

Poverty Briefs



Urban Poverty in Sri Lanka - 2013

Briefing Paper Series

No 14 – 2014

cepa
centre for poverty analysis

Urban Poverty In Sri Lanka - 2013

Ishara Rathnayake

**a revision of *Urban Poverty in Sri Lanka*
by Neranjana Gunatilleke and Azra Abdul Cader**

A Centre for Poverty Analysis (CEPA) Publication

Briefing Paper Series

No 14 – 2014

© Centre for Poverty Analysis 2014

The Poverty Briefs are part of the CEPA Briefing Paper Series, which aim to disseminate information in a timely and quick manner on issues which CEPA has generated information.

The Briefing Paper Series contain three categories:

- 1) **Poverty Briefs** : these are aimed at a specialist as a well non-specialist audience and are written in an informal and informative style.
- 2) **Policy Briefs** : these have a clear policy orientation and are aimed at policy makers in government, non-government, research and donor organisations that work on poverty and development issues.
- 3) **Thematic Briefs** : CEPA pursues an independent research agenda based on five thematic areas of focus – Migration, Post-war Development, Environment and Poverty, Vulnerability and Infrastructure. The Thematic Briefs cover any issues within these five thematic areas of research that deal with poverty and development in Sri Lanka.

Rathnayake, Ishara

Urban poverty in Sri Lanka - 2013 / Ishara Rathnayake .- Colombo :
Centre for Poverty Analysis , 2014

12 p. : 22cm. .- (Briefing paper series ; No. 14)

ISBN 978-955-1040-79-6

i. 362.5095493 DDC 23

ii. Title

iii. Series

1. Poverty -research - Sri Lanka
2. Urban poverty - Sri Lanka

Foreword

The Centre for Poverty Analysis first published *Urban Poverty in Sri Lanka* in 2004. The brief written by Neranjana Gunetilleke and Azra Abdul Cader presented an overview of urban poverty in Sri Lanka with a special focus on the city of Colombo.

In 2013, CEPA felt the need for a more current and updated version of the brief and the *Overview of Poverty in Sri Lanka – 2013* was written by Ishara Rathnayake.

The brief focuses on urban poverty in Sri Lanka with a special focus on the Colombo Metropolitan Area where urban poverty is most prevalent. It looks at the reactions to addressing urban poverty, challenges faced and highlights critical institutional and policy issues which affect attempts at addressing the problem.

Ishara is grateful to Romeshun Kulasabanathan and Geetha Mayadunne of the Poverty Assessment and Measurement Programme at CEPA for their input. She also thanks Mr. H M U Chularatne of Sevanatha and Eng. (Ms). Thamara Mallawaarachchi of the Colombo Municipal Council (CMC) for their assistance.

CEPA is grateful to the Think Tank Initiative for providing the funding to print this brief and for funding the Sinhala and Tamil translations.

The views and opinions expressed in this brief are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the Centre for Poverty Analysis.

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. The Context of Urban Poverty	1
2.1 The urban sector in Sri Lanka	1
2.2 Poverty in the urban sector	2
2.3 Poverty in Colombo city	2
2.4 Dimensions and dynamics of urban poverty in Colombo	3
2.5 Relative and absolute space	4
3. Reacting to Urban Poverty in Colombo	6
4. Challenges to Addressing Urban Poverty	10
4.1 Institutional landscape	10
4.2 Policy framework	12
4.3 Shifting towards expanding the knowledge base on urban poverty	13
5. Identifying Priority Areas that have Potential for Immediate Intervention	14
References/Further Reading	16

1. Introduction

This Poverty Brief will present an overview of the situation in relation to urban poverty with a special focus on the Colombo Metropolitan Area where urban poverty is most prevalent. The brief will look at the context of poverty in the Colombo Metropolitan Area, reactions to addressing urban poverty, challenges faced and highlight critical institutional and policy issues which affect attempts at addressing the problem. Finally, the brief will identify priority areas for immediate interventions.

Although the existence of rural and estate sector poverty has been acknowledged and discussed extensively since independence, poverty in the urban sector has been relatively neglected due to lack of awareness. Correspondingly, the knowledge base as well as policy formulation and interventions were heavily biased towards the rural and estate sectors. However, over the last three decades, urban poverty has gained a certain degree of prominence with the gradual acknowledgement of its specific nature and the establishment of institutions with an urban focus. Hence, the addressing of urban poverty issues has increasingly come to the forefront of policy and programme interventions.

2. The Context of Urban Poverty

2.1 The urban sector in Sri Lanka

In contrast to many developing economies, and especially those of South Asia, Sri Lanka reports relatively low rates of urbanisation. According to the Department of Census and Statistics (DCS) of 2001, the resident population in the Colombo Municipal Council (CMC) area was 647,100 and the total urban population of Sri Lanka was estimated at 2.97 million in 2000. That decreased to 2.92 million in 2010, keeping the urban population at 14% of the total population of Sri Lanka (http://www.indexmundi.com/sri_lanka/).

The above estimations are based on the current definition of 'urban sector' as areas governed by either Municipal or Urban Council. However, as the suburban sprawl around the city of Colombo expands, it brings into doubt the relevance of this definition, which is based on the administrative boundaries¹ rather than criteria based on built environment and socio-

¹ The Department of Census and Statistics defines urban sector as 'areas governed by either Municipal or Urban Council.' Definition of the estate sector is 'plantation areas which have more than 20 acres and having more than 10 residential labourers with single administration body' and rural sector is 'residential areas which do

economic structures. In the early 1980s, the urban growth rate of major cities, including Colombo, was below 1%. Yet since the mid 1980s, Colombo has experienced a rapid growth of its wider suburban areas, with the District experiencing a population growth of 20% between 1981 and 1992 and the urban population rising to over 60%, substantially higher than other districts which had a population growth rate of below 15%.

2.2 Poverty in the urban sector

Looking at urban poverty from a national point of view provides a very favourable picture. The urban sector has the lowest rates of poverty in Sri Lanka, with only 5.3% of the population (approximately 1 million) falling below the poverty line. This is significantly lower than the national rate of 8.9%².

In the conventional national definitions of poverty, the critical variables considered are the expenditure on food and non-food items. According to the DCS (2004), the official poverty line of Sri Lanka is expressed in terms of calorie intakes and is defined at the per-capita expenditure for a person to be able to meet the nutritional anchor of 2030 kilocalories. According to the latest data available³ the average per month expenditure of an urban household on food and drink is Rs. 16,003⁴ and it is about 36% of the total expenditure while the national average was at 42%. However, the dietary energy intakes of the urban poor and generally in the Colombo district are lower compared to the other districts (DCS, 2011). Income inequality in the urban sector also shows a similar picture. Gini coefficient of the mean household income in the urban sector is 0.48 and it is below the national average of 0.49. The figure indicates that income disparity among urban households is relatively lower. The figures suggest that the urban sector performs well compared to the national averages in terms of poverty and inequality.

2.3 Poverty in Colombo city

However, while it is accepted that in comparison to the rural and estate

not belong to urban or estate sectors'

² *Household Income and Expenditure Survey – 2009/10*, Final Report, Department of Census and Statistics, Sri Lanka

³ *Household Income and Expenditure Survey 2009/10*, Final Report, Department of Census and Statistics, Sri Lanka.

⁴ This figure refers to all urban households and is not disaggregated according to income groups.

sector the urban sector has relatively lower levels of deprivation, it must be emphasised that the high urban average on food expenditure is a reflection of the commoditisation of the urban sector, i.e. money is the primary variable in all aspects of livelihood. These figures have to be seen in the light of the fact that urban poverty in Colombo, as is the case frequently in developing economies, is characterised by households which have incomes that are above the national poverty line (not categorised as poor), but live in very poor quality housing, and in crowded, unsanitary and insecure conditions with a severe lack of infrastructure and access to basic services. Hence, a significant feature of urban poverty that needs to be stressed is that while low income is at the core of deprivation, even households with significant incomes may not have access to basic services, and a sanitary and secure living environment.

Most of the urban poor in Colombo live in slum and shanty settlements termed Under Served Settlements (USS). There are currently 1735 low income⁵ settlements within the Colombo Municipal limits within which approximately 50% of Colombo's population lives (Sevanatha, 2012). USS comprises areas within Colombo city that have a concentration of residential units built on state or private land and are not always owned by residents. While these residential areas have the common features of having a very high population density (approximately 820 persons per ha⁶ or four times the average of the city of Colombo) and congested housing (with each block averaging 1.5 perches), it is the chronic condition of the services and infrastructure available to the residents that give them their name.

2.4 Dimensions and dynamics of urban poverty in Colombo

The static picture of the nature of urban poverty and the interlinked issue of the dynamics of change is of interest for those who work to address poverty issues. The salient factors that impact poverty at the community and household level can be summarised as follows⁷:

⁵ Among the settlements, 1626 settlements are categorised under upgraded and fully upgraded categories. This indicates that the households in these settlements have improved their economic situation and hence have been able to improve the physical conditions of the houses with access to basic services such as water and electricity.

⁶ Calculated based on 2001 Census and existing data on USS land area and proportion of Colombo's population living within the USS.

⁷ This section is based on *Understanding the Dimensions and Dynamics of Poverty in Underserved Settlements in Colombo*, a study conducted by CEPA for CMC/PRIMUSS.

In terms of livelihood patterns, foreign employment, self-employment and enterprise, informal sector activities and low level formal sector employment in establishments such as the port, industries, the railway, city markets, the municipality etc. are dominant forms of livelihoods of the people with higher wellbeing, while semi-skilled wage labour is the most common form of livelihood among poor households.

A distinct feature of higher wellbeing households is the tendency for women to choose to stay at home as a result of an adequate household income while women of poor households engage in more labour intensive forms of livelihood such as domestic work and unskilled manual labour on construction sites.

2.5 Relative and absolute space

The location of the settlement relative to its surrounding and space within the settlement and household are determinants of community and households well-being. The central location of settlements is a key positive feature, as residents irrespective of their level of well-being, are well placed to access a wide range of services and facilities such as health services, educational and transport facilities, as well as good access to wage labour and other sources of employment that facilitates self-employment and enterprise. In contrast, the constrained space within the settlements, reflected by the size of housing units and lack of public space, is considered the critical negative feature of the USS. At the community level, the lack of space inhibits recreational activities and movement and exacerbates the spread of disease, while at the household level there is lack of space for social occasions (i.e. funerals, weddings) and undertaking home-based income-generation, as well as limited privacy. To move away from such conditions, residents often opt for migration to less congested areas, although this ability is influenced by affordability. Further, stigma and discrimination attached to the settlement names are concerns for both adults and especially for children. Admissions into higher quality schools are also hindered by the stigma that is attached to people living in these settlements (Gunetilleke and Abdul Cader, 2004).

The weakness in the availability of services and infrastructure is the defining variable for the USS. While economic dimensions form the core of poverty, access to services and infrastructure does not always correspond to income levels of the households. In terms of receiving specific services, the availability of domestic water sources, drainage of waste and surface water, toilets, electricity and roads can be identified as necessities for residents which are lacking. The dependence on public services is often higher amongst poorer settlements and the acute shortage that is created leads to inappropriate

and often illegal construction of toilets. This creates related problems of pipe blockages and sewerage overflows, diversion of sewerage systems into canals, which in turn create health related problems especially for children. Drainage issues come to the forefront because many of these settlements are situated on marginal land, such as marshes and canal reservations that are prone to flooding. The condition of roads leading to, as well as by lanes within the settlements are often in poor condition and this hinders access to and within the settlement.

Poor health conditions within the settlements are attributed to the proximity to stagnant canals, breeding grounds for mosquitoes which cause diseases such as filariasis. Furthermore, the congestion, high population density, and the close proximity of the housing structures, facilitate and accelerate the spread of the disease.

Abuse of drugs and alcohol can be considered as a factor that worsens the conditions of the urban poor. Addiction is often viewed as a main cause of low wellbeing for individuals and households. In addition they are more prone towards marital instability, crime and domestic violence. A livelihood assessment conducted for World Bank in 2012 (UNHABITAT *et al.*, 2012) in low income settlements in Colombo revealed that alcohol use by family members is a reason for insecurity within the household. The study also revealed that use of drugs and alcohol cause fear outside the house.

Housing and land rights are important elements of urban poverty. Over the years the improvement in housing conditions and an expansion of living space can be considered as a key milestone in improving the wellbeing of residents in the USS. This is in terms of an improvement in living conditions, increase in asset base, securing tenure (largely through building of permanent structures), and increased social status in terms of prestige and dignity. Furthermore, it has increased the ability of residents to acquire services, such as electrification, and provides opportunities for income generation, by renting out room/s or for home based activities.

Although there are numerous Community Based Organisations (CBOs) operating in the USS, the general level of CBO activity is low in most communities. Though CBOs provide a direct method of voicing residents' views and complaints to the authorities, informal, and formal networks can be considered to play a more significant role in improving the wellbeing of those in the USS. The stability of the settlement populations (as against constant migrations) and the long residence period can be considered as facilitators in developing and sustaining these networks.

3. Reacting to Urban Poverty in Colombo

The slow rate of reported urbanisation highlighted previously in this brief, and the pressing problems faced by the rural population meant that urban poverty was not considered a specialised priority area for state intervention until the 1970s. The slow rate of urbanisation, lower numbers of slums and shanty settlements located in the city were also reasons for the lack of government interventions on the livelihoods of the urban poor. As the growing problems of urban poverty came to be recognised gradually in the 1970s and 1980s, the predominant reaction by the state was in the area of housing development. This included policy and regulatory changes (e.g. Ceiling on Housing Property Law of 1973) and the establishment of state agencies (e.g. National Housing Development Authority, Common Amenities Board, etc.) for direct interventions where the state constructed housing for low-income families. In addition, there were schemes of cash handouts to the lowest income households by the Public Assistance Department of the Colombo Municipal Council (CMC). The Public Health Department of the CMC was also implementing programmes to improve the life of slum dwellers in the city. By the mid-1990s, however, urban poverty had gained acceptance as a special issue that warranted a holistic approach, which included housing, service delivery, health, education and skill-development, and community-development. Along with the greater awareness of the problem came the need to address these issues. While the city level macro plans – such as the Megapolis Plan of 2000, did not specifically take up the issue of urban poverty. The plan was to move the industries and warehouses away from the city to identified new locations and to develop the adjoining municipality of Sri Jayawardenapura Kotte as the administrative capital, a number of 'programmes' and 'projects' which targeted different aspects of deprivation were operated by different state agencies together with non-state actors such as funders, NGOs, CBOs and, at times, the conventional private sector (Gunetilleke and Abdul Cader, 2004).

The crucial shift in the orientation towards urban poverty came with the acceptance that the multiple and complex issues of deprivation faced by the USS had to be addressed irrespective of their non-conformation to the legal and regulatory requirements of the city. This was a major step for state agencies such as the CMC, which previously had little to do with USS on the basis that they were illegal entities within the city. While the CMC had a long history in providing services which were freely accessed by the lower-income citizens of Colombo (eg. preventive and curative health care, public recreational facilities, vocational training) they were not targeted towards the USS or the specific problems faced by them (Gunetilleke and Abdul Cader, 2004).

A programme, which could be seen as a watershed in the CMCs policy towards the USS, is the Members' Allocation that was put in place with the specific objective of facilitating the development of USS despite legal constraints. Since 1996 each of the 53 elected Members to the Municipal Council (MMC) has been allocated a fixed annual sum to be specifically spent on upgrading the living conditions of the USS (Gunetilleke and Abdul Cader, 2004). In 2013 the amount allocated was Rs. 3 million each, amounting to a total of Rs. 159 million per annum. The MMCs have a high degree of freedom in deciding on the allocation of these funds within the USS. In the past the highest level of spending has been on developing drainage and sewers followed by improving settlement level infrastructure (paving roads/lanes, street lighting etc.) and housing. While the Members' Allocation has enabled the CMC to invest in the development of the USS, the method used has meant that the system has become highly politicised and the level of planning and steering by the CMC has been undermined. Other programmes that specifically targeted the living conditions of the USS since the 1990s are listed in the table below (Gunetilleke and Abdul Cader, 2004).

Programme	Focus	Period	Partnership
Clean Settlement Programme	Onsite development and data collection	1994-1998	Ministry of Housing and Urban Development (MHUD), World Bank
Presidential Task Force on Urban Development and Housing/ Real Estate Exchange (Pvt.) Ltd. (REEL),	Development of commercial land through re-location to high density housing schemes	1994-	Government of Sri Lanka (GOSL), private company with urban agencies as share holders
Sustainable Townships Programme	Relocation through trading of owned land	2000-2001	United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS)
Participatory Improvement of Underserved Settlements in Colombo (PRIMUSS)	Water and sanitation, community strengthening	2002-2005	Colombo Municipal Council (CMC), German Technical Cooperation (GTZ), Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)
Poverty Reduction Programme	Economic development of USS, on site upgrading, community strengthening	2001-2003	CMC, UNCHS, Department for International Development (DFID)
Urban Basic Services Programme	Provision of common facilities in USS – toilets, taps, bathrooms in the Colombo district (city and greater Colombo)	1979-1993	United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), CMC, National Housing Development Authority (NHDA)

Programme	Focus	Period	Partnership
Healthy City Programme	Awareness raising for residents	2001-2004	World Health Organisation (WHO)
Local Area Sustainable Development Observatory (LASDO)	Digitalised mapping for pro-poor urban planning	2001-2003	CMC, European Commission (EC), Cities of Paris and Madrid, Asia Urbs
Focus City Action Research Project: Colombo City	Strengthen the capacity of people to better access urban basic services, reduce environmental pollution and vulnerability to natural disasters	2006-2010	CMC, Centre for Poverty Analysis (CEPA), International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Sevanatha
Colombo Community Empowerment Project	Empower the communities in the city of Colombo with knowledge and skills to actively engage with the CMC and other relevant governmental and non governmental institutions to improve livelihoods and the living environment in USS.	2011-2015	CMC, Sevanatha, DFID/UK

Source: Gunetilleke and Abdul Cader, 2004, & Website of the Colombo Municipal Council (CMC), accessed March 2014. http://www.cmc.lk/index.php?option=com_content&view=archive&Itemid=80

In addition, NGOs and other private organisations along with the government were involved in varying capacities and areas on different aspects of poverty to support interventions including access to safe drinking water, sanitation and drainage in the urban sector. CEPA (2010), with support from Environmental Cooperation-Asia (ECO-Asia) conducted a comparative assessment of the five different water service delivery models that have been put in place in Sri Lanka to provide knowledge about performance of different models and to design appropriate, effective and efficient water service projects for the urban poor. The assessment was conducted using five questions; relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The conclusions were that

each model contained its own advantages and disadvantages with respect to the above mentioned aspects and models have potential to improve access to water for urban poor communities while also reducing the non revenue water component.

Another study conducted by CEPA (2009) to understand the demand for water services among the urban poor to enable the design of pro-poor water services revealed that there are many existing programmes which are successfully providing pro-poor water connections and any programme to provide pro-poor water services also needs to address how the household will be provided adequate drainage and where applicable, sewerage connections.

Another recent livelihood assessment was conducted (UNHABITAT, CEPA et al., 2012) on flood-prone low income settlements in urban Colombo in order to enhance the understanding of the livelihoods and vulnerabilities of flood-prone USSs and to develop a framework for ranking them based on communities' livelihoods patterns. One of the interesting findings was that 76 percent of the surveyed communities are affected by floods and the surveyed communities have poor toilet facilities which overflow during the rainy season because of either poor or lack of sewerage connections.

4. Challenges to Addressing Urban Poverty

As urban poverty comes to be recognised as a specific subject area in need of targeted interventions, the challenges it faces can be seen to arise from three major sources;

- i. Complexities of the institutional landscape,
- ii. Weakness in the policy framework,
- iii. Limited knowledge about poverty and its effects.

4.1 Institutional landscape

Improving the living conditions of the urban poor through the development of USS involves a range of city specific and national institutions, which are responsible for the regulatory framework, service delivery, provision of infrastructure and facilities. The CMC, which has the longest history within the city, is the governing body of Colombo and the primary regulatory and service provision institution. As such, it has wide ranging planning and implementation functions within the city.

However, a number of institutions have been set up since the late 1970s to address specific issues. The Urban Development Authority (UDA) was set up to carry out planning and development activities – with special emphasis on land use policy - in all urban areas of Sri Lanka including Colombo. The Common Amenities Board (CAB) was established to construct and maintain services in low-income settlements in Colombo. The National Housing Development Authority (NHDA) provides housing loans, regulates housing ownership on land purchased by the authority. With the establishment of Real Estate Exchange Limited (REEL), the construction of high-rise apartments took over some of the development functions of the NHDA. Nation-wide service providers such as the Ceylon Electricity Board (CEB) and the National Water Supply and Drainage Board (NWSDB) operate within the USS too. Community Development Councils (CDC) were established in the 1980s to organise and mobilise the community to get involved in the decision making and implementation activities of projects in order to improve the living standards of USS in collaboration with the CMC and other institutions. The main focus of the CDC was on improving housing and implementation of services and infrastructure projects. The Urban Settlement Development Authority (USDA) was established in 2008 under the then Ministry of Urban Development and Sacred Area Development with the objectives of formulating national policy in relation to urban settlement development and ensuring implementation of such policy along with provision of improvements to the living conditions of persons in underserved settlements. The USDA is now functioning under the Ministry of Construction, Engineering Services, Housing and Common Amenities. The Ministry of Defence and Urban Development is also involved in upgrading the living conditions of the USS as well as beautification of the city of Colombo apart from flood control and road improvement. The UDA is also involved in building houses for the resettlement of shanty dwellers living in under-served settlements in the City of Colombo.

While the institutions mentioned above are the key players in the sector, there is a range of other institutions with special functions and regulatory mandates. There are inefficiencies because multiple institutions have overlapping mandates and overlapping areas of responsibility. The situation is aggravated when institutions have contradictory mandates. For example, provision of services to settlements automatically upgrades them and creates greater stability and a sense of ownership, which is in contrast to the policy of re-location. Hence, the NWSDB's programme to convert non-revenue water to revenue water by providing regularised household access to water was in direct contradiction to the attempts of relocation. The situation is made worse by the fact that the orientation of institutions is in a state of change as the focus on urban poverty increases. This is further complicated by the

fact that such changes in orientation are not followed by rapid changes in the legal status of these institutions. Hence, many pro-poor activities carried out by institutions such as the CMC are not within its strict legal mandate. State institutions frequently overcome these constraints by co-ordinating with non-government organisations, which are knowledgeable and active in the area of urban poverty alleviation.

There was a slight tension between the UDA and the CMC with regard to ownership in vesting some recreational parks situated in the prime lands in the Colombo city in the beautification process (Sunday Times, 2011). It is argued that this new development process in Colombo city lacks balance as it benefits a smaller proportion of the population. Furthermore, required public discussion and inspection of ongoing displacements and resettlement are also lacking, thus affecting the well-being of the displaced. (CEPA, 2013).

4.2 Policy framework

The issues faced in terms of institutional and legal framework are a reflection of the weak policy framework within which urban poverty issues are addressed in Sri Lanka. All attempts at planning the development of the city of Colombo has seen the city as a single unit where intervention was primarily in terms of spatial planning, systematising services and infrastructure for an expanding city and facilitating the economic growth of the city. This orientation is reflected in the Colombo Master Plan of 1978, City of Colombo Development Plan of 1985, Colombo Metropolitan Region Structure Plan of 1996, the Megapolis Plan of 2000 as well as the National Physical Plan 2011-2030. Considering it from the point of view of urban poverty, a significant shortcoming of these plans is that despite the gradual move towards acknowledging the complexities of urban poverty; housing and management of flood and drainage in low-lying areas continues to be considered as a special target group.

More recently an urban policy was introduced to convert Sri Lanka's urban vision into policy and action. According to the policy document Sri Lanka's Urban Vision is to "develop a system of competitive, environmentally sustainable, well-linked cities clustered in five metro regions and to provide every family with affordable and adequate urban shelter by 2020". The document also highlights that to address the issues it requires a multipronged strategy based on four pillars:

- Moving toward strategic and integrated national, regional, and urban planning.
- Ensuring sustainable financing and improvements of regional and urban infrastructure.
- Repositioning Urban Local Authorities (ULAs) as accountable service providers by developing new tools for performance based city management and finance.
- Promoting efficient and sustainable land and housing development for improved city liveability.

4.3 Shifting towards expanding knowledge base on urban poor

In Sri Lanka, the primary focus of poverty related knowledge building, policy making and critical evaluation has been the rural economies and societies. The urban poor in Sri Lanka have received little recognition as a special group which face dynamics and dimensions of poverty which are significantly different from the national – i.e. rural – norm.

Until the 1990s a cyclical relationship had developed between the lack of knowledge regarding the urban poor and the state limiting its poverty interventions to only very simple and basic interventions that sought to have an effect on household consumption and housing. However, as urban poverty received increasing attention from the state and other institutions, the lack of sufficient knowledge regarding the issues involved and potential solutions became a significant constraint to the optimum use of available resources and ensuring satisfactory outcomes. While gradually more studies are being conducted on the subject and databases developed⁸, there seems to be a strong feeling at the strategy and planning levels that decisions are taken, and programmes designed, with very little knowledge to back them up. Recently, in 2011, the UDA has carried out a survey of all the underserved settlements in Sri Lanka. Sevanatha with the partnership of the CMC updated the poverty profile report of Colombo in 2012 and also conducted a survey and an assessment of all the low income settlements in Colombo to identify priority settlements for further improvements.

⁸ Examples are: 1) Case studies of USS were carried out under the Clean Settlements Programme, 2) Data base and Poverty Profile City of Colombo; Urban Poverty Reduction through Community Empowerment, 2002.

5. Identifying Priority Areas which have Potential for Immediate Intervention

Despite the many constraints facing pro-poor interventions in Colombo, there are some factors that provide a very strong base for potentially successful interventions:

- Most USS in Colombo are very small in size. 74% of the settlements have less than 50 housing units and only 0.7% has more than 500 housing units. This allows external agencies to develop services with maximum community participation and minimum conflict.
- The population of the settlements are often third or fourth generation residents, hence, a very low level of in-migration is prevalent. Issues faced by in-migrations such as constantly expanding of the slums are not faced in Colombo.
- Rapid improvements have been made in the living conditions of the USS over the last three decades due to the residents' efforts and external interventions.

Hence, while it is difficult to address policy and legal issues which have an impact on institutions and macro planning, there are specific areas which can be addressed with potentially substantial impacts. These are:

- Strengthening the community based institutions: The Community Development Councils (CDCs) are best placed to facilitate sustainable and relevant improvements to the living conditions of the USS by co-operating with state and non-state agents. However, there is a need to strengthen its organisational capacities, leadership and negotiating skills, carry out team building, and improve the residents' ownership. It must be acknowledged that this is not an easy task as a number of projects have attempted 'mobilisation' and 'empowerment' interventions without significant success. However gradual change can be observed, and can be further developed if CDCs are recognised as partners to the state and non-state institutions rather than a means through which the CMC and other institutions operate within the USS. This would also need an expansion in the regulatory framework which currently governs the CDCs.
- Adolescence and children's issues: This is an area which needs urgent attention. The unstable social fabric creates an adverse environment especially for young children who are forced to grow up in child

unfriendly social and physical environments . Activities to strengthen the family unit and increase 'common areas' pre-schools, day care etc. should be undertaken along with the provision for broader educational opportunities, improving life skills, and security.

- Usage of services: Increasing civic consciousness/public education on use of available services and facilities (solid waste, toilets etc.)
- Skills development: Improving skills to get access to stable employment and or/higher paying wage labour/self employment.

References / Further Reading

CIA World Fact Book (2012), Sri Lanka Fact Book, Available online http://www.indexmundi.com/sri_lanka/

CEPA, 2009. *Survey on Willingness and Ability to Pay for Pro-Poor Household Water Connections*, Report submitted to Environmental Cooperation-Asia (Eco Asia) and USAID, Colombo: Centre for Poverty Analysis. Print.

CEPA, 2010. *Analysis of Pro-Poor Service Models for Urban Areas in Sri Lanka*, Final Report Submitted to Environmental Cooperation-Asia (Eco Asia), USAID, Centre for Poverty Analysis, Colombo

Collective for Economic Democratisation, 2014. "Towards a World-Class Colombo: Development without Democracy" in Gunasekara, V. & Alles, R. *You may say I'm a dreamer: Essays on reimagining development*. Colombo: Centre for Poverty Analysis. Chapter 3, pp 9-11. Print. Also published in *The Island* 16/06/2013. Available online at http://www.island.lk/index.php?page_cat=article-details&page=article-details&code_title=81464

Chularatne, H. M. U., 2000. *Land Tenure Issues and Improvement of Urban Low Income Settlements: Experiences of Colombo, Sri Lanka*, a paper presented at the Regional Workshop on Settlements of the Urban Poor: Challenges in the New Millennium, Colombo.

DFID/UNDP/UN-HABITAT/UMP, 2002. *Poverty Profile, City of Colombo: Urban Poverty Reduction through Community Empowerment*, Urban Poverty Reduction Project, Colombo:Sevanatha.

DCS, 2004. *Official Poverty Line for Sri Lanka*, Colombo: Department of Census and Statistics, Print

DCS, 2011. *Household Income and Expenditure Survey 2009/2010*, Colombo: Department of Census and Statistics. Print.

Gunatilleke, N., 2004. *Understanding the Dimensions and Dynamics of Poverty in Underserved Settlements in Colombo*, Working Paper No. 3. Colombo: Centre for Poverty Analysis/ Participatory Improvement of Underserved Settlements in Colombo (PRIMUSS)

Gunatilleke, N. & Abdul Cader, A., 2004 *Urban Poverty in Sri Lanka*, Poverty Brief 7, Colombo: Centre for Poverty Analysis. Print

Romeshun, K. & Mayadunne, G., 2011. *Appropriateness of the Sri Lanka poverty line for measuring urban poverty: the Case of Colombo*. Human Settlements Working Paper No. 35, London: International Institute for Environment and Development. Print.

Ministry of Urban Development and Sacred Area Development, 2009. *Urban Development*, Available online available at <http://www.urbanmin.gov.lk>.

Sevanatha, 2012. *Colombo Community Empowerment Project: Low Income Settlement Survey-2012*, Unpublished Data.

Fazlulhaq, N., 2011. *I'm not against beautification of Colombo, but it must be for all not some: Muzammil*, Article published in *The Sunday Times*, 23/10/2011, Available online at : http://www.sundaytimes.lk/111023/News/nws_31.html

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, World Bank, 2012. *Turning Sri Lanka's Urban Vision into Policy and Action*, Colombo: World Bank. Available online at: <http://www.unhabitat.lk/downloads/wburbanpolicy.pdf>

UN-HABITAT, CEPA & Sevanatha. 2012. "Livelihood Assessment of Flood-Prone Low-Income Settlements in the City of Colombo." Report prepared for the World Bank, Colombo.

Poverty Briefs

No. 1 Overview of Poverty in Sri Lanka

No. 2 Livelihoods and Poverty in Sri Lanka

No. 3 Poverty Reduction Strategy in Sri Lanka

No. 4 Dimensions of Conflict Outside the North and East of Sri Lanka

No. 5 Poverty and Youth Issues in Sri Lanka

No. 6 Poverty Issues in Southern Sri Lanka

No. 7 Urban Poverty in Sri Lanka

No. 8 Gender Dimensions of Poverty in Sri Lanka

No. 9 The Role of International Financial Institutions in Sri Lanka

No. 10 Poverty and Trade Issues in Sri Lanka

No. 11 Child Poverty in Sri Lanka

No. 12 Poverty and the challenge of the elderly

No. 13 Overview of Poverty in Sri Lanka – 2013

No. 14 Urban Poverty in Sri Lanka – 2013



Centre for Poverty Analysis

29 R G Senanayake Mawatha, Colombo 7, Sri Lanka

Tel: +94(011) 4690200, 2676955

Fax: +94(011) 2676959

Email: info@cepa.lk

Web: www.cepa.lk

