



International Organization for Migration (IOM)
The UN Migration Agency

EVALUATION REPORT

IOM CERF SUPPORTED RESPONSE IN SRI LANKA FOR LANDSLIDE-AFFECTED COMMUNITIES IN KEGALLE DISTRICT



April 2017

Contents

1. EVALUATION SCOPE AND RATIONALE	3
2. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	3
3. THE PROJECT AND ITS CONTEXT	3
Initial CERF Context and Proposal.....	3
IOM Response Set-up.....	5
Beneficiary Data and Response Modifications	6
4. Government Response Strategy	7
Defining the Risks and Needs.....	7
Inclusive process with real Beneficiary Choice.....	8
Land Allocation Results and Limitations	8
Permanent Housing Construction.....	9
5. MAJOR EVALUATION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:	10
6. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS:.....	11
Recommendation 1: Continue Beneficiary Support.....	11
Recommendation 2: Capacity Strengthening for the Government of Sri Lanka Response.....	12
Recommendation 3: UN Coordination System	13
7. ANNEX A: STRUCTURED FINDINGS	14
MATRIX 1: Analysis of project effectiveness.....	14
MATRIX 2: General Analysis and Recommendations	18
MATRIX 3: Alignment with IOM Progressive Resolution of Displacement Situations Framework (PRDS).....	23
8. ANNEXES B-C: Attachments	26
Annex B: CERF Internal Evaluation Meeting and Site Visits	26
Annex C: TS-Sri Lanka Model.....	26

I. EVALUATION SCOPE AND RATIONALE

IOM has a long history of responding to natural disasters and conflict in Sri Lanka. Given past experience, the mission devised the CERF programme response to the landslide affected communities in Sabaragamuwa Province to ensure a combination of emergency shelter and non food items (NFIs), as well as transitional shelter for families that could not return to their homes due to either home destruction or high risk designation by the Government of Sri Lanka (GoSL).

IOM Colombo requested an evaluation of the programme from the IOM Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (IOM ROAP) to:

- Provide an end-of-programme performance evaluation to determine the effectiveness of the response in relation to CERF criteria, GoSL response priorities and IOM's Humanitarian Policy;
- To the extent possible, provide an impact level assessment of the response, going beyond the direct CERF supported interventions, with particular focus on shelter and settlement issues related to landslide land and housing allocations;
- To assess gaps and additional needs to support long-term durable solutions in line with IOM's Progressive Resolution of Displacement Situations (PRDS) policy guidance.
- To document best practices and lessons learned particularly in the context of landslides

The evaluation was conducted by an IOM Regional Thematic Specialist, Andrew Lind, in December 2016. Although the project covered two districts within Sabaragamuwa Province - Kegalle and Rathnapura – the evaluation focused on the Kegalle district response which was the most comprehensive, including emergency shelter and NFI commodities distributions, and transitional shelter implementation on newly allocated land sites. In Rathnapura, per Government Agent (GA) priorities, IOM provided only basic Emergency non food items and shelter kits.

2. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation involved a mixed method of data gathering using a semi-structured interview focus that was modified depending on the key informants but guided by Matrix 1 and 2 in Annex A: Structured Findings. Annex B includes a detailed itinerary and meeting schedule.

In total, the IOM ROAP evaluator attended 26 meetings with different key informants from the Government and non-Government partners. The evaluation further involved direct observation in three divisions in Kegalle District at two camps and six transitional shelter sites. In most of the camps and shelter sites, structured interviews and discussions were held with local government authorities and project beneficiaries. Interviews with project beneficiaries focused primarily on satisfaction with IOM support and beneficiary concerns surrounding shelter, settlements, livelihoods and durable solutions in the post-landslide response as the primary target group were those affected by the landslide (including those who had lost homes and family members) as well as those in GoSL-designated high risk areas that are required to move to new locations.

3. THE PROJECT AND ITS CONTEXT

Initial CERF Context and Proposal

On 15 May 2016 Tropical Storm Roanu struck Sri Lanka and subsequent torrential rains resulted in severe flooding across the country and landslides in the hillsides of Sabaragamuwa Province. The situation on the

ground was extremely fluid with daily changes in figures for affected populations as well as for damaged and destroyed houses, assets and belongings. As per the Situation Report on 26 May 2016 by the Disaster Management Centre (DMC) of the Ministry of Disaster Management 301,602 individuals had been affected by floods and landslides with 104 reported deaths. Approximately, 21,484 were still displaced, living in camps and temporary accommodation. Large parts of the affected areas are inaccessible due to the presence of water or mud.

IOM initial rapid assessments conducted on 22-23 May 2016 in Gampaha, Colombo and Kegalle districts, and discussions with humanitarian partners on the ground and Government authorities clearly showed the gaps and constraints as well as the needs directly resulting from the crisis. Emergency shelter was required for those with completely destroyed houses and emergency shelter kits were needed for those with partially destroyed houses. According to preliminary figures from the 26 May Situation Report of DMC, the estimated number of destroyed houses across the country amounted to 623 and the number of damaged houses amounted to over 4,414, out of which at least 192 houses were reported to be fully damaged and 1,597 partially damaged in the Sabaragamuwa Province alone. As of 31 January 2017, the most recent update from the National Building Research Organization (NBRO) reported 178 houses as fully damaged and 1,735 houses were reported as partially damaged.



While in flood-affected areas people were expected to return to their homes as water levels receded, in landslide-affected regions people staying in evacuation centres (approx. 80% of the affected population) or hosted by relatives/friends (approx. 5-10% of the affected population) were unlikely to be able to return to their homes in the short term and the Government was considering options for mid to long term shelter arrangements until the landslide risk alert was withdrawn or until alternative land/housing was identified for those who will not be able to ever return to their homes.

Temples, community buildings and abandoned schools were being used as safe locations, with approximately 55,956 families (237,240 individuals) initially reported in 376 such locations. These locations were not prepared to accommodate such numbers and, due to a lack of partitioning, did not allow for adequate levels of privacy, nor did they allow for separate access to sanitation facilities. During the initial shelter assessment, IOM identified the primary immediate needs of affected populations as follows: kitchen utensils and cleaning supplies, sturdy enough to clean mud and debris and including disinfectant, for families returning home to be able to clean their houses and cook; mosquito netting, coils, flashlights and basic daily amenities; safe spaces for children to play and appropriate spaces for school-aged children to study while displaced. In addition, IOM targeted for Emergency Shelter (Tents) for 300 families to improve on the shelter options offered in camp settings.

Upon GoSL request for external support, and as agreed at the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) level, CERF funding was allocated to the two shelter lead agencies, IOM and UNHABITAT, to address sectoral needs. The shelter sector's overall response per geographic area aimed at capitalizing on each agency's comparative edge and sectoral experience in the country.

UNHABITAT targeted flood-affected urban districts (Colombo and Gampaha) and IOM focussed on assisting landslide-affected population, and to a lesser extent flood-affected communities in two rural districts (Kegalle and Rathnapura).

The project purposes/sector priorities were defined as follows:

- Provision of emergency shelter (family tents) for those with partially destroyed or damaged houses living in camps and camp-like settings (collective centres, and relocation sites). Emergency shelters took into account the specific context of the affected areas in the hillside and were used where affected families were able to return to their places of origin and depending on the geographic context.
- Provision of Emergency shelter kits for those with partially destroyed or damaged houses who could return home. Shelter kits were made up of tarpaulins/plastic sheeting as well as ropes, netting and the associated accoutrements.
- Provision of NFI to be distributed either through places of origin, where possible, or in camps. NFI included non-collapsible jerry cans, aluminium cooking pot, aluminium sauce pan with lid, deep stainless steel plates, stainless steel cups, stainless steel table-spoons, kitchen knife with stainless steel blade, towels, plastic mats, plastic basins, hurricane lamp, mosquito nets and coils, sanitary towel packets, curtains and torches for women and other items under dignity kits.
- Provision of transitional shelter for those with completely destroyed houses that received new relocation sites and were able to move out of the camps/collective centres. These were to be used for the worst affected families who would not be able to ever return to their homes and are to be given suitable alternative land allocation by the government.



IOM Emergency Tents – A. Lind © IOM, 2016



IOM Transitional Shelter – A. Lind © IOM, 2016

In the original CERF proposal IOM proposed the provision of 420 Transitional Shelters, 300 Emergency Shelters (tents), 1,000 shelter kits and 2,783 non-food items for the victims of floods and landslide in selected Divisional Secretariat (DS) Divisions across Kegalle and Rathnapura Districts in Sabragamuwa Province, though these targets were later revised as explained in the section below on beneficiary data and response modifications. The need for shelter was primarily in Kegalle District.

IOM Response Set-up

IOM requested and was granted space to establish its presence within the District Secretary's office (GA) in Kegalle, and allocated two desks within the Disaster Management Unit (DMU) in the District office. This allowed IOM to position two project staff with past shelter and engineering experience from previous response programmes in other parts of the country, including one staff with local language skills for improved coordination with beneficiary populations. The integration of IOM and the District DMU allowed for direct coordination and communication on a daily, informal and formal basis to facilitate the CERF response activities; it also improved IOM's coordination capacity with key government agencies and offices including the National Water Supply and Drainage Board (NWSDB), the National Building Research

Organization (NBRO), the Land Commissioner, and the Divisional Secretaries and their offices that led the response at the local level and attended regular coordination meetings at the district office.

Beneficiary Data and Response Modifications

Upon establishing the office and initiating procurement processes, the IOM staff found drastic differences in the verified data from Division offices and made adjustments quickly to ensure timely, efficient and appropriate use of CERF support. In particular, based on verified numbers and needs on the ground, IOM decreased the number of transition shelters to 286 (from 420), shelter kits to 600 (from 1000) and the number of non-food item kits to 1,750 (from 2,783). It should be noted that the inflation of data in situation reports at the national level (DMC) was something discussed by various UN and Government actors at a national level.

No changes were made for the numbers of tents – 300 – which were primarily distributed to 29 displacement sites (camps) located throughout Kegalle District. Although IOM does not normally provide tents for shelter as they are not reusable in construction, tents were selected in this event due to the likely long-term need for shelter for families in collective sites. Families in high risk zones were required to move to safe locations, and the tents offered the GoSL a safe location for temporary shelter. Many partners, including Shelter Box and bi-lateral Governments, provided tents to the GoSL for the response. IOM has also distributed tents to families who have been allocated land and intend to move out of camps and take residence on new land sites while beginning the permanent housing process.

In addition, the programme experienced a number of operational challenges in connection with the set-up of transitional shelters due to delays from the government side in terms of the identification and allocation of suitable land for relocation of people in high risk areas. The transitional shelter (TS) model is intended to provide a ‘better than tent’ option to families to quickly move out of camps and have an adequate structure for six months to two years, during the phase in which they build (or receive) a permanent home. The TS construction and delivery delays were due to a prolonged government process in land acquisition, surveying, land clearing and landscaping by the NBRO. Upon land allocation and clearance, IOM swiftly constructed 286 TS in Kegalle District by January 2017. More detail on the land process is covered in the below section on the Government response strategy.

As the total number of TS was reduced, IOM received approval from CERF to extend the timeframe and reallocate the bulk of remaining funds to provide permanent sanitation facilities (VIP Latrines) through World Vision International (WVI) to 160 IOM TS beneficiary families that were not covered by ongoing UNICEF WASH CERF programming (UNICEF funding covered 126 TS). In addition, IOM requested that WVI support in filling gaps at displacement sites (evacuation centres) including improvement of cooking spaces and spaces for school children to study, provision of solar lights and water filters, certified training to government camp managers in first aid and life-saving, sewage collection, and printing and dissemination of hygiene and awareness raising posters. IOM also provided a water bowser and tractor to support water provision at evacuation centres and TS locations until permanent water sources could be identified, and provision of a drainage and retaining wall to one camp in a cricket field to avoid flooding. The bowser is now running on a regular basis and, with the reallocated CERF funding, IOM supported the provision of 166 latrines, 299 water tanks, 190 water filters, 397 solar lights, and 1,272 garbage bins through WVI with training on waste management in camps by officers of the Medical Officers of Health.

Additional activities to support Kegalle District included a lessons learned workshop organized by District Secretariat Kegalle. Participants included NDRSC, Divisional Secretaries and relevant staff, including village headmen, NBRO, Department of Health, Land Commissioner, Local authorities and INGOs. The purpose of the workshop was to reflect on achievements, lessons learned and best practices from the

humanitarian response, as well as discuss next steps, such as efforts to support disaster risk reduction and help families better understand technical and financial details pertaining to the construction process.

4. GOVERNMENT RESPONSE STRATEGY

IOM's activities were aligned with the Government of Sri Lanka's (GoSL) response strategy. The GoSL developed general strategic responses and plans, both from the initial phases, including defining risks and needs, and taking into account the longer term displacement solutions for people affected by the landslide or living in High Risk areas (defined by NBRO).

Defining the Risks and Needs

In the aftermath of the landslide, the GoSL took the decision to evacuate all persons that could be considered at risk. In total, 131 people lost their lives, primarily from the community which has now resettled in Wasanthagama. A total of 29 camps and evacuation centres were in place throughout the district and the initial phase focused on managing the displaced population while conducting assessments on the land and risks. NBRO led the landslide risk assessment and categorized the population base on low, medium and high risk. Those that were deemed at medium and low risk were given specific information and conditions, but advised that they could return home. As observed below, as of 20 October 2016, a total of 1,918 families were designated as high risk in Kegalle District, while 4,713 were allowed to return home.

NBRO NEW REPORT					
THEN		1682	NOW		1918
Summary of Landslide Investigation Reports in Kegalle District, Landslide Disaster May 2016, (up to 2016.10.20)					
No	DS Division	No of Reports	High Risk	Medium Risk	Low risk
1	Aranayaka	52	569	1084	195
2	Bulathkohupitiya	77	437	544	145
3	Kegalle	82	228	749	150
4	Dehiowita	73	171	276	135
5	Yatiantota	43	142	256	85
6	Mawanella	28	99	242	19
7	Ruwanwella	23	78	68	0
8	Deraniyagala	51	58	223	82
9	Galigamuwa	37	53	199	9
10	Warakapola	30	46	135	42
11	Rabukkana	18	37	74	1
TOTAL		514	1918	3850	863

As per the latest report from the end of January 2017, an additional 23 families were included in the high risk category, bringing the total to 1,941 families, of which 1,175 families are already in the relocation plan and an additional 766 families are to be included in to the plan upon receiving cabinet approval. To address the needs of the families at high risk, most of which were in camps or evacuation centres (many are also with host families), the District began an intensive process of land acquisition and allocation. This process requires coordination of the District, Divisional Offices, NBRO, Land Commissioner, and NWSDB

(in particular, others as well). Initial work was haphazard and learning occurred as the pressure decreased and the process SOPs (unwritten) became known.

Per the NBRO officer, there are 48 approved sites for relocation in Kegalle District. At the end of February 2017, 423 families comprising 1,584 individuals continued to live in the camps, while 258 families were residing with extended families and relatives. The sites identified are often quite a distance from the original home. Although this is understandable given the safety risks of the landslide zone – on the side of the mountain (see picture below) – it will lead to additional concerns over livelihoods. Many of the families are still retaining (and the GoSL has not banned) their access to the original land for cultivation, though the women and children have moved to the new relocation sites. It will be important to continue to monitor the effects of this change, particularly on the income options, as women remain with the children which decreases the number of family members involved in cultivation in the origin site.

Inclusive process with real Beneficiary Choice

The GoSL took great pains to define a positive process to address the crisis and achieve durable solutions. In Matrix 3, we outline how this aligns with global criteria and guidance for Durable Solutions, taking as a framework IOM's Progressive Resolutions of Displacement Situations (PRDS) policy document and system. Although some of the administrative particulars are still being worked out, the GoSL defined the primary parameters for relocation and construction with openness to flexibility and choice for the displaced:

- a) Government responsible to allocate land for the 1941 families identified to be at high risk.
- b) Owners willing to find their own land can receive guidance/approval from NBRO and then will receive a land grant of LKR 400,000 (~USD 2,676)
- c) Committed (politically) to support permanent reconstruction – to date only found donors for about 130 guaranteed (February 2017)
- d) Permanent reconstruction to be based on 3 model homes that are disaster resilient (presented and designed by NBRO)
- e) Provision of LKR 1,200,000 (~USD8,000) to purchase building materials for owner driven construction in relocation sites for people who lost their houses and were categorized as high risk
- f) NBRO to provide technical instructions and support for families involved in own construction

Land Allocation Results and Limitations

Land allocations have been in line with basic standards, with GoSL focusing on moving people together (in village groups) wherever possible, and as short a distance from their current land as possible. As most of the affected population consists of farming communities, the GoSL has focused on ensuring they continue to have access to their previous land which was much larger than that which can be given, and is their primary source of income. Access will not be limited, but services and housing in the risk locations will not be permitted.

IOM was initially informed that land for TS construction would be identified and made available within a short time frame. However, official allocation of land by GoSL took time in this challenging environment. Once land was allocated for construction, access to water in these areas remained a challenge. Similarly, transportation of construction materials to the sites was complicated by the limited number of routes to the areas. Further, when the lands were ready for the construction process to commence, IOM still had to await NBRO technical certification and adequate access to reach the location with trucks of construction materials. Nonetheless, as soon as approval was received, IOM constructed 286 transitional shelters within four months to facilitate the move. Both the community and the local government expressed appreciation for the efficiency and pace of the work completed by IOM with the CERF funding.

The largest limit or difficulty on the land issues has been a combination of quality and quantity. The NBRO and DS noted this and some sites are particularly cumbersome, and in some places families will receive only about (maximum) 10 perches while, according to discussions with GoSL, the standard minimum in Sri Lanka is 20 perches.¹ The limited land size poses particular problems for space for construction given that many locations in Kegalle are on hillsides where cutting may be required to build homes. This often required additional shoring of the land, and additional costs for construction (larger foundations with pillars drilled into bedrock if possible).

Land allocations have been remarkable to date. At the end of March 2017, some 305 acres were identified for distribution in 48 relocation sites, of which 146 acres have already been distributed among beneficiaries in 19 relocation sites. In addition, 205 beneficiaries have been identified as eligible for the land grant of 400,000 LKR, of which 109 beneficiaries have already received the payment. An additional 318 beneficiaries will also be receiving this assistance and have been approved in the budget.

Permanent Housing Construction

With permanent housing construction in mind, IOM Transitional Shelters (TS) are mostly on the edges of the land to allow for space. Demolition of some shelters was required in Wasanthagama to accommodate the construction of permanent homes on the site with limited space. However, in the other relocation sites where more land was available, permanent house construction could commence without removal of the TS. For the most part, the TS locations do not pose a significant problem as it is unlikely that permanent homes will be built in many sites for some time, and the TS allows affected families to start returning to normal while they begin the slow process of construction.

Lastly, of particular note is the mixed method for addressing the need for permanent housing. The GoSL is fully aware of its own limitation, and has reached out via various Government and Non-Government partners, including the private sector. By March 2017 in Wasanthagama, 20 homes were already constructed by Dialog (Telcom Company) with private contractors, while an additional 30 homes were under construction and soon to be completed (10 each by Army, Navy and AirForce with funding for materials from Dialog). Habitat for Humanity has stepped forward to build 80 homes in three divisions, and there are various discussions with partners and private sector actors to push for more (note: Funding from China may build some houses, but the multi-story model is questionable given the environment).



Construction under way at TS site – A. Lind © IOM, 2016

Global guidance from the shelter sector based on best practices indicates the most appropriate and viable solution is to focus on owner driven construction. Per point e) above, the GoSL prefers this option. Originally the plan was for Military construction of all homes, but once numbers were realized to be above the initial plan of 300, and given the Military commitment to other activities at this time, the GoSL has settled on staged construction and money transfer system to support local families to rebuild on their

¹ Note: 10 perch = 2722.5 ft² = 252.9 m² ; 20 perch = 5445 ft² = 505.9 m²

own. Per GA Kegalle, they further plan to support the creation of local site focused community based organizations (CBOs) to support technical assistance and community mobilizing around reconstruction at all 56 sites.

For the construction grant, by March 526 eligible beneficiaries were identified for the first payment of LKR 40,000 of which 327 beneficiaries have already received payment. An additional 649 beneficiaries will also be financed under this category and have been approved in the budget.

5. MAJOR EVALUATION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

The evaluation shows that the project objectives and purposes have been achieved satisfactorily, and CERF support significantly contributed to the fast delivery of assistance to the affected populations through access to emergency and transitional shelters, emergency shelter kits and NFIs.

In particular, the Transitional Shelters (TS) were seen as the most effective element according to beneficiary and Government satisfaction, with requests for additional support beyond the scope of the project. With preliminary needs assessments already conducted, as soon as funds became available, IOM commenced implementation. Official allocation of land by GoSL took time in this challenging environment; however, as soon as approval was received, IOM provided rapid delivery of assistance through provision of 286 transitional shelters to beneficiaries within four months. This was a significant achievement given the task required of land identification and acquisition, survey and plotting, technical certification and land clearing to facilitate access to the site.

Both the community and the local government expressed appreciation for the efficiency and pace of the work completed by IOM with the CERF funding. The TS model was changed to fit local needs (including electricity, veranda, and privacy partitions). These shelters provided protection from the elements and the partitions enabled families to have privacy, separate spaces for sleeping, cooking, and play spaces and study space for school children. Many families with TS are also already working on permanent housing in many sites. In addition, contractors for this process were chosen from Kegalle district, which allowed for greater capacity through specialized knowledge and also provided support to affected communities, with one of the contractors coming from a high-risk area and hiring staff from that area.

Given the needs on the ground, the tents were seen as relevant, particularly as families in collective sites had a long-term need for shelter. This was especially so after Shelterbox, the other primary tent provider, exited due to constraints regarding its intervention. IOM allocated 300 such tents to affected communities in relocation sites. Although not part of the programme, IOM also supported Host/Tent community meetings to deal with problems and organize communal support – of particular note was the Ussappitiya Camp on cricket grounds which required buy in from the sport club.

IOM demonstrated flexibility to fill gaps in needs at evacuation sites. IOM was not officially a Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) partner (only GoSL), but still effectively supported evacuation sites. All interviewed DS and Evacuation Centre staff specifically noted that IOM delivered NFIs which were not delivered by others, including kitchen sets (stainless steel), stoves, solar kits (solar lights and USB), and other items specific to the needs of the evacuation centres in particular. Further, instead of distributing standard shelter kits (2 tarps and rope), IOM distributed toolkits that included a hammer, crow bar, hoe, shovel, tarp, rope and ground sheeting – all of which were thought to be of high quality and relevance, in line with suggestions made by the Government.

The water bowser and tractor proved critical to the intervention as there was an urgent need of water and the threat of drought loomed. The water supply also provided a strong incentive for families to move from tents to identified relocation sites. WVI was also a well-selected partner for this CERF-funded intervention. Their water tanks and latrines, although not specific to standard shelter packages, enabled IOM to ensure that the Transitional Shelters will be habitable. It was wise to return to the CERF secretariat to request this modification as the creation of TS without latrines and water storage capacity would have severely limited the recovery process especially given the geographical context of affected communities. They also have plans to remain working with the targeted communities which allows for increased sustainability on child protection and WASH given the IOM and UNICEF funding to their operation.

6. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS:

The following recommendations are context specific for early recovery and community stabilization and although, in this evaluation, they are directed towards IOM, they are equally valid and could be followed by other UN, INGO and relevant government entities.

Recommendation 1: Continue Beneficiary Support

On the whole, there has been effective support for the persons in designated high-risk areas. That being said, there are still a large number of families in need of land, movement to the new land site, and support in owner driven construction for permanent housing. Although IOM cannot continue transitional shelters at this time, the use of IOM tents and support to move people to safe and permanent locations needs to continue.

Short Term:

IOM SL should continue to liaise to support GoSL actors to ensure land allocation and permanent housing construction begins quickly. It is recommended that IOM take NBRO and DS to relocation sites under their direct management to facilitate (1) technical advice on house construction and (2) provide clear GoSL guidance on land and housing compensation packages (LKR 1.2m for housing). To ensure the sustainability of the process, IOM SL should do its best to:

- Conduct a rapid assessment in mid to late 2017 to observe tent and TS longevity the number of families (%) that have made tangible progress towards permanent reconstruction on new land, and GoSL provided services.
- Continue to discuss with DS and District, as well as national level DMC to ensure that funding and land allocation process continues. For example; if possible, suggest IOM or any other interested agency to provide support to continue work via GoSL direct funding for community construction and mobilization
- Work with DMC and other GoSL entities to establish Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) for Sri Lanka to support future tracking and monitoring of displacement, relocation, returns, process, and services in each site – currently no standard map and simple data form

Long Term:

Lastly, the families who have moved to relocation sites will require additional support in the long run. The primary issues of concern revolve around the relocation sites and the commitment by the GoSL to ensure access to services and livelihoods, as well as the new community nature of relocation sites and the question of cohesion and sustainability. There is good reason to believe – based on movements on the ground and focus discussions with beneficiaries and DS actors – that the commitment level of the GoSL is high, and will continue to push forward with relocations and land allocations for all households.

IOM and the GoSL should consider developing a community stabilization and livelihoods programme to ensure the sustainability of the interventions that have begun. Specific actions/programme solutions that should be considered include:

- **Disaster Resilient Infrastructure:** support to ensure that all sites have adequate access and services (water, schools, roads, clinics)
- **Comprehensive longitudinal livelihoods monitoring and services:** The relocation may have repercussions that are not visible at this time during the response phase and may lead to families choosing negative strategies (including return to high risk zones) in order to compensate
- **Psychosocial Stabilization work around community cohesion:** Most of the communities are a mix of villages and are only getting to know each other at this time. These particular sites with mixed village families will go through a process of governance and tension as they rebuild. There may be different effects for women, girls, boys and men. A long-term support programme to enable increasing local community participation and social cohesion will improve the resilience of the communities to further shocks.

Recommendation 2: Capacity Strengthening for the Government of Sri Lanka Response

During the course of the project, there were several key learning and standardization processes identified that would support improved management of future disaster scenarios by the GoSL. We would recommend projects in the future that focus on the Disaster Management systems to enable better preparedness and emergency response. In particular, IOM should:

- Support GoSL to develop Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) based on the land allocation lessons learned to disseminate for districts with similar needs in the future – these SOPs will establish core roles and responsibilities and enable districts to learn from the Kegalle experience and more rapidly set up multi-agency processes to allocate land when necessary after landslides or other disasters that require land processes.
- Document the locations that have been used as Evacuation Centres, including support to develop guidelines for quality and management of such centres, mapping of pre-selected and designated centres, and support for the GoSL on information management (IM) systems that enable them to coordinate and ensure adequate services at all such sites (IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix – DTM).
- Document and approve an official model for transitional shelters (TS) to ensure their use by GoSL and other actors in future emergencies. Given that land and construction process can take months and years to complete, it is important to plan for the transitional period immediately following the disaster event. NBRO has standard permanent housing designs, but it would be beneficial to the GoSL and IOM to ensure minimum standards on TS models to enable a transitional option that is pre-approved by the GoSL in future emergencies. The TS model was confusing to the Kegalle leadership at first, but then after the effective roll out, they were highly appreciative as the TS's delivered rapid options that gave families space to move forward with their permanent housing. This should be documented and used in future disasters – regardless of IOM involvement.
- Document combined kit standards (IOM and partners) and work with Shelter Partners and GoSL to create a standardized recommended package (NDRSC to inform agencies as well as Sri Lanka private donations on the standard NFIs packages required. These Information Tools can be disseminated immediately following future disasters to ensure more responsible and useful donations from bilateral governments as well as private individuals in Sri Lanka. Given that the

Shelter and WASH clusters are not currently in existence, this could be done in a working group format with DMC and NDRSC , IOM and key UN agencies and NGO agencies.

Recommendation 3: UN Coordination System

The cluster system was not activated and the only UN coordination mechanism was the RC and CERF focal point. Ad hoc coordination occurred between IOM and UNICEF, but there were no formal channels for coordination along cluster/sector/geographic lines. Normally, the Shelter Cluster would be a viable way to increase the number of coordination meetings to ensure additional sharing of information and knowledge as the response continues. Regardless of whether a shelter cluster is activated, IOM and/or other shelter sectors partners should support Red Cross SL to form an Emergency Shelter Working Group (ES WG) to compliment the WB Permanent Shelter group that is already in existence.

Given the middle-income nature of Sri Lanka, it is unlikely that a formal HCT set up will be required. Regardless, during emergency responses, particularly where CERF and other donor funding is present, monthly (or weekly) meetings should be held if possible with all partners (HCT + NGOs) to ensure efficiency, prevent redundancy, and enable partners to share information and knowledge that may facilitate the response capacity of partners.

7. ANNEX A: STRUCTURED FINDINGS

MATRIX I: Analysis of project effectiveness

Overall Objective: *To provide life-saving assistance to 8,356 most vulnerable people affected by the floods and landslides in selected DS divisions of Kegalle and Rathnapura Districts through shelter and NFI in a six-month time frame.*

PROJECT TARGETS	ACHIEVEMENTS	ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVENESS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>Outcome: Access to emergency, transitional shelters, shelter kits and NFI enables protection and life-saving in the short and medium term for the flood and landslide affected beneficiaries.</p>	<p>Target achieved for families supported through the IOM ES, NFIs and TS components.</p> <p>In total 1941 families in Kegalle District are classified as High Risk and therefore require relocation. IOM TS and ES support is primarily in this district with 286 TS and 300 additional tents (ES) to support families allocated new land: 586 families (Around 31% of total caseload)</p> <p>For Emergency Shelter and NFIs, 100% of the needs (1750 families) were covered in Kegalle per GA; additional items for increased dignity and lowered risk (water filters, solar kits, etc.) have been distributed</p>	<p>The Transitional Shelter (TS) is the most effective element of the project as seen both by beneficiary and Government satisfaction, including requests for additional support beyond the scope of the project.</p> <p>This outcome relied on Government land allocation, and the IOM TS and ES support pushed the GoSL to enable and produce results on the land process. The learning from the land process is also an achievement in itself given that many GoSL officials noted that they had learned and developed land options much quicker than in previous experiences.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support GoSL to develop SOPs based on the land allocation lessons learned to disseminate for districts with similar needs in the future – should include roles and responsibilities of key actors in the Government. • Assess livelihoods needs, particularly for women in the Kegalle transitional sites as the move to new locations may limit ability of women to participate in livelihoods depending on distance and requirement to stay home and look after children • Conduct post action assessment mission in mid-2017 to observe the number of families (%) that have made tangible progress towards permanent reconstruction

<p>Output 1: 420 families with destroyed houses by landslides have access to transitional shelters.</p> <p>Indicator 1: 420 transitional shelters provided.</p> <p>Modified: 286 TS</p>	<p>Actual: 286 TS will be completed by January 27, 2017 in 8 new community locations (permanent relocation sites)</p>	<p>IOM's response on TS was seen as highly relevant and efficient. Many DS expressed surprise at the speed at which IOM successfully built TS immediately upon land clearance and allocation. Quality and efficiency were highlighted, model was changed to fit local needs (to include electricity, veranda, privacy partitions) and families with TS are already working on their Permanent housing construction in many sites</p> <p>Contractors chosen from District – allows for more capacity and even support to affected communities as one contractor is from the high-risk area and hires staff from the same.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPS mark each house with photo of house and latrine for documentation and map of actions taken • Write up short summary of design process and design specs for future use and official approval at national (NBRO) level for TS options in future disasters. • Conduct 6-12 month assessment of TS to ensure learning and documentation of quality issues (currently they are new, so no longitudinal observations possible)
<p>Output 2: 300 families with partially damaged or destroyed houses by landslides or floods receive emergency shelters (tents).</p> <p>Indicator 2: 300 emergency shelters distributed among IDPs.</p>	<p>Actual: 300 tents allocated to date in the IDP sites and a few in transition sites</p> <p>Added items for gaps: Solar Lights (397) Water filters (190) First aid trainings with Govt in the IDP sites (total of 7) Life saving trainings (total of 7) Retaining wall and drainage for one IDP site</p>	<p>Quality: IOM tents were seen by GoSL and Beneficiaries as the highest quality, most expensive, and most relevant to the context because of the space they afforded, their user-friendly structure and durability. This was in contrast to the other ad hoc tents received from sources. One beneficiary even took the team inside to demonstrate his pride in the tent/home set up.</p> <p>Relevance: Given the needs on the ground, the tents were relevant, with 300 allocated to date.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with DMC and other GoSL entities to establish Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) for Sri Lanka to support future tracking and monitoring of displacement, relocation, returns, process, and services in each site – currently no standard map and simple data form • Suggest to GoSL to work with families to dismantle current IOM and non IOM tents to help families move and begin construction process • Document Evacuation Centres, map, and support GoSL to develop standard guidelines with NBRO and other entities for improved

		<p>Flexibility: Demonstrated flexibility with goods to fill gaps in needs at evacuation sites was highlighted and important as IOM was not officially a CCCM partner (only GoSL) but effectively supported evacuation sites.</p> <p>Host community: Although not part of programme, IOM supported Host/Tent community meetings to deal with problems and organize communal support – of particular note, Ussappitiya Camp on cricket grounds which required buy in from the sport club</p>	<p>coordination and oversight of evacuation centres in the future</p>
<p>Output 3: 2,783 families worst affected by landslides or floods receive NFI kits.</p> <p>Indicator 3: 2,783 NFI kits distributed among IDPs.</p> <p>Modified: 1,750 families</p>	<p>Actual: 1750 families served to date</p>	<p>Flexibility, Quality and Relevance: All DS and Evacuation Centre staff interviewed noted specifically that IOM delivered NFIs that were not delivered by others including kitchen sets (stainless steel), stoves, solar kits (solar light with USB port), and other items specific to the needs of the evacuation centres in particular.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document combined kit standards (IOM and partners) and work with Shelter Partners and GoSL to create a standardized recommended package (NDRSC) to educate SL private donations standardization – many NFIs were redundant or not targeted based on initial goodwill offerings
<p>Output 4: 1,000 families with partially damaged or destroyed houses by landslides or floods receive shelter kits.</p> <p>Indicator 4: 1,000 emergency shelter kits distributed among IDPs.</p> <p>Modified: 600 families</p>	<p>Actual: 600 families received shelter kits</p> <p>Plan: balance to be distributed with the NFIs as above</p>	<p>Flexibility, Quality and Relevance: Similar to the NFI kits the shelter kits that contained a modified (non standard) kit that included a hammer, crow bar, hoe, shovel, tarp, rope and ground sheeting (i.e. toolkit) were thought to be of high quality and relevance; in line with suggestions made by the Government.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above

<p>Output 5: Development of 286 latrines in support of transitional shelters to facilitate the safe and sustainable relocation of affected populations</p> <p>Indicator 5: 286 latrines provided in transitional shelters</p>	<p>Actual: 299 water tanks and 160 latrines via WVI; reminder for TS covered by UNICEF – total 286 latrines (one per TS)</p>	<p>Flexibility of CERF: The water tanks and latrines, although not specific to standard shelter packages, enabled IOM to ensure that the Transitional Shelters will be habitable. It was wise to return to the CERF secretariat to request this modification as the creation of TS without latrines and water storage capacity would have severely limited the recovery process especially given the geographical context of affected communities.</p> <p>WVI selected well - good work and plans to remain working with the targeted communities which allows for increased sustainability on child protection and WASH given the IOM and UNICEF funding to their operation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future TS should include a standard latrine in the tender and procurement process. Although the CERF partnership supported IOM to manage latrines for all families, it is more sensible to include the latrine and TS construction in one BoQ and ensure that all relevant resources for a household are covered in a uniform manner. This should be worked out, as Latrines fall under WASH, but there is no reason to limit Transitional Shelters to only the shelter structure with no latrine.
---	---	---	--

MATRIX 2: General Analysis and Recommendations

CRITERIA	OBSERVATIONS	RECOMMENDATION
Relevance:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly relevant mix of Tents, Emergency shelter kits, NFIs and Transitional Shelters – all interlocutors focused primarily on the IOM coordination and prioritization in accordance with GoSL response needs, flexibility to work with local systems, and willingness to adjust • Tents from IOM were initially seen as less relevant due to a similar intervention from ShelterBox , but as SB exited due to constraints and took tents with them, IOM was the primary tent and shelter supplier from then on • TS was not clear to GA and DS in terms of relevance initially, but all pointed out that this approach has drastically decreased the tensions as permanent housing will take much longer than expected; advocacy was intense on IOM side to convince the Government of the need, and they were all appreciative (after the fact) that they had listened to IOM and given space for IOM TS support in particular in the most affected areas (as opposed to tents only). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the CERF focused on Shelter, and no request for CCCM was received from the GoSL, IOM did not directly implement CCCM activities. CCCM would have been highly relevant in this context given the fact that the IDP sites (tented camps and evacuation centres) still remain and are likely to remain through mid-2017 at a minimum. Future shelter programmes should assess the likelihood that relocation and land allocation will be required – which takes a long time – and consider a direct IOM response, tracking and coordination with the GoSL actors to ensure adequate surveying of services and intentions for all evacuation centres and tented sites.
Efficiency and Cost-effectiveness:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All GoSL officials were particularly pleased with IOM efficiency in delivering most of the commodities, including the tents, shelter toolkits and NFIs within 30 days. • Purchase of materials was primarily done through SL local suppliers (efficient and supportive to local economy) • Complex cost effectiveness – approximately 150 USD per person served. TS in particular are about 1000 USD without latrines, likely closer to 1500 USD per TS with latrine and all supporting items. This option should be used sparingly for life saving (CERF), and particularly for similar scenarios in which relocation will be necessary (i.e. not for return) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IOM SL should explore the possibility of establishing LTAs with suppliers that have been chosen during this process to facilitate future procurement at scale and without undue administrative procedures. These LTAs can be reviewed every 6 months by the procurement department in collaboration with the emergencies unit

<p>Impact:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although a CERF rapid project, the TS and relocation elements have demonstrated clear direction towards positive long term impact in Kegalle; particularly should note that IOM TS programming included electricity, WASH, NFIs, and by creating community emphasis pushed the GoSL services (Electricity, Water) to move forward quickly • See PRDS analysis below for more comprehensive impact evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to liaise with and support GoSL actors to promote efficient land allocation and permanent housing construction; recommend taking NBRO and DS to relocation sites under their direct management to facilitate (1) technical advice on house construction and (2) clear GoSL guidance on land and housing compensation packages (1.2 m LKR for housing) • Support NBRO with implementation of the technical instructions to monitor the construction of owner driven houses as per the specified designs.
<p>Sustainability:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability was not the original intent, but the support that IOM gave to the District will ensure that families have a new (or 2nd) home in which they can invest for permanent housing • IOM did not take the direct role (face of the project) and left that to the Government for beneficiary interaction, selection and process for distributions and allocations of sites. Although this limited some of our knowledge of beneficiaries this <i>does</i> ensure improved sustainability as the entire process is owned by the district and DS offices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct rapid assessment in mid to late 2017 to observe tent and TS longevity, the housing construction % for families in new land, and GoSL provided services • Continue to discuss with DS and District, as well as national level DMC to ensure that funding and land allocation process continues. If possible, suggest IOM support for continued work via GoSL direct funding to IOM for community construction and mobilization
<p>Gender:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IOM had 2 staff on the project in Kegalle both of whom were men, which could have limited IOM direct knowledge of specific issues for women. IOM, therefore had extensive coordination with the DS and local government which was highly inclusive and had primarily women officers. • All stakeholder interviews conducted during this evaluation demonstrated that beneficiary participation by women was the highest. This may also be due to men going to their original home to farm. No specific strategy or gender lens was observed although the Tents were noted for having partitions within them, as well as the TS which allowed for improved privacy – targeted in particular for women based on cultural elements in SL. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DS in Bulathkohupitiy specifically mentioned the need to assess the women’s livelihoods elements as she is concerned that women will not have the same access as men. This was beyond the scope of the IOM project, but it should be noted for future options in longer term recovery and stabilization as the movement of the household and the effects on the women, girls, boys and men of the household may be different • Psychosocial support was also mentioned as an area of concern for children (new schools/location) and for women now dealing with a new community dynamic

Gender-based Violence:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specifics observed here, although WVI mentioned some worrying signs around tented camp areas. Each site has GoSL actors to monitor and provide security but most of these actors are men Child protection was the only observed/discussed area of intervention by partners in evacuation centres; no general protection overview was provided Some initial work on CCCM committees in ad hoc manner, which included increased women’s participation, but this was not directly linked to GBV or referrals systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of reporting on S/GBV does not mean that nothing is happening at the sites. In the future, agencies can implement a CCCM/Protection element to ensure that an adequate referral mechanism is in place to capture and support cases should they occur IOM DTM would enable reporting and referral to agencies with specific protection skills (UNFPA, UNHCR, etc.)
Partnerships:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IOM effectively used partnerships with CERF/UN partners, NGO (WVI) and other local stakeholders to provide services and needs and fill gaps Of particular note – not IOM’s direct responsibility – is the private sector partnership to build 50 permanent shelters in the relocation site in Wasanthagama. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private sector response is clearly creative and of interest in SL. IOM should work with the private sector coordination entities and the rotary club to coordinate and improve the response in the future. There was confusion, but capacity and good will. This should be channelled and IOM can support this
Coordination with UN:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only UN coordination mechanism is the RC and CERF focal point. Ad hoc coordination occurred between IOM and UNICEF, but there were no formal channels for coordination along cluster/sector/geographic lines All sectors should have standard coordination and discussions to report and share best practices. For example in the shelter sector this was the first time that IOM and UN Habitat sat together to discuss their respective responses on a single UN CERF Shelter application; although each work in separate locations, and therefore no operational coordination was required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IOM and/or other shelter sector partners should support Red Cross SL to form an Emergency Shelter Working Group (ES WG) to compliment the WB Permanent Shelter group that is already in existence. ES WG should meet monthly during emergencies UNCT should form an HCT WG to meet monthly and discuss CERF/response outputs and progress District level partners WG also will support coordination locally
Coordination with Government:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All GoSL interlocutors – national, district, division, community levels – expressed extreme satisfaction with IOM as a transparent, flexible, and collaborative organization that worked with the government to find solutions to problems as opposed to requesting and demanding answers GA of Kegalle provided IOM space and IOM supported the DMU daily and provided its inputs into the District 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IOM SL national staff are highly capable and IOM should continue to focus on using nationals that can work within the local context to push forward response objectives while fully understanding the cultural, linguistic and administrative structures of SL Continue the model of direct secondment/co-location with Government offices for future small to medium

	<p>coordination mechanisms as if it were part of the general governance system; this further enabled IOM to facilitate and gain access to key actors – most importantly the NBRO, Land Commissioner, and DS offices – and thus IOM pushed forward land allocations that would normally have taken years to resolve. Land process was still slower than required, but to date 56 sites have been identified and land preparations are underway at most of these sites.</p>	<p>scale disasters (with limited office presence); in larger disasters consider co location / secondment of 1-2 staff particularly for Information Management and Coordination roles</p>
<p>Validity of design:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial programme design was non-specific (though based on past responses) and thus modifications were necessary. This was partly to do with the move at UNCT level to request IOM to support Kegalle/landslides rather than the urban flood zones even though IOM had assessed the latter, thus requiring a very rapid assessment and decision making Transitional Shelter Design: TS design was good quality, respected by NBRO (mandated to make such determinations) and by beneficiaries as a solid interim option that is much preferred to tents, and will enable them to get back to their lives and have space to begin the process of permanent shelter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document the TS changes and the process timelines and difficulties required for land allocation to improve future planning for similar events Limited donor interest in the landslide response reduced the capacity to respond in full, or beyond the initial response and recovery phase. It is clear that there is still a great deal to occur and that GoSL is committed (at least at local levels) to ensure that all families transition to new sites. Overall, given the lack of actors and capacity on the ground, IOM and the GoSL would benefit from another 300-700 TS if possible as it is unlikely all permanent housing options will be possible within 2017, and this will lead to long-term displacement for many families
<p>Unanticipated effects:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Disaster Management: IOM seen as an example of transparency and proper work with Government, following protocols and processes, facilitating action, and working within the system to support the GoSL to achieve higher levels of output. Increased interest and impact in certain locations: IOM TS work pushed the GoSL actors and private sector to move more rapidly. Where past disasters have demonstrated long-term processes to allocate land and begin permanent construction, there are already 50 homes under construction in one of the IOM TS sites, and many more families commencing owner driven construction. The IOM push to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific recommendations on this except that lessons learned and documentation of these processes and actions should be held in IOM SL for future disasters. In particular, if DMC/MDM can conduct an evaluation of the programme and certify certain elements (TS, quality of NFIs, etc) this will support IOM to better respond in the future and jump over the political hurdles that occurred at the initial phases of this project.

open the sites and set up TS has worked in tandem with GoSL desires to move quickly, and the fact that people are on the new land within 6 months will drastically improve the chances that permanent housing processes occur and move forward before the pressure of emergency response wares off.

MATRIX 3: Alignment with IOM Progressive Resolution of Displacement Situations Framework (PRDS)

IOM developed a Durable Solutions framework that focuses on supporting resilience and progressive solutions to displacement situations. For more information on this framework, visit: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9JDytufibog>. The below is a summary of core areas assessed during the evaluation to determine the impact and durable nature of the work done. This does not focus only on the IOM response as the displacement solutions will be dependent primarily on GoSL governance and choices for the affected population.

PILLAR	CRITERIA FOR DURABLE SOLUTIONS ASSESSED	RESULT
<p>Protection, Safety and Security</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long-term safety, security and freedom of movement • Access to effective mechanisms that restore housing, land and property rights for those affected or at high risk and forced to move off their current land • Land documentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Measures and Reasonable Protection, Safety and Security • Safety is the primary reason for the high risk classification. GoSL is registering both evacuation centres and hosted families. GoSL is offering 400,000 LKR to families that choose their own new land with NBRO approval (grants) – see also below similar on housing models • Mechanisms to restore land rights are slow but on track and all families have been accounted for. For example in Aranayaka (most affected) out of 569 families in need of land, 526 have been allocated and 205 chose their own land • Land Commissioner noted that they have streamlined process and expect most families to receive documentation by early 2017
<p>Adequate Standard of Living</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An adequate standard of living (Shelter and Settlement Standards and access to Services) • Access to effective mechanisms that restore housing, land and property rights and ability to invest in land and property • Adequate shelter options and choices for families affected or deemed to be at high risk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed results to date on standard of living based on locations • Shelter options, including IOM TS and the Government plan with 3 model houses to choose from, and allocations promised of 1.2 m LKR for each family generally put a positive spin on the shelter and settlement issues for the long term (will be paid in stages to ensure quality control) • Some locations were chosen without adequate coordination with NBRO, NWSDB, and other key actors initially – these locations will require larger investments by GoSL to ensure water supply, access, and links to GoSL services. Some will require complex engineering including retaining walls and multi step and pillar (drilled into bedrock) construction techniques that may not be covered by the 1.2 m LKR

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Options exist though there are still likely to be 500+ families in tented sites or evacuation centres through mid to late 2017
<p>Sustainable Livelihoods and Employment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to employment and livelihoods Continued access to land for cultivation for farming families Additional options and resources available for families to diversify based on new location 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally positive, though some sites remain with gaps and questions Beneficiaries in many sites were satisfied that they retain their access to their current cultivation land even with movement up to 20km away. GoSL prioritized keeping communities together and limiting distance to their cultivation land. Some sites expressed dissatisfaction, particularly those with the most complex access issues as this limits the transport options and thus may cause families to spend large amounts of money or time to continue accessing their cultivation land (e.g. some are 4km or more from main roads, up steep inclines or inaccessible road areas) Red Cross through the GoSL is supporting 50,000 LKR grants and business diversification training at one site and this is supposed to continue to all IOM TS design is simple and easily adjusted (wooden frame) which has allowed select beneficiaries to set up shops and add on to the structure already – may support increased livelihoods options
<p>Inclusive Governance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation in public affairs Participation in process for determination of land, freedom to determine choice and present grievances to Government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive measures and reason to believe this will increase All sites have evident local government presence and outreach and families were present at visits and able to express their concerns and issues. Freedom of choice is central to the GoSL response and this limits the negative effects of relocation as families can choose to relocate on their own with GoSL grants New communities (mixed with up to 6 villages present) are being handed over to new village heads (host communities in some cases) and process is underway, but it remains to be seen how these communities will coalesce and whether they will establish their own Rural Development Society (RDS) Negative element identified: beneficiary 'lucky draw' selection in some sites for TS and Permanent housing through donors – would benefit from increase participation and support to communities defining selection criteria to support more targeting of those most in need

PRDS Recommendations for IOM SL:

The primary issues of concern revolve around the relocation sites and the commitment by the GoSL to ensure access to services and livelihoods, as well as the new community nature of relocation sites and the question of cohesion and sustainability. There is good reason to believe – based on movements on the ground and focus discussions with beneficiaries and DS actors – that the commitment level of the GoSL is high, and will continue to push forward with relocations and land allocations for all households.

IOM should consider working with the GoSL to develop a community stabilization and livelihoods programme to ensure the sustainability of the interventions that have begun. Specific actions/programme solutions that should be considered include:

- **Disaster Resilient Infrastructure:** support to ensure that all sites have adequate access and services (water, schools, roads, clinics)
- **Comprehensive longitudinal livelihoods monitoring and services:** The relocation may have repercussions that are not visible at this time during the response phase and may lead to families choosing negative strategies (including return to high risk zones) in order to compensate
- **Psychosocial Stabilization work around community cohesion:** Most of the communities are a mix of villages and are only getting to know each other at this time. These particular sites with mixed village families will go through a process of governance and tension as they rebuild. There may be different effects for women, girls, boys and men. A long term support programme to enable increasing local community participation and social cohesion will improve the resilience of the communities to further shocks.

8. ANNEXES B-C: Attachments

Annex B: CERF Internal Evaluation Meeting and Site Visits

Annex C: TS-Sri Lanka Model