

Sharing Studies and Conflict-Related Initiatives on Sri Lanka
Project

Proceedings

Seminar

Sharing Studies on Development and Conflict
in Sri Lanka

19 April 2002

Jeroen de Zeeuw

Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael'
Conflict Research Unit
May 2002



Netherlands Institute of
International Relations
'Clingendael'
Clingendael 7
2597 VH The Hague
P.O. Box 93080
2509 AB The Hague
Phone number: # 31-70-3245384
Telefax: # 31-70-3282002
Email: research@clingendael.nl
Website: <http://www.clingendael.nl/cru>

© Netherlands Institute of International Relations *Clingendael*. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright holders. *Clingendael* Institute, P.O. Box 93080, 2509 AB The Hague, The Netherlands.

Preface

This report is part of the research project entitled ‘Sharing Studies and Conflict-Related Initiatives on Sri Lanka’ commissioned to the Clingendael Institute by the Royal Netherlands Embassy (RNE) in Sri Lanka. It reflects the discussions held at the international seminar ‘Sharing Studies on Development and Conflict in Sri Lanka’ that was organized by the Conflict Research Unit (CRU) in collaboration with the RNE in Colombo on 19 April 2002.

The project started with the realization that since the 1990s there has been increasing attention on the position of donors and international organizations in conflict areas. The recognition that different kinds of assistance and diplomatic initiatives may either contribute to peace or exacerbate conflict has yielded numerous discussions, and these issues are also relevant to the case of Sri Lanka. Against this background, a number of donors and international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) have initiated studies to acquire a deeper understanding of the issues and processes involved. It was felt, however, that these studies were neither sufficiently shared, nor locally owned. Consequently, the Royal Netherlands Embassy in Colombo requested the CRU of the Clingendael Institute to address this issue by organizing a ‘Sharing Studies’ seminar.

I have tried to summarize the seminar’s discussions as accurately as possible. For the reporting on the working groups I have benefited greatly from the notes of Mr Chamindra Weerackody, Ms Sundari Jayasuriya and Mr Bart Klem. Any errors in fact or interpretation remain my sole responsibility.

Jeroen de Zeeuw
The Hague, May 2002

Contents

Preface	3
Contents	5
Executive Summary	7
Proceedings	9
Welcome by Mrs Susan Blankhart	9
Opening Statement by Hon. Mr Navarathnarajah	10
Introduction to the Seminar by Prof. Georg Frerks	12
Introduction to Working Groups	15
Working Group I	15
Working Group II	16
Working Group III	18
Working Group IV	19
Conclusions and Follow-up to the Seminar	21
Seminar Programme	23
Working Groups	25
Parallel Working Groups	25
Suggestions for Discussion in Working Groups, Round 1	25
Suggestions for Discussion in Working Groups, Round 2	26
Seminar Participants	27

Executive Summary

On 19 April 2002 an international group of both Sri Lankans and non-Sri Lankans, representing a broad range of organizations, were invited to Colombo to discuss a number of topics related to the role and capacity of donors and international organizations with regard to the Sri Lankan conflict. This report covers the introductory speeches by the keynote speakers and reflects the issues and questions raised during the seminar's various plenary and working group sessions. It moreover includes the results of the seminar by way of potential follow-up activities. The report concludes with a copy of the seminar programme, the working groups and a list of participants. The most important issues that were discussed are indicated below.

The Conflict and Development Nexus

The interrelationship between conflict and development was one of the major issues discussed during the seminar. Debates were held about the positive and potentially negative impacts of development assistance on conflict and peace dynamics, how development can be made more inclusive in order to avoid the exclusion of certain groups within society and diminish inequality, and the dominance of certain blueprint models, often incorporated in the phenomenon of globalization, that can trigger societal tensions. If planned, designed and implemented differently, more sensitive to the impact that they can have, development efforts can play an important contribution to rehabilitation, reconciliation and peace-building. In this context, the usefulness of peace and conflict impact assessments was briefly highlighted.

Role of Donors

The discussions in the working groups also touched upon the role of donors in Sri Lanka and their changing role over the years. Mainly pushing their own agendas in the past and ignoring the specific political context, the majority of donors nowadays are much more aware of the political situation in Sri Lanka. Moreover, some donors are already taking into account the potential impact that their activities and policies can have in the peace process, which has recently been stimulated. In view of the positive indications and the progress of this peace process, some participants indicated that Sri Lanka is now in a slow process of transformation. Donors were warned not to be too enthusiastic and to consider carefully what type of projects to fund with which partners (government, NGOs, etc.). Moreover, development efforts should be distributed in an equal manner, targeting problems both in the north, east as well as south of the country. Working in some of these 'uncleared' areas can create difficult problems for donor organizations.

Coordination Mechanisms

Regarding donor assistance in general, it was observed that coordination between donors and the Sri Lankan government could be strengthened. At present, dialogue and interaction between the two parties remains minimal. A strategic framework for donor assistance could prove useful in this respect. The widely debated Framework for Relief, Rehabilitation and Reconciliation ('3-R') as well as the Poverty Reduction Strategy ('PRS') initiative were considered instrumental in this respect. In spite of some criticisms of these frameworks, the general feeling was that the '3-R' Framework in particular provided a good starting point for a more participatory form of governance.

Dissemination of Research Findings

Most of the participants felt that the dissemination of research findings leaves much to be desired. Firstly, academic studies from research institutes, but also policy texts from international (development) organizations, are not systematically disseminated, let alone discussed with the involved stakeholders. Consequently, both local as well as international agencies have difficulty in accessing locally existing expertise on Sri Lanka. This can be improved by bringing scholars and policy-makers together in different fora and by organizing such activities as the 'Sharing Studies' seminar. Secondly, in order to reach a wider audience the issue of translation was felt to be crucial. This refers not only to transcription into other languages (English, Sinhala and Tamil), but also making texts more accessible by translating them into non-academic language. In this regard, the media could also play a useful role.

Suggestions for Follow-up Activities

During the discussions the participants identified a number of follow-up activities to the 'Sharing Studies' initiative. These include the organization of regional seminars in the south, north and east of Sri Lanka, the production of an annotated bibliography on conflict and development by Sri Lankan scholars, translating academic and policy texts into different languages and making them more accessible, developing collaborative research projects between researchers in Sri Lanka and abroad, etc.

Proceedings

Welcome by Mrs Susan Blankhart

Dear ladies and gentlemen,

It is my pleasure to welcome you to this seminar, entitled ‘Sharing Studies on Development and Conflict in Sri Lanka’: an important event considering the topics of today’s discussions; a very timely happening considering the current state of affairs in the Sri Lankan peace process. By hosting this seminar we give full Dutch support to the peace progress in Sri Lanka. Moreover, it testifies to the engagement of the Netherlands to Sri Lanka, with a long history of friendly bilateral contacts. Also, I want to congratulate the Clingendael Institute for organizing this event. They managed to bring together a group of experts, both from Sri Lanka and abroad, who will be asked to share their views on development and conflict (or should I say peace?) in future Sri Lanka.

I would like to draw your attention to the reason for this seminar. The idea to organize a seminar on ‘Sharing Studies’ originated from discussions almost two years ago. A number of international studies were published on how the international community could assist Sri Lanka in redressing the negative effects of the war that has hampered the island’s development for the past two decades. The studies focused mainly on development aid and emergency relief to Sri Lanka and the role of international development agencies and non-governmental organizations. The various publications have resulted in a broad range of lessons learned and recommendations for improving future international assistance. Although some of these studies have been discussed with people directly involved, mainly at the project level, discussions at a government and policy level have not taken place. A number of bilaterals, including the Netherlands, have recognized this problem and proposed bridging this information gap. The ‘Sharing Studies’ initiative aims to bring together the most recent international studies on Sri Lanka and discuss them with not only the authors but with representatives of relevant Sri Lankan and international organizations, representing academia, the civil service, media, and the diplomatic and development communities. The key objective is to reach a level of common understanding of the main issues and challenges ahead and to formulate new approaches and visions.

Although planned nearly one year ago in a period when prospects for peace seemed few, this seminar ties in with recent initiatives undertaken by the Sri Lankan government in the field of development, rehabilitation and the ongoing efforts to reach a peace settlement.

Ladies and gentlemen, I wish you an interesting and fruitful seminar in which common shared new approaches and visions will be discussed and developed that may strengthen the peace process in Sri Lanka.

Opening Statement by Hon. Mr Navarathnarajah

Distinguished participants,

First of all let me express my gratitude and honour at having been invited to the inauguration of this seminar. Initiatives such as this are part of the ongoing efforts to formulate more effective development strategies that are supported by the Sri Lankan stakeholders and the donor community. The Royal Netherlands Embassy and the Conflict Research Unit of the Clingendael Institute deserve our special thanks for convening this seminar.

Conflict and development are very much on the international agenda, particularly since the end of the Cold War. Conflict, and especially internal conflict, was one of the major issues on the political agenda of the Millennium Summit. Moreover, the interrelationship between conflict and development has been widely studied. It has been shown that development releases energies and forces that could cause conflict. At the broader macroeconomic level, globalization driven by ideology and technology has led to tensions. It is now broadly recognized that there are both benefits and risks in this process, with winners and losers. Addressing this topic, the Millennium Summit proposed to develop a more inclusive process of globalization, which spreads the benefits more widely and avoids rising disparities. This is the background against which the international community attempts to tackle the problems related to the rapid transformation of societies both at the national and local level.

By bringing together a number of participants from non-governmental agencies, the donor community, academics, civil servants, civil society and the media, this seminar provides an excellent opportunity for dialogue and debate around the central theme of development and conflict in Sri Lanka. Your discussions today will focus on conclusions from a number of research studies undertaken recently by the donor community and international non-governmental organizations regarding the complex interrelationship between development and conflict. The presence among us of a number of authors of these studies is particularly important in ensuring a meaningful exchange of views. The organizers of this seminar have pointed out that the studies reviewed were written mainly from a donor perspective and have therefore not always adequately reflected the stakeholders' concerns and perspectives. Consequently, the latter have often been excluded from the ongoing debates within the development community concerning the nexus of conflict and development. As another rationale of this seminar, it has been pointed out that the studies have not been systematically disseminated and discussed with the relevant Sri Lankan agencies and stakeholders. Nor has there been a concerted effort to ensure coordination of activities at the national and local levels. The objective of today's seminar is precisely to address these shortcomings and stimulate discussion on the challenges and tasks ahead. I am happy to note that the seminar has been designed in an interactive format to ensure fruitful dialogue and debate.

In the national context, this seminar is taking place at a particularly crucial juncture. The new government, which assumed office in December 2001, has presented its maiden budget, which focuses on stabilization of the economy and laying the basis for economic revival. In pursuit of the objective of ending the ethnic conflict and securing a durable peace, a mutually agreed ceasefire has been concluded, including an international monitoring mission. In order to address the urgent humanitarian problems confronting people in the conflict-affected areas, effective measures, including the removal of checkpoints and opening of major roads, have been taken to ensure free movement of people, essential goods and services. Concrete steps are being undertaken to stimulate substantive negotiations for a durable, political settlement. The international community has welcomed and supported these

efforts. I would like to take the opportunity to express the deep appreciation and sincere thanks of the people of Sri Lanka to the donor community, including the government and people of the Netherlands, for their consistent support over the years to Sri Lanka's development efforts.

This seminar is part of a broader, consultative process in which the donor community and different stakeholders within Sri Lanka interact both in the formulation of policies, strategies and programmes and in evaluations on their impact and results. In the past such interactions have taken place both at the bilateral level and in multilateral meetings, such as the Development Forum. This process has been intensified in the current context of achieving a durable peace in pursuit of development and reconstruction. Obviously, the forthcoming Development Forum to be held in Colombo in June 2002 will be an important occasion for comprehensive consultations on all aspects pertaining to peace and development. The United Nations Small Arms mission that visited Sri Lanka addressed the problem of proliferation of small and light weapons in the country. Furthermore, we are expecting a human needs assessment mission in Sri Lanka, which will hopefully arrive shortly at the invitation of the Sri Lankan government. This will provide another opportunity for comprehensive consultations on both development- and post-conflict-related issues.

In this context, it is relevant to refer to the recent initiatives taken by the Sri Lankan government in the field of development and peace. Among these are the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) and the Framework on Relief, Rehabilitation and Reconciliation ('3-R'). In order to ensure proper coordination of international assistance and avoid duplication as well as fragmentation, the Sri Lankan government has pursued an inclusive consultative process resulting in these initiatives, supported by the international development community with both bilateral and multilateral resources. The PRS process has been initiated in order to develop a broadly supported national poverty-reduction strategy. The government of Sri Lanka, in collaboration with local and international NGOs, is pursuing efforts to design a feasible plan that will target the root causes of poverty both in the urban and rural areas. The '3-R' Framework has been developed with maximum input from all stakeholders in order to ensure maximum output for all beneficiaries. During a three-year-long, extensive, consultative process with researchers, NGOs, religious groups and the business sector, a wide variety of perspectives and opinions have been obtained. This makes the '3-R' process the first attempt at reaching the highest level of inclusiveness in formulating strategies for relief, reconstruction and reconciliation. The '3-R' Framework is almost completed and will be presented at the Development Forum, scheduled to take place in June 2002. Both the '3-R' and the PRS processes are linked to the broader vision on how Sri Lanka will look in 2010, aiming at sustainable development, reduction of poverty and rising income levels.

Finally, I would like to draw attention to the background material, with the reports by Bart Klem of the Conflict Research Unit and Wolfram Zünzer of the Berghof Foundation, who both provide an excellent overview of the findings and recommendations from international research on Sri Lanka. Concluding, I hope that the topics mentioned in these reports and the issues that I have just raised will be dealt with during today's seminar. They are crucial in our continuing development and peace efforts. As in any seminar, there will be areas of consensus and agreement, but also areas on which people will disagree and therefore need further discussion. The seminar should therefore not be regarded as a single event, but part of a continuing process of raising awareness and understanding, for which future research and discussions will be necessary. The government of Sri Lanka very much supports such initiatives. I wish you all good luck in your discussions and look forward to the outcomes of the seminar.

Introduction to the Seminar by Prof. Georg Frerks

Excellencies, Additional Secretary, ladies and gentlemen, dear friends,

Let me first of all say that it is again a pleasure to be in Sri Lanka and especially to be with all of you. Although not my first time in this country, the circumstances in Sri Lanka today seem to be quite different from what we have seen over the years behind us. I hope that these changes prove sustainable and can realize our hopes for the future.

I do not intend to take too much of your time, because - as the Additional Secretary also mentioned - this is an interactive process and not one of several monologues. However, I would briefly like to comment on the idea of the seminar and highlight some of the major issues that emerged from the studies, especially the synthesis study by Bart Klem. Finally, I would like to say a few words on what we hope to achieve today and how this seminar is structured.

I am here as a representative of the Conflict Research Unit (CRU) of the Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael'. The CRU has been asked by the Royal Netherlands Embassy to prepare this conference and provide the background information. The Clingendael Institute has already been involved for a couple of years in academic and more applied research in Sri Lanka, in collaboration with our Sri Lankan counterpart, the International Centre of Ethnic Studies (ICES). We hope to build on these efforts to contribute to today's debates and the events that are unfolding now.

As acknowledged in the preface of the synthesis study, since the 1990s the position of donors and international organizations in conflict areas has received increasing attention. It is increasingly being recognized that development cooperation and international aid in general may help to reduce conflict by addressing some of the underlying causes, while there are also indications that in other cases this is not an automatic mechanism. Initiatives like 'Do No Harm' and 'Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment' have often indicated that development can be counter-productive. We therefore have to analyse how development activities work out in practice and what the role of development aid is in conflict situations. In that context, it is important to realize that development should never be seen as a politically neutral issue. It is, in fact, a fundamentally political issue involving political choices about the future nature of society, about realizing one's objectives, wishes and dreams for a better life. The nexus between development and conflict therefore proves to be an important issue for further analysis. As said, although conflict in and of itself can destroy the effects of earlier development efforts, development in and of itself may also be a reason for conflict. In the Philippines they use the expression 'development aggression' in this respect. In talking about globalization, it is important to realize that there are models of development that are not always welcomed and are even considered to be disruptive of other, more traditional and older modes of social organization. Development can also trigger tensions when it is distributed in a bad manner or badly managed. Finally, in a more positive tone, development can be used to address certain problems structurally, including the causes and triggers of conflict. In this way, development can be an instrument contributing to rehabilitation, reconciliation and peace-building, if development is sensitive enough to address such issues. Here I think that it is wise to make a distinction between different approaches used in development aid. Referring to the work of Jonathan Goodhand, we have to understand what development means in conflict situations. Are development agencies working around conflict, working in conflict or working on conflict? Research shows that development agencies have only recently started to address the causes of conflict. Working around conflict, not doing anything about it specifically, has been the most common experience.

Repeating what was said earlier, the way in which the background study has been organized of course has a number of limitations. Quite obviously, there was no possibility to refer to all studies on development and conflict in Sri Lanka. Secondly, we have decided to focus on studies initiated by the international community in order - as explained by the Ambassador - to share and discuss them with people in Sri Lanka. Unfortunately, this means that we have left out a number of very important studies on Sri Lanka by Sri Lankan academics, journalists and so on. Perhaps in the future, or perhaps as a conclusion of this seminar, you may suggest more work on that. In Annexe 1 of the report [*Sharing Studies on Development and Conflict in Sri Lanka: Synthesis of Eight Studies*, by Bart Klem], on page 37 to be exact, you can find the selection criteria and the justification of our methodological approach to this study. In order to remove potential criticism regarding the limited nature of the study, I think that it is good to keep this particular focus in mind.

Let me say a few words on some of the major issues that emerge from the selected studies, first of all on the nature and causes of conflict itself. At present it may seem that there is no use in looking back in large detail on the nature and causes of conflict in Sri Lanka. However, if we are not able to address them now, in the future some of these issues may linger on. One of the major conclusions from the studies was that the conflict in Sri Lanka is in fact multidimensional and dynamic, with the nature of conflict changing over time. Although in today's seminar we will take a more prospective view, I therefore believe that at least some level of understanding and agreement on the root causes is necessary for a good discussion.

In addition, it has been said that there is not *one* conflict in Sri Lanka, but a number of interrelated conflicts. Also, it was concluded by all authors that conflict could and should not be reduced to an ethnic divide or an ethnic divide only. Instead, the conflict has to be seen in a broader context of political ethnicization and state failure to represent the entirety of Sri Lankan society effectively and adequately. This has been underlined in the work of Sunil Bastian, for example.

Another interesting observation was that the international dimension of the conflict has received little attention in research. This seems logical against the background of relatively little international political action regarding the Sri Lankan conflict - sometimes depicted as one of those forgotten wars. However, in view of current political affairs both within and outside Sri Lanka, more research regarding the international dimensions of the conflict would be very worthwhile.

The same remark can be made regarding research on the role of development aid. Although, as said before, recognition of the multiple effects of development assistance *vis-à-vis* conflict is there, researchers have in fact collected very little systematic knowledge on this crucial topic. The first evaluations of the impact of development assistance on conflict dynamics are only now appearing, while well-documented studies identifying lessons learned are still few and far between. The potential and limitations of development assistance in the peace process, the question of whether the original mandate of development agencies permits them to work on conflict and peace-related issues, the strengths and weaknesses of working with NGOs, how development activities in conflict situations can be managed, how the type of funding can be improved and relevant expertise be made available but also more appropriate research methodology to study these items, are all questions to be looked into. If I may quote Jonathan Goodhand again who said 'Aid is a blunt instrument with limited leverage', we indeed have to think about the available development instruments we have and whether they are in fact suitable for a particular context. Similarly, other observers have concluded that the role of NGOs with regard to peace-building is minor, at least when compared to what is sometimes claimed. This raises the issue what, in fact, can be expected from development cooperation in the area

of peace and conflict. I personally believe that development cooperation has an important role to play, but that we still need to do further work on the nexus conflict-development. In Sri Lanka peace and conflict considerations are now increasingly inserted in development cooperation, while the '3-R' Framework is encompassing relief, rehabilitation and reconciliation at the same time. These are significant steps towards a firm framework to sensitize development cooperation to questions of peace and conflict.

Another essential element when working on conflict and development refers to the need to make a fundamental analysis of the political context and of conflict-related processes. Policy responses by donor agencies frequently lack such a deeper understanding and show a heavy reliance on traditional methods and reflexes. This may limit their possibilities to really impact on the prospects for peace. The studies outline the importance of long-term commitment, flexibility and they ask for unconventional approaches that do not fit into the boxed-in categories and budget lines of orthodox donor assistance.

Finally, the studies outline some important implications for donor assistance. The first theme relates to the observation that peace cannot be brought to Sri Lanka: Sri Lankans themselves must want it and have to make it. Development cooperation and any international action cannot have but a secondary role. Whereas aid, secondly, has been channeled to a fairly large degree through the government, there is a debate how the government as a party in the conflict can be induced or influenced towards positive change. The same question may apply to future LTTE-run administrations in the north and east of the country. Though conditionalities are usually not very effective, some observers have nevertheless called for stricter rules, while others emphasize the importance of mutually agreed frameworks. A third issue refers to the role of civil society. All authors see it as an important partner, but also argue for caution in view of inherent limitations. How do civil society organizations, for example, relate to the different ethnic groups? Are they also not under political control or influence from the former combatants or even part of their economies of violence? What can they achieve in the field of peace-building and reconciliation? Are they able to address the underlying and structural causes of conflict? A closer look at civil society from this perspective is certainly called for. A final issue is that of policy coordination and coherence. The fragmented nature of both the Sri Lankan society and government, and the donor community will make it very difficult to arrive at a coherent and consistent approach. Moreover, how to avoid top-down, centrally-controlled implementation mechanisms, and how to ensure respect for diversity? How to guarantee the inclusion of multiple stakeholders in these processes? All these issues are crucial questions that need to be addressed.

One would hope and envisage that the nexus between development, conflict and peace will be a positive one, working in the direction of peace, rehabilitation and reconciliation. However, development efforts can also be counterproductive, turning into a bone of contention. Therefore, high demands will be put on the analysis of the situation and the management and implementation of the process. Here Sri Lankan society has to take care and be in charge, as donors tend to rush in and out once a ceasefire or peace agreement has been concluded. In their eagerness to be present they may easily forget their own lessons regarding coordination, coherence and consistency.

These are all crucial elements that have been covered in the different studies and the synthesis report presented to you today. I hope that this concise overview will provide sufficient starting points for the discussion this afternoon, both in the plenary sessions and the different working groups. I would now like to invite you to the working group meetings and wish you a fruitful discussion.

Introduction to Working Groups

The studies reviewed in the background documentation cover a wide range of topics, related to conflict and development in Sri Lanka. These include, among other things, the impact of development assistance on peace and conflict dynamics, the relationship between donors and recipient organizations, the changing mandate of development assistance and coordination mechanisms. In order to stimulate debate and guarantee maximum involvement by the participants, the seminar programme was designed to be highly interactive. After the introductory speeches, the main part of the day consisted of discussions held in four parallel working groups. Based on the conclusions of the background material, a number of questions were identified for these working group sessions (see page 25). The main findings of these discussions are found below.

Working Group I

The discussion started with the role of donor agencies in Sri Lanka's conflict-affected areas. Some participants raised the frustration of the south of Sri Lanka concerning the manner in which development aid is directed to conflict-affected areas. People in the south feel insecure and perceive that resources are diverted mainly to the north and east, neglecting the development needs of southern Sri Lanka. In addition, some pointed out that the country's economy had been badly affected because of the conflicts in the south in 1971 and 1987. This provides another reason for donors and the Sri Lankan government to make sure that adequate resources are also allocated to the south. In this connection, the participants urged donors to be sensitive to perceptions in the south. If the southern parts of Sri Lanka are neglected in terms of development activities, donors as well as the Sri Lankan government risk eroding peace-building efforts in other parts of the country. The donor approach should therefore be more *inclusive* regarding certain geographical parts of Sri Lanka. In view of this debate, some felt that the principle of equity should apply to donor assistance. Donors should ensure that equal access to resources and opportunities are established both in the north as well as in the south. However, others argued that it is not equity that matters, but reaching a *compromise* between the north and the south regarding allocation of resources.

Regarding donor assistance in general, it was observed that coordination between donors and the Sri Lankan government could be strengthened. At present, dialogue and interaction between the two parties remains minimal. As a first step in this regard, a central registry of donors and their activities would be useful. Moreover, participants felt that the Sri Lankan government should introduce a policy framework in order to streamline donor assistance better to the conflict-affected areas. In this framework the donors' mandate to work in the conflict-affected areas should be clearly spelt out. In addition, an area-specific and a well-focused mechanism that monitors development and peace-building activities at different levels should be introduced and jointly implemented by all concerned parties, including government, donors, militants, civil society organizations, etc. The idea behind this framework is to improve the transparency of development assistance in the country by making it more accountable, assessing its past and monitoring its future performance.

Another topic discussed in this working group revolved around ownership versus mutual responsibility, namely the ownership of the poverty reduction process in the country: does the government have a stake in the process or is it predominantly donor-driven? It was agreed that the government is the key stakeholder in the poverty reduction process and should therefore own it. In this

regard, good governance and accountability are important prerequisites. Some held the view in the debate that the term 'sense of ownership' is gradually losing its meaning. They argued that there is a need for the different partners to join hands in development efforts, thereby carrying 'mutual responsibility' for their actions.

Working group participants discussed the role of the media in the peace-building process. Some were of the opinion that the media does not adequately project reality in the conflict-affected areas. For example, the real plight of common people living in the conflict-affected areas is hardly presented to southern Sri Lanka. Instead, pictures of militant groups with their weaponry as well as images of large amounts of food aid being moved to the conflict areas are frequently shown on television. Television viewers in the south construct a relationship between the two and perceive that food aid is provided to the militant groups. Among the people in the south this creates feelings of enmity towards the north, particularly among the unemployed youth, who feel that they are being discriminated against. Obviously, such feelings of animosity do not help peace-building processes.

The issue of poverty and conflict was only briefly discussed. Conflict was regarded as a major threat to poverty reduction. In order better to understand the linkages between the two processes, the group felt that development workers as well as civil society institutions have to be more involved in conflict resolution processes.

By way of follow-up to the seminar, some participants proposed organizing a summit with the participation of all stakeholders, including government agencies and donors, as well as a broad representation of civil society, in order to discuss the pertinent issues, share information and work out appropriate strategies for peace-building and the development of the conflict-affected areas. Such a 'national conference' should result in continuous dialogue between the parties involved.

Working Group II

There was a general comment from the participants that the studies reviewed in the background paper were written before the ceasefire agreement had been signed and therefore reflected a different political setting. The immediate challenge that international agencies now face is how to deal with the government of Sri Lanka (GoSL) and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE)? In this connection, people wondered whether peace would be possible without the LTTE taking serious steps to develop a more 'democratic' form of governance.

Most of the participants agreed that the current 'peace process' is still very fragile, with a number of major issues still to be resolved, including the issue of the interim administration in the north and east of Sri Lanka, the problem of ex-combatants and the question of the return of refugees. Against this background, some felt that the current situation is mutually beneficial for both the GoSL and the LTTE. The government does not (yet) have to decide on the future political status of LTTE-controlled areas, while the LTTE remains in control of the north and the east, without being fought by the GoSL. Therefore, donors now have to come up with an appropriate assistance framework that corresponds with the new situation. Some participants warned donors to be careful not to fall into the trap of perceptions: the south claiming that aid money has mainly been directed at the north and the east, while the LTTE argues that the areas under their control have hardly received any funds. Research, however, has shown that in reality most donor assistance has been spent in southern parts of the country. Apart from media bias, this might be a reflection of the impossibility for any development agency (except for humanitarian organizations) to work in non-government-controlled areas. The

working group participants felt that international agencies should be given full mandate by the GoSL to work in LTTE-controlled areas, an issue that might be facilitated by the establishment of a new interim administration in the north and east in the near future. In that case, the question remains, however, of whether international agencies are prepared to assist the LTTE in making the necessary transformation from a military-led movement to a more democratic, political organization. In this respect, the useful role of intermediary groups familiar to the LTTE was highlighted. Vice versa, it was mentioned that there are signs that the LTTE - albeit marginally - is allowing more room for involvement by civil society groups. The international community can play a stronger role in this process. Asking whether international development agencies are equipped with adequate knowledge for this process, there was a call for more involvement from local experts. The biggest obstacle, however, remained the lack of political consent to work in the 'uncleared areas'. One of the main conclusions in this working group, therefore, centred around the notion that the international community is restricted in its actions by national political parameters, which do not allow for all parties to benefit from international assistance. However, not everything should be left to the international community. It was felt that the GoSL should take its responsibility in financing appropriate development projects in the country in order to address certain grievances among the population. There was little sympathy among the participants for the passive and rather uncritical attitude of the GoSL in this regard. So far the relationship between donors and the GoSL was considered to be rather top-down. Increasing the national ownership over the country's development would probably take some more time. In this connection, it was emphasized that the international community should refrain from dictating the pace of the peace process. The GoSL should be given time to adapt its structures to the new situation and should therefore not be overloaded with radical ideas and donor funds. The uncertain response from the LTTE to new government initiatives is another indication that the peace process should not be pushed too quickly.

In the second round of discussion, the issue of research on conflict and peace-building initiatives was discussed. It was said that the dissemination of research findings in policy formulation and community-level discussions could be improved. There was a general feeling that the problem is not about funding new research projects, but how local and international agencies can access existing expertise on Sri Lanka in order to improve their operational strategies. This limited access was explained, among other things, by: the collapse of the universities, especially in their role as documentation centres; the presentation of research findings (in academic journals rather than short, non-academic briefing papers); and the lack of sufficient up-to-date information. Moreover, it was argued that research should make better use of local stakeholders and informants, especially regarding how local community organizations operate in the current political context in Sri Lanka. Vice versa, international agencies and research organizations should provide better access to their documents and policy papers. In this regard, the issue of translation was highlighted in order to reach a wider, also non-academic, audience. This refers to translation in terms of transcription into other languages (English, Sinhala and Tamil) as well as in terms of translation into non-academic language. The media could perhaps play a useful role in this process.

Thirdly, the topic of the '3-R' Framework was addressed. Despite the fact that this Framework was heralded in the media and by international agencies as a successful, participatory initiative, there were strong doubts from the participants about whether this was correct. Some questioned the apparent bias in thematic emphasis and argued that reports were not always properly circulated, mainly because of too critical commenting; while others wondered to what extent the initial inputs had been fed into

the final Framework document and if this will be reported back to all discussion group participants. One participant noted that the different themes in the '3-R' process - relief, rehabilitation and reconciliation - have distinct time frames and therefore require a different approach. Apart from the critical comments, participants regarded the initiative in and of itself as positive, as it is the first ever such activity aiming at maximum participation and coordination. The question now is how this will continue. There was fear among the participants that the Framework will become part of a political and bureaucratic power game, and will finally be implemented in a rather top-down, technocratic manner.

Finally, the participants indicated a number of follow-up activities to this seminar. These included the development of another bibliography regarding conflict and development in Sri Lanka, compiled by Sri Lankan researchers; the organization of a seminar where Sri Lankans and international experts can discuss and review the entire '3-R' process as such; similar 'sharing studies seminars' to be organized in the south, north and east of Sri Lanka with Sinhalese and Tamil participants from academia and NGOs; and, finally, the distribution of a proceedings report and the background paper, translated in different languages.

Working Group III

Many participants in the group highlighted the current situation in Sri Lanka. Recent political changes in the conflict situation were attributed to a political change, away from the 'war for peace' policy of the People's Alliance (PA) government. Moreover, the country's economy had suffered as never before, and this was said to have contributed a great deal to ending the protracted conflict. Together with the acceptance of the United National Party (UNP) that the war cannot be won in the short term without incurring massive costs to the economy and society, Sri Lanka now seems to be in a transitional period. The events of 11 September 2001 no doubt contributed to this transition, but were by no means regarded as the main factor.

Concerning the development of Sri Lanka, it was asserted that in the past it was mainly donor-driven, with the majority of donors not concerned about political dynamics in the country. The IMF and the World Bank in particular were criticized by a number of participants for contributing to tensions in the country. All participants considered this a negative side to development assistance. It was only after 1987 and the uprising by Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (JVP, People's Liberation Front) that the international donor community realized that it could not ignore the ethno-political situation in the country and realized that it could no longer work 'around conflict' but had to work 'on the conflict' as well. Today, the international donor community is much more aware of the political situation in Sri Lanka and can therefore wield greater influence for positive change. According to some this is also connected to a change in international (development) policy. In recent decades, donors mainly focused on poverty alleviation in a number of countries, including Sri Lanka. In the last decade, however, things have changed and development assistance is targeted more specifically to local problems, including projects in the sphere of good governance, civil society and human rights. Moreover, some participants felt that donors are more inclined nowadays to pose conditions - mainly in the field of human rights - while disbursing aid money. In this regard, it was asked whether the international community should also use development aid as a tool to promote the '3-R' process? The question remained, however, as to how assistance should be channelled to the north and east of the country and what strategies the international community should adopt to facilitate this process. Some

participants felt here that the donors should not mastermind national development plans and argued instead for locally devised schemes.

Regarding the impact of development assistance on peace-building, a number of participants argued that there have been many development projects implemented in Sri Lanka but that there has also been much criticism as to how effective they have been in helping to redress the conflict. The question often asked is whether development aid implemented in such a way aggravates an already tense situation. Without providing a direct correlation between development assistance and the Sri Lankan conflict, one participant had observed that in recent years the funds spent on the war and on development projects were almost equal. Considering the sometimes negative effects of development assistance and the large sums of development aid that are given by the donor community to the Sri Lankan government, some participants in this working group argued for the development of a mechanism to monitor how the funds are used. There was some debate about which (international) agency might be most capable of undertaking this and how to coordinate such monitoring activities.

The topic of research was only briefly discussed in the working group. It was argued that donors nowadays use and commission research studies as input for their development policies. This process was considered to be totally donor-driven. In this respect, the participants considered it advisable to collaborate more with Sri Lankan professionals and academics.

Moreover, the participants raised a number of open questions for which nobody seemed to have a sufficient answer:

- How to move from the interim process to peace?
- How to involve the LTTE in the '3-R' process?
- How to engage donors in working both with the government and the LTTE?
- How to deal with demobilization?
- How to include the south in the peace process and subsequent development programmes?
- How to monitor human rights standards and influence constitutional change?
- How to influence key stakeholders and decision-makers?
- How to bridge the language barrier?

Finally, the group identified a number of recommendations contributing to peace-building. These included improving the management of information flows; enhancing transparent donor policies; establishing translation centres, supported by a joint donor translation facility; gathering more information as to what is happening at the local level; encouraging participation by the Sri Lankan academic community in research studies; and informing donors about public opinion in important development issues.

Working Group IV

In general there was a broad range of ideas brought up in this working group, with views varying frequently and widely. Although consensus was reached only on a number of issues, the discussion was felt to have been constructive.

The Sri Lankan conflict proper was only briefly discussed, with an introduction to the 'greed and grievance' debate. One of the participants explained that grievance refers to tensions raised to violent levels by groups of people being excluded or marginalized, whereas greed implies conflict as a means for people aiming to optimize resources to serve their (economic) interests. In this respect, it was mentioned that war has become an institution in Sri Lanka, implying that it continues (partly) because

people are profiting from it. One important observation in this regard was that the economy in the south is increasingly reliant on soldiers sending their salaries home. However, some participants felt that this influence should not be exaggerated. It was pointed out that a large number of people, supposedly profiting from the war, had voted for peace in the elections.

With regard to the international community, some argued that the bigger donors still considered the conflict as a negative externality in the 'normal linear' development process. According to one participant this had to do with changing views about development cooperation over the years. Nowadays development assistance is increasingly seen as a medium for bridge-building between contending parties in addition to poverty alleviation. However, it was asserted that the support of the public back home is crucial to donors, with this public tending to embrace a simplistic perception of victims and causes. This hampers donors in moving towards a broader approach that addresses causes of conflict instead of simply tackling visible symptoms. This creates an 'uneasy balance' for donors in managing the views of their constituencies (the public back home), their own views and the views supported in Sri Lanka.

Taking a different perspective, another participant explained that the Sri Lankan government is also facing a difficult situation. The government's burden in supporting a large number of people in the north and east of the country is often not appreciated. The process of including all communities in the north and east was said to be troubled by this lack of appreciation as well as by strong Tamil aspirations. In addition, when criticizing the government's approach, donors need to take into account the fact that the government's resources for the north and the east are almost entirely absorbed by the sheer day-to-day subsistence requirements of the population. As a result, there was said to be little capacity for more sophisticated initiatives.

There was general agreement that the current peace process and the government's efforts in it are very promising. However, the group stressed the importance of resisting the temptation to 'rush for peace'. Civil society in the north and east of Sri Lanka, for example, cannot yet be treated as if it has reached a situation of peace. It should be understood that Sri Lanka is now in a slow process of transformation. Defining one's position in this transformation process is difficult for donors as well as NGOs. The presence of international actors in the north and east of Sri Lanka was said to be crucial in the peace process. International actors played an important role in maintaining communication between the LTTE and the government prior to signing the ceasefire, and they currently continue to play a parallel role to the peace process in working out the implementation of assistance in war-torn areas. It was pointed out that within this process the presence of 'trusted individuals or organizations' is of eminent importance to donors. They function as a source of information and may play a facilitating role in the peace process. These local 'brokers' can obviously not be 'created' out of the blue, but more effort can be placed in identifying them. The central issue within the current peace process is the lack of trust and understanding between the different communities. Many people have not been in contact with each other for a long time. Similar to the discussions in the other working groups, it was mentioned that regional imbalances and perceptions should be taken into account. Also here, the example was raised of people in the south believing that most money is spent in the north. In establishing contact between communities, creative initiatives are needed. Neighbourhood-level initiatives, such as bringing together local Tamil, Sinhala and Muslim communities, can be relatively cheap and effective. Previous experiences have shown that such small initiatives may be more fruitful than high-profile, nationwide activities.

On the national level, the ‘3-R’ process was generally hailed by all participants. It was classified as a confidence-building activity that greatly contributed to the government’s legitimacy. Even though it may have been awkward at times, the inclusion of a wide range of actors turned out to be constructive. Getting the Ministry of Defence aboard was considered one of the major successes of the process. The big issue for the future is how to include the LTTE and other actors from the north and east of Sri Lanka. Equally, participants felt that the media would have to be represented in the process. Until now the press has not been included in the ‘3-R’ Framework as some organizations, including the Sri Lankan government and the World Bank, felt uncomfortable about discussing sensitive issues together with media representatives.

The role of the press was discussed in many different contexts. Contrary to the English-language press, the Sinhala and Tamil press were said to be rather chauvinistic. As most Sri Lankans read in either of these two languages, it was considered desirable to stimulate the media to take a more peace-minded approach.

Finally, ideas concerning follow-ups to the seminar were brought to the fore. Firstly, it was observed that the seminar was rather donor-oriented. In the future, therefore, a similar seminar should be organized focusing on Sri Lankan studies in the field of conflict and development. Some participants emphasized the importance of including Sri Lankan universities in this process. Secondly, it was suggested that the Clingendael initiative be linked to the ‘3-R’ process. Another idea focused on the inclusion of the press in future activities, and to explore what the potential relevance could be of organizations that are related to both development cooperation and the media.

Conclusions and Follow-up to the Seminar

The brief plenary debate after the workshops touched on the need for demilitarization of Sri Lankan society, including the difficult process of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR); the important role of the media as one of the building blocks in creating trust and confidence within the Sri Lankan population; the rural transition in the south of Sri Lanka; the issue of unemployment (except for the Sri Lankan army); and the negative effects of the neoliberal, market-oriented development policies of major donors, including the IMF. The plenary debate was concluded by Georg Frerks who emphasized the suggestions made about ‘good donorship’: donors should carefully review their policies on the impact of peace and conflict, ground their work in local realities, make their projects and policies more inclusive and become more accountable. Based on the outcomes of the working group sessions and the plenary debates, a number of possible follow-up activities for the ‘Sharing Studies’ project were identified:

1. Regional ‘Sharing Studies’ seminars with Sri Lankans and international staff, including academia, NGOs, civil servants, journalists, etc.;
2. Sri Lankan scholars to write an annotated bibliography, covering recent Sri Lankan writings on development and conflict;
3. Collaborative research projects between Sri Lankan and international researchers on lessons learned in development and conflict;
4. Translation of original and review studies from Sri Lankan and international academics or international organizations into easily accessible, non-academic writings produced in English, Sinhala and Tamil;

5. Dissemination of the above-mentioned translated studies, as well as the translated versions of the background documentation and proceedings report;
6. Establishment of a collective donor fund for translation of academic and policy texts in multiple languages (English, Sinhala and Tamil);
7. Connect the 'Sharing Studies' initiative to the '3-R' process. In connection to this, an interactive seminar was proposed to identify lessons learned and recommendations from the '3-R' process;
8. The organization of a national conference on sharing pertinent issues in the field of development (and conflict) in order to work out appropriate strategies for peace-building and development in Sri Lanka.

Peter Kuperus of the Royal Netherlands Embassy concluded the seminar by thanking all the participants and briefly summarizing the main elements of the day, the most important being: the necessity for follow-up to key activities like the '3-R' and PRS processes; the importance of improving the inclusiveness of these processes; the use of these development processes as vehicles for stimulating more inclusive, democratic and pluralistic governance systems, especially in the north and east of Sri Lanka; and, finally, the responsibility of donors who have a crucial task in bridging the gap of trust between the different communities in Sri Lanka.

Seminar Programme

09.00h	Registration and Coffee
09.30h	Welcome <i>H.E. Mrs Susan Blankhart, the Netherlands' Ambassador to Sri Lanka</i>
09.35	Lighting of the Oil Lamp
09.40h	Opening Statement <i>Hon. Mr Navarathnarajah, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sri Lanka</i>
09.50h	Introduction to the Seminar <i>Prof. Georg Frerks, Head of the Conflict Research Unit, Clingendael Institute, the Netherlands</i>
10.15h	Exploring Key Issues Plenary Debate
10.45h	Break
11.15h	Introduction to Working Groups, Round 1 <i>Prof. Georg Frerks</i>
11.25h	Parallel Working Groups, Round 1
12.30h	Lunch
14.00h	Introduction to Parallel Working Groups, Round 2 <i>Prof. Georg Frerks</i>
14.05h	Parallel Working Groups, Round 2

15.15h	Break
15.45h	Reporting by Working Group Rapporteurs
16.20h	Conclusions and Follow-up <i>Plenary Debate (facilitation: Prof. Georg Frerks)</i>
17.00h	Closing Remarks <i>Mr Peter Kuperus, Deputy Head of the Dutch Mission, Sri Lanka</i> <i>Prof. Georg Frerks</i>
17.10h	Cocktails

Working Groups

Parallel Working Groups

Group I (blue) Moonstone/Amethyst

Chair:

Mr Tudor Silva

Kick-off round 1:

Ms Niloufer Lebbe

Kick-off round 2:

Mr Nick Lewer

Rapporteur:

Mr S. Balakrishnan

Secretary:

Mr Chamindra
Weerackody

Mr V. Ariyaratne

Mr Christoph Feyen

Ms Dilrukshi Fonseka

Mr Dayan Jayatilake

Mr Navarathnarajah

Mr N. Shanmugaratnam

Group II (yellow) Moonstone/Amethyst

Chair:

Mr Kingsley de Silva

Kick-off round 1:

Mr Kethesh Loganathan

Kick-off round 2:

Ms Irma Specht

Rapporteur:

Mr Sunil Bastian

Secretary:

Mr Jeroen de Zeeuw

Ms Farah Mihlar
Ahamed

Mr Phil Esmond

Mrs Stina Karlton

Mr William Knox

Mrs Champika

Liyanaarachchi

Mr Gary Ribbons

Group III (green) Topaz

Chair:

Mr Lionel Fernando

Kick-off round 1:

Mr Kenneth Bush

Kick-off round 2:

Mr Joe Weeramunda

Rapporteur:

Mr Keethaponcalan

Secretary:

Ms Sundari Jayasuriya

Ms Berit

Mr Tyrol Ferdinands

Mr Georg Frerks

Mrs Vishaka Hidellage

Ms Anthea Mulakala

Group IV (red) Garnet

Chair:

Mr T. Lankaneson

Kick-off round 1:

Mr Jonathan Goodhand

Kick-off round 2:

Mr Keith Noyahr

Rapporteur:

Mr Sasanka Perera

Secretary:

Mr Bart Klem

Mr Christian Barbero

Mr Peter Kuperus

Mrs Sarala Fernando

Mrs Claudia Ibarguen

Suggestions for Discussion in Working Groups, Round 1

1. *Impact of development assistance*

- What has the influence of development projects been on the peace and conflict dynamic in Sri Lanka?

- What was the role of international and local development organizations in this process?
- How can development assistance be more ‘sensitized’ to conflict situations?
- Can the impact of development assistance be predicted, channelled and, if necessary, redressed?
- How can development assistance contribute to the sustainability of the peace process?
- What type of medium-term strategies can be developed in this regard?

2. *Role of international agencies*

- What role do international (development) agencies play in the conflict and peace dynamic in Sri Lanka?
- What changes in mandates of international agencies can be distinguished?
- How can development agencies contribute to conflict prevention and peace-building?
- Are these agencies properly equipped to such future roles and what is needed in this regard?
- How can relevant departments within international agencies (not only development cooperation but also political desks) be included more effectively?

Suggestions for Discussion in Working Groups, Round 2

3. *Management of information and expertise*

- How to manage the influx of innovative ideas concerning development and conflict in Sri Lanka?
- How to avoid the danger of a technocratic top-down process and instead to include the perspectives of local stakeholders, providing them access to available expertise?
- What can we learn from the ‘3-R’ and the PRS processes in this regard?
- How can the international community strengthen these processes?
- How to translate research findings (on Sri Lanka) into policy and practice?
- How to distribute relevant material more effectively among not only donors and the Sri Lankan government, but also among the wider Sinhalese, Tamil and Muslim communities?

4. *Implementation and coordination mechanisms*

- How can fragmented development efforts be coordinated more effectively, considering the negative effect of scattered assistance on the conflict and peace dynamic?
- How to guarantee local ownership (including Tamil, Sinhalese and Muslim beneficiaries) of these coordination arrangements?
- How to solve the tension between centralized coordination and flexibility of local action?
- What quick and intermediate implementation strategies can be envisaged to maintain momentum, strengthen confidence and build foundations for long-term involvement?

5. *Seminar Follow-up*

- Are there any suggestions for a follow-up of this seminar?
- What type of research projects (including Sri Lankan and international researchers) could support these activities?
- Which actors should be included in these activities?

Seminar Participants

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 1. Ms Farah Mihlar Ahamed | <i>Times of India</i> newspaper (Sri Lanka) |
| 2. Mr V. Ariyaratne | Sarvodaya Shramadana Movement (Sri Lanka) |
| 3. Mr S. Balakrishnan | National Peace Council of Sri Lanka |
| 4. Mr Christian Barbero | Care International (Sri Lanka) |
| 5. Mr Sunil Bastian | ICES Colombo (Sri Lanka) |
| 6. Ms Berit | International Labour Organization (Sri Lanka) |
| 7. Mrs Susan Blankhart | Royal Netherlands Embassy (Sri Lanka) |
| 8. Mr Kenneth Bush | Centre for Foreign Policy Studies (Switzerland) |
| 9. Mr Phil Esmond | Oxfam (Sri Lanka) |
| 10. Mr Tyrol Ferdinands | INPACT (Sri Lanka) |
| 11. Mr Lionel Fernando | Embassy of Sri Lanka (Netherlands) |
| 12. Mrs Sarala Fernando | Sri Lanka Institute for International Relations |
| 13. Mr Christoph Feyen | GTZ Office, Colombo (Sri Lanka) |
| 14. Ms Dilrukshi Fonseka | Berghof Foundation for Conflict Studies, Sri Lanka Office |
| 15. Mr Georg Frerks | Clingendael Institute (Netherlands) |
| 16. Mr Jonathan Goodhand | School of Oriental and African Studies (United Kingdom) |
| 17. Mrs Vishaka Hidellage | Intermediate Technology Development Group (Sri Lanka) |
| 18. Mrs Claudia Ibarguen | Centre for Poverty Analysis (Sri Lanka) |
| 19. Ms Sundari Jayasuriya | Berghof Foundation for Conflict Studies, Sri Lanka Office |
| 20. Mr Dayan Jayatilake | Faculty of Arts, University of Colombo (Sri Lanka) |
| 21. Mrs Stina Karlton | Embassy of Sweden (Sri Lanka) |
| 22. Mr S.I. Keethapongcalan | University of Colombo (Sri Lanka) |
| 23. Mr Bart Klem | Clingendael Institute (Netherlands) |
| 24. Mr William Knox | Thirupathiya Peace Service (Sri Lanka) |
| 25. Mr Peter Kuperus | Royal Netherlands Embassy (Sri Lanka) |
| 26. Mr T. Lankaneson | NECORD Project (Sri Lanka) |
| 27. Ms Niloufer Lebbe | Consortium of Humanitarian Agencies (Sri Lanka) |
| 28. Mr Nick Lewer | Centre for Conflict Resolution, University of Bradford (United Kingdom) |
| 29. Mrs Champika Liyanaarachchi | <i>Daily Mirror</i> (Sri Lanka) |

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 30. Mr Kethesh Loganathan | Centre for Policy Alternatives (Sri Lanka) |
| 31. Ms Anthea Mulakala | High Commission of Great Britain/DFID (Sri Lanka) |
| 32. Mr Navarathnarajah | Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Sri Lanka) |
| 33. Mr Keith Noyahr | <i>Daily Mirror</i> (Sri Lanka) |
| 34. Mr Sasanka Perera | University of Colombo (Sri Lanka) |
| 35. Mr Gary Ribbons | United States Agency for International Development
(Sri Lanka) |
| 36. Mr N. Shanmugaratnam | Agricultural University of Norway (Sri Lanka) |
| 37. Mr Kingsley de Silva | ICES Kandy (Sri Lanka) |
| 38. Mr Kalinga Tudor Silva | Centre for Poverty Analysis (Sri Lanka) |
| 39. Ms Irma Specht | International Labour Organization (Switzerland) |
| 40. Mr Chamindra Weerackody | IPID (Sri Lanka) |
| 41. Mr Dinesh Weerakkoddy | GlaxoSmithkline (Sri Lanka) |
| 42. Mr Joe Weeramunda | University of Colombo (Sri Lanka) |
| 43. Mr Jeroen de Zeeuw | Clingendael Institute (Netherlands) |