




Researching livelihoods and
services affected by conflict



Livelihoods, basic services and social protection in Sri Lanka

Working Paper 6

Priyanthi Fernando and Sonali Moonesinghe

August 2012


centre for poverty analysis

About us

Secure Livelihoods Research Consortium (SLRC) aims to generate a stronger evidence base on how people make a living, educate their children, deal with illness and access other basic services in conflict-affected situations (CAS). Providing better access to basic services, social protection and support to livelihoods matters for the human welfare of people affected by conflict, the achievement of development targets such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and international efforts at peace- and state-building.

At the centre of SLRC's research are three core themes, developed over the course of an intensive one-year inception phase:

- State legitimacy: experiences, perceptions and expectations of the state and local governance in conflict-affected situations
- State capacity: building effective states that deliver services and social protection in conflict-affected situations
- Livelihood trajectories and economic activity under conflict

The Overseas Development Institute (ODI) is the lead organisation. SLRC partners include the Centre for Poverty Analysis (CEPA) in Sri Lanka, Feinstein International Center (FIC, Tufts University), the Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit (AREU), the Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI) in Pakistan, Disaster Studies of Wageningen University (WUR) in the Netherlands, the Nepal Centre for Contemporary Research (NCCR), and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO).

Secure Livelihoods Research Consortium
Overseas Development Institute
111 Westminster Bridge Road
London SE1 7JD, UK

T +44 (0)20 7922 0300
F +44 (0)20 7922 0399
E slrc@odi.org.uk
W www.odi.org.uk/slrc

Disclaimer: The views presented in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of DFID, SLRC or our partners. SLRC working papers present information, analysis on issues relating to livelihoods, basic services and social protection in conflict-affected situations. This and other SLRC reports are available from www.odi.org.uk/slrc. Funded by DFID.

Readers are encouraged to quote or reproduce material from SLRC Briefing Papers for their own publications. As copyright holder, SLRC requests due acknowledgement and a copy of the publication

Contents

About us	i	
Tables, figures and boxes	iii	
Abbreviations	iv	
Preface	v	
Executive summary	vi	
1	Introduction	1
2	Country context	2
2.1	Political context	2
2.2	Socio-economic context	3
3	Livelihoods and growth	5
3.1	Defining and understanding livelihoods	5
3.2	Livelihoods and the economy	6
3.3	Factors affecting the livelihoods of conflict-affected people	7
4	Basic services and social protection	13
4.1	Defining social protection	13
4.2	Policy and practice in Sri Lanka	14
5	The evidence: data, methods and quality	19
6	Conclusion	20
Annex		22
Bibliography		27

Tables, figures and boxes

Figures

1 Contribution of evidence papers to inception phase 23

Boxes

2 Draft outline for country evidence papers 26

Abbreviations

ARU	Applied Research Unit (UNOPS)
CFA	Ceasefire Agreement
DFID	Department for International Development
EPRLF	Eelam Peoples' Revolutionary Liberation Front
HIES	Household Income and Expenditure Survey
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
INGO	International Non-governmental Organisation
IPKF	Indian Peace Keeping Force
JVP	Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna
LTTE	Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PTF	Presidential Task Force
JPA	Joint Plan of Action
SAARC	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
SLAF	Sri Lanka Armed Forces
TNA	Tamil National Alliance
UN	United Nations
UN DESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
UNP	United National Party
UPFA	United People's Freedom Alliance
USD	United States Dollar

Preface

This paper is one of a series of evidence papers produced by the Secure Livelihoods Research Consortium (SLRC) as part of its inception phase (January 2011 – March 2012). Seven country evidence papers have been produced (Afghanistan, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, South Sudan, Uganda and DRC) and are supported by two global evidence papers focusing on social protection and basic services, and growth and livelihoods respectively. Each paper systematically explores and assesses the available evidence about livelihoods, social protection and basic services in the country. The papers do not attempt to generate new data, nor produce new analyses. Rather they assess what is already known and review the quality of the current evidence base. The papers, along with a series of global and country-based stakeholder consultations, have been used to formulate the future research agenda of the SLRC.

This paper was written by Priyanthi Fernando and Sonali Moonesinghe. Thanks to DFID staff for their comments on earlier versions of the paper. Responsibility for the arguments and views presented in the paper lie with the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of SLRC partner organisations or the UK Department for International Development (DFID) which funds the SLRC.

Executive summary

Drawing on a review of key literature and a series of consultations with policy makers, practitioners and academics, this paper explores and assesses the current state of knowledge on livelihoods, basic services and social protection in Sri Lanka. In particular, it examines:

- How the actions of and interactions between state, non-state and private actors, as well as individuals, households and communities shape processes of service delivery (and receipt) and determine livelihood outcomes (in conflict-affected situations);
- Whether or how the delivery of basic services, the provision of social protection and the implementation of livelihood programmes can contribute to state-building in the Sri Lankan contexts; and
- What power dynamics and political processes support livelihoods and underpin decisions about delivering basic services and providing social protection in the Sri Lankan contexts.

Sri Lanka has just witnessed the end of a protracted war that lasted for the best part of three decades, the roots and causes of which are multiple and complex. In brief, the post-independent politics and policies of a majority-led political leadership contributed to economic and political processes that laid the foundation for violent forms of social and political dissent. Ultimately, this led to the emergence of militant groups in both the north and east of Sri Lanka, as well as in the south. Conflicts appear to have stemmed from the disillusionment, frustration and increasing radicalisation of youth in their attitude towards the state, rejecting what they perceived as exclusionary policies. The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) emerged as a key protagonist in the long drawn-out war in the north and east, with other less powerful groups either having been absorbed or destroyed by the LTTE or absorbed into the national political landscape. Meanwhile, in the south, the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna joined the national political process.

This review focuses on how the war affected livelihoods in the north and east, and examines to what extent affected people were able to access basic services and social protection. Much of the discussion in this review focuses on periods of the conflict, including the ceasefire. The review finds that war in Sri Lanka exerted significant impacts on peoples' lives, but that the specific effects were highly contextual, varying across geographical areas as well as within and between ethnic groups. There were many key actors in the war—the LTTE, the Government of Sri Lanka, the Indian Peace Keeping Force—as well as many phases to the conflict, which resulted in multiple displacements. For those affected, this required the adoption of different strategies and a continuous negotiation of livelihood strategies and activities.

The main factors affecting livelihoods included violence, insecurity, displacement, access to productive resources (particularly land and water bodies, such as the sea and lagoons), people's ability to mobilise and use social networks, and migration. Implicit throughout the conflict period was the idea that the state should support livelihoods by providing basic services and social protection. It could also be argued the LTTE implicitly subscribed to this view by establishing a quasi-state. However, this state-centric attitude has also led to a system of political patronage that has been carried over into the post-war period. The literature also provides considerable evidence of peoples' agency during the conflict, and provides an understanding of the different strategies adopted by households.

There are several areas that this review was not able to cover adequately, mostly because documented evidence was difficult to obtain. The available evidence is considerably stronger on livelihoods than it is on social protection and basic service provision, despite the fact that throughout the conflict the Government of Sri Lanka was able to maintain a modicum of service provision and social protection, sometimes in parallel with the LTTE. We have also not included detailed information about Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), their livelihoods, their access to basic services and their right to social protection, or their situation three years after the end of the war, which saw many return to their places of origin to face the challenges of reconstruction and reintegration.

The body of evidence on livelihoods, basic services and social protection in Sri Lanka is growing, but, given the current restrictions to access the north for purposes of research, at a relatively slow pace. In

terms of persisting gaps in the literature, it is difficult to find research on the role of the private sector and NGOs in the public domain. Given that NGOs played a significant role during the periods of violence, and that the private sector continues to gain strength in the north and east in the absence of overt violence, this is particularly frustrating. In addition, the government's post-war response has been to rebuild economic infrastructure, but the impact of this approach has yet to be assessed. Another area where there is no easily accessible evidence is in traditional forms of social protection and service provision. Nonetheless, the lack of reliable quantitative data on the north and east is also a constraint. The 2012 census is likely to help bridge this gap and should provide data for longitudinal comparisons. There are also opportunities to generate qualitative longitudinal information through follow-up studies in villages that were studied during the war or during the ceasefire period. For instance, a study of coastal fishing and tourism as livelihood and growth opportunities would no doubt be useful. The strong military presence that continues, mainly in the north, may however prove to be an ongoing constraint to data gathering and research.

1 Introduction

The overarching objective of this review is to assess the current state of knowledge on livelihoods, basic services and social protection in Sri Lanka (see Annex 1 for the original Terms of Reference). More specifically, it sets out to review the evidence on:

- How the actions of and interactions between state, non-state and private actors, as well as individuals, households and communities shape processes of service delivery (and receipt) and determine livelihood outcomes (in conflict-affected situations);
- Whether or how the delivery of basic services, the provision of social protection and the implementation of livelihood programmes can contribute to state-building in the Sri Lankan contexts; and
- What power dynamics and political processes support livelihoods and underpin decisions about delivering basic services and providing social protection in the Sri Lankan contexts.

Our assessment of the current state of knowledge comprised a staged process, beginning with a comprehensive literature review, which was subsequently revisited and expanded in order to include sub-themes that were originally insufficiently covered. Also included in the process was information gathered by researchers at the Centre for Poverty Analysis (CEPA) working on a parallel study into land tenure in northern Sri Lanka. In particular, information retrieved and generated as part of this parallel study included up-to-date data on livelihoods, basic service delivery and resettlement. Finally, this review has been informed by the findings of a series of stakeholder consultations, conducted as part of SLRC's research agenda development process. Those interviewed include individuals who are integrally linked into the kinds of processes shaping livelihoods and service delivery outcomes, such as policy makers, practitioners and academics.

Several challenges were faced during the development of this review. One challenge has been the inaccessibility of existing information, particularly data collected by the different agencies in the north, which they are unwilling to share because of the perceived political sensitivity of the information. In addition, official government data from the Department of Census and Statistics does not always include information on the north and east regions, meaning most macro indices will be subject to correction when data from these areas become available. Another challenge has been the fluidity of the situation in Sri Lanka and the rapidity of the changes that are taking place in the areas directly affected by the conflict, which subsequently limit the validity of existing data to particular times and particular places. Indeed, between the start of the development of this review (March 2011) and its completion (April 2012), many contextual changes have taken place, and it has not been possible to fully capture these within the review. It should also be pointed out that this review does not consider the situation after December 2011, when the first draft was completed.

2 Country context

2.1 Political context

Sri Lanka's political history is characterised by its post-independence inheritance of a highly centralised state structure, administered by a similarly centralised bureaucracy. Post-independence political ideology also reflected a rhetoric that emphasised 'nation building', 'national culture' and 'national sovereignty', at the cost of internal diversity and a plural society. The social cleavages that resulted arose partly out of the aspirations of some to see Sri Lanka recognised as a 'nation state' seeking entry into the modern international system, and partly out of an inherited political process and electoral system that encouraged partisan politics, which inevitably placed the numerical majority in a favoured position. The post-independence politics and policies of the majority-led political leadership contributed to the gradual unfolding of an 'ethnicised' political process which laid the foundation for an emergence and escalation of violent forms of socio-political dissent. Ultimately, this led to the creation of militant groups, the rise of militant warfare, and the beginning of a long drawn-out conflict in northern and eastern Sri Lanka. The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) emerged as a key protagonist in the war in the north-east, with other less powerful groups being either absorbed into or destroyed by the LTTE, or absorbed into the national political landscape and thus rendered mute.

It should also be mentioned that the country has witnessed violent conflict in the south too. While the north-east districts experienced armed conflict with sharply ethnicised dimensions, the south witnessed the birth and revival of the militant Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (JVP), who led two violent, ideologically driven armed insurgencies against the state. Conflicts in both regions appear to have stemmed from disillusionment, frustration and an increasing radicalisation of the youth in their attitude towards both the state as well as unfavourable socioeconomic and political conditions, rejecting what they perceived as being exclusionary policies.

Today, a number of previously militant forces have either joined the national political process – the JVP, for example, has emerged as a prominent political force – or ceased to exist in any meaningful sense, and the north-eastern militant youth are now said to have been 'eliminated'. The current political context reflects the conditions that followed for two years after the end of the protracted 30-year war. The President and his party, the United People's Freedom Alliance (UPFA), have capitalised on the mass support mobilised during the war from the majority Sinhalese community. Constitutional change brought about by the 18th Amendment has effectively centralised power by eliminating the checks on presidential power that had existed under the 17th Amendment. The previously existing two-term limit has also been removed.

The President can now exercise almost direct control over every arm of government, and is also constitutionally authorised to make appointments to a number of positions including the higher judiciary, thereby in effect allowing the UPFA to enjoy the support of over two-thirds of the members of Parliament. However, allegations of corruption and nepotism against the ruling family, together with the perceived persecution of the former presidential contender and victorious army general, have eroded some of the President's popularity. Recent industrial action by university lecturers and mass protests by garment industry workers could be symptomatic of the simmering public discontent with the government.

The major political challenge facing Sri Lanka today is that of post-war reconciliation and development. A recent report by three independent experts appointed by the Secretary General of the United Nations found 'credible allegations' of war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by both sides during the closing stages of the civil conflict, and called for domestic and international investigations into the abuses. Meanwhile, the support enjoyed by the President in the south of the island is not reflected in Tamil dominated parts of the north and the east, where the Tamil National Alliance—a party advocating a federal power sharing arrangement—hold sway. In addition, the north and east remain heavily militarised and the resettlement process has been slow, dogged as it has been by Tamil concerns that the state is promoting Sinhalese settlements in Tamil areas in a bid to change the demographic composition of the north and east.

2.2 Socio-economic context

Both the conflict and the 2004 tsunami exerted devastating impacts on society and economic development in Sri Lanka, taking a toll on human, physical, financial, social, natural and institutional capacities within the country. Impacts have been most severe in the north and eastern provinces, particularly in the two districts of Killinochchi and Mullaitivu, where the final military operations were carried out.

While a positive context for peace, reconciliation and development has emerged, so too have a range of new challenges with potentially having long-term consequences. In particular, the displacement and resettlement of approximately 280,000 people in the north of the country (UNDP-UNOPS, 2011) has further complicated an already complex post-war environment and created particular challenges for development planning. Socio-economic realities are defined by demographics, livelihood patterns, cultural practices, political history and, in a post-war context, include the direct and indirect impacts of war on the local economy. In Sri Lanka, society and social relations are integrally linked to and defined by economic production and livelihood strategies. The impacts of war are especially visible in this regard, manifested as they are through changing modes of production, the pursuit of alternative livelihood strategies, and the disintegration of existing social relations and the establishment of new ones, including new patterns of social exclusion (UNDP-UNOPS, 2011).

Despite continuing conflict over the past few decades, economic indicators reflect strong and consistent rates of economic growth, which have ranged between four and seven per cent during the period 1991 – 2008 (National Council for Economic Development, 2008). Yet, macroeconomic imbalances, including persistent budget deficits, continue to cause serious concern.

Overall, social indicators in Sri Lanka, especially in education and healthcare, reflect a positive trend at the national level. With life expectancy in the mid-70s and an infant mortality rate of 12 per 1,000 live births (UN DESA, 2011), the state of healthcare in Sri Lanka consistently outperforms that of its neighbours. In education, Sri Lanka boasts a literacy rate of over 90 per cent (UNDP, 2009). The education index is 0.84 and combined gross enrolment for primary and secondary education is just under 100 per cent (UNDP, 2009). In addition, recent attempts to change the admissions system to universities to include a mandatory training programme at military camps upon entrance have been protested in parliament and elsewhere.

At the regional level, however, there are significant disparities requiring the attention of policy makers and planners, revealing that inadequate infrastructure and weaknesses in service delivery systems are some of the main factors causing unequal outcomes (National Council for Economic Development, 2008). Unfortunately, there is lack of poverty and inequality data for the north and east of the country. These regions have not been covered by the 1990/1991 and 2002 Household Income and Expenditure Surveys (HIES) due to security concerns, while the 2006/2007 estimates include only part of the eastern province. A few surveys have partially covered the area in recent years, but none cover consumption poverty estimates or have been able to field adequate samples (World Bank, 2009). Further, internally displaced persons (IDPs) have been excluded from official Department of Census and Statistics surveys, although a comprehensive national census survey is expected to take place in 2012.

It should also be noted that, when available, data on per capita incomes as well as health and education indicators show a consistently lower level in the north and east when compared to other regions (Sarvanathan, 2007; UNOPS ARU, 2010). A study five years ago by Sarvanathan (2007) estimated that, at the time, the north-east had the lowest level of per capita income in the country and scored badly on selected indicators of relative deprivation: infant mortality and maternal mortality were significantly higher than the national average—almost 20 per cent of the births in the north and east were unassisted home births—while a significantly higher percentage of children were found to be underweight both at birth and at five years of age. Sarvanathan's study also showed that primary educational attainment in the northern and eastern provinces was lagging far behind the rest of the island, even though the average secondary school performance was considerably higher than the rest of the country. There were also considerable variations both within and between provinces, as well as between districts for both health and education indicators. In addition, income inequality as measured by the Gini coefficient was particularly high in the east (Sarvanathan, 2007).

The government has outlined its main development challenges in the *Mahinda Chintana: Vision for a New Sri Lanka. A Ten Year Horizon Development Framework, 2006 – 2016* (Department of National Planning, 2006). In particular, it is aiming :

- to accelerate growth through increased infrastructure investment;
- to achieve a more equitable development through providing assistance to lagging regions; and
- to strengthen public service delivery to ensure quality and performance of services to meet modern development needs.

More recently, the original *Mahinda Chintana* has been updated in the document *Mahinda Chintana – A Brighter Future* (Government of Sri Lanka, 2011). In the north and east, this vision is being implemented through two overarching programmes, *Uthuru Wasanthaya* (Northern Spring) and *Negenahira Navodaya* (Eastern Revival), which involve constructing and improving roads, improving water, sanitation and irrigation access, and facilitating the registration of land in the both regions.

3 Livelihoods and growth

There have been several studies on the cost of the war at the national level, but only limited research into the impacts on the regional economies of the north and east, the areas in which the protracted war between the LTTE and the government was most concentrated.

Sarvananthan (2007) argues that the dramatic decline of these regional economies took place mainly after 1990, following a failed attempt by India to broker peace and the deployment of the Indian Peace Keeping Force (IPKF). It is argued that many factors contributed to this decline, including the economic embargo imposed by the Sri Lankan government (probably, Sarvananthan suggests, the single biggest factor), extortion by the LTTE and their implementation of illegal taxation regimes, the establishment of High Security Zones, restrictions on fishing, the setting of land mines on agricultural land, limited mobility, lack of electricity, unceasing violence against individuals, and lack of physical security more generally. According to Sarvananthan, after 1990, the Northern Province changed from a predominantly agrarian economy to a service-dominated economy, with 70 per cent of the provincial GDP accruing from the service sector. The single highest contributor to provincial GDP was found to be, unsurprisingly, the public administrative and defence sector, but even though this accounted for 38 per cent of GDP, and agriculture for only 20 per cent, agriculture still employed around 56 per cent of the population, making it dominant in terms of being a key livelihood source / strategy.

Although it should be pointed out that the war had considerable impacts outside of the north and east, our focus in this review is largely on how it affected the livelihoods of people living in areas that were directly and most severely affected by the conflict.

3.1 Defining and understanding livelihoods

One of the most widely accepted definitions of 'livelihoods' is as follows: 'a livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living' (Carney, 1998).

Much of the literature on livelihoods in Sri Lanka, and in particular on livelihoods in areas directly affected by war, takes as its basis the DFID Sustainable Livelihoods Framework. According to the DFID framework:

A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base (Chambers and Conway, 1992)

The DFID framework and the definitions that emerge from them (Jaspars and O'Callaghan, 2010; Kulatunga and Lakshman, 2010) also tend to incorporate features of the capabilities approach espoused by Amartya Sen (Sen, 1983) and later by Martha Nussbaum (Nussbaum, 2003). Sen and Nussbaum advocate a departure from the measurement of conventional resource-based indicators for development, growth and distributive justice. Instead, they propose that resources be viewed as essential enablers that assist human beings in achieving various functional ends. Policymakers are encouraged to focus on allocating resources and establishing external conditions in a manner that maximises human capabilities. Viewing livelihoods and growth from a human capabilities lens rather than focusing purely on income generation or resource allocation *per se* reflects a more advanced understanding of the concept of livelihoods in Sri Lanka.

A more complex, and possibly an even more appropriate, analysis of what constitutes and affects livelihoods in a conflict-affected context, could come from applying a political ecology approach to understanding livelihoods. This perspective aims to inject a stronger understanding of structural issues, such as property relations and configurations of power, into livelihoods analysis, and to also highlight the perceptions, values, decision-making processes, negotiations and strategic behaviours of different livelihood actors (Bohle and Funfgeld, 2007). This approach has some advantages over a rights-based

framework, such as that of the UNDP (Weerelt and Ismalebbe, 2009), which arguably underplays the political nature of development programming.

Jaspars and O'Callaghan (2010) have pointed out several features of livelihoods in conflict situations. These are summarised below:

- Livelihoods can be exploitative because one group's livelihoods can be dependent on the exploitation of another's.
- Livelihood strategies can be violent as they can include coercive practices or practices that entail risks to safety. Joining the military or allowing a family member to be conscripted to the LTTE are examples of high-risk livelihood strategies that were adopted during the war in Sri Lanka.
- Assets can also be a liability and can make some communities or households vulnerable to attack or exploitation. The exhortation of tax by the LTTE from business people and at transport checkpoints demonstrated such exploitation. Many families therefore underplayed the extent of their assets.
- Policies, institutions and processes often consist of different forms of deliberate violence and abuse, which is why livelihood frameworks need to incorporate power relations and politics more explicitly.

3.2 Livelihoods and the economy

Socio-economic reasons for the Sri Lankan conflict are explored to some extent by the existing literature. Gamage (2009) argues that the J R Jayewardene's UNP government gave rise to the LTTE and JVP conflicts by shifting the political system of Sri Lanka towards a centralised power system, and through the introduction of economic liberalisation policies which saw the dismantling of the welfare state and the removal of agricultural protection for small farmers. For Gamage, economic liberalisation, as a politico-economic system, has been a major contributing factor to conflict in Sri Lanka. Some also argue that the conflict itself created disparities between the north-east and the rest of the country, and that economic liberalisation exacerbated existing tensions between the Sinhalese and Tamil communities. These existing tensions were originally a consequence of actions that include the establishment of Sinhala colonies in areas where Tamil communities predominated and tensions around the domination of the Sinhala language (Gamage, 2009).

Some studies make a case for the integration of a political economy analysis into understanding the conflict. Palmer (2005), for instance, argues that in Sri Lanka, economic activities did not cease during the war but rather influenced the dynamics of conflict, adapting and diversifying according to the conditions of the armed violence. She suggests that 'the legacy of "resource reductionism" continues to influence how analysts look at different conflict systems', and argues that a deeper understanding of the Sri Lankan non-resource-based war economy needs to include not only 'stakeholders' economic motivations... but more open thinking on who these stakeholders are'. The stakeholders in the case of Sri Lanka's conflict extended beyond the people directly affected, the government, the Sri Lanka Armed Forces, the LTTE and other armed groups, to the diaspora (a source of financial and political support to the LTTE), to the Sinhala South (home to a majority of the armed forces), to the Eastern Muslim community (who felt marginalised and used by both the LTTE and the government), and to the up-country Tamils (considered outsiders by both the government and the LTTE) (Palmer, 2005).

Goodhand et al. (2000) and Bohle and Funfgeld (2007) point to three different types of political economies that emerged as a result of prolonged violence in Sri Lanka: a war economy (controlled by conflict entrepreneurs); a speculative economy (engineered by armed forces and conflict profiteers); and a survival economy (involving the vast majority of the population). Survival took different forms in different areas, but mainly households either retreated into a subsistence economy, or diversified their economic activities. Households tended to be reluctant to think long term: the trend was to reject market-based economic activities with high transaction costs and instead lean towards short-term opportunism. State entitlements became important to poor families, even in areas where the state's presence was weak and gender roles changed with women entering the public sphere, negotiating roadblocks and accessing markets. Joining military groups – whether the army (for young men from poor areas in the south), the LTTE (for those from the impoverished north-east), or the home guards (for young men in Sinhala border villages) – became an alternative strategy for maintaining household

economic activity (Goodhand et al., 2000; Korf, 2004). Conflict entrepreneurs included those who earned commissions on arms contracts or received kickbacks for facilitating paperwork, and those who taxed the movement of goods and people. This included the LTTE, who had implemented an extensive taxation system in areas under its control, but also various paramilitary groups who controlled transport routes or the trade of certain commodities. Micro-level studies also show groups of people who exploited the situation, especially in 'grey areas' where there was neither a strong LTTE or government presence, in order to profiteer through various means, including: by illegally felling trees for timber; by colonising land; or by exploiting differences in product prices. The studies also show that a 'new rich' class profited and thus emerged from the lack of a strong legal and regulatory environment (Goodhand et al., 2000).

The link between livelihoods and the economy has also been explored in terms of the 'peace dividend' during the brief period of the Cease Fire Agreement (CFA) in 2002 (Culbert, 2005; Orjuela, 2008). Sarvanathan (2007) argues that even though growth rates for the northern and eastern provinces were higher during the ceasefire years than anywhere else in the country, there was no transformation of the structure, nature and extent of the economy of the region, which meant that once violence resumed, the high growth 'bubble' could not be sustained.

Kelegama (2005) has even suggested there was no peace dividend, either for the people in the north and east where the war was taking place, or for the people in the south, where expenditure on development had been compromised by the heavy defence expenditure of the government. In addition, the need to implement structural adjustment policies in order to obtain aid, the fiscal adjustments that cut expenditure rather than mobilised revenue, and the hesitancy of the private sector to invest in a politically unstable environment all meant there was no economic dividend to the south.

The ceasefire undoubtedly brought with it some improvement in the war-affected areas through improved security, better relationships between ethnic communities, and greater access to goods and services, as well as improved school enrolment. However, poverty in the north prevailed and development was hindered by the government, LTTE and donors. More specifically, the government was bureaucratic, the LTTE hugely suspicious and demanding, and the donors naïve, in the sense that they were unable to fathom the complexity of the relationships between the different actors and tended to take a one-size-fits-all approach that did not recognise the peculiarities of the Sri Lankan context (Kelegama, 2005).

The period of ceasefire (2002–2006) saw the publication of much research into the war and its impacts, with many studies adopting an optimistic outlook which assumed the post-war peace that prevailed would not lead to a resumption of violence.

3.3 Factors affecting the livelihoods of conflict-affected people

The literature indicates that the livelihoods of people living in conflict-affected areas were, and are, influenced by a number of interrelated factors, which we will explore in this section. Much of this literature is comprised of location-specific micro-level studies carried out by researchers during the conflict years, and is largely an expression of impact from the peoples' perspective.

3.3.1 Violence and insecurity

The most obvious factor shaping people's livelihood strategies and outcomes was violence and insecurity; a factor which brought the inter-linkages between livelihoods and protection into the discourse. Livelihoods have also been discussed within the social protection literature, as support expanded to include improved access to markets, strengthened services and advocacy for the government to meet its obligations regarding livelihood recovery, grants and compensation (Kulatunga and Lakshman, 2010).

Tied up with the levels of violence and security are the political timelines that affected the conflict situation on the ground, resulting in fluctuating bouts of violence and influencing the actions of various actors, including the government, the military, the LTTE, civil society, donors and other non-state actors. Recognising the connections between people's livelihoods, the actions of warring parties and the levels of violence, Jaspars and O'Callaghan (2010) have advocated for a radical re-thinking in programme

planning on the part of the international aid community, recommending a combined protection and livelihoods strategy as a more effective and appropriate response to addressing livelihood risks.

In their study of fisheries in Jaffna, Siluvaasan and Stokke (2006) show how the ability of Jaffna fisher folk to make a living varied through different phases of the war, as did the role of different actors during those phases. Before the war, the north and east produced more than 50 per cent of the country's fishing output, and the Jaffna District alone accounted for around 20 to 25 per cent. By the end of the Third Eelam War in 2002, this had dropped to 5 per cent or less. Prior to the war, the livelihoods of fishing communities was not a critical factor in Tamil nationalist politics, but the impact of the war on fishing was so devastating that the issue became a central element of the post-war reconstruction and development agenda during the ceasefire, and continues to be so even today.

During the 1980s, Jaffna District experienced the loss of fishing vessels, infrastructure and fishing families, as many people left due to the violence. In the period following the Indo-Lanka Peace Accord in 1987 and the arrival in Jaffna of the Indian Peace Keeping Force (IPKF), some fishing restrictions were relaxed and a certain consolidation of fisheries took place, but it was not long before the war against the Sri Lankan army was replaced by open hostility between the LTTE and the IPKF. During this particular period, there was a small increase in the number of fish caught, but the security constraints remained. Between 1995 and 2000, even though the Jaffna peninsula was declared 'liberated' – i.e. brought under government control – the imposition and extension of restrictions, intended to ensure state control and security, deprived local fishing families of their livelihoods. The military prohibited deep sea fishing and fishing in the Northern sea, while fishing villages suffered aerial bombardments, representing as they did targets of army campaigns. This led to many fisher families leaving the district and becoming refugees in India or in the Vanni. Meanwhile, those who remained were unable to make effective use of the limited fishing capacity they possessed.

Tsunami assistance from NGOs provided some fishing families with boats and equipment, although the top-down nature of their distribution raised questions about the appropriateness of the assistance. The opening of the A9 highway following the peace process should have enabled Jaffna fishing families to market their fish, but the destruction of all ice plants and the weakening of institutions, such as the fisheries cooperatives (which could have helped families with finance and marketing), reduced the capacity of the fishing families to recover (Siluvaithasan and Stokke, 2006). All of this leaves most Jaffna fishing families in a situation of economic marginalisation, amidst rich fish resources that have been replenished through years of under-exploitation. It has also left them vulnerable to conflicts over resources with Indian fishermen, and, since the end of the war, to potential conflicts with migratory fishing families from the south and the west who are beginning to resume a practice that lay dormant for three decades.

The development of the fishing sector has been identified as an important driver of livelihood recovery in the conflict-affected areas, but there remain many constraints, especially for small-scale fishers. These constraints include: being trapped in cycles of debt due to the inherent seasonality of fishing practices; the lack of capital required to access appropriate technology and to diversify fishing methods; the reluctance of the younger generation to engage in direct fishing activities; and the de-prioritisation of coastal/near shore fisheries by the government, who are instead encouraging off-shore fishing (Liyanaage and Munas, 2011).

Bohle and Funfgeld (2007) see the actions of the different actors that make up the context in which people negotiate their livelihood options as potentially 'violent environments'. In Sri Lanka, the most violent geographical areas were those referred to as 'grey areas' where there was more than one single protection regime. The authors describe the Batticaloa lagoon, a highly contested space between the Sri Lanka Armed Forces and the LTTE, as such an environment. The Sri Lanka Armed Forces established control through the declaration of zones of restriction, supervision, no-entry and high security, whilst in 'uncleared' areas, the LTTE established its own regimes of security and civilian control, including taxation, administration, education and justice systems. Bohle and Funfgeld describe how the drastic measures taken by the Armed Forces and the LTTE to assert control over the Batticaloa lagoon had severe impacts on the lagoon environment and the associated natural resources, and ultimately on the livelihoods of lagoon fishermen.

The timeline of political activities and fluctuating violence affected the livelihoods of other groups as well, particularly in contested areas, which shifted from being 'cleared' to 'uncleared' as they went from being under the control of the Sri Lankan military to being under the control of the LTTE. Some traditional livelihood practices (such as *chena* cultivation or collection of jungle produce) were abandoned by Sinhala villages in the Ampara district for fear of being attacked by LTTE cadres in the jungle. Households within these villages also abandoned paddy land close to the 'uncleared' areas, and began cultivating their fields under the protection of the Sri Lanka Armed Forces or the home-guards (Nigel, 2009).

The breakdown of inter-ethnic relations and interactions affected markets for buying and selling produce as well as labour markets. Communities became highly segregated and mutual fears of being harassed became widespread. Traditionally, eastern Tamils and Muslims shared deep cultural ties and long-established practices of joint paddy cultivation, as well as other forms of economic cooperation and interdependence. In the early years of the war, Tamil militancy enjoyed a degree of support from Muslims in the East, given their shared experience of language-based discrimination (International Crisis Group, 2008). However, Tamil nationalism was unable to accommodate Muslims on an equal level, and with the expulsion of Muslims from Jaffna in 1990, the relationship between Muslims and Tamils in the East deteriorated considerably. In the east, Sinhala families did not generally feel comfortable obtaining wage labour in towns like Batticaloa, or working on lands owned by Tamils or Muslims. Muslim families living in relatively safe areas near market towns found that crossing areas that bordered Tamil settlements in order to work their fields created tensions. Several Muslim families bought paddy land belonging to Tamils who moved away, but some also lost land due to restrictions imposed by the LTTE (Korf, 2004; Nigel, 2009).

3.3.2 Livelihoods and land

Land transactions in conflict-affected areas were incredibly complicated. A study by the Centre for International Cooperation and Security at Bradford University from 2004 sheds light on the impact of the war at the household level, highlighting in particular how it affected the proper exercise of land, property and housing rights (Alison, 2004). Other studies show that most people in the north and east became victims of various land-related problems which affected many people's livelihoods, such as displacement, military or LTTE occupation of private property, imposition of security measures, loss of documentation, poor access to water, and informal dispute resolution (Centre for Policy Alternatives, 2005; International Crisis Group, 2009).

Another central other issue was the creation of High Security Zones, which were areas taken over by the Sri Lanka Armed Forces for security reasons. These areas were taken over without following the laws of land acquisition (Fonseka and Raheem, 2008; 2009). Fieldwork carried out by CEPA in 2005 and 2011 has shown that High Security Zones had, and continue to have, a considerable negative impact on peoples' livelihoods by restricting mobility and access to paddy fields or fisheries landing sites. Fonseka and Raheem (2010) also point out that the centralised control of all matters relating to land in the Eastern Province contravenes the Thirteenth Amendment to the Sri Lankan constitution, under which rights over land, land tenure, transfer and alienation of land, land use, land settlement and land improvement are placed within the Provincial Council List, and thus fall within the jurisdiction of the provinces.

In the north and east, land was sold, acquired and claimed during the different phases of the war according to the ascendancy of different actors in particular locations. This is referred to in the literature either as illegal occupation of land (Fonseka and Raheem, 2010) or as 'land grabbing', which is when members of one ethnic group illegally occupy land belonging to another ethnic group, a practice that increased when majority Tamil areas were occupied by the Armed Forces and when majority Muslim areas were occupied by the LTTE (Angel, 2008). In Nigel's study, a displaced Muslim complained that Tamils who sold their land to Muslims tried to claim it back during the time of the Ceasefire, and that Muslim families felt constantly harassed by both the IPKF and the Eelam Peoples' Revolutionary Liberation Front (EPRLF). After the IPKF left in 1990, the LTTE took over a large portion of land belonging to Muslims in the southern part of Ampara, and as soon as the area was 'cleared', the government began building houses for Tamils on land that was owned by Muslims (Nigel, 2009).

3.3.3 Displacement

Displacement has seriously affected livelihoods, with many households in the north and east experiencing multiple displacements. However, displacement did not make households solely dependent on external assistance, as might be assumed. Morais and Ahmed (2010), studying the behaviour of microfinance recipients in the Vanni, found that the most common livelihood choices after an emergency and during displacement included petty trade, small business (often for better-off households), wage labour, and obtaining some of the host community's land for small-scale cultivation. They also note that as soon as productive activities resumed, recipients invested in movable assets, which were preferred over cash. This indicates a strategy of building up resilience to recurring negative impacts by postponing immediate consumption for the purpose of meeting long-term needs. This finding is consistent with the idea that livelihoods in protracted conflict situations should be understood as:

The ways in which people access and mobilise resources that enable them to pursue goals necessary for their survival and longer-term well-being, and thereby reduce the vulnerability created and exacerbated by conflict (Jaspars and Shoham, 2002)

People's need to reduce vulnerability and deal with immediate risks was sometimes so strong that it led to the adoption of livelihood strategies that were less than ideal. Displaced Tamil families returning to one of the villages in the east studied by Korf (2004) were reluctant to engage in new, promising agricultural ventures, such as the cultivation of onion. Deeply suspicious about the future, and reluctant to invest their money in anything that they might lose if they were forced to flee again, these families instead opted to lease out their land to adjacent villagers and worked instead as wage labourers, often on their own land leaving others to reap the profits of the onion boom.

Displaced households from another Tamil village in the east found themselves having to leave behind their traditional livelihood activity of paddy cultivation (Korf, 2004). These families instead took up highland vegetable cultivation on other paddy farmers' fields in the 'cleared' areas. Although thought to be a socially inferior occupation to being a paddy farmer and suffering some initial decline, vegetable cultivation brought these families considerable cash income. Indeed, vegetable farming proved to be a more lucrative livelihood strategy than paddy farming mainly because the inputs for paddy cultivation were considerably more expensive due to the restricted mobility of goods during the war years. Some families used their new financial assets to build houses in their home villages, which they hoped to use mainly as dowry for marriage and help them re-establish their status in their place of origin. These two examples from Korf's work also indicate that families were willing to sacrifice the social status deriving from landownership and paddy cultivation in favour of strategies that were perceived as more secure (leasing their land out) or more lucrative (cultivating vegetables outside their village).

Lack of access to physical infrastructure has also been a major constraint on livelihood strategies and activities in the area. War-damaged roads and bridges created or contributed to a number of problems, including the isolation of communities and lack of electrical power. In addition, damaged irrigation resources, such as tanks and channels, as well as the destruction or military take-over of landing sites contributed towards restricting the development of enterprises, agriculture and fishing. The main thrust of the government's reconstruction agenda is on economic development, narrowly construed as the delivery of hardware, particularly infrastructure. With considerable assistance from bilateral donors such as China and India, and multilaterals such as the Asian Development Bank, the *neganahira navodaya* and *uthuru wasanthaya* programmes in the Eastern and Northern provinces, respectively, have focused on building roads and bridges, as well as rehabilitating irrigation works. However, there is some concern that if war-affected communities are to take advantage of the new infrastructure, they will need considerably more assistance (in terms of local infrastructure development, and also in terms of human capacity development and financial capital).

3.3.4 Peoples' livelihood strategies

As outlined above, conflict forces people to adopt different strategies and practice different activities in order to maintain their livelihoods. Korf (2004) suggests there are three elements to a household's livelihood strategy:

- managing personal risk and security

- adjusting household economics
- accessing external support

Here we highlight some interesting, and sometimes surprising, characteristics of adopted strategies in the Sri Lankan context.

An overarching finding evident within the literature is that livelihood strategies depend greatly on the local political geography of war. They are negotiated, manipulated and shaped within the context of security risks, reduced access, and resource issues in conflict settings. Hence, we can observe a large variation in livelihood outcomes (Korf, 2004). Yet, the differences are not always related to ethnicity, as might be supposed. In Nigel's (2009) study of three villages in Ampara District, the Tamil villages suffered from a lack of alternative livelihood options, but in Korf's (2004) study, households in the Tamil village under study were able to adapt, indicating that ethnicity can have different outcomes in different locations and at different points in time.

Livelihood outcomes are also affected by how different ethnic groups utilise social and political capital to secure entitlements to natural resources (Korf, 2003). Resource entitlements in multi-ethnic areas such as Trincomalee are 'ethnicised' in the sense that service delivery, opportunities and access to limited resources tend to be unequally distributed amongst the three ethnic groups (Sinhalese, Tamils, Muslims). This is primarily because these groups are unequally endowed with political capital. Korf (2003) observes that patron-client networks based on ethnicity shape the relative bargaining power of local actors. As suggested above, ethnicity can be an important (but not the sole) determinant of their relative bargaining power, and thus also of their endowments of social and political capital. Hence, dominant ethnic groups appear to be in a better position to access and use resources under conditions of warfare and during post-conflict periods. This system appears to reproduce perceived grievances amongst the different ethnic groups, thereby perpetuating the conditions for ethnic violence.

The contextual nature of livelihood strategies becomes apparent in discussions about diversification. In their study into strategies for adjusting livelihoods and building resilience among communities in the northern province (traditionally crop producers), Morais and Ahmed (2010) find that one of the most widespread outcomes for households has been to diversify into complementary income earning activities, such as petty trading, poultry keeping, and goat rearing. Similarly, a combined UN agency study of livelihoods in Jaffna district (ILO and FAO, 2007) highlights the resilience and perseverance of local people in the face of continued conflict, through the creation of alternative livelihoods and the diversification of livelihood options. However, this has not been the case for all affected communities. Korf's (2004) work in the east has shown that households often did not diversify their livelihoods, but rather chose to confine their livelihood activities to a key income source. This may have been because the households under study faced limited choices, but it may also be related to the fact that, for many households, remittances from family members working abroad (mainly in the Middle East) had become a major means by which household income could be stabilised.

Kulatunga and Lakshman (2010) show that households in the North Central Province (i.e. in border villages) adopted various strategies, sometimes in combination, to counter livelihood and security threats. They found clear evidence that strategies directed at mitigating security concerns invariably caused livelihood failures, and that there was a trade-off between livelihood strategies and protection goals. For instance, while enlisting in the military was considered a viable livelihood option, and one that brought in additional income, it also increased the degree of risk to the family. The unequal distribution of political assets between Sinhala and Muslim families within the North Central Province also meant that Muslims tended to focus more on protection strategies than the Sinhalese. For poor Tamil families (such as those from lagoon fishing families in Batticaloa), enlisting a son in the LTTE emerged as a strategy to minimise compulsory financial contributions, to secure access to special services provided by the LTTE, and to gain some protection for the rest of the family in times of particularly acute fighting (Bohle and Funfgeld, 2007).

3.3.5 Migration

Migration was an important strategy of survival for people affected by conflict, as it has been for other marginalised groups. The World Bank Poverty Assessment of 2007 suggests that with the Ceasefire in 2002 and the ability of people to travel relatively safely within the country, large numbers of people

from the Northern and Eastern provinces migrated to Colombo due to the lack of economic opportunity in their native region (World Bank, 2007). It was often the better off and the wealthy who had the resources and social networks necessary to migrate. Korf (2004), for example, points out that wealthier Tamils used their financial assets, contacts, resources and the expanding Tamil diaspora network to migrate to safer areas, chiefly Colombo or to foreign destinations. Better off Sinhala farmers also tended to abandon their fields in order to live with relatives in areas outside the war zone. Muslim families in the east had no such option seeing as they rarely had relatives elsewhere. Their main option was instead to migrate to the Middle-East, with many becoming economically better off as a result of this migration. Labour migration and remittances were considered as the most important source of income and a way for families to build up resilience by a large number of Muslim families in the east (Nigel, 2009).

Remittances into Sri Lanka have increased from around USD 800 million in 1995 to an estimated USD 4500 million in 2011 (World Bank, 2011). Not all of this is from the north and east: remittances from Sinhalese migrants from the south are also included. It is assumed that the official figures exclude the large sum of Tamil funds remitted through informal channels (Cheran and Aiken, 2005; International Crisis Group, 2010). During the war years, and even during the ceasefire, the formal banking system had almost totally collapsed in conflict-affected areas, which meant informal money transfers became the only way of receiving money. Following the end of the war, however, there has been a banking boom in the north and the east, with 136 banks branches receiving Central Bank permission to operate in these two areas.

3.3.6 Changing family roles and gender relations

Conflict has, to some degree, reshaped the division of labour within many families. Young men in many villages often had to keep a low profile for fear of forced conscription into the LTTE or harassment from the security forces. This, and the increase in female headed households, encouraged women in the north and east to take on roles outside the household. This meant that even though women felt particularly vulnerable because of the violence, they were better able to cross road blocks, inform the army about the movements of militant groups, get men out of detention, go to the market to sell produce, or travel to the Middle East to find work. These roles contrast sharply with the traditional values held by Tamil and Muslim communities. Nonetheless, unequal gender relations persist. Specifically, the lack of basic facilities such as water, access roads, transport, health care, sanitation and substandard housing compound women's workload (Wanasundera, 2006)

3.3.7 Village studies

CEPA has generated considerable information about people in conflict-affected areas through extensive fieldwork in these areas (particularly in the east and in the northwest district of Puttalam) from the period 2004 to 2010. These village studies provide micro level data about how women and men manage their livelihoods and work themselves out of poverty, how they interact with the Sri Lankan government, the armed forces, the LTTE and other actors, and how conflicts are mediated at a village level. The studies were carried out for the World Bank's Moving Out of Poverty programme (CEPA, 2006), and for the study on 'Conflict Sensitivity, Development Effectiveness and Inequalities and Conflict in Sri Lanka' led by the Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity (CRISE) (Diprose et al., 2010).

4 Basic services and social protection

4.1 Defining social protection

Definitions of social protection appear to be shaped by the purpose and objective of particular studies, which tend to do one or some of the following: inform and/or recommend intervention programmes in the immediate aftermath of conflict/natural disaster; to inform and/or advocate for national policy dialogue and legislative change; or seek to generate academic understanding.

Definitions tend to fall within the following categorisations:

- Social protection as protection of human rights (linked into security discourses)
- Social protection as protection and safety linked to basic services and/or livelihoods
- Social protection as social security, insurance, safety nets provision and the welfare state (the conventional approach)

The first two categorisations fall within the rubric of conflict/disaster recovery and development, and the third within the discourse of poverty eradication and economic development.

The social protection framework in post-conflict recovery contexts brings together different discourses on rights and access to justice, livelihood strategies and socio-economic status, as well as human security and protecting human rights (Thalayasingam, 2006). Some studies have highlighted the need to adjust our current understandings and to treat human security as a continuously evolving phenomenon and 'justice', 'reconciliation' and 'human security' as gradual processes of social transformation (Thalayasingam, 2006). However, Bastian (2009) argues that the conflict with the LTTE has hardened the focus of the discourse on state security, making it difficult to generate new ideas about social security or to look at structures and processes that generate insecurity.

UNDP has moved away from a purely economic focus on human development, and now takes a more holistic approach to the analysis of social protection, basic services and livelihoods (UNDP, 2000). Importantly, it acknowledges the integral connection with human rights as a means of ensuring the freedom, wellbeing and dignity of all people. That said, UNDP has been criticised for underplaying the complexities of decision-making processes, negotiations, strategies of multiple actors and configurations of power involved in an equally complex polity of plural communities, politicised governance structures and the political nature of development programming (Bohle and Funfgeld, 2007).

Some of the existing literature links livelihoods to protection, whereby protection is conceptualised in terms of risks to physical safety and direct obstacles to mobility, such as curfews, checkpoints and permit requirements. These threats to security limit the ability of people to negotiate, resulting in restricted access to basic services and livelihoods, and reduce communities to subsistence activities for economic survival. A more expansive definition of social protection can be found in the *Mahinda Chintana*, which views the state as the primary provider obligated to guarantee social protection for conflict-affected communities (Department of National Planning, 2006; World Bank, 2006). The literature also promotes a holistic approach to addressing the risks faced by communities in conflict-affected areas.

Multi-sectoral project design is considered to be more effective than isolated interventions in terms of impact and long-term sustainability (Jaspars, 2010; Kulatunga and Lakshman, 2010; Lindenberg, 2002; Thalasingam et al., 2009; Wimaladharmasiri et al., 2005). It has been pointed out that the separation of protection and livelihoods is an artificial construct produced by humanitarian and development aid actors, and not a distinction made by conflict-affected communities (Jaspars and O'Callaghan, 2010). Such a compartmentalisation limits in-depth analysis and understanding of the nature of threats in conflict-affected situations as well as the underlying issues of concern: people's

capacity; people's resilience; and the subtler operational dynamics in local settings – all of which combine to constrain effective responses.

Material emerging from studies adopting the traditional approach to defining social protection provides an overview of the social security and welfare system in Sri Lanka in general, and offers information about its programmes and different elements. Such studies emphasise the need to strengthening the welfare system, highlighting limitations, weaknesses, areas for expansion, and challenges faced by policy makers (Asian Development Bank, 2007; Gunatilaka, 2010; World Bank, 2006). The studies make recommendations for social protection reform within the broader context of poverty reduction, encourage the promotion of equitable growth, and outline implications for overall socio-economic development in conflict-affected settings. Equitable growth is equated with the expansion of social protection programs, defined by ADB as 'the set of policies and programs designed to reduce poverty and vulnerability by promoting efficient labor markets, diminishing people's exposure to risks, and enhancing their capacity to protect themselves against hazards and the interruption/loss of income' (Asian Development Bank, 2007).

A more critical reading of the traditional definition can be found in a recent review of social protection (Kabeer, 2009). Kabeer notes the challenges of delineating social protection in ways that reflect local realities and distinguish them from the broader but related concepts of poverty reduction and social development. The terminology of social protection is considered relatively new and not frequently used in the policy discourse in South Asia. Rather, the most commonly used terms in relation to social protection are: social security, social assistance, social safety nets, and social welfare for key vulnerable groups such as the elderly, children with special needs, underemployed/unemployed, sick and disabled people and those living in poor households. The debate surrounding the inclusion of microfinance now leans toward including it in interventions only if it is linked to micro-insurance, community self-help systems or other such social protection 'initiatives' (Asian Development Bank, 2007; Kabeer, 2009). This is in line with the 'integrated programme planning' discussed above.

However, the terms 'social security' and 'social assistance' have been critiqued for their dualistic nature: social security is provided for the formal workforce, and social assistance or social welfare for the socially 'handicapped'. Further, the informal sector that comprises around 65 per cent of Sri Lanka's economically active population is not supported by either. Debates around social protection are increasingly influenced by the awareness of local economic constraints within the context of globalisation, an expanding informal workforce, and new forms of informality within the formal economy. There is also a growing demand across the South Asian region to expand social protection coverage beyond the small group of formal of formal workers (Kabeer, 2009).

4.2 Policy and practice in Sri Lanka

4.2.1 State policy on social welfare/protection and basic services

Sri Lanka's Human Development Indicators and achievements towards the Millennium Development Goals have been hailed as a relative success in terms of social welfare policy making in a conventional sense (Institute of Policy Studies, 2010). The country has a history of strong social welfare policy with active state intervention in the provision of basic needs that dates back to the colonial and post-independence periods. Universal provision of heavily subsidised education, health care, transport, fuel and fertiliser form the base of the welfare policy. The state's incentive and intent to pursue such policies has been closely tied to political ideologies of the time. Literature points towards changes in commitment to these policies in line with fundamental changes in political ideology and economic liberalization policies, noting also the impact of protracted war on welfare budgets (Kabeer, 2009).

Since independence, Sri Lanka's highly centralised state structure has resulted in the dependence of much of the population on state services and the entrenchment of patronage systems for individual and group enrichment (Bastian, 2007). In an environment where political agendas overshadow all aspects of policy making, the intent and capacity of state policy making processes on social protection are subject to much debate (Peiris, 2011).

In Sri Lanka, the national level negotiation of development policies and programmes between donor agencies, government and civil society organisations (CSOs) remains a highly politicised process. It is

shaped by the interests, agendas and power dynamics of the state, as well as those of various international actors, institutions, organisations, groups and group leaders in society. Indeed, while actions and decisions made at the global level translate into the introduction of structural adjustment policies, liberalised markets or pro-poor development agendas at the national, all of these are still subject to significant negotiation (Diprose et al., 2010).

The current policy frameworks that provide direction and form the base for social welfare policy planning and programmes in Sri Lanka are outlined in two sets of key documents:

- the *Mahinda Chintana* documents that include a pre-election manifesto, the *Mahinda Chintana: Vision for a New Sri Lanka - 10 year Development Framework for 2006 and 2016* (Department of National Planning, 2006) and *Mahinda Chintana: A Brighter Future 2010*
- the Sri Lanka Action Plan – based on its commitment to the SAARC Social Charter aimed at the promotion of social welfare of the people of South Asia (Government of Sri Lanka, 2008)

The *Mahinda Chintana 2006-2016* development framework is articulated in the language of poverty reduction, economic growth and development. Social protection is expanded beyond social welfare assistance, safety nets, and cash/food grants and conceptualised as ‘a mechanism to reach people outside the mainstream of development.’ Social protection is presented as a holistic approach to changing the role of vulnerable groups (vulnerable here includes conflict-affected), from passive recipients to active participants in the economic development process. Seemingly sound in theory, effective translation into practice remains to be seen.

In the post-war context, the most recent policy initiatives in relation to the recovery and resettlement process are conveyed in a Joint Plan for Assistance (JPA) to the Northern Province (Government of Sri Lanka, 2011), which also provides a framework within which aid and assistance can be managed. Guided by the Presidential Task Force (PTF), the JPA was developed jointly by UN Agencies, INGOs and the government, and aims to assist people in the north in their recovery and rebuilding processes and ensure long-term sustainable development of the region in the shortest possible timeframe (Government of Sri Lanka, 2011).

The Government of Sri Lanka implements a range of schemes that focus on providing safety nets for vulnerable groups. The Samurdhi programme is the main initiative to directly target poor and vulnerable households and communities. In addition, a number of other programmes focus on specific aspects of deprivation, providing cash transfers to households or individuals, or subsidising access to particular products such as infant milk, food supplements (*Thripasha*), school uniforms and text books (CEPA, 2009). These schemes tend to be implemented either by the Ministries of the central government or through the Provincial Councils and include programmes that assist persons displaced by conflict as well as emergency assistance to people affected by natural disasters (Asian Development Bank, 2007; World Bank, 2006). During the war, however, communities in the north and east received considerably more aid from international agencies than they did from these government programmes, which set them apart from other vulnerable communities in the country (CEPA, 2006).

The Samurdhi programme adopts a triple development approach: welfare, microfinance and community development. Its main component is welfare, which includes consumption support (Samurdhi subsidy) and social insurance for families whose income falls below a defined level. Microfinance schemes aim to provide financial services to the poor through a series of Samurdhi banks set up throughout the country. Community development focuses on supporting the provision of economic and social infrastructure, agriculture and nutrition in particular areas. The reviewed literature does not specifically analyse the Samurdhi welfare programme’s impact on the north-east, but rather considers its application across the country as a whole. Fieldwork carried out by CEPA in the north and east in 2005/6 indicates that, even though the Samurdhi Programme was not very active in these areas, the programme was highly valued by the communities, because even though the resource transfers were not very substantial, it nonetheless allowed them to access central government services (CEPA, 2006).

The government’s commitment to the SAARC social charter (2008-2015), intended to promote the welfare of the people of South Asia by improving their quality of life, is formulated in a National Plan of Action (Government of Sri Lanka, 2008). Social protection is articulated within a broader strategy of

poverty reduction and eradication, with a specific provision of safety nets to prevent further deterioration of the living standards of the poor, along with expansion of income opportunities for the poor. Special attention is also given to: vulnerable groups on low incomes; women in terms of addressing gender-based violence and promoting empowerment plans; and youth in terms of education and child protection.

4.2.2 Implementation

The history of social welfare policy and its trajectory is well documented. However, the literature indicates that translation into practice and implementation is linked to a complex system comprised of globalised economies, international financial institutional paradigms and compliance pressures, armed conflict and natural disaster recovery. The capacity of state institutions to deliver basic services alternates between weak or weakened capacity and corruption, in an ever more complex and politicised system.

4.2.3 Local governance structures and public services

Service delivery within the local governance system reveals confusion and overlap between the currently existing dual structures (elected local government and administrative structures) (UNDP-UNOPS, 2011). This is the result of poorly defined and understood mandates, power struggles, overlapping roles and functions and widespread allegations of corruption, with a constituency disillusioned with the ability of government officials to address grievances equitably.

Interestingly, it is also indicated that confidence levels in governance structures vary along ethnic lines. It is highest among the Sinhala respondents, an indication perhaps of the effective functioning of local governance in Sinhala-concentrated areas. However, differences in perceptions and confidence levels present in themselves a particular obstacle to effective and equitable local governance and basic service delivery (UNOPS-UNDP, 2011).

Service delivery is often linked to a system characterised by political patronage, partisan politics and political manipulations that prevail in local governance (Moonesinghe, 2006). Despite the limited attention paid to the study of patronage within the literature, patronage has had a powerful influence on democracy and possibilities for transformation in post-colonial and post-civil war Sri Lanka (Jayasundara-Smits, 2010). Since the 1970s, political parties have become established as a key medium of patronage and power at local levels, seriously undermining equality in service delivery and livelihood opportunities in the process (Jayasundara-Smits, 2010; Korf, 2003). The phenomenon appears to be particularly prevalent where different ethnic groups have varied levels of political capital at their disposal within the patron-client model. Hence, the patron-client-based system of entitlements that is observed in conflict-affected areas has resulted in the emergence of ethnicised entitlements to resources (Korf, 2003). Such a clientelistic political system endangers movement towards peacebuilding at the macro-level, seeing as the logics of ethnic conflict are constantly reproduced at the local and regional levels (Korf, 2003). This has undoubtedly undermined the trust people have in the functioning of local governance structure. Service delivery and building state-citizen relations in such environments are critical challenges, as evidenced in the literature.

4.2.4 Service delivery, protection and IDPs

The literature on resettled or relocated IDP populations recognises the need for various levels of relief assistance, protection and livelihood support. Acknowledging people's responses to livelihood-related and protection risks, a number of studies emphasise combined approaches, integrating protection and livelihood support as key programme strategies (Jaspars, 2009; Kulatunga and Lakshman, 2010; Thalayasingam, 2006). Livelihood support is extended beyond income generation to include improving safe access to markets, strengthening services, and supporting advocacy to ensure the government meet its responsibilities with regards to livelihood recovery grants and compensation.

There are particular protection concerns around IDP children. A study by the Centre for Policy Alternatives and Save the Children Sri Lanka (2008) has documented the issues that exacerbate child poverty, highlighting in particular the lack of services (including protection). The study provides insights into protection care issues faced by children in IDP camps, and include recommendations aimed at informing national policy and programming in support of designing service delivery that is sensitive to child protection needs. The most recent 'Concluding Observation Reports' of the UN Committee on the

Rights of the Child notes that corruption remains prevalent in the public sector, notably in education, due mainly to a lack of transparency in public financing and weak parliamentary oversight. This affects the efficiency of resources allocated and services provided for children (Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2010).

4.2.5 People's initiatives

A review of access to justice, as a basic service falling under social protection in post-conflict contexts (Thalayasingam, 2006), shows that people's own initiatives in seeking justice and mediation to solve their problems are not greatly influenced by socio-economic/livelihoods status. Rather, their initiatives are more closely linked to the communities' collective experiences, identity and confidence in institutions they are familiar with and respect. People in Jaffna, compelled to cope with sustained exposure to conflict over long periods, have responded by creating alternative forms of livelihoods, thereby diversifying their options (ILO and FAO, 2007). The study emphasises the role of people's agency in the recovery and development process and acknowledges their initiatives in resolution of issues, the significance of utilising information generated by affected communities, and incorporates ideas of how they deal with recovery and resolution of problems in recovery and development initiatives. It highly recommends recovery support for indigenous efforts and people's choice of solutions as a priority for future programmes.

Further focus on people's perspectives/livelihood initiatives shows that households in the North Central Province had adopted various strategies, sometimes in combination, to counter the livelihood and security threats of the protracted conflict in Sri Lanka (Kulatunga and Lakshman, 2010). There was clear evidence that strategies directed at mitigating security concerns for instance, invariably caused livelihood failures. According to the study, certain livelihood strategies demanded a trade-off vis-à-vis protection goals. A good example was the propensity of householders to enlist in the military. While such a strategy enhanced income and was therefore seen as a viable livelihood option, the hazards of military enlistment diminished protection.

4.2.6 The role of NGOs and donors

While the role of the state in social protection provision is understood as being essential, it is evident that NGOs also play a significant role. Various organisations have experimented with various models of social provision, have helped put the participatory approach onto the development agenda, and have mobilised groups of poor people to claim their rights and lobby the state to change policy. In general, they have proved more effective than the state in reaching the vulnerable and excluded. However, it is acknowledged that NGOs have neither the national outreach nor the mandate to provide social protection coverage for all, which points to the challenges of governance in social protection (Kabeer, 2009).

In addition, criticisms have been levelled at the apparent 'homogenisation' of the NGO sector, which, it is argued, has led to a departure from active advocacy, lobbying and collective mobilisation, and into social provision through donor-driven agendas. Efforts at commercialising the provision of microfinance across the sub-continent are cited as one example of this (Kabeer, 2009). The deep involvement of international lenders and donors in the policy making of countries in crisis can lead to 'ventriloquising' policy through national political leaders. This can give the impression of local 'ownership' of reform without substance, and can undermine the relationship between national citizens, policymakers and service providers (Batley, 2004).

Donor interventions grounded in a holistic approach to human development tend to be more effective in terms of their impact on public service delivery and the social wellbeing of communities. Conceptual separation of protection and livelihoods in aid delivery and development discourse highlight existing concerns raised within the literature, in particular the compartmentalisation of development planning which has led to ineffective responses and service delivery and even contributed to the emergence of fresh conflict. A holistic approach to protection and livelihood promotion is emphasised as being essential in the context of communities emerging out of protracted conflict (Munas et al., 2009).

4.2.7 The role of the private sector

Literature analysing the role of the private sector in service delivery and social protection provision is sparse, and we still lack understanding of how private sector actors stimulate economic growth and

generate economic multipliers in Sri Lanka. None of the studies reviewed for this paper focus specifically on these essential questions. However, as Sarvananthan (2011) argues, an individual and corporate entrepreneur-led growth strategy is the appropriate strategy to revive the national economy as well as the formerly war-torn regional economies. Moreover, it is argued that the current military peace should be transformed into a civil peace in the former war-torn areas (Sarvananthan, 2011).

5 The evidence: data, methods and quality

At the time of writing, statistical data on the areas directly affected by the conflict (i.e. the north and east) were not available from the official government statistical agency, the Department of Census and Statistics. While some efforts have been made recently to include these areas, the data remain patchy. This has led to continued criticism that the omission of these regions has affected the overall national picture.

Some statistical data were collected by the Central Bank of Sri Lanka in the north and east during the Ceasefire period (2002–2004) for the Consumer Finance Survey in 2003, but this became invalidated almost immediately afterwards as a result of the Asian tsunami that affected large areas of the north and east of the island. The Centre for Information Resources Management (CIRM) was another source of statistical information, for the east in particular, and several agencies (e.g. the World Food Programme, UNDP) have collected statistical information that is not always available in the public domain. The most recent Household Income and Expenditure Survey (2009/10) was more complete, but failed to collect data from three northern districts: Mannar, Killinochchi and Muallaithivu (Department of Census and Statistics, 2011). A major survey of conflict-affected districts carried out immediately after the war by the UN has not been released to users outside the system.

Much of the literature that is available looks at the conflict from a political and political economy perspective, and is qualitative in nature. There is a strong rights discourse in relation to the way the conflict itself is framed and in the way its impacts are understood. Political researchers are not always explicit about their positions and their biases, so balancing sources becomes a major challenge in an evidence review such as this. There is also a tendency for published research to have a much stronger ‘outsider’ perspective, while local perspectives are largely found in the less accessible ‘grey’ literature. It must be noted at this stage that the literature reviewed was limited to those produced in English, and excludes writing in Sinhala and Tamil.

There is also a significant amount of research that is grounded in a micro context and based on village studies. They bring in certain elements of the people’s voices and while it is not possible to generalise from these micro studies, they help build a good understanding of the dynamics of the relationships between different actors. These studies primarily explore issues relating to livelihoods and human rights, and there is considerably less available information on basic services and social protection.

6 Conclusion

It is almost three years since the war ended in Sri Lanka. Much of the literature reviewed in this paper relates to periods of the conflict, including the brief cessation of hostilities during the ceasefire. The conflict had a significant impact on peoples' livelihoods, but the literature shows that the impacts were highly contextual, varying across geographical areas and within ethnic groups. Throughout the war, livelihoods were constantly negotiated and, in many respects, became an outcome of the actions of and interactions between the different social and ethnic groups and the main protagonists in the conflict – the LTTE and the Government of Sri Lanka. Implicit in most of the literature is the thinking that the state is the provider of basic services and social protection, a role that was also played by the LTTE in the development of a quasi-government in the areas it occupied.

There are several areas this review was not able to cover adequately, largely due to the difficulty in obtaining documented evidence. The current review is skewed towards understanding the interaction between the politics of the conflict and the provision of basic services and social protection. This needs to be backed up by evidence of levels of provision and increased access to these services, which is not necessarily available.

We have not included detailed information about Internally Displaced Persons, their livelihoods, their access to basic services and their right to social protection. Nor have we discussed in much detail their situation two years after the fighting ended, which has seen many return to their places of origin where they now face the challenges of reintegration and reconstruction. Recent fieldwork in three districts in the north indicates significant issues of vulnerability, particularly for young, female headed households. Anecdotal evidence on limited access to health care for people affected during the last stages of the war requires further investigation. This is also a rapidly changing scenario, as government plans for the economic recovery of the war-affected areas are currently being put into operation.

The literature is also relatively sparse about the role of the private sector and non-governmental organisations in bridging gaps in the provision of basic services and social protection and in supporting livelihoods. That said, recent work carried out by the Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity (CRISE) in the east and in the north-west has generated a data set that can be further analysed to understand the impact of development sector activities in conflict-affected situations in greater detail.

As mentioned earlier, a country stakeholder consultation helped inform the development of this review paper. During the discussions, many stakeholders were concerned that there were few reliable quantitative data on the north and east. The 2012 Census is likely to help bridge this gap, and should provide further data for longitudinal comparisons. There are also opportunities to generate qualitative longitudinal information through follow-up studies in villages that were studied during the war or during the ceasefire period. A study of coastal fishing as an opportunity for developing livelihoods and encouraging growth would also be of interest not only in relation to changing livelihood practices in the north and east, but also in terms of government plans to develop tourism in these areas.

The main constraint to gathering further data will be the strong military presence that continues, particularly in the north, and the role the Presidential Task Force plays in vetting any activity that takes place in these areas. The role of the military in the economic recovery of the north and the east is yet to be analysed, but could have an impact on livelihoods and vulnerability.

This review confirms that Sri Lanka's conflict cannot be seen simply as a resource-based conflict; it is a conflict that is in reality more grievance-based, one that has been shaped and driven by perceptions of exclusion and entitlement access failures. It is also true that despite three decades of war, the state has maintained a presence in the areas of conflict, providing a modicum of services. What is not clear is how post-war policies will address issues of exclusion and access to entitlements. Currently, the thrust seems to be irrevocably on economic development as a panacea for all issues. We would argue that monitoring the continuing interaction between the government and the people, particularly (but necessarily only) in the north and east, would provide valuable insights and learning into how

livelihoods, basic services and social protection intersect with perceptions of exclusion and entitlements in a post-war situation. It would also contribute to understandings of reconstruction, reintegration and rehabilitation, both in Sri Lanka and further afield.

Annex

Annex 1: Terms of reference

Evidence papers protocol

In our general and technical tender for the Secure Livelihoods Research Consortium (SLRC) we raised concerns about the current state of literature on fragile states and on service delivery, social protection and livelihoods. We argued that the literature tended to provide generic overviews of issues (sometimes even literature reviews of other literature reviews) rather than more rigorous empirical and context-specific analysis. We identified four core weaknesses:


- A case study focus on small geographical pockets or individual sectors that led to a partial rather than comprehensive portrayal of people's own lives and livelihoods in fragile and conflict-affected situations;
- A lack of comparable studies due to the use of different methods, definitions and contexts;
- A focus on snapshots or stock-takes of livelihoods, social protection and service delivery and a lack of longitudinal analysis that enables our understanding, particularly at household and community level, to be dynamic instead of static; and
- Research that is isolated from rather than integrated into economic analyses of growth and development

The production of evidence papers during the inception phase of our RPC provides an opportunity to us to test the extent and depth of these weaknesses and to begin to tackle the weaknesses. In the inception phase of the Secure Livelihoods Research Consortium (SLRC) we will be producing 10 evidence papers (Figure 1):

- 1 Global synthesis of what we know about growth and livelihoods in fragile and conflict-affected situations
- 2 Global synthesis of what we know about basic services and social protection in fragile and conflict-affected situations
- 3 Synthesis of what we know about growth, livelihoods, basic services and social protection in Nepal
- 4 Synthesis of what we know about growth, livelihoods, basic services and social protection in Sri Lanka
- 5 Synthesis of what we know about growth, livelihoods, basic services and social protection in Afghanistan
- 6 Synthesis of what we know about growth, livelihoods, basic services and social protection in Pakistan
- 7 Synthesis of what we know about growth, livelihoods, basic services and social protection in DRC
- 8 Synthesis of what we know about growth, livelihoods, basic services and social protection in South Sudan
- 9 Synthesis of what we know about growth, livelihoods, basic services and social protection in Uganda
- 10 Gender paper

This paper describes our methodological protocol for the production of the evidence papers. It describes how we will capture elements of the systematic review methodology without carrying out a systematic review. A full systematic review would have limited usefulness given: the large number of questions that we have to answer; the lack of agreed terminology or complexity of many of the themes (and therefore search strings) that our research covers ('fragile', 'social cohesion', 'basic services', 'livelihoods', 'growth'); and that recent reviews have demonstrated that only very small numbers of high quality research outputs are identified by systematic reviews

Figure 1 : Contribution of evidence papers to inception phase



However, our evidence papers will certainly benefit from adapting some of elements of the systematic review, especially because we will have a large team working on the papers, spread across different geographical locations and institutional homes. Benefits include:

- More careful development of research questions (rather than research themes or areas), including deconstruction of research questions in terms of population, intervention, comparator and outcome. This is particularly important given the very broad parameters of our research;
- Ensuring a consistent sampling and interpretation of literature;
- Reducing bias in our analysis of policies and programmes;
- Systematically assessing research quality and using this to identify gaps in research outputs based on quality rather than quantity of outputs; and
- The opportunity to establish a baseline for assessing the current state of research and replicating our process in 5–6 years' time to assess our impact

Research questions

Our research questions have been developed in consultation with RPC partners and affiliates and with DFID. They are significantly more complex than typical systematic review questions.

For evidence papers 1 –2 (Growth and Livelihoods, Basic Services and Social Protection), authors will be required to answer the following questions:

- **People:** What is known about peoples' own responses, disaggregated by gender, to conflict and their tactics for making a living and maintaining access to basic services and social protection?
- **Governance:** How do state and society interact in the institutional arrangements that mediate livelihoods, social protection and access to services? What are the gender dimensions of these interactions?
- **Aid:** What aid is being provided and its effectiveness in supporting access to basic services, livelihoods and social protection? What is known about the gendered impact of aid?
- **Private sector:** What is known about the role of the private sector in a) delivering services and social protection and b) stimulating multipliers and growth linkages?
- **Linkages:** What linkages between people-aid-governance determine outcomes in relation to livelihoods and access to social protection and basic services?
- **Data:** What current, gender-disaggregated data exists on poverty levels, livelihoods, growth, access to basic services, access to social protection and key health and nutrition indicators and what quality is it?

- **Quality:** What is the quality of the current evidence (including the extent to which gender is analysed)
- **Methods:** What methods are currently being used to research livelihoods, access to services and social protection
- **Gaps:** What gaps exist in the evidence, research methods and secondary data

For each of evidence papers 3– 5 (Afghanistan / Pakistan, Sri Lanka / Nepal, Uganda / South Sudan / DRC), authors will be required to answer the same questions:

- **People:** What are peoples' own responses, disaggregated by gender, to conflict and tactics for making a living and maintaining access to basic services?
- **Governance:** How do state and society interact in the institutional arrangements that mediate livelihoods, social protection and access to services? What are the gender dimensions of these interactions?
- **Aid:** What aid is being provided and its effectiveness in supporting access to basic services, livelihoods and social protection? What is known about the gendered impacts of aid?
- **Linkages:** What linkages between people-aid-governance determine outcomes in relation to livelihoods and access to social protection and basic services?
- **Private sector:** What is known about the role of the private sector in a) delivering services and social protection and b) stimulating multipliers and growth linkages?
- **Data:** What current, gender-disaggregated data exists on poverty levels, livelihoods, growth, access to basic services, access to social protection and key health and nutrition indicators and what quality is it?
- **Quality:** What is the quality of the current evidence (including the extent to which gender is analysed)
- **Methods:** The types of methods currently being used to research livelihoods, access to services and social protection
- **Gaps:** What gaps exist in the evidence, research methods and secondary data

For such a large research programme with multiple outputs, it is difficult to pin down the parameters of research questions as would be the case in a systematic review: there will be no single definition of *population, intervention, comparator and outcome*¹ that makes sense across all questions and countries. Guidelines and regular consultation will be used to ensure that across the team, there is some consistency in setting parameters.

Searching and recording strategy

All of the evidence papers will be based on a thorough and systematic literature search. A broad range of relevant academic databases will be searched (see Appendix 1 for an initial list). The London-based team will coordinate the search so that there is no replication of effort across the different teams responsible for papers 1 – 5. For each evidence paper the team will list of databases/ sources to be used and the search terms that will be applied. Criteria will be developed for how to decide on the relevance of sources. The list of databases and sources, search terms and criteria will be shared between the different evidence paper teams to ensure a consistent and replicable approach. The London-based team (evidence papers 1 and 2) will lead on the identification of formal published literature, particularly that found in open and closed access journals. The country-based teams (evidence papers 3–5) will focus on grey literature specific to their respective countries. All teams will regularly share other literature that their searches uncover.

A database system (possibly EPPI Reviewer 4– to be confirmed) will be used to manage and code studies found during the review.

¹ **Population** - who are you looking at? E.g. All beneficiaries of service delivery? Only poor people receiving services? All poor people? All people in fragile or conflict-affected countries? **Intervention**- what kind of programme/ change are you studying? E.g. receiving social protection, providing separate toilets for girls in schools, ensuring markets are regulated? **Comparator** - what are you comparing the intervention against? E.g. beneficiaries versus non-beneficiaries; cash transfer programmes versus public works programmes, or comparing beneficiary situation before and after receiving services. **Outcome**- what impacts are you looking at? How income changes? How attitudes towards the state change? If girls' school attendance increases?

The following will therefore be developed jointly by the research assistants / evidence paper leaders and research directors over the next month:

- A list of databases and sources to be used
- Agreed search terms to be applied and definitions for terms
- Criteria for deciding on the relevance of articles and other literature to be included in the analysis
- An agreed matrix for analysing and classifying the results of these searches

All studies will record the search process and the criteria by which literature is included or excluded (what search terms are used, where results are found, why literature was excluded etc.) in a way that will enable the studies to be replicated in 2015 and ensure that the analysis is transparent and objective.

Evidence papers 3–5 will also require a review of the grey literature including policy documents, evaluations and other unpublished documents. This should be gathered in-country and globally by consulting with key stakeholders (donors, aid agencies, government etc.) in an iterative process with the stakeholder consultation.

The review will cover both content (what are the key issues raised in the literature) and make judgements about the quality of the evidence and methods used.

Analysis

The results from these searches will be systematically analysed using an agreed matrix for classifying results. This will be developed by the London teams for the global syntheses and shared and adapted by the teams working evidence papers 3–5.

The analysis process for the global syntheses will be agreed in week commencing Monday 2nd May. It is anticipated that either

- 1 Specific sectors will be allocated to the four team members (RS, RM and 2 x research assistants) and each researcher will iteratively build an analysis of that sector with sectoral inputs from sector specialist; or
- 2 Research themes (especially people-aid-governance) will be divided between the researchers and they will iteratively build an analysis of that theme with inputs for sector leads; or
- 3 Based on this division of labour the teams will produce a shared analysis of quality and methods. The team for papers 1–2 will produce weekly reports on progress and findings and meet weekly to share results of analysis. These reports will be shared with those working on other evidence papers.

The process (for the global synthesis) will be shared with teams working on evidence papers 3–5 who will adapt it to fit the specific context for their work. It is anticipated that evidence Papers 3–5 will follow the shared outline to maximise comparative findings. A draft outline is proposed below which will be revised based on comments now and discussion with the research teams once the reviews are underway. A decision will need to be made about whether each evidence paper has two-three separate chapters for each countries, or whether each sections includes all (2 or 3) countries.

Box 1: Draft outline for country evidence papers

Introduction – 1 page

Country Contexts – 3 pages

A section outlining the basic social, economic and political context of the two – three countries in question. It should include core indicators such as the percentage of people with access to clean water etc. from sources such as the Human Development Index.

Livelihoods and growth – 15 pages

Basic services and social protection – 15 pages

Each of these sections should be broken down into sub-sections on:

People: What are peoples' own responses, disaggregated by gender, to conflict and tactics for making a living and maintaining access to basic services?

Governance: How do state and society interact in the institutional arrangements that mediate livelihoods, social protection and access to services? What are the gender dimensions of these interactions?

Aid: What aid is being provided and its effectiveness in supporting access to basic services, livelihoods and social protection? What is known about the gendered impacts of aid?

Linkages: What linkages between people-aid-governance determine outcomes in relation to livelihoods and access to social protection and basic services?

Private sector: What is known about the role of the private sector in a) delivering services and social protection and b) stimulating multipliers and growth linkages?

Data: What current, gender-disaggregated data exists on poverty levels, livelihoods, growth, access to basic services, access to social protection and key health and nutrition indicators and what quality is it?

Quality: What is the quality of the current evidence (including the extent to which gender is analysed)

Methods: The types of methods currently being used to research livelihoods, access to services and social protection

Gaps: What gaps exist in the evidence, research methods and secondary data

Conclusions – 6 pages

Bibliography

- Alison, M. (2004). *Armed Violence and Poverty in Sri Lanka: A Mini Case Study for the Armed Violence and Poverty Initiative*. Centre for International Cooperation and Security. University of Bradford .
- Angel, A. (2008). *National Legal framework for IDPs in Sri Lanka: A Critical Analysis*. Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies.
- Asian Development Bank. (2007). *Scaling Up the Social Protection Index for Committed Poverty Reduction, Sri Lanka Country Report*. ADB.
- Bastian, S. (2009). 'Politics of Social Exclusion, State Reform and Security in Sri Lanka'. *IDS Bulletin* Volume 40 No 2 , pp. 88-95.
- Batley, R. (2004). 'The Politics of Service Delivery Reform'. *Development and Change*, Volume 35, Number 1 , 31-56
- Bohle, H., and Funfgeld, H. (2007). 'The Political Ecology of Violence in Eastern Sri Lanka'. *Development and Change* 38:4, 587-792.
- Carney, D. (1998). 'Sustainable Rural Livelihoods. What contribution can we make?' Department for International Development's Natural Resources Advisers' Conference. DFID
- Centre for Policy Alternatives. (2005). *Women's Access to and Ownership of Land and Property in Batticaloa, Jaffna and the Vanni*
- Centre for Policy Alternatives and Save the Children Sri Lanka. (2008). 'Child Protection in Internal Displacement: Policy, Administration and Impact (2007-2008)'. Paper presented at Centre for Poverty Analysis, 10th Annual Symposium on Poverty Research in Sri Lanka. unpublished.
- Centre for Poverty Analysis (CEPA). (2006). 'Moving Out of Poverty in Conflict – Affected Areas in Sri Lanka'. Unpublished report.
- Centre for Poverty Analysis (CEPA). (2009). 'Rapid Scoping Study of Supplementary Welfare Schemes in Sri Lanka'. Unpublished report.
- Chambers, R., and Conway, G. R. (1992). 'Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century'. Discussion Paper 296, Institute of Development Studies, UK.
- Cheran, R., and Aiken, S. (2005). *The Impact of International Informal Banking on Canada: A Case Study of Tamil Transnational Money Transfer Networks (Undiyal)*.
- Committee on the Rights of the Child. (2010). *Concluding Observations: Sri Lanka*. New York: UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.
- Culbert, V. (2005). 'Civil Society Development versus the Peace Dividend: International Aid in the Wannai'. *Disasters* Vol 29 no1 , 38-57.
- Department of Census and Statistics. (2011). *Household Income and Expenditure Survey 2009/10*.
- Department of National Planning. (2006). *Mahinda Chintana: Vision for a New Sri Lanka*. Ministry of Finance and Planning.
- Diprose, R., Cader, A. A., and Thalayasingam, P. (2010). *Conflict-sensitivity, development effectiveness, inequalities, and conflict in Sri Lanka: Understanding aid programming, voice and action in local conflict-affected environments*. Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity (CRISE).
- Fonseka, B., and Raheem, M. (2008). *A Brief Profile of the Trincomalee High Security Zone and Other Land Issues in Trincomalee District*. Centre for Policy Alternatives .
- Fonseka, B., and Raheem, M. (2010). *Land in the Eastern Province: Politics, Policy and Conflict*. Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Fonseka, B., and Raheem, M. (2009). *Trincomalee High Security Zone and Special Economic Zone*. Centre for Policy Alternatives.

- Gamage, S. (2009). 'Economic Liberalisation, Changes in Governance Structure and Ethnic Conflict on Sri Lanka'. *Journal of Contemporary Asia* Volume 39 no 2 , 247-261.
- Goodhand, J., Hulme, D., and Lewer, N. (2000). 'Social Capital and the Political Economy of Violence: A case study of Sri Lanka'. *Disasters* 24:4 , 390-406.
- Government of Sri Lanka. (2011). *Joint Plan of Action for the Northern Province*.
- Government of Sri Lanka. (2011). *Mahinda Chintana - a brighter future*. Accessed January 2012: http://www.priu.gov.lk/mahindachinthana/mahinda_chintana_brighter_future_eng.pdf
- Government of Sri Lanka. (2008). *Sri Lanka Action Plan 2008-2015, SAARC Social Charter*. National Coordinating Committee, Prime Minister's Office.
- Gunatilaka, R. (2010). *Safety Nets for Social Protection: Sri Lanka's Samurdhi Programme*.
- ILO and FAO. (2007). *Livelihood situation and mitigation measures in Jaffna*. United Nations.
- Institute of Policy Studies. (2010). *Millennium Development Goals Sri Lanka: Country Report 2008/2009*. Institute of Policy Studies.
- International Crisis Group. (2009). 'Development Assistance and Conflict in Sri Lanka: Lessons from the Eastern Province'. Asia Report No.165.
- International Crisis Group. (2010). 'The Sri Lanka Diaspora after the LTTE'. Asia Report No 186.
- Jaspars, S. (2009). *Livelihoods and protection in Sri Lanka: A review of DRC's Integrated Livelihoods, Protection and Emergency Response Programme in Sri Lanka*. HPG.
- Jaspars, S., and O'Callaghan. (2010). *Challenging choices: protection and livelihoods in conflict – Case studies from Darfur, Chechnya, Sri Lanka and the Occupied Palestinian Territories*. Humanitarian Policy Group, Overseas Development Institute.
- Jaspars, S., and Shoham, J. (2002). 'A Critical Review of approaches to assessing and monitoring livelihoods in situations of chronic conflict and political instability'. Working Paper 191. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Jayasundara-Smiths, S. (2010). *Patronage in Sri Lanka: Tracing the genesis and contemporary outcomes on State-building*.
- Kabeer, N. (2009). 'A Review of Social Protection in South Asia'. Social Protection in Asia Working Paper Series unpublished draft.
- Kelegama, S. (2005). 'Transforming Conflict with an Economic Dividend: the Sri Lankan Experience'. *The Round Table* Vol 94 no 381, 429-442.
- Korf, B. (2003). 'Ethnicised entitlements: property Rights and Civil War in Sri Lanka'. ZEF Discussion Papers on Development Policy, no 75. Centre for Development Research.
- Korf, B. (2004). 'War, Livelihoods and Vulnerability in Sri Lanka'. *Development and Change* Vol 35 no 2, 275-295.
- Kulatunga, S. T., and Lakshman, R. W. (2010). 'Livelihoods under protracted conflict: A case study of Sri Lanka'. Working Paper Series No. 62. Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford Department of International Development University of Oxford.
- Lindenberg, M. (2002). 'Measuring Household Livelihood Security at the Family and Community Level in the Developing World'. *World Development* , Vol. 30 (No. 2), 301–318.
- Liyanage, G., and Munas, M. (2011). 'Survival of small-scale fisheries in post-war Sri Lanka'. In R. Chuenpagdee, *World Small Scale Fisheries Contemporary Vision*. Eburon Academic Publishers.
- Moonesinghe, S. (2006). *Politics, Power Dynamics and Disaster – A Study on Tsunami Affected Districts, Sri Lanka*. Colombo: International Centre for Ethnic Studies (ICES).
- Morais, N., and Ahmed, M. M. (2010). 'Sustaining Livelihoods in Complex Emergencies: Experiences of Sri Lanka'. *Development in Practice* Volume 20 no 1.
- Munas, M., Lokuge, G., and Thalayasingam, P. (2009). 'Agriculture and Fisheries Livelihoods in the North and East'. Centre for Poverty Analysis. Unpublished.

- National Council for Economic Development. (2008). *MDG Report*. NCED, Colombo.
- Nigel, J. (2009). 'Livelihoods in a conflict setting'. *Norwegian Journal of Geography*, Vol. 63, 23-34.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2003). 'Capabilities as fundamental Entitlements: Sen and Social Justice'. *Feminist Economics* 9 (2/3), 33-59.
- Orjuela, C. (2008). 'Reaping the Harvest of Peace? The politics of reconstruction during Sri Lanka's 2002 Peace process'. *Critical Asian Studies* 4:2, 211-232.
- Palmer, N. (2005). *Defining a different war economy: the Case of Sri Lanka*. Berghof Research Centre for Constructive Conflict Management.
- Peiris, P. (2011). 'Evidence Based Policy Making in Sri Lanka: An Account of a Researcher'. Core Group meeting for the South Asia Evidence Based Policy in Development Network. Colombo, Sri Lanka.
- Sarvananthan, M. (2011). 'Sri Lanka: putting entrepreneurship at the heart of economic revival in the north, east, and beyond'. *Contemporary South Asia* Vol. 19 Issue 2, 205-213.
- Sarvananthan, M. (2007). *Economy of the Conflict Region in Sri Lanka: From Economic Embargo to Economic Repression*. Washington D.C.: East West Centre.
- Sen, A. (1983). 'Poor, relatively speaking'. *Oxford Economic Papers*, Vol 35 Issue 2, 153-169.
- Siluvaithasan, A. S., and Stokke, K. (2006). 'Fisheries under Fire: impacts of war and challenges of reconstruction and development in Jaffna fisheries, Sri Lanka'. *Norwegian Journal of Geography* Vol 60, 240-248.
- Sivathamby, K. (2005). *Being a Tamil and Sri Lankan*. Colombo: Kumaran Press Private Limited.
- Thalayasingam, P. (2006). *Dealing with Demons? An exploratory study on post-conflict justice*. Centre for Poverty Analysis.
- Thalayasingam, P., Lokuge, G., and Munas, M. (2009). *Making Peace-Keeping Peace: A study on community conflict management in Puttalam*. Centre for Poverty Analysis.
- UNDP. (2000). *Human Development Report*. New York: UNDP
- UNDP-UNOPS. (2011). *Socio-Economic Baseline Analysis*. United Nations Development Programme.
- UNOPS ARU. (2010). *Literature Review Report of Existing Socio-economic Data for the North, East and Adjacent Districts of Sri Lanka, 2006-2009*.
- Wanasundera, L (2006) *Rural Women in Sri Lanka's Post-conflict Rural Economy*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific,
- Weerelt, P. V., and Ismalebbe, Z. (2009). 'The normative impact of Human Rights on programming in the UNDP'. In Alfredsson, G. et al. (eds) *International Human Rights Monitoring Mechanisms: Essays in Honour of Jakob Th .Moller* (pp. 285-290).
- Wimaladharma, S., Silva, A. D., and Silva, N. D. (2005). *Growing up with War: Experiences of Children Affected by Armed Conflict in the Eastern Province of Sri Lanka*. Centre for Poverty Analysis.
- World Bank. (2009). *Country Assistance Strategy 2009-2012*. Colombo: The World Bank.
- World Bank. (2011). *Migrant Remittance Inflows*. Accessed January 2012: <http://go.worldbank.org/092X1CHHD0>.
- World Bank. (2007). *Poverty Assessment Sri Lanka*.
- World Bank. (2006). *Sri Lanka: Strengthening Social Protection*.



SLRC Working Papers present research questions, methods, analysis and discussion of research results (from case studies or desk-based research) on issues relating to livelihoods, basic services and social protection in conflict-affected situations. They are intended to stimulate debate on policy implications of research findings.

This and other SLRC reports are available from www.odi.org.uk/slrc. Funded by DFID.

The views presented in this paper are those of the author(s) and not necessarily the views of SLRC or DFID. ©SLRC 2012.

Readers are encouraged to quote or reproduce material from SLRC Working Papers for their own publications. As copyright holder, SLRC requests due acknowledgement and a copy of the publication.

Secure Livelihoods Research Consortium (SLRC)
Overseas Development Institute (ODI)
111 Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7JD
United Kingdom

T +44 (0)20 7922 8249
F +44 (0)20 7922 0399
E slrc@odi.org.uk
www.odi.org.uk/slrc

