

POST-TSUNAMI HOUSING RECONSTRUCTION KALUTARA DISTRICT, SRI LANKA

Final Report & Lessons Learnt



**Belgian Red Cross – French Speaking Community
June 2009**

The Belgian Red Cross-French speaking community addresses a special thank to Lily Ryan Collins for her kind contribution to the document. Lily Ryan Collins worked in Sri Lanka as a Community Infrastructure/Construction Delegate from September 2008 until June 2009.

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	7
1.1	THE DISASTER.....	7
1.2	THE INTERNATIONAL RESPONSE.....	7
1.3	THE BELGIAN RED CROSS RESPONSE.....	7
1.4	THE CONTEXT OF RELIEF AND RECOVERY.....	9
1.5	THE STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT.....	9
2	BELGIAN RED CROSS RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT.....	10
2.1	OBJECTIVES.....	10
2.2	CONTEXT.....	10
2.2.1	<i>Working with the Government of Sri Lanka (GoSL)</i>	10
2.2.2	<i>Working with the Red Cross Movement</i>	12
2.3	IMPLEMENTATION.....	13
2.3.1	<i>Geographical Focus</i>	13
2.3.2	<i>Beneficiary Selection</i>	13
2.3.3	<i>Housing construction approach</i>	15
2.3.4	<i>Cash-for-Housing Implementation</i>	16
2.3.5	<i>Infrastructure Construction in Resettlement Sites</i>	17
2.3.6	<i>Community Programme</i>	17
2.3.7	<i>Handover and Closing-Out</i>	19
2.4	RESULTS.....	20
2.4.1	<i>Construction</i>	20
2.4.2	<i>Community</i>	23
2.4.3	<i>Occupancy Rates</i>	26
3	LESSONS LEARNT FROM THE RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT.....	28
3.1	TAKING AN INTEGRATED AND SUSTAINABLE APPROACH.....	28
3.2	HOUSING.....	29
3.2.1	<i>Cash-for-Housing</i>	29
3.2.2	<i>House Design</i>	32
3.3	RESETTLEMENT SITES.....	34
3.3.1	<i>Site Selection</i>	34
3.3.2	<i>Social Development of New Communities</i>	35
3.3.3	<i>Integration with the Host Community</i>	36
3.3.4	<i>Livelihoods</i>	37
3.3.5	<i>Land Rights</i>	38

3.4	BENEFICIARY SELECTION AND WORKING WITH PARTNERS.....	39
3.4.1	<i>Beneficiary Selection</i>	39
3.4.2	<i>Working with the Government of Sri Lanka</i>	40
3.4.3	<i>Working with the Red Cross Movement</i>	42
3.5	OWNERSHIP AND ACCOUNTABILITY	44
3.5.1	<i>Ownership</i>	45
3.5.2	<i>Accountability</i>	47
3.6	PROJECT MANAGEMENT	48
3.6.1	<i>Development of a Logical Framework (Logframe)</i>	49
3.6.2	<i>Monitoring and Evaluation</i>	49
3.6.3	<i>Stakeholder Analysis</i>	50
3.6.4	<i>Risks and Opportunities</i>	50
3.6.5	<i>Reporting and Documentation</i>	52
3.6.6	<i>Recommendations</i>	52
3.7	RECOMMENDATIONS	53
4	CONCLUSION	57
	APPENDIX A: <i>Summary of Beneficiary Documentation by Settlement</i>	
	APPENDIX B: <i>Steps to Obtain State Land Grants / Leaflet Distributed at Land Rights Workshops</i>	
	APPENDIX C: <i>Steps to Obtain Certificate of Conformity</i>	
	APPENDIX D: <i>Risk and Opportunity Register for CRB Project</i>	

Executive Summary

The tsunami that struck Sri Lanka on 26th December 2004 caused the loss of over 35,000 lives and the destruction of over 65,000 houses, as well as social upheaval and psychological trauma for the survivors. Between March 2005 and May 2009, Belgian Red Cross –French speaking community (CRB) implemented a housing reconstruction project in the District of Kalutara, on the South-West coast of Sri Lanka. With co-funding from the Luxemburg Red Cross and the Rode Kruis Vlaanderen, CRB funded the construction of four-hundred and ninety-six high quality houses, including ten resettlement sites on land donated by the government. In the resettlement sites, infrastructure such as roads and drains, and community facilities such as community centres and children’s play parks were also constructed. Drinking water infrastructure was also provided where necessary.

Alongside the construction programme, CRB ran a community programme in the resettlement sites. The programme supported the new communities in building up the organisations, relationships, and knowledge necessary to act collectively to make the settlement sustainable, both physically and socially. As part of the community programme, CRB also promoted land rights for housing beneficiaries on state land, and advocated within the Red Cross Movement for similar programmes to be run on a wider scale.

CRB constructed almost all housing under an ‘owner-driven’ approach, in which beneficiaries were given cash grants and managed the reconstruction themselves with CRB’s supervision and support. Using this system, CRB was able to start reconstruction before other Partner National Societies (PNSs). The owner-driven approach also made beneficiaries the central actors in their recovery, which helped them to realise their strengths, and focus achievable goals while rebuilding their lives.

Lessons Learnt

CRB recognises that there are many lessons to be learnt going forward. Some aspects of the project were very well executed, such as beneficiary selection and cash-for-housing implementation. Others left room for improvement. Amongst the most significant shortcomings was CRB’s initial failure to recognise the great challenges involved in successfully resettling people. Further, weak project management had a negative impact on objectives and approach, as well as efficiency and organisation. A selection of the most important recommendations from the ‘Lessons Learnt’ section of this report is given below. Some of the recommendations were fully or partially implemented by CRB, while others are to be adopted for future projects.

Taking an Integrated and Sustainable Approach

- At identification stage, aim to create a project that focuses on the broad objective of reducing vulnerabilities and increasing capacities amongst beneficiaries.
- Carry out a rigorous assessment of whether any project activities may have a negative impact on the social and / or environmental status quo. If yes, revise the planned method of implementation.

Housing

Cash-for-Housing

- Provide beneficiaries with close technical support from well-qualified staff.
- Strictly link payments to completion of the previous stage.

House Design

- Adopt a design that incorporates environmentally-friendly features, and allows for future expansion.
- Adjust house size according to beneficiary family size.

Resettlement Sites

- Only carry out resettlement where there is no alternative.

Site Selection

- If resettlement is necessary, select sites on the basis of a detailed analysis of each proposed site, considering socio-economic and physical features. Reject sites that risk becoming unsustainable.

Social Development of New Communities

- Run a community programme alongside the construction programme throughout the project, and structure the project to ensure a high level of integration between the two teams.
- Start working with the communities at the earliest possible stage, to ease the transition.

Integration with the Host Community

- Carry out extensive consultation with the host community before construction begins, including analysing their needs, and explaining how the new settlement will affect them.
- Designate a proportion of project funding to host community projects.

Livelihoods

- Treat livelihoods support as holistic, encompassing human, natural, financial, social and physical capital.
- Develop a programme to support beneficiaries' in finding opportunities for income generation in the new community.

Land Rights

- Where beneficiaries' land rights situation is not clear, dedicate resources to discovering information, sharing it with the beneficiaries, and pressuring government to accelerate the issuing of documentation.

Working with Partners

Local Authorities

- Identify potential sticking points and areas of disagreement with the authorities. Resolve them with a clear deadline, ensuring that the authorities have an understanding of project time constraints.

The Host National Society

- Find ways to maintain cooperation with the National Society, even where this proves challenging, while maintaining beneficiary welfare as the top priority.

Ownership

General

- Build the beneficiaries' capacity to understand the technical and financial limitations of the project, so that they can take a greater degree of ownership of important decisions.

Housing Projects

- Allow the beneficiaries to make minor changes in house design.
- For resettlement sites, involve the beneficiaries in site planning where regulations allow.

Accountability

- Create formal feedback mechanisms that enable all beneficiaries, including the least confident, to express grievances.

- Keep a record of grievances, identify patterns of repeated complaints, and act accordingly.
- Where possible, create strong feedback mechanisms that give beneficiaries genuine control over the project, and create powerful incentives for project staff to respond to their grievances.

Project Management

- Create a project logical framework that identifies objectives, expected results, activities, and SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound) indicators. Choose a model that is flexible enough to incorporate changes in objectives and context.
- Adopt a monitoring and evaluation framework that requires regular evaluation against performance indicators. Feed the results back into project planning, and revise the logical framework where necessary.
- Carry out a stakeholder analysis and create a stakeholder engagement strategy.
- Use a Risk and Opportunity Register to predict and manage risks, and anticipate and capitalise on opportunities.
- Create rigorous reporting and documentation standards, ensuring that there is a historical record of significant events and decisions.

1 Introduction

1.1 The Disaster

In the early morning of December 26th 2004, an under-sea earthquake off the coast of Aceh, Indonesia, caused a series of tsunamis in the Indian Ocean. The waves killed approximately 228,000 people across 14 countries, with Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Thailand and India suffering the greatest loss of life.¹ In Sri Lanka over 35,000 lives were lost. Total economic damage and losses for the tsunami were estimated at just over US \$10 billion. Sri Lanka suffered losses of around US \$1,454 million,² including destruction of 65,275 houses and damage to a further 38,561.³

Beyond the statistics, the tsunamis caused immeasurable social damage, destroying families, communities and livelihoods along the coastlines of the affected countries.

1.2 The International Response

The response to the tsunami was unprecedented. Approximately US\$13.5 billion was given or pledged for the international tsunami relief and recovery operation, of which an unusually high proportion - around half - came from private donors.⁴ The Red Cross Movement (RCM) received approximately US\$2.7 billion,⁵ and CRB received Euros 11.7 million (€ 0.7 million from public institutions in Belgium; € 4,9 million from RC partners; and € 6.1 million from private donors).⁶

Over seventy Red Cross National Societies pledged their support, and thirty-two were active in Sri Lanka in the immediate aftermath of the disaster, working in coordination with the Sri Lanka Red Cross Society (SLRCS) and the International Federation of the Red Cross / Red Crescent (IFRC). The IFRC made a pledge on behalf of the Red Cross Movement to construct or contribute to the construction of 17,000 – 18,000 houses.⁷ Many other organisations, from major NGOs to small foundations, participated in the recovery operation.

1.3 The Belgian Red Cross Response

The Belgian Red Cross, Francophone Community (Croix-Rouge de Belgique - CRB) began its operations in Sri Lanka in March 2005. The largest component of CRB operations was the construction of permanent housing for families who lost their homes in the tsunami.⁸ CRB worked in partnership with the Government of Sri Lanka (GoSL), the IFRC, and to a lesser degree with the SLRCS (for a few resettlement sites), to provide tsunami victims with good quality homes, and enable them to restart their lives.

¹ Cosgrave, J (2007) *Synthesis Report: Expanded Summary. Joint evaluation of the international response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami*. London: Tsunami Evaluation Coalition

² *ibid*

³ IFRC Mid-Term Review Report, 2006

⁴ *ibid*

⁵ <http://www.ifrc.org/what/disasters/response/tsunamis/map.asp> (2009) *Tsunami Operation - Key Facts and Figures*. IFRC Website

⁶ It should be noted that, although the response to the tsunami was unprecedented, the scale of the disaster in terms of loss of life and economic loss has been exceeded several times in the past half-century. For example: a storm surge in the Bay of Bengal in 1970 killed 300,000 – 500,000 people, the Ethiopian famine of 1984-85 killed over 900,000 people. Cosgrave (2007).

⁷ IFRC, Geneva (September 2006) *Tsunami Emergency and Recovery: Revised Secretariat Plan and Budget 2005-2007*

⁸ CRB also carried out a psychosocial support project (March '05 - March '08), and a cleaning project in the early stages of recovery (April 2005 – January 2006). For information on the psycho-social project, refer 'Final Project Report: Psychosocial Support Project', January 2008. As the cleaning project was minor and short-lived, a final report was not deemed necessary.

The housing reconstruction project ran until May 2009 in the district of Kalutara, on the south-west coast of Sri Lanka. During this time, with co-funding from the Luxemburg Red Cross and from the Rode Kruis Vlaanderen, CRB supported the construction of four-hundred and ninety-five houses, of which four-hundred and fifty-five were directly implemented by CRB, and 40 were constructed by other parties. Of the four-hundred and fifty-five implemented by CRB, two-hundred and twenty were built on the owner's original plot or other land privately owned by them, while two-hundred and thirty-five were built in ten 'resettlement sites' on land donated by the GoSL. All but fifty-two of the houses were constructed using the 'Cash for Housing' model, whereby beneficiaries receive cash in instalments to construct their own home, with support and technical supervision from CRB staff. In the resettlement sites, CRB also constructed infrastructure such as roads and drains, and community infrastructure such as community centres and children's play parks.

<p>496 houses funded by CRB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 455 directly implemented by CRB • 41 constructed by other parties
<p>455 houses implemented by CRB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 403 through owner-driven cash-for-housing • 52 by a private contractor (donor-driven)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 220 on owners' original plots or private land • 235 in resettlement sites

Box 1.1: Houses constructed by category

Running parallel with the construction programme, CRB ran a psychosocial programme⁹ and, towards the end of the project, a community programme in the resettlement sites. The aim of the programme was to support the new communities in building up organisations, relationships, and knowledge that would enable them to act collectively to promote the sustainability of the settlement. This applies to physical sustainability (e.g. maintenance of infrastructure) and social sustainability (e.g. community groups able to resolve problems, approach local authorities and organise community events). The community programme included support for the creation of Community-Based Organisations (CBOs) in the larger settlements, integration activities with the host community, and workshops on garbage management and infrastructure maintenance. Further activities included the promotion of land rights, as the land in resettlement sites was owned by the state, and working to obtain local authority technical approvals for the houses.

⁹ For further details on the psychosocial programme, please refer 'Final Project Report: Psychosocial Support Project', January 2008.

1.4 The Context of Relief and Recovery

Due to the influx of funding post-tsunami, the CRB programme was well-financed. However, the scale of the post-tsunami operation also presented many challenges. The large number of organisations operating made coordination very difficult, and the influx of funds resulted in rapid inflation, particularly in the construction industry, as well as a shortage of skilled labour.

In addition, the capacity of CRB's two main partner organisations – the GoSL and SLRCS – was stretched by the scale of the disaster and the recovery operation. This made working through them challenging at times.

In sum, the project was carried out in a context of generous funding, but great complexity.

1.5 The Structure of this Report

This report is divided into two main sections. Section 2 provides a non-analytical summary of the housing reconstruction and community work carried out by CRB, while Section 3 – 'lessons learnt' - analyses CRB's performance and gives recommendations for future similar projects.

Section 2 starts with the project objectives, and moves on to the context, in particular the relationship with the Government of Sri Lanka and the Red Cross Movement. The project implementation is then described, covering beneficiary selection, the housing reconstruction method and implementation, infrastructure construction, the community programme, and the handover process at project closure. Finally, the results for the construction and community programme are given, as well as the occupancy rates for the resettlement sites.

Section 3 starts with an overall assessment of CRB's performance in taking an integrated and sustainable approach. It moves on to discuss the cash-for-housing approach, and house design. Next is a detailed analysis of CRB's performance on resettlement sites, which is where the greatest challenges were faced. The evaluation then moves on to discuss beneficiary selection, and working with the Government of Sri Lanka and the Red Cross Movement. This is followed by an overall analysis of CRB's performance in beneficiary ownership and organisational accountability. The final section is an evaluation of CRB's performance in project management, followed by a summary of all recommendations.

Section 4 concludes.

2 Belgian Red Cross Reconstruction Project

2.1 Objectives

The primary objective of the CRB housing reconstruction project was to provide safe, secure, good quality housing for people whose houses had been destroyed or severely damaged in the tsunami. Within that scope, CRB aimed, as far as was possible, to help the most vulnerable members of society; one of the core objectives of the Red Cross Movement. How this was achieved is further discussed in section 2.3.2 - 'Beneficiary Selection'.

As well as physical reconstruction, CRB aimed to support the psychological recovery of tsunami victims. This was achieved through the psychosocial project, and also by adopting the cash for housing approach, which developed beneficiaries' belief in their ability to lead their own recovery, and encouraged them to focus on achievable goals while rebuilding their lives.

Beneficiaries were relocated to resettlement sites when their old home was in the 'buffer zone' – a coastal zone in which the GoSL did not permit reconstruction in order to protect the coastal environment.¹⁰ In the resettlement sites, the beneficiaries and CRB faced many more challenges than reconstruction on owner's original plots or private land. The challenges were both physical, such as lack of infrastructure, and social, such as loss of previous community bonds and livelihoods. Here, CRB aimed to build strong communities that are well integrated with the host community and able to act collectively to improve their quality of life. In addition, CRB aimed to provide high-quality infrastructure, such as roads and drains, and facilities such as drinking water where necessary, to ensure that the settlement as a whole provided a safe and well-functioning environment.

2.2 Context

CRB worked with the Government of Sri Lanka (GoSL) at both local and national level, and the Red Cross Movement (RCM). Close collaboration with these parties was essential for the success and sustainability of the project.

2.2.1 Working with the Government of Sri Lanka (GoSL)

2.2.1.1 Government approach and regulations

Top-up Grants

In the wake of the tsunami, the GoSL adopted a policy of awarding 'top-up grants' of US\$2,500 to enable families to re-build their homes. Many organisations collaborated with the GoSL in this approach, providing additional funds where there was a shortfall, and / or assisting with technical supervision. CRB did not take part in this scheme however, and decided instead to help tsunami victims that, as far as CRB was aware, were not receiving any other types of aid.¹¹ This approach was taken as this is where the need appeared to be greatest. CRB did cooperate with the GoSL in many other ways, as described below.

The Buffer Zone

Shortly after the tsunami occurred, the GoSL designated a no-build buffer zone that, in the south west of the country, stretched 100m inland from the sea. At the start of 2006, the GoSL decided

¹⁰ Centre for Policy Alternatives (November 2005) *Landlessness and Land Rights in Post-Tsunami Sri Lanka*

¹¹ Once they completed the construction of their house with CRB support, many beneficiaries applied and received a top-up grant from the government and used part of that grant to further improve their house (e.g. for tiling the floor).

to relax the buffer zone, with the new zone varying depending on coastal conditions. In Kalutara district the zone ranged between 35 and 60m from the sea. Although this decision was positive in many ways, it made the process of beneficiary assignment more complicated. People whose destroyed or damaged house was situated between the old and new buffer zone limits were entitled to choose between a new house built by a donor agency, or to rebuild their damaged house on their own land.¹²

2.2.1.2 Collaboration with the government

CRB's relationship with the GoSL was formalised through three Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) signed by the SLRCS and the Kalutara District Secretary, for the largest resettlement sites: Onchilyawatta, Payagalawatta and Kurudelgahawatta. However, CRB also worked closely with the local authorities during the construction of houses on owners' original plots or private land, and smaller resettlement sites for which there was no such MoU. Collaboration mainly occurred at District level (the District of Kalutara) and at the smaller level of Divisions. The main bodies CRB worked with are as follows:

- District Secretary Kalutara (Government Agent): contact for district-level issues, or in cases where lower-level government bodies were unable / unwilling to support the programme.
- Divisional Secretaries for the Divisions of Beruwela, Panadura, Kalutara, Bandaragama and Dodangoda: contact for division-level issues, such as beneficiary selection, resettlement sites, registering CBOs.
- 'Pradeshiya Sabha': Equivalent of a Municipal Council; functions at Division level; contact for approvals of plans and houses, and issues such as solid waste disposal and drainage.
- 'Grama Nilidari': Village Headman / woman: contact for village-level issues.

In addition, CRB consulted with government at national level in order to research land rights for beneficiaries living on state land, in particular the Land Commissioner General's Department.

CRB also worked with government utilities bodies to provide amenities in the resettlement sites, for example the National Water Supply and Drainage Board, the Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Unit and the Ceylon Electricity Board.

Resettlement Sites

Where CRB constructed resettlement sites for tsunami victims previously living inside the buffer zone, the land was provided by the GoSL. The Divisional Secretaries provided several options for relocation sites, which were assessed by CRB and the most suitable sites selected. The State maintained ownership of the site during construction. Ownership of the land should pass to the beneficiaries at a future time – this is discussed further in section 2.3.6.

Technical Supervision

CRB aimed to collaborate with the Technical Officers (TO) of the Divisional Secretary and the Pradeshiya Sabha in the technical supervision of the construction. Housing plans were approved by the TOs of the Divisional Secretary before construction began, and CRB also sought 'Certificate of Conformity' from the Pradeshiya Sabha post-construction – a document attesting that the house complies with local authority regulations.

Collaboration was sought with the local authorities in the construction of infrastructure in the resettlement sites. In particular, the guidance and supervision of the Divisional Secretary and the Pradeshiya Sabha were sought where it was necessary to link the site's internal storm water drainage system to a suitable outlet or existing drainage system outside the site. It was particularly important to coordinate with local authorities here, as CRB was carrying out

¹² Centre for Policy Alternatives (November 2005) *Landlessness and Land Rights in Post-Tsunami Sri Lanka*

construction work, and linking with existing infrastructure, in areas that were beyond their jurisdiction.

At the early stages of the reconstruction project, a Technical Officer from the Beruwela Divisional Secretariat worked very closely with CRB, producing drawings and supervising construction. CRB donated a computer to the Beruwela Divisional Secretariat in order to assist the Technical Officer in carrying out the tsunami recovery work. Later in the project the level of cooperation lessened, although close relationships were still maintained with the authorities in the Divisions where resettlement sites were constructed.

Coordination of Beneficiary Selection

In Sri Lanka, beneficiary selection was centralised through local government. Although this gave aid organizations less autonomy in beneficiary selection, and opened up the possibility of corruption through favours or bribes, the local authorities were far better placed to classify beneficiaries than any external organisation. Centralising beneficiary selection was also the only way to ensure that there were no overlaps, with beneficiaries receiving houses from more than one organisation. Further, giving government ownership of beneficiary selection gave the beneficiaries greater security from the risk of possible future challenges to their right of ownership. An explanation of CRB's approach to beneficiary selection is given in section 2.3.2.

2.2.2 Working with the Red Cross Movement

Red Cross Movement coordination in the tsunami response is carried out through the Movement Platform, a joint body of the National Society (SLRCS), the IFRC and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). Strategic policy decisions are made by this body, which gives guidance to the Partner National Societies (PNSs). Consultation is carried out with the PNSs in the Movement Task Force, which combines the Platform with the National Societies. The aim of the Task Force is to:

'ensure 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.'¹³

Technical Committees form a meeting place for the IFRC, SLRCS and PNSs. Their objective is to bring together programme managers and technical experts from specific areas to develop and promote appropriate solutions for movement-wide technical issues.

PNSs in Sri Lanka have no legal status, and therefore operate under the legal umbrella of the IFRC, with whom they sign an integration agreement. All Sri Lankan staff were officially employees of either the IFRC or SLRCS, and so human resources were managed in coordination with those bodies.

Cooperation with SLRCS in the construction project was less than for the psychosocial project, as construction is not one of SLRCS's 'core areas'. In addition, SLRCS Kalutara Branch did not show a high level of interest in participating in owner-driven reconstruction activities. Therefore, CRB's cooperation with SLRCS was less than would have been desired.

However, CRB did cooperate closely with SLRCS at the national level on the one contractor-built housing project; a resettlement site of 52 houses named Payagalawatta. Here SLRCS was responsible for creating an MoU with GoSL, selecting the Architect for all donor-driven housing schemes in the District of Kalutara, carrying out the tender process, and selecting the Contractor.

¹³ IFRC Mid-Term Review Report, 2006

CRB held an MoU with SLRCS detailing the two parties' respective roles and responsibilities, signed in 2005 and valid throughout the time they were operational in Sri Lanka.

2.3 Implementation

This section explains CRB's approach to the implementation of the project, starting with geographical focus, and moving on to beneficiary selection, housing construction, infrastructure construction in resettlement sites, the community programme in resettlement sites, and finally the handover process at project closure.

2.3.1 Geographical Focus

CRB was assigned the district of Kalutara in a planning operation carried out by the IFRC and SLRCS, designed to ensure an appropriate distribution of work between the PNSs working in Sri Lanka. In Kalutara District the coastal divisions were naturally the focus of CRB's work; that is Beruwela, Panadura and Kalutara. Nevertheless, some of the resettlement sites were situated in non-coastal divisions; Bandaragama and Dodangoda. Table 2.1 lists the houses constructed in each division.

Division	Houses Constructed
Beruwela	213, of which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 135 on owners' original plots / private land • 78 in resettlement sites
Bandaragama	105 houses in resettlement sites
Panadura	72 houses on owners' original plots / private land
Dodangoda	52 houses in resettlement sites
Kalutara	13 houses on owners' original plots / private land

Table 2.1: Houses constructed by Division

2.3.2 Beneficiary Selection

As explained in section 2.2.1.2, beneficiary selection was centralised through local government authorities. The Divisional Secretaries proposed beneficiaries to organisations, who could then make their own assessment and negotiate to produce a final beneficiary list that was satisfactory to both parties.

The GoSL approach to reconstruction was 'a house for a house'; anyone whose house had been destroyed or severely damaged was eligible for a new house, *regardless of ownership or wealth*. This policy had important consequences for CRB. Firstly it implied that people who had been illegal squatters were eligible for a new house. Secondly, it resulted in some wealthy beneficiaries being proposed by the local authorities; there were examples of landlords who had lost several houses, and were eligible to have several houses re-built, even if they were resident in an area not affected by the tsunami.

The 'house-for-a-house' policy presented two key challenges to CRB's objective to help the most vulnerable members of society. Firstly, many of the most vulnerable people affected by the tsunami were illegal squatter with no deed. A deed was the easiest way to ascertain that

applicants were eligible. In order to be able to help these vulnerable people, CRB proposed an alternative set of documents to the deed. These documents were required to prove: (1) that the house to be replaced had been destroyed or severely damaged by the tsunami; (2) that the person had occupied the house. More details are given in box 2.1.

Secondly, CRB did not wish to provide homes for people who clearly had sufficient resources to cope by themselves, as this would have run counter to the principal of helping the most vulnerable members of society. The beneficiary selection criteria were designed to prevent this from occurring. A summary of the most important points from the selection criteria can be found in box 2.1.

CRB Beneficiary Selection Criteria

- Only one house will be given to a single applicant.
- CRB reserves the right to reject an application if the applicant currently lives in another house that belongs to him / her. Therefore he / she must be:
 - living in a temporary shelter
 - living with a friend or relative since the tsunami
 - renting a house that is not his / her own.
- The house must be totally damaged and uninhabitable (to be verified by CRB).
- A new house will only be given for a damaged house, not commercial premises.
- The applicant or any member of his / her household should not have received any aid towards housing from any other organisation, apart from the top-up grant from the government.
- The application must be approved by the Grama Nilidari and the Divisional Secretary.
- The recipient must be willing to move out of their current residence.
- The recipient must have their own plot of land, or be donated a plot by the government, which is sufficiently large to comply with local authority regulations on plot size for house construction.
- If the candidate does not have a deed, he / she must present alternative documents to prove their permanent residency before the tsunami, and must have new land donated by the government or private land. Examples of alternative documents are: school reports, police report, voting registration, government tsunami-victim card, tax bills.

Box 2.1: Summary of Beneficiary Selection Criteria

In late 2007, CRB staff took the decision to include 'sub-families' in the category of eligible beneficiaries. These were cases in which two or more generations of family members were living together in one house, and there were at least six people in total in the household (as defined by the Kalutara District Secretary). The child / children of the owners and their spouse(s) could then be defined as a sub-family. This decision was taken as it was found that many tsunami victims still living in camps at this stage were sub-families.

When presented with a beneficiary list by the local authorities, CRB staff would carry out a full assessment of each beneficiary, including visiting their old home to assess the level of damage, interviewing the beneficiary, and collecting copies of all the required documentation to prove that they were eligible. Of the beneficiaries proposed by the government, five-hundred and forty-three - over half those proposed - were rejected, demonstrating that the assessment process was rigorous.¹⁴ An end-of-project review of beneficiary documentation in CRB's possession reveals that X% of beneficiaries have the correct documentation to meet the selection criteria. A summary of beneficiary documentation by community can be found in Appendix A.

2.3.3 Housing construction approach

Two main construction approaches were adopted by the RCM in Sri Lanka, labelled 'donor-driven' and 'owner-driven'. Under the donor-driven approach, the RCM organisation employed a contractor to construct the houses, and there was limited involvement on the part of the beneficiaries. Under the owner-driven approach, the beneficiaries were the main players in the house construction. One model of owner-driven housing construction used by the RCM in Sri Lanka was 'cash-for-housing', whereby beneficiaries are given cash grants in instalments, and manage the construction of their homes themselves with the technical supervision of the donor organisation. This was the model adopted by CRB.

In Sri Lanka, the reconstruction of permanent housing through the donor driven approach was inevitably delayed by the process of establishing procedures for carrying out the work in cooperation with the GoSL and through the SLRCS. While this process was on-going, CRB took the decision to start permanent reconstruction through the cash-for-housing approach in areas where beneficiaries could rebuild on their original plots (outside the buffer zone). Speed of reconstruction was one reason for adopting this approach, but there were other motivations. Firstly, the owner-driven approach made the beneficiaries active participants in their recovery, rather than passive recipients of donor aid. This gave them greater ownership of their home, and built their belief in their ability to be the central actors in their recuperation. Secondly, most of the beneficiaries had managed the construction of their own homes in the first place (a very common practice in Sri Lanka), and they knew the suppliers and skilled-labourers in the area. Thirdly, the approach supported the local economy, rather than the large, urban-based firms contractors would have been likely to use. Finally, there were no concerns about infrastructure when rebuilding on owners' original plots, as it was already present. CRB was the first PNS to begin reconstruction of permanent housing. The first cash grant was given on March 22nd 2005 in Beruwela Division, and the first houses were completed by June that year. By the one year anniversary of the tsunami, CRB had reconstructed 117 houses while the vast majority of other PNSs had not yet started the reconstruction of permanent housing. The cash-for-housing approach was not initially advocated by the RCM, but was later adopted by most PNSs and the IFRC, in part due to CRB projects demonstrating that it could be both quickly and successfully implemented.

The owner-driven approach presents many more challenges in the case of resettlement sites. The principal challenge is that infrastructure, such as roads and drains, needs to be constructed as well as the houses. The beneficiaries cannot be expected to do this work as they are fully occupied with their homes. The infrastructure must therefore be constructed under a donor-driven approach, which entails the difficult task of coordinating owner-driven homes and donor-driven infrastructure on one site. In addition, the beneficiaries do not know the area in which they are being relocated, and will not have friends and neighbours who they can rely on for help and temporary accommodation during the construction process.

¹⁴ Further information on selected and rejected beneficiaries can be found in the Beneficiary Documentation Database.

CRB, in line with guidance from the IFRC, therefore began construction of resettlement sites under the donor-driven approach in the community of Payagalawatta, Dodangoda Division. In the donor-driven approach, the SLRCS / IFRC Construction Cell selected a consultant to manage projects for the whole of Kalutara District, and then opened a tender through which a contractor was selected to implement the housing construction under the supervision of the consultant. It quickly became clear that this approach was not working well. The consultant was not carrying out their supervision duties, meaning that CRB staff also had to take on a supervisory role, resulting in conflicting instructions to the contractor. The contractor was performing poorly, with inferior quality construction and long delays in completion. This was due in part to the increase in demand for construction specialists post-tsunami, with insufficient firms to carry out the work. In addition, houses built under the donor-driven approach were more costly than those built under the owner-driven approach, meaning that fewer houses in total could be constructed. The CRB team took the decision that housing reconstruction on resettlement sites would also be carried out under the owner-driven approach, with the infrastructure constructed later. Finally, only the Payagalawatta site (52 houses) was constructed under the donor-driven approach. The Contractor took almost two years to complete these houses. Another site of 23 houses (Kurudelgahawatta) was started by a contractor, but they were asked to leave at an early stage and the project changed to owner-driven.¹⁵

2.3.4 Cash-for-Housing Implementation

The foundation of the Cash-for-Housing approach is a relationship of trust, respect and support between the beneficiaries and the implementing organisation. CRB developed this relationship by holding regular meetings with the beneficiaries, and by providing regular technical support on site. Beneficiaries whose new homes would be in close proximity were formed into working groups. A 'zero meeting' was then held with this group to explain how the programme would work, and the roles and responsibilities of each party, and to ensure that the people were committed to the programme. A further meeting was held when each of the seven cash grants was made. The payments were made in public, with a witness from the Divisional Secretariat. A technical presentation was made with drawings and photographs to explain what construction tasks needed to be carried out in the next stage, and beneficiaries were encouraged to raise questions and concerns. During implementation, CRB supervisors were on site every day, with visits from the Project Manager twice a week, and fortnightly visits from the Construction Delegate.

In addition, Field Officers from the psychosocial project, and later the community project, gave supplementary support where beneficiaries were struggling to complete their homes.

Variation in designs, and therefore beneficiary input into design, was restricted due to: the technical difficulties of supervising construction of several different designs; the difficulty of obtaining local authority approval for several designs; the necessity of ensuring that all houses had approximately the same cost. Generally, therefore, one base design was adopted for all houses. This design was made taking into consideration the original design of damaged homes in the area, as well as government regulations. Beneficiaries could make changes during the construction process, for example they could decide whether they wished to have an indoor kitchen as shown on the design, or save the funds to build their own outdoor kitchen later.¹⁶

¹⁵ For more discussion on cash-for-housing programmes, and a practical guide to their implementation, refer to the 'CRB Cash-for-Housing Guidelines', May 2009.

¹⁶ For a detailed explanation of the Cash-for-Housing approach, refer to the CRB 'Cash-for-Housing in Sri Lanka' report, 2007.

2.3.5 Infrastructure Construction in Resettlement Sites

The infrastructure in resettlement sites was constructed by contractors working under the supervision of CRB Site Engineers and Site Supervisors, with regular visits from the Construction Delegate. For all construction contracts, a tender notice was placed at the Divisional Secretariat and tenders were assessed on criteria of cost and quality. The tender evaluation process was duly documented and approved by the Country Coordinator. A contract was then drawn up, designed to ensure that CRB's liability was protected, that any cost or time variations in the works were under the control of CRB, and to ensure that the contractors had strong incentives to produce a high quality product.¹⁷

2.3.6 Community Programme

Throughout the project, CRB aimed to incorporate a social aspect to the reconstruction work in resettlement sites. In the majority of resettlement sites, the beneficiaries did not know each other before moving to the site, and were therefore missing the community ties that provide a safety net for low income earners, and a way to mobilise collective action. Further, moving away from their original location and community resulted in disruption of livelihoods for some beneficiaries.

Building Strong, Sustainable Communities

The Community Programme followed on from the Psychosocial Programme which ended in March 2008, and ran from September 2008 to May 2009. The aim of the programme was to strengthen communities and ensure their sustainability during the final phase of the project. A central objective was to support the communities to develop Community-Based Organisations (CBOs) in the largest resettlement sites. A CBO is a formal organization, registered with the local authorities, with a Chairperson, Secretary and Treasurer and various committee members from the community. CBOs enable community members to act collectively to resolve problems, approach the authorities, organise events, and support vulnerable community members. In Sri Lanka, if a CBO registers with the local authorities they can apply for funding to carry out works to improve the infrastructure in their community. The development of CBOs was seen as central to the communities' sustainability.

For the resettlement sites to be socially sustainable, it was important that a good relationship was developed with the host community. This presented many challenges, as often host community members were resentful towards the new community for multiple reasons, including an increased strain on resources, increased levels of solid waste and storm-water runoff, and jealousy that they were receiving a new, high quality home and land. The community team worked to encourage the integration of the new community with the host community in two main ways. Firstly, in the one community where there was significant conflict (Kurudalgahawatta), CRB developed a programme run by an external consultant to reduce tensions (refer section 2.4.2 for details). Secondly, in all the larger resettlement sites, CRB supported the beneficiaries with logistics and funding to organise community events to which the host community was invited.

The physical sustainability of the community depended on community members having the necessary knowledge to carry out maintenance, one of the most important aspects of which is garbage management. The community team organised a series of garbage management workshops in the larger sites, run by the local authority Public Health Inspector. The team also ran workshops in the larger sites on how to maintain the storm water drainage systems and septic tanks.

¹⁷ For a detailed guide on contract management, refer 'CRB Construction Contract Management', May 2009.

Finally, where the beneficiaries feel that they have ownership of infrastructure and facilities, and that they have been fully consulted, they are more likely to be satisfied with what has been provided, and to maintain it. The community team worked to consult beneficiaries on infrastructure and facilities provision, and involve them in the implementation, particularly where a drinking water system was provided.

Community Infrastructure

Community infrastructure, such as community centres, libraries, children's play parks and sports facilities were provided in some of the larger resettlement sites. These facilities provided gathering places and recreational activities for children and youths. The need for these facilities was assessed based on: (1) beneficiaries' requests in participatory meetings in each community; (2) mapping of the area to assess whether facilities were already available nearby. Where facilities were available nearby, new facilities were not constructed. Not only was there not a great need, but CRB wished to promote integration with the host community, which would be encouraged by new community members using host community facilities.¹⁸

Land Rights and Local Authority Technical Approvals

For those beneficiaries living on state land (i.e. resettlement sites), the status of their ownership of the land was unclear. By late 2008, four years after the tsunami, they still had no documents proving that they had a right to be occupying the land and the house that had been constructed for them. Nor did they know what kind of documentation they could expect to receive, or when they would receive it. This was a matter of concern for Red Cross housing beneficiaries across the Movement, yet it had not been addressed at Movement level. CRB took the initiative to meet local and national government figures to establish what documentation the beneficiaries should receive, and the process to obtain it. The community team successfully pressured the local authority to begin the process, and held land rights workshops with the presence of two land rights lawyers to pass all necessary information to the beneficiaries. The information was shared with the RCM at Technical Committee level, and other PNSs and the IFRC used CRB's input to support their own beneficiaries.¹⁹

In addition, the community team worked to obtain local authority technical approvals for the houses in the resettlement sites (Certificate of Conformity – CoC). CoC registers the house as officially a legal construction that complies with local authority regulations. Similarly to the work on land rights, CRB worked to find out the correct process to obtain CoC, and shared this information with the rest of the RCM. Although CoC does not officially confer any land rights, CRB believed that it would provide a degree more security of tenure, and would be a helpful document for the beneficiaries to hold in the future if they wished to extend the house or had problems with utilities.²⁰

Supporting the Construction Programme

Finally, the community team supported the construction programme in two main ways. Firstly, the team worked throughout the final stages of the project to resolve minor conflicts that arose due to some beneficiaries feeling that they were being disadvantaged in the construction programme, usually due to the positioning of roads, drains and retaining walls. Secondly, the community team supported the construction team with the most difficult houses under the cash-for-housing programme, where there were significant delays in the beneficiaries completing their houses. The community team field staff worked with the beneficiaries to help them to resolve their problems, and encourage them to complete.

¹⁸ For further details, please refer to the 'Community Infrastructure Needs Assessment' May 09.

¹⁹ For further details, please refer to the 'CRB Tsunami Housing Beneficiaries Land Rights Report', January 2009.

²⁰ For further details, please refer to the 'CRB Approach to Obtaining CoC', January 2009.

Principal Objectives of the Community Programme in New Settlements

- Develop the social fabric of new communities, including supporting the beneficiaries to create CBOs.
- Support the development of a positive relationship between the new community and the host community.
- Carry out training to build beneficiaries' ability to physically maintain the community, including garbage management and maintenance of drainage and septic tanks.
- Give beneficiaries ownership of infrastructure and facilities through consultation and direct involvement.
- Install community infrastructure such as play parks and sports facilities, whilst giving the beneficiaries ownership of all important decisions.
- Establish what type of land rights documentation the beneficiaries will receive, its conditions, and the process to obtain it. Pass all information to the beneficiaries and use influence with local authorities to accelerate the process.
- Obtain local authority technical approvals for the houses.
- Support the construction programme by resolving conflict and supporting beneficiaries who are struggling to complete their homes.

2.3.7 Handover and Closing-Out

In the final stages of the project, CRB implemented a programme of handing over infrastructure, facilities and documentation to the appropriate groups. This process contributed to long-term sustainability by: passing responsibility for operation and maintenance to bodies other than CRB; raising awareness of the existence and needs of the resettlement sites among local authorities; raising awareness of CRB's imminent departure for all groups.

Handover Ceremonies

Handover ceremonies were held in the five largest resettlement sites.²¹ Invitees included: local government representatives from the District Secretary, Divisional Secretary, Pradeshiya Sabha and Grama Nilidari levels, SLRCS and IFRC, representatives from government utilities boards, religious representatives for all denominations in the settlement, and host community representatives. CRB was responsible for the first tsunami housing settlement to be completed by the RCM in Sri Lanka (Three Lands in Beruwela, June 2006), and the Prime Minister attended the handover ceremony. The ceremonies were organised by SLRCS or CRB in coordination with the community.²² The ceremonies provided an opportunity for the new community to raise awareness of their existence and any support they may need in future from the various invitees, promoted pride and bonding amongst new community members, and integration with the host community, and gave a clear message to all attendees that CRB was leaving the country.

Handover of Maintenance of Facilities to CBOs

On completion of community facilities, CRB handed over responsibility for operation and maintenance to the resettlement site CBOs. This was of particular importance for the drinking water system in Onchilyawatta, where CRB ensured that the community was aware of their responsibilities, and facilitated the development of a relationship between the CBO and the government's Kalutara District Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Unit (RWS&SU), who could provide support in case of difficulties.

²¹ In the 'Three Lands' Development (Dawatagahawatta, Elabadoita, Ralageovita), handover ceremonies were held in 2006, as this is when the sites were completed.

²² SLRCS took responsibility for organising the ceremony where they had had a high level of involvement in the site; otherwise it was CRB.

In the case of the community centres and libraries, responsibility for operation and maintenance was also officially handed over to the CBOs on completion. For the libraries, CRB supported the community in setting up a library committee that would be responsible for the day-to-day running of the service.

Beneficiary Documentation

CRB left various documents with the beneficiaries, with the aim of ensuring that they had proof of their right to be occupying the house and the land, and of GoSL endorsement of the project. This was less of a concern where beneficiaries had rebuilt their homes on their original plots or private land, as they had the deed of the land. These beneficiaries were left with a copy of their house plan, approved by the local authorities.

In the case of resettlement sites, beneficiaries were left with:

- A copy of a letter from the Divisional Secretary with the names of all eligible beneficiaries for that site.
- A copy of the approved site survey plan and the approved as-built drawing²³ of the house.
- Certificate of Conformity from the Pradeshiya Sabha where they were obtained (the majority of sites).

CRB Close-Out Documentation

On close-out, CRB obtained letters from the Divisional Secretaries confirming that all houses, infrastructure, community infrastructure and facilities had been satisfactorily completed. CRB also obtained three 'Certificates of Completion' from the District Secretary for the largest sites (Onchilyawatta, Payagalawatta, Kurudelgahawatta), which served to close the Memoranda of Understanding signed for these sites between SLRCS and the GoSL.

2.4 Results

The results of the construction and community projects are described below.

2.4.1 Construction

Four-hundred and ninety-six good quality new homes were constructed.²⁴ All houses were constructed to local authority regulations, and have floor areas of 600 – 800 square feet (55 – 75 m²). Ten resettlement sites were created, ranging in size from five families to eighty-two.

In eight of the resettlement sites (all settlements larger than six families), paved roads and a concrete drainage system were provided. In the three largest sites (Onchilyawatta – 82 families, Payagalawatta – 52 families, Kurudelgahawatta – 23 families) landscaping was carried out consisting of retaining walls and the sloping and turfing of slopes where erosion would have created future problems. The settlement of Kuttimale (14 families) was constructed in an area prone to flooding.²⁵ Therefore earth-filling was carried out on the majority of the plots to raise their level.

²³ An 'As-built' drawing is a drawing completed post-construction, showing the building exactly as it is in reality. This is needed to obtain CoC.

²⁴ Although 455 houses were constructed, CRB has only 453 beneficiaries. This is because one house in Payagalawatta was donated as a library, and one is occupied by an encroacher. CRB has been requesting that the local authorities to evict the encroacher since April 2008. Although some progress has been made, he has not been evicted at the time of writing.

²⁵ As noted in section 3.3.1.2, relocation sites were provided by the GoSL, and CRB had little influence in their selection. It is true, however, that the houses in Kuttimale should have been constructed with a higher plinth to reduce the risk of flooding inside the houses.

Two of the resettlement sites did not have a piped water supply. In the case of Onchilyawatta (82 families), piped water is theoretically due to be provided in 2010, so an interim solution was provided. A deep borehole was dug on site, along with a pump and iron filtration system and a distribution system of pipes and tanks with 17 tap points. The IFRC provided significant support for this project; an IFRC Water-Sanitation Delegate designed the system and a member of senior National staff spent two days on site supervising the implementation.

In Kuttimale (14 families), there is no short-term prospect of piped water being provided. CRB provided a rain water harvesting system. Each family has two tanks connected to the gutters on their roof, with a total storage capacity of 6000 litres, and an internal connection from the tanks to their kitchen and bathroom taps.

Five community centres were constructed in total, one in Payagalawatta, one in Dawatagahawatta (part of the 'three lands' community with a total of 47 families), and three in communities in which CRB did not construct housing. The demand for these three community centres came from communities with which the Psychosocial programme worked in the early stages of the project. Their construction aided the rehabilitation of communities close to the coast after the disaster. Two libraries were constructed; one purpose-built in Elabadoita, and one converted from a house in Payagalawatta.

In some of the sites, work was also carried out in the surrounding host community. For example, in Onchilyawatta (82 families) and Kurudelgahawatta (23 families), drains were constructed outside the site to connect the internal drainage system with pre-existing drainage systems in the host community. This was not necessary in Payagalawatta (52 families) as the site was surrounded by paddy fields, so storm water was released into the paddy fields after going through a soakage system to reduce the quantity and improve the quality. In Kurudelgahawatta, work was also carried out on a host community road that had been damaged by heavy vehicles during construction.

The results are summarised in Table 3.1.

Settlement / Random Houses	Housing / Infrastructure / Facilities provided
Random Houses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 220 houses
Onchilyawatta (Bandaragama)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 82 houses • Tarred roads • Concrete drainage system, connecting with existing drainage systems outside the site • Landscaping – retaining walls • Drinking water from deep borehole, including submersible pump, iron filtration system and distribution network. 17 Tap points. • Two children's play parks
Payagalawatta (Dodangoda)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 52 houses (one of which was donated as a library / pre-school) • Community centre • Tarred roads • Concrete drainage system • Landscaping – retaining walls and cutting and turfing of slopes • Children's play park • Volley ball court • Streetlamps

Kurudelgahawatta (Bandaragama)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23 houses • Concrete roads • Concrete drainage system • Repairs to a concrete host community road damaged during construction. • Construction of a drain in the host community to connect up with the internal drainage system • Landscaping – retaining walls
Three Lands: Dawatagahawatta (20), Ralageovita (14), Elabadoita (13) (Beruwela)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 47 houses • Tarred roads • Concrete drainage system • Repairs to a concrete host community road damaged during construction. • Community centre and village leader office (Dawatagahawatta) • Library (Elabadoita) • Children's play park (Ralageovita) • Volleyball court (Ralageovita)
Kuttimale (Beruwela)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 houses • Tarred roads • Concrete drainage system • Rain water harvesting system with 6000l storage capacity tanks and internal connections • Earth filling in the majority plots to prevent flooding
Ganearaba ²⁶ (Beruwela)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 houses • Tarred roads
Malagahawatta (Beruwela)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 houses • Tarred roads • Concrete drainage system
Tupiyawatta ²⁷ (Beruwela)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 houses
Payagala North (Beruwela)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community centre
Moragalla (Beruwela)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community centre
Kaluwamodara (Beruwela)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community centre

Table 2.2: Housing, Infrastructure, Community Infrastructure and Facilities Provided

²⁶ A drainage system was not deemed to be necessary in Ganearaba because it is on level ground, and in an isolated area with few other houses around; there is no main drain to connect the drainage system to.

²⁷ Tarred roads were not seen as necessary in Tupiyawatta as it is a very small community, and the existing earthen roads are sufficient. Likewise drainage is not seen as necessary and, in any case, there is no main drain nearby to connect to.

2.4.2 Community

A brief description of the results of the work carried out under the community programme in the resettlement sites is given below, while full details are given in table 2.3. Please note that this does not include all details of earlier, community-oriented work carried out by the psychosocial team, details of which can be found in the psychosocial project final report.

CBOs were established, functioning well, and registered with the local government in Three Lands, Onchilyawatta, Payagalawatta and Kurudelgahawatta.

Garbage management workshops were carried out by the Public Health Inspector in Onchilyawatta, Payagalawatta, Kurudelgahawatta and Kuttimale. The community was taught how to separate bio-degradable from non-biodegradable waste, how to make compost, and how to make a home-garden. Maintenance of drain and septic tank workshops were carried out by CRB Field Staff in the same communities. Community members were taught how to clean and maintain the community drains, and the process they needed to go through to have their septic tanks emptied.

Land rights workshops were run in all resettlement sites. The workshops were organised in collaboration with the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions (COHRE) – an international Non-Governmental Organisation with an office in Sri Lanka that promotes land rights for the vulnerable. Two land rights lawyers participated in the meetings, to present technical legal information and answer questions. A leaflet was produced in Sinhala and English by CRB, with the help of COHRE and the Divisional Secretaries, to distribute at the meetings. It was officially approved by the Divisional Secretary of each relevant Division before distribution. In addition, regular meetings were held with the local authorities to ensure that they were processing the land rights documentation for beneficiaries on state land. All information and documentation, as well as an explanation of CRB's approach, was shared with the Red Cross Movement. A summary of the steps in the process to obtain the State Land Grant as well as the leaflet distributed in the workshops, can be found in Appendix B.

CoC was obtained for Kuttimale, Payagalawatta, Dawatagahawatta, Elabadoita, Ganearaba, and Tupiyawatta. In Kurudelgahawatta and Onchilyawatta, all the necessary documentation was handed over to the beneficiaries, the steps they needed to take to obtain the approval were explained to them in a meeting, and responsibility was handed over to them. All information and documentation, as well as an explanation of CRB's approach, was shared with the Red Cross Movement. A summary of the steps in the process can be found in Appendix C.

Children's play parks were installed in Onchilyawatta and Payagalawatta, with the full participation of the beneficiaries. The beneficiaries decided which items they wanted, and where the play parks would be situated in a community meeting. They provided the unskilled labour necessary for installation. A volleyball court was also installed in Payagalawatta, for which the same procedure was followed.

In Onchilyawatta, extensive consultation was carried out with the community as to which solution to adopt for temporary water provision. Each proposed solution was discussed in a community meeting. The community rejected both rain water harvesting and tube wells were before the final solution of a deep borehole and iron filtration was proposed and accepted. The community agreed to provide the unskilled labour for the works in return for CRB adopting their preferred solution. Both the decision-making and the provision of labour served to give the community ownership of the water infrastructure.

In Kurudelgahawatta, there was conflict both within the community and between the CRB beneficiaries and the new community. A conflict mediation consultant was employed, and a conflict resolution programme carried out with the consultant and CRB staff. Activities included

meetings with the CRB beneficiaries and the host community, a training programme on conflict resolution with the CRB beneficiaries, meetings with local authorities, and mobilisation of the Kurudelgahawatta CBO. The Consultant also held regular meetings with CRB staff to inform them of his findings and the actions they could take to improve the situation.²⁸ The end result was a significant reduction in conflict with the host community, and better relations within the community.

New Year ceremonies in which the host community participated were held, with financial and logistics support from CRB, in Onchilyawatta, Payagalawatta and Kurudelgahawatta. Final handover ceremonies, organised and funded by CRB, to which host community representatives were invited, were held in the above three communities and Kuttimale.

Several difficult houses were completed with support from the community team, and the construction programme ran more smoothly due to community team intervention when conflict arose.

Settlement	Community Activities Carried out
Onchilyawatta (82)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported the community in establishing a Community-Based Organisation (CBO), registered with the local authorities. • Organised a series of garbage management workshops run by the Division's Public Health Inspector. • Carried out a workshop on maintenance of community drainage and septic tanks. • Ran a workshop on CoC, and distributed the necessary documents to the beneficiaries. The final stages of obtaining the approval were left to them. • Ran a land rights workshop with the community, to inform them of: the type of documentation they will receive and its conditions; the procedure that must be gone through to obtain the documentation; the stage that their community is at in this procedure, and what they should do to follow it up. • Held regular meetings with the local authority to ensure that they were processing the community's land rights documentation. • Held regular meetings to ensure that the community was fully involved in the selection of a solution for temporary water provision. Coordinated with the beneficiaries to provide the unskilled labour to implement their chosen solution. • Installed two children's play parks for which the community selected the equipment and location, and provided the unskilled labour for installation. • Provided trees for the community to plant in communal areas. • Sponsored a Sri Lankan New Year ceremony (mid April) to which the host community was invited. • Coordinated with beneficiaries to organise a final handover ceremony in the community in mid May, to which host community representatives were invited.

²⁸ For details, please refer to the 'Community Status Report' Nov 08 / Jan 09 / Mar 09, and updated version May 09, and to the Conflict Mediator's monthly reports.

Payagalawatta (52)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported the community to establish a Community-Based Organisation. • Organised garbage management workshops run by the Division's Public Health Inspector. • Carried out a workshop on maintenance of community drainage and septic tanks. • Obtained CoC (as the houses in Payagalawatta were built by a contractor, CRB did the work to obtain CoC, rather than the beneficiaries). • Carried out a land rights workshop. • Held regular meetings with the local authority to ensure that they were processing the community's land rights documentation. • Installed a children's play park and volleyball court, for which the community selected the locations and equipment, and provided the unskilled labour. • Supported the community in setting up the library and pre-school. • Provided trees for the community to plant in communal areas. • Sponsored a Sri Lankan New Year ceremony (mid April) to which the host community was invited. • Coordinated with beneficiaries to organise a final handover ceremony in the community in mid May, to which host community representatives were invited.
Kurudalgahawatta (23)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organised a process of conflict resolution, necessary as there was conflict both within the community, and between the CRB beneficiaries and the host community. The result was that conflict was considerably reduced. • Supported the community to establish a Community-Based Organisation (CBO). • Organised garbage management workshops run by the Division's Public Health Inspector. • Carried out a workshop on maintenance of community drainage and septic tanks. • Carried out a CoC meeting. • Carried out a land rights workshop. • Held regular meetings with the local authority to ensure that they were processing the community's land rights documentation. • Sponsored a Sri Lankan New Year ceremony (mid April) to which the host community was invited. • Coordinated with beneficiaries to organise a final handover ceremony in the community in mid May, to which host community representatives were invited.
Kuttimale (14)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carried out a garbage management workshop. • Carried out a workshop on maintenance of community drainage and septic tanks.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carried out a CoC meeting, and supported the beneficiaries in obtaining CoC. Carried out a land rights workshop. Held regular meetings with the local authority to ensure that they were processing the community's land rights documentation. Coordinated with beneficiaries to organise a final handover ceremony in the community in mid May, to which host community representatives were invited.
Ganearaba, Malagahawatta, Tupiyawatta, and Three Lands: Dawatagahawatta (20), Ralageovita (14), Elabadoita (13)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carried out a land rights workshop. Held regular meetings with the local authority to ensure that they were processing the community's land rights documentation. <p>(Please note that a considerable amount of work was previously carried out in Three Lands by the psychosocial team, including establishing a CBO).</p>

Table 2.3: Activities carried out by the community team in each community

2.4.3 Occupancy Rates

Table 2.4 below gives the occupancy rates for each settlement in May 2009.²⁹ Homes in which the beneficiaries come at weekends only are counted as occupied, since they are taking possession of their home, but may not be able to live there due to work or other commitments. It is debatable whether homes that are rented out should be counted as occupied or unoccupied therefore figures for both cases are given where necessary.

Settlement	Occupancy rate not including renters	Comments
Onchilyawatta (82)	89%	1 house weekend visitors 9 houses closed
Payagalawatta (52)	74% without renters 86% with renters	2 houses weekend visitors 6 houses rented out 7 houses closed
Kurudelgahawatta (23)	96%	1 house closed – beneficiary lives and works abroad.
Three Lands (47) (Dawatagahawatta, Elabadoita, Ralageovita)	100%	
Kuttimale (14)	93% without renters 100% with renters	6 houses weekend visitors 1 house rented out
Ganearaba (6)	100%	
Tupiyawatta (5)	80%	1 house closed
Malgahawatta (5)	100%	

Table 2.4: Occupancy rates for resettlement sites in May 2009

²⁹ No occupancy survey was carried out for the random houses but, since they were built on the owner's original plots or private land, the occupancy rate is assumed to be high. Visits to random houses for other purposes support this hypothesis.

Almost every tsunami resettlement site constructed in Sri Lanka has unoccupied houses for several reasons. Firstly, one outcome of the GoSL house-for-a-house scheme is that some beneficiaries have other homes. Although CRB tried to discover and reject these cases, it would not always have been possible. Secondly, some beneficiaries have found work in other parts of Sri Lanka or other countries since the tsunami, and so are obliged to live elsewhere. Thirdly, several of the resettlement sites are quite far inland, so that beneficiaries who rely on the sea for their livelihood may not wish to live in the settlement even though they accepted a house there. This is particularly likely to be the case for Payagalawatta, which has the lowest occupancy rate and is the most isolated community. In addition, settlements which were built a long time after the tsunami tend to have lower occupancy rates as the beneficiaries in these settlements did not have such an urgent need for a new home, and may have found alternative accommodation before construction was complete.³⁰ In sum, it is natural that people need to move for employment or other reasons, therefore an occupancy rate below 100% is an anticipated outcome, and is not seen as a cause for concern.

³⁰ This hypothesis is supported by the fact that Three Lands, the first resettlement site constructed and the closest to the sea, has an occupancy rate of 100%.

3 Lessons Learnt from the Reconstruction Project

This section evaluates CRB's performance and makes recommendations for future projects. It is structured to address the more important themes first. Section 3.1 makes an overall assessment of CRB's performance in taking an integrated and sustainable approach. Section 3.2 discusses housing; the cash-for-housing approach and house design. Section 3.3 is a detailed analysis of CRB's performance on resettlement sites, which is where the greatest challenges were faced. Section 3.4 discusses beneficiary selection and working with partners, specifically the GOSL and Red Cross partners. Section 3.5 is an overall analysis of CRB's performance in beneficiary ownership and organisational accountability, while section 3.6 is an evaluation of CRB's performance in project management.

These sections are generally structured to give the context, followed by an analysis of CRB's performance, and then recommendations.

Section 3.7 brings together all recommendations.

3.1 Taking an Integrated and Sustainable Approach

Context

Before engaging in a detailed analysis of how CRB performed in specific project areas, it is valuable to consider the overall approach taken to project identification. A broad-ranging evaluation of the international response to the tsunami carried out by SIDA and the Evaluation Joint Steering Committee finds that 'the most successful interventions are those that have promoted integrated approaches, touching on a broad variety of sectors, and are linked to longer term development planning'.³¹

Performance

CRB made an early decision to define the project not only in terms of physical reconstruction, but also community development. This decision had a very positive impact on the sustainability of the project, and on final beneficiary satisfaction.³²

Nevertheless, it is worth considering how CRB could have aimed even further beyond the basic concept of physical reconstruction, to take a broader focus on 'reducing vulnerabilities and increasing capacities'.³³ For example, CRB could have considered how the project could more effectively support 'livelihoods' defined holistically, i.e. how it could increase the beneficiaries' human, natural, financial, social and physical capital.^{34 35} CRB would then perhaps have identified some of the opportunities discussed below in section 3.4, 'New

³¹ SIDA / Evaluation Joint Steering Committee (2009), *A Ripple in Development? A Long Term Perspective on the Response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami*, Draft Report Feb 2009, pp. 51

³² The SIDA / Evaluation Joint Steering Committee evaluation finds that 'There is a direct correlation between the successful rebuilding of communities and the adoption of an integrated approach to programming through the mobilisation of social capital, that is, where a housing project is complemented by a livelihoods or community support activity', SIDA / Evaluation Joint Steering Committee (2009), pp. 29

³³ IFRC Mid-Term Review, 2005, pp. 11

³⁴ DFID Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance Sheets: 1.1: Overview

³⁵ As an example, Oxfam Australia identified their tsunami recovery operation as 'addressing structural poverty in tsunami affected areas'. They constructed housing for structurally poor, but non-tsunami affected people, as well as those affected by the tsunami, and worked with both tsunami-affected and non-tsunami-affected communities in social mobilisation, gender, rights awareness, functional literacy, peace-building and livelihoods (Roubin, Danielle, Documentation and M& E Associate, Oxfam Australia, personal communication, June 2009). It would have been difficult for CRB to have implemented such a programme alone, as they did not have the in-house expertise or the mandate from the RCM. Nevertheless an overall analysis at identification stage of how the project could have been more holistic, and therefore more sustainable, would have been valuable.

Settlements', such as investing time and funds into creating a good relationship with the host community from an early stage, and running an income-generation support programme for resettled tsunami victims.

It would also have been beneficial for CRB to have given greater consideration to any potential harmful impacts the project could have had; for example creating tensions in communities that had previously been peaceful; over-extending existing resources in host communities; and environmental damage. This would have facilitated the development of a strategy to avoid any potential harm, or at least mitigate damage as far as possible. Such an approach would also have developed a stronger consciousness in the project team of the potential harmful effects of major reconstruction projects.

Recommendations

- At identification stage, aim to create a project that focuses on the broad objective of reducing vulnerabilities and increasing capacities amongst beneficiaries. The project should aim to build beneficiaries' human, natural, financial, social and physical capital.
- Carry out a rigorous assessment of whether any project activities may have a negative impact on the social and / or environmental status quo (the 'do-no-harm' principal). If yes, revise the planned method of implementation.

3.2 Housing

3.2.1 Cash-for-Housing

Context

Cash-for-housing was not broadly used by the RCM when CRB started its work in Sri Lanka, nor was it promoted. CRB successfully introduced the approach, firstly on owners' original plots or private land, and then in the more challenging and untested context of resettlement sites. The approach was later adopted across the RCM, and had a positive impact on CRB and other RCM reconstruction projects by empowering beneficiaries and giving them greater ownership of the reconstruction. Nevertheless, cash-for-housing presents challenges as well as advantages. These are summarised in the table below.

Cash-for-Housing: Advantages

Empowers beneficiaries

- Makes beneficiaries the central actors in their own recovery, rather than passive recipients of aid.
- Develops a sense of pride in their achievement.

Ownership and satisfaction

- Self-build creates ownership, and makes beneficiaries more likely to carry out maintenance.³⁶
- Beneficiaries have higher satisfaction levels with a house they have built themselves.

Develops skills

- Beneficiaries develop skills in construction, as well as managing time, logistics and money.
- Makes them more employable, and more able to carry out maintenance tasks on their homes.

Aids psychological recovery following disaster

- Encourages beneficiaries to focus achievable goals while rebuilding their lives, and builds self-esteem.

Good for the local economy

- Beneficiaries use local supplies and labour, as opposed to the large-scale suppliers often used by Contractors.

Less expensive

- Costs are reduced because beneficiaries manage the construction, rather than a Contractor.
- Beneficiaries are able to identify cheap local suppliers – transport costs are reduced.

Better quality homes

- Making the future residents responsible for construction is the best way to ensure quality.

Faster construction

- Beneficiaries have stronger incentives than Contractors to complete their homes rapidly.

Develops Social Bonds in Resettlement Sites

- Beneficiaries work together in groups, creating a sense of community before they occupy their homes.

³⁶ The broad-ranging evaluation carried out by SIDA and the Evaluation Joint Steering Committee finds that 'Overwhelmingly positive responses on information and consultation come from communities where owner-driven as opposed to donor-driven reconstruction was implemented'. SIDA / Evaluation Joint Steering Committee (2009), *A Ripple in Development? A Long Term Perspective on the Response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami*, pp. 34

Cash-for-Housing: Challenges

Technical supervision

- Rigorous technical supervision is necessary as few beneficiaries are technically qualified to build their own homes.

Risk of unfinished houses

- Some beneficiaries may not have sufficient capacity to construct their homes even with high levels of supervision.
- Beneficiaries may be inclined to save cash rather than carry out tasks that are important for durability or sanitation, but are not perceived as essential (e.g. grey water disposal, paint and varnish). Payment stages must be closely linked to completion of previous stage to avoid this.
- Rate of construction is much slower when houses constructed a long time after the disaster, as the need is not so great. This can cause difficulties with completion.

Changing costs

- Difficult to accurately predict payments at the start of construction as large cash flows after a disaster cause inflation. Changing payments during construction is difficult, but may be necessary.

Risk of misunderstandings over payments

- Total transparency regarding payments is necessary – how much, why, full explanation for any changes. Otherwise can result in misunderstandings and conflict.
- Payments must be made in public, with witnesses, preferably from local authorities.

Design Constraints

- Difficult to introduce new and innovative designs as beneficiaries and local masons will not know the construction method.

Table 3.1: Advantages and Challenges of Cash-for-Housing

Performance

CRB's performance in implementing cash-for-housing was very good; an opinion supported by the results of an independent Evaluation carried out by the District Secretariat in May 2009.³⁷ The technical quality of the houses is high, as is the level of satisfaction of the beneficiaries.

A very small proportion of houses remain unfinished according to the original housing Bill of Quantities, although the pending items are not structural. They include: making an electricity connection, fixing inside doors, applying a second coat of paint and / or varnish, rendering the bathroom, building a grey water soakage pit. Houses have remained unfinished where payments were not strictly linked to the completion of the previous stage.³⁸

A very small proportion of the beneficiaries (less than 1%) did not have the capacity to manage the construction of their homes, even with close supervision. In these cases, CRB took over the management with their consent, by handling the money and making purchases and payments in

³⁷ QAM Evaluation of Belgian Red Cross (French) Housing Reconstruction Projects in Kalutara District, Kalutara District Secretariat, May 2009

³⁸ It should also be noted that the final (8th) payment was intended to be for 'optional items', including many of those mentioned here. They payment was intended principally as a motive to finish the other, more important, tasks.

their presence. This was time-consuming, but the end result was the successful completion of the houses.

Misunderstandings over payments occurred in one settlement only – Kurudelgahawatta – which was particularly complex as, as explained in Section 2.3.3, a Contractor began the work, but the site was later switched to cash-for-housing. The houses were at different stages when the Contractor left, so the beneficiaries received different payments. In addition, there were three sizes of houses in Kurudelgahawatta, for three family sizes. A concerted effort was made by the staff to explain the logic behind the payments, but more could have been done.

Recommendations

- Use cash-for-housing wherever possible, but with an awareness of the challenges to be faced.
- Provide beneficiaries with close technical support from well-qualified staff.
- Strictly link payments to completion of the previous stage.
- Maintain complete transparency regarding payments and give a full explanation for any changes.
- Provide the same amount of cash for all members of a single group; do not include different house sizes in the same group.
- Develop an alternative strategy for cases where beneficiaries are unable to manage the construction of their homes, but use it only when the standard approach is clearly impossible.

3.2.2 House Design

Context

The design of the CRB houses was conventional; it was based on an assessment of the houses damaged in the tsunami, and was designed by a local Architect. Little effort was made to adopt latest best practice, including environmentally-friendly design features. This is commented upon in the IFRC mid-term Evaluation of the CRB project.³⁹

There are several reasons why CRB chose to adopt a conventional design. Firstly, when using the cash-for-housing approach it is important to adopt a design that the beneficiaries and local masons and craftsmen understand, and for which it is easy to source materials. Secondly, conventional houses are more easily accepted by the beneficiaries, and more easily maintained. Thirdly, it would have been more difficult to gain local authority approval for unconventional designs.

Performance

Nevertheless, CRB could have made a greater effort to incorporate innovative design features, particularly environmentally-friendly features. Other PNSs demonstrated that this could be done; for example the Finnish Red Cross adopted solar panels for power, while the Rode Kruis Vlaanderen contracted the American Red Cross to construct wetlands for grey water purification. Materials and specialist labour for these works could have been sourced independently by CRB, while the house itself was constructed through cash-for-housing.⁴⁰

³⁹ IFRC Mid-Term Review Report, 2006

⁴⁰ Introducing environmentally-friendly technologies would have been likely to increase the cost of each house, and somewhat reduce the number of houses that could be built. Careful consideration is therefore needed as to whether adopting such technologies is justified. A small increase in the cost of housing can be justified in some cases by the argument that aid organisations have an important role to play in promoting the use and acceptance of these technologies, and in creating markets for products such as solar panels. This is particularly the case in the tsunami-affected countries, in which there was more than sufficient funding to provide new homes for those whose homes had been destroyed (although this was probably not understood at the start of the operation). In the case of CRB, there is little evidence that consideration was given to the possibility of adopting environmentally-friendly technologies.

One further comment made in the IFRC Evaluation is that outdoor kitchens were not incorporated in the design, although many beneficiaries would have preferred this option.⁴¹ CRB did not give beneficiaries the choice of an outdoor kitchen due to the significant difference in cost it would have entailed from those who had internal kitchens, and the increased difficulty in gaining local authority approval with two buildings on the land. Beneficiaries were given the option of not building the internal kitchen features, such as the chimney and work surfaces, and using the money saved to build their own external kitchen. Many have done so.

The majority of the houses implemented by BRC were designed with sufficient capacity in the foundations and columns to withstand the construction of a second storey. This design feature is very valuable to the beneficiaries, as it allows them to accommodate future expanding families and resources without having to purchase new land. This design was not adopted in just three sites, which were originally planned for donor-driven construction, and therefore designed by a consultancy; Onchilyawatta, Payagalawatta and Kurudelgahawatta. It is commendable that CRB adopted a design with the option of future expansion for most houses, although it would have been preferable to insist on this feature for the planned donor-driven sites as well.

Finally, CRB could have given greater consideration to varying house size according to beneficiary family size. This was done in just two settlements; Payagalawatta and Kurudelgahawatta, which were designed by a consultant. Adopting such a strategy would have been challenging for various reasons. Firstly, as discussed in Section 3.4.1 below, for the resettlement sites a final beneficiary list was not generally available at the time that construction began. Therefore all family sizes were not known. Secondly, beneficiaries would inevitably have tried to find ways to increase their apparent family size when they learnt of the policy, and verifying the correct family size would have entailed extra work on the part of CRB field staff. Thirdly, any variation in the house awarded would have caused resentment and jealousy between beneficiaries, even if it was done for a valid reason.

Nevertheless, CRB could have made an effort to implement this policy where possible, for example for houses built on the owner's original plot or private land, and in sites where the majority of beneficiaries were known before construction commenced. The strategy would need to be implemented in a certain way in order to function successfully. Firstly, the variation in house should be minor; for example one extra bedroom for families with more than five members. Secondly, there should be a cut off date for establishing beneficiary family size; children born after this date would not be counted (this would prevent late changes in planning, and the possibility of families having more children to obtain a larger house). Most importantly, the policy should be clearly explained to the beneficiaries before construction begins, and their grievances heard and responded to. With these conditions, adjusting house size for family size could have had a positive impact on the appropriateness of the CRB houses, and therefore the sustainability of the project.

Recommendations

- Investigate the feasibility of adopting innovative design features, particularly environmentally-friendly features, even if this means that some construction tasks must be implemented outside the cash-for-housing framework, and that the cost of each house is slightly increased.
- Adopt a design that allows for future expansion of the house.
- Adjust the size of the house according to the size of the beneficiary family where final beneficiary lists are available before construction begins. Clearly explain the policy to beneficiaries at an early stage, and respond to any grievances.

⁴¹ IFRC Mid-Term Review Report, Project Specific Section: CRB, 2006, pp. 8

3.3 Resettlement Sites

Resettling people is extremely socially disruptive, and should only be done when there are no alternatives. In the case of the tsunami, government regulations made resettlement necessary. The enormous challenges of successfully resettling people were not fully recognised in the early stages of the CRB project. This section discusses how the process could have been improved. It starts by discussing site selection, goes on to address the social development of new communities and integration with the host community, and moves on to issues of livelihoods and land rights.

3.3.1 Site Selection

Context

As previously stated, resettlement sites were proposed by the Divisional Secretary. Although many sites were proposed, the vast majority had to be rejected due to factors such as isolation from the nearest urban centre, lack of access roads, unsuitable soil conditions, etc.⁴² CRB staff made an evaluation and selected the sites they believed were most appropriate. The options were limited both by the small number of suitable sites proposed by the Divisional Secretary and time pressure to begin construction.

Performance

Project documentation reveals that CRB carried out an initial physical assessment of all sites, and a thorough assessment, including physical and socio-economic factors, of the Payagalawatta site.⁴³ Overall, however, CRB's analysis of most of the sites proposed was not sufficiently rigorous. The project would have benefited from a detailed analysis of each site, encompassing social and physical features. Examples of what the study could cover are as follows:

Social

- Likelihood of host community acceptance of new residents. This would cover aspects such as:
 - potential ethnic or religious clashes;⁴⁴
 - extent to which the new community would over-extend host community resources and facilities.
- Employment opportunities in the new site; particularly whether beneficiaries will be able to continue their previous income generating activities.
- Proximity of schools, clinics / hospitals, transport hubs, etc.

Physical

- Outlet for resettlement site storm water drainage – can it be connected to the host community drainage system? Will this put a strain on the system, or necessitate the construction of new drains in areas that will be unacceptable to the host community?
- How to connect up with host community roads. Will the additional traffic cause disruption to the host community?
- Is the area prone to flooding or landslides?
- Will the new community be able to connect to a nearby drinking water supply?
- Will the new community be able to connect to the electricity national grid?

⁴² An 'Assessment of Lands' carried out in August 2006 lists 31 sites assessed by CRB, of which 13 had to be rejected outright.

⁴³ Initial physical assessment refers to the 'Assessment of Lands', August 2006. It is possible that more in-depth assessments of other sites were carried out, but these were not available in the project documentation.

⁴⁴ A finding of the Evaluation carried out by SIDA and the Evaluation Joint Steering Committee is that 'Conflict sensitivity analysis should be part of all international organisation and NGO programming, based on explicit analysis or mapping of the immediate conflict environment', (SIDA / Evaluation Joint Steering Committee (2009), *A Ripple in Development? A Long Term Perspective on the Response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami*, Draft Report Feb 2009, pp. 53)

Had this exercise been done for all sites, it is likely that some of the proposed sites would have been rejected. For example, in Kurudelgahawatta, there is conflict between the host community and the new community, due in part to ethnic differences.⁴⁵ Although the situation is now improved, this is likely to be a long-term source of tension for the residents, and jeopardises the sustainability of the project. The community of Kuttimale is an example of physical factors jeopardising sustainability; it is situated in an area that floods regularly, and the earth is waterlogged throughout the monsoon season.

Recommendations

- Only carry out resettlement where there is no alternative.
- If resettlement is necessary, carry out a detailed analysis of each proposed site, considering socio-economic and physical features.
- Take a decision as to whether the site is appropriate based on the results of the analysis, considering the long-term sustainability of the site, and the wellbeing of the residents.

3.3.2 Social Development of New Communities

Context

Beneficiaries in the resettlement sites were not usually known to each other before the CRB project. The sites therefore brought together people who had no social ties, and often very different backgrounds.

Amongst low income earners in Sri Lanka, as in most developing countries, communities play a vital role in wellbeing. Communities support households in myriad ways, including: providing a safety net for families that fall into difficulties, or are short of funds for family events such as weddings and funerals; creating opportunities for collective action to improve wellbeing through community projects and engagement with local authorities; organising cultural and religious events; communal childcare for working mothers; sharing information on employment opportunities. Losing contact with their old communities was very disruptive for the CRB beneficiaries, and forming social bonds with the new community was a big step in restarting their lives after the tsunami. Aside from the factors mentioned above, the construction process would be made far easier if beneficiaries could work together, for example by communally sourcing materials and labour, and contributing to community infrastructure.

For all these reasons, the social development of the new communities was central to the success of the CRB project.

Performance

CRB incorporated community programmes alongside the construction work for almost the entire project duration, which indisputably had a positive impact on project outcomes. Community work was implemented through the psychosocial project from March 2005 – March 2008, and through the community programme from September 2008 – May 2009. As described in Section 2.4.2, these programmes supported the communities in the larger settlements to establish CBOs, which formed the basis of collective action. Additional work was carried out to create opportunities for the beneficiaries to bond, for example organisation of community events, and the construction of community infrastructure. In addition, the beneficiaries were encouraged to form working groups during house construction.

However, there are areas in which CRB's work could have been improved. In particular, it would have been beneficial to have formed stronger links between the psychosocial team and the

⁴⁵ For a more detailed explanation of the problems in Kurudegahawatta, refer to 'Community Status Report', Nov 08/Jan 09/ Mar 09, and the updated version May 2009, and the Conflict Mediator's monthly reports.

construction team. The psychosocial project was initially entirely separate from the construction project; they worked with communities affected by the tsunami, but not necessarily CRB housing beneficiaries. The two teams never fully integrated. Had the two teams worked more closely, they could have developed a more comprehensive programme of community development in the resettlement sites. In addition, integration between the two teams would have facilitated the development of a more holistic programme overall; the psychosocial team staff could have advised the construction team of the social impacts of their work, and suggested changes in approach where necessary, and the construction team could have asked for support from the psychosocial team in conflict resolution.

It would have been beneficial to have started work with the resettled beneficiaries at an earlier stage in the construction process. This particularly applies to Onchilyawatta and Kurudelgahawatta, where a full programme only began when construction was almost complete. This was largely due to the lack of integration between the psychosocial and construction teams.

Recommendations

- Run a community programme alongside the construction programme throughout the project. The community programme should address issues such as: developing the social fabric of new communities; creating links with the host community; conflict resolution; training to impart the skills and knowledge necessary to make the community sustainable; creating links between communities and local authorities.
- Ensure a high level of integration between the two teams, with a platform for communication and sharing of ideas, leading to a jointly developed approach.
- In the case of resettlement sites, start working with the communities at the earliest possible stage. This will make the transition easier for the beneficiaries, and aid the successful implementation of the construction programme.

3.3.3 Integration with the Host Community

Context

Host community members are often resentful of settlers due to the disruption they cause and the strain they put on their resources. New settlements can also generate jealousy, as poor host community members see it as unjustified that disaster victims receive aid while they do not.⁴⁶ A good relationship between the host community and the new community makes a vital contribution to the social sustainability of resettlement sites, by reducing socially disruptive conflict and creating linkages that help the beneficiaries establish themselves in the new area.

Performance

In the CRB sites, little consultation was carried out with the host communities before construction began. As previously explained, the GoSL was responsible for providing the sites, for informing the host community of the development, and theoretically for providing infrastructure and amenities. The GoSL was therefore partly responsible for host-community consultation, but given their limited capacity, CRB should have devoted more resources to this process. Greater consultation with the host community before construction began would have made the process more inclusive, and reduced resentment on the part of host-community members. Consultation with government authorities and host community should have included discussion on future plans for diversion of storm water from the resettlement sites through the host community, as this later became a source of conflict in all the larger sites.

⁴⁶ The broad-ranging Evaluation carried out by SIDA and the Evaluation Joint Steering Committee finds that 'the distribution of aid has been by far the single most important source of conflict within the communities', (SIDA / Evaluation Joint Steering Committee (2009), *A Ripple in Development? A Long Term Perspective on the Response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami*, Draft Report Feb 2009, pp. 33)

Given the importance of a good relationship with the host community, the project would have benefited from designated funding for the development of host community infrastructure and facilities.⁴⁷ CRB initially designated all funds purely for tsunami victims, yet carrying out activities which helped to develop a good relationship with the host community would have been of great benefit to the tsunami victims, even if indirectly. Host community resentment of new settlements is entirely natural, but funding for projects that bring them direct benefits would change their perspective.⁴⁸ It would become easier for the beneficiaries to form a good relationship with the host community, which would have a significant positive impact on their welfare.

Although CRB did not initially assign funds for host community infrastructure, significant funding was eventually spent building roads and drains for the host communities in Kurudelgahawatta and Onchilyawatta, as a way to reduce conflict. It would have been better to have assigned these funds from the beginning of the project, and entered into a dialog with the host community regarding how they wished the funds to be spent.

CRB's programme to promote integration with the host community mainly consisted of soft activities, such as inviting host community members to community events. However, if host community members do not see concrete benefits from the programme, or see only disadvantages, they may not engage with these soft activities, and are unlikely to be appeased by them.

Recommendations

- Carry out consultation with the host community before construction begins. Ask them what they would like to see from the project, and clearly explain how the new settlement will affect them, including matters such as storm water runoff and transport links.
- Designate a proportion (approximately 20%) of project funding for host community projects.

3.3.4 Livelihoods

Definition

In this report, the definition of livelihoods is broad, in line with the UK Department for International Development (DFID) Sustainable Livelihoods Framework. The framework defines a livelihood as comprising 'the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living'.⁴⁹ Livelihood assets are defined as five types of capital: human, natural, financial, social and physical. As such, a housing programme is in fact a livelihoods programme, as it provides physical capital, and access to financial capital through credit. The psychosocial and community programmes are also livelihoods programmes as they increase social and human capital. Using this definition, a livelihoods programme is not distinct from a construction or community programme, as pointed out in the IFRC Mid-Term Review.⁵⁰

However, several Red Cross bodies, including the IFRC, ran separate livelihoods programmes as part of the tsunami recovery operation. The programmes were designed to provide beneficiaries with access to incomes through providing training and grants to start small businesses.

⁴⁷ Funding could be in the region of 20% of total project funds. This would allow significant works to be carried out but would still leave the majority of funding for the victims themselves.

⁴⁸ For example, Oxfam Australia identified their tsunami recovery operation as 'addressing structural poverty in tsunami affected areas'. They constructed housing for structurally poor, but non-tsunami affected people, as well as those affected by the tsunami. (Roubin, Danielle, Documentation and M& E Associate, Oxfam Australia, personal communication, June 2009).

⁴⁹ DFID Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance Sheets: 1.1: Overview

⁵⁰ IFRC Mid-Term Review Report, 2006, pp. 11

Performance

CRB did not run a separate livelihoods programme as defined in the previous paragraph, as there were neither the resources nor the expertise to run such a programme within the organisation. A wide-ranging report on the post-tsunami recovery operation finds that many of the livelihoods programmes carried out in Sri Lanka had little positive impact, or sometimes even a negative impact, as they were short-term, poorly planned, and involved little market analysis.⁵¹ Given this outcome, CRB were wise to decide not to implement this type of programme with their limited resources. Further, as explained above, CRB's other programmes made a significant contribution to providing beneficiaries with sustainable livelihoods.

The land rights programme was particularly important in the context of livelihoods. When beneficiaries have documents proving their ownership of the land, they will have access to credit from commercial banks, which will significantly increase their income-earning capacity. CRB worked to accelerate the issue of these documents, and to inform beneficiaries of how they could use them to access credit in the future.

However, for the resettlement sites, more in-depth consideration could have been given to how the project could support beneficiaries' livelihoods. Considering livelihoods purely from an income generation point of view, this would have included analysis of whether beneficiaries would be able to maintain their income sources in the new site or, if not, what alternatives were available. It would have been beneficial to: (1) carry out research on beneficiaries' sources of income at an early stage; (2) based on the results of the survey, design a programme to carry out capacity building and make links with local organisations and NGOs that could help the beneficiaries continue with previous income-generating activities, or identify new opportunities.⁵²⁵³

Recommendations

- Treat livelihoods as holistic, encompassing human, natural, financial, social and physical capital.
- Without necessarily providing grants, develop a programme to support beneficiaries in finding opportunities for income generation in the new community, based on a study of their previous income sources.

3.3.5 Land Rights

Context

More than four years after the tsunami, housing beneficiaries living on state land still have no documents proving their ownership of the property. As discussed previously, such documentation is extremely important for beneficiaries' security, and so they can gain access to benefits such as commercial credit. The GoSL took a long time to establish a land rights policy for resettled tsunami victims, which made it difficult for organisations to engage with land rights issues. In addition, as discussed in section 2.3.6, PNSs could have expected that such an important and cross-cutting issue would have been dealt with at Red Cross Movement level.

⁵¹ SIDA / Evaluation Joint Steering Committee (2009), *A Ripple in Development? A Long Term Perspective on the Response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami: Joint Follow-Up Evaluation to the Tsunami Evaluation Coalition Report on the Linkage of Relief, Rehabilitation and Development in Response to the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami (TEC LRRD 2)*, Draft Report Feb 2009, pp. 50; Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency and Evaluation Joint Steering Committee

⁵² This type of survey was carried out for Payagalawatta in early 2006.

⁵³ It should be noted that CRB carried out a livelihoods survey in January 2009, for which beneficiaries were asked to provide information about their income sources before and after the tsunami. The results suggest that the beneficiaries were not worse-off after the tsunami.

Performance

CRB appears to have been the first RCM organisation in Sri Lanka to investigate land rights issues. As discussed in section 2.3.6, the results of CRB's investigation were shared with the rest of the RCM, and other PNSs and the IFRC used the information to support their own beneficiaries. CRB therefore made an important contribution to addressing the issue of land rights across the RCM in Sri Lanka.

Nevertheless, CRB did not begin to work on this issue until late 2008. Land-rights is always a significant issue in resettlement sites, and CRB's failure to address it at an earlier stage was again due to a lack of understanding of the complexity of resettlement projects.⁵⁴ CRB could have performed better by gaining an understanding of land rights law for people living on state land at an earlier stage, and sharing this information with the beneficiaries and the RCM. CRB could also have collaborated with other RCM organisations to encourage the GoSL to develop a policy at an earlier stage.

Recommendations

- Where beneficiaries' land rights situation is not clear, work with the government and NGOs with legal expertise to establish: what documents they will receive; the conditions set by those documents; the process to receive it. Begin this process at the earliest stage possible.
- Share all information with the beneficiaries.

3.4 Beneficiary Selection and Working with Partners

3.4.1 Beneficiary Selection

Context

As stated in Section 2.2.1.2, beneficiary selection in Sri Lanka was carried out through the Divisional Secretaries. Each organisation was then free to implement its own policy of verification of beneficiaries.

Performance

CRB's beneficiary selection process was rigorous, as demonstrated by the fact that over half the beneficiaries proposed by the GoSL were rejected. The high occupancy rates in the new settlements, which are above the average for RCM settlements,⁵⁵ demonstrate that CRB was successful in selecting beneficiaries who were genuinely in need of a new home.

CRB targeted the most vulnerable tsunami victims by including squatters as potential beneficiaries if they were able to provide alternative documentation. However, a small proportion of CRB's beneficiaries are too wealthy to be classified as vulnerable. It was difficult to avoid this due to the GoSL's policy of a house for a house; it is likely that some beneficiaries with other

⁵⁴ The failure of development organisations to address land rights issues at an early stage is criticised in all three broad-ranging evaluations consulted by the author:

The TEC Evaluation finds that 'Land –rights issues sometimes seemed to come as a surprise for some agencies, despite this being a key issue all post-disaster housing reconstruction'. Cosgrave, J (2007) *Synthesis Report: Expanded Summary. Joint evaluation of the international response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami*. London: Tsunami Evaluation Coalition (no page numbers).

The SIDA / Joint Evaluation Steering Committee Report finds that 'A major problem for many beneficiaries in Sri Lanka is that a great majority have not received land tenure for their relocation plots, leaving them vulnerable to future predatory practices'. SIDA / Evaluation Joint Steering Committee (2009), *A Ripple in Development? A Long Term Perspective on the Response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami*, pp. 34

The IFRC Review recommends that 'The project should help to make sure that formal titles of ownership and possession are in place before formal exit'. IFRC Mid-Term Review Report, 2006, pp. 21

⁵⁵ Personal communication with IFRC Head of Delegation (Paul Emes), May 2009

properties were selected despite CRB's careful screening. Beyond the policy of rejecting beneficiaries with another property, carrying out an accurate means test of potential beneficiaries would have been beyond CRB's scope. Many of the wealthier proposed beneficiaries were rejected however, on the grounds that CRB would not accept candidates currently living in another home that belonged to them.

One potential criticism of CRB's policy is that a final, fixed beneficiary list was not available for many of the new settlements until after construction began.⁵⁶ This made it difficult to carry out community-building activities before construction started, and changes to the beneficiary list led to disruption and a sense of insecurity for the remaining households. However, this was outside CRB's control to a large degree, as the local authorities were responsible for final beneficiary lists. Further, due to the abundance of post-tsunami funding, those organisations that did wait for a final, fixed beneficiary list before starting construction sometimes found that they had difficulty in finding beneficiaries that met their criteria.

Recommendations

- Clearly define beneficiary selection criteria from the start, and ensure that any changes are formalised and broadly communicated.
- Whenever possible, establish a clearly defined beneficiary list for new settlements before beginning construction.
- Ensure that beneficiary selection criteria are designed to select the most vulnerable.
- Carry out a rigorous assessment of all proposed beneficiaries, including an interview and discussions with neighbouring families to ensure that the candidate is legitimate.

3.4.2 Working with the Government of Sri Lanka

Context

Working closely with the GoSL was essential, for reasons described in Section 2 of this report. The government provided the beneficiary lists, the resettlement sites, approvals and authorisations, and were significantly involved in the provision of infrastructure and amenities in some locations. Close cooperation with the GoSL was also necessary to ensure that CRB was abiding by Sri Lankan law concerning the construction of houses, roads, and drains. In addition to these practical concerns, involvement with the GoSL was vital for the project's legitimacy and long-term sustainability.

Decision-making in Sri Lanka remains centralised, despite the apparently devolved structure, and many operations involve lengthy procedures with documentation passing through several levels of government (refer process to obtain State Land Grants, Appendix B). Further, procedures are often not transparent or formalised, and tend to vary between districts. In addition, as in the majority of developing countries, low wages and organisational culture make bribery and corruption common. This results in delays in some quarters for people or organisations that are not willing or able to bribe.

Performance

CRB made a concerted effort to develop a close relationship with local government from the start of the project, and succeeded very well in the early stages.⁵⁷ This effort is to be commended, and the positive effect of the relationship on the project in terms of legitimacy and resolution of problems is notable.

⁵⁶ IFRC Mid-Term Review Report, 2006, pp. 19. However, the IFRC report also states that the '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'. pp. 23

⁵⁷ The IFRC Mid-Term Review Report finds that, in the case of CRB, 'The excellent linkages to the local authorities have provided a solid base of action and beneficiary lists have mostly not seen the changes that other programmes have felt'. IFRC Mid-Term Review Report, 2006: Project Specific Sections; Belgian-French Red Cross, pp. 1

The close relationship with local authorities decreased at the later stages of the project. This may have been due to the Construction Delegate being under a great deal of time pressure during infrastructure construction, as well as local authorities losing their initial enthusiasm for tsunami reconstruction projects. In addition, it was far easier to maintain the relationship in the early stages of the project when work was ongoing in Beruwela Division only, compared to three Divisions (Beruwela, Bandaragama, Dodangoda) during the final phase. The loss of contact had a negative impact on the project, particularly on the resolution of some of the most serious challenges faced during close-out, such as: finding an acceptable solution to channelling storm water out of the resettlement sites through the host communities; reaching compromises as to the infrastructure and facilities to be provided by CRB, and that which would be provided by the government; resolving conflict between the host community and the new community in Kurudelgahawatta; finding a solution for temporary water supply in Onchilyawatta. All these issues were eventually resolved to a greater or lesser level of satisfaction, in part through a renewed engagement with the local authorities in the very final stages of the project.

One of the most significant difficulties encountered in dealing with the local authorities was reaching an understanding as to whether CRB or the GoSL was responsible for providing infrastructure and amenities. In the MoUs for Onchilyawatta and Kurudelgahawatta, there is a clause that states: 'The GoSL shall be responsible for providing infrastructure amenities such as water, electricity and roads to the project site and direct to the house'. For all sites apart from Three Lands (where CRB constructed the infrastructure immediately after completion of the houses), CRB waited for the GoSL to act on this clause and provide the infrastructure. They did not, apparently due to budget constraints. The result was that infrastructure was provided at a very late stage in the project by CRB, and constructed under a great deal of time pressure. The lack of communication with the GoSL in this case may have been due to a loss of the former close relationship, and also a lack of assertiveness in obtaining a clear response from the relevant parties. However, it is true that obtaining a clear response from local authorities is often difficult.

CRB did not succeed in forming a good relationship with one local body (Pradeshiya Sabha). This was unfortunate, as CRB was dependent on this body to resolve many issues of concern in two of the largest sites; Onchilyawatta and Kurudelgahawatta. This body proved consistently uncooperative and frequently sought bribes in return for support. Having little other recourse, CRB resorted to liaising with higher levels of authority – the Divisional and District Secretaries – when resolving issues that would normally have been dealt with by the Pradeshiya Sabha, such as drainage outside the site. However, CRB continued to include the Pradeshiya Sabha on all correspondence, invite them to ceremonies, and so on. Although not ideal, this appeared to be the only possible approach.

Recommendations

- Maintain a close relationship with the local authorities throughout project implementation, even if this has short-term time and efficiency implications.
- Incorporate time for building and maintaining relationships with local government into project planning, with an awareness of:
 - how time-consuming this can be;
 - the importance of the involvement of Delegates or senior local staff, as government officials tend to be unresponsive to requests from junior staff.
- Identify potential sticking points and areas of disagreement with the authorities that will impact the project at the earliest possible stage. Begin the process to resolve them through compromise with a clear deadline, ensuring that the authorities have an understanding of your time constraints.
- Where local authorities prove very difficult to work with, approach their superiors for support and guidance, without excluding the difficult body from involvement in the project.

3.4.3 Working with the Red Cross Movement

3.4.3.1 Sri Lanka Red Cross Society

Context

Following the tsunami, SLRCS's scope and volume of operations reached a level far beyond anything previously experienced. Naturally their capacity was stretched, and it was not always possible for PNSs to fully implement the principal of working through the National Society.

SLRCS's direct involvement in cash-for-housing projects was less than for donor-driven projects, as their standard procurement tasks were now carried out by the beneficiaries. Nevertheless, CRB made an effort to involve the Kalutara Branch, for example by inviting them to all meetings where cash grants were awarded to beneficiaries in the presence of the Divisional Secretary, and the next stage of construction explained.

At national level, CRB's move to owner-driven housing also reduced the contact with SLRCS as they were no longer involved in procurement of either Consultants and Contractors or materials. When the time came to construct infrastructure in the resettlement sites, CRB took the decision to manage procurement on its own as there was a great deal of time pressure to complete the infrastructure and to ensure that the limited end-of-project budget went as far as possible in providing high quality infrastructure.

Performance

CRB's working relationship with SLRCS was very limited for almost the whole duration of the construction project. Close cooperation with the National Society when carrying out projects in foreign countries is a central feature of the RCM structure, yet this was not followed in the case of CRB and SLRCS. There are several reasons for this.

As stated above, CRB's decision to adopt cash-for-housing as the principal approach led to a natural disengagement with SLRCS, as it was no longer necessary to carry out procurement through them. This decision was based on several factors as described in section 2.3.3, but a principal factor was that the donor-driven approach, working through SLRCS, was not working well. This approach was costly, and had created severe delays. CRB's efforts to involve SLRCS in the cash-for-housing approach at Branch level were not successful.

However, disengagement with SLRCS was also due to a conscious decision on the part of CRB. CRB believed that the beneficiaries would gain from the disengagement, as the project would be carried out faster, and the funds would stretch further. Further, construction is not a core area of the SLRCS. The objective of engaging with the Host National Society - to build up their capacity to carry out tasks independently in the future - therefore has less relevance in this case. CRB believed that a significant investment in building SLRCS's construction capacity would be an inappropriate use of resources. Finally, CRB believed that there were already a sufficient number of PNSs involved with SLRCS. Receiving different advice, guidance and requests from each PNS was not easy for the Host National Society, and stretched their capacity beyond what could reasonably be expected of them.

Nevertheless, most PNSs cooperated with SLRCS to a greater extent than CRB, and responsibility for the breakdown of the relationship must be borne in part by CRB staff, who demonstrated a lack of willingness to compromise and find alternative ways to engage with the National Society. Despite the mitigating circumstances, the CRB project in Sri Lanka sets a poor example of PNS engagement with the National Society.

Recommendations

- Try to find ways to maintain cooperation with the Host National Society, even where this proves challenging, and even if it is not based on direct project involvement.
- Where the project is not a core area of the Host National Society, do not invest significant resources in capacity building in this sector. Consider alternative, more sustainable investment opportunities.
- Where direct engagement with the National Society will clearly disadvantage beneficiaries, alternatives must be sought.

3.4.3.2 International Federation of the Red Cross / Red Crescent and other Partner National Societies

CRB maintained a good relationship with the IFRC and other PNSs throughout the project. CRB took a movement-centred approach on matters such as giving feedback on the implementation of cash-for-housing and encouraging its wider application, and land rights issues for beneficiaries on state land. There are several areas in which CRB would have benefitted from greater support from the IFRC.

The first is the matter of land rights. Land ownership is a major issue for thousands of Red Cross beneficiaries in Sri Lanka, who are made vulnerable by not having documentation proving that they have a right to be occupying their Red Cross house. This puts them at risk of eviction, and prevents them from taking advantage of the many benefits brought by owning a house, such as access to commercial credit. The IFRC has far greater access than most PNSs to high-level politicians and, had it addressed the issue of land rights shortly after the tsunami, would have been able to exercise significant leverage due to the large quantity of funds under its control. Finally, however, CRB appears to have been the first Red Cross organisation to act on this matter, in late 2008. Although the IFRC is now acting to clarify the issue of land rights, other PNSs have received little guidance, and most have already closed their delegation, or are closing soon.

The second is in the coordination of information-sharing with other PNSs. Most PNSs faced very similar challenges in housing reconstruction, and more opportunities for information-sharing would have enabled them to pool their knowledge and take a more united stand on matters involving the GoSL. Although meetings were occasionally organised by the IFRC, more frequent meetings, or the creation of other forums for information sharing would have been very valuable.

Finally, since similar or identical MoUs were signed with the GoSL for all major resettlement sites, the IFRC could have taken a more leading role in establishing whether the GoSL genuinely intended to provide infrastructure, and passing this information onto the PNSs.

CRB could have made more effort to engage in independent cooperation with the other PNSs working in Kalutara – the Irish and the Spanish. While Construction Delegates have organized spontaneously several joint field visits, more structured and regular sharing of information between these PNSs would have helped all concerned to solve problems and improve project quality, and to present a united front to the local authorities on issues such as infrastructure and drinking water provision.

Recommendations

- Identify Movement-wide issues at an early stage and encourage the IFRC to address them.
- Coordinate with other PNSs independently if this is not facilitated by the IFRC.

3.5 Ownership and Accountability

Two frequently heard criticisms of the tsunami recovery operation are that: beneficiaries were not given sufficient ownership of the project; and that implementing organisations were not sufficiently accountable to the beneficiaries, focussing more on donor accountability.⁵⁸

Definitions of ownership and accountability are given in box 3.1 below, and the extent to which CRB succeeded in creating ownership and accountability is evaluated in sections 3.8.1 and 3.8.2 respectively.

Ownership

'Those who own a process control it; they decide which priorities and policies apply. Ownership can be vested in all levels of society... For example, a government may own the national water policy, but the regional government may own the implementation of that policy, while the community may own the management of the water points in their village.'⁵⁹

In the context of the tsunami, the tsunami Evaluation Coalition, which carried out the broadest-ranging evaluation of the international response to the tsunami, recommends that 'The international humanitarian community needs a fundamental reorientation from supplying aid to supporting and facilitating communities' own relief and recovery priorities'. The reason for promoting ownership is that 'the affected population is far more knowledgeable about their context, needs and capacities than external agencies'.⁶⁰

Accountability

'Accountability refers to organisations (or individuals) being held responsible to a particular group for the affects of their actions. There are two prerequisites for accountability toward any particular group. First, the group must have accurate information about the policies and actions of the organisation and their impact. This demands transparency from organisations. Second, they must have a mechanism through which they cannot only raise their concerns, but can also have their questions answered and influence present and future policies and actions.'⁶¹

Ownership and Accountability are Intertwined

The affected population cannot take ownership unless the implementing organisation is accountable to them.

Box 3.1: Ownership and Accountability

⁵⁸ Cosgrave, J (2007) *Synthesis Report: Expanded Summary. Joint evaluation of the international response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami*. London: Tsunami Evaluation Coalition

⁵⁹ Chambers, R., and Institute of Development Studies (IDS) (2004) *Ideas for Development: reflecting forwards* (IDS Working Paper no. 238) Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex

⁶⁰ Cosgrave, J (2007) *Synthesis Report: Expanded Summary. Joint evaluation of the international response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami*. London: Tsunami Evaluation Coalition

⁶¹ *ibid*

3.5.1 Ownership

Context

In the context of the definition above, the CRB beneficiaries were not given full ownership of the project, which would have entailed facilitating them, at village level, to prioritise how funds were to be dispersed, and to own aspects of the project such as site selection and planning. Although an excellent idea in principle, there are several reasons why this would have been practically very difficult. Firstly, giving the beneficiaries full ownership of a complex and high-budget construction project is difficult due to the limitations of their understanding of the technical aspects of reconstruction projects, and of the implementing organisations' budgetary limitations. For example, the majority of beneficiaries will not understand the technical constraints on site planning, such as designing a drainage system, and will not have a good understanding of what can be achieved within the project budget. Secondly, if offered the choice, beneficiaries are very unlikely to choose to spend the budget on collective goods such as roads and drainage systems, and will choose instead to have more money invested in their individual houses. The final result would be a dysfunctional site.⁶² Full beneficiary ownership perhaps could have been achieved with a huge investment in capacity building, and a very long-term planning phase. It is debatable whether beneficiaries would have accepted the consequent demands on their time and delays in construction. Nevertheless, they were not offered the choice. CRB could have carried out extended capacity-building to enable the beneficiaries to have a greater stake in the process, even if they could not take full ownership.

For the resettlement sites, a further obstacle was the late selection of beneficiaries by the GoSL. The resettlement sites would certainly have benefited from greater beneficiary involvement in site planning. However, final beneficiary lists were not received until well after construction had started, making this type of exercise impossible. It is often justified to delay implementation in order to facilitate beneficiary involvement, but in this case several previous delays had resulted in a great deal of time pressure to commence work.

One of the most important aspects of ownership for the resettled beneficiaries was the extent to which they were able to choose their new location. Again, CRB could not have a great deal of influence over this, as the Divisional Secretaries provided the resettlement sites. All beneficiaries accepted by CRB were made fully aware of the site location and encouraged to visit. If they did not wish to move to the site, they were free to seek another organisation to provide them with a house.

Performance

CRB adopted the cash-for-housing approach in order to give beneficiaries a greater degree of ownership over the reconstruction. Although a condition of them receiving the full grant was that they completed the house to CRB specifications, they did have ownership of: the suppliers and labourers; the pace of reconstruction (within reason); aesthetic finishes such as paint and carpentry; changes in design to a small extent, for example choosing not to build an internal kitchen. It was necessary to oblige the beneficiaries to build to CRB's technical specifications, as CRB had a duty of care to the beneficiaries to ensure that the houses were structurally sound, durable, and hygienic.

⁶² This is the case in all societies, and is the reason why governments forcibly tax citizens and use the profits to construct collective goods.

However, CRB is criticised in the IFRC Mid-term Review for not allowing the beneficiaries to participate 'in the design, changes and tailoring of the house to suit'.⁶³ As discussed in Section 2.3.4, CRB chose to limit the number of possible house designs due to: issues around varying cost for different designs; the difficulty of obtaining local authority approval for several designs; the complexity of technically supervising several different designs. Small variations were permitted, such as not including an internal kitchen and chimney. Nevertheless, beneficiaries could have been given a greater degree of ownership over the house design. They could have been consulted over the initial design, and CRB could have made it clear to them from the start that they were permitted to make small changes in the design, as long as they discussed them with the construction team first. Further, rather than adopting just one standard design, CRB could have developed two or three standard designs, and allowed beneficiaries to choose their preferred option.

Beneficiaries could, in theory, have been given greater ownership of the sites by greater involvement in site planning before construction began (i.e. layout of houses, roads and drains). However, before being given authorisation to begin construction by the local authorities, CRB had to gain government approval for the site layout. This was a long and complex process, which delayed construction in most cases, and involvement of the beneficiaries would have created further delays. Further, the beneficiary list was not available until after site approval was given. Therefore, although beneficiary involvement in site planning is generally recommended, it was not possible in this case.⁶⁴

Although CRB was not able to give the beneficiaries ownership of site planning, they were given ownership in the choice of community infrastructure (as described in Section 2.4.2) and, in the case of Onchilyawatta, drinking water provision. These initiatives were successful; the beneficiaries demonstrated a high degree of satisfaction and acceptance of responsibility for the infrastructure.

Recommendations

General

- Build the beneficiaries' capacity to understand the technical and financial limitations of the project, so that they can take a greater degree of ownership of important decisions.
- Give the beneficiaries the greatest degree of ownership possible, whilst acknowledging the limitations of: their technical knowledge; their understanding of the constraints of the project budget.

Housing Projects

- Consult the beneficiaries when creating the standard house design.
- Allow the beneficiaries to make a choice between three standard house designs.
- Make it clear to the beneficiaries that they can make minor design changes, as long as they consult the construction team.
- Involve the beneficiaries in site planning where local authority regulations allow.
- Factor in time for beneficiary participation in all project stages.
- Ensure that beneficiaries have seen resettlement sites, and are fully aware of the implications of relocating, before making their final choice.

⁶³ IFRC Mid-Term Review Report Part 2: Project Specific Sections: Kalutara, 2006

⁶⁴ However, the project implementer must be aware of the risk of beneficiaries changing their mind several times and thus creating delays, and selecting the locations of roads and drains out of self-interest rather than in the collective interest. Such risks can be minimised by carrying out a concurrent capacity-building programme.

3.5.2 Accountability

Context

In an owner-driven project, beneficiaries are both the clients and the implementers, so to some extent they are accountable to themselves. For example, the beneficiaries are principally responsible for the quality of their houses, and the speed of construction. However, even for the housing, the implementing organisation must be accountable for some aspects, for example the house design and the calculation of payments. Further, for resettlement sites, the implementing organisation takes responsibility for the layout, infrastructure, and facilities.

Performance

CRB generally promoted a high degree of transparency, leaving the beneficiaries well informed of the project design. The one area in which this was not fulfilled was the infrastructure in new settlements. This was due to the rushed implementation, and also to the fact that there was no parallel community programme running at the time that infrastructure planning was carried out.

During housing construction, construction supervisors were regularly on site, so beneficiaries could verbally express grievances to them. However, as found in the IFRC Mid-Term Review, technical staff who were not fully integrated into RC/RC values tended to work in a way that emphasised the 'supremacy of expert roles' and resulted in 'overbearing decision-making on behalf of beneficiaries'. The IFRC Review concludes that 'beneficiaries have not felt comfortable in voicing their opinions'.⁶⁵ It is debatable whether this last point is entirely true in the case of CRB beneficiaries. The experience of project staff suggests that most beneficiaries were not reluctant to verbally express grievances on site. Nevertheless, it is likely that the less confident beneficiaries were too timid to approach project staff, and that those who did complain may not have been listened to by technical staff. Further, technical staff, who were under pressure to complete their work quickly and to a high standard, sometimes felt overwhelmed by frequent complaints from beneficiaries.⁶⁶ In either case, the on-site verbal feedback mechanism cannot be seen as satisfactory.

In 2007, CRB introduced a formal grievance mechanism whereby beneficiaries were asked to write a letter explaining their grievance, and the letter would always receive a response from a Delegate. This was a positive step, but had three drawbacks. Firstly, the letter was not anonymous, so the less confident beneficiaries may not have felt comfortable using the mechanism. Secondly, project staff had no strong incentive to respond to the beneficiary's grievance if it implied delay or additional costs. Finally, no historical record was kept of grievances. This would have served to identify patterns of repeated complaints, indicating widespread dissatisfaction with aspects of the project.

An example of a feedback mechanism which would have addressed some of these issues is the 'Feedback Box'. The feedback box is a 'silent' feedback mechanism. Beneficiaries write grievances on anonymous notes, and drop them in a box on site, which is emptied every two weeks. Site staff and managers hold a meeting to discuss the grievances and how they can be addressed. A meeting is then held on site with the beneficiaries and the results of the staff meeting are explained and discussed. This approach makes it easier for all beneficiaries, including the most vulnerable, to express grievances without stigma or the need for a direct confrontation with project staff. Minutes of the meetings create a record of grievances.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ IFRC Mid-Term Review Report, 2006, pp. 17 / 19

⁶⁶ The likelihood of this situation arising can also be reduced by careful selection of staff who are able to relate to beneficiaries, and who understand that beneficiary satisfaction, rather than the physical construction, is at the centre of the project.

⁶⁷ Concept from IFRC Mid-Term Review Report, 2006, pp. 20. Embellished by author.

However, the mechanisms discussed here are not 'strong' accountability mechanisms, as project managers have no strong incentives to respond to beneficiary feedback. No matter how concerned project staff are with beneficiary welfare, they will tend to ignore their feedback if acting on it would create delays or additional costs. An example of a strong feedback mechanism would be giving the beneficiaries the power, as a collective group, to freeze the project budget (and therefore temporarily stop the project) if they are not satisfied with outcomes after consultation with project staff. Introducing such a mechanism obliges the implementing organisation to pass a high degree of control to the beneficiaries. However, the risk of negative outcomes is less than may be imagined, as beneficiaries are clearly disadvantaging themselves by freezing the project budget, and are only likely to do so when they are extremely dissatisfied.⁶⁸ Since strong accountability mechanisms give project staff far greater incentives to respond to beneficiary feedback, this should act as a safeguard to prevent the project from deteriorating to the point where the beneficiaries would be so dissatisfied that they would stop the work.

Recommendations

- Create formal feedback mechanisms that enable all beneficiaries, including the least confident, to express grievances. The mechanism should bypass site staff, and grievances should be addressed by management.
- Create a platform to discuss the organisation's response to grievances with beneficiaries, and give them a chance to respond.
- Keep a record of grievances, and use this to identify patterns of repeated complaints that indicate the need for project-wide improvements.
- Where possible, create strong feedback mechanisms that give beneficiaries the power to freeze the project budget. This gives beneficiaries genuine ownership, and creates powerful incentives for project staff to respond to their feedback.

3.6 Project Management

CRB's project management was weak in a number of areas; this section discusses how it could have been improved.

The project cycle is commonly defined as: identification, planning (formulation and appraisal), implementation and monitoring, evaluation. This is not a linear process. Rather, changes in goals or context (which occur with great frequency in international development projects), and the results of evaluations, are fed back into the planning stage as the project progresses, and in turn change the way the project is implemented.

Project identification is not discussed here, as this is addressed in Section 3.1: 'An Integrated and Sustainable Approach?'. The topic addressed here, in order, are; development of a logical framework; monitoring and evaluation; stakeholder analysis; risks and opportunities; reporting and documentation; recommendations.

⁶⁸ Such mechanisms have been successfully adopted as part of a process of governmental devolution in Bolivia, where grassroots organisations have access to municipal budgets and are empowered to freeze funds if projects are not being carried out to their satisfaction. (Faguet, Jean-Paul, Decentralization and *Local Government in Bolivia: An Overview from the Bottom Up* (April 23, 2003). Crisis States Programme Working Paper No. 29).

3.6.1 Development of a Logical Framework (Logframe)

The CRB project would have benefited a great deal from a logframe that set out:

- the expected results of the project;
- the activities required to achieve those results;
- assumptions that might affect CRB's ability to carry out the activities and / or achieve the results;
- SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound) indicators to measure whether the results had been achieved.

No logframe or indicators were developed during the project lifespan. This can be partially explained by the fact that as funding was provided by private donors, there was no external demand for such a tool. In addition, it would have been very difficult to make accurate predictions of the project results in the early stages, due to the number of organisations involved and lack of information regarding beneficiaries numbers from the GoSL. Nevertheless, a logframe created with the understanding that regular revisions would be necessary would have helped CRB to clarify their objectives and work in a more organised manner. Since the funding came principally from private donors, CRB could have used such a tool in a flexible way, and avoided an excessive focus on objectives set before the context is fully understood (a frequently-heard criticism of donor-imposed logframes).

Project Duration

The CRB project duration was finally four and a half years, although it was initially programmed to be three years. The projected three-year duration was based on the assumption that all houses would be built on the owners' original plots or private land, which is faster and simpler than resettlement sites. However, there were insufficient numbers of tsunami victims outside the buffer zone with destroyed or severely damaged houses, so CRB took the decision to begin construction in resettlement sites. This took far longer due to the delay in obtaining appropriate sites, the need to build infrastructure, and also due to the fact that beneficiaries took longer to build their houses later in the project as their need for a new home was not so great. Although it would have been impossible to predict all that occurred, a planning tool such as a logframe could have identified the assumption that there were sufficient beneficiaries who could rebuild their homes on their original plots or private land. The projected project timeframe may then have been more realistic.

3.6.2 Monitoring and Evaluation

No formal monitoring and evaluation procedure was adopted. Ideally, monitoring and evaluation would have been carried out every few months; data would have been collected against the project indicators and used to evaluate performance.⁶⁹ This would have enabled the project team to make an informed review of the project planning tools, and make changes to improve project implementation. This would have been an excellent mechanism for identifying and tackling problems at an early stage.

As well as an internal monitoring and evaluation process, the CRB project would have benefited from an external mid-term evaluation, as carried out by several other PNSs. Such an evaluation would have raised issues not obvious to the project team, and created conditions for a significant revision in planning at mid-term.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ It is important to ensure that the monitoring and evaluation process is simple enough, and / or there are sufficient staff, so that the process supports the project, rather than becoming a burden on staff.

⁷⁰ CRB did have access to the IFRC Mid-Term Review, which had a small section on their project. However, a more detailed and extensive evaluation would have provided more useful feedback.

CRB did commission an end-of-project independent evaluation by the Kalutara District Secretariat. This was carried out using the 'Quality Assurance Method' (QAM) developed by the German development organisation GTZ.⁷¹ The results were very positive.

3.6.3 Stakeholder Analysis

In the context of a reconstruction project, a stakeholder is any individual or organisations that will have an impact on, and / or be impacted by, the project. A stakeholder analysis is an exercise to: identify stakeholders; assess their likely impact on the project; assess the project's likely impact on them; decide how to engage with them.

This would have been a very useful exercise for CRB. In particular, the analysis would have helped CRB to recognise the importance of the host community in resettlement sites, and develop a strategy to engage with them. A stakeholder analysis would also have encouraged CRB to develop an understanding of the part that would be played by various local government bodies in the project. This would have created an understanding of the extent to which the success of the project depended on local authorities, and encouraged CRB to develop a comprehensive strategy for engagement with government, which could have been maintained throughout the changes in project management.

A further exercise closely linked with stakeholder analysis is creating stakeholder accountability mechanisms. Formal accountability mechanisms should be introduced for all major stakeholders, enabling them to express grievances, and receive a response from the implementing organisation.

3.6.4 Risks and Opportunities

In all international development projects, there are risks that may set the project back in terms of time, cost, beneficiary satisfaction, and other outcomes. There are also opportunities to improve outcomes that may not be recognised in the rush to implement. It is possible to predict many project risks, and manage them so that they do not have a significant impact on the project, or at least develop a strategy to manage them when they do arise. Similarly, making a concerted effort to recognise and take advantage of opportunities can have a very positive effect on project outcomes. This can be done through a 'Risk and Opportunity Register' which is discussed and updated at weekly meetings, in parallel with discussions on the project programme.

No predictive risk or opportunity management was carried out in the CRB project. Examples of risks and opportunities that could have been managed / capitalised upon are given in Box 3.2, while a Risk and Opportunity Register with examples from the CRB project (which is by no means comprehensive) can be found in Appendix D. Not all risks can be predicted, and it is far easier to create such a register with hindsight than during the project planning phase. Further, generating and updating such a document requires time and effort; the project manager will not be able to carry out this exercise unless they have staff in sufficient numbers and with appropriate skills to support them with other important activities. Nevertheless, this is an important management tool for project with many risks, such as the CRB housing reconstruction project.

⁷¹ GTZ developed the method with the aim of providing local authorities with a broad-ranging but simple tool to assess housing reconstruction projects. Staff in the District Secretariats were trained to carry out the evaluation, which consisted of a field survey from which the data was entered into software that produced a diagrammatic representation of how the project had performed. Refer 'QAM Evaluation of CRB post-tsunami housing resettlement sites, Kalutara District, May 2009'.

Risk	Mitigation
Sites proposed by District Secretaries are not suitable for permanent housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop clear indicators (physical and social) for acceptable sites, and pass this information on to Divisional and District Secretaries. • Where unacceptable sites are proposed, react quickly to explain to the District Secretary the reasons for rejection, and the urgency of finding a new site. • If the Divisional Secretary is unresponsive, request the support of the District Secretary.
Government does not construct infrastructure (roads and drains).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain communication with GoSL regarding their commitment to construct infrastructure. • Set deadline for clear evidence the GoSL is going to construct infrastructure. Deadline should be such that, if CRB has to construct infrastructure, this will not have a major impact on programming. • Maintain sufficient funds and human resources to construct infrastructure until there is clarity regarding which party will be responsible for construction.
Conflict between the host community and CRB beneficiaries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carry out extensive consultation with the host community before construction begins, including a discussion of storm water drainage outlets. Involve the local authorities. • Dedicate a proportion of the project budget to improving / constructing infrastructure in the host community. • Carry out community activities that create social bonds between the host community and the new community.
Local authorities do not cooperate in providing approvals / technical support.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a good relationship with local authorities. Keep them well informed, and consult them on all decisions. • Start work on approvals at the earliest stage possible. If possible, do not start construction until approval has been given, and use this as leverage to hurry local authorities. • Where local authorities remain uncooperative, appeal to the next highest level of local government for support.
Opportunity	Capitalisation
Work with other PNSs in Kalutara District on issues that affect new settlements, such as land rights, drinking water provision and construction of infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organise regular (monthly?) meetings in Kalutara with other PNSs working in the District. • Arrange to make joint visits to local government with other PNSs.
Implement works in host community through host community CBOs, thus providing them with income and generating positive sentiment toward the project.	Implement works in host community through CBOs, for example construction of drains to connect with new settlement drains, either directly or through the Divisional Secretary. Ensure DS is involved / informed in either case.

Box 3.2: Risks and Opportunities

3.6.5 Reporting and Documentation

Reporting and documentation was generally weak. Particular examples are:

- No formal filing system existed for either hard or soft documents until the very end of the project. Documentation, including important items such as copies of beneficiary selection documents, were not kept in labelled or ordered files, and much of it was lost.
- There was little reporting detailing decisions made and the reasons behind those decisions. Examples are: beneficiary selection criteria; site selection (except for Payagalawatta); minutes of significant meetings with government officials.
- There was no standard format for the monthly site reports, and each delegate has chosen a different format and emphasis.
- Even where documents have been created, they are often not clearly labelled with the author and date, rendering them very difficult to use.

This created difficulties when Country Coordinators and delegates changed. The lack of information left those finishing the project with little understanding the history of conflicts and obstacles, for example with water provision in Onchilyawatta, or conflicts between the host community and the new community in Onchilyawatta and Kurudelgahawatta. This left them vulnerable to accusations from project stakeholders. In the case of the beneficiary selection documentation, since most documents had been either lost or never collected, two members of staff were required to work for three months collecting and recording documentation at the very end of the project.

3.6.6 Recommendations

Develop a Logframe

- Create a project logframe that identifies objective, activities, assumptions and SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound) indicators. Choose a model that is flexible enough to incorporate changes in objectives and context.

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Adopt a monitoring and evaluation framework that requires regular evaluation against performance indicators. The results of the evaluation feed back into project planning and thus generate improvements in implementation.
- Fund external mid-term and final evaluations.

Stakeholder Analysis

- Carry out a stakeholder analysis that identifies stakeholders; assesses their likely impact on the project; assesses the project's likely impact on them. Use this to create a stakeholder engagement strategy.
- Develop and implement stakeholder accountability mechanisms.

Risks and Opportunities

- Use a Risk and Opportunity Register to: predict and manage risks that are likely to impact on programme, cost and stakeholder satisfaction; anticipate and take advantage of opportunities.

Reporting and Documentation

- Create a standardised filing system for both hard and soft documents from the start of the project. Filing structures for hard and soft documents should reflect each other.
- Put in place standardised reporting requirements, including a standard structure for the monthly site reports, reporting on significant project decisions, and reporting on monitoring and evaluation.
- Creating a referencing system for all documents that clearly indicates the author and date of creation.

3.7 Recommendations

Taking an Integrated and Sustainable Approach

- At identification stage, aim to create a project that focuses on the broad objective of reducing vulnerabilities and increasing capacities amongst beneficiaries. The project should aim to build beneficiaries' human, natural, financial, social and physical capital.
- Carry out a rigorous assessment of whether any project activities may have a negative impact on the social and / or environmental status quo (the 'do-no-harm' principal). If yes, revise the planned method of implementation.

Housing

Cash-for-Housing

- Use cash-for-housing wherever possible, but with an awareness of the challenges to be faced.
- Provide beneficiaries with close technical support from well-qualified staff.
- Strictly link payments to completion of the previous stage.
- Maintain complete transparency regarding payments and give a full explanation for any changes.
- Provide the same amount of cash for all members of a single group; do not include different house sizes in the same group.
- Develop an alternative strategy for cases where beneficiaries are unable to manage the construction of their homes, but use it only when the standard approach is clearly impossible.

House Design

- Investigate the feasibility of adopting innovative design features, particularly environmentally-friendly features, even if this means that some construction tasks must be implemented outside the cash-for-housing framework, and that the cost of each house is slightly increased.
- Adopt a design that allows for future expansion of the house.
- Adjust the size of the house according to the size of the beneficiary family where final beneficiary lists are available before construction begins. Clearly explain the policy to beneficiaries at an early stage, and respond to any grievances.

Resettlement Sites

- Only carry out resettlement where there is no alternative.

Site Selection

- If resettlement is necessary, carry out a detailed analysis of each proposed site, considering socio-economic and physical features.
- Take a decision as to whether the site is appropriate based on the results of the analysis, considering the long-term sustainability of the site, and the wellbeing of the residents.

Social Development of New Communities

- Run a community programme alongside the construction programme throughout the project. The community programme should address issues such as: developing the social fabric of new communities; creating links with the host community; conflict resolution; training to impart the skills and knowledge necessary to make the community sustainable; creating links between communities and local authorities.
- Ensure a high level of integration between the two teams, with a platform for communication and sharing of ideas, leading to a jointly developed approach.
- In the case of resettlement sites, start working with the communities at the earliest possible stage. This will make the transition easier for the beneficiaries, and aid the successful implementation of the construction programme.

Integration with the Host Community

- Carry out consultation with the host community before construction begins. Ask them what they would like to see from the project, and clearly explain how the new settlement will affect them, including matters such as storm water runoff and transport links.
- Designate a proportion (approximately 20%) of project funding for host community projects.

Livelihoods

- Treat livelihoods as holistic, encompassing human, natural, financial, social and physical capital.
- Without necessarily providing grants, develop a programme to support beneficiaries in finding opportunities for income generation in the new community, based on a study of their previous income sources.

Land Rights

- Where beneficiaries' land rights situation is not clear, work with the government and NGOs with legal expertise to establish: what documents they will receive; the conditions set by those documents; the process to receive it. Begin this process at the earliest stage possible.
- Share all information with the beneficiaries.

Beneficiary Selection and Working with Partners

Beneficiary Selection

- Clearly define beneficiary selection criteria from the start, and ensure that any changes are formalised and broadly communicated.
- Whenever possible, establish a clearly defined beneficiary list for new settlements before beginning construction.
- Ensure that beneficiary selection criteria are designed to select the most vulnerable.
- Carry out a rigorous assessment of all proposed beneficiaries, including an interview and discussions with neighbouring families to ensure that the candidate is legitimate.

Working with Local Authorities

- Maintain a close relationship with the local authorities throughout project implementation, even if this has short-term time and efficiency implications.
- Incorporate time for building and maintaining relationships with local government into project planning, with an awareness of:
 - how time-consuming this can be;
 - the importance of the involvement of Delegates or senior local staff, as government officials tend to be unresponsive to requests from junior staff.
- Identify potential sticking points and areas of disagreement with the authorities that will impact the project at the earliest possible stage. Begin the process to resolve them through compromise with a clear deadline, ensuring that the authorities have an understanding of your time constraints.
- Where local authorities prove very difficult to work with, approach their superiors for support and guidance, without excluding the difficult body from involvement in the project.

Working with the Host National Society

- Try to find ways to maintain cooperation with the Host National Society, even where this proves challenging, and even if it is not based on direct project involvement.
- Where the project is not a core area of the Host National Society, do not invest significant resources in capacity building in this sector. Consider alternative, more sustainable investment opportunities.
Where direct engagement with the National Society will clearly disadvantage beneficiaries, alternatives must be sought.

Working with the IFRC and other PNSs

- Identify Movement-wide issues at an early stage and encourage the IFRC to address them.
- Coordinate with other PNSs independently if this is not facilitated by the IFRC.

Ownership

General

- Build the beneficiaries' capacity to understand the technical and financial limitations of the project, so that they can take a greater degree of ownership of important decisions.
- Give the beneficiaries the greatest degree of ownership possible, whilst acknowledging the limitations of: their technical knowledge; their understanding of the constraints of the project budget.

Housing Projects

- Consult the beneficiaries when creating the standard house design.
- Allow the beneficiaries to make a choice between three standard house designs.
- Make it clear to the beneficiaries that they can make minor design changes, as long as they consult the construction team.
- Involve the beneficiaries in site planning where local authority regulations allow.
- Factor in time for beneficiary participation in all project stages.
- Ensure that beneficiaries have seen resettlement sites, and are fully aware of the implications of relocating, before making their final choice.

Accountability

- Create formal feedback mechanisms that enable all beneficiaries, including the least confident, to express grievances. The mechanism should bypass site staff, and grievances should be addressed by management.
- Create a platform to discuss the organisation's response to grievances with beneficiaries, and give them a chance to respond.
- Keep a record of grievances, and use this to identify patterns of repeated complaints that indicate the need for project-wide improvements.
- Where possible, create strong feedback mechanisms that give beneficiaries the power to freeze the project budget. This gives beneficiaries genuine ownership, and creates powerful incentives for project staff to respond to their feedback.

Project Management

Develop a Logframe

- Create a project logframe that identifies objective, activities, assumptions and SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound) indicators. Choose a model that is flexible enough to incorporate changes in objectives and context.

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Adopt a monitoring and evaluation framework that requires regular evaluation against performance indicators. The results of the evaluation feed back into project planning and thus generate improvements in implementation.
- Fund external mid-term and final evaluations.

Stakeholder Analysis

- Carry out a stakeholder analysis that identifies stakeholders; assesses their likely impact on the project; assesses the project's likely impact on them. Use this to create a stakeholder engagement strategy.
- Develop and implement stakeholder accountability mechanisms.

Risks and Opportunities

- Use a Risk and Opportunity Register to: predict and manage risks that are likely to impact on programme, cost and stakeholder satisfaction; anticipate and take advantage of opportunities.

Reporting and Documentation

- Create a standardised filing system for both hard and soft documents from the start of the project. Filing structures for hard and soft documents should reflect each other.
- Put in place standardised reporting requirements, including a standard structure for the monthly site reports, reporting on significant project decisions, and reporting on monitoring and evaluation.
- Creating a referencing system for all documents that clearly indicates the author and date of creation.

4 Conclusion

Four and a half years after the tsunami struck, almost all those who lost their homes in the disaster have been re-housed, and their lives are beginning to return to normality. The philosophy of 'building back better' has succeeded in most instances, and many people are living in better accommodation than they were before the tsunami. Red Cross houses have a reputation for high quality in Sri Lanka, and being assigned a Red Cross home has come to be seen as fortunate.⁷²

The post-tsunami environment presented many challenges, including the huge number of organisations trying to achieve the same goals, inflation due to high demand for materials and labour, challenges associated with working with the GoSL and the SLRCS, and the difficulty of relocating people whose homes had been in the buffer zone. In spite of these challenges, CRB succeeded in constructing four-hundred and ninety-six quality houses, and creating ten resettlement sites with infrastructure and facilities. CRB also ran a successful programme to build strong, sustainable communities and promote land rights for the beneficiaries on state land.

Outside the context of their own project, CRB made two very significant contributions to the Red Cross tsunami recovery operation. The first was that they successfully pioneered the use of cash-for-housing, which was later adopted across the RCM. This resulted in higher-quality, less costly homes, faster construction, and greater ownership for the beneficiaries. The second was that they recognised the importance of land rights for beneficiaries living on state land, and discovered information which was shared with the rest of the RCM and used to support beneficiaries of other RC societies.

Despite the overall success of the project, CRB recognises that there are lessons to be learnt going forward. Some aspects of the project were very well executed, such as beneficiary selection and cash-for-housing implementation. Others left room for improvement.

CRB did not initially recognise the great challenges involved in successfully resettling people. There are many lessons to be learnt from CRB's experience on resettlement sites, including: site selection should always be carried out on the basis of a detailed study of socio-economic and physical features; monetary and time resources should be devoted to creating a positive relationship between the beneficiaries and the host community; land rights should be addressed at an early stage. Nevertheless, CRB's decision to incorporate a community development programme alongside the construction work made a very positive contribution to beneficiary welfare and overall sustainability.

By adopting cash-for-housing as the construction method, CRB gave beneficiaries a greater degree of ownership over the reconstruction, and made them central actors in their own recovery, rather than passive recipients of aid. Ownership could have been improved by carrying out more capacity building to enable beneficiaries to participate in important decisions, and by allowing beneficiaries to make minor design changes. Further, CRB's accountability to the beneficiaries could have been improved by introducing formalised grievance mechanisms, or 'stronger' accountability mechanisms that gave beneficiaries a greater degree of control over the project.

⁷² IFRC Mid-Term Review Report, 2006, pp. 10

Stronger project management would have brought many advantages. At identification stage, opportunities for a broader focus on increasing capacities and reducing vulnerabilities could have been recognised and acted upon. An analysis of any potential harm resulting from project activities could have been carried out, and corresponding mitigation measures adopted. Risks could have managed or avoided, and opportunities capitalised upon. A stakeholder analysis would have helped to prevent any stakeholders from being negatively impacted, while also harnessing their positive contribution. Finally, a well-developed set of indicators combined with monitoring and evaluation would have identified weaknesses, and created opportunities to improve project quality and sustainability.

CRB recognises these shortcomings, and will be sure to capitalise on the lessons learnt in future projects.

Although there was room for improvement, CRB worked successfully in the challenging post-tsunami environment. CRB leaves four-hundred and ninety-four families with high-quality new homes, and ten resettlement sites with high-quality infrastructure, including community facilities. CRB's success is due in large part to their well-qualified and dedicated technical staff, and their rigorous supervision during construction. Looking beyond physical infrastructure, the high levels of beneficiary satisfaction also owe much to CRB's community-focused approach, and the resources devoted to running a social programme alongside the construction work. CRB carried out a challenging physical construction project in Sri Lanka, while maintaining a beneficiary-centred approach, and never losing site of the principal objective of helping the most vulnerable members of society.

Appendix A
Summary of Beneficiary Documentation by Settlement

No	Group Name	Deed		Police Report		<i>Summary</i> % that do not have deed or other proof of permanent residency.
		Have*	Don't have	Have*	Don't have	
1	Panadura -01 < 11 >	64%	36%	45%	55%	0%
	Panadura -02 < 12 >	83%	17%	83%	17%	0%
	Panadura -03 < 10 >	80%	20%	80%	20%	0%
	Panadura -04 < 11 >	63%	37%	100%	0%	0%
	Panadura -05 < 13 >	69%	31%	69%	31%	0%
	Panadura -06 < 9 >	56%	44%	89%	11%	0%
	Panadura -07 < 6 >	50%	50%	50%	50%	0%
2	Beruwala -01 < 9 >	66%	34%	66%	34%	0%
	Beruwala -02 < 16 >	75%	25%	88%	13%	0%
	Beruwala -03 < 28 >	82%	18%	68%	32%	0%
	Beruwala -04 < 7 >	100%	0%	86%	14%	0%
	Beruwala -05 < 37 >	73%	27%	70%	30%	0%
	Beruwala -06 < 20 >	70%	30%	80%	20%	0%
	Beruwala -09 < 18 >	67%	33%	67%	33%	0%
3	Kaluthara -01 < 8 >	75%	25%	88%	13%	0%
	Kaluthara -02 < 5 >	80%	20%	80%	20%	0%
	Average <220>	73%	27%	75%	25%	0%

Note: * Included in "have" are those people who have deeds not in their name, haven't deed but have an affidavit or other proof that that can claim ownership of the land.

Appendix B

Steps to Obtain State Land Grants / Leaflet Distributed at Land Rights Workshops

The Divisional Secretaries are responsible for the first stages; completing the 'recommendations for alienation of state land' which consist of two forms, one for each beneficiary (TsuDePa 1) and one for each settlement (TsuDePa 2).

1. The Divisional Secretary sends the TsuDePa 1 form to the Grama Nilidari (village headperson) who fills in details for each beneficiary.
2. The Grama Nilidari sends the form to Land Officer of Pradesha Sabha for checking and approval (this stage is sometimes carried out by the Land Officer of the Divisional Secretariat).
3. The Land Officer sends the form to the Divisional Secretary for final approval.
4. The Divisional Secretary fills out the TsuDePa 2 form for the whole community.
5. The Divisional Secretary sends the forms to the District Secretary (Government Agent) for approval.
6. The District Secretary forwards the forms to the Provincial Land Commissioner.
7. The Provincial Land Commissioner sends the recommendations to the Provincial Council for approval.
8. Once approved, the Provincial Land Commissioner sends the recommendations to the Land Commissioner General in Colombo.
9. The Land Commissioner General approves the recommendations, creates the Tsunami State Land Grants, and forwards them to the Land Minister.
10. The Land Minister approves the Grants and forwards them to the Presidential Secretariat.
11. The Presidential Secretariat approves and signs the Tsunami State Land Grants.

Leaflet Distributed to Beneficiaries in Land Rights Workshops

Documentation for
Tsunami Housing
Beneficiaries
Living on State Land



➤ It is very important to obtain the Tsunami Dimana Pathra. The Tsunami Dimana Pathra is official, legal proof that you own the land.




.....
Divisional Secretary
Beruwala

29/04/2009
Date

Wimal Gunatunga
Divisional Secretary
Beruwala


.....
Lily Ryan Collins
Community Delegate
Belgian Red Cross/French

29.04.2009
Date



➤ Families that lost their homes due to the Tsunami who have received homes on state land should receive a 'Tsunami Dimana Pathra'.

➤ From the date of issue of the Tsunami Dimana Pathra, the land will legally belong to you (subject to the conditions in the Grant), and not to the State.



➤ In order for you to receive the Tsunami Dimana Pathra, the Divisional Secretary needs to issue documents to the Provincial Land Commissioner through the District Secretary.

➤ The documents then go for approval to the Land

Commissioner General in Colombo, the Land Ministry, and the Presidential Secretariat. Then the Tsunami Dimana Pathra is issued.



➤ The Tsunami Dimana Pathra has special conditions; you will not be able to sell, transfer, or rent the land or the house for 10 years after receiving the grant, except to children and blood relations.

➤ After 10 years, you will be released from the special conditions. The normal conditions in a state land grant will continue to apply to you, or to anyone who buys the land or house.



➤ The Tsunami Dimana Pathra will be issued in the name of the person on the Divisional Secretary's beneficiary list.

➤ If the person has passed away, you should inform the Divisional Secretary. The Tsunami Dimana Pathra will then be issued in the name of the husband / wife. If the husband / wife has also passed away, the Tsunami Dimana Pathra will be issued in the name of the eldest son if no other successor has been nominated.



Appendix C

Steps in Obtaining Certificate of Conformity (CoC)

Steps in Obtaining CoC:

The process for obtaining CoC is different in a rural area (under the jurisdiction of the Pradesha Saba) than in an urban area (under the jurisdiction of the Urban Council). Below is a description of the steps in the process in each case. It is important to note that this is an approximation; it is difficult to be certain of all the approvals needed at each stage, and there are likely to be differences between Divisions.

CoC in a Rural Area (Pradesha Saba)

- Master plan (survey plan of the land) produced by Survey Department and approved by the Divisional Secretary (D.S.).
- House plan approved by the Pradesha Saba.
- Block-out plan approved by Pradesha Saba.
- Submit Gazette Notification regarding transfer of land and letter from D.S. approving transfer of land to Pradesha Saba with block-out plan to the Pradesha Saba.
- Residents fill out Building Approval Application books.
- As-built drawings completed and three copies given to each resident.
- Resident applies for Building Approval by taking Building Approval Application along with three copies of as-built drawing and one copy of approved block-out plan to Pradesha Saba. They pay a fee for approval of the as-built drawing (≈ 450 - 750LKR).
- Technical Officer (T.O.) carries out inspection and gives approval or not.
- Resident applies for CoC by taking request letter and approved as-built drawing to Pradesha Saba. Pays another fee to receive the CoC (≈ 250 - 500LKR).

CoC in an Urban Area (Urban Council)

- Master plan (survey plan of the land) produced by Survey Department and approved by the District Secretary (G.A.).
- House plan approved by the Urban Council.
- Block-out plan approved by the Urban Council.
- Submit Gazette Notification regarding transfer of land and letter from D.S. approving transfer of land to Urban Council with block-out plan to the Urban Council.
- Residents fill out Building Approval Application books.
- 'Abstract of Title Deed' (AT) form filled out and signed by lawyer. This form lists the names of the residents and confirms the transfer of land from the previous owner to the D.S.
- Each plot is given a tax assessment number during a site visit by the T.O. once all other approvals have been obtained.
- As-built drawings completed and three copies given to each resident.
- Resident applies for Building Approval by taking Building Approval Application along with three copies of as-built drawing and one copy of approved block-out plan to Urban Council. They pay a fee for approval of the as-built drawing (≈ 450 - 750LKR).
- Technical Officer (T.O.) carries out inspection and gives approval or not.
- Resident applies for CoC by taking request letter and approved as-built drawing to Urban Council. Pays another fee to receive the CoC (≈ 250 - 500LKR).

Appendix D
Risk and Opportunity Register for CRB Project

AREA OF WORK	RISK	CONSEQUENCE	IMPACT ON COST / PROGRAMME / SUSTAINABILITY	LIKELIHOOD	OVERALL RISK	MITIGATION
Site Selection	Sites proposed by District Secretaries are not suitable for permanent housing.	Delays project programme. In extreme case, planned number of houses cannot be built.	H	M	H	Develop clear indicators (physical and social) for acceptable sites, and pass this information on to Divisional and District Secretaries.
						Where unacceptable sites are proposed, react quickly to explain to the District Secretary the reasons for rejection, and the urgency of finding a new site.
						If the Divisional Secretary is unresponsive, request the support of the District Secretary.
Beneficiary Selection	Insufficient number of acceptable beneficiaries proposed by Divisional Secretaries	Delays project programme. Risk of constructing houses with no-one to occupy them.	H	L	M	Develop clear beneficiary selection criteria, and pass this information on to Divisional and District Secretaries.
						Maintain constant communication with Divisional Secretaries regarding number of beneficiaries still required.
Housing Construction (Cash-for-Housing)	Beneficiaries do not complete houses within expected timeframe	Delays project programme.	M	M	M	Maintain constant communication with beneficiaries regarding construction deadlines.
						Where beneficiaries are unresponsive, involve community team to support them. If they remain unresponsive involve senior project staff and issue letters threatening to stop their payments.
						If still unresponsive after X months and three letters, issue letter informing them that they have been removed from the programme. (Can be reinstated later if demonstrate renewed interest).

AREA OF WORK	RISK	CONSEQUENCE	IMPACT ON COST / PROGRAMME / SUSTAINABILITY	LIKELIHOOD	OVERALL RISK	MITIGATION
Resettlement sites	Government does not construct infrastructure (roads and drains).	CRB obliged to construct infrastructure, resulting in delays and increased cost.	H	H	H	Maintain communication with GoSL regarding their commitment to construct infrastructure.
						Set deadline for clear evidence the GoSL is going to construct infrastructure. Deadline should be such that, if CRB has to construct infrastructure, this will not have a major impact on programming.
						Maintain sufficient funds and human resources to construct infrastructure until there is clarity regarding which party will construct it.
Resettlement sites	Conflict between the host community and CRB beneficiaries.	Reduced beneficiary and host community welfare. In extreme case, unsustainable community.	M / H	M	H	Carry out extensive consultation with the host community before construction begins, including a discussion of storm water drainage outlets. Involve the local authorities.
						Dedicate a proportion of the project budget to improving / constructing infrastructure in the host community.
						Carry out community activities that create social bonds between the host community and the new community.

Resettlement sites	Local authorities do not cooperate in providing approvals / technical support.	Delays to project programme. In worst case, unauthorised sites.	H	M	M / H	Develop a good relationship with local authorities. Keep them well informed, and consult them on all decisions
						Start work on approvals at the earliest stage possible. If possible, do not start construction until approval has been given, and use this as leverage to hurry local authorities.
						Where local authorities remain uncooperative, appeal to the next highest level of local government for support.
Resettlement sites	Beneficiaries do not receive documentation proving that they own the land from the Government	Reduced beneficiary welfare. Risk of eviction.	M	M	M	Investigate what type of documentation beneficiaries should receive, and which Government departments are responsible.
						Put pressure on relevant Government departments to issue documentation as soon as possible. Work with other RC bodies and NGOs with expertise in land law if possible.
						Inform the beneficiaries of what type of documentation they should receive, and the steps they need to take.

AREA OF WORK	OPPORTUNITY	CONSEQUENCE	IMPACT ON COST / PROGRAMME / SUSTAINABILITY	FEASIBILITY	OVERALL OPPORTUNITY	CAPITALISATION
Housing construction	Introduce a model of housing reconstruction which is owner-driven, rather than donor-driven, such as cash-for housing.	Give beneficiaries greater ownership of the project, thus empowering them, building their self-esteem, and helping them to overcome the disaster.	H	H	H	Test the proposed owner-driven model in a small site. If successful, introduce broadly and share positive outcome with other RC bodies.
New Settlements	Work with other PNSs in Kalutara District on issues that affect new settlements, such as land rights, drinking water provision and construction of infrastructure	Pooling of knowledge and ideas on how to overcome difficulties in new settlements. More influence on local authorities by presenting a united front.	M	H	M/H	Organise regular (monthly?) meetings in Kalutara with other PNSs working in the District.
New Settlements	Implement works in host community through host community CBOs.	Providing host community with opportunities for paid labour creates positive sentiment towards project, and improves relationship between host community and new community. Makes host community responsible for quality of works.	M	M/H	H	Implement works in host community through CBOs, either directly or through the Divisional Secretary. Ensure DS is involved / informed in either case.