All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.

- Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)
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one: introduction
violence against women in the post-tsunami context

A crucial concern emerging from tsunami affected communities after the disaster was women’s experience of violence against them. While there were considerable relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts taking place, it seemed that women’s experience was revealing flaws and gaps in the interventions and methods of their implementation. In the context where recovery efforts are still underway, it was considered important to understand whether women’s rights are violated because they are women and if so, to understand the reasons for this situation and deliberate on the policy implications and the prospect of community led solutions.

This report is based on the work of alliances of 174 organisations and their discussions with 7,583 tsunami affected women in India, Maldives, Puntland (in Somalia)¹, Sri Lanka and Thailand. This “people’s report” is not the report of an individual person or agency, but it is the culmination of a process which has engaged members of the alliance and community representatives.

The tsunami of 26th December 2004 was a disaster of unprecedented magnitude. Across the 12 affected countries in Asia and Africa more than 230,000 people were reported dead or missing and over 2.1 million were displaced and left homeless. It resulted in the large-scale loss of livelihoods and the destruction of millions of dollars of infrastructure. The positive aspect of this disaster was that it generated the biggest ever global response. Citizens and governments around the world gave unprecedented contributions with enormous resources mobilised for assistance.

---

¹ Puntland is a region in north-eastern Somalia which in 1998 declared itself to be a semi-autonomous state. Unlike neighbouring Somaliland, it does not seek independence from Somalia.
Violence Against Women in the post-tsunami context

Numerous studies looking at the tsunami and other disasters conclude that there is a differential impact of any disaster on the affected population and a differential timeframe in their recovery. The impact is greatest on poor people and excluded communities. Violence against women is a global menace which cuts across all the social, cultural, geographic, religious and economic boundaries. It has no class, caste, race, ethnic, educational or age barriers. Legal, social, cultural and religious norms and practices permit violence to be committed against women with impunity. This violence perpetrated against women under normal circumstances is further magnified in the aftermath of disasters.

A closer examination of violence in the post-disaster context reveals that it extends beyond the conventional understanding of violence being only physical, sexual or emotional. The persistent discrimination perpetrated by the state, communities and families in civil, political, social, cultural and economic aspects of women’s living is also violence. This sustained denial and abuse restricts women’s opportunities to recover. It frequently denies women in general - and single, older, women with disabilities or women-headed households in particular - to live a life with dignity and security.

In this report the discussions with tsunami affected women regarding their experiences and understandings of the violence perpetrated against them in the aftermath of the disaster was juxtaposed to the rights set out in the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). This is the most comprehensive international instrument, bringing together the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of women. It imposes legally binding duties on signatory states (Somalia is yet to sign CEDAW) to eliminate discrimination against women and bring about gender equality. The five countries covered in this report uphold through their constitutions, national laws, policies and guidelines, and through the ratification of United Nations covenants (again except Somalia) that discrimination against women is illegal and that women are equal in the law. An underlying assumption of the approach and process used in this report is that it is the responsibility of the state to fulfil the fundamental rights of women set out in CEDAW, even in the aftermath of a disaster. This framework was used to talk with women about their perceptions of their rights and the extent to which these are being fulfilled by the state and other agencies. Violence was looked at in terms of the right to protection, security and bodily integrity, as well as the structural discrimination brought about by the violations of other rights. The aim of discussions with tsunami affected women was not to extract information, but to collectivise knowledge, analysis, bargaining power and voice as a prelude to women claiming their rights.

Discussions with women in all five countries revealed that whether or not women know of their rights and/or what they are entitled to, the laws, policies and guidelines espoused are not being translated into practice. The mechanisms and codes of conduct and standards which exist and which should uphold and protect women’s rights are both ineffectual and ignored. Throughout the relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction phases, women’s responses indicate that state and non-state actors tend to regard them as passive beneficiaries rather than as equal citizens with equal rights to assistance and capacities to participate. Women were all too frequently not consulted about their needs and issues and excluded from decision-making bodies such as planning and implementation committees.

Based on the principle that governments have the responsibility to protect and provide what is necessary for each and every citizen to enjoy their rights, a critical analysis of the laws and policies relevant to the rights and entitlements of women – particularly in relation to violence against women – was undertaken in each of the participating countries. This critical analysis also included the tsunami guidelines and policies adopted by states.

After analysing the policies of the respective countries and conducting a brief review of relevant literature, this report records the views and aspirations of the women as evidenced through discussions. Following the conclusion of this report a Women’s Charter is presented with a set of demands for the policies and practices of disaster response institutions. The Charter includes demands relating to the response in the current context and for informing appropriate policies and guidelines for future disaster response.
two: relevant laws, policies & institutions for curbing violence against women & for disaster response

While the constitution in each of the five countries participating in this report does not specifically deal with violence against women, it does enshrine the equality of all citizens. There are also constitutional provisions to ensure protection from discrimination on the grounds of religion, race, caste, sex or place of birth\(^1\). All the countries except Somalia have ratified the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), and some of them have reservations to certain articles\(^2\). Except Somalia, they are signatories to the Convention on Racial Discrimination and the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

India, Sri Lanka and Thailand have ratified the Declaration on Eliminating Violence Against Women and other covenants such as the Convention on Torture. India, Sri Lanka and Thailand have also ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). However, in most of the countries the institutions have been ineffective in ensuring the implementation of their resolution towards these covenants and particularly CEDAW. Although not a signatory to CEDAW, Puntland’s constitution enshrines certain rights of women.

---

2. Maldives has reservations to 7a and 16; Thailand to 16 and 29; India made declaratory statements to 5 and 16(1)
In the Maldives the Ministry of Gender and Family has established a Gender Management System, Gender Equality Council, and a Child and Family Protection Equality Authority which concentrates on high-level policy issues associated with gender, family and child protection by formulating policy guidelines, establishing standards and monitoring and evaluating systems. The Gender Equality Council came into existence in 2000 with the aim of reducing gender disparity, but it has met just once since its inception. The restructured Child and Family Protection Authority is working towards the decentralisation and establishment of Social Protection Service Centres in outer atolls to provide shelter and other assistance to survivors of abuse and violence. The Family and Child Protection Unit of the Police Service deals with cases of violence and other crimes, but it does not have any provisions specifically for violence against women.

The government of Sri Lanka has adopted the Women’s Charter prepared by women’s organisations which places an obligation on the state to follow its principles. There are several government and semi-government bodies dealing with violence against women: Ministry of Child Development and Women’s Empowerment, Women’s Bureau, and National Committee on Women. There are gender focal persons in each of the other ministries and psychosocial counselling centres operating under the Ministry of Social Welfare. The Population and Reproductive Health Policy contains some provisions related to violence against women.

In India there are ministries such as the Ministry on Women and Children, Ministry of Social Justice, and Social Welfare Board who are responsible for the effective implementation of laws and policies. In addition there is the National Commission for Women, a statutory body set up to ensure effective enforcement and protection of the fundamental rights and the directive principles under the Constitution. In 2001 the ‘National Policy for the Empowerment of Women’ was adopted with the primary goal of bridging the gap between the de jure rights of women under the law and the de facto rights that they exercise. There are also State Commissions for Women in most Indian states, but these are not considered very effective. Specialised courts like Family Courts and Mahila (women’s) Courts have also been set up in several states. However, procedures are slow with a large number of cases delayed, especially those pertaining to the claim of maintenance. India has several other laws to check violence against women and girls such as the Child Marriage Restraint Act, Widow Remarriage Act, Pre-Conception and Pre-natal Diagnostic Techniques Act (PNDT Act 1994, amended in 2003) to curtail sex-selective abortion, Commission of Sati Prevention Act 1987, and Dowry Prohibition Act 1961 that protects women from dowry harassment.

In Thailand the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS) works towards social development, social justice and equality, the promotion and development of quality of life, and the security of individuals, family and community. The MSDHS has four agencies that are responsible for implementing CEDAW: Department of Social Development and Welfare, Office of Women’s Affairs and Family Development, Office of Welfare Promotion, Protection and Empowerment of Vulnerable Groups, and Community Organisations Development Institute. The government has assigned the posts of Chief Gender Equality Officer (CGEO) and centres for gender equality called Gender Focal Point (GFP) in all the ministries and government departments to ensure the implementation of CEDAW principles in terms of gender equality. In Thailand there are around 20 hospital-run centres in the whole country which provide assistance to the survivors of violence against women.

In Somalia after 16 years of civil war and concomitant anarchy, the process of building up structures and institutions in Puntland state is underway. The government of Puntland has established the Ministry of Women’s Development and Family Affairs (MOWDAFA) and the judiciary and law enforcement institutions have been reconstructed.

The cursory analysis of the laws, policies and institutions and their performance in all these countries reveals an inadequate state of affairs. Despite establishing so many ministries and departments, the countries have not been able to adequately address gender inequality and reduce violence against women, and this may be attributed to some of the following:

- **There are no specific laws, policies or institutions to address the exacerbation of violence against women after disasters.**

The Sri Lankan government responded to the tsunami by setting up the Task Force for Rebuilding the Nation (TAFREN), later replaced by the Reconstruction and Development Agency (RADA), to coordinate the reconstruction process. In addition three new laws were passed: Tsunami (Special Provisions) Act, Registration of Deaths (Temporary Provisions) Act, and the Disaster Management Act. All operate in conjunction with the existing laws in the country. The RADA Livelihood Division recently formulated a Divisional Livelihood Development Planning (DLDP) which mentions that community participation will play a major role. However, it does not specify that women’s voices will be heard.

In India the apex body for natural disaster management and mitigation – the National Disaster Management Authority - is under the chairpersonship of the Prime Minister. The National Institute for Disaster Management...
(NIDM) was established in 2004 with the primary objectives to: a) undertake quality research covering both natural and human induced disasters, b) work as a national resource centre for the central and state governments, c) professionalise disaster risk reduction and emergency management, d) promote formal training and education for disaster management in India and in the region, and e) build working partnerships with all the stakeholders. For effective implementation of relief measures the Government of India (GOI) has set up a Standing National Crisis Management Committee under the chairmanship of Cabinet Secretary GOI and a Natural Disaster Management Control Room. In 2005 a Disaster Management Act was introduced which provides for setting up national and state level Disaster Management Authorities. This Act recognises the vulnerabilities of women and children. The government has developed guidelines that include gender sensitivity as one of the over-arching principles that should govern the implementation process. There are no specific disaster response bodies at the state level, although in Tamil Nadu the position of Special Officer for Relief and Rehabilitation was created after the tsunami.

In India the post-tsunami intervention by the state was carried out on the basis of a series of government orders. As many as 170 Government Orders were passed by the state government of Tamil Nadu which functioned as the guidelines for all post-disaster interventions. Besides food, water and other necessary items, the orders ensured provision of temporary shelter, a permanent house for a damaged house, and monetary compensation to those whose boats and nets were damaged. There were orders such as the exemption of school fees for the tsunami affected children and the provision of financial assistance to orphaned children and single women above 18 years of age. In Kerala the Government Orders issued with regard to the tsunami did not contain any specific provision with regard to women or Dalits. For example, there is no rehabilitation policy to provide for women widowed by the tsunami. Although Dalits are also involved in fishing and its allied activities, there is no provision for their rehabilitation.

In Puntland the government set up an emergency response and preparedness commission headed by the Vice President and a technical committee to coordinate responses to the tsunami. This was later restructured and an autonomous institution – Humanitarian Affairs and Disaster Management Agency (HADMA) – was established under the Office of the President. The government and other humanitarian actors laid down specific gender responsive guidelines to ensure gender mainstreaming in all programs and at all levels. However, the representation of women in all the phases of the disaster response interventions was extremely limited.

- **There are multiple laws and institutions seemingly responsible for addressing violence against women in a general setting.**

These multiple laws and agencies accept violence against women in the post disaster context as a peripheral issue and responsibility. There is little clarity in the roles of each, and a lack of coordination among them. In the absence of a single institutional framework women survivors of violence are at a loss regarding where to seek help.

There is a paucity of institutional support to women survivors of violence in all of countries covered in this report. Most of the respective governments have not provided women's shelters for survivors, nor are there comprehensive service centres that can take care of the accommodation, counselling and legal requirements of survivors.

There are three different sets of legal frameworks in Puntland: constitutional, customary (Xeer) and Shariah (Islamic), all of which have different court networks. While the Ministry of Justice enacts the secular justice system which has provisions for the equality of women, in practice both customary law, the most prevalent law in which the council of elders gives the judgment, and Shariah law violate the principles of equality.

- **The policies may be discriminatory even in the conventional understanding of violence against women, let alone in regard to structural discrimination.**

In none of the countries is marital rape considered an offence, even though it violates a woman’s right to bodily integrity. While abortion is legal in India and permissible in certain circumstances in Sri Lanka, it is not so in the Maldives and Thailand. In both these countries abortion is an offence, with survivors of rape forced to bear the burden of unwanted pregnancy or undergo unsafe abortions. In Thailand, rape survivors can undergo abortion, but by the time the court trial is over it is usually too late to proceed with the operation. In the Maldives the Act calls two male or four female witnesses to convict the perpetrator of rape which is highly unrealistic. The Puntland constitution grants abortion only if the health of the pregnant woman is threatened. However, customary law does not allow abortion and instead it directs the rapist to marry the victim, an act that can be seen as a reward rather than punishment for the perpetrator.

---

3. www.nidm.india.nic.in
The Maldives is yet to draft an Act to address domestic violence. It presently has a Family Act which deals with marital issues but it is highly discriminatory. In cases of divorce, custody of children is given to the mother and guardianship to the father, thereby undervaluing the capability of the mother to rear the child even when she is economically independent.

In Puntland customary law is applied in cases of domestic violence, with cases brought to the attention of the Village Elders Committee. Serious cases may go to the attention of the Mayor/District Commissioner. It is reported that the system is highly patriarchal and instances of perpetrators bribing the judges are common.

In the Maldives there is no legal framework to ensure protection against sexual harassment. In Thailand the Labor Protection Law 1997, which prohibits sexual harassment of female employees and children in the formal sector, does not apply to the informal sector where women constitute more than 70% of the workforce.

- **The institutional delivery mechanisms are not adequately organised to realise the intention enshrined in the laws and policies.**

In Sri Lanka in April 2006, a Tsunami Housing Policy (THP) was formulated by RADA to establish a framework for the distribution of state land and cash allocations to those affected by the tsunami. The policy makes reference to the fact that Divisional Secretaries must ensure that priority is given to vulnerable groups such as single women and multi-child households. Cash grants for housing go to the registered owner of the land/house. In practice cash allocations have been deposited into bank accounts which are usually in the name of the male head of the household. Although banks were instructed to convert these accounts into joint accounts this did not happen in most cases. Land allocation by the state to the ‘head of the household’ generally refers to the man of the household and effectively disavows women owning property. The process for obtaining land titles in joint names remains an unresolved issue.

In Sri Lanka, Article 14 (1)(g) of the Constitution gives women the right to move the court against sexual harassment at the workplace. India issued a set of guidelines in 1997 to prevent sexual harassment of women in the workplace, intended to be mandatory. However, in both cases there are not sufficient mechanisms to ensure compliance.

Specific legal instruments dealing with domestic violence have been passed in India (Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act 2005) and Sri Lanka (Protection from Domestic Violence Act 2005) but these need to be effectively implemented. India still needs to put the mechanisms in place for the enforcement of the Act. In the case of Sri Lanka there are several loopholes that affect the adequate implementation of the law. For example, the definition of domestic violence does not cover economic abuse. However, the law does set out the duties of police officers who play a fundamental role in collecting evidence and leading the prosecution. In Thailand the Office of Women’s Affairs and Family Development is championing an Act of Protection of Domestic Violence Victim, but this is being held up because it lacks clear guidelines for its application.

There are national and international NGOs dealing with violence against women in these countries. While there are only a few in Thailand and the Maldives, there is a range of organisations in India and Sri Lanka covering the multiple needs of survivors of violence against women. But there is a lack of coordination among them. In India there are innumerable non-formal dispute resolution mechanisms at the community level which are more accessible to women and offer some immediate redress.

- **The institutional delivery mechanisms themselves do not always offer sensitised personnel, making it difficult for the survivor to seek assistance.**

In Puntland, district courts and police forces are supported to restore the rule of law and security to the region. However, these institutions lack the capacity to offer adequate protection for survivors of violence, and officials discriminate against women. Likewise in Thailand it is reported that women who seek action against abuse by family members are likely to face a hostile situation at the police stations and in the courts. For survivors of sexual violence the focus is often on the morality of the woman rather than the crime. Each of the countries reported that women are often advised to ‘adjust’ or reconcile rather than claim their rights.
The regional institutional landscape on disaster risk reduction and response

This section concentrates on South Asia and does not include institutions in Southeast Asia or Africa. In 2005 an open-ended regional strategy for disaster reduction in Asia (Asia Partnership) was launched by the UN Inter-Agency Secretariat for International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR), Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre (ADPC) and Asian Disaster Reduction Centre (ADRC) in consultation with UNDP’s Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery and United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP).

In 1987 the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) initiated a “Regional Study on the Causes and Consequences of Natural Disasters and the Protection and Preservation of Environment”. The SAARC Meteorology Research Centre was established in Dhaka (1995) and the SAARC Coastal Zone Management Centre in Male (2004). It was only after the tsunami that the Association recognised the need for a regional disaster policy. Building upon the Hyogo framework, the expert group meeting in Dhaka in November 2006 formulated the document “Disaster Management in South Asia: A Comprehensive Regional Framework for Action 2006-2015”. The emphasis of the framework is on the technical aspects of warning and risk reduction, although it does make reference to the empowerment of the “community at risk – particularly women, the poor and the disadvantaged” in its strategic goals and calls for “a community focus with strong emphasis on issues of gender and the disadvantaged embedded in all programmes”. The framework does not emphasise the involvement and participation of community members – especially women – in disaster relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction. The framework also does not address the conflicts and wars that have ravaged South Asian countries and does not offer any intervention for those affected by these human-made disasters.
three: previous studies
on violence against women in disasters

Since the tsunami, a large number of studies on gender issues in disaster response have been conducted. These studies take note of the differential impact of disaster on women and men, as evident in the greater number of deaths of women. They highlight the disadvantages imposed on women, not only in terms of access to resources but also in terms of restrictive social roles. Studies show that post-tsunami women have the additional burden of increased domestic work, while the incidence of violence against women has escalated (Rees, Cook, Pittaway & Bartolomei 2005; Fischer 2005; Oxfam 2005; Global Fund for Women 2005; APWLD 2006; Ford Foundation 2006; Solidaritas Perempuan 2006; INFORM 2006).

- Many reports have highlighted the universal prevalence of violence against women. (Watts & Zimmerman 2002; UNIFEM 2003; WHO 2001; WHO 2005). The incidence of violence against women is found to be significantly high in the South Asian region (Coomaraswamy 2005; UNFPA & AFFPD 2003; UNICEF & UNIFEM SARO 2004). These works suggest that a woman most commonly encounters violence at home and that the perpetrator is often her husband or close relatives. The consequences of violence against women are seen to affect all aspects of the everyday life of the woman, especially her health (Watts & Zimmerman 2002; UNIFEM 2003; WHO 2001; WHO 2005).
In terms of the states’ failure to address the issue of violence against women, it is argued that the loopholes and gender biases in the legal systems of South Asian countries hamper the delivery of justice to women survivors. (UNFPA & AFFPD 2003; UNICEF ROSA & UNIFEM SARO 2004; Coomaraswamy 2005)

Studies have shown that the incidence of violence against women is exacerbated in disasters. After a disaster the pressure even in a non-violent relationship can result in violence, whereas it is likely to increase in an already violent relationship (Wiest, Mocellin & Motsisi 1994; Enarson & Morrow 1998; Fordham 1999; Enarson 2000; Felten-Biermann 2005; Mac Donald 2005).

Asia has experienced the highest number and worst disasters (about 38% of the world’s major natural disasters, accounting for 57% of people killed by natural disasters and 88% of the affected people’), with the incidence of violence against women being extensive in South Asia. Despite this, pre-tsunami few studies had been conducted in the region to examine the correlation between the two.

The roots of violence are understood to lie in the patriarchal ideology that regards the woman’s role in the family as simply the custodian of family honour. The slightest threat to the man’s honour and power can result in him asserting his masculinity by violent means, possibly against the women of “his” house (Naved 2003; Coomaraswamy 2005).

Studies conducted in Somalia (UNICEF; MOWDAFA 2005) report that women’s rights in political, social and economic domains are frequently violated, and attribute the cause of widespread violence against women to deep rooted discriminatory cultural traditions, lack of governing structures to protect women’s rights, women’s lack of control over economic resources and the low level of education of women.

Many works highlight that the inequality between women and men is often perpetuated by the disaster response agencies. Despite their central roles in families, communities and economies, women are relatively invisible when it comes to the disaster relief operations. Due to their lower position in society the considerable efforts of women before, during and after a natural disaster are masked by the “female victim/male rescuer” paradigm (Enarson & Morrow 1998; Fordham 1999; Enarson 2000; Felten-Biermann 2005).

The human rights of women are often violated in disaster response through their forced relocation, exclusion from receiving compensation, and denial of a role in decision making (Global Fund for Women 2005; Oxfam 2005; Yonder, Akcar & Gopalan 2005; APWLD 2006; PDHRE 2006).

The studies conclude that it is erroneous to overlook the resilient capacities of women and see them as a homogenous vulnerable group. They contend disasters could be turned into opportunities to reduce pre-existing inequities. The crucial role for women in disaster mitigation and response is consistently emphasised (Wiest, Mocellin & Motsisi 1998; Enarson 2000; UN/ISDR 2001; UNECLAC 2003; Sphere 2004; UN/ISDR 2001; UNECLAC 2003; Sphere 2004; Yonder, Akcar & Gopalan 2005; Global Fund for Women 2005; PDHRE 2006; HIC-HLRN & PDHRE 2006; COHORE 2006, APWLD 2006).

four: approach & methodology
creating a people’s report across five countries

Principles

The approach and methodology used in the process of bringing out this people’s report strove to embody the following principles:

• analysis is primarily informed and led by the experience of tsunami-affected women at the community level;
• the primary understanding is that human rights are core and that it is the state’s responsibility to ensure affected women enjoy their rights;
• the right to information is fundamental if women are to know and claim their rights and actively participate in decision making;
• alliances of the affected women with their institutions and allies will be formed in each country to collectively engage with the policy-making/implementing institutions to realise their rights;
• affected women at the ground level will initiate structures and mechanisms to combat violence against women at family, community, district and national levels;
• discussions with tsunami affected women would not simply extract information, but collectivise knowledge, analysis, bargaining power and voice as a prelude to women claiming their rights.
Focus and methods

The discussions sought to explore the following key questions: whether women are aware of their rights in the post-disaster context; the extent to which they received their rights; the barriers they encountered to obtaining their rights; the incidence and forms of violence women encountered in the family and in the community post-tsunami, reasons for the increase in violence against women, and its impact upon them.

A set of suggested questions were developed to guide both the discussions and interviews which were adapted for use by each country (see Appendix 1). The information generated through the community consultative process was collated and analysed to produce country level “people’s reports”. The term “people’s report” is used to capture the idea that it is not a report of an individual person or agency, but the culmination of the process which has engaged members of the alliance and community representatives in its production. Members of the various country level alliances came together at an international meeting in Colombo in early March 2007 to formulate this synthesised international people’s report and a charter on violence against women post-tsunami in South Asia.

Coverage and sampling

Across the five countries 7,583 tsunami-affected women were consulted through discussions and individual interviews in 316 villages, islands and settlements. The sampling criteria is described in Appendix 2.

Table 1: Sample for community level discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Maldives</th>
<th>Sri Lanka</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Thailand¹</th>
<th>Puntland (Somalia)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographical coverage</td>
<td>9 islands/2 atolls</td>
<td>6 districts</td>
<td>3 states 2 union territories</td>
<td>2 villages</td>
<td>2 districts 6 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>3,833</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of focus groups</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants in focus groups</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>3,833</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of interviews</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of organisations in the alliance</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process

The following activities were conducted, using an iterative process:

- assessment of the policy environment and actors involved;
- alliance and capacity building with organisations, movements and activists working on or interested in combating violence against women;
- development of communication strategies and appropriate materials to inform the community of the rights and entitlements of women to security, protection, compensation and service provision in the post-tsunami context;
- community awareness raising on human rights vis-à-vis violence against women in the post-tsunami context, community analysis and organising to fight violence against women (for example, through the formation/strengthening of community mechanisms such as vigilance committees and access to resources and services such as legal aid);
- generating information for policy intervention through the formulation of the people’s report and national alliance consensus leading to advocacy work;
- international alliance building towards influencing post-disaster policies which impact on women’s rights in the post-disaster context.

Mobilising women’s action while conducting the process

Associated organising and campaign work to prevent violence against women was carried out. Some examples of this include:

- in the Maldives community-level workers based with island community organisations – and trained to facilitate the community consultations – are supporting emerging women’s groups;
- in India the “Act Now – A Campaign Against Violence on Women in Disasters” was launched by the alliance which resulted in several district and zonal meetings or rallies to raise women’s rights concerns with the relevant authorities;
- in Tamil Nadu and Kerala states (India) the training of local level cadres to check violence against women in their communities has led to the formation of vigilance cells with linkages to the law enforcement machinery and women’s organisations;
- in Chennai (India) a state-level public hearing was conducted, centred around a jury of imminent people hearing the testimonies of 15 tsunami-affected women. Over 1,500 women from 11 tsunami-affected districts participated.

Constraints

There were a number of constraints which influenced the way in which the process was carried out. These included the limited time frame, the tensions involved in trying to implement the principles in practice and grapple with a different approach and methodology, the challenge of the people’s report being a by-product of the overall process rather than the end product, and generating organic links between the community, national and international levels.

1. In Thailand only women from Moken (sea gypsy) communities and Burmese migrants were consulted as they were considered to be the most vulnerable segments of the population after the tsunami. Most Moken do not have citizenship in Thailand and both groups lack identity cards.
five: women’s voices

Women’s right to protection, security and bodily integrity

The temporary shelter was built in a flood prone area. We lost our shelter again in floods and a fire. Again we were shifted to Kargil Nagar. There is no work, no food to feed our children, so I sold my kidney and got a small amount. Again I was exploited as they did not give me the promised amount. Now I am suffering due to heavy abdominal pain. I cannot do any more work. (India)

There was a general consensus among the tsunami affected women consulted across all the five countries that the incidence of violence against women increased after the tsunami. They reported an escalation in emotional, physical and sexual violence.

• In India almost all women consulted said they had suffered emotional violence. In the Maldives one third of women said they had experienced emotional violence such as belittling and harassment.

Structural violence: the denial of women’s rights in disaster relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction

Violence against women is not just physical and emotional. Structural violence is the denial of women’s rights. Structural violence deprives women of the equal chance to a decent life with dignity and security. It is the denial of the right to information, to participation and decision making, to adequate housing and land ownership, education, health, food, water and livelihood.
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adopt a tsunami orphan and did not have the courage to tell the family. One of the beatings by her sister-in-law was so harsh that Allirani ran out of the house screaming, much to the shock of the other residents of the temporary shelters. This was when she made up her mind to fight the physical and emotional trauma and started enquiring about adoption. But with no one to support her, she finally gave up and submitted to the demands of her husband’s family. Allirani had the operation in a private hospital. Allirani refused and was subjected to physical torture by her mother-in-law and sister-in-law. Her husband was a silent spectator to the entire event. He also wanted Allirani to have the operation. But Allirani wanted to adopt a tsunami orphan and did not have the courage to tell the family. One of the beatings by her sister-in-law was so harsh that Allirani ran out of the house screaming, much to the shock of the other residents of the temporary shelters. This was when she made up her mind to fight the physical and emotional trauma and started enquiring about adoption. But with no one to support her, she finally gave up and submitted to the demands of her husband’s family. Allirani had the operation in a private clinic and then faced another problem – getting the promised 25,000 rupees from the government. Allirani was all alone as she ran from one office to another trying to claim her money. Every unsuccessful day resulted in more shouting from the family.

Almost nine out of ten Indian women stated they experienced physical violence. In Sri Lanka six out of ten women had experienced physical violence within the two years post-tsunami and for more than half of them the perpetrator of the violence was their husband. In Puntland one third of the women had experienced violence perpetrated by neighbours or strangers, while one quarter said it was inflicted by their husband and another quarter said it was inflicted by male relatives.

One third of Indian women and a fifth of Sri Lankan women said they had experienced sexual violence and one out of six Maldivian women said they had experienced physical and sexual violence in and out of marriage. In Puntland nearly a quarter of the women had experienced sexual abuse and/or rape. Women felt that after the tsunami the incidence is rising. Girls as young as six years or women in their fifties could be victims of rape.

“...Two weeks ago while she was coming back from school. With the assistance of my neighbours, I took her to the hospital. She sustained very serious injury to her genitals. I was not able to buy the drugs prescribed by the doctors because the medical bill was too high. Everyone advised me not to go to the police because I will not get any help - they will just waste my time. Thank God she is doing well healthwise but she keeps having nightmares.”
(Puntland)

Discussions with women in Sri Lanka indicated that the place where they feel they are most susceptible to violence is in their own home, particularly at their husband’s place. Likewise, in the Maldives four out of ten women rated their husband’s house as the place where violence is most prevalent, with slightly less stating that women were most vulnerable on roads.

Tsunami affected women in India also cited other incidents where women’s right to bodily integrity was violated. They reported sexual harassment in public places, such as on buses and when selling fish. Deprivation pushed some women to take extreme measures such as:

- girls from poor families had been pushed into the rising sex tourism industry in the coastal regions of India, and trafficking was found in Prakasam and Visakhapatnam in Andhra Pradesh;
- arrangement of early (underage) marriages for girls. This was found to be common in all villages where women were consulted in Andhra Pradesh;
- thirty-four women from among 18,60 families displaced from seven hamlets of North Chennai had resorted to selling a kidney for survival. These families had initially been put in a temporary settlement in Kargil Nagar, but were again relocated to another area following a fire and flooding in the settlement. This relocation process created uncertainty among the relocated families and led to loss of their livelihood, with the women selling their kidneys to maintain their families.
- another example of the abuse of women’s right to bodily integrity is recanalisation which has been forced upon some Indian women whose families who were left childless after the tsunami.

In Puntland the right to women’s bodily integrity is challenged in childhood through the institutionalised practice of female genital mutilation (FGM). Almost all Somali women undergo this painful procedure.
Causes of violence

Women attributed the escalation in violence against them post-tsunami to a number of factors, many of which were common to all the five countries.

A majority of the women felt that the violence resulted from men’s frustration/anger compounded by their unemployment and lack of counselling to overcome grief and frustration; their consumption of alcohol or drugs; the husband’s suspicion or mistrust; extramarital liaison by the husband; dowry demands and poverty.

For example, in India nine out of ten women attributed the increased alcoholism among men to the increased incidence of physical and emotional violence. This was related to cash payments being paid exclusively to men which was then used to buy alcohol. Women related this response of men to their socialisation. That is, responding to the tragedy by resorting to alcohol or drugs. Women in Puntland felt that nine out of ten men are addicted to chewing khat (intoxicating leaves) on which many spend much of their income. All the women attributed domestic violence to this practice.

Across the five countries the lack of security in camps or temporary settlements was cited as a major factor leading to increased violence. Lack of privacy particularly in regard to toilet and bathing facilities, and inadequate lighting at night consistently made women vulnerable to violence. Women consulted in Sri Lanka also mentioned that the exposure of women to “outsiders” (unknown strangers living in proximity to them in the camps and temporary settlements) as a causal factor. Maldivian women also mentioned increased vulnerability due to family and community disruption.

Consequences of violence

Women reported that the consequence of the violence against them in the post-tsunami context had not only resulted in physical injuries, but also in emotional and social consequences.

• In the context of physical violence, most women experienced injuries to the head, followed by arms, legs, back, face and lips.

• The emotional consequences were loss of self-worth, fear and depression. The Maldivian women expressed the effects as heartache, humiliation, shame, sorrow and marginalisation to the extent that the survivor feels isolated from society and ends up feeling unwanted. The women from Sri Lanka and India expressed the effects as anger, depression, fear, feeling of loneliness and suicidal tendencies. In Sri Lanka four out of 100 women said they felt suicidal and several women spoke of their attempts to commit suicide: “Once, because I couldn’t bear this suffering anymore I took poison. But I didn’t die.” (Eastern Sri Lanka)

• In Puntland rape carries a heavy stigma. If the rapist is known to the victim women stated that not only does the rapist violate their right to bodily integrity but also effectively denies their right to life.

The social consequences of isolation and stigmatisation further de-motivate and marginalise women. Socio-cultural norms mean that the disgrace is attached to the survivor of physical and sexual violence.
violence and not to the perpetrator. Women said that the shame and humiliation spills over the entire family making it difficult for the family to find marital alliances for the survivor as well as other unmarried members of the family.

Coping strategies

Women’s most common coping mechanism was sharing their experience of violence with someone they trusted – this could be their husband if the perpetrator was somebody else. Many of them said that they maintain silence because they fear shame.

Some of the women consulted in Sri Lanka said that if the perpetrator is not the husband then women may come together and respond to the violence in several ways such as identifying and ostracising the perpetrator, informing the police, providing assistance and support to the survivor of violence and not isolating or blaming her. However, if the perpetrator is the husband, people outside the family are unlikely to get involved as this is seen to be a “private” family matter.

“We don’t want to put our nose where it does not belong. It is their problem; we do not want to be a part of it. If we even tried to help those who are facing this they would say that they don’t want our help.” (Maldives)

Not retaliating to the violence or not taking action can also be seen as a coping strategy. Women gave the following reasons for this:

• They were afraid of being shamed, but felt this passivity then contributed to further violence. Women are socialised into a culture of silence, instilling in them that they must endure the violence and maintain the family’s integrity.

“All I want is my husband to stop drinking and bring up my children in peace. My future seems bleak but I am not going to give up for the sake of my children.” (Sri Lanka)

• Many women felt that by talking with parents or relations and exposing the problem they would be vulnerable to more violence from their husbands.

“After being sexually violated I felt that it was my fault. I was not able to tell my husband anything about the incident for fear that he would misunderstand. I felt a great sense of repulsion at the whole thing.” (Sri Lanka)

• Some women perceived that their own behaviour had caused the violence. They accepted that their own actions – or inactions – had caused men to act violently towards them.

“People who inflict physical injury on anyone would not do it without any reason. If they had no reason they would not hit anyone.” (Maldives)

• Many women believed that a husband is entitled to have access to his wife’s body.

“I think my husband has the right to hit me.” (Sri Lanka)

• Some of the women said that beating the wife shows that her husband feels very close to her - “he will not beat someone else’s wife” - and if they resist, the husband will seek solace in another woman.

• Very few of the women consulted were aware of the fact that they could seek legal redress for domestic violence. The laws and policies

Yashodhara of South Andaman is the second wife to Ghanshyam whose first wife left due to his violent behaviour and alcoholism. Ghanshyam regularly spent his day’s income on liquor and would abuse Yashodhara physically. He routinely returned home very late at night intoxicated, beat her and threw her out of the house. Yashodhara endured it for her child. Yashodhara started earning from a cash-for-work programme. She used to hide her income from her husband so that he did not waste it on liquor. At times he used to find out and spend it. When she could not bear it any further Yashodhara approached the women’s group, formed through the support of an NGO in her village. A few members of the group went and spoke to her husband. Ghanshyam finally accepted his mistake and vowed to stop drinking. However, Ghanshyam broke his promise as quickly as he made it. The abuse, violence and torture resumed. Yashodhara went back to the women’s group and reported his behaviour. This time, two women camped inside Yashodhara’s house at night and waited for Ghanshyam’s arrival. When he returned late at night, drunk, and banged upon the door to enter, they did not allow him entry. Exhausted and irritated, he gave up and slept outside on the street. This happened quite a few times. Finally, Yashodhara and Ghanshyam came to an understanding that he will not drink outside his house and will not return home drunk. This time, he was warned of serious consequences if he was abusive to Yashodhara. The situation of Yashodhara’s family has improved a lot since then.
which are in place to provide redress to the violation of women’s right to protection and bodily integrity are often unknown to women.

- The laws and policies which are in place are inadequately implemented and there are barriers in the justice system that make it quite inaccessible for women. The women consulted stated that survivors of violence against women are not able to turn to the law for redress. They were not confident that the police would take any action against the perpetrator. Women reported being told to go home and reconcile with their husbands.

- Likewise, women in Puntland said they have no access and unclear information related to judiciary systems and claiming entitlements. Those who know of legal recourse are wary of corrupt judges. One woman reported her ex-husband as saying: "I will pay all your entitlements to the judge and you will end up with nothing. Even if I kill you no one will ask for your blood (compensation)."

In Thailand the marginalised women of migrant Burmese or Moken communities do not have legal options, since they are required to produce identity cards at the police station. Even if the migrant woman possesses an ID card and she takes the initiative to register the complaint with police, she may have to seek formal permission to travel because the Thai government does not allow free movement of migrants across the provinces and her residence may be a distance from the town and the police station.

The women from these communities reported having been extorted several times by the police. The police do not understand the language of Burmese or Moken women and the complaint is registered in Thai language which is not comprehensible to the women. There is no facility of interpreters at the police station or in the courts. All this keeps these survivors of violence away from the legal redress.

Likewise, in eastern Sri Lanka where the majority Muslim and Tamil populations use Tamil language but where most of the police are Sinhalese whose proficiency in Tamil is poor, women felt that they were unlikely to get assistance regarding domestic violence.

**Right to information and decision making**

"I lost everything in the tsunami. I approached the Grama Sevaka (village level government officer) to get information on compensation, but he refused to give the information and told me to come another day. This repeatedly happened. Finally I went and met with the Divisional Secretary and he asked why I did not come earlier – now it is too late. That was the reply I got!"

(Woman in conflict-affected eastern province of Sri Lanka)

A common experience of women survivors of the tsunami - cutting across the boundaries of the countries - is the denial of their right to information. Most women consulted in each of the countries said that they were not clearly informed about their entitlements regarding relief and rehabilitation packages.
Umathevi says that she is “not just a wife any more”. She is the leader of the female Community Based-Organisation (CBO) in Trincomalee district in northeastern Sri Lanka. Umathevi loves her new job which is done on a voluntary basis. The CBO encourages female villagers to make democratic decisions that represent the true desires and needs of the community. “Now women of the village have a sense of esteem and the power to make changes in their own lives,” Umathevi says confidently.

- In the Maldives seven out of ten women had information about food items they were entitled to, nine out of ten knew of their housing rights, and almost seven out of ten were aware of the cash grant. However, the details of the compensation package were not fully disclosed thereby disabling women of the knowledge of their full entitlements. In Sri Lanka, seven out of ten women were not aware of the various kinds of compensation they were entitled to even though many received it. Only one third of the women consulted were aware of their right to food while almost six out of ten women consulted did not know about their right to safe drinking water. In India most women consulted said they were largely unaware of their rights, government schemes and entitlements. Dalit, tribal and minority women were particularly deprived of information and entitlements. In Thailand many women from coastal communities were largely uninformed and unaware of their rights, particularly the Moken and Burmese migrant women. Relief aid was felt to be more accessible to those who had information on their rights than to the less informed who are usually women.

- Women also stated that information was often not clear, that there was misinformation as well as false promises.
  “I have been promised a lot of things by a lot of people but I have not received any of it.” (Resident of an IDP camp, Maldives)

The various factors women identified as limiting their access to information were:

- the location of the government offices/information centres at a considerable distance from where they were staying;
- Immobility increases in the event of disasters as women are committed to provide care for their dependents and are not in a position to participate in discussions and obtain information;
- the psychological trauma that women experienced hampered their ability to take initiative and seek assistance or information;
- political, cultural and economic factors influenced their access to the relief measures such as:
  - In some areas political party allegiance was a consideration in the provision of assistance and support from some agencies.
  - Women also reported cases where officials granted land and housing compensation when given money.
  - As women are largely denied access to political power or economic resources they were unable to get their entitlements from unscrupulous officials.
  - Cultural mores restrict the mobility of women in general and those who lost their husbands in particular. For example, Muslim women observe a long mourning period marked by confinement so that they could not come forward and seek assistance or their entitlements.

The right to decision making has been severely violated. Almost all the women consulted from all the countries stated that women had either been excluded or given a very limited role in planning and decision-making fora dealing with relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction, particularly as committee members. The recognition of men as heads of households, which is discussed elsewhere, was a major cause of women being left out.
At some places it was reported that men who held political positions at the time of the disaster and who had political clout at the village level, as well as religious leaders were given the prerogative to make decisions regarding relief and rehabilitation programmes. Women felt that their needs, and particularly the special needs of older, single or women with disabilities, were overlooked. Socially excluded groups suffered due to the caste hierarchy, with Dalits (a socio-economically disadvantaged caste group) and tribal women being the worst affected. Women spoke of the biased views of state officials and others working on relief and rehabilitation programmes who saw themselves as the “providers”, the survivors of disaster as passive recipients, and women as a vulnerable group.

“There is a monthly committee who views the progress of the new houses, but not everyone knows about the progress or how the houses will be given” (Resident of an IDP camp, Maldives).

**Right to food, clean drinking water and sanitation**

“I am 45 years old and a single woman from Nainarkuppam. I lost my sister very long back. After her death my sister’s husband eloped with another woman and I took the responsibility of bringing up my sister’s children. I have no ration card in my name and hence I did not receive any aid or relief of any sort from the government.” (India)

Generally the women consulted felt that their right to food, clean drinking water and sanitation was not adequately addressed.

- A major issue raised was the recognition of men as heads of households resulting in women frequently being left out at the time of registration and later. This was particularly so for single women, women with disabilities, older women and women heading households (for example, women whose husband had deserted them and now had another family).
- The insensitive mechanisms of distribution which required standing in a queue for hours were detrimental to the health of pregnant women and those who were ailing or had disabilities.
- In some places cultural practices acted as a barrier to women seeking assistance (women are not supposed to be interacting with outsiders especially men), thus women were less equipped and less able than men to access food at the distribution points.

In Sri Lanka seven out of ten women reported that immediately after the tsunami they received food, and eight out of ten received cash for food. While nine out of ten women reported having access to water, they were concerned with the location of the source. Fetching water from distant sources has been a strenuous exercise for women already burdened with numerous household chores and additional responsibility for providing care to the ailing members of the family. However, in the rehabilitation stage access to water decreased due to the salination of wells as many women were unaware of their right to get them cleaned through government initiatives. Four out of ten women had access to sanitation facilities. In the Maldives most women received the basic food package. The special needs of diabetic people were addressed in food packages and most of the women had access to water. In Puntland three quarters of women said they did not get any relief entitlements. One fifth said they received food packages while a quarter had received some cash compensation. The humanitarian relief assistance tended to be distributed through the village committees comprised mainly of men
elders and leaders. Women felt that their needs were not adequately met because of they were unrepresented.

Women in India said that even though food and water was provided they found it inadequate. The dietary needs of pregnant and lactating women and children were largely ignored and single women, women with disabilities and women from socially disadvantaged groups faced difficulties in gaining access to food packages.

In India grassroots workers pointed out that certain socially disadvantaged groups were ignored in the initial response. For instance, many villages of Irula (a tribal community) were damaged along the coast of Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh, displacing over 1,800 families. However, in the immediate aftermath of the disaster, only 12 or 13 Irula families received compensation. The official focus was initially on the dominant fishermen communities. Irulas do not live directly on the coast and were not considered directly affected by the tsunami. Also, being a tribal community they did not have a strong public presence. Many of them also did not have community certificates. Consequently, they were excluded from any welfare or relief support. Dalits were also initially left out of relief operations. A similar situation was experienced by some groups of Moken in Thailand who were ignored by the government due to their stateless status. The Moken do not have any identity card, house or boat registration, and so were not able to claim any monetary compensation from the government. Relief aid was mostly provided to them by private agencies or foundations.

In southern Thailand, male Burmese migrant workers are usually accompanied by their wives and children who do not have work permits. After the tsunami the Burmese were much less likely to approach the authorities to claim the body of a family member. Both the Ministry of Interior and Ministry of Public Health officers as well as some NGOs maintained that emergency relief is not for the Burmese migrants or the Moken. Some Burmese migrants, including pregnant women or mothers with young children, fled to the hills out of fear of arrest and deportation which made them more vulnerable and less able to access relief aid.

In temporary settlements in all countries women and girls experienced distress due to toilets for women and men being common or located too close together, thereby putting their security at risk and violating their privacy. Poor lighting of the toilets made it difficult for women to use them at night. At some places in India the temporary shelters did not have toilets and in some cases the permanent houses were not provided with separate bathing spaces. Lack of appropriate clothing was a problem for some women.

**Right to education and health**

“I am 70 years old. I saw my husband and all my children including my one-year-old grandchild taken by the sea and they died. I was also hit in my hip and thrown in the corner. I should have died too – now I am living all alone in tears with no one to take care of me and unable to move till today.” (India)

While education facilities were generally provided there were a number of factors that limited girl children’s access to it related to mobility and distance, culture and discrimination.

The tsunami completely destroyed 59 schools and partially damaged a further 183 affecting more than 79,000 children in Sri Lanka. Another 444 schools became temporary shelters for an estimated 300,000 people made instantly homeless. Sri Lanka’s literacy rate of 92.3% is one of the highest in South Asia, but the tsunami adversely affected this success, with retention rates for students in higher education dropping, especially those for girls. The ongoing conflict in the North and East has led to further displacement of children from conflict and tsunami affected areas.

Sources: RADA, CIA Fact Book
In Sri Lanka nine out of ten women had access to schools for their children within three months, but in India and the Maldives the situation was very different.

- Distance and lack of transport facilities impeded access, particularly for girl children. In some areas schools stopped after the primary level, leaving students of higher level little option other than to quit studies – particularly the girl students.
- Girls taking up the duties of women lost in the tsunami were compelled to stay at home and look after their siblings;
- Girls dropped out of school due to the rising practice of under-age marriages.
- In the absence of adequate resources children could not attend the school because they had to attend to the household chores or supplement the family income. Although the government ordered the fee-waiver for children of tsunami-affected families this was not implemented in many cases, resulting in a high drop-out rate of daughters. Whenever there was a resource constraint, the girl’s education (versus the boy’s education) was usually compromised.
- In the Maldives with rising fundamentalism, in some cases girls’ education in schools has been stopped, with some religious leaders promoting the belief that the tsunami was God’s punishment for women’s improper behaviour.

After the tsunami there were no epidemic outbreaks in any of the countries. However, women experienced reproductive health care to be inadequate in general and especially for pregnant or lactating mothers. Too often the health centres are located at a considerable distance and transport was problematic. The availability of the services of midwives is insufficient at new settlements. Mental health care was found to be inadequate.

- In the Maldives women stated that they had access to health care centres on every island, but for specialised care they had to travel to regional hospitals which was difficult especially for pregnant women or women with disabilities. In Sri Lanka women felt the situation is gradually improving with the repair of the hospitals and clinics. However, if these are far away women do not find the clinics/hospitals accessible to them as they need the company of others to visit these places.
- In Sri Lanka women felt that there was a lack of trained medical and paramedical personnel to deal with the heightened medical requirements of the survivors.
- In India women reported a paucity of women doctors in the medical camps randomly conducted at some temporary settlements.
- The government played a negligible role in provision of health care in India instead people had to rely on the services provided by NGOs. Women also reported that the health needs of older women were neglected.
Right to housing, property and land

“I was forced to sign a paper by the village administrator. Later I understood it was for evicting me from the house site.” (India)

The delay in the provision of land and permanent houses was the greatest source of uncertainty and distress. A significant number of women said their families remain deprived of their right to land and housing. Women in all the countries experienced a lack of space, facilities and privacy, as well as overcrowding and unhealthy conditions in the temporary settlements and camps.

In India, Sri Lanka and Thailand women expressed extreme dissatisfaction over the government housing policy which threatens them with eviction or requires them to be relocated away from the seashore. Women stated that this:

- ignores the fact they have been living on the coast for generations and have traditional/customary or communal ownership over the land where they live;
- does not take account of the interconnectedness between their life and livelihood. For fishing communities and other groups who depend on the sea, their way of life is built around the sea.

The lack of clarity surrounding policies on coastal zones and land allocation and the rights of squatters and renters means that many communities are facing the ongoing threat of eviction or life in temporary settlements.

Women have experienced land grabbing, dispossession and violence. In Tamil Nadu, India, the fishing village of Kovalam has been subjected to conflict regarding their land and the tsunami has worsened the situation. One woman described her part in the fight for the villagers’ coastal rights which has even involved confrontation with the police:

“One day policemen entered the village and randomly picked people and beat us up.”

The interests of powerful investors clash very often with the right of ordinary citizens. For her and thousands like her, the struggle against forced eviction has just begun. (India)

In Thailand a significant number of fishing communities have been involved in land disputes since the tsunami. They have been depending on marine resources and access to the sea for many generations while living on their land as traditional owners without any legal documents. However, since the tsunami a number of communities are being threatened with eviction. Although this is public land some private owners are now appearing with land titles. (Thailand)

In Sri Lanka and India changes in buffer zone or coastal zone management policies have deprived many people of their right to their land, housing and access to the sea. In India people rebuilding within the 100 metre buffer zone did not receive any assistance for housing from government as this was available to them only if they relocated inland in new settlement areas.

However if people's land was beyond the buffer zone they received compensation for reconstruction. In Sri Lanka, while the initial buffer zone limits were later relaxed, women stated that in some cases this

In India women reported that economic independence led to decreased violence against them. For example, some women said that when they were engaged in cash for work programmes and bringing money home the violence decreased. However this was not sustained as once the work was finished the violence started again. It was also women’s experience that wherever the interventions by civil society organisations led to housing and the rebuilding of livelihoods, such as support for women’s collectives, this created space and visibility for women which helped to contain the violence against them to some extent.

“I don’t know what will happen to us. We have heard that there are no new houses for old people. Where do they expect us to go? We don’t know what is going on.”
(Older woman, IDP Camp, Maldives)
Relocation or forced eviction from coastal areas has impacted heavily on those who depend on the sea for their livelihood. The policies and practices do not take into account the concept of homestead land whereby people have a right to have access to their livelihood and to the land around their house to carry out their livelihood activities. In India and Sri Lanka there was general dissatisfaction among the women on the location of new houses built far away from their original location, making it difficult to revive their previous livelihood activities. Many women who were engaged in home-based economic activities reported now being dependent on their spouses’ income due to displacement.

Across all the countries women stated that they were largely excluded from participating in deciding the location and design of houses, and have often found the design and quality of houses to be unsuitable and inadequate. Single women, widows, women with disabilities and socially excluded women experienced discrimination in house allocation.

In the new housing settlements in Thailand the arrangements pose a problem for some communities as occupancy was done on a lottery basis. This meant people picked numbers instead of selecting their own house location. Unlike the pre-tsunami village set-up, many families did not get to live near their relatives and some even have to live in a separate housing complex. This dilutes association among kin members, leaving women housebound as they are no longer easily able to leave the house and children under the care of relatives.

In the Maldives some of the women said that only the families with at least two children were receiving new houses and that older and single women were not entitled to new houses. The women questioned the grounds of eliminating certain categories of people from the entitlement. There were also cases reported where women were denied entitlement to the house because they did not get registered as internally displaced people (IDPs) as they refused to stay in the camp. These women asked for some justification as to why women who chose a safer place such as a friend’s or relatives’ house over the camps lost their right to housing.

Women also reported that political links and paying money to officials influenced the receipt of compensation, including land and houses.

As mentioned previously, women from all countries said that the quality of temporary shelters made life very difficult. In India women reported that the temporary shelters were aimed at accommodating families and were not sensitive to the needs of single women. They also reported lack of sewage and garbage disposal. The insensitive grouping together of people of different castes in settlements created tensions for people.

**Right to livelihood**

*On the day of the tsunami I was selling beetles at the Hambantota Market and I lost everything. But I was not considered when livelihood assistance was given as I was only a small-scale business woman.* (Sri Lanka)
Women from all the countries said that the governments did not take women’s livelihood into account:

- women across the countries reported that there was little assessment done regarding the loss of micro-enterprises in which women are mostly engaged;
- women were not sufficiently consulted about their livelihood options regarding traditional or alternative livelihoods;
- attention was diverted from micro-enterprises to sectoral development, specifically fisheries and tourism;
- the states tended not to pay attention to the revival of livelihood in the agricultural sector where women workers are the majority;
- compensation for livelihood materials focused primarily on men’s livelihoods and the subsequent discrimination in resource allocation for livelihoods perpetuated the inequities between women and men;
- in India women with no adult male in their families were excluded from the allocation of boats, trawlers and nets;
- since women were not consulted to find out what they had been doing prior to the tsunami they found that the livelihood assistance they received was not consistent with their requirements – for example, the distribution of sewing machines which could not be utilised for generating an income;
- the way support was provided maintained the status quo so that women with marginal livelihoods were not given opportunities to improve their status;
- there was inadequate support to (re)develop market linkages.

On one of the islands women in the camps wanted to start small businesses where they could earn money to contribute to household income, but according to these women they were not allowed to do it because it would hinder the existing businesses on the island. “They say that temporary shelters are just shelters for covering your head and sleeping, and you cannot do anything to earn money here.” (IDP camp in Maldives)

In Nagapattinam district of India alone nearly three lakh women live by selling fish, dried fish or working as small commission agents. On the day of the tsunami, there were many women on the sea shore who lost their money while on the way to purchase fish, while they were vending their catch, or while engaged in commission agent work. Many lost their fish drying shed. These women and their livelihood were neglected by the government. On the other hand, the men commission agents and ice plant owners got compensation from the government.

In Sri Lanka only a third of the women consulted were able to get back to their livelihoods. Most of the women felt that the livelihood requirements of the affected communities in general – and those of women in particular – have not been given the due attention. Women reported differences between the southern and eastern regions in rebuilding their livelihoods. Conflict-displaced women in the eastern region were yet again deprived of their livelihood, this time by the tsunami.

The women felt that in the rehabilitation and reconstruction process attention was mainly on the building of large-scale infrastructure which displaced the women who were small traders or small entrepreneurs. In most cases where women have been able to continue with previous or take up newer livelihood activities, it has been due to their own determination and efforts.

In Sri Lanka only a third of the women consulted were able to get back to their livelihoods. Most of the women felt that the livelihood requirements of the affected communities in general – and those of women in particular – have not been given the due attention. Women reported differences between the southern and eastern regions in rebuilding their livelihoods. Conflict-displaced women in the eastern region were yet again deprived of their livelihood, this time by the tsunami.

The women felt that in the rehabilitation and reconstruction process attention was mainly on the building of large-scale infrastructure which displaced the women who were small traders or small entrepreneurs. In most cases where women have been able to continue with previous or take up newer livelihood activities, it has been due to their own determination and efforts.
six: conclusion
moving forward

The universal prevalence of violence against
women has made it an accepted part of life.
While violence against women is widespread
even in “normal” circumstances, the tsunami affected
women consulted declared there has been
an increase in violence against them following
the disaster. In the countries involved in this
process the tsunami affected women consistently
experienced structural discrimination or violence
at community, district and national levels in their
interactions with the people and systems intended
to protect and ensure their rights. The dominant
political, social and cultural beliefs and practices,
which both accept and perpetuate violence against
women, profoundly influence the formulation and
implementation of the legal framework.

Isolated incidents of collective action in villages took the
issue of violence against women beyond the private sphere.
There were instances of increased economic independence
through ‘cash for work’ programmes, which simultaneously
contributed to the reduction of violence against women.
However it was clearly evident that the systems and
strategies to combat violence against women – to ensure
their protection, security and bodily integrity – are inadequate
in all of the countries. This is true in normal circumstances but
even more so in the post-disaster context where violence has
increased. Similarly, the policies, strategies and mechanisms
to ensure women’s equal rights to information, decision making,
food, water, sanitation, education, health, housing,
land and livelihood are flawed or lacking.
In the countries included in this report there are legal frameworks which should afford protection and security for women. The countries, with the exception of Somalia, have signed CEDAW and some have even translated CEDAW into local laws and set up national mechanisms for their implementation. However, in none of the countries is there a law to specifically address violence against women in post-disaster situations, even though the magnitude of the problem is grave.

Women, irrespective of their age or marital status, reported their susceptibility to violence, often from a male family member, in the confines of their home. Irrespective of whether it is a temporary shelter or a permanent house, the residence becomes a safe place for men to exercise power over women, often in a violent manner and with virtual impunity. Even in the disaster context where it appears that everyone is equally vulnerable, men still exert this power over women.

Following the tsunami women were regarded as a homogenous group with little consideration for cultural, traditional and religious differences, or for the special needs of pregnant and lactating women, older women, adolescent girls and women with disabilities. The discrimination against socially excluded groups, for example the Moken in Thailand and Dalits and Irulas in India, continued even in the immediate aftermath of the disaster. Within these groups women are doubly disadvantaged. Without specific policies to address this discrimination it is most unlikely that the rights of marginalised communities will be adequately met in a post disaster situation. Similarly, until the issues of structural, physical, sexual and emotional violence against women are addressed through and enshrined in disaster response policies, women’s rights will continue to be violated.

All the countries have a range of policies or guidelines which mainly cover the technical aspects of disaster relief and recovery processes including livelihood, land and housing rights, health and education. However, most tsunami policies did not address the specific needs of women and at times the content of the policies themselves discriminated against women and violated their rights.

- The assumed status of men as heads of the households further marginalised women in the disaster context and clearly discriminated against single women, widows, women with disabilities, older women and women who were the co-heads of households.
- The lack of attention to women’s livelihoods perpetuated the myth that men are the sole breadwinner and contributors to the national economy. Any income that women bring to their families is considered supplementary and incidental to the main income, and is usually overlooked despite being crucial to the family’s survival. This view resulted in women being overlooked in the allocation of resources for livelihood restoration or being given quite inappropriate materials due to a lack of prior consultation. The emphasis on formal sector development reflects the political belief that this is the most effective and efficient strategy to promote the economic development of the country. However, it effectively marginalises women home-based workers and micro-entrepreneurs.

- The policies or guidelines which ‘encourage’ coastal dwellers to move inland through the allocation of replacement land and housing are disastrous for communities whose life and livelihoods depend on their proximity to the sea. They are also a grave violation of their rights. Again, there was little consideration of the impact of this relocation on women. Decisions on the no-build coastal zone areas and allocation of houses and land were made without consulting the affected communities, and women in particular.

- As women often do not have access to political decision making processes single women and widows in particular were disenfranchised and often overlooked in the registration process and subsequent allocation of land and houses. The space that government institutions provide to engage women in decision-making processes is extremely limited.

- The expectation that displaced communities would be housed in temporary shelters for less than six months was overly-optimistic. In some cases this transitory situation has dragged on for years, bringing distress to women who are coping with sub-standard living conditions and lack of privacy.

The effective implementation of anti-discrimination laws is a problem due to structural and social impediments which have not been addressed. Despite the continuous rhetoric of the importance of women’s participation in development and disaster response, this principle was violated. The guidelines and strategies to “mainstream gender equity” have not been practiced.

The too frequent perceptions of implementing response agencies of women as helpless victims or passive beneficiaries undermined women’s rightful status as rights-holders and confirmed them in the role of dependent recipients. As such, relief items, compensation and assistance with livelihoods were delivered under the guise of benefits or gifts rather than as their fundamental rights. This perception, together with that of “saving” the survivors, resulted in a general disregard for the resilience of communities – particularly women – to manage their own recovery. It
clearly discounts women’s political agency and denies them the opportunity to make their own decisions. This resulted in women’s needs, interests and contributions being ignored in relief and rehabilitation efforts.

In a disaster context the challenge of “mainstreaming gender”, which is problematic under any normal circumstances, is greatly exacerbated following a disaster when attention is focused on the prompt delivery of resources and outputs rather than on process, and more specifically on how these interventions impact on women. Sensitivity to individual rights and needs, cultural and traditional norms and discrimination based on sex, caste, age and ethnicity are forgotten in an output-oriented process.

The distance still to go in fully embracing women’s rights was often evidenced by the insensitivity of primarily male disaster response workers to women’s concern for privacy, and the distress this caused for affected women. The often authoritarian and bureaucratic mechanisms for information provision, registration, distribution of relief and even for taking legal recourse against injustice also discriminated against women; often intimidating them, discouraging their participation and denying them their rights. Staff of these institutions often advise women to accept or ‘adjust’ to the situation rather than to claim their rights.

Having laws, codes and standards will not automatically reduce the incidence of violence unless and until all stakeholders are made aware of their existence and sensitised to violence against women in the disaster context. Women across the five countries were, by and large, not aware of their rights as citizens and not even aware of their right to question the compensation they received from the authorities. This prevented them from claiming their entitlements, questioning the quality of distributed items, voicing their specific needs and protesting against any discrepancies or corruption.
seven: charter on VAW post-tsunami
demanding an end to violence against women in disasters

We, the tsunami affected women from India, the Maldives and Sri Lanka, are deeply concerned with the continuing widespread violation of women’s rights in the post-disaster context. We experience the violence as not only as physical, sexual and emotional violence. We also experience as acts of violence the sustained structural discrimination that denies us of our right to information; basic amenities; health and education; housing and land; livelihoods; participation and decision-making, which is perpetrated by the state, society, community, and the family. This denial and abuse of our rights impedes our potentiality and agency to be active partners in development.

We request that you take our demands to the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation so that our voice can influence the formulation of the policies and practices that affect our life and livelihood.

1. This Charter reflects the specific concerns of the women from South Asian countries (India, Maldives and Sri Lanka) and it has been presented in various fora in South Asia including the People’s South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) meeting held in Delhi in April 2007.
1. Right to information

We are deeply concerned with the denial of the right of women to information. Most of us across the countries did not know of our entitlements to relief and rehabilitation. The practice of men being registered as heads of households generally excluded our access to entitlements, particularly for the single, widowed, women with disabilities and older women among us.

India: We, the women of the coastal communities, were largely unaware of our rights. Particularly as Dalit, tribal or minority women, we were denied information.

Maldives: Seven out of ten among us knew about the food items we were entitled to, nine out of ten knew of our housing rights, and seven out of ten were aware of the cash grant. However, the details of the compensation package were not fully disclosed, thereby denying us of this information.

Sri Lanka: Six out of ten among us did not know about our right to safe drinking water whereas only one third of us were aware of our right to food.

We strongly demand that:
I. States must be transparent and effective in providing women easy access to information regarding their entitlements and rights.
II. Women must be equally recognised as heads of households irrespective of their marital, caste, ethnic, class, age or religious status.

2. Right to food, clean water and sanitation

We are deeply concerned with the provision of basic needs to women in the aftermath of a disaster. In temporary shelters we experienced difficulties due to the location, improper lighting and lack of privacy, particularly with regard to toilets and bathroom facilities, and the lack of appropriate clothing in some cases.

India: Even though food and water was provided we found it inadequate - particularly so for those of us from the socially disadvantaged groups, or for the pregnant women or lactating mothers among us. Generally the design of sanitation facilitations violated our privacy.

Maldives: Most of us received the basic food package. The special needs of diabetics were addressed in the food package and most of us had access to water.

Sri Lanka: Immediately after the tsunami seven out of ten among us received food, eight out of ten received cash for food, and nine out of ten had access to water. However, in the later stages access to water decreased due to the salination of wells as many of us were unaware of our right to get them cleaned through government initiatives. Four out of ten among us had access to sanitation facilities.

We strongly demand that:
I. States must ensure equal rights to food, clean water and clothing to women of all communities without discrimination
II. States must provide secure and safe sanitation.

3. Right to education and health

We are deeply concerned with the right of girl children to access education and women's access to adequate health care.

India: Though the government ordered the fee-waiver for children of tsunami-affected families this was not implemented in many cases, resulting in a high drop-out rate of our daughters.

Maldives: Education facilities were provided but we are concerned with the safety and security for girls seeking higher education that is not available on all islands. Rising fundamentalism is affecting our girls' access to education in some cases.
Sri Lanka: Nine out of ten of us had access to school within three months but distance and lack of transport facilities impeded access, particularly for our girl children. Girls dropped out of school due to under-age marriages as well as being compelled to stay at home and look after their siblings.

After the tsunami there were no epidemic outbreaks in any of the countries. However, we experienced reproductive health care to be inadequate in general and especially for those of us who were pregnant or lactating mothers. Too often the health centres are located at a considerable distance and transport is difficult for us. The availability of the services of midwives is insufficient at new settlements. We found mental health care to be inadequate.

India: We experienced a paucity of women doctors in the medical camps which were randomly conducted at temporary shelters. The government played a negligible role in provision of health care and instead we had to rely on the services provided by NGOs. For older women among us our health needs were neglected.

Maldives: Even though there are health centres on every island we had to travel to regional hospitals for specialised care which is a problem especially for the pregnant women among us.

Sri Lanka: Seven out of ten among us had access to health care.

We strongly demand that...
I. Special attention must be given to the education of girl children, and measures taken to reduce their drop-out rate.
II. Easy access for women to health facilities and effective reproductive and mental health care must be ensured.

4. Right to housing and land

We are deeply concerned with....
the delay in the provision of permanent houses to the affected communities. Across all the countries we were largely excluded from participating in deciding the location and design of houses. In temporary shelters and camps we experienced lack of space, facilities, privacy, overcrowding and unhealthy conditions. We have found the design and quality of houses to be often unsuitable. As single women, widows, women with disabilities and socially-excluded women we experienced discrimination in house allocation.

Many of us who were engaged in home-based economic activities earlier are now forced to be dependent on our spouses' income due to displacement.

Given the lack of clarity of policies on coastal zones and land allocation, and regarding the rights of squatters and renters, we have faced eviction or the ongoing threat of eviction. Relocation or forced eviction from coastal areas has impacted heavily on those of us who depended on the sea for our livelihood.

India: In temporary shelters we experienced lack of sewage and garbage disposal. The insensitive grouping together of people of different castes in shelters created tensions for us.

Maldives: Those of us who are single or older women or who had families with less than two children found we were not entitled to houses.

Sri Lanka: In some areas, where land had previously been in women's names in the new allocation joint ownership was promoted. For example, in Muslim communities, new allocation rules led to land ownership by men which disadvantaged us as women, particularly when men marry again.

We strongly demand that...
I. Policies on housing and land allocation must take into consideration the previous practices and the impact the policies can have on women.
II. Affirmative action must be taken in land and house allocation to include single women, widows, women with disabilities and older women.
III. Women must be consulted in the design and construction of temporary and permanent houses
IV. Women's right to own homestead land and have access to their livelihood must be ensured.
V. The right of people to remain in their original place of habitation must not be violated.
5. Right to livelihood

We are deeply concerned with...
the concentration on sectoral development – specifically of fisheries and tourism – and the minimal attention to micro-enterprises where we were/are mostly engaged. Lack of assessment and consultations with us regarding the loss of our livelihoods has disempowered us in rebuilding our livelihoods.

Compensation for livelihood materials focused primarily on men’s livelihoods and the subsequent discrimination in resource allocation perpetuated the inequities between women and men. Revival of livelihoods in the agricultural sector where we women workers are in the majority tended to be neglected. Systematic efforts and resources were not given to our traditional and alternative livelihoods and there was inadequate support to develop market linkages. The relocation of fisher families away from the coast also disrupted those of us who have sea-based livelihoods. Political interference and corruption affected our access to livelihood support. Many of us who are widows were unable to obtain compensation for our deceased husbands’ lost livelihood equipment.

India: If we had no adult male in our family we were excluded from the list for the allocation of boats, trawlers and nets.

Maldives: Half of us received livelihood assistance. However, due to lack of consultation this support was often inappropriate. For example, the distribution of sewing machines which we cannot utilise for our livelihood.

Sri Lanka: One third of us have resumed our livelihood. In the rehabilitation and reconstruction process attention was focused on the building of large scale infrastructure which displaced some of us who were small traders or entrepreneurs.

We strongly demand that...
I. Women’s economic rights must be recognised, alongside accepting us as income earners.
II. An assessment must be made of micro-enterprises and special attention paid and support given to women’s needs such as credit, market linkages, skills and business development services for alternative livelihood/upgrading traditional livelihood, and compensation for loss of livelihood.
III. To ensure women’s involvement in macro and sectoral economic development, our entrepreneurial skills must be upgraded with the necessary resource support.
IV. Affirmative action must be taken to promote the livelihoods of excluded and marginalised women such as single women, widows and women with disabilities.

6. Right to participation and decision-making

We are deeply concerned that...
we were too often denied the right to participate in planning and decision-making fora and committees, resulting in our specific needs such as reproductive health, livelihood, safety and security being largely ignored. The social, political, religious and cultural prejudices of decision makers reinforced the status quo. Despite constant demands and several agreed standards/codes of practice, the space for us to participate in decision-making remained minimal. The view of us as passive, vulnerable recipients and being confined to the home perpetrated our marginalisation from decision-making.

India: The traditional feudal leadership and religious institutions exercised power and control over communities and marginalised us in the relief and rehabilitation process. Socially excluded groups among us suffered due to the caste hierarchy, with Dalits and tribal women being the worst affected.

Maldives: Centralised planning excluded our participation, and our lack of political empowerment limited our involvement at the island level.

Sri Lanka: We were not included as decision makers in state apparatus dealing with relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction, particularly as committee members.

We strongly demand that...
I. Women’s right to decision making must be ensured through the appointment of women in all decision-making committees and fora from community to national level.
ii. Women must be consulted and involved in policy formulation and programme design for relief operations, camp management, damage and needs assessments, allocation of houses and land, and the rebuilding of livelihoods.
7. Right to protection, security and bodily integrity

We are gravely concerned with...
the increased incidence of violence against us after the tsunami in all the countries. We identify a range of
causes for violence against women but the underlying reason is the power imbalance between women and men
within the family and in the community at large.

The extensive violence against us in the post-tsunami context has not only resulted in physical injuries but also in
social consequences such as isolation, stigma, loss of self-worth, fear, depression etc which further de-motivates
and marginalises us. This has also led to suicide.

India: Nine out of ten of us experienced increased alcoholism among men, which we attribute to the increasing
incidence of physical and emotional violence. This is related to cash payments being paid exclusively to men,
compounded by their unemployment and lack of counselling to overcome grief and frustration. In instances of
extreme deprivation some of us have had to sell our kidneys or take up sex work. We have found incidents of
early marriages, polygamy (by men) and forced recanalisation. There are also reports of girls being pushed into
sex tourism in the coastal regions.

Maldives: One in six of us experienced physical and sexual violence in and out of marriage. A third of us have
experienced verbal and physical harassment in the workplace and on the roads. The majority of us feel that
violence within the community has increased after the tsunami.

Sri Lanka: Over half of us have experienced physical violence within the last two years, in fifty percent of cases
this was by our husbands.

We strongly demand that...
I. Those who perpetrate violence against women must be punished regardless of the circumstances and zero
tolerance of violence against women in disaster or any other situation must be enforced.
II. The ineffectiveness and blockages in the implementation of laws and policies on violence against women
must be acknowledged.
III. Mechanisms must be put in place to hold both the state and the relevant officials accountable.
IV. A critical mass of women must be developed and included in decision-making in the prevention, intervention
and advocacy on violence against women, particularly in the post-disaster situation.

We demand that the states eliminate all forms of violence against women, be it emotional, physical, sexual or
structural violence and ensure the freedom of women to secure their rights. We demand that the states adopt
this charter, incorporate women’s demands into the laws and policies on relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction
– especially on housing and land, livelihood, education and health and most importantly in laws on violence
against women, and ensure their effective implementation and monitoring.

Endorsement

More than 164 organisations endorse this women’s charter of demands (see Appendix 3). We recognise the
efforts made by states to respond to the unprecedented scale of this tsunami disaster. However, we are acutely
aware of the suffering and hardships facing women affected by the tsunami and reiterate the urgency and gravity
of their demands.²

Contact details

India
Coastal Women’s Movement
Pazhaveli Vempakkam
Chengulput 601 103
Tamil Nadu
Tel: +91(0) 44 2742 9429
Email: vasanthachaari@yahoo.co.in

The Maldives
Care Society
Male’
Tel: +96 (0) 33 22297
Email: info@caresociety.org.mv

Sri Lanka
Sri Lanka Forum for the Prevention of
Violence Against Women
Walawe Kantha Maha Sangamaya
Dalubahena Road
Kula North, Lunama, Ambalantota
Tel: +94 (0) 47 567 4937
Email: hambanthotavaw@yahoo.com

² This charter evolved out of discussions with 7,315 tsunami affected women in 308 communities in India, Sri Lanka and Maldives.
appendix 1 Suggested questions for community discussions & interviews

Suggested questions to guide the community discussions

Entitlements/compensation
1. Do you know what, and how much compensation you were/are entitled to receive from the government after the tsunami?
2. After the tsunami what entitlements did you actually receive? Each country to list the specific entitlements:
   • food/food items/cash grants for food (list exactly were people were entitled to and for how many months);
   • cash grant for livelihood restoration;
   • compensation for death of family members (family head, other members);
   • compensation for injury (loss of limbs/eyes etc.);
   • concessions for utilities (if provided);
   • assistance for house repair;
   • construction of new house;
   • provision of boat and net;
   • provision of other livelihood tools;
   • any other (please specify)

If women were denied certain entitlements
3. Why do you think you were not given that compensation? List the reasons given
4. Did you see any differences when the compensation packages were given to women as compared to men?
5. From which agency did you receive most assistance – the government, NGOs or others?
6. (a) Did the government officials and/or other agencies inform you and other women in the community about your entitlements?
   (b) For each institution mentioned in Q5 ask: Was the information provided by xxxx adequate; insufficient; difficult for women/girls to access; inadequate/rarely provided information.
7. Which of the local authorities did you/women find easy to access and obtain your entitlements from? Why are they easy for women to access?
8. Which of the local authorities did you/women find difficult to access and obtain your entitlements from? Why are they difficult for women to access?
9. In your opinion what are the factors that prevent women / girls – knowing about, being included, being consulted, claiming their spaces and services i.e. their rights and entitlements?
10. In your opinion how can the obstacles be addressed at different levels of rights? For each of the following rights talk with women about:
    (a) if they knew about their right.
    (b) their interaction with local authorities or other agencies
    (c) what/if they took any actions to claim their rights after the tsunami
    (d) what they think they might do if they were confronted with another disaster in the future.

Right to food
11. Do you know that after a disaster it is your right to get food? That it is not just charity or good-will. Do you think that this right to food was met after the tsunami? In terms of quantity and quality?
   What about the specific food needs of different groups such as: pregnant women; women who are breastfeeding
   In your opinion, who do you think is responsible to provide this right?
   If this right was/is not met, did you take any action? If yes, what action? With whom? What was the result?
   In the future, if you were faced by another disaster, what would you do with regard to your right to food?

Right to clean water
12. Do you know that after a disaster you have a right to clean water i.e. water you can safely drink, which is not salty. Did/do you have sufficient water for drinking, washing, cleaning etc? (compare pre-post tsunami)
   If this right was/is not met, did you take any action? If yes, what action? With whom? What was the result?
   In the future, if you were faced by another disaster, what would you do with regard to your right to water?
Right to health services
13. Did you have access to appropriate medical treatment? (Compare pre- to post-tsunami)
What about health services providing pre-natal and post-natal care, immunization etc
If this right was/is not met, did you take any action? If yes, what action? With whom? What was the result?
In the future, if you were faced by another disaster, what would you do with regard to your right to appropriate health services?

Right to housing
14. Where are you living now?
Do you know that you have a right to housing? That is, housing with room for privacy, for cooking and sleeping.
What are the problems you face(d) in terms of housing?
Have you been consulted about your housing? To what extent are you involved in making decisions about housing?
If you are living in your own house now:
- was it repaired or rebuilt?
- Is it in your original location or have you been re-settled?
- Were you consulted? Are you satisfied?
- What problems are you facing at present?
If you are living in temporary shelters:
- What is preventing you moving from here?
- Do you know about the future of your permanent shelter? Are you being consulted?
- Are you satisfied with the temporary shelter?
- What are the problems you are facing?
- What forms of violence are women and girls facing in the temporary shelter?
If you are living with relatives or friends:
- Do you know about the future of your permanent shelter?
If your right to housing was/is not met, did you take any action? If yes, what action? With whom? What was the result?
In the future, if you were faced by another disaster, what would you do with regard to your right to housing?

Right to ownership of land and inheritance
15. If you owned land before the tsunami, in whose name was the title of the land?
Is the title of your land now in the name of you/your husband/joint title?
If your husband/male head of household died have you been able to secure inheritance?

Right to education
16. How many months after the tsunami did your children get back to school? What were the temporary arrangements for restoring education?
If you compare pre-tsunami to post-tsunami – are your children going to school? How many have discontinued their education after the tsunami? Is it girls or boys or both who have stopped going? Why?

Right to work and employment
17. Is your work/occupation now the same or different to what you did pre-tsunami?
Were you – as a woman - able to access livelihood grants and/or the replacements of livelihood gear/tools? (how many of the women were able?)
Were you able to access credit/loans, appropriate training etc? Why/not?
Are you able to take up the work you feel able to do or not? Why?

Right to participation in decision-making
17. Were you, or other women in your neighbourhood involved with government authorities, NGOs etc. in planning and making decisions?
Do you think that you are better organized now than before the tsunami?
If you are faced with another disaster, what would you do differently?

Gaps
18. What are the gaps in the laws and policies that you can think of?
19. What are the gaps in the way entitlements are derived from the laws/policies that have been
implemented/ delivered at the community level that you can think of?
20. What are the mechanisms in place so that what is in the government policy actually reaches the people? Are they adequate?
21. What are your suggestions to improve delivery and implementation of entitlements?
22. Do you think that those who were engaged in the tsunami response were sensitive to women and their needs? Why do you think so?

Violence against women – within the family
23. Do you think that violence against women within the family has increased after the tsunami? This includes physical, emotional/ psychological violence.
If yes, that is, violence has increased, why do you think this is so?
24. Do you think if violence is used against a woman that she must have done or said something to deserve it?

Violence against women – within the community
25. Do you think that violence against women within the community has increased after the tsunami? This includes physical, emotional/ psychological violence.
If yes, that is, violence has increased, why do you think this is so?
26. In your opinion where are women/girls most vulnerable to physical violence?
27. In your opinion at what age is a woman/girl more vulnerable to be a victim of violence?
28. In your opinion what marital status of a woman/girl makes them more vulnerable to be a victim of violence?
29. In your opinion what are the consequences of violence on:
   (a) Women and girl survivors of VAW
   (b) The families of survivors of VAW
   (c) The community
30. What are your coping strategies to combat violence against women
   (a) as individuals
   (b) as communities
31. What do you think the community could do to reduce people blaming women for what happened to them and to stop stigmatising women?
32. What support do you think is needed to assist women who experience violence against them?
33. If women are economically dependent on their husband/family, do you think this influences their response to what they can do when violence is used against them? Why?
34. What recommendations do you have for government, NGOs or other agencies to reduce violence against women?
Suggested questions for individual interviews
1. How old are you?
2. What is your marital status?
3. How many children do you have?
4. Who do you live with?
5. Where (in whose house) do you live?
6. Who supports the family financially? Who supports the children?
7. (a) Where do you think women/girls are most vulnerable to violence?
   (b) Why do you think women are most vulnerable in this place(s)?
8. Do you think that violence against women has increased after tsunami?
   If yes, why do you think this has happened? Are there any specific reasons for this?
9. Have you experienced any physical violence against you in the past two years?
10. By whom? (What is that person's relationship to you?)
11. Did it happen to you more than once?
12. What type of incidence was it? Why was s/he violent towards you?
13. Where on the body did s/he hurt you?
14. What (hand, knife, stick, cane, etc) did s/he use to hurt you?
15. Where (place) did it happen?
16. How did you feel? What did you do? Did you talk to anyone about this? Why/not?
17. Do you know that it is never acceptable or right for someone to use physical violence against you – no matter what you do or say? The use of physical force by a man against a woman can never be justified.
   What is your opinion about this? Do you agree?
18. How did/do you cope?
19. Have you ever been forced into sex without your consent - outside marriage?
20. By whom? (What is that person's relationship to you?)
21. How did you feel? What happened to you afterwards?
22. What did you do? Did you seek help or support? From whom?
23. Did you report it to the police or other authorities? Can you explain why/not?
24. Do you ever feel threatened in your physical relationship with your husband?
25. What did you do? Have you been able to talk to your husband about this?
26. Have you been able to talk to anyone about this? How do you cope?
27. Does your husband discuss things with you and listen to you? Do you feel that your husband treats you with dignity and honour?
28. If you have been emotionally hurt, what type of incidence hurt you most?
29. Have you ever been belittled or degraded in front of others or when you were alone by anyone?
30. Who was that person? (Mention the relationship) Why do you think s/he did this?
31. Have you ever been harassed by anyone (in public or private)?
32. Who was it (mention relationship)? Why do you think s/he did this?
33. What coping strategies have you used when violence was used against you? (How did you face what happened to you?)
34. Are you economically dependent on your husband/family? Do you think this influences your response to what you can do when violence is used against you? Why?
35. Does the community have any strategies to respond to incidents of violence against women?
36. What do you think the community could do to reduce people blaming women for what happened to them and to stop stigmatizing women?
37. What support do you think is needed to assist women who experience violence against them?
38. What do you recommend to government, NGOs or other agencies to stop violence against women?
Appendix 2 Details of the sample & approach

The criteria for location included both a) tsunami-affected communities where alliance members were working so that the first step taken through community discussions could be followed up through supporting women’s ideas for organising and community action; and b) presence of different social groups, geographical spread and displacement.

In Sri Lanka consultations were conducted in three districts in both the south and east of the island. These included Tamil, Sinhalese and Muslim women. In 20 village areas in the east 1,200 women were consulted in 240 focus groups and 717 women were interviewed individually. In the south a total of 2,633 women were consulted in 128 focus groups and a further 525 individual interviews were held. In India the community discussions were carried out in 99 villages in the three states of Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala, and from the union territories of Pondicherry and Andaman Islands. This comprised 61 villages in seven districts of Tamil Nadu, 20 villages in two districts in Andhra Pradesh, nine villages in three districts in Kerala and nine villages in Andaman Island. Discussions and interviews were conducted with a total of 232 women from nine islands in Raa and Lamu atolls in the Maldives. In Thailand women were consulted in two villages and in Puntland in six villages in two districts. The sample of tsunami-affected women involved in the consultations upon which this report is based is not representative. However, women’s views across the five countries indicate some clear trends and common issues.

Essentially, the community-level process aimed to achieve a number of things simultaneously:

- inform women of their rights and facilitate community-level discussions to stimulate analysis and reflection among women and lead to organisation and action at the community level to protect women against violence;
- generate the information and evidence needed to effectively influence policy and practices at all levels – community, district/atoll, national and international;
- information on women’s rights was disseminated in local languages through posters, street theatre, booklets, radio, song, legal awareness camps and signature campaigns.

In each country the people who facilitated the community consultations (group discussions and interviews) were trained by members of the alliance. The information collected from the discussions/interviews was later collated and analysed by a core group and the country level people’s report compiled. This was then presented back to the alliance for discussion and comment.

In each country sampling was purposive to include married, single, widowed and divorced women across the age range, as well as women from poor and socially excluded communities and different ethnic groups. In Thailand, due to time constraints only Moken and Burmese migrant women were consulted. They were also among the most vulnerable tsunami-affected populations in Thailand as they do not have Thai citizenship and consequently they faced discrimination in the relief and recovery process. Women were primarily engaged through focus group discussions with a smaller number of women being interviewed, mostly randomly selected from among the focus group members. Given that discussing violence in the family is very sensitive in each of the five countries, questions relating to personal experience were discussed in 1,372 individual interviews.
## Appendix 3 List of organisations endorsing this charter

### India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of Organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Person endorsing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Pondicherry Multipurpose Social Service Society (PMSSS)</td>
<td>Pondicherry</td>
<td>Ratchkanathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Best of Depressed (BEST)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lenin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Association for Sarva Seva Farms (ASSEFA)</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Prabakaran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Swayam Shikshan Prayog (SSP)</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Ab lincon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Life Help Centre for Rural Rehabilitation and Development</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>League for Education and Development (LEAD)</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Devenesan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Adventist Development and Relief Agency - India (ADRA India)</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Sachivalan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Rural Education and Action for Liberation (REAL)</td>
<td>Pondicherry</td>
<td>Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Bless - Livelihood Advancement Centre (BLESS)</td>
<td>Arun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>India - Global Social Service Society (IGSSS)</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Antony Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Rural Education and Action Development (READ)</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Vaidhyananathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>MANUSHI</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Rita Raj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Centre for Social Service and Research (CSSR)</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Lakshmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Tsunami Legal Action Committee (TLAC)</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Sheeba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Church’s Auxiliary for Social Action (CASA)</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Paul Lutur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Gandhi Rural Education and Research (GRES)</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Kumar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Integrated Women Development Institute (IWDA)</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Paul Danirl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Mother Nal Thondu Niruvanan (MNTN)</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Rajendran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Jivica - SNS Foundation</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Lijo Thomose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Centre for Community Organisation and Development (CECODE)</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Selvaraj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>BLISS - A Ruralisation Movement</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Antony Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>MOTHER Trust</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Raja Latha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Puduyugam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Selvanathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Organisation For Ezham Refugee Rehabilitation (OFERR)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Damayendran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Social Awareness Society for Youths (SASY)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shanthi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Alternative for India Development (AID)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Krishna Mohan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Tamil Nadu Women’s Forum (TNWF)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vinila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Society for Education and Development (SRED)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fatima Burnad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Dalit Women’s Movement (DWM)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Magimai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Women’s Collective (WC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheelu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Gandhian Unit for Integrated Development and Education (GUIDE)</td>
<td>Kanchipurm</td>
<td>Vasantha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>EKTA</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Bimla Chandrasekhae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Siga Community Service Guild (SIGA)</td>
<td>Thiruvallur</td>
<td>Valli Gopal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Arunodhaya Centre for Street and Working Children (Arunodhaya)</td>
<td>Thiruvallur</td>
<td>Virgil D’samy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>SANGAMAM</td>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>Hilda Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Social Need Education and Community Awareness (SNEHA)</td>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>Jesurathinam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Community Organisation Development Trust C-DOT</td>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>Rajendran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Upliftment of Downtrodden and Village Improvement Society (UDAVI)</td>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>Kedarnath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Irula Tribal Women’s Welfare Society (ITTWI)</td>
<td>Kanchipuram</td>
<td>Krishanand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Village Education Service Association (VESAI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sundar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>PRAXIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alex Tuscano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Trust for Rural Uplift and Education (TRUE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Napeolean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Annai Teresa Welfare Trust (ATWT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeeyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Integrated Rural Workers Organisation (IRWO)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chandran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Jeevajothi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr.Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Pazaverkadu Action Network (PAN)</td>
<td>Thiruvallur</td>
<td>Ammmerkhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>ActionAid International, India</td>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>Amar Jyothi Nayak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>National Alliance of Women’s Organizations (NAWO)</td>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>Annadurai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Tamil Nadu Menavar Peravai</td>
<td></td>
<td>N. Subrayan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Head load women</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Jothi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Center for Rural Education and Economic Development (CREED)</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Nadasanabhapathi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>United Lutheran Evangelical Churches of India (ULECI)</td>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>Nirmala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Cuddalore Resource Centre (CRC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arivazagi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Teera Desa Mahla Vedi (TDMV)</td>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>Magline Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Bharathi Trust</td>
<td>Chengulpet</td>
<td>Sidhthma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Cheshire Home</td>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>Murali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Women’s Education And Economic Development Trust (WEED)</td>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>Renuga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Association For Rural Development (ARD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Basheer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name of Organisation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Person endorsing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Fishermen Youth Welfare Association (FYWA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shanker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>VIKASA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Cultural Association for Mass Education and Liberation (CAMEL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Society for Integrated Rural Development (SFIRD)</td>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>Ravipradeep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Tamil Nadu Resource Team (TNRT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Society for National Integration and Rural Development (SNIRD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jawahar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Visihta Gramodaya Swamyam Sadhanan Parishad (SADHANA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>SK Ismail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Dalit Women Development Sangam (DWDS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Komala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>SEVAPRIYA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vedavalli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Society for Women (SWORD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ramalakssmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>People’s Development Center (PDC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pramila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>BEIMSENA</td>
<td>Pondicherry</td>
<td>Murthi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Kadalora Pengal Padukappu I Yakkam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Matsyaganthi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Sirunalai Ever Green Multipurpose Community Development Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>Viswasam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Rural Integration for Community Education (RICE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rajaram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Animation, Development, Employment and Communication Network</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Lalitha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Maldives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of Organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Person endorsing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Society for Women against Drugs</td>
<td>Male’</td>
<td>Fathmath Afiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Henveiru Women’s Development Committee</td>
<td>Male’</td>
<td>Vaseema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Care Society</td>
<td>Male’</td>
<td>Fathmath Afiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Jamhiyyathu-saif</td>
<td>Raa/Unugoofoaru</td>
<td>Abdullah Rasheed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Kendhoo Zuvaanunge Gulhun</td>
<td>Baa/Kendhoo</td>
<td>Ahmed Yoosuf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Goidhoo Zuvaanunge Jamiiya</td>
<td>Baa/Goidhoo</td>
<td>Ilyas Ibrahim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Maamendhoo Island Development &amp; Youth Awareness Assoc.</td>
<td>Gaaf Alif/</td>
<td>Amir Abdul Kareem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Dharavandhoo Islanders Society</td>
<td>Baa/</td>
<td>Mohamed Nasih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Foundation of Eydhafushi Youth Linkage (FEYLI)</td>
<td>Baa/Eydhafushi</td>
<td>Ibrahim Mohamed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Women’s Development Committee</td>
<td>Laamu/</td>
<td>Mariyam Rasheedha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Nilandhoo Island Development Society</td>
<td>Dhanbidhoo</td>
<td>Mohamed Adil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Laamu Maabaidhoo Isdharivarunge Gulhun</td>
<td>Gaaf Alif/</td>
<td>Mohamed Shafeeq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Hulhudhuffaaru Zuvaanunge Rooh</td>
<td>Maabaidhoo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sri Lanka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of Organisation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Person endorsing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Help–O</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>T. M. Ayoma Tennakoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>DEIHERM</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>Neshad Mandalawatte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Access for All</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>N.K. Samarakisinghe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Rural women’s Front</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>Siriyan Pathirage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Tsunami Women’s Welfare Society</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>D.C Nayomi Madhigeethika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Katugoda Muslim Welfare Association</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>M.S. Rifaay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Women’s Centre</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>Kanchana Abeysekera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Saviya Foundation</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>Vinitha Violet subsasinghe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Sarvodaya Society</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>Ramanie Perera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>Premawathie de Silva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Sanasa</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>Samanthi Mangalika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Lakmina Women’s Society</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>G.M. Anitha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Diriyata Saviyak</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>N. Princy Ramya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Lakmina Women’s Society</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>K.D. Daya Somasiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Arthacharya Foundation</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>A.H. Malithi Samanthika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Human Rights Society</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>D. G. Hemachandra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Ekamuthu Women’s Cooperative Foundation</td>
<td>Eppala</td>
<td>Ariyawathe Gamage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Praja Shakti Foundation</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>Yamuna Nanayakkara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Tsunami Affected Women’s Organisation</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>S. W. Indrani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Diriyata Saviyak</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>M.O.N. Romlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>W. S. Emalina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23 " Chandra Bandara
24 " G. S. Piyaseeli
25 " M. Yasmin
26 " M.B.U. Haleema
27 " M.R.F. Aruba
28 " M.S. Fasiha
29 " M.B.U. Wohfiya
30 " M.N.F. Nifaya
31 " M.K.F. Nusha
32 " M. F. Fhasmina
33 " Simiya Nugam
34 " F. Khamila
35 " Farjana Farvin
36 " N. Kareema
37 " Rashiba
38 " Shihama Mubarak
39 " Shiha Hamsa
40 " Koshala Vinodini Perera
41 " H. L. Padumawathie
42 " W. Chitri
43 " M.G. Dayawathie
44 " W.M. Nimalawathie
45 " R. S. Gnanawathie
46 " K.T. Dulcy
47 " P.N. Rohini
48 " W. Mallika
49 " B.G. Nirmani
50 " B. S. Siriyawathie
51 " Champa Seelawathie
52 " N.S. Renuka
53 " G. Priyanthi
54 " Nufuha Mohamed
55 " Sithi Hifa
56 " M.M.F Munawara
57 " K.P. Dilrukshi
58 " V.H. Achala Damayanti
59 " W.C.N. Dherasekera
60 " J. Pathmi
61 " K. G. Priyanthi
62 " K. D. Pramila Perera
63 " Madanisa Sithi
65 " Maraliya Sithi
66 " S. Farina
67 " Siththi Fathuma
68 " B.H. Kusumawathie
69 " B.A. Anoma Janaki
70 " H.L. Rani
71 " Fathima Jifriya
72 " F. Nihara
73 " F. Subaya
74 " H.U. Kadeesja
75 " Fathuma Lafriya
76 " L.H. Hinni Nona
77 " S.G. Roshani
78 " P.L. Dulcy Ratnasekara
79 " P.L.s. Ratnasekea
80 " Indrani Hewawitharan
81 " Leela Ratnasekara
82 " Dili Gunasekara
83 " Champika Perera
84 " Samagi Seva Foundation  Galle  S.H.P. Dhanushika
85 " NESEC Foundation  Hikkaduwa  S.L.I. Jayalath
86 " Sumagi Friends Forum  Opatha  C. Amarage
87 " Rural Development Society  Manampita  Iranganie Thrimavithana
88 " Ruhuna Handa Development Forum  Galle  -
89 " Sri Eksath Welfare Society  Hikkaduwa  W. Gamini Sirisena
90 " Dam Piyasa Women’s Organisation  Ahangama  Subhani Ranga  K. Pathirana
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Jayavi Crew</td>
<td>Galle</td>
<td>Manusha Nanayakkara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Purnaseva Women's Society</td>
<td>Unawatuna</td>
<td>A.T.H. Kanthi Gunatunge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Liya Saviya</td>
<td>Unawatuna</td>
<td>D. Devika Priyadarshani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Ekamuthu Women's Society</td>
<td>Yaddehimulla</td>
<td>B. Kanthi Perera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Swarnaseva Women's Society</td>
<td>Unawatuna</td>
<td>Reethika Amaradasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Parami Seva Women's Society</td>
<td>Ganahena</td>
<td>H. K. Thulsi Nandanie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Sri Saddharmadana Seva Society</td>
<td>Peelagoda</td>
<td>K.H. Monika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Mettha Welfare Society</td>
<td>Peelagoda</td>
<td>A. Chandrakanthi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Vimukthi Women's Society</td>
<td>Andayamwatta</td>
<td>G.W. Thaksala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Dilena Tharu Women's Society</td>
<td>Ganahena</td>
<td>H.G.A Nilmini Kumar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Rural Development Society</td>
<td>Ganahena</td>
<td>M. D. Samanmali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Walawe Kantha Maha Sangamaya</td>
<td>Hambantota</td>
<td>G. Hettiarachchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H. B. Bhagya Jayamali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Y. Jayan</td>
</tr>
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<td>K. P. Samantha Priyadarshana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>I. H. Rusuru Chinthaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>T. M. N. Achini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>M. G. G. Inoka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Subhashini Andrahennadi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Rasika Jayasuriya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>W. G. Suresh Jayalal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>Iranganie Chandrasekera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>P. P. Nilantha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>J. H. Nilan Anuruddha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>H. W. O. K. Sandya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>M. K. Lakshini Jeevanthi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Lasith Abeyweera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>W. K. Siranga Kumar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>K. H. Gayani Dinesha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Lakshmi Samaranayake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>W. Nirosaha Kumari</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>D. B. Evanji Chathurika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>L. G. Rangana Nimali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>J. A. Jeewani Raniga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>P. W. Anura Priyantha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>M. R. G. Mallika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>E. P. Piyadasa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>Sinhala Tamil Women’s Network</td>
<td>Kantale Nadeesha Ramanayaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Shakti Organisation</td>
<td>Kantale M.A.C.R.Mallawarachi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>Eastern Women’s United Organization</td>
<td>Kantale R.G.Podimanike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>Foundation for Co-Existence</td>
<td>Trincomalee Sharmila Suntharalingam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>J.S.H.James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>R.Jeyapdeen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>T.Vasanthakumar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>T.Ravikumar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>H.Jeyakumar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>G.B.Sabeshan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Women in Need</td>
<td>Colombo Savithri Wijesekare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>ActionAid International</td>
<td>Colombo Bijay Kumar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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