF have been implementing an owner-driven housing project, in Paranakade, Gurubebila, Kapparathota South and Pelena South GN, Weligama DS in the District of Matara.

The project realized by the Belgium Red Cross Flanders is based on an owner-driven housing programme providing finacial and technical support for the owners of fully and partially damaged houses to reconstruct in situ.

BRCF agrees to top-up the grant given by the GoSL and distributed in cooperation with the SDC. BRCF renders technical advice and support until the end of the works according to a bill of quantities and a step plan. The beneficiary is responsible for the construction of his own house and agrees to invest the given grants (GoSL and BRCF grant) in full and only for the construction of the house within a certain project periode. The first 4 steps in payments will be transferred by the SDC, the others by the BRCF. The beneficiary signs a receipt for verification.

In order to follow up different projects in an organised way BRCF proposes the beneficiaries the following conditions:

<u>For FULLY DEMAGED CASES:</u>

- The consultant architect deployed by BRCF designed 4 different typologies, all with an approval of the Local Authorities; the beneficiary has to choose one of these 4 typologies, taking into account the size of his plot; the beneficiary has to provide a survey plan drawn by a licensed surveyor.

- The architect will provide plans and an according bill of quantities; everything in this BOQ will be integrated in the building process; this BOQ is a prevailing document.
- Once the typology and the positioning of the house has been chosen, the architect will provide the drawings for the approval with the Local Authorities; these plans have to be submitted together with the Building Application document, with the Tsunami Police Report, with the AGA letter supporting a fully damaged case and an assessment paying strip.
- The government grant counts Rs 250.000; BRCF program adds a max of Rs 750.000.

For PARTIALLY DEMAGED CASES:

- Each house will be assessed by an engineer of the BRCF. A bill of quantities will be made, which will step out the whole reconstruction process. Here also this BOQ is a prevailing document.
- The government grant counts Rs. 100.000; BRCF program adds a max of Rs. 400.000.
- The rest of the process is according to above mentioned fully damaged cases procedures

To supervise the finacal side of the construction the beneficiary has to inform the BRCF that a certain step has been finished; 14 steps in fully damaged cases and maximum 5 in partially damaged cases. All receipts related to acquisition of materials and labours will be handed over and filled in an invoice register. After finishing a certain step of the construction this document has to be handed over before the next instalment will be transferred. Technical Officers of the Swiss Development Cooperation and the BRCF perform progress checks at the end of each milestone (step). No further work can be performed until the previous milestone has been checked. The last two instalments are related to a financial assessment of the whole project. Normally the engineers check each site every two days. In addition BRC Flanders has a letter box at the DS office as a safety precaution in case the beneficiary hasn't seen the engineer during a couple of days. This box is checked daily.

Beneficiaries can saves money by doing work themselves. Money saved in the construction process can be use for example for valence boards and gutters, inside painting, furniture, upgraded sewerage systems etc. - but only after approval by the BRC Flanders

This procedure is described in an agreement called "Cash for repair and reconstruction" between the beneficiary and the BRCF. Annex to this agreement are: receipts for verification in (5 and 14 steps, invoices registers for 13 steps and the demolition, demand formulary and demand strips for progress check up, demand strips for payment.

4.1.2 Project Findings

4.1.2.1 Findings: Beneficiary issues

Appreciative Remarks:	***Suggestions and Concerns:***
Participation	
• *As beneficiaries are using their own entire land or damaged house, the level of involvement appears to be generally high in all stages of the building process.* • *BRCF conducts community meetings bi-weekly to discuss all openly issues. Due to these meetings beneficiaries were able to alter the initial set-up of the program in various ways.* • *Due to the individual aspect of this program the design of the house and the way of reconstruction is personally discussed with the beneficiaries; extensions and alternative solutations (e.g. room surfaces, bathroom-toilet and kitchen matters) can be discussed* • *Beneficiaries and their family members are able to participate in the renovation of their damaged house.* • *BRCF advices the beneficiary not to give up a good job to participate in the building process and introduced contractors to those beneficiaries who didn't know how to otherwise find one.*	• *There were several statements of beneficiaries voicing that they would have appreciated a better information and training in order to be able to get the job done properly as they didn't have any prior expertise in construction and therefore felt they were not in a position to get the best out of the program and meet/understand the requirements of BRCS*[37] • *Some beneficiaries would have preferred to be able to design their own plan and not having to choose one of the four type plans offered by BRCF.* • *The individual needs of the beneficiaries were not considered in the planning stage (they had to select out of 4 types). However during the implementation the beneficiaries were able to make changes according to their individual needs to the type selected.* • *Some beneficiaries initially thought that they had to cooperate with the contractors introduced by BRCF.* • *Some beneficiaries expressed that they had problems with contractosr but were not strong enough to defend their position although in theory they had the possibility to change the contractor*38.

[37] Comment Construction Del. BRCF: Every two weeks a community meeting was arranged. During the assessments, the BRC Flanders went through the whole procedure with the beneficiaries explaining the whole contract and the whole construction process. Once construction was started workshops were given 'Building with Pride' where basic building techniques were explained to the beneficiary. In this way the beneficiary becomes a second supervisor being able to immediately check his own laborers. The BRCF engineers still do the whole supervision. Furthermore other workshops were done explaining them different owner driven approaches, different watsan possibilities, management issues,… The whole point is to facilitate the beneficiaries with management and supervision skills (AWARENESS PROGRAM). It is not the intention to make skilled laborers out of for example fishermen.

[38] Comment Construction Del. BRCF: According to me, all contractor problems were related to contractors that were chosen by the beneficiaries themselves. These contractors didn't even want to give an estimate of the BoQ. Furthermore it was mostly the beneficiaries who were trying to trick the contractor in only paying him 750.000 instead of the 1.000.000 that they are getting in total. We facilitated the discussions between both parties in resolving all problems.

Livelihoods	
• *The beneficiaries building or rebuilding their houses in their old neighbourhood and can take up their pre-tsunami livelihood activities again.* • *The adaptability of the plan allowed some beneficiaries to install a work space or shop in their house to replace the one destroyed by the tsunami and be able to sustain their livelihood.*	

4.1.2.2 Findings: Technical delivery

Appreciative Remarks:	***Suggestions and Concerns:***
Project Management	
• *It appears that a good and extensive cooperation between the beneficiaries, the project managers, the technical staff (BRCF engineers) and the contractors and craftsman was established* • *Beneficiaries choose the owner driven project of BRCF because it offered the best conditions regarding amount of money, technical support and duration of the follow up available* • *Rs 40.000 were foreseen for the demolition of the fully damaged house. If the beneficiaries want, they can keep the 40.000 and eventually start the repair of the "fully" damaged house.*	• *In one case a beneficiary was not aware of the program duration and expressed concerns that the program might be closed without him being able to complete his house*[39] • *It was mentioned by beneficiaries that they are afraid that BRC might not support the full reconstruction but stop their support arbitrarily at one point* • *In some cases it was mentioned that the process of discussing individual changes to plans with BRCF to accommodate beneficiary's personal needs and plans was perceived as difficult and cumbersome.*[40] • *Delays due to late payments (due to unspecified reason) appear to pose a problem in some cases, especially as some beneficiaries had to leave the camp they were living in.*
The site & environment	
• *The reconstruction sites are within existing communities, and blended in without significant disruption.*	• *In some cases the plot size doesn't allow for up to standard sanitation solutions.*

[39] Comment Construction Del. BRCF: From the start of the project it was mentioned that there is no pressure on the timeframe. We especially mentioned that we do not want people to see this project as an income generating element and that they would leave their current job to work on the site. All rates are inclusive all labor cost.

[40] Comment Construction Del. BRCF: We started off with two different approaches for fully damaged: reconstruction of their existing house with a top-up of 400.000 or a totally new building with a top-up of 750.000 but with demolition of the old building. Eventually to make it more simple and to deal with the problem of existing families we simplified our program and said that the existing structure can stay. At the end of the project we will have to make an awareness program to demolish some structures because they are unsafe and could collapse.

The houses	
• *In fully damaged cases the beneficiaries have to choose out of 4 models. Floor space of the models is 590 to 650 ft²* • *The projects allows within the budget little changes proposed by the beneficiary - Houses can be build bigger if the beneficiary can prove his financial capacity to complete construction within the program period* • *The beneficiary has to build a black water treatment: in an information session about pro and contras the beneficiary can choose between the emplacement of a septic tank (included in the program), a bio filter or a dry toilet (both at extra cost).*	• *Many beneficiaries voiced that they would have preferred to have more freedom in the construction (e.g. not being bound to use one of four typologies) and the decision of where to put the house on the plot.* • *Some of the beneficiaries complained about the design of the four types (e.g. houses are too small; bedrooms are too small,...)* • *Some of the beneficiaries who had bigger houses and cannot provide enough funds to reconstruct a house of the original size would have preferred an incremental approach to construction (not finishing the whole house but only part of it) which is not possible in the BRC program*[41].

4.1.2.2 Findings: Design issues

Appreciative Remarks:	***Suggestions and Concerns:***
• *BRCF used the service of a lo local architect-consultant (office in Galle).* • *The typology of the models, double storey house, was chosen by BRCF to help beneficiaries who are owners of small plots of land to keep enough space to enlarge the house, add a work space, an external kitchen, etc. It also offers a satisfying solution to women and children fearing a new tsunami.*	• *Project management is unhappy with one of the designs developed by the consultant, hence not promoting it actively, thereby cutting down the choice of beneficiaries to effectively 3 models.* • *Traditional design ("Vashtu") rules were not taken in consideration, by the architect consultant when designing the typologies.* • *Some families stated that they had to accept compromises in design because of program regulations imposed by BRCF but will rectify these after the program finishes.*

4.1.2.3 Organisational & Institutional Issues

Appreciative Remarks:	***Suggestions and Concerns:***
Beneficiary relations	
• *The initial damage assessment was done by governmental experts after Tsunami. Beneficiaries who not agreeing have a double 'appeal' possibility to challenge the Gov.*	• *Beneficiaries expressed that they would have preferred to have more freedom in choosing design and planning site layout* • *It was also mentioned by some interviewees that that they would have preferred not to*

[41] Comment Country Coordinator BRCF: Our decision to avoid leaving half finished houses was clearly rooted in lessons learned from previous BRCF construction projects. All evaluations of major construction programs e.g. Bosnia, Kosovo, Gujarat, indicate that the vast majority of half finished houses originate out of great ambition by the owner but are never finished, some exceptions not taken into account. This results in leaking slabs and rusting reinforcement steel, deteriorating quality of the community from city planning perspective and in the end resulting in a vast quantity of abandoned housing. These facts were clearly documented in the evolution over a 10 year period of the massive housing projects in e.g. the Balkans.

authorities decision. • *Technical support is given during the full construction period by 2 BRC (local) engineers.* • *Besides regular community meetings, BRCF organized a "beneficiary satisfaction survey" on 26.10.2006 supported by the IFRC Livelihood Team; on 31.10.2006 BRCF proposed the results in a feedback beneficiary meeting.* • *Execution of works (building new house) takes 3 to 6 months.*	*finish the house within the program and only inhabit a partly finished house that would be completed on an incremental basis later but respond in its structure to their long term housing needs and aspirations.*
Government Stakeholders	
• *Base grant approval procedures were done by SDC together with NHDA.* • *DS is very happy with the program and wants BRCF to extend the running program for more new cases.* • *The cooperation between the DS and the project manager appears to be good..* • *The DS was consulted during the design of the plans and approved them.*	• *BRCF expressed the opinion that Implementation of the reconstruction programme would have been quicker and more straight forward if they would have handled base grants as well as top up without any involvement of other actors/donors (GoSL, SDC, NHDA)* • *At one point the DS suspended construction works at some sites due to NHDA concerns on too small floor sizes (the issue was resolve after a couple of weeks).* • *BRCF chose to work with own staff instead of cooperating with NHDA as their offer to support the top up programme was considered by BRCF as to expensive.* • *NHDA expressed their preference for another owner driven program implemented by themselves with funds of the NGO "GOAL Project" in which beneficiaries had more freedom of choice regarding design and restrictions in timing of construction (GAOL Project didn't expect a complete house as end result of their support programme).* • *Unfortunately there was no such thing as a lead agency established in the district to coordinate the activities of the various humanitarian actors in Top UP in the district.*
RC/RC issues	
• *The BEO of SLRCS Branch and the Sen. Proj. Officer expressed their full support for the owner driven programme of BRCF as they thought it achieves better value for money than donor driven projects*	• *The review team couldn't find any visible indications for an involvement of the SLRCS Branch Matara in the project besides an initial beneficiary survey, which was done in cooperation with the branch during a pilot project. According to BRC*

	the quality of the outcome was low due to the fact that the volunteers used for the purpose didn't have sufficient qualification and the survey actually needed to be done by skilled engineers.
Construction team	
• *It appears that the internal coordination and within the construction team as well as with the beneficiaries went over all well due to a high degree of motivation and personal involvement of the acting persons*	• *Some minor lacks in the flow of information between the project team and the beneficiaries were indicated throughout the interviews*

4.1.3 Specific Conclusions & Recommendations

4.1.3.1 Efficiency

Have project resources been utilised to achieve the best possible performance[42]?

- *Due to standardized planning the total cost of each project is predictable in advance.*
- *Due to the high level of personal beneficiary involvement the quality of work done so far appears to be high.*
- *Due to the system of stage payments, the regular technical review of the important construction phases and based on the observations made by the review team, chances are deemed high that houses, which are currently under construction, will be finished according to GoSL construction standards and project completion will be possible within the planned time and budget.*

To improve the efficiency of resource utilisation it is recommended that:

- *A payment system that involves a smaller number of steps and instalments (up to 14!) in order to cut administrative cost and simplify the process should be considered*

4.1.3.2 Effectiveness

Will the project achieve its objectives?

- *The main objective of supporting tsunami affected people in reconstruction of their houses will be met. Final statements regarding the degree of beneficiary satisfaction will only be possible based on a final evaluation after program completion.*
- *The overall risk of failure of the program is low due to the following reasons:*
  - *The program is done on a case by case basis. So if one individual case fails, this will not jeopardize the outcome of whole program.*
  - *The money is disbursed in instalments.*
  - *The program has an inbuilt real time feedback mechanism.*

To enhance the ability of the project to achieve better its objectives, it is recommended that:

- *To avoid unnecessary uncertainty among project partners one needs to be as clear as possible in communicating the key parameters for the program from the very beginning, as there are:*

[42] In examining the efficiency of the project, the review team tried to establish whether or not project resources had been utilised to achieve the best possible performance. They also examined working relationships and the efficiency of decision making.

- *when does the program end?*
- *which contractors may or may not be used?*
- *how flexible is the program in terms of accommodating individual wishes*

- *It would be worth reviewing the training and information program provided to the beneficiaries by BRCF on basis of lessons learnt and experiences made by both beneficiaries and the project team during implementation so far in order to further develop its quality.*

4.1.3.3 Relevance

Does the project make sense in the context of meeting the long term shelter needs of tsunami affected people, and why?

- *The project responds to a need after Tsunami for people affected to be supported in reconstruction of their dwellings*
- *The concept of the program promotes a self reliant, responsible approach towards utilization of project resources among project partners using the initiative and self help capacity of the effected families to actively restart their lives.*
- *On the other hand the program plays on financial safety for the donor; the max of 1 instalment is 110.000 rup. ; the average instalment is 80.000 ru ; all payments are done by bank transfers*

In order to enhance the relevance of the project, it is recommended that:

- *Consider a less restricted and regularized way of support to the individual families by focusing the programme more on the needs of the supported project partners instead of donor expectations.*

4.1.3.4 Sustainability

Does the project offer an opportunity to reap lasting benefits from the projects[43]***?***

- *The degree of personal involvement of the beneficiary is likely to result in a good understanding of the construction work and a good quality of the finishing of the house.*
- *Maintenance and knowledge about proper use of technical installations will hence be easy for the house owners and hence sustainability seems to be not so much of a concern.*

For the project to enable lasting benefits from opportunities it is recommended that:

- *In addition the support could be extended to initiate community building processes in 'owner driven'- area's in order to install and ensure maintenance procedures of public spaces, of drainages, streetlights, wetlands, and solid waist policy*

Ecologic matters

- *To ensure sustainability in housing and environmental aspects it is recommended to create guidelines, animation/information sessions and workshops around the following topics:*
  - *Maintenance of the house and the private technical installations (drains, septic tanks, toilets water pipes,..)*
  - *Extension of dwellings in relation to neighbours*
  - *Community based water and sanitation (PHAST training)*

[43] Sustainability: project offers opportunities to cope with and recover from stresses and shocks due to disaster and maintains or enhances people's capabilities and assets while not putting their future generations (children, spouse and neighbours) into trouble / vulnerable positions.

- *Water and electricity supply*
- *Solid waste management*

Annex 1

Mid Term Review – Matara from 21 to 27 January, 2007.

People met.

No.	Name	Designation	Organization
1.	A.W.Saratha	Divisional Secretary	DS Office, Weligama
2.	Thandula S. Vipulagama	Project Architect	Suchith Mohitti Associates.
3.	Piyumal Fernando	Senior Project Architect	- do -
4.	Birgit Vaes (Ms)	Construction Delegates	Belgium RC
5.	Martijn Goddeeris	- do -	- do -
6.	Namala Jayantha	Branch Executive	SLRC , Matara
7.	Sudharma S. Kumara	Senior Project Officer	- do -
8.	H.M.Manjula Pushpa	Community Liaison Officer	IERC, Matara
9.	Ravi Nissantha	Construction Engineer	- do -
10.	Samira Vithana	- do -	- do -
11.	Taniya Wood (Ms)	Field Representative	- do -
12.	Baladeva	Project Engineer	Belgium RC
13.	K.P. Silva	- do -	- do -
14.	I. Liyanagama (Ms)	Asst. Divisional Secretary	DS office, Devinuwara
15.	L.H.S.Hemantha	Asst. Director	- do -
16.	C. Vitharana	Colonization Officer	- do -
17.	Y.S.S.Dolamulla (Ms)	Senior Manager	NHDA, Matara
18.	N.H.Premasiri	Asst. Engineer	- do -
19.	S.Wickrasekara	- do -	- do -
20.	Hemantha Weerasooriya	Tech. Officer	- do -
21.	A.G.A.Linton	Chairman	Pradeshiya Sabha, Devinuwara
22.	Sarath Sapugoda	Secretary	- do -
23.	Malani (Ms)	Tech. Officer	- d0 -

Annex 2.1

Mid Term Review: Primary Questionnaire – Beneficiaries

Purpose of the MTR:

Assess progress to date towards achieving project objectives, capture learning, and to improve project performance

Parameters

- We will be asking you questions about the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of RC construction projects
- This interview will take approximately 60 minutes
- Your comments will be treated as confidential – you will not be directly quoted in the report.
- You will have the opportunity to ask any questions of the review team at the end of the interview.

Relevance

Does the construction project make sense in the context of meeting the long term shelter needs of tsunami affected people in Kalutara? Why?

How did you think you influenced the Red Cross housing project?	
Where you involved in planning for your house as part of the Red Cross housing project?	
Do you think the Red Cross housing project is relevant according to your needs?	
Has the Red Cross housing project supported the shelter needs of your community?	
What do you think makes for a successful shelter project in Kalutara?	

Efficiency

Have project resources been utilized to achieve the best possible performance?

Was this an appropriate project for your community?	
Why did you decide to be part of this project?	

Effectiveness

Did the project achieve its objectives?

Did you receive the house you expected in the time indicated by the project team?	
Apart from the house – what else was promised and provided through the project (e.g. roads, electricity, community infrastructure)?	
If you were involved in another tsunami recovery project, what you do differently?	

Sustainability

That the construction program offers an opportunity for communities to reap lasting benefits

Affordability – how can the costs associated with occupying the new houses be met by beneficiaries?

Security – are the housing projects providing a secure environment for the community development?

Do you think you are able to afford to maintain the new houses?	
What do you think will be the long-term benefit of receiving this house?	

How satisfied with your house? *(Where 1 is least satisfied and 5 is very*	**a) quality of construction**

satisfied)	1 2 3 4 5 **b) location** 1 2 3 4 5 **c) community facilities** 1 2 3 4 5 **d) water and sanitation** 1 2 3 4 5 **e) roads and electricity** 1 2 3 4 5
What are your concerns about your new house?	
How do you think the Red Cross housing project could improve?	

Thank you for your time.

Annex 2.2

Mid Term Review: Primary Questionnaire – <u>Stakeholders</u> (Govt, PNS, SLRCS)

Purpose of the MTR:

Assess progress to date towards achieving project objectives, capture learning, and to improve project performance

Parameters

- We will be asking you questions about the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of RC construction projects
- This interview will take approximately 60 minutes
- Your comments will be treated as confidential – you will not be directly quoted in the report.
- You will have the opportunity to ask any questions of the review team at the end of the interview.

Relevance

Does the construction project make sense in the context of meeting the long term shelter needs of tsunami affected people in Kalutara? Why?

How were <u>you</u> involved in the design and implementation of the project? and / or How were <u>beneficiaries</u> involved in the design and implementation of the project?		GoSL, SLRCS All
Where did <u>you</u> or your department have the most influence? and / or Where did <u>beneficiaries</u> have the most influence?		GoSL, SLRCS All
How were <u>your</u> views incorporated into the project? and / or How were <u>beneficiaries</u> views incorporated into the project?		GoSL, SLRCS All
In your opinion, do you think the project has adapted to the changing situation on the ground?		All
Were the permanent shelter needs of the beneficiaries properly		All

addressed?		
What do you think makes for a successful shelter project in Kalutara?		All
Were the construction projects relevant to SLRCS branch development?		PNS, SLRCS

Efficiency

Have project resources been utilized to achieve the best possible performance?

In your opinion, does the project represent value for money?		ALL
Was the project implemented in a timely manner?		ALL
Was your organization adequately involved in project implementation?		GoSL, SLRCS

Effectiveness

Did the project achieve its objectives?

Were the number and quality of houses constructed on time?		ALL
Were there any other expected results attained, eg community infrastructure?		ALL
If you had to start over again, what you do differently?		ALL

Sustainability

That the construction program offers an opportunity for communities to reap lasting benefits

Affordability – how can the costs associated with occupying the new houses be met by beneficiaries?

Security – are the housing projects providing a secure environment for community development?

What do you think sustainability means for housing construction projects in Kalutara?		ALL
Do you think the new houses can be maintained by the beneficiaries?		ALL

Externalities

External factors that may affect the project such as environmental, conflict, socio-political, economic – market forces, etc

What external factors that may influence the project implementation were identified at the start?		PROJECT TEAM, SLRCS
What external factors impacted upon the project?		PROJECT TEAM, SLRCS
Were external factors successfully managed?		PROJECT TEAM, SLRCS
What would you change about the way the project deals with external factors?		PROJECT TEAM, SLRCS

Annex 3

ToR for RCM Mid Term Reviews Program of construction projects in Sri Lanka

Background

Since the Tsunami of 26th of Dec. 2004 the Red Cross has committed itself to the reconstruction of 15.000 houses all over Sri Lanka. 21 National Red Cross Societies, IFRC and SLRCS are currently working in Sri Lanka in implementing Housing Construction Projects. The range of activities reaches from mere cash grants to families reconstructing their damaged or destroyed houses to massive relocation projects involving the construction of several hundred new houses including infrastructure development and construction of community facilities.

By the mid of 2006 only a small proportion (around 5 %) of the projects planned are finalized. The rest of the projects are ongoing at different stages of progress. Project plans are indicating that the vast majority of the housing projects will be finalized by the mid of 2007.

The RCM construction program is suffering from considerable delays in implementation, inflated prices for material and labour in the construction market and a lack of competent and reliable consultants and contractors in the country. In addition the conditions based on which construction projects were developed have been changing severely since the start of the RCM operation. Particularly the identification of available land, the changes in the regulations on restriction of construction and reconstruction within the coastal belt and the identification of beneficiaries have put huge challenges on the implementing agencies.

The RCM partners are under increasing pressure from the beneficiaries, the GOSL, donors and the media to expedite the projects and demonstrate that their usage of resources within the construction program is effective, efficient and creating adequate results for the Tsunami affected population.

Objectives

In order to provide reliable knowledge for all RCM partners, beneficiaries and other stakeholders in the recovery process of the ongoing construction program, to ensure quality and accountability leading to an equity of the final output, and improvements in project implementation through the sharing of the lessons learnt so far in construction projects, a series of assessment in the form of mid term reviews are initiated by IFRC Construction Coordination.

The main objective of the envisaged series of mid term reviews is to provide knowledge to stakeholders in RCM construction projects about the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the RCM construction program.

The reason for choosing the tool of a mid term reviews is to use the results to give real time feedback and come up with suggestions for improvements to project managers and implementing agencies in a stage when such corrections are still meaningful and timely

Expected Outcomes

The main outcome targeted in the process of evaluation is to improve on the efficiency and effectiveness of the RCM construction projects, while making them more relevant and sustainable to the beneficiaries and other stakeholders. This is to be achieved through knowledge sharing, coordination and cooperation between the various stake holders within and outside the RCM by involving them actively in the discussion and elaboration of conclusions and suggestions for improvements, based on the process of the Mid-Term evalution. The involvement of beneficiaries, local authorities and other outside stake holders is expected to contribute significantly to a better common understanding and acceptance of the projects.

The expected outputs of the evaluation process can be summed up as:

2. As the single tangible output, the evaluation process will produce a written report, based on the gathering and sharing of information through a consultation process with multiple stakeholders, leading to a process of analysis and the dissemination of the knowledge and lessons learnt of construction projects and their implementation among the different actors and stakeholders of RCM construction projects.
3. Through the report, the evaluation process is expected to improve the RCM wide knowledge by establishing a common framework for the analysis of construction projects within the RCM as well as among different groups of stakeholders.
4. Through the report, the evaluation process is expected to also assist in the identification of critical attributes of assumptions on the project implementation and subsequent indicators to be monitored.
5. Through the report, the evaluation process is furthermore expected to provide advice on best practice and in the identification of information and knowledge needs and recognizing the appropriate way of applying different information gathering techniques
6. Overall, the process of the evaluation is expected to contribute to the creation of a knowledge base to improve the setting up and the management of the projects, and the handling of risks associated with efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the initiatives.
7. Still, through the process, the evaluation is expected to help to ensure that best practice is disseminated in quality and accountability within the RCM, taking into account and assessing current needs and concerns of beneficiaries, implementing partners and other stakeholders.
8. Lastly, through the process and the knowledge created and disseminated, positive contribution is expected to the improvement of the RCM-wide coordination activities.

.

For whom?

1. Implementing Parties
2. Beneficiaries
3. SLRCS
4. IFRC
5. Donors
6. Gov. and Loc. Authorities

Project Ownership and Reporting

The project owner is the RC Movement as a whole, represented by the Task Force. The evaluation results will be reviewed by the members of the TEC Construction. Based on the recommendation of the TEC Construction Task Force shall approve the Evaluation Reports. The report will be composed of two sections: in the first place there will be a joint section, covering RCM wide issues and common matters to all of the individual projects, and secondly, a project specific section will be produced for each single initiative.

Scope are selected housing construction projects of all districts RCM partners are working in irrespective of whether they are owner or donor driven, relocation or reconstruction projects. It is not scope of this ToR to be used as guidelines to evaluate Health Infrastructure Construction projects.

Evaluation reports will be available to all RCM partners. The whole report or selected parts of it can also be presented to local authorities, GOSL and all stake holders involved based on approval by Task Force.

Specific Issues

Main focus of the evaluation is to give indications on the relevancy, coherence and acceptance of RCM construction program post tsunami in Sri Lanka. Thus the key questions to answer are:

1. As to what extend is RCM construction program meeting the needs and expectations of the beneficiaries?
2. What is the local authorities' perception of RCM construction projects? How could we improve acceptance, cooperation and coordination?
3. How much divergence is there in the overall value of the housing provided by the different NS partners e.g. quality of materials, size of home and other services provided?

Below you find a list of some of the topics the different experts within the team need to address in the course of the evaluation. This list is indicative and may be added to in the course of each individual evaluation. Overall the various topics need to be addressed in terms of efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability, in conjunction with: i) beneficiaries, ii) the technical delivery of the project, iii) the internal and external institutional linkages:

- Social impact of intervention
- Technical quality of construction
- Project management quality (time, cost, quality relation)
- Questions on "time cost" in the event of a delay of a project
- Externalities affecting the project
- Environmental Impact of the project
- Relevance and sustainability
- Impact of program on and linkage with SLRCS' mid and long term development

A standard set of guiding questions dealing with the above listed will be developed in the course of a first pilot evaluation.

Timeframe and Schedule

Starting with a pilot evaluation in November 2006 up to 4 projects of one district per month should go through the described evaluation process until the end of June 2007, when according to project plans most of the housing construction projects will be concluded.

The results and recommendations will be made available to all movement partners. If deemed necessary by any member of the TEC Construction or Task Force, special TEC Meetings will be held to discuss the outcome of MTRs and recommend actions to be taken in response to the highlighted findings. Should TEC find that the value added by further reviews decreases over time, the series can be stopped at any time.

Composition of the Evaluation Team - Roles and Responsibilities

Overall Coordinator

The overall coordination of the evaluation activities of RCM construction Sri Lanka will be with the program officer risk management of SLRCS/IFRC TSSC. She/he will have the lead in planning, organizing and ensuring a proper execution of the evaluation of all RCM construction projects. It is suggested that the SLRCS Programme Officer Risk Management, currently Mrs. Renuka Ekanayake takes over this position. Responsibilities will comprise but not be limited to the following:

- Work out a time plan for mid term evaluation of all housing construction projects implemented through RCM partners
- Ensure that the reviews are carried out according to the requirements of RCM as outlined in this ToR, procedural guidelines and specific ToRs for team leader and team members of the evaluation team
- Coordinate with SLRCS branches the necessary preparation for the reviews
- Receive and distribute the evaluation reports and documentation
- Maintain proper filing system of RCM construction project reviews

Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will be composed of the following members of which only the Team Leader will be constantly the same, while the rest of the team members will be selected by the Team Leader in agreement with the concerned stake holders, based on required expertise and experience and local as well as timely availability:

1. Team Leader
2. PNS Representative
3. IFRC Representative
4. SLRCS Representative

The following two ground rules should be followed regarding the team composition:

- Team members should not be directly involved with the projects they review in order to avoid biased perceptions and conflicts of interest and to foster cross district lessons learning.
- To address a gender balance, the team should have at least one female member.

Below you find a broad outline of the roles and responsibilities of the different evaluation team members which will be dealt with in detailed ToRs for the Team Leader as well as the Team Members.

Team Leaders' role and responsibilities

- Overall responsibility for conducting the review according to this ToR
- Select the members of the evaluation panel together with relevant stakeholders that will include SLRCS, IFRC, PNSs
- Planning and initiation of all activities necessary to carry out the actual evaluation
- Facilitation of the work shops and group discussions
- Documentation of the outcome according to detailed ToR of position
- Presentation of the results to the different stakeholders
- Capturing of lessons learnt and transfer of feedback including advice and suggestions for improvement to respective project management

Team Members roles and responsibilities

- Provide their expertise in the evaluation as assigned by the Team Leader
- Familiarize themselves with Evaluation Methodology and Tools used
- Study the provided documents on the projects subject to evaluation
- Participate and act as resource persons in the review and the adjoining meetings and workshops
- Support the Team Leader in compiling the necessary information
- Draft report covering their field of expertise as assigned by the team leader on basis of standard templates, questions and indicators
- Provide advise based on findings to implementing parties of the evaluated projects

The following fields of expertise will need to be covered by the team members:

- Technical Expertise Construction Management will need to cover
    - Provide technical expertise in the course of the assessment
    - Provide expertise on project management issues looking into project plan, cost plan, efficiency of resource usage etc.
- Technical Expertise Livelihoods and Social Development will need to cover
    - all social aspects as livelihood, beneficiary involvement and social sustainability issues
    - aspects of community consultation and participation
- Local Expertise will need to cover
    - Impact of intervention within the affected communities as well as the host and surrounding communities
    - long term impact of the project on SLRCS and linking of the project into SLRCS core activities development

Available Documentation

The evaluation team will undertake their assessment using the following resources of information:

1. Project Proposal as submitted by the implementing party to RCM

2. Log frame, detailed project plan, designs and cost estimates provided by the implementing party complementing the basic information given in the project proposal
3. Regular progress reporting on the project and all other available documentation on project progress
4. Tec. standards, procedures and guidelines as worked out and agreed on by the RCM Tec. Com. Construction
5. Sphere Standards of Community Participation
6. History of Background, Basic Conditions and Policy Changes during the period of operation
7. Findings based on perceptions during extensive site visits
8. Interviews based on a standard list of questions and indicators with all stakeholders involved in the project inclusive but not limited to the following:
    - Project Management (e.g. Construction delegate, Livelihoods delegate, Local engineer, consultants etc.)
    - Beneficiaries
    - Local government authorities
    - SLRCS branch representatives and local staff
    - Representatives of other RC Agencies working in the area if appropriate
9. In the course of the evaluation a workshop involving all groups of stakeholders mentioned above discussing the perceptions and judgements of the participants on the respective project will be conducted. The focus in this workshops will lie on:
    - strengthening cooperation between beneficiaries, RCM partners and outside stakeholders
    - sharing of experiences, knowledge and lessons learnt
    - establishing of a common analysis among different groups of stakeholders

Methodology

The reviews will be carried out with the involvement and consultation of all relevant partners of the program. Participatory research methodology will be used in order to get a strong element of beneficiary involvement in the evaluation. Development of a participatory evaluation methodology would be a task for the consultant who would be hired for the mid term evaluation.

The following activities shall be part of each individual evaluation:

1. Site Visit
2. Discussions based on standard guidelines with all stakeholders involved in the project inclusive but not limited to the following:
    - Project Management (e.g. Construction delegate, Livelihoods delegate, Local engineer, consultants etc.) – During Site Visits
    - Beneficiaries – Focus Group Discussion
    - Local government authorities
    - SLRCS branch representatives and local staff – Group Discussion
    - Representatives of other RC Agencies working in the area – During WS
3. In the course of the review a workshop involving all groups of stakeholders mentioned above discussing the perceptions and judgements of the participants on the respective project will be conducted. The focus in this workshops will lie on:
    - discussion of issues arising out or the findings during the prior review process

- strengthening cooperation between beneficiaries, RCM partners and outside stakeholders
- sharing of experiences, knowledge and lessons learnt
- establishing of a common analysis among different groups of stakeholders

The Evaluation Process

Preparation Phase – Office Work

- Ø Plan jointly with all stakeholders time schedule and venue of the evaluation
- Ø Initiate all necessary preparation
- Ø Inform all persons involved
- Ø Selection of evaluation team members
- Ø Pre-meeting including team briefing, achieving a common understanding among the team members on objectives, methodology, roles and responsibilities, allocation of tasks and handing over of relevant material, templates, etc.
- Ø Study of existing documentation of the project provided by TSSC, Mov. Coordination and Implementing Agency

Actions to be taken:

- v collect necessary documents — 3 days – TSSC
- v Read all documents — 1 day – TL, TM
- v Secretarial work — 3 days – TSSC

Evaluation Phase – Field Work

District-wise reviews of 4 projects per district are proposed due to the magnitude of task and the location of projects.

- Ø Site visit
- Ø Interviews with beneficiaries and community representatives of affected as well as host communities
- Ø Interview and discussion with implementing team
- Ø External Interviews with District Secretary, Divisional Secretary, Pradesha Sabah, Grama Niladari and Samurdhi Officer
- Ø Interview/Discussion with SLRCS Branch Representatives
- Ø Interview/Discussion with Consultant and Contractors
- Ø Presentation of preliminary findings and recommendations
- Ø Workshop with stakeholders on district level

Actions to be taken:

- v Organize team — 2 days – TSSC

- Team Briefing ½ day – TL, TM
- Prepare and arrange Agenda 2 days/proj. – Branch, PNS
- Travel to districts / return 2 days – TL, TM
- Site Visit plus Interviews with relevant persons 3 days – TL, TM visits incl. Focus Group, Smurdhi Off., GN, DS, BEO talks – organized by respective PNSs
- Organize workshop 1 day – Branch, PNS
- Conduct workshop 1 day – TL, TM

Documentation Phase

- Team Leader drafts final report and compiles contributions from different team members
- Presentation of Draft Report, comments and suggestions to Implementing Agency
- Dissemination of Final Report to TEC. Construction, RCM Coordination, SLRCS Branch and IFRC Field Representative
- Presentation and Discussion of Report during monthly TEC Construction Meeting
- Publication and archiving of report

Actions to be taken:

- draft and compile reviews reports 2 days – TL, TM
- prepare draft report 2 days – TL
- present draft report to RCM 1 day – TL
- prepare final report 1 days – TL

Estimated Cost of Reviews Series

Cost per District (max. 4 projects) SLR 320.000,-

For more information please see detailed budget

Annex:

1. Time Plan
2. Questions to be addressed by the different specialist team members
3. ToR Team Leader, Team Members
4. Budget
5. Guidelines and templates for Interviews (in preparation)
6. Guidelines for Workshop with stakeholders (in preparation)

Annex 4

Matara District Mid Term Review – Contact List

Review Team

Team Leader	K. A. Jayarathne	kajay5939@yahoo.com	94 722425939
Construction	Klaus Palkovits	klaus.palkovits@ifrc.org	94 773207805
SLRCS Expert	Renuka Ekenayake	slrcrenuka@gmail.com	94 773600947
SLRCS Livelihoods	Mr. Manatunga		94 382235329
PNS Arch. Expert	Eric Selis	EricSelis@fcs.be	
PNS Arch./Eng. Exp.	Caroline Henrotay	chenrota@vub.ac.be	

Colombo Head Office Team

Administration	Lynette Ekenayake	lynette.ekenayake@ifrc.org	94 773442903
IFRC Coordination	Klaus Palkovits	klaus.palkovits@ifrc.org	94 773207805
SLRCS Coordination	Renuka Ekenayake	slrcrenuka@gmail.com	94 773600947