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Abstract

A construction project is a temporary, one time only and short term undertaking that creates the built environment. Stakeholders of a construction project are any identifiable group or individual who can affect, or is affected by, the achievement of a project’s objectives. Hence, stakeholders vary depending on the nature of the project undertaken. A disaster frequently leads to annihilation of buildings and infrastructure, including houses. This disrupts livelihoods and affects the personal, social and economic lives of the victims, and hinders development of the country. The 2004 Boxing Day Tsunami caused massive destruction in Sri Lanka and made 98,000 people homeless. Providing houses, which was a vital part of re-instating the livelihoods of people displaced by the Tsunami, became a challenging task and gave birth to a large number of post-disaster housing reconstruction (PDHR) projects. A wide array of stakeholders came together in such projects to execute the final outcome. In the aftermath of early reconstruction efforts, dissatisfaction was expressed by some stakeholders. Areas of criticism included time, cost, quality, coordination with infrastructure and linkage to livelihoods. There is now growing recognition of a need to more effectively identify and classify stakeholders of PDHR projects so that expectations can be more successfully managed. This paper presents the interim results of a study to identify and classify the stakeholders of PDHR projects in Sri Lanka, based on an extensive review of the literature and pilot interviews with stakeholders involved in housing reconstruction projects in Sri Lanka. The results identified seven stakeholder groups: the client; contractor; consultant; donor; NGO’s; INGO’s; CBO’s; and, the beneficiary of PDHR in Sri Lanka. Primary–secondary, internal-external, voluntary-non voluntary, and social-non social were four main classifications of stakeholders that emerged from the literature. Interviews were used to categorise the identified stakeholders under a suitable classification. Stakeholder expectation gaps of PDHR in Sri Lanka were identified under three main themes: problems relating to design and the quality of the house; problems of relocation; and, institutional problems. Strategies employed to identify, monitor, control and to improve stakeholder expectations are also unearthed.
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1. Introduction

The tsunami waves that struck nearly 2/3 of the Sri Lankan coastal belt on the 24th December 2004 resulted in 35,320 confirmed deaths and 6,300 missing people. The economic loss has been estimated at US$ 2.2 billion, disregarding the cost of social disorder. Nearly 516,100 were displaced of which 33% were below the poverty line. 98,000 dwelling houses and 75% of the fishing fleet, which is the main livelihood of the coastal population, were damaged. More than 500 tourism related businesses, which was the main source of income in this area, were damaged. Further, 23,449 acres of agricultural lands were salinated. 200 Education Institutes were damaged and 450 others were used as temporary camps for displaced people (UN/OCHA, 2005). The world's worst train tragedy, killing 1700 passengers, happened on this tsunami day. This context necessitated operations to rehabilitate, recover and reconstruct the affected community (UN/OCHA, 2005).

The task of reconstruction after the 2004 Tsunami became an onerous challenge to Sri Lanka. This required the deliberate and coordinated efforts of all stakeholders for effective and efficient recovery of the affected community. Re-housing formed one of the greatest challenges for Sri Lanka. A year later, 4,299 new houses had been built and another 25,000 were planned, of which 10,707 were under construction. A start had yet to be made on planning the remaining 68,000 dwellings (GoSL, 2005). Similarly, Oxfam reported that 12 months after the Tsunami, around 20% of the people made homeless were not yet in satisfactory permanent accommodation (Oxfam International, 2005, p6). A year and a half after the tsunami, the situation appeared little better, with most people who lost their homes still without a permanent roof over their heads and many still faced an uncertain future. This is despite the record public and donor response resulting in a quick and largely successful immediate human relief effort. In 2006, approximately 200,000 people were still displaced (ICRC, 2006). Further, dissatisfaction was expressed by many stakeholder groups in relation to features of the house, relocation and other institutional problems.

The broader aim of this study is to explore and investigate how to identify, classify and manage stakeholders, and their expectations in order to deliver effective post-disaster housing reconstruction in Sri Lanka. This paper presents the interim findings of the study, based on an initial set of interviews and a review of the literature. Methods to identify and classify stakeholders are considered in the context of post-disaster housing reconstruction. The study goes on to explore stakeholder expectation gaps in post-disaster housing reconstruction in Sri Lanka and the mechanisms used to identify, monitor and control and improve the stakeholder requirements.
2. Literature review

2.1 Identifying and classifying stakeholders from a construction point of view

A construction project is a temporary, one time only and short term undertaking that creates the built environment. Walker, et al. (2008), defined stakeholders of a construction project as individuals or groups who have interest or some aspects of rights or ownership in the project, and can contribute to or may be impacted by, either the work or outcomes of the project. Representatives of different and sometimes discrepant interests are regarded as stakeholders of a construction project (Olander and Landin, 2005). This infers that stakeholder is a collective noun embracing a wider group of people. Newcombe (2003) has accommodated in his definition of stakeholders ‘groups or individuals who have a stake in, or expectation of, the project’s performance and include clients, project managers, designers, subcontractors, suppliers, funding bodies, users and the community at large’. Stakeholders of a construction project are affected by or affect the development of the project. Hence, capturing their input is a key component of the project development process. It is noted that there are common parties coming under the spectrum of construction and post-disaster housing reconstruction project contexts. Winch (2002) identified internal stakeholders of a construction project as the parties who have a legal contract with the client and external stakeholders as a group who possess a direct interest with the project. CIOB (2008) categorise construction related stakeholders into three groups: namely, business partners, regulatory agencies and external influencers. Further, Walker, et al. (2008) illustrates stakeholders in four groups: upstream supply chain partners; downstream supply chain partners; external stakeholders; and, project stakeholder group. It can be deduced that stakeholders of a construction project are any identifiable group or individual who can affect, or is affected by, the achievement of a project’s objectives.

Varying understandings of stakeholders have given rise to differentiating among stakeholders depending on the power, legitimacy and urgency to the project (Podnar and Jancic, 2006). Changes in stakeholder relations occur due to predictable, unpredictable, internal and external factors. This paper will focus upon stakeholders that emerge following a disaster, which could be predictable or unpredictable, and where, internal or external factors may influence the reconstruction projects.

2.2 Stakeholders in post-disaster housing reconstruction in Sri Lanka

The precise stakeholders will evolve depending on the context and the situation (Carroll, 1999; Winn, 2001; Bunn et.al., 2002; Andriof and Waddock, 2002). Further, stakeholders may be in reference to a project, a company or an organisation. Thus, stakeholders of post-disaster housing reconstruction projects and their requirements are likely to be different to a normal construction project. For example, for housing in the post-disaster situation, there are some added challenges: the scene is
generally very chaotic and resources are in scarce supply, with simultaneous projects being launched by numerous local and international organisations for housing and infrastructure repairs, for livelihoods creation, and for a range of other social programmes; projects must be completed as quickly as possible to foster recovery and to satisfy donors who want to see results; and, the post-disaster period is generally seen as a good opportunity to engage in activities that will increase the level of development and reduce vulnerability to future disasters, implying that projects must be implemented with sustainability in mind (Davidson et al., 2007).

However, in such circumstances, a country like Sri Lanka typically lacks strategies for delivering effective disaster reconstruction and managing the associated resources. There is however growing recognition that the construction industry has a responsibility to assist communities to anticipate, assess, prevent, prepare, respond and recover from disasters (Haigh, et al., 2006; Haigh and Amaratunga, 2010) by contributing in developing, implementing and operationalising the appropriate strategies. In order to do this, stakeholders of construction projects composed of professionals such as engineers, quantity surveyors, architects, project managers, clients, contractors have to work hand in hand. Going beyond this, a disaster tends to introduce other stakeholders, such as NGOs, INGO’s, Donor agencies, CBO’s and beneficiaries, alongside more traditional construction project stakeholders. It is also important to identify a suitable classification for the wide array of above mentioned stakeholders.

Within the literature (Clarkson, 1995; Olander and Landin 2005; Podnar and Jancic, 2006) four main classifications of stakeholder are identified: primary-secondary, internal-external, voluntary-non-voluntary, and social-non-social. Primary stakeholders are parties who derive a benefit directly out of the project. Secondary stakeholders are indirectly affected parties who act as intermediaries. Internal stakeholders of a construction project are the parties who have a legal contract with the client. External stakeholders are a group who possess a direct interest with the project. Voluntary stakeholders have a contractual relationship with the project. Non voluntary stakeholders do not have a contractual agreement. Social stakeholders are actively involved in the decision making process. Non-social stakeholders do not have a direct voice.

2.3 Stakeholder requirements and expectation gaps in Post-Disaster Housing Reconstruction (PDHR)

Stakeholder requirements refer to needs or a feature compulsory in PDHR. Conversely, an expectation is a hope or belief of the stakeholders in relation to PDHR which may be realistic or unrealistic. Hence, the expectations should be managed. Therefore, the expectations of PDHR could be placed at a higher level of the hierarchy of requirements.
Nissanka et al. (2008) and Ratnayake and Rameezdeen (2008) identifying and classifying stakeholders in PDHR as an under-researched domain in Sri Lanka where further in-depth studies are required. Although many studies (Oloruntoba, 2005; Rex, 2006; Weerakoon et al., 2007; Mulligan and Shaw, 2007) have been carried out to explore the expectations of stakeholders in a disaster in Sri Lanka, there is a lack of literature to examine the relationships with different stakeholders in PDHR. Effective disaster management in Sri Lanka is threatened by institutional constraints, gaps in communication, lack of access to professional skills and knowledge to support local effort, and failure in management and planning (RICS, 2006). Further, the civil conflict which continued for more than three decades has slowed down the process of PDHR.

Local requirements of the type of shelter to be provided through the reconstruction program differed from what the intervening agency was prepared to provide. For example, permanent houses that were built by certain NGOs in the aftermath of the 2004 Tsunami failed to consider the needs of the beneficiaries and the quality was inadequate (GoSL, 2005). In Sri Lanka, the President celebrated the fact that 50,000 transitional shelters had been put up in the first six months but, with the start of the monsoon season, many of these homes were already in need of upgrading (Oxfam International, 2005, p.5). Similarly, an evaluation for CARE, Oxfam and World Vision’s response to the tsunami in Sri Lanka by Bhattacharjee et al. (2005) found a series of flaws in the design and implementation of housing programmes (ProVention, 2005a, p.6). Moreover, gaps were reported in the areas of livelihood development (TEC, 2006, p.16; Telford et al., 2006; Perry, 2007; Lyons, 2009), incompatibility of socio-cultural and religious norms (Provention, 2005; Fazlulhaq, 2008; Lyons, 2009), infrastructure and other services (TAFREN, 2005; GoSL, 2005; Weerakoon et al., 2007; Hayles, 2008), institutional problems dominated by red tape and politics (Oloruntoba, 2005; Rex, 2006; Weerakoon et al., 2007; Mulligan and Shaw, 2007). As of 2008, reports identified that families were still living in temporary shelter in certain western parts of Sri Lanka. They were in the process of obtaining a permanent house since 2004 and have not received any assistance to obtain a house for the house they lost. Further, they are threatened to evacuate the places where they were currently residing at (Relief Web, 2008; Fazlulha, 2008). Though some have received the money from the funding body, but have been deceived by the sellers of land where the municipality is not allowing them to put up a house.

From the literature there is an apparent dissatisfaction from stakeholders and therefore need to further understand the bases of classifications where their requirements can be better managed. The gaps in stakeholder expectations and their underlying causes should also be further unearthed. The results of the preliminary interviews are presented in the section of ‘Findings’ followed by Research Methods.
3. Research method

An extensive survey of the literature and pilot interviews were the research methods adopted for this study. Literature review section (2.1) stipulates the importance of identifying and classifying stakeholders in a construction point of view, which laid the foundation for identifying the stakeholders of post-disaster housing reconstruction projects and recognising a suitable classification. Further, stakeholder expectation gaps pertaining to post-disaster housing reconstruction were identified from the literature.

Fifteen open ended questionnaires were distributed among the personnel who got involved in post-disaster housing in Sri Lanka, representing the government, private sector, NGO’s, donor agencies and the community, out of which seven responded and consented for a brief interview. Seven pilot interviews provided rich data on the real life experience of the interviewees. Findings were discussed in detail in the following section.

4. Findings

Respondents’ represented the government, funding body, INGO, NGO, academia, contractor and the consultant. Seven pilot interviews enabled testing the data collected and analysing strategies. Further these formed the base for the next phase of the study. The findings of the preliminary interviews are discussed under three main headings;

4.1 Identification of stakeholders and their engagements

4.2 Classification of stakeholders in the context of PDHR

4.3 Stakeholder expectations and gaps identified in PDHR in Sri Lanka categorised under three main headings; time, cost, quality and design of the house, problems of relocation and institutional problems

4.4 Strategies to identify, monitor and control and to improve stakeholder satisfaction

4.1 Identification of stakeholders and their engagements

Providing houses, which was a vital part of re-instating the livelihoods of people displaced by the Tsunami, became a challenging task and gave birth to a large number of post-disaster housing reconstruction projects. A wide array of stakeholders such as the government, the private sector, NGO’s, INGO’s, CBO’s, humanitarian organisations came together in such projects to execute the final outcome. The type of engagement is summarised in the Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Type of engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Client</td>
<td>Client can be public or private. In most of the cases it is the government. Disaster is a social phenomenon. In the context of a disaster, the government takes the lead in terms of formulating and maintaining regulations, policies and monitoring the adherence to these. Setting the standards relating to the delivery of post-disaster housing reconstruction projects is also a vital role played by the government. E.g. Buffer zone imposed by the government after Tsunami. The main difference between a normal construction project and a community project is that the client and the beneficiary is the same in a normal construction project and in a post-disaster housing reconstruction project the main initiator is the government and benefit accrues to the community affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consultant</td>
<td>Provides the consultancy advice for the project on designing, evaluating the cost, technical issues/advice (engineering advice electrical, civil etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contractor/sub contractors</td>
<td>Engage in actual construction according to the designs, specifications, contract documents communicated by the relevant parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Funding body/donor</td>
<td>E.g. UN, ADB, ICRC. Address humanitarian issues while providing the necessary funds to the community project. Ensures that the funds are utilised for the purpose. E.g. if a precondition is imposed to spend the money on community development, the donor has to make sure that the funds are used for this particular activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NGO’s (Local)</td>
<td>Acted as the mediator of the funding body and the government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6. INGO’s         | Developed and incorporated guidelines to strengthen local capacity and ensure accountability to vulnerable populations receiving humanitarian and development assistance  
|                   | Assisted in constructing tens of thousands of temporary shelters and permanent homes and creating livelihood programs  
|                   | Supported microcredit and other programs designed to empower local communities.  
|                   | Provision of expert advice and other resources to reinstate the affected community. INGO assistance included provision medical assistance, counselling for the people suffered from mental trauma.  
|                   | Educated the public and the media on the components and nature of effective and sustainable disaster preparedness and response. |
| 7. Beneficiary/ End User | Is the most important stakeholder. Since, they are the beneficiaries their engagement should be to communicate their needs/requirements to the relevant parties involved in executing the post-disaster housing reconstruction project.  
|                   | Designing the house and supplying labour (skilled/ unskilled) at the stage of construction (in donor driven housing programme) |
| 8. CBO’s/General public | Assisted the affected community by way of supplying provisions such as food, clothing and other necessities at the immediate relief stage.  
|                   | Voluntary involvement in clearing the debris, provision of labour at the construction phase of housing. |
It is clear that post-disaster housing reconstruction is a co-ordinated effort for a unitary outcome. Hence, it was revealed that conflict of interests become explicit once the effort is operationalised leading to expectation gaps. Therefore, classification of stakeholders is crucial in housing reconstruction projects.

**4.2 Classification of stakeholders in the context of PDHR**

Within the literature four main classifications of stakeholder are identified: primary-secondary, internal-external, voluntary-non-voluntary, and social-non-social. Table 2 categorises the stakeholders under each classification.

*Table 2 Different classifications of stakeholders (Source: Researcher’s compilation based on pilot interviews)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Stakeholders</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affected community/ End user/ Beneficiary</strong></td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor/sub contractors</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs/INGOs</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor/ Funding body</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs representing local people/general public</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary stakeholders derive a benefit directly out of the project and it is the affected community (beneficiary) in PDHR. Secondary stakeholders are indirectly affected parties who act as intermediaries. Consultant, contractor, NGO, INGO’s Donor agency, Government, CBOs, general public constitute the secondary stakeholder group in post-disaster housing reconstruction.

Internal stakeholders of a reconstruction project have a legal contract with the client. The client may be the government, private sector who has a legal contract with, the consultant, NGOs, INGOs, donor...
agencies or vice-versa. They also operate entirely within the boundary of the project. External stakeholders are a group who possess a direct interest with the project but exist independently of the focal project. CBOs generally represent the general public inclusive of the affected community. Therefore a vested interest of the project exists along with a legal contract. Thus, it can be argued that both internal and external classification could equally be applied to CBOs.

Voluntary stakeholders have a contractual relationship with the project. Non voluntary stakeholders do not have a contractual agreement and cannot withdraw the stake they have in a project. Beneficiary is a non voluntary stakeholder who does not have a contractual relationship with the project but have a stake in the project which cannot be withdrawn. For example a tsunami victim who is entitled to a house cannot refuse the given shelter or house. Contractor and the consultant have a relationship with the project and classified as ‘voluntary’. On the other hand classification of NGO’s, INGO’s, donor agency, CBOs and the government were subject to argument. Some respondents were in the view that NGO’s, INGO’s, government, donors and CBO’s, do not directly get involved in the construction activities of the project. Therefore they were not directly involved and classified as non-voluntary. Others held the opinion that they do have a relationship with the project from the inception to the execution. Both the arguments appeared to be valid in case of PDR projects. Certain NGO’s’ INGO’s, CBO’s supplied consultancy service as well as contractors where they became voluntary’ stakeholders. For example in donor driven housing donor, NGO, government became voluntary stakeholders and in owner driven housing the same stakeholders became non-voluntary. It can be concluded that voluntary- non-voluntary classification depends on the nature of the housing project. Similar debate arose in social and non-social classification of stakeholders. Social stakeholders actively involved in the decision making process. Non-social stakeholders do not have a direct voice. The strategic decisions relating to post-disaster housing rested upon the government. Thus, agreed unanimously to classify under social stakeholders.

Respondents held differing viewpoints in relation to the categorisation of CBOs under the classification of internal-external, NGOs under the classification of voluntary- non-voluntary, donor agency and the government under social and non-social classifications. It is also vital to identify the expectation gaps of the stakeholders in PDHR as it has formed the bases for the above compilation. However, in the aftermath of early reconstruction efforts, dissatisfaction was expressed by some stakeholders. Areas of criticism included time, cost, quality, coordination with infrastructure and linkage to livelihoods.
4.3 Stakeholder expectations and gaps identified in post-disaster housing reconstructions in Sri Lanka

Stakeholder expectations and gaps are identified under three main titles, problems relating to quality and design of the houses, problems relating to relocation and institutional problems. Following sections demonstrate these problems in detail.

4.3.1 Problems related to time, cost, quality and design of the houses

Respondents suggested that timely handover of a housing project, keeping within the budget while retaining quality standards, and appropriateness to local cultural and social design, are crucial in post-disaster housing reconstruction. They also agreed that a gap in one or more criteria may lead or aggravate the problem in some other area. Delays in plans for land acquisition and permanent housing in Sri Lanka had delayed timely completion of houses. Six interviewees expressed that a lack of strategies and resources to manage the unanticipated situations such as escalation of construction costs, unanticipated funding gaps, material and labour shortages amounted to delays in timely handover of the housing projects. One interviewee representing a private sector multinational organisation in Sri Lanka had experience of a project where the donor was the parent company and the project management team formed the employees in the organisation. The community affected formed the labour force, which helped to overcome resource constraints and enabled a smoother functioning of the process, even in the difficult situation.

All seven interviewees stated that nothing was reported so far regarding the poor structures of the houses and they used the materials of good quality. Also the interviewees represented INGO’s were locals who are based in Sri Lanka. However, interviewees were of the opinion that due to the shortages of building materials, labour, and other resources, the quality of housing had been affected. Moreover, an internal competition among the INGO’s to complete the projects before the other, had expensed the quality and design of housing. Moreover, the requirement of the beneficiary and the social norm had been poorly considered by the INGOs when designing the houses. Thus, they agreed that certain INGOs used materials which are of poor quality and did not suit the weather conditions of the country. Therefore, it is clear that question of sustainability of post disaster housing is yet to be resolved.

4.3.2 Problems of relocation

4.3.2.1 Livelihood problems

An interviewee representing the private sector and a donor agency revealed that their company looked into the livelihood matters in collaboration with a local NGO. The victims were given masonry training where they could render the labour to generate an income, wherever they are within the
homeland. Another interviewee disclosed that housing projects which were ‘owner driven’, where the victims occupying the house contributed in designing and building the house, reported less livelihood problems. However, relocation leading to livelihood problems should be addressed by the relevant authorities such as the government. The interviewee representing the contracting organisation revealed that their main concern is profit but the organisation contributed more in discharging social responsibility when it came to Tsunami housing. Respondents also expressed their views on employment generation for the women who got victimised twice by relocation and loss of their husbands. They expressed that it was a challenging task because many of the victimised women were housewives and the men had been the bread winners. If they are to given a job then they should be trained or given resources for self employment which is an additional burden to the organisation. They also revealed that the post-disaster housing reconstruction budget did not provide any room to expand the activities to cover such elements. One interviewee representing the consultancy organisation highlighted that, some of the youth who were previously engaged in temporary jobs have now been depending on the financial assistance given by the government and a tendency for addiction to drugs and alcohol has been observed. Thus, the unemployment has burdened the economy deteriorating the quality of life of the people.

4.3.2.2 Mismatch between cultural and social patterns/norms

An interviewee representing the private sector revealed that his organisation carried out a survey with the assistance of the government and a local NGO to identify the victims who came from the same neighbourhood before deciding the place of relocation in the districts of Trincomalee and Batticaloa. Nevertheless, the interviewee representing the INGO expressed that they carried out the construction where they were instructed without considering the incompatibilities that might crop up in the future. Further, design of the houses has not catered the privacy issues, space requirements and cultural and social patterns.

Two interviewees agreed that their organisation could have given greater thought to local customs, including the needs of extended families, the location of the kitchen, the building of verandas, privacy and weatherproofing when the houses are put up in the areas away from the original places. Nevertheless, they could not achieve these objectives due to the strict time limits, given design and location. Also, they expressed that the organisation did not anticipate the behavioural outcome of the fisheries community who used to live in individual houses and being transferred to condominium properties. Social tension between the victims and the neighbourhood too has given room for disharmony.
4.3.2.3 Infrastructure and other facilities

Six interviewees highlighted that infrastructure and other facilities were not taken into account when the post-disaster housing project was undertaken. They were also of the view that the government should take the sole responsibility of providing the infrastructure and the facilities. One interviewee agreed that the product was executed within a strict time limit and scarcity of resources such as materials, labour, lands and finances hindered adequate consideration of related infrastructure. Moreover, insufficient infrastructure and other services such as water and sanitation, electricity, transportation systems, postal services, education facilities, medical facilities etc. have aggravated their traumatic situation. Therefore, the importance of a proper infrastructure system and other services which is interlinked to the efforts of PDHR was stressed in the discussions. It is observed that due to poor access to infrastructure and other services several other problems including degradation of quality of life have cropped up in Sri Lanka. Thus, PDHR has many other aspects to look into apart from ‘providing a house’.

4.3.3 Institutional problems

Two interviewees expressed that the objectives of their project was fully achieved. For example, one respondent described an occasion where an external audit was carried out to ensure that funds allocated for the housing project were not misappropriated. Also they revealed that communication and co-ordination with other stakeholders was well in place during the process of reconstruction. They also revealed that the projects undertaken in north and east of the country were delayed due to the ongoing civil war, where they had to work in consultation with the members representing the group who fought for a separate homeland in the north and the east.

Post-disaster housing reconstruction undertaken by the INGO has outsourced the building part to a private contractor, where participation of the community was minimal. Also, communication with the government and consultation of the community and other authorities had been carried out at remote level which has barred essential local knowledge and suitable policies coming into the process of reconstruction. This might lead to a creation of confusion among the stakeholders and development of a unitary policy framework is inhibited.

One respondent revealed that the structure of the organisation is such that spontaneous decisions were suppressed. The process of decision making had to go through a cumbersome process which took a prolonged time. For example, obtaining the title deed of the lands that were outside the buffer zone became a time consuming task due to the red tape and bureaucratic structures. All seven interviewees agreed that decision making in relation to the reconstruction process was lagged behind due to the political uncertainty, exacerbated by the civil conflict and the tendency of incoming governments to overturn the arrangements of their predecessors, which contributed to a poor investment climate.
Though key challenges in relation to post tsunami housing resettlement were jointly identified by stakeholders, their expectations were poorly addressed.

4.4 Strategies to identify, monitor and control and to improve stakeholder satisfaction

The pilot interviews carried out with personnel representing the government, private sector (including construction professionals), NGOs and INGO’s highlighted that stakeholder requirements vary over time. Strategies to identify the stakeholder expectations could be categorised into two main parts, firstly strategies at organisational level and secondly, strategies at operational level. It was revealed that consultants and contactors can have the expectations at organisational level, which become explicit through corporate social responsibility and corporate governance. Operational level strategies composed of a dialogue with community leaders in order to capture the expectations of the end user by way of interviews, progress meeting and discussions with stakeholders, historical statistics and feedback surveys.

Monitoring and control mechanisms were carried out at regular intervals to assess their livelihood patterns, changes in the lifestyle and income levels. One interviewee disclosed that midyear, monitoring and evaluation strategy was implemented through using evaluation tools established within the organisation and published via annual report. Relying on independent press, feedback from the employees and families affected were also employed as alternative strategies. An interviewee representing the private sector believed that their project achieved all the objectives and it was a success. This was evidenced by the positive feedback received from the affected communities, government, employees, community leaders and other relevant parties. It was noted that PDHR is a collective effort of the government, private sector including the construction professionals such as the consultants and the contractors. One interviewee expressed that,

"From the government point of view getting planning permissions indicates adherence to rules, regulations, and policies. Hence, the consultant should communicate identified variations with the client. Nevertheless, contractors’ main concern is to maximise profits but the standard of their product in terms of time, cost, and quality should be maintained at all time. However, the donor is keen on finding out the benefits and value for money gained by other stakeholders such as the government and the end user. Thus, capturing the expectations of the end user and incorporating them in the process of reconstruction adds value to the product. Further, the end user should be given an opportunity to monitor during the design and construction phases in order to ensure their requirements are met."

Intense communication with the stakeholder and continuous supply chain of resources are crucial in the process of PDHR, to execute a product with added value. This became more explicit in the discussion of strategies to improve the stakeholder satisfaction.
It was also stressed that, expectations changes over time, with the environment and differing necessities. Distributing a structured questionnaire was proposed as a tool of gaining the feedback at the end of the project which will highlight gaps and appropriate measure to be implemented in future projects. Moreover, it was recommended that the end user should be given a chance to input their ideas into the process of PDHR, having decided whether the requirements are feasible. Previous experience of the contractor too should not be forgotten in this process. Therefore, it can be concluded that more participative approach of decision making would enable optimal utilisation of resources where stakeholder satisfaction could be improved in post-disaster housing reconstruction in Sri Lanka.

5. Discussion

Stakeholder groups identified and their engagements in the literature and interviews were similar. Therefore, the literature enumerates stakeholders in construction project context in a concrete manner, the interviewees held different viewpoints in their classifications. Clarkson (1995), O’Higgins and Morgan (2006) expressed a contrasting viewpoint to the existing primary secondary classification of stakeholders, parties who are directly affected and indirectly affected respectively. They perceived that some “public stakeholder groups” (e.g. government and communities) are also primary as they provide infrastructure for the operations of the project. Secondary stakeholders, on the other hand, have been defined by Clarkson (1995) as “those who influence or affect, or are influenced or affected by, the project, but they are not engaged in transactions with the project and are not essential for its survival”. However, this premise is not acceptable in case of PDHR. Secondary stakeholders such as the government, consultant, contractor NGO’s, INGO’s, donor agency perform many transactions from the inception to the execution of the project. Employment generation, sustainable reconstruction, provision of infrastructure and other facilities are some of the activities which are vital for the long term survival of the project rest on the hands of the government most of the time. According to Lyons (2009), following were the own words of a victimised resident, who got relocated in relation to provision of infrastructure and other facilities;

“No transport. . . no postal service . . . and there is no system in place for such activities. . . the absence of street lamps—in some seasons elephants come . . .and with the absence of lighting it is very dangerous to travel on the roads in the night. . . The village has a huge garbage problem.”

Podnar and Jancic (2006) perceived that continuous support of primary stakeholders is needed if the company wants to avoid serious reputation damage. Similarly, in reconstruction projects the ‘beneficiary’ could retain or damage the reputation of the other stakeholders.

Moreover, the emergence of two types of housing reconstruction projects, ‘owner driven’ and ‘donor driven’ had an impact on these classifications. Therefore, the factors mentioned above too are subject
to change. Nevertheless, the interview findings highlighted that the parties engaged in post-disaster housing reconstruction have not diverted sufficient attention on related infrastructure.

Issues in relation to time and cost, problems of relocation, unearthed in literature and interviews reflected similar results, except for one occasion. It was evidenced that, if the supply chain partners are within the organisation it will minimise the adverse effects of macroeconomic factors such as inflation leading to reduced quality defects.

One respondent revealed that the organisation he represented carried out a post-project audit to ensure the transparency and accountability of the transactions. This had affirmed that resources were equally distributed among the PDHR projects undertaken in the Eastern Province and the Southern Province.

Communication, consultation and coordination with other stakeholder groups, community participation, timely decision making were noted as important ingredients by all the interviewees. Nevertheless, the literature provides accounts of many occasions were these ingredients were lacking. Accordingly, historical data and statistics, timely information, interviews/informal meetings, progress meetings/discussions with the stakeholders, inclusion of NGO’s in board of trustees, on site observation to assess the real impact of the destruction in order to identify the expectations accordingly, progress reports, site visits, feedback survey were proposed to gauge stakeholder requirements.

The key success / failure factors identified from literature and interview findings are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3 Key success/ failure factors of post-disaster housing reconstruction in Sri Lanka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success/ failure factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Related to the house</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional problems</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely supply of material and labour (expert opinion and construction craftsmen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely handover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of resources- Physical and human (Professional/ expert advice, information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting the budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low cost building materials, labour and other resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitary policies and frameworks/ Supportive laws and regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality standards of materials, labour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features of the house</th>
<th>Clearly defined goals and commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Design of the house suiting to cultural and social patterns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Changeability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Aesthetics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community participation</th>
<th>Effective information management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability of infrastructure and other facilities</th>
<th>Effective communication with all the stakeholder groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient mobilisation and disbursement of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value addition to the product by introducing new technologies and materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post completion audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above discussion is based on the findings of literature and seven pilot interviews, identified a wide range of issues. A detailed study is required to better understand the relationships between these issues.

6. Conclusion

PDHR projects are usually community based and mostly non profit oriented, which is in contrast to a traditional construction project. PDHR is an opportunity for the private sector to execute corporate social responsibilities. The stakeholders of such a project could be defined as any individual or a
group who are affected and/or who could affect the achievement of the PDHR project objectives. Identification of stakeholders suggested by literature and the findings of the pilot study remained the same. Interviewees’ categorisation of stakeholders under different classification varied regarding internal-external, voluntary-non voluntary and social-non social classifications. Differing classifications emerged due to the environment, social standing, exposure, education, experience, culture, attitudes, values and different types of housing reconstruction (owner and donor driven) projects that some of the interviewees got exposed to. It elucidated stakeholder requirements PDHR, classification of stakeholders and identification of relationships. This paper sets out a few preliminary findings of the literature survey and pilot interviews where opinions of individuals are highlighted. Detail case study interviews have to be carried out to gain a holistic picture of the scenario. Researcher expects to carry out the case study interviews with the experts representing the government, private sector, NGO’s, INGO’s, CBO’s, Humanitarian Organisations in the future.
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