

HUMANITARIAN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN (HIP)

SRI LANKA

1 CONTEXT

Sri Lanka has a population of 20 million, ranks 97th out of 187 on UNDP's Human Development Index, and is classified in category 2 according to DG ECHO's internal Global Needs Assessment. The area of focus of this HIP is the Northern Province which was most heavily affected by the conflict. This context is also considered to be a forgotten crisis according to DG ECHO.

In May 2009 the Sri Lankan armed forces defeated the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), thereby ending a violent war that spanned three decades. 80% of the people displaced in the final stages of the conflict, from April 2008 onwards, have returned to their place of origin (230,000 persons¹); however the conditions of their return are still a cause for concern. Militarisation of the former war areas remains high. In addition to its sheer presence, the role of the military in the delivery of assistance to returnees has often blurred the distinction between civilian and military assistance. Whilst economic and development indicators for much of the country are encouraging and among the best rated in the region, pockets of extreme vulnerability (including high risk for sexual exploitation, Gender Based Violence (GBV), and extreme vulnerability of women, children, elderly and Persons with Disabilities (PwD)) caused by 30 years of war, notably the final months of intense battle, have left the north and parts of the east of the country scarred and struggling to recover.

The post-conflict situation remains fragile. Basic administrative/civilian services are not yet fully operational in the former war zones and employment opportunities are very limited. Traditionally, the population of the north relied heavily on farming (both rice and vegetable) as well as lagoon and open sea fishing. While many have been able to recover their traditional livelihood activities, there are important pockets of vulnerability that have access to neither, either because of traditional gender-based division of labour, land occupation by third parties or lack of access to the sea or farming/fishing material.

Access to livelihoods is one of the main concerns, the absence of which leads affected populations to resort to harmful coping mechanisms for lack of an alternative (for example prostitution, asset depletion). Whilst in terms of outlook, development activities are well-placed to address these needs, they remain focused on blanket coverage. DG ECHO-funded humanitarian assistance has a twofold added value: first to provide targeted assistance, focussing on the most vulnerable households and, second, to ensure protection mainstreaming across the sectors of intervention.

¹ UNHCR

2 HUMANITARIAN NEEDS

1) Affected people/ potential beneficiaries:

Conflict-affected communities in general are considered to be the most fragile, however there are varying degrees of urgency with regard to their needs. Due to the long duration of the former war, there have been multiple waves of displacement. One commonly used definition to distinguish protracted from recently displaced persons is April 2008, when the final chapter of the war began. It is considered that those displaced in the Northern Province after April 2008 are most in need of urgent assistance in their return to their place of origin. This is especially the case for material assistance. The estimated total population of this caseload is 230,000 people.

Within this category, emphasis should be placed on the most vulnerable which includes Women headed households, the Elderly, households and persons with disabilities.

2) Description of most acute humanitarian needs:

- Protection – Ensure access to legal services, protection from violence and ensure access to humanitarian aid for most vulnerable. Protection mainstreaming is key in all other sectors of intervention by ensuring effective beneficiary selection mechanisms and adapting programs to ensure that the needs of the most vulnerable are considered and met.
- Humanitarian demining – Mine/Explosive Remnants of War clearance and Mine Risk Education in areas of recent return.
- Coordination - Ensure constructive interaction among stakeholders involved in the aid effort, providing accurate and adequate info analysis and sharing as well as advocacy on key issues related to aid implementation in line with international principles.
- Food assistance/Livelihoods – Food and livelihood needs persist and require support programs to lessen dependence of external assistance and render the conflict affected population self-reliant; gaining a more accurate understanding of household economy of the most vulnerable and ensuring effective data-sharing with development agencies.
- Transitional Shelter – Provide transitional shelter solutions until permanent housing programs follow; legal assistance with respect to land ownership.
- Health –Mental health support and psychosocial activities which could be mainstreamed in other sectors of intervention; support to persons with disabilities; assessment of nutrition situation.
- Water & Sanitation – Access to clean water and sanitary facilities in the areas of return and displacement.

The incorporation of cross-cutting issues such as Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), protection and psychosocial programming needs to be ensured. The last stages of the

conflict caused psychological trauma for a large number of people, which has created a high need for psycho-social support with a holistic approach. Ideally it should be made in close linkage with local health and education actors to encourage sustainability.

3 HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE

1) National / local response and involvement

The Government of Sri Lanka maintains its focus of assistance on large-scale infrastructure development in the former conflict areas. Interest to allocate resources to basic civilian services is limited. One key challenge in post-war Sri Lanka is the need for coherent policy initiatives in areas that have a direct impact on humanitarian and development assistance such as land attribution.

2) International Humanitarian Response

Funding of international humanitarian assistance in Sri Lanka has been gradually decreasing since the end of the war. Multi-lateral funding initiatives are communicated in the form of the Joint Plan of Assistance Northern Province (JPA) co-drafted by the Sri Lankan Presidential Taskforce for Return and Rehabilitation (PTF) and the UN.

Under the 2012 JPA, USD 147,5 M have been requested with Food Security, Shelter/Housing, Mine Action and National protection mechanisms as the main areas of intervention (in terms of funding allocations)². The 2011 JPA which requested 289 MUSD saw 35% of the funding requirements covered. General interest and engagement in the humanitarian situation in Sri Lanka has waned significantly on the part of the international humanitarian donor community, and this trend is likely to continue in the short term. The cluster system is still in place but is gradually being untied to transfer coordination responsibilities to Sri Lankan line ministries. This trend is not in itself negative as long as the necessary means and capacities are made available by the Government of Sri Lanka to allow for effective, accountable and strategic coordination.

3) Constraints and DG ECHO response capacity in terms of:

i) Access/humanitarian space

Humanitarian space has been historically fragile in Sri Lanka where the risk of politicisation of aid is high. Partners need to ensure expatriate presence in the areas of intervention as a protection measure and ensure stringent application of the humanitarian principles as well as coordination with military best practices. There is a need for independent and credible needs assessments in order to enhance a better evidence based understanding of outstanding humanitarian requirements.

² Joint Plan of Assistance, 2012 http://www.hpsl.lk/docs/2012_JPA_21_February_2012-FINAL.pdf

ii) Partners

A number of DG ECHO partners are phasing out thus limiting the response capacity for humanitarian aid delivery.

iii) Absorption capacity on the ground and efficiency of operations

Absorption capacity is limited due to gradual withdrawal of NGOs and gradual reduction in UN presence. Furthermore, restrictions on the duration of stay of expatriates create high turnover and the risk of institutional memory loss.

4) Envisaged DG ECHO response and expected results of humanitarian aid interventions.

DG ECHO funding seeks to maximise its impact by prioritising assistance to the most vulnerable in a principled and equitable manner. In line with previous funding decisions material assistance will prioritise recently returned IDP (new caseload) which includes transitional shelter, food assistance/livelihood and protection-related WASH installations. Hardware assistance interventions need to be designed with solid protection mainstreaming as well as DRR and LRRD considerations. Food assistance programs should also integrate a nutrition lens in the operational strategy.

Beyond material assistance the sensitive and fragile protection environment in the former war zones as well as the limited reach of civilian-run government services accentuate the need to fill gaps in these sectors namely Health (especially Mental Health and assistance to persons with disabilities) and protection in the form of protection monitoring and legal assistance among other services. These services should be accessible to all returnees regardless of the time or duration of their displacement. Emphasis should also be placed on consolidating evidence on needs and improving the knowledge base of the present humanitarian/early recovery status in the former conflict areas. Humanitarian demining will also figure among the priority sectors of intervention, especially focussing on safe return for those still in displacement as well as access to livelihoods.

4 LRRD, COORDINATION AND TRANSITION

1) *Other DG ECHO interventions*

Since the end of the war in 2009, two emergency decisions plus two funding decisions (one ad hoc 2010, one HIP 2011) have been adopted to facilitate the return process, at a time when the majority of the targeted population were still in a state of displacement. The situation has now changed significantly in that the focus of the present HIP is to consolidate the interventions post-conflict, by focusing on software assistance with protection as the focal point. In parallel, DIPECHO funding has been introduced to Sri Lanka in 2011 and DG ECHO is presently considering reinforcing

linkages between Disaster Risk Reduction and other sectors of intervention such as livelihood and food assistance.

2) *Other services/donors availability*

The bulk of external assistance is funded by multi-lateral development donors, notably the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank. Coordination and strategic dialogue need to be further enhanced. ECHO has commissioned an external evaluation to look into the state of LRRD in post-conflict Sri Lanka to feed into the coming operational strategy for DG ECHO for 2013 and beyond.

3) *Other concomitant EU interventions*

DG ECHO's main partner in terms of LRRD is the EU Delegation and development instruments (DEVCO, EEAS). Main areas of overlapping interventions are implemented in Vavuniya (Aid to Uprooted people (AUP 2008)) and in Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu (AUP 2010) and in the sectors of Shelter/permanent housing with a total of 6952 houses, post humanitarian interventions in the sectors of livelihoods and community infrastructures (Assistance to Conflict Affected People (ACAP) 41 MEUR – North and East) and support to rehabilitation and sustainable development for returnees through Social and Economic Measures (SEM, 16 MEUR).

4) *Exit scenarios.*

Apart from implementing the LRRD approach as described above, under point 4(3), DG ECHO's exit strategy depends very much on the capacity of the Sri Lankan government to prioritise human security in the north and east, and facilitate the normalization of civilian life in those areas. This is coupled with the need for development agencies to fully take on board concerns related to protection, and furthermore to strengthen protection mainstreaming in development programs regardless of the core sector of intervention. In order to see indications of a sincere and genuine reconstruction and reconciliation, the government will have to show a willingness to address the root causes of the conflict. Such measures will have to be taken in order to bridge the gap between humanitarian aid and development.

5 OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL DETAILS

The provisions of the financing decision ECHO/WWD/BUD/2012/01000 and the general conditions of the Partnership Agreement with the European Commission shall take precedence over the provisions in this document.

5.1 Contacts³

Operational Unit in charge : ECHO/B 5

³ Single Forms will be submitted to DG ECHO using APPEL (e-SingleForm)

Contact persons at HQ : Dominique Gryn - dominique.gryn@ec.europa.eu
in the field : Jeroen Uytterschaut – jeroen.uytterschaut@echofield.eu;
Michelle Cicic - michelle.cicic@echofield.eu

5.2 Financial info

Indicative Allocation: EUR 4,500,000 million

Man-made crises: Hum. Aid: EUR 3,500,0000 Food Assistance: EUR 1,000,000

5.3 Proposal Assessment

Assessment round 1

- a) Description of the humanitarian aid interventions relating to this assessment round: all interventions as described under section 3.4 of this HIP
- b) Indicative amount to be allocated in this round of proposals: Humanitarian Aid: EUR 3.500,000; Food Assistance: EUR 1,000,000.
- c) Costs will be eligible from 01/07/2012⁴, Actions will start from 01/07/2012
- d) The expected initial duration for the Action is up to 12 months
- e) Potential partners: All DG ECHO Partners
- f) Information to be provided: Single Form
- g) Indicative date for receipt of the above requested information: 25/06/2012⁵
- h) Commonly used principles will be applied for the assessment of proposals, such as quality of needs assessment, relevance of intervention sectors, and knowledge of the country / region.

⁴ The eligibility date of the Action is not linked to the date of receipt of the Single Form. It is either the eligibility date set in the Single form or the eligibility date of the HIP, what ever occurs latest.

⁵ The Commission reserves the right to consider Single Forms transmitted after this date, especially in case certain needs / priorities are not covered by the received Single Forms.