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When a giant killer wave created by an earthquake off the Indonesian coast swept into Sri Lanka the day after Christmas in December 2004, more than 35,000 people lost their lives, more than 100,000 homes along the coast were destroyed and for the hundreds of thousands of survivors, the word tsunami was etched into memory as a new horror never to be forgotten.

Indeed, the tsunami which claimed up to 430,000 lives in the neighbouring Indian Ocean rim countries, brought in its wake one of the largest and best funded humanitarian responses in recent history: the homeless received shelter, the hungry were fed, and the outbreak of diseases largely prevented.

And over and above this, the tsunami disaster served to change the way of thinking and the approaches to natural disasters of many in the international humanitarian community. This is where UN-HABITAT and Sri Lanka benefited from mobilizing a proven people centric and community driven methodology. While the agency, the Government and partner international and local stakeholders were versed in such, this peoples process and the owner driven approach has not been utilized in a recovery effort of vast magnitude. Consequently lessons learnt were many.

The tsunami disaster in Sri Lanka reaffirmed our view that the humanitarian assistance was not just a response to a tragic event, but also an opportunity to promote empowered, more disaster resilient communities.

First, that recovery must begin well before the end of the humanitarian response phase. The affected governments and international organizations such as UN system must always organize in such a way that the transition from relief to recovery and development is managed more seamlessly.

Second, that the process of recovery is led by those affected, that they are “empowered” to be in charge and make decisions and contribute actively towards rebuilding their lives rather than just brick and mortar. Thus far such an “owner driven” approach has proved successful in Sri Lanka for upgrading low income shelter as well as rebuilding shelter in disaster and conflict recovery. The approach entails seizing all the moral, financial and political opportunities it can, and help communities onto a better path with the focus on equity, human rights and gender equality.

Third, that we champion a new kind of recovery which seeks to build back better, rather than simply restore what was there before. That the recovery process takes advantage of the opportunity to better plan settlements, as well as ensure technical soundness of housing, and community infrastructure being rebuilt.

Fourth, recovery over time must include disaster mitigation principles like early warning systems, public education and the construction of more resilient structures;

At the heart of the success of UN-HABITAT’s efforts in Sri Lanka was the participatory, consultative “Peoples Process”, where the people affected were enabled in holistically rebuilding their communities. I am proud that this people’s process we came to call it, saw its inception in Sri Lanka in the 1980s as a result of a UN-HABITAT initiative.

I wish to express my gratitude to the Government of Sri Lanka, the Ministries of Nation Building, Urban Development, Housing, Resettlement, Economic Development, and their predecessors, the international humanitarian community, the business sector and all our partners for enabling this recovery process. Especially, I wish to thank the local communities with whom we worked.

I hope that this publication will be a tribute to those forced so cruelly to “rebuild” their lives, and a reference for approaches contributing towards successful post disaster recovery.

Dr. Joan Clos
Undersecretary-General of the United Nations,
Executive Director UN-HABITAT
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At 6.58 a.m. on December 26, 2004, an earthquake measuring 9.0 on the Richter scale occurred off the Sumatran coast, triggering a tsunami of unprecedented proportions. Less than two hours later, huge waves struck two-thirds of the Sri Lankan coastline – an extent of more than one thousand kilometres.

The Asian Tsunami of December 2004 killed almost a quarter of a million people in India, Indonesia, Thailand and Sri Lanka. Houses were severely damaged or reduced to rubble. Livelihoods were disrupted and livelihood assets destroyed. It was impossible to reduce the tsunami’s impact or manage its outcome. Inevitably, the consequences were dire.

In Sri Lanka the tsunami killed about 35,000 people, injured 22,000 and displaced several hundred thousand. It damaged 30,000 homes and destroyed a further 70,000. It swept away belongings and equipment and wrecked infrastructure and trade. More than 150,000 people lost their livelihoods.

What’s more, the tsunami worsened the problems of vulnerable people. A third of the people affected by it lived below the poverty line. Thousands of people, particularly in the country’s conflict-ridden North and East, were already experiencing years of displacement. And it was in the north-eastern coast that two-thirds of the deaths and almost 60 per cent of the displacement took place. Sri Lanka’s emergency relief efforts were successful in meeting the immediate needs of people but the speed of recovery of different groups was varied.

Sri Lanka had not experienced a natural disaster of this scale in recorded history. Relief, recovery and reconstruction posed an enormous challenge. Rebuilding people’s lives, particularly after a disaster as huge as the tsunami, was never going to be easy. Although the government was able to restore basic services quickly with generous local, national and international help, meeting the demands for shelter became a struggle. It was the most complex part of the tsunami recovery process.

The tsunami occurred the day after Christmas Day in 2004 and in many ways this timing proved to have enormous significance for what would follow. Sri Lanka is a popular tourist destination for tens of thousands of Europeans who are looking to
TURNING AROUND THE TSUNAMI

Avoid winter back home and relax around the magnificent Sri Lankan beaches. When the tsunami struck these tourists were instantly affected and a number were killed. This gave the tsunami an additional international profile and video footage was transmitted around the globe almost instantly.

For every tourist who was in Sri Lanka, probably a hundred friends and family watched on in horror back home. This, combined with the impact of this disaster striking at Christmas, resulted in the largest outpouring of support ever seen in post-disaster fundraising, with queues forming outside banks and institutions that had been designated as collection points for cash donations.

Foreign aid donated to Sri Lanka was estimated at more than US$3 billion with more than US$1 billion being given for housing alone. The implications of this are discussed in more detail under Resource Mobilization.

People were forced to rebuild their ways of life: ruins of a Hindu shrine destroyed

There was much that UN-HABITAT had learnt from the agency's previous post-conflict and post-disaster reconstruction and recovery programmes in countries such as Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Myanmar, Nepal, Indonesia, Pakistan and the Philippines. Moreover, the agency had been working in Sri Lanka for almost three decades, supporting a series of innovative and ground-breaking housing and settlement development practices and policies, in partnership with the government, NGOs and community organizations. The combined experience and knowledge enabled UN-HABITAT to contribute effectively to the island's post-tsunami reconstruction efforts.

Since 1978, UN-HABITAT has helped influence housing and urban policy developments in Sri Lanka. The agency’s programmes have included assistance to the:

- **Master Plan for Colombo (1978-1983)** which included the setting up of a Slum and Shanty Unit, one of the first successful slum upgrading programmes in a developing country. The Slum and Shanty Development Programme made it possible for low-income communities to gain individual lots with leasehold tenure, enabling them to improve their houses.

- **International Year for Shelter of the Homeless Demonstration Project (1982-1987)** on the development of low-income shelter initiatives and the integration of information and training activities.

- **Million Houses Programme (1984-1988)** through a training programme for community participation. This was an innovative programme, changing the government’s role from a provider of shelter to that of an enabler and facilitator in the housing process.

- **Million-and-a-Half Houses Programme (1989-1993)** through the continuation of the UN-HABITAT Programme for Community Participation, institutionalizing participatory approaches such as community action planning.

- **Sustainable Cities Programme** that began in the late 1990s and improved environmental planning capacity and urban planning strategies. This programme is still operational and has covered many cities in the country. In 2004, it extended its support to the government’s Urban Governance Programme.

- **Urban Poverty Reduction through Community Empowerment Project (2001-2003)**.

- **The Lunawa Lake Environment Improvement and Community Development Project**, which started in 2001, covering two municipalities within the Colombo Metropolitan Area with a focus on the implementation of an involuntary-resettlement policy for people affected by development projects.

UN-HABITAT played a key role in mainstreaming participatory methodologies in settlement development in Sri Lanka, including Community Action Planning and Community Contracting. Today, these principles are also being incorporated in urban governance, through broad-based city consultations, to ensure the greater recognition of the voice of the poor in local government.
In December 2004, UN-HABITAT demonstrated its ability to respond quickly and effectively to a disaster recovery situation. The agency worked with the Sri Lankan government, donors and key stakeholders to assess the tsunami’s impact and prioritize areas that were most in need. This was the beginning of UN-HABITAT’s involvement in Sri Lanka’s post-tsunami reconstruction programme.

Initially, the Japanese government funded UN-HABITAT projects covering five cities and 25 settlements – a concerted programme that would put into practice a people’s process of recovery and reconstruction. Despite the tsunami’s enormous negative impact, reconstruction provided an opportunity for ‘building back better’, addressing disparities and improving quality of life.

Once emergency relief was complete, it became evident that recovery and reconstruction was a much more complex and challenging task. The single largest damage to physical assets was to housing and it became a priority concern. However, repair and reconstruction activities were affected by a range of factors including lack of planning and coordination in areas such as needs assessment and resource allocation and delays in finalizing beneficiary lists.

The Sri Lankan government’s decision to introduce a coastal buffer zone had made it necessary to implement two distinct programmes. ‘Donor-driven’ housing, for families who had been living within the buffer zone, removed people from their localities with little consultation, making integration into their new neighbourhoods difficult. However, ‘homeowner-driven’ housing, for partially- and fully-damaged houses outside the buffer zone, ensured that people remain in their familiar neighbourhoods and would be responsible for rebuilding their homes. UN-HABITAT was one of the main advocates of the homeowner-driven process.

In April 2005, the government revised its housing policy, departing from the earlier centralized system, and devolved control to the districts. The District Secretaries now had the responsibility for tsunami housing projects, which were implemented in partnership with donor organizations, state agencies and non-governmental organizations. A key aspect of the policy revisions was the redefining of the coastal buffer zone: 40,000 families could now rebuild their homes on their own land inside the ‘old’ but outside the ‘new’ buffer zone.
Conventional approaches to post-disaster recovery and reconstruction have little community engagement, resulting in people’s growing dependency on the provision of assistance and a passive attitude towards reconstruction. Good intentions are rarely backed by proper long-term planning. In UN-HABITAT’s post-tsunami initiatives, people were actively involved in the reconstruction process, which in turn resulted in their empowerment, both as individuals and as communities.

This community-centred approach underscored the fact that, while families may be vulnerable on their own, their ability to cope is enhanced through mutual help when they are part of an organized group and work collectively. Community mobilization tapped on people’s resourcefulness — community members were motivated to take a lead in planning and implementing reconstruction and development initiatives. Thus, mobilizing people and the creation of Community Development Councils (CDCs) through a participatory and democratic process preceded all reconstruction activities.

Key stakeholders came together at Community Action Planning (CAP) workshops, organized by the CDCs and facilitated by project implementation teams, to agree on a prioritized set of activities within a clear time frame. Those responsible for carrying out the tasks were also identified and included individuals, groups, local authorities, other state institutions and donor agencies. CAP ensures that a range of views are taken into account and enables the negotiation of outcomes. It is based on principles of good governance that include concepts such as inclusiveness, partnership, accountability, decentralization, capacity-building and empowerment. Indeed, CAP is a creative process that promotes self-respect, self-confidence and self-reliance.

Community members improved their skills in management, bookkeeping, report writing, information gathering and data collection as well as in construction work and livelihood development. CDCs also took on community construction contracts to build communities’ infrastructure, with the money saved being channeled into other community development work. Community construction added to the sense of ownership and responsibility that was being created among the people and resulted in stronger commitment towards the repair and maintenance of new infrastructure.
In addition to the Hambantota district, UN-HABITAT’s interventions in post-tsunami reconstruction and restoration also extended to Batticaloa, Jaffna, Trincomalee, Kalutara and Galle districts and continued for several years.

In 2007, three years after the tsunami, thousands of families were still without adequate houses. That's when UN-HABITAT stepped in with the Rebuilding Community Infrastructure and Shelter (RCIS) project in the Ampara district, in partnership with Norwegian People’s Aid (NPA) and the NPA/Solidar INGO Consortium.

When the project began people were demoralized because they had not been able to make adequate progress with the government grant of Rs. 250,000 (USD 2,264) ASSUMING IT IS SRI LANKAN RUPEE$to rebuild their homes. Moreover, in a large number of cases, they had not received the full amount due to them. The project provided top-up grants to help 475 families complete their houses as well as financial and technical support to build infrastructure and improve livelihoods.

The initial challenge was to help people gain confidence in the process that was being introduced. Thus, at the outset, project staff held large public meetings that also included key local government officials, to introduce people to project objectives and to share details of potential beneficiaries—a move aimed to ensure community interest, involvement and trust. The meetings also enabled the project to obtain initial feedback from community members and to respond to their questions. This was a clear indication that the project would be implemented in a participatory, transparent and accountable manner.

Project staff, particularly the RCIS community mobilizers, facilitated the setting up of CDCs in the 12 project areas. The project appointed eight community mobilizers who worked along with two engineers – one from RCIS and the other from the NPA/Solidar INGO Consortium.

---

**SETTLING DOWN STRONGER**

**Uddhakandara, Hambantota District**

One of UN-HABITAT’s first post-tsunami rebuilding projects was the resettlement of 157 families from dispersed communities in the Hambantota district, in a 40-acre land allocated by the government in Uddhakandara in Tissamaharama. For some people, this was as much as 40 kilometres away from the homes they had lost. Families were selected through the District Plan for Rapid Action (DPRA) based on the extent of damage and the vulnerability of households in terms of physical and economic conditions. The project was able to extend both financial and technical support to another 61 low-income families who were already living in the neighbourhood so that their homes could match the standard of the 157 new houses being built for the relocated families. This minimized conflict with the newly-settled community and facilitated assimilation. Thus, a total of 218 families benefited from the project.

When we came here we had no houses to begin with. We made makeshift homes by cutting down a few trees in the nearby forest. Not all of us came from the same area and we also had to get to know the people who were already living here. It was a completely new experience and it wasn’t an easy one.

- Meththa Nandani

There was so much to be done. It was not just a matter of building houses. A large number of people were being integrated with a host community. We weren’t just project staff. We were part of the process.

- Lionel Hewavasam, UN-HABITAT District Manager, Hambantota

Five years later, the Uddhakandara settlement shows no signs of its difficult beginnings. Spacious brick houses in different shapes and colors. Home gardens with flowers and vegetables. An expansive community hall and pre-school designed to catch light and circulate air. A large playground surrounded by a green fence. Well-maintained gravel roads. What was the formula that turned a dry zone of scrubland into the green habitat it is today?

The community was organized by first setting up 16 small cluster groups, each including householders living close to each other so that they could interact and communicate with each other easily. All the houses in the settlement were covered by these groups. This helped us get to know each other and to discuss what we needed to do.

- M.M.K. Dharmadasa, President, cluster group 8

When we had the community action planning workshop every single house was represented – we, the newcomers and also the people who were already living here. Everyone had a chance to have their say. We listed out all the problems, decided what we could do about them, considered the best possible options. Then we chose people who would be responsible for each task. That’s how we prepared our action plan.

- L.P. Piyanthilake, Treasurer, FCDC

In Uddhakandara, money allocated for house building was released to the bank accounts operated by the CDCs. Individual householders operated savings accounts and funds for house construction were released to them when the building had reached pre-determined stages of completion. Each household also built a 5,000-litre rainwater harvesting tank to help see them through the drought months. Two large underground tanks, maintained by the CDCs, were built to serve the entire community.

- L.P. Piyanthilake, Treasurer, FCDC
In a way, we were intermediaries, we were in the middle. We had to satisfy people, many of whom had lost hope, and we had to talk to the government.

- Arugamam Gowreeswaran, Community Mobilizer

Another problem project staff had to deal with was that both the Urban Development Authority and the Pradeshiya Sabhava, the local government authority, were seriously understaffed. However, as work progressed, people were able to deal directly with government officials and other agencies.

RCIS provided each family with Rs. 300,000 in four instalments, based on set building targets, to complete their homes. An additional Rs. 50,000 helped people build a good toilet. The CDCs reserved 2.5% of the housing allocations for community development work. The project also allocated Rs. 8,000 for each household for infrastructure work.

Outcomes

- People built houses that are both secure and comfortable. Special attention is paid to aspects like adequate light and ventilation.
- People consulted the local Public Health Inspector before building their latrines and wells. They are located and built to give priority to health and sanitation.
- Septic tanks, which separate liquid and solid wastes, replaced the more traditional soakage pits.
- CDCs ensured that all sections of the community were represented in project activities and their views taken into account.
- Women were appointed to key positions in the CDCs in communities where women are traditionally confined to home.
- Community members gained confidence to talk directly to local authorities and negotiate assistance and services.
- Project infrastructure was built by trained construction committees mainly comprising community members.
- Communities built pre-schools, community halls, drains and culverts and electricity main line supplies.
- The most vulnerable community members gained knowledge and start-up grants to develop livelihoods. People formed links with a range of organizations and agencies to further improve their circumstances.
UN-HABITAT's tsunami response work was a coordinated effort carried out in partnership with a range of stakeholders. The formation and registration of CDCs was the beginning of partnership building within the community for collaborative decision making, problem solving and resource sharing. Communities learnt the principles of partnership: trust, solidarity and accountability through their experience of working together. Links were made between CDCs and Divisional Secretariats, Pradeshiya Sabhas, government departments, NGOs/INGOs and a range of supporters and donors, including the private sector.

Monthly meetings comprising all stakeholders of the reconstruction activities were a means of exchanging experiences and checking progress. The projects not only helped people build their homes but also helped them to develop their capacity to interact, communicate and negotiate with each other and the authorities and build secure environments and sustainable livelihoods.

CDCs were responsible for building community infrastructure using the money households received for this purpose. Building was carried out mainly by trained community construction committees - the training focused on both management and technical skills needed to carry out the work. Generally, at least two of the committee members had experience in construction. Construction Committees managed all aspects of the construction—the purchase of materials, storage, maintenance of accounts, and monitoring of work. Thus community construction contracts helped cut costs, improve community skills and facilitate operation and maintenance work.
The importance of partnerships continued to be evident throughout project timeframes. UN-HABITAT discussed people’s livelihood needs with related government departments like the Department of Agriculture and agriculture extension services, the Department of Animal Production and Health and the Department of Small and Medium Enterprises Development and also linked people with potential donors.

Gunaseeli is from Kundumadu Village and received only 100,000 rupees of the government allocation. She was so much in debt that she even had to go into hiding from impatient creditors. The house she managed to build had to be brought down because of its poor quality: “Immediately after the tsunami, everyone became a mason, and people had to go along with it. But things have changed now. With the project, we received technical advice from the beginning to the end of construction. Not just that, being a member of a CDC means that we can negotiate for better rates with construction workers who are good at their work and we can buy construction materials in bulk.” In Kundumadu, a multi-purpose building, on land donated by Gunaseeli, will serve as a pre-school and community centre. Even before the building was completed, the CDC had drawn up a maintenance and sustainability plan for the centre.

In Ampara the Al Noor and Al Amal CDCs in Ninthavur came together to build a multi-purpose building: a common pre-school, library and CDC office. The community construction system, which enabled any savings from construction to be fed back into the CDC, was at work. While one CDC managed the funds, both CDCs monitored building progress and the use of funds. A building supervisor and storekeeper were appointed for the construction period.

The RCIS project’s infrastructure development in the area included drains and culverts in Thirukovil, electricity supply in Vinayagar and a fish stall in Komari.

Through partnerships with stakeholders livelihood activities such as cattle farming were promoted.
Although people have many common concerns, disasters do affect people differently because of the variety of roles they play in society and the community and because of differences in their needs and vulnerabilities. Sensitivity to difference is vital to empowering people so that they can move on from the physical and emotional devastation of a disaster.

UN-HABITAT recognized the opportunity afforded by the post-disaster situation and its recovery and reconstruction process for social transformation. Particular effort was made to ensure inclusiveness and fair representation of people in terms of ethnicity and gender as well as social and economic status in CDCs and project activities. This could be considered one of the most crucial tasks undertaken by the community mobilizers.

Anticipating a better future; It was not uncommon that women were heads of household, and were in charge of reconstruction

A diverse group from different ethnicities worked together to build a communal water supply
Disasters destroy and disrupt. Yet, a disaster can recreate and reconstruct. It can bring opportunities for people to rebuild their lives in ways that reconfigure social relationships. It can, for example, empower women. The December 2004 tsunami was no exception.

T. Rufia from Kalmunai, a 32-year-old mother of two girls, faced the challenge of the tsunami single-handedly, with her husband in the ‘safer’ confines of a prison. Her house collapsed to the ground but she and her children were unharmed. When the government gave her Rs. 250,000 to build a new home, she knew it would not be enough but focused on establishing a firm foundation for the family she is responsible for.

Rufia points out that setting up a CDC was a not an easy task but it was certainly an empowering one: “First, we needed to register the CDC with the local authorities. As its Secretary, I went with a few other office bearers to the Divisional Secretary’s office to get this done. I then took on the responsibility of opening a bank account for the CDC. I had not done this before and no one took us seriously. Today it’s a different story. They treat us with respect. We have managed millions of rupees through this account.”

In many areas of the country, socially and culturally imposed restrictions to women’s mobility and social contact limit their access to information and undermine their confidence. Rufia is happy that she can now deal easily with banks and other institutions. After a year of being the CDC Secretary, she stepped down to let another member take up her position: “This is the policy of our CDC. When we are office bearers, we gain a lot of experience and we feel we should also give others a chance.”

With the Rs. 350,000 that she received in instalments from the RCIS project, Rufia completed her house to a ‘secure and habitable’ standard. This essentially means that her home has at least one lockable room and enough light and ventilation for healthy and secure living.

Rufia is intent on improving the sewing business she began when she was donated a sewing machine after the tsunami. But what she really wants is to become a teacher, because she has seen the difference that knowledge can make: “It will be education first and employment next for my two daughters,” says Rufia, “then they can think about marriage.”

AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF TWO CDCs

In the Batticaloa district, in the eastern province, the CDC of the Muslim village of Kuchchaveli was working with the newly-settled Tamil community of Kumburupiti to build much-needed infrastructure. The Kumburupiti community, comprising largely of people who were displaced both by the conflict and the tsunami, did not have a CDC that was registered; to do so would take too long as the infrastructure development project had to be completed within a period of six months.

We’ve moved into these houses but there much more to be done. We have a serious water shortage and we also didn’t have proper septic tanks. This is what the project was able to fund. Our community development council is still new, it has to be registered for us to be able to open a bank account, which is necessary if we take on community contracts.

- A. Yuharajah

Kuchchaveli is not in the immediate neighbourhood but the CDC was glad to help.

We knew what our friends were going through was not easy. They were really down. I think when we joined them there was a sense of relief. We were addressing the problems together. Our CDC is well-established and had already taken up community contracts. So now we are doing this together. If we make any profit from the building contract we will share it 50-50. We’ve already planned to build a bus halt and a small library with any money we make.

- S.M. Haroon, CDC President

In the meanwhile, the Kuchchaveli CDC encouraged the Kumburupiti CDC to become more active. As soon as the large well they are building is completed, many households want to start organic home gardening.

We need to be self reliant in some way. We’ve decided to start growing some food in our own gardens.

- V. Selvarani
The change in the government’s housing policy in 2006 by reducing the buffer zone paved the way for the primacy of a homeowner-driven housing programme as the main focus of the post-tsunami shelter effort. The new policy addressed most of the housing requirements of the displaced. It incorporates the following principles:

- A house for a house regardless of ownership
- All affected families to be considered
- Community participation both at organization and construction level
- Equity between beneficiaries
- Prioritizing the owner driven scheme supplemented by donor assistance without prejudice to the houses already built by the donors

In 2006, one of the biggest tsunami recovery programmes got underway through a partnership initiated by UN-HABITAT. The Community Recovery and Reconstruction Partnership (CRRP) was implemented jointly by the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), the Sri Lanka Red Cross Society (SLRCS) and UN-HABITAT.

CRRP demonstrated the superiority of the homeowner-driven approach in house construction over the donor-driven direct construction approach. It was evident that householders who were more engaged in the rebuilding of their homes were more satisfied with the final result and were also able to recover faster from the trauma caused by the tsunami.
BUILDING BACK BETTER

The vast majority of households contributed their own labor and resources to rebuild their homes. As a result, most people built houses that were of a higher standard than the minimum stipulated in the implementation guidelines. At the same time, however, project staff faced the difficult task of persuading families to work within the resources available to them. The incremental building of houses, in several stages as and when householders obtain resources, is part of the Sri Lankan house building tradition. Under this process a house is completed over a period of time. This is a concept that had to be understood when implementing the homeowner-driven housing programme.

S. Buvanesvari, a mother of three daughters and a son, built her house by leaving room for expansion when she had accumulated enough savings. Shanthini, a grandmother, had the same idea, but she is impatient to complete building: Completing the house is as important as building it. We had to leave room to build larger because we have so many children and grandchildren. But building costs are increasing and it looks like it’s a difficult target to achieve.

Under the CRRP, households received a top-up grant for house building to supplement the government’s base grant, a separate grant for water- and sanitation-related expenses, and technical guidance for building. In addition, the project provided a grant for the repair of or improvement to community infrastructure and for facilitating livelihood development.

As the CRRP was a fully homeowner-driven programme, land ownership and tenure issues were minimal. There were, however, delays in obtaining documentation on proof of ownership. Most documents, especially land permits issued by the State, had been lost or misplaced during the tsunami. The project had to adopt flexible practices where certification by Divisional Secretaries was accepted in place of permits. The CRRP implementation structure, with its quick decision-making process, flexibility and beneficiary focus on land and related issues, is a useful model for disaster recovery projects.

Incremental building is a norm in Sri Lanka, many families built a “500sqft” core house at first, and extended to suit their own aspirations.
UN-HABITAT provided technical assistance to the CDCs as well as to individual households. Following the initial training on basic house design and technical skills as well as project management and transparent administration of funds, CDCs played a vital role in the reconstruction process. CDC members joined the project’s technical staff to help individual households design their homes, prepared technical documents and supervised the reconstruction work. As far as possible, both skilled and unskilled labour was sourced from within the community. The acquired skills remain within the community and would be indispensable when maintaining the new assets.

UN-HABITAT was committed not just to building secure and durable houses but also improving the overall quality of people’s lives. The project insisted on certain quality requirements and standards in house construction. Houses had to reach minimum standards as stipulated by the National Housing Development Authority (NHDA).

A sanitary latrine with an appropriate effluent disposal system and a separate kitchen or a cooking space were essential requirements. The use of asbestos for roofing was discouraged, while the use of clay roofing tiles was actively promoted. At least one lockable room was insisted upon as a security need, while windows and doors as necessary for light and ventilation were stipulated. A vast majority of the beneficiary families, especially those who lived in makeshift shelters along the coast, had never experienced adequate sanitation facilities.

**GUIDELINES FOR HOUSING IN SRI LANKA**

The National Housing Development Authority, 2005

- House to be bounded by walls and covered by slab or a roof (Asbestos should not be used as a roofing material)
- One lockable internal room
- One internal or external kitchen/cooking space
- One internal or external sanitary latrine with adequate effluent disposal (according to specifications)
- Windows and doors as necessary for air, light and security
- Internal partitioning to meet householder requirements
- Electrical network in accordance with standards set by the Institute for Construction Training and Development (ICTAD)
- A minimum area of 500 square feet.
In Thiruchentoor in the Trincomalee district the Community Recovery and Reconstruction Partnership project helped 191 households to build homes. People were living in transit camps before they moved into temporary housing and eventually started building their own homes. Jeyarani is particularly happy about the advice given by technical officers when designing and building the house. The windows would not have been as large if we didn’t get their advice and there would have been less light in the house. More light makes a big difference.

**BENEFICIARY LOG BOOK**

The CRRP project introduced a Householder’s Log Book which was an innovative step that facilitated the construction process. The book, where all advice, technical and otherwise, to beneficiary builders was noted, became an important information tool and medium of communication between householders and the implementing team. It was also an educational process – the documentation of questions, explanations and guidance.

I was in debt, but used every cent of the 200,000 rupees I got from the government to build one room and part of the roof. When I got the money from UN-HABITAT and Solidar, I got some good technical advice as well. I decided not to use asbestos sheeting for the roof and made my windows larger. So I’ve built a solid house that is good to live in. And the CDC was always there to help out. I was very much part of the process of building my home. Now that I’ve built it, I can think of other things.

- Kadija Umma, Ampara

In Uddhakandara, to facilitate construction work 30 people from the settlement received training in masonry, carpentry, plumbing and electrical wiring. This enabled significant savings on building costs. The project’s technical officers worked closely with the householders to finalize house plans as well as guide the entire construction process.

Mr. Chandana, the technical officer, was very particular about every detail. We had to complete something perfectly before going on to the next step. For example, we couldn’t fix the doors until the frames were fixed exactly right. Sometimes we found this really frustrating. But we began to understand the value of doing this correctly. The CDCs began to supervise construction closely. Not even a small amount of cement was allowed to go waste. Some people saved money by buying materials in bulk and doing part of the construction themselves.

- Jayantha Abenayake, President, Pinsara Community Development
One of the problems the government had to deal with after the tsunami was the lack of suitable land for resettlement. In the Uddhakandara project the community regularly experienced drought and strong winds, and ‘swelling and shrinking’ of the soil. The project ensured that, from the very beginning, people would be introduced to community-based disaster prevention and mitigation concepts and practices. Each household carefully followed the guidelines for building in high wind- and drought-prone areas published by Sri Lanka Urban Multi-hazard Disaster Mitigation Project. Households were allocated Rs. 456,000 for each home, which occupied an average area of 586 sq. ft.

We made the foundation stronger and placed it on hard ground. When we couldn’t do that we applied a layer of sand. We had reinforced concrete beams on the top of walls and the load bearing walls were made thicker. The roof was anchored to the concrete beams and the tiles were cemented down so that they would withstand high winds.

- M. Rupawathi, Secretary, FCDC
The Uddhakandara settlement learnt about disaster preparedness through workshops held by the Disaster Management Coordinating Unit (DMCU) of the Disaster Management Centre at the Hambantota District Secretariat. The CDCs transformed themselves into disaster management committees when a disaster was expected or occurred – and they’ve already gained some practical experience. Part of the settlement was flooded when heavy rains breached the neighbouring irrigation tank, the Yodha Wewa. The CDCs immediately banded together to repair and reinforce the tank bund. Not surprisingly, community members are particularly sensitive to the need to recognize their vulnerabilities and to be prepared for adversity.

All our homes have been insured against fire and other natural disasters like cyclones, floods and earthquakes. In addition to this, there is a life cover for the husband and wife in case of accidental death. When one of our members drowned while fishing, the family was able to get 100,000 rupees under this coverage.

- M.A. Pushpa Nandani

LOOKING ELSEWHERE FOR A HOME

Many makeshift houses that occupied the reservations along the beach and railway line in the Colombo district were completely destroyed by the tsunami. To add to the tragedy, people could not reconstruct their houses as their land fell within the buffer zone set by the government. People were moved to transit camps and lived a difficult life in unhealthy and congested conditions, waiting for the authorities to come up with proposals to re-house them. As land in the Colombo District was not available, authorities gave people the option of buying their own land with a grant of Rs. 250,000 a family. People had no choice but to look for land elsewhere, as land prices in the Colombo district were unaffordable. People started looking for land in the neighbouring Kalutara District, but could afford to buy land only in the remote rural areas far removed from their traditional coastal habitats.

Twenty-three families from Moratuwa bought land in Weralugahagodella and moved into temporary shelters. Not long after, they experienced a natural disaster – flooding due to the heavy rains in the Kalutara District. Many of the shelters collapsed and the residents also lost their source of drinking water because even the wells had been submerged. Moreover, the canal flowing through the housing site was sluggish with silt and overgrown weeds and could not carry the flood waters fast enough.

We heard about this situation by reading a newspaper article. It was such an unfortunate thing to happen. We visited the area and talked to the people. They had faced so many challenges. The felt tricked by the person who sold the land, they didn’t feel they were welcome in the neighbourhood. The Community Recovery and Reconstruction Partnership was well placed to help them. We started as we always do, by forming a community development council. There is less chance of things going wrong when the community gets organised.

- A.K. Jinadasa, UN-HABITAT District Manager, Kalutara

We didn’t know what to do when we were struck by the second disaster. We were living in small temporary houses. They weren’t habitable anymore. But then the project arrived and we got organized. Being the CDC secretary meant there was so much to do... and lots of criticism to take. People were both desperate and impatient. It was important that I remained strong and patient. Now that we can actually live in these houses without fear of another flood we can get on with our lives. It’s something we’ve been waiting for, for more than four years.

- Manel Fernando, CDC Secretary

Recovery and Reconstruction Partnership was well placed to help them. We started as we always do, by forming a community development council. There is less chance of things going wrong when the community gets organised.

- A.K. Jinadasa, UN-HABITAT District Manager, Kalutara

The project provided full grants for housing construction. The UN-HABITAT district team and engineers talked with the householders and the local authorities and determined the levels to which the foundations of the houses should be raised to avoid the seasonal flood waters. UN-HABITAT also prepared designs for raised footpaths with pipe crossings to access the new houses as well as for raised internal roads. The project also succeeded in bringing electricity to the settlement.

The CRRP evolved a process where the Sri Lanka Red Cross Society incorporated the community development councils into its own branch network. SLRCS is continuing with consolidation activities, especially in livelihoods development, community-based disaster risk management, environmental protection and maintenance of infrastructure.
More than US$1 billion was donated to support housing recovery within the first six months following the tsunami. The funding 'profile' was remarkable: firstly because the vast majority of the funds were donated by individuals and private companies rather than the traditional large institutional donors, and secondly because NGOs often had more funds to distribute as grants than foreign governments, UN agencies, and even multi-lateral organizations. It was not uncommon for large NGOs to have budgets in excess of US$30m, while some exceeded US$100m.

Almost from the outset it became clear that funding for reconstruction would not be the major challenge. As with all modern disasters, comes the 'curse and blessing' of hundreds of new implementation agencies who bring funding, or the hope of funding. Some 500 new agencies had arrived in Sri Lanka, 100 of which had developed housing components into their programmes. Probably fewer than 25 per cent had any previous experience in housing construction, most having emergency and temporary shelter experience at best.

In this environment the need for clear, simple policy was essential if chaos was to be avoided. UN-HABITAT engaged with the Sri Lankan government at the earliest stages to offer support and guidance on developing equitable policies around housing construction methodology, standards, cost limits and integrated settlement planning. Seven weeks after the tsunami struck, the government closed its emergency Centre for National Operations (CNO) and opened the new Task Force for Rebuilding the Nation (TAFREN), later to be reorganized and renamed the Reconstruction and Development Agency (RADA). In 2007/8 most of the functions were passed on to the newly-formed Ministry of Nation Building, where tsunami reconstruction was a minor portfolio. These agencies were responsible for overseeing reconstruction across all sectors and the development of appropriate policies.

A key lesson learnt by many governments affected by the tsunami was that greater utilization of existing structures and capacity building of ministries such as housing, water and sanitation, urban development, environment and disaster management would be
preferable to creating a stream of new institutions with questionable experience and skills. These ad-hoc institutions also lead to major institutional memory loss.

Positively speaking, the housing-related policies which did emerge were quite straightforward and, though developed with minimal consultation, were reasonably effective at setting a minimum standard. However, there were two exceptions: by not enforcing a ‘ceiling’ cash limit, widespread inequity was experienced and the ‘Buffer Zone’ policy which saw the demarcation of an exclusion zone around the island restricting the ‘right of return’ to areas within 200 metres of the sea in the East and 100 metres in the west of the island caused the greatest delay in housing reconstruction efforts.

Although the policy was well meaning and intended to keep people safe from future tsunami type events, it was an emotion-based response rather than a scientific risk assessment response.

This policy meant that around 40,000 families could not return to their old land close to the sea, adversely affecting their livelihoods and ways of life. As soon as the policy was introduced, a host of agencies with UN-HABITAT at the forefront lobbied for it to be revised. Many construction projects were put on hold as agencies were reluctant to build houses inland for relocation, as a change of policy would mean that families could once again return.

In November 2005, 11 months after the tsunami, the policy was amended and the buffer zone was greatly reduced with new boundaries based on a Coastal Conservation Department initiative from 2004, just before the tsunami. It took almost four months before the new policy was understood and in the hands of implementing agencies. UN-HABITAT had spent months briefing agencies and preparing them for the changes which would have major programmatic implications.

‘HERDING CATS’ (COORDINATION)

As the title suggests, coordinating hundreds of newly-arrived agencies was an almost insurmountable task. Immediately after the tsunami, UN-HABITAT advocated strongly for an integrated coordination to support the government’s effort. While funding for reconstruction projects was plentiful, funding for coordination proved elusive. Although UN-HABITAT provided guidance and support to a

Most devastated houses were in close proximity to the sea, many were affected by the “Buffer Zone” policy
range of agencies and government institutions from the onset, only in October 2006, some 20 months after the tsunami, did the agency receive funding to develop the ‘Technical Advisory Support for the Coordination Mechanism on Permanent Housing’ project (TASCMPH).

The project was designed to support activities which would lead to families returning home or moving to their new home at the earliest possible time, and to help resolve any impediments. The project quickly identified the following key challenges:

- Buffer Zone Policy uncertainty caused an enormous loss of momentum
- Absence of finalized beneficiary lists confused the planning process and led to serious delays and lack of transparency
- Donors and INGOs inexperienced in the housing construction sector often failed to deliver and at times lead to ineffective supervision of contractors by these agencies, resulting in defects and quality issues. Lack of consultation and awareness of ground realities led to non-occupation of new houses by affected families (5-10% of relocation programme), this was a stark contrast to the homeowner-driven approach, which proved overwhelmingly to be the most successful reconstruction methodology for low-density housing. Agencies competing to provide ‘the best houses’ resulted in cost escalation meaning that fewer affected families were reached and at a higher cost
- Insufficient priority given to environmental and integrated infrastructure issues
- A lack of flexibility in relation to gender related land ownership issues (co-ownership)
- Need for clear policy on equity issues such as inequity between and within tsunami affected communities, inequity between tsunami affected and unaffected neighbouring poor and equity between tsunami and conflict affected.

The project strived to support coordination at national and district levels by strengthening existing mechanisms and where necessary, developing new mechanisms, processes and tools. A key activity was to support the Government Agents (GAs) and the Ministry of Nation Building in identifying accurate beneficiary lists. At a policy level the project assisted in the preparation of guidelines and policy relating to vulnerability, security of tenure and gender equity, and also promoted the necessity for inclusion of post-disaster scenarios within a National Housing Policy.

The following tools were utilized in supporting this process:

- ‘District Housing Profiles’, giving an overview of tsunami housing damage and progress and main issues affecting each of the districts
- Needs assessments and construction progress reports on a monthly basis
- The Housing and Habitat Forum (H&H) and the Donor Working Group on Housing (DWGH). The H&H was a forum for technical staff to raise issues and share information with other agencies and to raise issues that required resolution at a national level. The DWGH addressed national level issues with a strong focus on financing issues.
- A wide range of briefings to all stakeholders which helped create joint planning and synergies between agencies
- Documentation of the Lessons Learned on housing coordination, early recovery and recovery stages of reconstruction

**WHAT DID WE LEARN ABOUT RESOURCE MOBILIZATION, POLICY SUPPORT AND COORDINATION?**

Post-disaster resources will flow into most affected countries. That is not the time to begin thinking about how to organize or mobilize additional funds. Pre-disaster planning is essential to avoid both time loss and wastage of resources. Agencies with strong track records and coherent well thought through projects will be funded.

Clear and simple policy that has included reasonable consultation is one of the greatest assets to speedy recovery. While this is generally the responsibility of the government agency, a heavy burden also rests with donors, and particularly UN Agencies, to support this and ensure that it happens.

Reconstruction takes considerable time even with massive resources. The absorption capacity and delivery capacity of any country is limited and often greatly reduced around the time of a major disaster. Realistic planning can help speed up reconstruction and it can also highlight the need for targeted resources, capacity building and specific skills training programmes that will be required. Four to five years is probably the most reasonable recovery planning cycle for major disasters.

The importance of effective coordination is too often under-estimated and coordination is too often conducted ineffectively. UN-HABITAT’s tsunami housing coordination project demonstrated that effective, integrated coordination can achieve a wide range of successful outcomes, including the timely return home and recovery for affected families and the saving of tens of millions of dollars.
In many areas affected by the tsunami, although people had succeeded in rebuilding their homes, communities still had some way to go to achieve satisfactory infrastructure and livelihoods even five years later. In the Rebuilding Community Infrastructure and Facilities project implemented in collaboration with IFAD, UN-HABITAT’s extensive experience in a people’s process of reconstruction and recovery was once again put to good use. The project followed the same approach used for the reconstruction of houses: setting up CDCs (where they were none), holding CAP workshops, developing necessary community skills and, as far as possible, building infrastructure through community contracts managed by CDCs.

Moving on from a disaster to development requires that people reduce their vulnerability in economic terms as well.

In Uddhakandara, three welfare units were set up under the three CDCs to grant small loans and operate as support groups when households experienced financial hardships such as when a death occurred in the family. A separate savings system is operated at cluster group level, raising funds through membership contributions and other creative means like holding small auctions. The funds were also used to grant small loans to cluster group members.

Here, a Women’s Bank was set up with 42 members...
TURNING AROUND THE TSUNAMI

in five groups. Today membership has risen to 143 in nine groups. The initiative was supported by the Women’s Bank Federation of Colombo.

People make regular savings. When we started giving loans we began with Rs. 500 but we have even gone up to Rs. 50,000. During both the dry and wet farming seasons, everybody needs loans. As it is a revolving fund, the loan applications are scrutinized. The money is always circulating.

- Meththa Nandani, Women’s Bank Manager

The UN-HABITAT district office held career and business development programmes for 50 people. They learnt how to formulate projects and prepare project reports for small home-based income-generating projects. People also gained skills in particular livelihood skills that included sewing,

Savings through micro finance schemes such as women’s banks strengthen the voice of women

SERIOUS ABOUT BUSINESS

One room of a community hall has been turned into a small shoe factory at the Kadirgamar Tsunami Housing Project at Valahanduwa, 16 km from Galle. Improving livelihoods was a top priority for many of the people whose move had meant that their traditional form of income was lost.

Fourteen people showed a keen interest in starting a collective shoe production business. They first followed a comprehensive training in the manufacture of shoes and learnt about accessing raw material as well as the market. The project provided Rs. 187,000 for the training as well as the initial stock of raw material.

The group has secured a regular market and shares profits between the 14 members. A second batch of people is waiting to be trained and join the business.

We want to do this business not just to give us an extra income. We will improve our production and capture a wider market. We will soon make it our main occupation.

- Sunethra Jayanthi
goat farming, mushroom cultivation and making ornamental products.

A total of 135 families submitted individual proposals for small scale projects. UN-HABITAT initiated a dialogue with the Bank of Ceylon in Tissamaharama to enable a project specific loan scheme for small and medium industries. The Bank of Ceylon accepted 135 project proposals and granted individual loans up to a maximum of Rs. 200,000. These loans were granted on the recommendation of the CDCs; having a personal guarantor was not a requirement.

The Rebuilding Community Infrastructure and Shelter project (RCIS) supported the poorest householders to rebuild their livelihoods by developing their skills and providing small ‘start-up’ grants. UN-HABITAT linked the CDCs with other agencies so that people can benefit from a wide range of expertise and assistance. A.H. Mohamed Jezeer, the Training and Livelihoods Coordinator of the project, points out that a new and well-built house alone does not ensure a family’s well being. People need a dependable source of income: “Better livelihoods mean improved assets which, in turn, lead to reduced poverty and better resilience. This is what we want the RCIS livelihood initiatives to achieve”.

V. Kanthi from Kundumadu in Potuwil has just completed her house and the project is helping her set up a small dairy-based enterprise. She is anxious to improve her income because she must bring up five children on her own. Ravia Amma learnt new home gardening techniques from her husband who was recently trained on the subject. She will use her garden produce to feed her family as well to make some extra money.
It is significant that the RCIS project had as its first objective the rebuilding of "social capital" – i.e. the empowerment of the community. This may be the project’s most significant achievement. When the project began, none of the communities in the 12 project areas in Amparai had the benefit of CDCs. Today, all 12 localities have active CDCs committed to continuing and strengthening their activities.

CDCs have gained recognition as well as the strength to negotiate with their political representatives and local authorities; they have evolved a system of democratic and transparent ‘local’ governance. The people of Uddhakandara, for example, decided recently that public space in the settlement should not be used at election time to divide people and pollute the environment. Posters, flags and banners are allowed only within people’s individual compounds. Political labels are also disallowed at community functions; only the national flag is flown.

They do, however, sometimes make an exception. The Italian flag is displayed at some functions as a gesture of gratitude to the main donor of the project that supported the development of their settlement.

UN-HABITAT post-tsunami reconstruction projects incorporated several key aspects that contributed to sustainability:

- Appointing committed and active community mobilizers
- Setting up representative CDCs that carry out its activities in an inclusive, open and transparent manner
- Building the capacities of people to communicate, manage, negotiate and lead
- Facilitating the formation of good relationships between community members and local authorities
- Ensuring community savings so that people are able to develop their livelihoods through revolving micro-credit schemes.

Eighteen families from Dehiwala, in the Colombo district, where they lived by the sea before the tsunami, are slowly settling down in Raigamwatte with help from the Community Recovery and Reconstruction Partnership. Violet Peiris decided to write the deed in her daughter’s name. She is focused...
on ensuring that her children and grandchildren have the more secure life that she had had. Violet runs a small grocery store in her house and supplies lunch packets for construction workers: I work really hard to make some money. We used to be able to get loans quite easily in our earlier neighbourhood. Here no one wants to lend us any money. I needed to improve my business. It was good to get help from the project for it.

Violet’s daughter Sujeewa is the President of the CDC:

My husband and I have begun a fruit business. He goes quite a distance to buy fruit cheap in large quantities. We need to think creatively to grow under difficult conditions. The settlement is slowly looking up. All the homes have electricity now and we get water from a common well. We also built a storm water drain through a community contract.

UN-HABITAT demonstrated a high level of ownership and satisfaction in the homeowner-driven rebuilding strategy. It built the capacity of communities to face social, financial, environmental and economic challenges beyond immediate reconstruction. People are confident of ensuring the long-term sustainability of their settlements through legally-recognized CDCs that were set up by the communities at the beginning of the projects – and have now outlived project timeframes. The principles and processes on which the projects are based continue to be adopted in Sri Lanka and elsewhere by other implementing agencies as well.

One of UN-HABITAT’s most recent initiatives has been the Consolidation for Settlement Capacity Building and Livelihoods Development Support to Build Sustainability of Communities in Eastern Sri Lanka. The main objective of the project was to improve the competence of people who are engaged in development activities to take a holistic approach to development and enhance the co-ordination mechanism between communities and institutions. The project developed guidelines and conducted training programmes to build capacity of local authority staff, community leaders and officials from relevant agencies.

Guidelines developed by the project:
- Formation of Project Proposals
- Strengthening Community Development Councils
- Establishing a Revolving Fund by a Community Development Council
- Maintenance of books and documents of a Community Development Council
- Maintenance of common facilities
- Community evaluation for settlement management

UN-HABITAT will continue to promote the participatory development process it has successfully adopted in its tsunami recovery programme in Sri Lanka. Local knowledge, inter-personal networks, contacts, and the capacity to work together are collective assets of people living in displaced circumstances and inhospitable environments. This social capital can be enhanced and utilized in the rebuilding process.
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REBUILDING COMMUNITY SHELTER AND INFRASTRUCTURE

architecture for humanity

Donor: Architecture for Humanity
Location(s): Districts of Hambantota and Colombo
Amount: USD 130,000
Output: Community Infrastructure

Australian Red Cross

Donor: Australian Red Cross
Location(s): District of Jaffna
Amount: USD 308,000
Output: 43 houses

Donor: Australian Red Cross
Location(s): District of Hambantota
Amount: USD 201,096
Output: 42 houses

BASF

Donor: BASF
Location(s): Districts of Galle
Amount: USD 531,000
Output: Community Infrastructure / Construction of a New Fish Market & Restaurant Complex

Fukuoka, Citizens of

Donor: Fukuoka, Citizens of
Location(s): District of Galle
Amount: USD 174,000
Output: 47 houses
Donor: IFAD
Location(s): Districts of Kaluthara, Galle, Matara, Hambantota, Ampara, Batticaloa and Trincomalee
Amount: USD 1,650,000
Output: Community Infrastructure / Livelihoods

Donor: IFRC (Community Recovery & Reconstruction Partnership)
Location(s): Districts of Ampara, Batticaloa, Colombo, Kaluthara and Jaffna
Amount: USD 2,990,412
Output: 6431 Houses and Community Infrastructure

Donor: Italian Corporation
Location(s): Districts of Ampara & Kaluthara
Amount: USD 1,220,870
Output: 200 houses and community infrastructure

Donor: Italian Corporation
Location(s): District of Hambantota
Amount: USD 854,185
Output: 176 houses and community infrastructure

Donor: Japan, Govt. of
Location(s): Districts of Galle, Batticaloa, Jaffna and Kilinochchi
Amount: USD 3,000,000
Output: 1133 houses and community infrastructure

Donor: KBGC
Location(s): District of Ampara
Amount: USD 331,540
Output: 75 houses
### Donor: Munich, City of

Location(s): District of Ampara  
Amount: USD 188,790  
Output: Humanitarian Assistance / Emergency relief & Community Infrastructure

Location(s): District of Batticaloa  
Amount: USD 1,321,004  
Output: 40 houses and Community infrastructure

### Donor: Nuremberg, City of

Location(s): District of Ampara  
Amount: USD 430,000  
Output: Community Infrastructure / Healthcare Centre

### Donor: Overseas

Location(s): District of Ampara  
Amount: USD 246,154  
Output: Community Infrastructure

### Donor: Salvation Army

Location(s): District of Jaffna  
Amount: USD 1,631,014  
Output: 210 Houses and Community Infrastructure

### Donor: Solidar

Location(s): District of Ampara  
Amount: USD 2,500,000  
Output: 475 houses and Community infrastructure
Donor: United Arab Emirates, Govt. of (Channeled through Red Crescent of the United Arab Emirates)
Location(s): Districts of Galle, Batticaloa, Ampara, Trincomalee
Amount: USD 4,540,465
Output: 1324 houses and community infrastructure

Donor: United Nations Development Programme
Location(s): Colombo
Amount: USD 766,810
Output: 100 Houses

Location(s): District of Trincomalee
Amount: USD 175,844
Output: Community Infrastructure

Location(s): All Affected Districts
Amount: USD 50,000
Output: Technical Advisory Support for the Coordination Mechanism on Permanent Housing

Donor: Vitoria, City of
Location(s): District of Batticaloa
Amount: USD 134,532
Output: Humanitarian Assistance / Emergency relief & Community Infrastructure

Donor: World Jewish Relief
Location(s): All Affected Districts
Amount: USD 96,965
Output: Consolidation for sustainability of settlements

Technical Advisory Support for the Coordination Mechanism on Permanent Housing

Donor: Multi-donor
Donor: UNICEF
Amount: USD 564,954

Donor: American Red Cross
Amount: USD 77,630
Following the massive destruction left behind by the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami in Sri Lanka, UN-HABITAT assisted the reconstruction of nearly 10,000 homes and community infrastructure. The agency also provided the government with technical support in coordination of the housing sector. At the heart of the agency's successful efforts was the “People’s Process” where communities were given ownership of their recovery, and brought together in building better, sustainable communities. This book aims to highlight the success of the thousands who rebuilt their lives and provide a reference of approaches, methodology and lessons learnt for post-disaster recovery.